

important secondary literature is contained in the bibliographies of Udovitch and Saleh, they need not be listed here. Special mention must, however, be made of D. Santillana, *Istituzioni di diritto musulmano malichita con riguardo anche al sistema sciafito*, 2 vols., Rome 1925-38. (J.D. LATHAM)

MUFETTISH [see Supplement].

AL-MUFĪD, ABŪ ʿABD ALLĀH MUHAMMAD b. Muḥammad b. al-Nuʿmān al-Ḥārithī al-ʿUkbarī, Imāmī Shīʿī theologian and jurist, was born on 11 Dhū l-Ḳaʿda 336/23 May 948 (other dates mentioned, 333 and 338, seem less likely) in Suwaykat Ibn al-Baṣrī near ʿUkbarā.

His family was of Southern Arab descent of the Banu l-Ḥārith b. Kaʿb, and his father had been a teacher in Wasīt before moving to ʿUkbarā. After his father's profession, al-Mufīd was also known as Ibn al-Muʿallim. He came to Baghdād as a boy and already in Muḥarram 347/April 958 heard *ḥadīth* in the Mosque of al-Manṣūr. His teacher in *fiḥh* was Djaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. Kūlūya of Kumm (d. 369/979-80). In theology, his main teacher seems to have been Abu l'-Djaysh al-Muzaʿfar b. Muḥammad al-Balkhī al-Warrāk (d. 367/977-8). The statement of al-Nad̄jashī (308) that he first read with Tāhir, the *ghulām* of Abu l'-Djaysh, is probably to be understood as meaning that he studied as a boy with Abu l'-Djaysh's assistant before continuing with the master. Abu l'-Djaysh al-Balkhī is described in the Imāmī sources as a disciple of the Imāmī *mutakallim* Abū Sahl b. Nawbakht. Most likely he had earlier studied in his home town under Abu l'-Kāsim al-Balkhī al-Kaʿbī, the head of the Baghdād school of the Muʿtazila. It was evidently from him that al-Mufīd received his basic training in the Muʿtazilī doctrine of the Baghdād school and his acquaintance with the teaching of the Banū Nawbakht. A later report which describes him as a disciple of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Baṣrī and al-Rummānī, both representatives of the Baṣran Muʿtazilī school, is legendary and probably without foundation. He heard tradition from a large number of Shīʿī or pro-Shīʿī traditionists, among them Abū ʿUbayd Allāh al-Marzubānī (d. 384/994) and the *ḥafīẓ* Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. al-Djīʿābī (d. 355/966). The tradition of the Imāmī school of Kumm he received chiefly from Ibn Kūlūya, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Walīd al-Kummī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Dāwūd b. ʿAlī al-Kummī (d. 368/978-9), and Abū Djaʿfar b. Bābūya (d. 381/991-2), whom he heard presumably during his visits of Baghdād in 352/963 and 355/966. There is no evidence that al-Mufīd ever visited Kumm.

He soon became the leading theologian and spokesman of the Imāmiyya. Ibn al-Nadīm, writing in 377/987-8, describes him as such, and Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī characterises him in this period as a resourceful and persevering debater with a pleasant surface (*al-Imtāʿ wa l-muʿānasa*, ed. A. Amīn and A. al-Zayn, Cairo 1953, i, 141). He taught and held discussion sessions in his house and mosque in the Darb Riyāh in al-Karkh, and elsewhere engaged in debates with numerous scholars of opposing factions, among them the Ashʿarī al-Bākillānī and the Muʿtazilīs al-Rummānī and Kādī ʿAbd al-Djabbār.

Most of his writings, which numbered about two hundred, are known only by title. He wrote refutations of treatises and view of Muʿtazilīs like Djaʿfar b. Ḥarb, al-Djāhīz, Abū ʿAlī al-Djubbāʿī, Abū l'-Kāsim al-Balkhī, al-Wāsiṭī, Ibn al-Ikhshīd, Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Baṣrī, al-Rummānī, al-Khālīdī, al-Naṣīb(īn)ī, al-Ṣāhib b. ʿAbbād, ʿAbd al-Djabbār and Abū Rashīd (?); of Sunni traditionalist theologians like Ibn al-

Kullāb and al-Karābīsī; of Kurʿān experts like Kutrub and Ṭḥalab; of the Shīʿī followers of al-Hallāj; and of Imāmī scholars with whom he disagreed like Ibn Bābūya, Ibn ʿAwn al-Asadī, and Ibn Djunayd al-Iskāfī. The wide recognition of his authority among Imāmīs outside Baghdād is reflected in his written answers to questions sent to him from the communities in Khwārazm, Naysābūr, Djurdjān, Sāriya, Tabaristān, Ṣāghān, Dīnawar, Khūzistān, Fārs, al-Rakka, al-Ḥāʾir, and ʿUkbarā, besides answers to named individuals elsewhere. Despite his outspoken anti-Sunni polemics, his relations with the authorities were generally good. The Būyid ʿAḍud al-Dawla is said to have visited him often. Together with other prominent Imāmī leaders, he signed the document impugning the genealogy of the Fātimid caliphs drawn up at the order of the ʿAbbāsīd caliph al-Kādir in 402/1011-12. During riots between Sunnīs and Shīʿīs in Baghdād, he was three times, in 392/1002, 398/1008 and 409/1018, banished from the town, although he does not appear to have been involved in starting them. Each time the order was either revoked or he was soon allowed to return. Abū Manṣūr al-Ṭabrisī (al-Ṭabarī) quotes two letters which he is said to have received from the Hidden Imām in Ṣafar 410/June 1019 and Dhū l-Ḥijja 420/1022 (*al-Iḥtiḍāq*, Naḍjaf 1367-8/1966, ii, 318-25). Later sources mention a third letter. In one of them he is addressed with his honorific *laḡab* al-Shaykh al-Mufīd. Stories about how he first received this agnomen are legendary.

