

DURUZ (Druzes), sing. *Durzi*, a Syrian people professing an initiatory faith derived from the Isma'iliyya [q.v.]. They call themselves *Muwahhidun*, "unitarians", and number (in the mid-twentieth century) almost 200,000, living in various parts of Syria, especially in the mountains of the Lebanon, Anti-Lebanon, and Hawran, chiefly as cultivators and landlords.

The faith originated in the closing years of the reign of al-Hakim [q.v.], Fatimid Caliph of Egypt (386-411/996-1021). According to the Isma'ili Shi'i faith then officially received in Egypt, al-Hakim, as *imam*, was the divinely appointed and authoritative guardian of Islam, holding a position among men which answered to that of the cosmic principle *al-ʿakl al-faʿal*, the active intellect, and unquestionable head of the Isma'ili religious hierarchy. Al-Hakim proved an eccentric ruler both in his personal life and in his religious policy, which flouted alternately the feelings of Isma'ilis and Sunnis alike. In his last years he seems to have wished to be regarded as a divine figure, above any rank which official Isma'ilism could accord him. A number of Isma'ilis were in fact inclined so to regard him and, evidently with his private permission, set about organizing a following in the expectation of a public acknowledgement of the position.

The first of these men to catch the public eye was al-Darazi [q.v.], a non-Arab (like several of the leaders); the whole movement was called al-Daraziyya (or al-Durziyya) on his account. He seems to have interpreted the mood of the Hakim-cult circles in terms of a recurrent Isma'ili heterodox attitude which exalted the *td>wil* (inner truth) and its representative, the *imam*, over the *tanzil* (outward revelation) and its representative, the Prophet; so

632 DUROZ
giving the current *imam*, al-Hakim, a supernatural status as embodiment of *al-ʿakl al-kullī*, the highest cosmic intellect. But his public activity (408/1017-8) caused disturbances and forced al-Hakim to be more cautious. In 410, however, al-Hakim gave his support to another leader, Hamza b. cAH [q.v.] of Suzan in Iran, who gave to the Hakim cult its definitive Druze form.

Hamza had begun his mission in 408/1017 (the first year of the Druze era—the second being 410, when the public mission was renewed) and claimed to have been the only authorized spokesman for al-Hakim from the first. In 410, after al-Darazi's death, he tried to rally the whole movement under himself. His doctrine was evidently more original than al-Darazi's. It was, like Isma'ili doctrine generally, a doctrine of cosmic emanation from the One and of return to the One through human gnosis. But it was unique in its special emphasis on the immediate presence of the cosmic One and made correspondingly rather less of the subordinate emanations.

Hence Hamza called his own followers "Unitarians" par excellence.

For Hamza, al-Hakim was no longer merely *imam*, however highly exalted. Hamza himself was the *imam*, the human guide, and therefore *al-ʿakl al-kullī*, the first cosmic principle; while al-Hakim was the embodiment of the ultimate One, the Godhead who created the Intellect itself and was accordingly Himself beyond name or office, beyond even good or evil. Compared to Him, cA11 and the Isma'ili *imams* as such were secondary figures (though, since the One is ever present even when unrevealed,

some of the latter, together with several obscure figures from earlier times, had also been embodiments of the One in their time). In al-Hakim, the One was uniquely present openly in history. The contrasting extravagances of his life expressed the workings of the ultimately Powerful, Whose acts could not be called to account, though they always revealed a meaning to His *imam*, the *akl*, the cosmic intellect, Hamza. Al-Hakim was the present *makdm*, locus, of the Creator; only in knowledge of Him could men purify themselves. Accordingly, Hamza's teaching was no longer strictly an extremist Isma'ilism, though it made use of extremist Isma'ili conceptions and language; it claimed to be an independent religion superseding both the Sunni *tanazzil* and the Isma'ili *ta'wil*.

Hamza evidently looked to al-Hakim to introduce, by his caliphal power, the messianic culmination of history, forcing all men to discard the various symbolisms of the old revealed religions, including Isma'ilism, and to worship the One alone, revealed clearly in al-Hakim. In preparation for al-Hakim's decisive move, Hamza, as *imam*, built up his own organization within the Hakim-cult circles to spread the true doctrine. Like al-Hakim and Hamza himself, the members of this organization embodied cosmic principles. There were five great *hudud*, cosmic ranks, adopted in a modified form from Isma'ili lore: the *akl* (Hamza—identical with Shatnill, the "true Adam" during the current historical cycle, during which the One is also known as al-Bar); the *Nafs al-Kulliyya*, Universal Soul (Isma'il b. Muhammad al-Tamiml); the *Kalima*, the Word (Muhammad b. Wahb al-Kurashl); the Right Wing or the *Sdbik*, the Preceder, in Isma'ilism identified with the *akl* but here demoted (Salama b. Abd al-Wahhab); and the Left Wing or the *Tali*, the Follower, in Isma'ilism identified with the *nafs* (Abu 'l-Hasan cAII b. Ahmad al-Samukl, caUed Baha' al-Din al-Muktana). Below these five ranks were a number of *dd'is*, missionaries; *ma'dhuns*, licensed to preach; and *mukdsirs*, persuaders—embodying respectively the cosmic *d'iad*, effort; *fath*, opening; and *khaydl*, fantasy. Subordinated to these were the common believers. (In all these ranks what was regarded was not the individual person, the embodiment, but the undying principle of which the embodiment was merely the current veil; in the ordinary person this implied an eternally reincarnated soul). To one or another of these ranks were attributed most of the titles or concepts that figured in the complex Isma'ili system. Despite this hierarchy, however, the immediate presence of the One was kept primary and remained so in later Druzism.

