

# THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF  
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

**B. LEWIS, V. L. MÉNAGE, CH. PELLAT AND † J. SCHACHT**

ASSISTED BY C. DUMONT, SECRETARY GENERAL, AND E. VAN DONZEL AND  
G. R. HAWTING, EDITORIAL SECRETARIES

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME III

**H—IRAM**

PHOTOMECHANICAL REPRINT



LEIDEN  
**E. J. BRILL**

1986

LONDON  
**LUZAC & CO.**

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

*Former and present members:* A. ABEL, C. C. BERG, F. GABRIELI, E. GARCÍA GÓMEZ, *the late* H. A. R. GIBB, *the late* J. H. KRAMERS, *the late* E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL, [*the late* G. LEVI DELLA VIDA], T. LEWICKI, B. LEWIN, B. LEWIS, [*the late* E. LITTMANN], *the late* H. MASSÉ, G. C. MILES, H. S. NYBERG, R. PARET, J. PEDERSEN, CH. PELLAT, *the late* N. W. POSTHUMUS, *the late* J. SCHACHT, F. C. WIEDER

*Former and present associated members:* *the late* H. H. ABDUL WAHAB, *the late* A. ADNAN ADIVAR, A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI, *the late* HUSAIN DJAJADININGRAT, A. A. A. FYZEE, HALIL INALCIK, *the late* M. FUAD KÖPRÜLÜ, İBRAHİM MADKOUR, *the late* KHALIL MARDAM BEY, NAJİ AL-ASIL, *the late* MUHAMMAD SHAFI, *the late* MUSTAFA AL-SHIHABI, *the late* HASAN TAGHIZADE, E. TYAN

*Former and present honorary members:* *the late* G. LEVI DELLA VIDA; *the late* E. LITTMANN

ON THE COMPLETION OF THE THIRD VOLUME OF THE NEW EDITION OF THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE PAYS HOMAGE TO THE MEMORY OF J. SCHACHT, MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE AND OF THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEES, DECEASED IN 1969.

The articles in this volumes were published in double fascicles of 128 pages from 1965 onwards, the dates of publication being:

1965: fascs. 41-42, pp. 1-128  
1966: fascs. 43-46, pp. 129-384  
1967: fascs. 47-50, pp. 385-640  
1968: fascs. 51-54, pp. 641-896

1969: fascs. 55-56, pp. 897-1024  
1970: fascs. 57-58, pp. 1025-1152  
1971: fascs. 59-60, pp. 1153-1270

First published 1971  
Reprinted 1979

ISBN 90 04 08118 6

*Copyright 1971 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands*  
*All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the Editors*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

400/July 1010), and Muḥammad al-Mahdī appeared before him to answer for his conduct, before being removed for execution. Hishām then nominally ruled, with Wāḍih as his *ḥāḍib* and the real power. The siege dragged on, since Sulaymān would have none of Hishām as Caliph, till 403, when after the attempted flight and death of Wāḍih and further unavailing resistance, Cordova surrendered on 26 Shawwāl/9 May 1013. The entry of the Berber army and the subsequent sack were the virtual end of Umayyad Cordova [see *KURṬUBA*]. Hishām did not long survive the disaster to his capital. He was killed by a son of Sulaymān al-Mustaʿīn in *Dhu* 'l-Ḳaʿda 403/May 1013 (Ibn al-Khaṭīb). This was the 'second death'. (There was also a 'third death' much later, in 451/1059, when the 'Abbāsid al-Muʿtaḍid [q.v.] ceased to make prayer for Hishām, whose existence he and his father by a convenient fiction had maintained for many years.)