In theology, al-Mufīd rejected the cardinal Muʿtazilī position that the basic truths of religion can and must be discovered by reason alone, and he insisted that transmitted revelation (*samʿ*) is indispensable for reason to gain religious knowledge. In practice, he mostly adopted the doctrine of Abū l'-Kāsim al-Balkhī (d. 319/932), the head of the Baghdād Muʿtazilī school, as against the Baṣran Muʿtazilī doctrine prevalent in Baghdād in his time. He wrote a book on 'the agreement of the Baghdādīs of the Muʿtazila with what is related from the Imāms'. Excluded were subjects which touched on vital Imāmī dogma, the imāmate and related points. Against the Muʿtazilī affirmation of the unconditional punishment of the unrepentant sinner in the hereafter, he upheld the Imāmī belief in the effective intercession of the Prophet and the Imāms for the sinners of their community. He rejected the Muʿtazilī doctrine of the intermediate position of the grave sinner between believer and unbeliever [see AL-MANZILA BAYN AL-MANZILATAYN] as incompatible with Shīʿism and affirmed the Imāmī belief in *radīʿa*, the return of some of the dead to life at the time of the advent of the Mahdī. The Imāmī doctrine of *badʿ* [q.v.] he cautiously explained as identical in substance with the general Muslim notion of *naskh*, the abrogation of religious law, and the Muʿtazilī doctrine about God's changing man's life-span and sustenance in accordance with their actions. Concerning the Kurʿān, he held that there were neither substantial additions nor deletions in the ʿUṭmānic text, but that the enemies of ʿAlī had changed the arrangement of verses and suppressed the commentary contained in his codex. In agreement with earlier Imāmī theologians like Hishām b. al-Hakam, Abū Sahl b. Nawbakht and his teacher Abū l'-Djaysh, he rejected the materialist Muʿtazilī identification of man with the body, or part of it, and defined the essence of man as spirit and a simple substance (*djawhar basīṭ*).

In the religious law, al-Mufīd repudiated the use of *iḡtihād* and analogy (*kiyās*) and criticised his older con-

temporary Abū 'Alī Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. al-Djunayd al-Iskāfī, whom he met in Baghdād and from whom he related traditions, for advocating their employment. He was equally critical of the Imāmī traditionalist school of Kūmm, which he accused of accepting often contradictory single (*ahād*) traditions of the *Imāms* as a basis of the law. He held that single traditions were valid only if they could be supported by one of the sources of certain knowledge, reason, a Qur'ānic text, a widely transmitted (*mutawātir*) tradition, or the consensus of the Muslims or of the Imāmiyya. Many of the traditions which he transmitted to his disciple al-Tūsī were incorporated by the latter in his *K. Tahdhīb al-ahkām*, one of the canonical collections of Imāmī traditions. The first part of this book, written still in the lifetime of al-Mufīd, is a commentary on the latter's theological and legal compendium *al-Risāla al-muknī'a*. On the question of the length of the month of Ramaḍān, which was disputed at the time, al-Mufīd at first followed his teacher Ibn Kūlūya in holding that it always must number a full thirty days, a doctrine adopted in Fāṭimid Ismā'īlī law. Later, he changed his position and supported the view that the length of Ramaḍān is determined by the sighting of the new moon, which became standard Imāmī doctrine. In his criticism of Ibn Bābūya's creed he also rejected his belief that all *Imāms* had been murdered by their opponents.

Al-Mufīd died on 3 Ramaḍān 413/29 November 1032. The funeral worship was led by his pupil al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā and was attended by a huge crowd. He was buried at first in his house and later in the *Maḳābir Kuraysh* next to his teacher Ibn Kūlūya and near the *Imām* Muḥammad al-Djāwād. Virtually all the leading Imāmī scholars of the following generation were his students: the Sharīfs al-Raḍī and al-Murtaḍā, the Shaykh al-Tūsī, al-Nadjāshī, al-Karādjakī, Sālār al-Daylamī, Abū 'l-Salāḥ al-Halabī and others. Al-Mufīd's influence on later Imāmī theology remained restricted, however, since the Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, followed by Shaykh al-Tūsī, adopted Baṣran Mu'tazilī doctrine in preference to his.

