

Dali (al-Hāḍijī) Muḥammad b. al-Ḥarsh) attacked the town, and the Turkish garrison fled. Bū Dali proclaimed himself sultan and entrusted the government of Djidjelli to one of his supporters with the title of *agha*. Sent with a squadron to punish the rebels, the ra'īs Ḥamīdu bombarded the town, without result (1805). But shortly afterwards, having been maltreated by the Kabyles, the inhabitants made their submission to the dey who set up a new garrison in the town.

The fall of the Turkish Government in 1830 gave the people of Djidjelli their independence which they kept until 1839, when the sack of a French trading-post made Marshal Valée, the Governor-General of Algeria, decide to have the town occupied, on 13 May 1839. But the garrison, having no communications with the hinterland, remained besieged by the Kabyles until the moment when an expedition led by general Saint-Armand brought the tribes of the Little Kabylia to submission (1851).

*Bibliography*: Féraud, *Histoire des villes de la province de Constantine, Gigelli*, Constantine 1870; Watbled, *Expédition du duc de Beaufort contre Gigelli*, in *RA*, 1873; Montchicourt, *L'expédition de Djidjelli (1864)*, in *Revue maritime*, 1898; P. Marçais, *Textes arabes de Djidjelli*, Paris 1954; idem, *Le parler arabe de Djidjelli (Nord Constantinois, Algérie)*, Paris 1956; A. Retout, *Histoire de Djidjelli*, Algiers 1927; *Guide Bleu*, Paris 1955. (G. YVER\*)

**DJIHĀD** etymologically signifies an effort directed towards a determined objective. (Cf. *idjīhād*: the work of the scholar-jurists in seeking the solution of legal problems; *mudjāhada* or, again, *djīhād*: an effort directed upon oneself for the attainment of moral and religious perfection. Certain writers, particularly among those of Shī'ite persuasion, qualify this *djīhād* as "spiritual *djīhād*" and as "the greater *djīhād*", in opposition to the *djīhād* which is our present concern and which is called "physical *djīhād*" or "the lesser *djīhād*". It is, however, very much more usual for the term *djīhād* to denote this latter form of "effort".)

In law, according to general doctrine and in historical tradition, the *djīhād* consists of military action with the object of the expansion of Islam and, if need be, of its defence.

The notion stems from the fundamental principle of the universality of Islam: this religion, along with the temporal power which it implies, ought to embrace to whole universe, if necessary by force. The principle, however, must be partially combined with another which tolerates the existence, within the Islamic community itself, of the adherents of "the religions with holy books", i.e., Christians, Jews and *Madjūs* [q.v.]. As far as these latter are concerned the *djīhād* ceases as soon as they agree to submit to the political authority of Islam and to pay the poll tax (*djizya* [q.v.]) and the land tax (*kharādī* [q.v.]). As long as the question could still, in fact, be posed, a controversy existed—generally resolved by a negative answer—on the question as to whether the Christians and Jews of the Arabian peninsula were entitled to such treatment as of right. To the non-scripturaries, in particular the idolaters, this half measure has no application according to the opinion of the majority: their conversion to Islam is obligatory under pain of being put to death or reduced into slavery.

In principle, the *djīhād* is the one form of war which is permissible in Islam, for, in theory, Islam must constitute a single community organized under

a single authority and any armed conflict between Muslims is prohibited.

Following, however, the disintegration of Muslim unity and the appearance, beginning in the middle of the 2nd/8th century, of an ever increasing number of independent States, the question arose as to how the wars which sprang up between them were to be classified. They were never included within the strict notion of *djīhād*—even in the case of wars between states of different religious persuasion—at least according to the general Sunnī doctrine; and it is only by an abuse of language that this term is sometimes applied to them, while those authors who seek for a precise terminology label them only as *kitāl* or *mukātala* (conflict, war). There is even hesitation in referring to the struggle against the renegade groups in Islam as *djīhād*. The viewpoint of Shī'ite doctrine is not the same, for, according to the Shī'a, a refusal to subscribe to their teaching is equivalent to unbelief (*kufr*). The same holds good, *a fortiori*, for the Khārījite doctrine [see further TAKFĪR].