**Bibliography:** Ibn 'Idhārī, *al-Bayān al-mughrib*, ii, 269-321, iii, 38-60, 100-14, 199-200; Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *A'māl al-a'lām*, ed. E. Lévi-Provençal, Rabāt 1353/1934, 49-142 (especially 104-141); Ibn Khaldūn, Beirut 1958, iv(v), 318-27; Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 497-502, ix, 152-4; Maḥḥārī, *Nafḥ al-ṭib*, Leiden ed., indices; Dozy, *Histoire des musulmans d'Espagne*, revised ed., Leiden 1932, ii, 200-314; E. Lévi-Provençal, *Histoire de l'Espagne musulmane*, revised ed., Paris-Leiden 1950, ii, 206 ff., 219-20, 230-1, 291 ff. and indices; Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz, *La España musulmana*<sup>3</sup>, Buenos Aires 1960, i, 330-87. (D. M. DUNLOP)

**HISHĀM III, AL-MUʿTADD BI'LLĀH b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Abd al-Rahmān III**, the last of the Umayyad Caliphs of Cordova. Born in 364/974-75, he is said to have been the elder brother of 'Abd al-Rahmān IV, al-Murtadā [q.v.], whom he accompanied in the rout at Granada in which the latter was killed (408/1018). Hishām escaped to Ḳaṣr al-Bunt (Alpuente) in the province of Valencia, where he was received by the 'Amirid *mawla* 'Abd Allāh b. Kāsim al-Fihri. Proclaimed Caliph by the Cordovans in Rabī' II 418/June 1027, he remained at Ḳaṣr al-Bunt for more than 2 years, making his official entry into Cordova only in *Dhu* 'l-Hijja 420/December 1029. Owing principally to his *wazīr* Ḥakam b. Saʿīd al-Ḳazzāz, a man of obscure origin, whose financial measures were supposed to favour the Berbers, the Caliphate of Hishām III soon became unacceptable to the Cordovans. The disaffection resulted in the murder of the unpopular *wazīr*, and Hishām was at the same time deposed (*Dhu* 'l-Hijja 422/November 1031). But this time no new Caliph was elected. A council of notables headed by Abu 'l-Ḥazm b. Djaḥwar took control. The last Umayyad Caliph was allowed to retire, and ended his days at Lārīda (Lerida) in Ṣafar 428/December 1036. A new era of Spanish Muslim history had begun—that of the Party Kings (*mulūk al-tawāʾif*, *reyes de Taifas*). The governor of Lerida with whom the last Umayyad found refuge was Sulaymān b. Hūd [see *HŪD*IDS].

**Bibliography:** Ibn 'Idhārī, *al-Bayān al-mughrib*, iii, 127, 145-52; Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *A'māl al-a'lām*, 153, 160-62; idem, *al-Iḥāṭa*, Escorial MS. Ar. 1673, page 381; al-Ḥumaydī, *Djaḍhwat al-muktabis*, Cairo 1953, 26; Dozy, *Histoire des musulmans d'Espagne*, rev. edition, Leiden 1932, ii, 338-346; E. Lévi-Provençal, *Histoire de l'Espagne musulmane*, rev. edition, Paris-Leiden 1950, ii, 337-345; Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz, *La España musulmana*<sup>3</sup>, Buenos Aires 1960, i, 395-7. (D. M. DUNLOP)

**HISHĀM B. 'AMR AL-FUWAṬĪ** (or AL-FAWṬĪ), a Muʿtazilī of Baṣra, where he was the pupil of Abu 'l-Hudhayl [q.v.]. After having probably been a wandering propagator of *Iʿizāl* (Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, ed. Fück, in *Prof. Muḥ. Shafīʿ presentation volume*, Lahore 1955, 68-9), he went to Baghdād during the caliphate of al-Maʾmūn and died there at a date not known exactly, but probably before 218/833.