Ranged in opposition to these true *tiudud*, and equally the creatures of al-Hakim as the ultimate One, were a series of false *hudud*, accounting for the dark side of the cosmos, and embodied likewise in men of al-Hakim's time—for instance, in al-Hakim's Isma'ili officials, teachers of the misleading doctrines of the old faiths. The eschatological drama was seen as the conflict between Hamza as *Kd'im al-zamdn*, Master of the Time, with his true *hudud*, who would at last be openly supported by al-Hakim, and these false teachers whom al-Hakim would openly abandon. The followers of the Hakim-cult, whether under al-Darazi or under Hamza, seem to have been eager to precipitate events by proclaiming abroad the abolition of all the old faiths, including the *shari'a* law of Islam and its Isma'ili *bdtin* interpretation. Despite Hamza's relative cautiousness, insults to the established faith were offered publicly, with al-Hakim's

tacit support, and riots ensued. The innovators, who regarded themselves as emancipated from the *shari'a*, were accused of every sort of gross immorality. The Hakim cult seems to have contributed heavily to the growing political crisis of al-Hakim's last years.

When al-Hakim disappeared, late in 411/1021, Hamza announced that he had withdrawn to test his adherents and would soon return to manifest his full power, placing the sword of victory in Hamza's own hands. Soon after, at the end of 411, Hamza himself withdrew, to return with al-Hakim. The faith then entered into a period corresponding to the little *ghayba* of the Twelver Shi'is, with the *Tali*, Baha al-Din al-Muktana [*q.v.*], as link between the absent Hamza and the faithful.

After al-Hakim's disappearance, the Hakim cult seems to have gradually ceased activity in Egypt, but to have afforded the ideology for a wave of peasant revolts in Syria. There proselytizing was pursued actively by a number of missionaries, some of whose names have been preserved; the movement gained control of some mountainous areas, where they are said to have torn down the mosques and established their own new system of law. Presumably they dispossessed the old landlords in favour of a free peasantry. In 423/1032 the *amir* of Antioch, aided by the *amir* of Aleppo, suppressed a group in the Djabal al-Summak which included peasants who had gathered there from the vicinity of Aleppo.

In the midst of the turmoil, al-Muktana at Alexandria (who had been appointed *Tali* only at the last minute, in 411) tried to maintain Hamza's authority and his own. He was evidently in touch with the absent Hamza and was preparing for his momentary advent from the Yemen. He encouraged the rebels in the Djabal al-Summak after their defeat. His many pastoral letters—some directed not only to Syria but to contacts and converts in all

DURCZ 633
Isma'ili communities, as far away as Sind—served meanwhile to lay down Druze orthodoxy. He had to struggle against more than one claimant to leadership, of whom Ibn al-Kurdi, aided by one Sikkin, seems to have been the most prominent; some of these seem to have encouraged a wide moral licence which he condemned. But with the years the general movement faded away and the Syrian peasant revolt seemed hopelessly torn by dissension; at last al-Muktana discharged all his *dd'is* and, sometime after 425/1034, himself withdrew from the faithful, as had Hamza; though he continued to send out letters as late as 434/1042-3.

Despite al-Muktana's discouragement, his work became the basis of such of the movement as did survive. Later Druzes have supposed it was al-Muktana himself who compiled one hundred and eleven letters, many of them his own, some of them by Hamza and by Isma'ili al-Tamimi, and certain pieces by al-Hakim, into a canon which has since served as Druze scripture, called *Rasa'il al-Hikma*, the Book of Wisdom. From the time of al-Muktana's withdrawal began a period, lasting to the present among the Syrian Druzes, of passive expectation of Hamza's and al-Hakim's return, which has corresponded to the greater *ghayba* of the Twelver Shi'is.

Hamza's hierarchical organization, including the *dd'is* and lesser ranks, fell into disuse and the scriptural canon has served as guide in place of the absent *hudud*. Though al-Muktana had insisted on continuing proselytizing as long as possible, on his withdrawal it ceased and it was taught that