The *djīhād* is a duty. This precept is laid down in all the sources. It is true that there are to be found in the Qur'ān divergent, and even contradictory, texts. These are classified by the doctrine, apart from certain variations of detail, into four successive categories: those which enjoin pardon for offences and encourage the invitation to Islam by peaceful persuasion; those which enjoin fighting to ward off aggression; those which enjoin the initiative in attack, provided it is not within the four sacred months; and those which enjoin the initiative in attack absolutely, at all times and in all places. In sum, these differences correspond to the stages in the development of Muḥammad's thought and to the modifications of policy resulting from particular circumstances; the Meccan period during which Muḥammad, in general, confines himself to moral and religious teaching, and the Medina period when, having become the leader of a politico-religious community, he is able to undertake, spontaneously, the struggle against those who do not wish to join this community or submit to his authority. The doctrine holds that the later texts abrogate the former contradictory texts (the theory of *naskh* [q.v.]), to such effect that only those of the last category remain indubitably valid; and, accordingly, the rule on the subject may be formulated in these absolute terms: "the fight (*djīhād*) is obligatory even when they (the unbelievers) have not themselves started it".

In two isolated opinions, however, attempts were made to temper the rule in some respects. According to one of these views, attributed to 'Atā (d. 114/732-3), the ancient prohibition against fighting during the sacred months remains valid; while according to the other, attributed to Sufyān al-Thawrī (born 97/715), the *djīhād* is obligatory only in defence; it is simply recommended (*li'l-nadb*) in attack. According to a view held by modern orientalist scholarship, Muḥammad's conception of the *djīhād* as attack applied only in relation to the peoples of Arabia; its general application was the result of the *idjmā'* (general consensus of opinion) of the immediately succeeding generations. At root, of course, this involves the problem as to whether Muḥammad had conceived of Islam as universal or not.

The opinion of al-Thawrī appears to have been adopted by al-Iḍḥāhiz. The heterodox movement of the Aḥmadiyya [q.v.], beginning towards the end of the 19th century, would go further than al-

Thawri inasmuch as it refuses to recognize the legitimacy of the *djihād* even as a recommended activity. Cf., in the same sense, the doctrine of Bābism (see BĀB).

According to the general doctrine of the Shī'a, due account taken of their dogma concerning "the absence of the Imām", who alone has the necessary competence to order war, the practice of the *djihād* is necessarily suspended until the re-appearance of the Imām or the *ad hoc* appointment of a vicar designated by him for this task. The Zaydī sect, however, which does not recognize this dogma, follows the same teaching as that of the Sunni doctrine.

Characteristics of the duty of *djihād*. The *djihād* is not an end in itself but a means which, in itself, is an evil (*fasād*), but which becomes legitimate and necessary by reason of the objective towards which it is directed: to rid the world of a greater evil; it is "good" from the fact that its purpose is "good" (*hasan li-husn ghayrih*).

A religious duty. The *djihād* has the effect of extending the sway of the faith; it is prescribed by God and his Prophet; the Muslim dedicates himself to the *djihād* in the same way that, in Christianity, the monk dedicates himself to the service of God; in the same vein it is said in different *hadīths* that "the *djihād* is the monasticism of Islam"; the *djihād* is "an act of pure devotion"; it is "one of the gates to Paradise"; rich heavenly rewards are guaranteed for those who devote themselves to it; those who fall in the *djihād* are the martyrs of the faith, etc. A substantial part of the doctrine reckons the *djihād* among the very "pillars" (*arkan*) of the religion, along with prayer and fasting etc. It is a duty which falls upon every Muslim who is male, free and able-bodied. It is generally considered that non-Muslims may be called upon to assist the Muslims in the *djihād*.