His personal doctrine, which had a certain influence on al-Ashʿarī [q.v.], differs appreciably, according to Ibn al-Nadīm (*op. cit.*), from the teachings of the other Muʿtazila, but the data given by the heresiographers are not always in agreement. Thus, according to al-Baghdādī (*Fark*, 150), he forbade murder of any kind, whereas according to al-Shahrastānī (*Milal*, on the margin of Ibn Ḥazm, *Fiṣal*, i, 94) he allowed the assassination of opponents of *Iʿizāl* and in that respect showed a fanaticism unusual among the Muʿtazila. Al-Shahrastānī (*op. cit.*, i, 91) emphasizes the extremism of his theory of free-will, for al-Fuwaṭī denies the intervention of God in the affairs of man, even when a verse of the *Qurʾān* states that God caused men to do such and such a deed. "Things" not being eternal, God cannot know them before having given them existence (al-Ashʿarī, *Maḳālāt*, ed. Ritter, 157, 488, 489; al-Shahrastānī, *op. cit.*, i, 94), for a "thing" is the realization of the essence within existence, that which has been created by God. He rejects the doctrine that God can be seen 'with the heart' (al-Ashʿarī, *op. cit.*, 157) and holds that it is not the accidents that prove that God is creator, but material things (al-Shahrastānī, *op. cit.*, i, 92; al-Khayyāt, *Intiṣār*, ed. and trans. A. Nader, Beirut 1957, text 49, trans. 54), that is to say the substances which are realized when God gives them existence. Al-Fuwaṭī regards as infidels those who believe that heaven and hell already exist, since these are for the moment unnecessary (al-Baghdādī, *op. cit.*, 150; al-Idjī, *Mawāḳif*, 375; al-Shahrastānī, *op. cit.*, i, 93). In politics, he tends to the Sunnī view; he holds that the *imām* ought to be elected, but he would allow this only in a time of calm and order, which al-Shahrastānī (*op. cit.*, i, 93) considers a sign of hostility towards the caliphate of 'Alī (cf. al-Baghdādī, *op. cit.*, 150; idem, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 271; Pellat, in *St. Isl.*, xv, 39).

The basic points of the doctrine of al-Fuwaṭī are now known only from the heresiographers, but Ibn al-Nadīm attributes to him the following works: *K. al-Maḥlūk*; *K. al-Radd ʿala 'l-Aṣamm fi nafy al-ḥarakāt*; *K. Khalk al-Kurʾān*; *K. al-Tawḥīd*; *K. Djaḥwāb ahl Khurāsān*; *Kitāb ilā ahl al-Baṣra*; *K. Uṣūl al-khams (sic)*; *K. ʿala 'l-Bakriyya*; *Kitāb ʿalā Abi 'l-Hudhayl fi 'l-naʿim*.

**Bibliography:** in the article; see also A. N. Nader, *Le système philosophique des Muʿtazila*, Beirut 1956, index and bibliography there given. (CH. PELLAT)

**HISHĀM B. AL-ḤAKAM ABŪ MUḤAMMAD**, the most prominent representative of Imāmī *kalām* [q.v.] in the time of the Imāms Djaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and Mūsā al-Kāzim. A client of the tribe of Kinda, he was born and raised in Wāsit, but later lived in Kūfa among the Banū Shaybān. He is said to have been a Djaḥmī before his conversion to Shiʿism by the Imām Djaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. Other accounts, however, point to his early association with representatives of dualist religions, notably with Abū Shākir al-Dayṣānī. It is certain that after his conversion to Shiʿism he held disputations with Abū Shākir and

other dualists, and some of his conceptions of physics are evidently influenced by their doctrines. He became closely associated with Imām Dja'far and then with Mūsā al-Kāzim, whom he, unlike many other Shī'ī leaders, recognized immediately after Dja'far's death (148/765). In Kūfa he owned a shop together with the Ibāḍī scholar 'Abd Allāh b. Yazīd, with whom he maintained a close partnership all his life despite their doctrinal differences. In his later life Hishām belonged to the circle of theologians who held disputations in the presence of Yahyā b. Khālīd al-Barmakī and apparently presided over some of the discussions. He lived and carried on his trade in al-Karkh. He was accused by some Shī'īs of having been partly responsible for the arrest of Mūsā al-Kāzim. The Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd is said to have taken an interest in his views and then, finding them dangerous, reacted by ordering the arrest of the imām. Hishām was forced to go into hiding and died shortly afterwards in the year 179/795-6. Other accounts, which state that his death occurred either shortly after the downfall of the Barmakids (186/803), or in the year 199/814-5, or during the caliphate of al-Ma'mūn, do not appear reliable. In any case, there are no reports indicating any activity of his during the imamate of 'Alī al-Rīdā (183-203/711-818).