thenceforth no further conversion to the Unitarian truth could be accepted. (To this ban there have been a few exceptions). The Druzes became a closed community, keeping their doctrines secret, frowning on intermarriage and permitting neither conversion nor apostasy, and governing themselves as far as possible in such mountain fastnesses as they had seized, notably in the Wadi Taym Allah by Mount Hermon. These converts from the Syrian peasantry, led—according to tradition—by certain families from old Arabian tribes, formed in time a homogeneous people with distinctive physical features and social customs, dominated by their own aristocracy of ruling families. The aristocratic families have been noted equally for their habits of lawless raiding, for their uncompromising hospitality, and for their strict moral discipline which spared, for instance, the women of those they plundered and which was merciless toward unchastity in Druze women. (There is little foundation for the long series of Western speculations which assigned to the Druzes one or another exotic racial source, such as Persia or France). During this long period of autonomous closed group life there appeared a new system of religious practice strongly contrasting to the hierarchism which had disappeared. We know of a number of writers on the gnostic cosmology and cyclical sacred history implied already by Hamza, and commentators on the scriptural canon, but it is not known just when the new system took full form, though this was presumably at least by the time of the great Druze moralist (whose tomb is revered by both Druzes and Christians), ‘Abd Allah al-Tanukhl [see AL-TANUKHI, ‘ABD ALLAH], d. 885/1480. By this system the Druze community has been divided into *‘ufrkd* (sing. *-dkil*), "sages" initiated into the truths of the faith, and *diuhhd* (sing. *didhil*), "ignorant", not initiated and yet members of the community. (Those aristocratic notables who are not initiated may be distinguished from the ordinary *diuhhd* in their character of *amir*). Any adult Druze (man or woman) can be initiated if found worthy after considerable trial, but must thereafter lead a soberly religious life, uttering regular daily prayers, abstaining from all stimulants, from lying, from stealing, from revenge (including raiding in feuds), and so on. The *‘ukkd* are distinguished by a special dress with white turbans. As long as one is still a *didhil*, he is permitted more personal indulgences, within the code of honour of the Druze community, but he cannot look to spiritual growth; however, if he fails to be initiated in a given lifetime he can expect a renewed opportunity in a future birth.

The more pious or learned of the *‘ukkd* are accorded special authority in the community as *shaykhs*. In addition to what is required of the ordinary *‘ukkd*, they must be very circumspect morally, not making use of goods of a dubious source, avoiding any excess in their daily behaviour, keeping themselves on good terms with all, and ready to make peace wherever there is a quarrel. In each Druze district some one of these *shaykhs*, normally chosen from a given family, is recognized as holding the highest religious authority, as *ra‘is*. The *shaykhs* are trained in a special school; they spend much time in copying religious works and especially the scriptural canon, and the more zealous commonly have gone on spiritual retreats in *khalwas*, houses of religious retirement, built in unfrequented spots; some have even devoted their whole lives to such retirement. Preferably any *‘dkil*

should support himself with his hands, but the *shaykhs* are a fit object of alms by the *diuhhdal*, nevertheless. They are expected to offer spiritual guidance to their *didhil* neighbours, presiding at such occasions as weddings and funerals.

All the *'ukkdal* attend at least some of the *madilis* services, held on the eve of Friday in starkly simple houses of worship, though *diuhhdal* have been admitted to the least secret of these, when moral homilies are read in classical Arabic. The *'ukkdal* alone are permitted to read the more secret books of the faith and to participate in, or even know about, its secret ritual—which the Druzes have allowed the outside world to suppose involves a metallic figure of a calf in some way, whether as representing the human aspect of al-Hakim or possibly the animality of Hamza's enemies. (The neighbours of the Druzes have not been slow to accuse them of licentious orgies at their secret services).

Hamza and al-Muktana prescribed a sevenfold set of commandments, replacing the Muslim "pillars of the faith", which have become the basis of the moral discipline of the *'ukkdal* and to some degree of all Druzes. They must above all speak truth among the faithful (or at least keep silent, but never misrepresent), a commandment which includes truth in the theological sense; but lying to unbelievers is permitted in defence of themselves or of the faith. This first commandment covers also any act, such as stealing, which must entail lying. The second commandment is to defend and help one another, and seems to imply carrying arms for the purpose. The other commandments are to renounce all former religions; to dissociate themselves from unbelievers; to recognize the unity of Our Lord (Mawlana, the general title given al-Hakim as the One) in all ages; to be content with whatever he does; and to submit to His orders, particularly as transmitted through his *hudud*. Hamza prescribed, in addition, special rules of justice and of personal status to replace the

34 DUROZ

shari'a, notably insisting on equality of treatment between husband and wife in marriage; thus divorce was penalized in either partner unless for good cause. The faith of the *djuhhdal* is placed under the general guidance of the *'ukkdal*, but it is strongly affected by the principle of religious dissimulation—that to protect the secrecy of his faith, a Druze must affect to accept the faith of those in power about him; that is, normally, Sunni Islam. Druzes have accepted the Hanafi legal system, though with modifications such as permission of more unlimited bequests and placing of limitations on divorce. They celebrate the *Hd*—though not the Hadjdi nor the Ramadan fast; many families use circumcision (or baptism), but attach no religious meaning thereto; at funerals they may use Islamic formulas but the key feature is the blessing of the *shaykhs*. Like Syrians of other faiths, they visit the shrines of Khidr [*q.v.*] and the tombs of the prophets and saints. Nevertheless, even the *djuhhdal* know, and may freely speak of, the principle of their unitarianism. They possess a developed doctrine of creation and eschatology, which is founded in the teachings of the *'ukkdal*. The number of souls in existence is fixed, all souls being reincarnated immediately upon death (unless, having reached perfection, they ascend to the stars); those which believed in Hamza's time are always reincarnated as Druzes, either in Syria or in a supposed Druze community in China. The variety of incarnations each soul passes through gives a thorough moral testing. (Some of the *djuhhdal*

believe in reincarnation of the wicked in lower animals). In the end, when al-Hakim and Hamza reappear to conquer and establish justice in the whole world, those Druzes who have shown up well will be the rulers of all mankind. The best will then dwell nearest to God—a notion which the *ʿakkāl* understand, like much else, in a spiritual sense.