A "collective" obligation (*farḍ kifāya*) in contrast to *farḍ 'ayn*. The *farḍ kifāya* is that duty which is imposed upon the community considered as a whole and which only becomes obligatory for each individual in particular to the extent that his intervention is necessary for the realization of the purpose envisaged by the law. Thus, as soon as there exists a group of Muslims whose number is sufficient to fulfil the needs of a particular conflict, the obligation of the *djihād* no longer rests on the others. The general teaching is that the duty of *djihād* falls, in the first place, individually as a *farḍ 'ayn*, upon those who live in the territory nearest to the enemy, and that the same holds good in the case of the inhabitants of a town which is besieged. In the organized State, however, the appreciation of the precise moment at which the *djihād* is transformed into an *'ayn* obligation is a matter for the discretion of the sovereign; so that, in the case of general mobilization, the *djihād* loses, for all the members of the community, its character of *farḍ kifāya*, and becomes, instead, *farḍ 'ayn*.

All this implies, however, that for those who hold the reins of authority and, in particular, the sovereign, the *djihād* is always an individual duty, since their own personal action is necessary in every case. Where there are several independent Muslim states, the duty will fall upon the ruler of the state which is nearest to the enemy.

Further, the duty of the *djihād* is relative and contingent in this dual sense that, on the one hand, it only comes into being when the circumstances are favourable and of such a nature as to offer some hope

of a victorious outcome, and, on the other hand, the fulfilment of the duty may be renounced in consideration of the payment by the enemy of goods reaching a certain value, if such policy appears to be in conformity with the interests of the moment.

Its subsidiary character. Since the *djihād* is nothing more than a means to effect conversion to Islam or submission to its authority, there is only occasion to undertake it in circumstances where the people against whom it is directed have first been invited to join Islam. Discussion turned on the question as to whether it was necessary, on this ground, to address a formal invitation to the enemy. The general doctrine holds that since Islam is sufficiently widespread in the world, all peoples are presumed to know that they have been invited to join it. It is observed, however, that it would be desirable to repeat the invitation, except in cases where there is ground for apprehension that the enemy, thus forewarned, would profit from such a delay by better organizing his defences and, in this way, compromising the successful outcome of the *djihād*.

Its perpetual character. The duty of the *djihād* exists as long as the universal domination of Islam has not been attained. "Until the day of the resurrection", and "until the end of the world" say the maxims. Peace with non-Muslim nations is, therefore, a provisional state of affairs only; the chance of circumstances alone can justify it temporarily. Furthermore there can be no question of genuine peace treaties with these nations; only truces, whose duration ought not, in principle, to exceed ten years, are authorized. But even such truces are precarious, inasmuch as they can, before they expire, be repudiated unilaterally should it appear more profitable for Islam to resume the conflict. It is, however, recognized that such repudiation should be brought to the notice of the infidel party, and that he should be afforded sufficient opportunity to be able to disseminate the news of it throughout the whole of his territory [see *ṢULḤ*].

Its defensive as well as offensive character. The *djihād* has principally an offensive character; but it is equally a *djihād* when it is a case of defending Islam against aggression. This indeed, is the essential purpose of the *ribāṭ* [q.v.] undertaken by isolated groups or individuals settled on the frontiers of Islam. The *ribāṭ* is a particularly meritorious act.

Finally, there is at the present time a thesis, of a wholly apologetic character, according to which Islam relies for its expansion exclusively upon persuasion and other peaceful means, and the *djihād* is only authorized in cases of "self defence" and of "support owed to a defenceless ally or brother". Disregarding entirely the previous doctrine and historical tradition, as well as the texts of the *Qur'ān* and the *sunna* on the basis of which it was formulated, but claiming, even so, to remain within the bounds of strict orthodoxy, this thesis takes into account only those early texts which state the contrary (v. *supra*).