The theory of the imamate which Hishām elaborated has remained at the basis of the Imāmī doctrine. It rests on the idea of the permanent need for a divinely guided imām who could act as the authoritative teacher of mankind in all religious matters. The imām thus was the legatee (*waṣī*) of the Prophet. He was infallible (*ma'sūm*) in all his acts and words, but unlike the prophets did not receive divine messages (*waḥy*). In contrast to the later generally accepted Imāmī doctrine, Hishām held that the prophets, since their acts could be criticized by divine messages, did not have to be infallible, and that Muḥammad and the other prophets had, indeed, at time committed acts of disobedience. Muḥammad had installed 'Alī as his legatee and lieutenant (*khalīfa*) by explicit appointment (*naṣṣ*). The whole community with only a few exceptions, such as al-Mikdād, Salmān, Abū Dharr and 'Ammār, had apostasized by turning away from 'Alī and accepting Abū Bakr as caliph. The imamate was to be transmitted among the descendants of 'Alī and Fāṭima until the day of the resurrection. Each imām installed his successor by an explicit appointment. Whoever obeyed the imām was a true believer, whoever opposed or rejected him, an infidel (*kāfir*). To safeguard the faith and the community of believers, the imām and his followers in case of necessity were permitted or obliged to practice dissimulation (*takiyya* [q.v.]) concerning their religious beliefs. The imām was not expected to revolt against the existing illegal government, and rebellion without his authorization was unlawful.

Hishām defined God as a finite, three-dimensional body (*ḍiṣm*) and as radiant light. God had been in no place, then He produced space by His movement and came to be in a place, namely the Throne. The doctrine that God was a body was based on Hishām's general view that only bodies have existence. At the same time Hishām rejected the doctrine of other contemporary Imāmī theologians like al-Djāwālīkī and Mu'min ("Shayṭān") al-Ṭāk that God had a shape like that of man. He thus represented a rather anti-anthropomorphist attitude within the contemporary Imāmīyya, and only from the perspective of the Mu'tazila and the later Imāmīyya

could he be accused of gross anthropomorphism (*tashbīh* [q.v.]). Hishām held that God did not know things or events before they came into being and argued that God's knowing them from eternity would entail their existence from eternity. The objection that this view would necessitate God's being originally ignorant and knowing only through a knowledge produced in time was met by Hishām with his general theory concerning the attributes of God. Knowledge, power, life, sight, hearing etc. were descriptive attributes (*ṣifāt*), rather than accidents (*a'rāḍ*), and could not be further described as being eternal or produced. Since these attributes could not be described as being either God, or part of Him, or other than Him, Hishām by this view also evaded the problem raised by the Mu'tazilīs concerning the multiplicity of God's accidents, which threatened the concept of His unity. By considering the Qur'ān as a descriptive attribute of God, he could furthermore maintain that it was neither creator, nor created, nor uncreated. This neutral position in the dispute concerning the createdness of the Qur'ān tallied with a statement attributed to Imām Dja'far. The reciting of the Qur'ān, however, according to Hishām's view was created.

In agreement with the Muslim predestinarians Hishām considered the acts of men as created by God. With the majority of contemporary Imāmīs he thus upheld the doctrine of divine determinism (*ḥadar*). On the other hand, he attempted to maintain man's responsibility by defining his acts as being in one respect his choice (*ikhtiyār*), resulting from his will, and as being in another respect compulsion, because of the need for an additional efficient cause. He also supported the distinctively Imāmī doctrines of the return (*ra'dī'a* [q.v.]) of the dead before the day of the resurrection, the admissibility of a change of God's decisions (*badā'* [q.v.]) and of the suppression and corruption of parts of the Qur'ān in the official version. His views on physics, such as the rejection of atomism, the opinion that two particles may interpenetrate each other (*mudākhala*), that a particle may pass from one place to another without passing through all intervening places (*tafra* [q.v.]), and his identification of man with the spirit (*rūḥ*) to the exclusion of the body have influenced the views of the Mu'tazilī al-Nazzām.