Bibliography: The Druze canon is available in numerous manuscripts in European, American, and Syrian libraries, as are many other Druze writings. A description and some translation of the canon is included in the fundamental work of Silvestre de Sacy, *Expose" de la religion des Druzes*, 2 vols., Paris 1838 (partial translation, Philipp Wolff, *Die Drusen und ihre Vorlufur*, Leipzig 1845); see also his *Memoire sur Vorigine du culte que les Druzes rendent a la figure d'un veau* in *Memoires de Vinstitut royal, classe d'histoire*, iii, 1818, 74 ff. Some Druze pieces are printed and annotated in Silvestre de Sacy's *Chrestomathie arabe*, ii, Paris 1826. Other Druze writings are printed in Christian Seybold, *Die Drusenschrift: Kitdb Alnoqat Waldawdir* (and N.-L. Kirchhai *Das Buck der Punkte und Kreise*), Leipzig 1902; in Henri Guys, *Theogonie des Druzes*, Paris 1863; in Martin Sprengling, *The Berlin Druze lexicon* in *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, Ivi (1939), 388-414, and Ivii (1940), 75 ff. (which includes an excellent study of Druze cosmology); in Rudolph Strothmann, *Drusen-Antwort auf Nusairl Angriff*, in *7s/.*, xxv (1939), 269-81; in Ernst von Döbeln, *Bin Traktat aus den Schriften der Drusen*, in *Monde Oriental*, iii (1909), 89-126; in J. Khalil and L. Ronzevalle, *al-Risaldt al-Qustantiniyya*, MFOB, iii, Beirut, 1909, 493-534. A common Druze "catechism" has been variously published and translated; see Eichhorn, *Repertorium fur morgenlndische und biblische Literatur*, xii (1783), or Regnault, *CaUchisme a Vnsage des Druses djahels*, in *Bull. de la Societe de Gdographie* (Paris), vii (1827), 22-30. The most important general study, apart from those mentioned above, is Narcisse Bouron, *Les Druzes, histoire du Liban et de la Montague haouranaise*, Paris 1930. Useful is Hanna Abu-Rashid, *Dʿabal al-Duruz*, Cairo 1925. Henri Guys, *La Nation druze, son histoire, sa religion, ses mœurs, et son etat politique*, Paris 1863, is often incautious. Of the many travellers who have written of them, the best is Max von Oppenheim, *Vom Mittelmeer zum Persischen Golf*, Berlin 1899, i, noff. Also interesting is W. B. Seabrook, *Adventures in Arabia*, New York 1927, chap. ix. On modern Druze legal status see F. van den Steen de Jehay, *De la situation legate des sujets ottomans non-musulmans*, Brussels 1906, and J. N. D. Anderson, *Personal law of the Druze community* in *WI* (1952), i ff., 83 ff. Especially for listings of manuscripts, see Hans Wehr, *Zu den Schriften Hamzas im Drusenkanon* in *ZDMG*, xcvi (1942), 187-207; also A. F. L. Beeston, *An ancient Druze manuscript* in *Bodleian Library Record*, v/6 (October 1956). For further references, especially to travellers' writings, see bibliography in Bouron, and footnotes in Philip K. Hitti, *The origins of the Druze people and religion*, New York 1928 (includes also some translated fragments); omitted from these two are F. Tournebize, *Les Druzes* in *Etudes des peres de la Compagnie de Jesus*, 5 October 1897; B. J. Taylor, *La Syrie, la Palestine, et la Judée*, Paris 1855> 35-40, 76-83; Henri Aucapitaine, *Etude sur les Druzes* in *Nouvelles Annales des Voyages*, VI^{me}

serie, February 1862; *Magasin pittoresque*, 1841, 367, and 1861, 226. For chroniclers on the earliest period, see Silvestre de Sacy, *Expose* (Nuwayri, *Nihdyat al-Arab*; Md. Dja:farl, *Anhad[al-tardk*; Severus of Ushmuriayn, *Life of Patriarch Zechariah*; Abu 'l-Mahasin Ibn Taghribirdi, *al-Nud^um alzdhirra* [based on Sibtl Ibn al-Djawzi, *Mir*dt alzamdnl*]; and Djurdjus al-Makin, *Ta^rikh al-Muslimln*). The latter is based on Yahya al-Antakl, continuation of Euty chius, *Scriptores Arabici*, text, ser. III, vii/2, ed. L. Cheikho, B. Carra de Vaux, H. Zayyat, Beirut 1909, 220 ff.; see also Ibn al-Adim, *Ta^rikh Halab*, s.a. 423; M. G. S. Hodgson, *Al-Darazi and Hamza in the origin of the Druze religion*, in *JAOS*, lxxxii (1962), 5-20. (M. G. S. HODGSON)