*Bibliography*: Dāmād Ef., *Madjma' al-anhur*, ed. Aḥmad b. 'Uthmān, 1328/1910, i, 636 ff.; Dardir, *al-Sharḥ al-ṣaghīr*, with the gloss of Ṣāwī, i, 398 ff.; *Djāhiz, Rasā'il*, ed. Sandūbī, Cairo 1933, 57; Farrā', *Aḥkām sultāniyya*, Cairo, 25 ff.; Goldziher, *Schi'itische*, in *ZDMG*, lxiv, 531 ff.; Addison, *The Ahmadiya movement*, in *Harvard Theological Review*, xxii, 1 ff.; Ibn 'Abidin,

*Radd al-muhtār*, Istanbul 1314/1905, iii, 315 ff.; Ibn 'Abd al-Rahmān, *Rahmat al-umma fi 'khtlāf al-a'imma*, Cairo, 294; Ibn Djumā'a, *Tahrir al-ahkām*, ed. Kofler, (in *Islamica*, 1934), 349 ff.; Ibn Kudāma, *Mughni*, 3rd. ed. Rashid Riḍā, Cairo 1367/1947, viii, 345 ff.; Ibn Taymiyya, *al-Siyāsa al-shar'iyya*, Cairo 1322/1904, 156 ff.; Marāghī, *al-Tashrī' al-islāmī*, Cairo, 24 ff.; Māwardī, *Aḥkam sultāniyya*, Cairo, 30 ff.; Querry, *Recueil de lois concernant les musulmans chiites*, Paris 1871, i, 321; Rashid Riḍā, *Khilāfa*, Cairo 1341/1922, 29, 51; Sarakhsī, *Mabsūt*, Cairo, x, 35; Shāfi'ī, *Kitāb al-umm*, Cairo 1903, with the Muzanī gloss, v, 180 ff.; Gaudfroy-Demombynes, *Mahomet*, Paris 1957, 578 ff.; Draz, *Le droit international publié et l'Islam*, in *Revue égyptienne de droit international public*, 1949, 17 ff.; Haneberg, *Das muslimische Kriegerrecht* (Abh. der kgl. Bayer. Akad. der Wissensch., 1870, philos.-philol. cl., xiii. Bd., II. Abt.), 219 ff.; Juynboll, *Handbuch* 57, 335 ff.; Milliot, *Introd. à l'étude du droit musulman*, Paris 1953, 22, 34; Ṣā'idi, *al-Siyāsa al-islāmīyya*, Cairo; Sanhoury, *Le Califat*, thesis, Lyon 1925, 146; Strothmann, *Das Staatsrecht der Zaiditen*, Strasbourg 1922, 42 ff.; Muh. Shadid, *al-Djihād fi 'l-Islām*, 1960; *ĪA*, art. Cihād (Halim Sabit Ṣibay). (E. TYAN)

#### DJIHĀNGĪR [see DJAHĀNGĪR].

**DJILD.** The use of leather (*djild*, *adīm*) as a writing material is well known in the Near East. In Egypt it was used already in the Middle Kingdom; leather manuscripts are known from the empire of Meroe and Nubia to the south of Egypt, from Palestine and Persia. In the latter country the βασιλικαὶ ἀποθήραι—the Royal archives consisting of leather documents—were known to Ctesias (*apud* Diodorus Siculus, ii, 32, cf. *DAFTAR*), and when the Persians conquered Egypt for a short time at the beginning of the 7th century A.D., they continued to write on leather here. The leather pieces found in Egypt and preserved in several European collections testify to this fact. When the Persians conquered Southern Arabia soon after 570 A.D., they greatly encouraged the leather industry there; the South-Arabian leather was famous as a writing material of special delicacy and smoothness. But even before the Persian occupation of the Yaman, leather was known there as a writing material. The debenture of a Himyarite to the grandfather of the Prophet Muḥammad, 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib b. Hāshim, which was preserved in the treasury of the Caliph al-Ma'mūn, was written on a piece of leather. Leather was thus well known to the Arabs even before Islam, and poets like al-Murakkiṣh the Elder and Labīd quote instances to this effect. Arabs even knew how to colour skins yellow with saffron, and later invented, in al-Kūfa, an improvement on the treatment of skins, *viz.*, they replaced quick-lime (which made the skins very dry) by dates, so that the skins became soft. We are told of numerous cases when the Prophet Muḥammad wrote (or had written) on leather—*e.g.*, gifts of lands and wells—and even pieces of the Revelation were written on it. His immediate successors, *e.g.*, 'Alī, followed this example. As a peculiarity it may be mentioned that the Caliph 'Uḥmān is credited with a Qur'an, written on ostrich-skin and preserved in the 'Ārif Hikmet Library in Medina (cf. *ZDMG*, xc, 1956, 102). During the Umayyad period leather was used among the Arabs as writing material; for example the poet Dhu 'l-Rumma (d. 117/735-6) mentions it in one of his *Qasidas* (*Aghāni*, xvi, 111).