Bibliography: *Fihrist*, 178, 197; Nadjāshī, *al-Ridjāl*, Kūmm 1407/1986, 399-403; Tūsī, *Fihrist kutub al-Shi'a*, ed. A. Sprenger, Calcutta 1853, 314-16; *Ta'rīkh Baghdād*, iii, 231; Ibn Shahrāshūb, *Ma'ālim al-ulamā'*, ed. 'A. Ikḥbāl, Tehran 1353/1934, 100-102; Ibn al-Djāwzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, Hyderabad 1355-6/1936-7, vii, 220, 237-8; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, ix, 196, 217; Nūr Allāh Shustarī, *Madjālis al-mu'minīn*, Tehran 1375/1955-6, i, 463-4; Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt al-djannāt*, [Tehran] 1347/1928, 536-43; al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, *Mustadrak al-wasā'il*, 1382/1963, iii, 517-21; H. al-Mūsawī al-Kharsān, introd. to Tūsī, *Tahdhīb al-ahkām*, Nadjaf 1959, 4-43; Sezgin, *GAS*, i, 549-51; W. Madelung, *Imamism and Mu'tazilite theology*, in *Le Shi'isme Imāmīte*, ed. T. Fahd, Paris 1970, 21-5; D. Sourdel, *L'Imamisme vu par le Cheikh al-Mufid*, in *REI*, xl (1972), 217-96 (contains a translation of al-Mufīd's *Awā'il al-makālāt*); idem, *Les Conceptions Imāmītes au début du XIe siècle d'après le Shaykh al-Mufid*, in *Islamic civilisation, 950-1150*, ed. D.S. Richards, Oxford 1973, 187-200; M.J. McDermott, *The theology of al-Shaikh al-Mufid*, Beirut 1978; *Kitāb al-Irshād: The Book of Guidance*, by Shaykh al-Mufid, tr. I.K.A. Howard, London 1981. (W. MADELUNG)

MUFRAD (A.), a technical term of Arabic grammar, which can have four ranges of meaning. In a general way, it means "singular", being synonymous with *wāḥid* and in opposition to *muṭhannā* "in the

dual" and *madmū'at* "in the plural". In morphology, it means "simple", as opposed to *murakkab* "compound" and designates a noun made up of a single element. In syntax, it means "in isolation", as opposed to *muḍāf* "in annexation" and designates a noun which is not followed by a determining complement. In lexicography, more often used in the plural *mufradāt*, it means "the words taken in isolation in the lexicon".

Bibliography. G. Troupeau, *Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sibawayhi*, Paris 1976, 159.

(G. TROUPEAU)

MUFTĪ [see FATWĀ].

MUGHALS, an Indo-Muslim dynasty which ruled, latterly with decreasing effectiveness, 932-1274/1526-1858.

1. History
2. External relations
3. Administrative and social organisation
4. Economy and internal commerce
5. External commerce and European trade connections with Mughal India
6. Religious life
7. Architecture
8. Carpets and textiles
9. Painting and the applied arts
10. Literature
11. Numismatics

1. History. This article, like the section on History in *HIND*, iv, above, aims at being no more than a guide to the numerous articles on the history of the Mughal dynasty in India to be found elsewhere in the *Encyclopaedia*, and to relate these to a chronological framework.

The Mughals were given their first foothold in Indian territory in 800/1398 when Pīr Muḥammad, governor of Kābul and a grandson of Tīmūr, attacked Učch and Multān, and established a governor in Dīpālpur; when this governor was attacked and killed, Tīmūr [*q.v.*] himself sacked Dīpālpur and Bhaṭnēr, marching through Pānīpat to Dīhlī, which was occupied, sacked and plundered, and many of its inhabitants massacred. When Tīmūr withdrew in 801/1399 the Dīhlī sultanate was left in anarchy and bankruptcy; Maḥmūd Tughluḳ returned to Dīhlī almost powerless, and in the Panḍjāb the Sayyid Khidr Khān [*q.v.*] ruled as governor owing allegiance to Tīmūr or his son Shāh Rukh [*q.v.*]. The Dīhlī sultanate later fell to Khidr Khān in 817/1414, and he and his house ruled until 855/1451, without however causing any further Mughal concern. For this period see TİMÜR; SHĀH RUKH; KHIDR KHĀN; MAḤMŪD TUGHLUḲ; for Tīmūr's ancestry, see TİMŪRIDS.

Bābur, b. 888/1483-4, was descended in the fifth generation from Tīmūr, and on his mother's side from Činghiz Khān [*q.v.*]; heir to the small kingdom of Farghānā [*q.v.*], his early years were mostly spent in conflict with his cousins of the petty principalities of Afghānistān and Transoxiana which were what remained of the Tīmūrid legacy, never conclusively successful against Samarkand, but eventually (910/1504) taking possession of Kābul [*q.v.*] and gaining suzerainty over Ghaznī; possession of the strategically important Kandahār [*q.v.*] in 928/1522 strengthened his hand. He had already made minor forays into India; he was invited to intervene in the affairs of the Dīhlī sultanate (disputed between three members of Lāhawar), but soon showed that his action was more in his own interest than that of the Lōdis when he defeated the combined Afghān armies at the first battle of Pānīpat [*q.v.*] in 932/1526. He moved on