(ii) — OTTOMAN PERIOD

When the Ottoman and the Mamluk armies met in battle at Mardj Dabik in 922/1516, the Druzes fought on both sides. The Buhturids from the west of the country fought on the side of the Mamluks, while the Maenids of Shuf supported the Ottomans by allying themselves to Ghazall, the *nd^ib* of Damascus. Under the Ottomans, the Druzes were governed by local dynasties, of which the Al Tanukh, the Maenids and the vShihabids, and particularly the last two (for whose genealogy see Zambaur, i, 108 ff.) were the most important. At the battle of Mardj Dabik the Maenids were led by the Amir Fakhr al-Din I, who at the crucial point changed sides, abandoning the Mamluk Kansuh al-Ghuri and going over to Sultan Sellm I in Damascus. The Sultan rewarded him with overlordship over the amirs of Mount Lebanon, the Al Tanukh dynasty being confined to Sayda and Sur (Blau, *Zur Geschichte Syriens*, in *ZDMG*, viii (1854), 480 ff.). In 951/1544 Maenid rule passed to Fakhr al-Din's son Korkmaz. Druze attacks against the Ottomans led in 992/1584 to a punitive expedition by Ibrahim Pasha, the *wall* of Egypt. The son of Korkmaz, the Amir Fakhr al-DIn DUROZ 635

II [*q.v.*] challenged the *wall* of Tripoli, Sayf-oghlu Yusuf Pasha. He had some initial successes, but was eventually forced to withdraw to the Mountain, after the defeat of the rebels in 1016/1607 in the battle between Kuyudju Murad Pasha and Djanbulat-oghlu, the importance of whose family among the Druzes dates from this time. The Druze alliance dissolved as a result of the expeditions led by land by the *wall* of Damascus, Hafiz Pasha, and by sea by the Kapudan Pasha Okiiz ("The Bull") Mehmed Pasha between 1018/1609 and 1022/1613. Fakhr al-DIn allied himself to Florence in 1017/1608 and on 30 Radjab 1022/15 September 1613 he went to Italy to seek help under the alliance, returning to the Djabal in 1027/1618. Maenid rule was preserved during his absence, particularly as his spies in Istanbul and Damascus gave preliminary warning of any Ottoman military measures. Although the Ottoman Sultan, by a *fermdn* issued in 1034/1625, recognized Fakhr al-DIn as *Amir* of the Druzes from Aleppo to Jerusalem (Haydar, i, 715), the latter was subjected to constant pressure from Kiiciik Ahmed Pasha, who had been appointed *wall* of Damascus by Murad IV. In 1044/1634 the Druzes were decisively defeated at Magharat Djarzln, the Amir and three of his children being carried off prisoner to Istanbul, where all but Husayn Bey were executed.

The death of Fakhr al-DIn marked the end of Maenid ascendancy. It was followed by Kaysi-Yamani dissension. Fakhr al-DIn, like the ruling