A letter on leather, addressed in Arabic by the Sogh'dian ruler Diwashti to the governor Djarrāh b. 'Abd Allāh about 100/719, was discovered in 1932 in Zaratshān in Central Asia (cf. I. Yu. Krachkovsky, *Among Arabic manuscripts*, Leiden 1953, 142). This document was not a unique piece, for the book-collection of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn, mentioned in Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* (40, 54), contained also leather pieces along with papers and papyri. Various documents on leather are preserved in different papyrus-collections; the oldest piece, a debenture in respect of a nuptial gift, dated 233/847, is in the possession of the Egyptian National Library in Cairo (Cat. Ta'rikh, n° 1871), the youngest, dated 722 A.H., of the State Museum in Berlin. Special mention must be made of Qur'an-manuscripts written on antelope-skins, to which al-Birūnī refers in his *Ta'rikh al-Hind* (81).

A special kind of leather is parchment (*djild*, *warak*, *kirtās*, *raḥk*, *rikk*), refined from skins of sheep, goats and calves. It was known in Arabia already in the fifth century A.D., since the Himyarite poet Kudam b. Qādim mentions it in his poem, and Labīd speaks of "talking parchment" (*tirs nātik*). *Tirs* means parchment from which the original text had been washed off and which then was written on again; such a *tirs*, bearing a Latin biblical fragment of the fifth century A.D. on one side and an Arabic legal text of the 1st/7th century running across the Latin text on the other, is preserved in Florence. Such palimpsests are still rare. Parchment was used—among other materials—to write parts of the Revelation, and such scraps were found in the legacy of the Prophet. The use of parchment for sacred books was specific for the Hebrews, and the parchment *Thora*-rolls were well known to the Arabs (cf. Bakrī, *Mu'djam*, ii, 511, who quotes a verse of Djarīr (d. 110/728)). Also the Prophet Muḥammad used parchment on several occasions, and *raḥk* as well as *kirtās* is mentioned in the Qur'an (VI, 7, LII, 3). The collection of the Holy Book of Islam, arranged by Zayd b. Ḥābit, is also said to have been written on parchment (A. Sprenger, *Das Leben und die Lehre des Muḥammad*, iii, p. xl). In the early Umayyad period parchment was preferred as a writing material along with papyri in Syria; in Egypt it was especially used for Qur'an-codices—as also in other Islamic countries—but only exceptionally for secular literary texts. In North Africa a depository of the Sidi 'Ukba Mosque in al-Qayrawān furnished lately some hundreds of literary parchment manuscripts. In 'Irāk parchment was predominantly used in the chanceries until the Barmakid al-Faḍl b. Yahyā b. Khālid replaced it by paper. A special precious kind of parchment was made of gazelle-skins. This gazelle-parchment was expensive but nevertheless mentioned several times in papyri, *e.g.*, also in a magical text. The Egyptian National Library possesses several Qur'an manuscripts written on gazelle-parchment (cf. *Fihrist al-kutub al-'arabiyya al-maḥḥūza bi 'l-kutubkhāna al-Khedīwiyya*, i, Cairo 1892-93, 2). In Egypt parchment, made of skins of sheep, goats and calves, plays a very minor rôle in comparison with papyrus. The oldest parchment document hitherto known is dated 168/784; it formed part of the collection of the late German consul Todros Muhareb in Luxor. A specially precious kind of parchment was purple-coloured, well known from early Latin mediaeval manuscripts. The collection of F. Martin contained a beautiful blue-coloured parchment with exquisite Kūfic script in gold, originally belonging to a