branch of the Al Tanukh before the Ma'nid ascendancy, belonged to the YamanI clan (known as *akll*, "white" by the Ottomans, the Kaysis being known as "red", *kizilli*, cf. Findiklili Mehmed Agha, *Ta'rikh*, Istanbul 1928, i, 215; C.-F. Volney, i, 414, note i). Amir Malham, who succeeded him in 1045/1635, represented the Kaysi clan and was opposed by the Amir 'Ali 'Alam al-Din on behalf of the Yamanis. Dissension gave openings for Ottoman intervention, as in 1061/1651 by the *wall* of Tripoli, Hasan Pasha. In 1064/1654 Amir Malham extended his rule to Safad, by agreement with the *wall* of Damascus. Malham died in 1069/1659 and was succeeded in the Djabal by his son Amir Ahmad, the last Ma'nid ruler, who died in 1108/1697 and was succeeded by Shihabids of the Kaysi clan. The latter had been protected by Amir Ahmad, who had refused to give them up to the *wall* of Damascus, Kopriliu Fadil Ahmed Pasha, in 1070/1660. The *wall* of Damascus, helped by the *wall* of Tripoli, thereupon defeated the joint Ma'nid-Shihabid forces at Kasrawan. The two dynasties later fell out, however, with the Ma'nids winning a short-lived victory at al-Fulful in 1076/1666 (Ibn Sabata, Salih b. Yahya, appendix, 237). After the death of Amir Ahmad, however, it was the Shihabid *amir* of Rasheya, Bashlr b. Husayn, who was chosen overlord of the Djabal with the agreement of the Ottomans. The Yamanis tried unsuccessfully to undo Kaysi ascendancy: from the court in Istanbul Husayn, the son of Fakhr al-Din II, managed, for example, to relegate Bashlr to the position of regent to the 12-year old Haydar, of the family of the *amir*?, of Hasbeya, whose local supporters later poisoned Bashlr. But when Haydar became Amir in his own right he crushed the Yamanis at the battle of 'Ayn-Dara which changed the whole feudal picture of the Djabal. Thereafter under the overlordship of the Shihabls, who tried to prevent Druze-Maronite struggles, the Djanbulats reigned over Shuf, Abu 'l-Lama: held Matn, while at vShuwayfat the Arslan family of the YamanI clan had to share their rule with Talmuk Yamanis. In holding together the Djabal, the Shihabls had to rely on the support of Ottoman *walls*, whose intervention led to the increase in the number of local *shaykhs*, who in turn exerted pressure on the *amir*. Thus, while the *shaykhs*, paid tribute to the *amir*; it was they who decided in council whether to keep the peace or wage war. Amir Haydar died in 1144/1732 in the Shihabi capital at Dayr al-Kamar, having in 1141/1729 abdicated in favour of his son Malham. Under the latter's rule which lasted until 1167/1754, the port of Bayrut regained the importance which it had enjoyed under Fakhr al-Din and became the second Shihabi centre after Dayr al-Kamar. Many of Malham's children were converted to Roman Catholicism, Christianity in general gaining ground in the Djabal. Malham and his successors generally tried to maintain a balance between local Muslims and Christians. Thus, when in 1171/1758 Greek pirates flying the Russian flag attacked Bayrut and when local Muslims retaliated by attacking the Franciscan monastery in the town, two of the Muslim leaders were hanged at the Amir's orders. Malham was succeeded by his brothers Ahmad (the father of the historian Ahmad al-Shihabi) and Mansur, although Nu'man Pasha, the Ottoman *wall* of Sayda, appointed to the amlrate Kasim b. 'Umar, who, however, had to content himself with the area round Hazlr. Kasim died a Christian in 1182/1768, his son Bashlr II also making no secret of his

Christian beliefs (Blau, *op. cit.*, 496; Lammens, *La Syrie*, Beirut 1921, ii, 100 ff.). These conversions did not, of course, prevent the majority of Druzes from retaining their faith, a fact which sowed the seed of future trouble. Mansur was dismissed in 1184/1770 by Derwish Pasha, the *wall* of Sayda, and replaced by Amir Yusuf. In 1185/1771 when the Russian fleet commanded by Alexei Orlov was encouraged by Zahir al-Umar, the rebel ruler of Safad and Acre, to bombard Bayrut, Mansur sued for peace against payment of 25,000 piastres, while Amir Yusuf asked for Ottoman reinforcements, whereupon Uthman Pasha, the *wall* of Damascus, despatched Djazzar Ahmad Pasha who occupied Bayrut in the name of Amir Yusuf. The latter succeeded, however, in ejecting this unwelcome deputy from Bayrut in 1187/1773 after a four-month siege, in which he was helped by the Russian fleet which he summoned from Cyprus. Nevertheless, Djazzar Ahmad Pasha continued to exert pressure from Acre and Sayda on the Shihabls of the Djabal. Payment of a tribute and loyalty to the Ottoman cause in the face of the Napoleonic expedition from Egypt, did not shield Bashir II from this pressure. Even although Yusuf Diya Pasha, the commander of the Ottoman forces against Napoleon, confirmed Bashir as ruler of the Djabal, Djazzar Ahmad Pasha had him expelled by forces commanded by Husayn and Sa'ad al-Din, the sons of the Amir Yusuf, whom he wanted to appoint in his place. Bashir sought refuge with the British admiral Sidney Smith, who took him in his flagship to al-Arish, returning later to the Djabal, Djazzar Ahmad Pasha contenting himself this time with keeping one of Bashir's sons as a hostage. Pressure on the Druzes decreased in 1804 with the death of Djazzar Pasha. In 1810 when the Wahhabls threatened Damascus, the *wall* Yusuf Pasha asked the help of Siileyman Pasha, the *sandiak-beyi* of Acre, who in turn summoned the Druzes to Damascus. The Druzes forced the departure of Yusuf Pasha and were only with difficulty compelled to retire into the

636 DURtFZ

Hawran by Suleyman Pasha's successor, 'Abd Allah Pasha. Bashir's absence from the Djabal had, however, caused so much resentment that the *wall* of Damascus and 'Abd Allah Pasha were forced to allow the *shaykhs* to summon him back to the Lebanon. Bashir thereafter sided with 'Abd Allah Pasha, in his revolt against the Ottomans in Acre, whereupon his rival Shaykh Djanbulat had 'Abbas al-Shihabl proclaimed *amir*, while Bashir and his sons had to seek refuge with Muhammad cAH in Egypt. Before long, however, Bashir was back, defeated Djanbulat at the battle of Mukhtara in 1825 and had him executed. In the following year, an attack on Bayrut by the fleet of the Greek insurgents led once again to a *pogrom* of local Christians, many of whom emigrated to the Djabal. Muslim feeling against Bashir was also inflamed by the permission given to Melkite Christians to settle in the Djabal. In 1830 Bashir once again helped 'Abd Allah Pasha, this time to suppress a revolt in Nablus. He then sided with Muhammad cAH against the Ottomans and helped the conquests of Ibrahim Pasha.

(M. C. §IHABEDDIN TEKINDA6)

After the Kitahya agreement of 1833 Bashir did his best to help the Egyptians, securing in return a wide autonomy for the Lebanon. Egyptian rule was at first welcomed, particularly as certain impositions on non-Muslims were abolished, but difficulties arose when Ibrahim Pasha tried to confiscate firearms and to call up Druzes. In 1835 Ibrahim

Pasha introduced troops into Dayr al-Kamar and tried to collect the arms of local Christians but preferred later to suspend his measures in so far as they affected the Druzes. Nevertheless a Druze revolt broke out in 1837 when an attempt was made to call up Druzes in the Hawran, who retaliated by assassinating Ibrahim Pasha's emissaries. The Ottoman Government tried to stir up the Druzes and to supply arms to them, Ibrahim Pasha retaliating by stirring up the Kurds and by closing Syrian ports to Ottoman shipping. A Druze revolt broke out in Ladja, but from his palace in Bayt al-Din, from where he exercised wide influence over the Maronites, Bashir succeeded in preventing its spreading from the Hawran to the Lebanon, believing as he did that thanks to French support the Egyptians would be finally victorious. A general revolt in the Lebanon, including this time the Maronites, broke out again, however, when Ibrahim Pasha made another attempt to call in arms and Egyptian forces in Bayrut found their communications cut. On 14 August 1840 the British naval commander Sir Charles Napier established contact with the rebels, who were supplied with arms after the joint bombardment of Bayrut the following month by British, Austrian and Ottoman ships. After vainly waiting for help from Ibrahim Pasha in Dayr al-Kamar, Bashir submitted to the Sultan, whose troops were in the process of reconquering Syria as a result of the London agreement. Bashir's personal security was guaranteed, but he was nevertheless deposed in favour of a relative, Bashir Kasim Malham. The Egyptian occupation on the one hand disorganized the feudal structure of the Djabal and, on the other, sharpened antagonism between the Druzes and the Maronites. Bashir Kasim's rule lasted for approximately one year and was underpinned by the *Mushlr* of Sayda, Selim Pasha, whose seat of government was transferred to Bayrut and who formed a mixed council of the various communities to advise the *amir*. Taxation reform (the Egyptians had raised the taxation of the Djabal from 3,650 to 6,500 purses and this was then reduced to 3,500 purses) and the question of compensation led to communal friction, which erupted at Baaklin, after which many houses and shops were set on fire at Dayr al-Kamar. Relative peace was restored after the Druze adventurer Shibal al-Uryan, who was in the service of the *wall* of Damascus, was forced to return to that city from Zahla. These events caused much stir abroad and led to foreign complaints against the Ottoman administration. The Ottomans thereupon deposed Bashir Kasim, and entrusted the administration of the Djabal directly to the *ser'asker* Mustafa Nuri Pasha, who in turn appointed to the amlrate one of his infantry commanders, the *mrlriwd* eOmer Pasha. Continued foreign displeasure led to the despatch to Bayrut of Selim Bey as an investigator in 1842, but the latter's report that the situation was satisfactory and that the appointment of either a Druze or a Maronite *amir* was impossible, was disbelieved by foreign ambassadors at the Porte. Meanwhile new incidents were reported, whereupon Esad Mukhlis Pasha was appointed *mushlr* of Sayda, and after his arrival at Bayrut the *ser'asker's* mission was declared completed. Esad Pasha appointed two *kd'im-makdms*, the Maronite Haydar from Bayt Abi 'l-Lamic and the Druze Mir Ahmad from Bayt Arslan, and detached the northern districts of Djubayl from the Djabal, placing them under Tripoli. More serious troubles broke out in 1845,

when Esad Pasha was succeeded by the *wall* of Aleppo, Wedjihl Pasha. Bloody incidents included an attack by the Maronites on the Druzes of Matn as well as Druze attacks on the monasteries of Abi and Sulima which were set on fire. Accusations and counter-accusations followed, the French accusing Wedjihl Pasha of being pro-Druze, while the French themselves were being accused of stirring up the Maronites. Another mission was then undertaken by the Foreign Minister Shekib Efendi, who started by demanding that all arms should be handed in, an order which led to resistance and further complications. A further emissary, the *ferlk* (divisional general) Emm Pasha was sent to Bayrut in January 1846. He helped Shekib Efendi in his work of reorganization, returning with him in June 1846. Shekib Efendi's reforms provided for the retention of the two *kd'im-makdms*, advised by mixed councils, special deputies (*wekllj*) being elected in villages having a mixed population. The two *kd'im-makdms* were to receive a salary of 12,500 piastres a month each, and to be appointed and dismissed directly by the Sultan on the advice of the *mushlr* of Sayda. The councils were given judicial as well as administrative and financial powers. Stability was thus established at the beginning of 1847, even although the failure to expel some trouble-making Druze leaders created difficulties. Taxes were apportioned between the two communities, the Maronites being asked to pay 1994 and the Druzes 1506 purses.

Peace was preserved until the *khatt-i humdyun* of 1856, which by its promise of concessions to non-Muslim subjects led to a more generalized Christian-Muslim rivalry. The first signs of trouble appeared in 1859. In the following year the Druzes and the Maronites clashed openly, whereupon Khurshid Pasha sent troops to the border between the two *fyadds*. This did not prevent the major outbreak of 1860: in May the Druzes attacked and set fire to villages in Matn; in June they were joined by Druzes from the Hawran, led by Isma'il Atrash (the Djabal Druzes being led mainly by Sa'ld DjanDUROZ

— DUST MUHAMMAD 637
bulat and Khattar Ahmad). While the General Council of the province (*Medjlis-i 'Umumi*) rejected the *wall's* suggestion to send troops, the Druzes overpowered the defenders of Government House at Hasbeya, massacring the local Christians: similar outrages were perpetrated at Rasheya, Ba'albak (where local government was overthrown by the Harkubin family), Zahla and Dayr al-Kamar. To crush the insurrection the Ottoman Government dispatched the Foreign Minister Fusad Pasha, arming him with emergency powers. His arrival coincided with a massacre of Christians in Damascus by the local mob, reinforced by Druzes and Bedouins. In the meantime Khurshid Pasha had secured an armistice between Druzes and Maronites, of which Fu'ad Pasha did not approve, on the grounds that it compromised future judicial proceedings, but which he feared to denounce as bloodshed might then be renewed. France intervened directly by landing 5,000 troops and by suggesting the total expulsion of the Druzes from the Djabal. This Fusad Pasha succeeded in avoiding by taking firm action against guilty Druze leaders, pursuing and apprehending them, and finally putting them on trial at a court-martial at Mukhtara, where some of them were sentenced to death. He also took severe punitive action in Damascus and had the *wall* Ahmed Pasha sent under escort for trial in Istanbul, Khurshid Pasha having also been dismissed from Bayrut.

These measures made possible the evacuation of French troops from the Djabal. Under the agreement signed on 9 June 1861, the Djabal was completely detached from the *wildyets* of Bayrut and of Damascus and placed under a Christian *mutasarraf*, who was, however, to come from outside the district. The *mutasarraf* was to be advised by an agent (*wakil*) from each community. Administrative councils were also formed at the centre and in seven newly formed *kadds*; a mixed police force was also constituted. At the instance of foreign embassies, an Armenian Catholic, Dawud Pasha, was appointed *mutasarraf*, a post which he retained for five years and in which he was succeeded by a Christian Arab, Franko Pasha. Dawud Pasha had many schools opened in Druze as well as in Maronite villages, and the Druzes continued to prosper under his successor. Disorder continued to prevail, however, among the Druzes of the Hawran who were joined by refugees from the Lebanon, so that Djabal Hawran began to be known as Djabal Duruz. Here Druzes came under the ascendancy of the Atrash family, as a result of the leading role played by Isma'îl al-Atrash in the events of 1860. Isma'îl's son Ibrahim raided Suwayda, the capital of the Djabal Hawran, in 1879. When the *wall* of Damascus led a punitive expedition against him, the Druzes put up a stiff resistance until an armistice was concluded in 1880. There was more trouble when Ibrahim's son Shibli was imprisoned at Dar'â by the Ottoman authorities, as a result of incidents which were largely economic and social in origin. The Druzes rose up again and Shibli had to be freed. Shibli was once again arrested and once again freed by a Druze insurrection in 1893, when in alliance with the Ban! Fadjr he led his followers against the Ruwala tribe. During these troubles many Druze families were banished to Anatolia, but they were later allowed to return, while, at the same time, projects to call up the Druzes for military service were dropped.

In the meantime the Druzes in the Lebanon remained peaceful until 1897 when they complained that Maronite pressure was constantly increasing and when they demanded the formation of a separate *kadd* for the 10,000 Druzes of Matn, in case the Maronites succeeded in detaching four communes (*ndfyiya*) from the only one existing Muslim *kadd* at Shuf. After the Young Turkish Revolution of 1908 operations against the Druzes were entrusted to Saml Pasha, who proclaimed martial law and then summoned the Druze leaders to Damascus where he had many of them executed. Druze resistance continued, nevertheless, until 1911. Druze demands became irrelevant when, after the beginning of the First World War, the capitulations, and with them Lebanese autonomy, were abolished and Isma'îl Hakkl Bey was appointed independent *mutasarraf*. During the war, Djemal Pasha kept some Druze leaders as "guests" in Jerusalem. Also during the war, the Druze leader, Yahya al-Atrash, whom Djemal Pasha accused of complicity with the French (*Khdiirdt*, Istanbul 1339, 179), died and was succeeded by his son Sellm. Djemal Pasha praised the services of two members of the Atrash family, Naslb and 'Abd al-Ghaffar, but a third member, Sultan, whose father had been executed by Saml Pasha, was opposed to the Ottomans and was the first Druze leader to enter Damascus with the Allied troops on 2 October 1918.

(M. TAYYIB GoKBiLGiN)