After Hishām's death his doctrine was propagated and defended by his disciple Yūnus b. 'Abd al-Rahmān (d. 208/823-4), by Muḥammad b. Khālīl al-Sakkāk, and later by the Nisābūrī al-Faḍl b. Shādhān (d. ca. 260/874-5). He and his school were opposed on some points by rival Imāmī schools of *kalām* and on principle by Imāmī traditionists opposed to *kalām* in general. With the progressive adoption of Mu'tazilī theology, particularly from the 4th/10th century, Hishām's school became extinct. Although many of his opinions were highly objectionable from the point of view of later Imāmī doctrine, the Imāmī attitude toward him has generally remained favorable.

Of Hishām's many writings listed in the *Fihrist* of al-Nadīm none is extant. His *K. Ikhtilāf al-nās fi 'l-imāma* was probably used by al-Hasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī as the basis of his own *K. Firaḥ al-shī'a*. Hishām's discussions with other theologians and heretics are frequently quoted in both Sunnī and Shī'ī works.

*Bibliography:* al-Khayyāṭ, *al-Intiṣār*, ed. Nyberg, Cairo 1925, index; Ibn Qutayba, *Ta'wīl muḥṭalif al-ḥadīth*, Cairo 1326, 59 f.; idem, *Uyūn al-akhbār*, Cairo 1343-9/1925-30, ii, 142,

150, 153 f.; al-Nawbakhtī, *Firaḥ al-shī'a*, ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul 1931, index; al-Ash'arī, *Maḥālāt al-islāmiyyīn*, ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul 1929-33, index; al-Mas'ūdī, *Murūdī*, v, 443 f., vii, 232-6; *Fihrist*, 175 f.; *WZKM*, iv, 226; al-Kashshī, *Riḍjāl*, al-Nadīf n.d., 220-38; al-Malaṭī, *al-Tanbīh wa 'l-radd*, ed. S. Dederling, Leipzig 1936, 19 f.; Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, Cairo 1317-27, iv, 185; Yāqūt, *Mu'djam al-buldān*, i, 14; Ibn Dā'ūd al-Ḥillī, *al-Riḍjāl*, Tehrān 1342, 367 f., 525; Nūr Allāh Shuṣhtarī, *Madjālis al-mu'minin*, lith. Tehrān 1299, 153-9; al-Madīlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, Tehrān 1376, x, 234-9. There are only inadequate expositions of his doctrine: M. Horten, *Die philosophischen Systeme der spekulativen Theologen im Islam*, Bonn 1912, 170-8; A. S. Tritton, *Muslim theology*, London 1947, 74-8. On the influence of dualistic systems on his doctrine and his own influence on al-Nazzām: O. Pretzl, *Die früh-islamische Atomenlehre*, in *Isl.*, xix (1931), 119-29; idem, *Die frühislamische Attributenlehre*, Munich 1940, 16-9, 38 f., 48 f.; S. Pines, *Beiträge zur islamischen Atomenlehre*, Berlin 1936, 4, 16-20, 101 f. On his doctrine concerning predestination: M. Watt, *Free Will and Predestination in Islam*, London 1948, 116-8. W. Madelung, *Bemerkungen zur imamitischen Firaq-Literatur*, in *Isl.*, xliii (1967), 37-52. (W. MADELUNG)

**HISHĀM B. MUḤAMMAD AL-KALBĪ** [see AL-KALBĪ].

**ḤIṢN** (A.), "fortress", is a fairly common element in place-names, e.g., Ḥiṣn al-Akrād, Ḥiṣn Kayfā [qq.v.], etc. This article surveys, so far as the present state of knowledge permits, the development of fortifications in certain areas of the Islamic world. Some aspects of this subject, the military architecture of the donjon and the bastion, are treated s.v. **BURĠ** and others s.v. **KAL'A** and **SŪR**. Offensive operations, the techniques of siege-craft, are dealt with in general s.v. **ḤIṢĀR**; for siege-engines employed before the invention of gunpowder, see **ARRĀḌA**, **KAWS** and **MANDJANĪK**; for the use in defence of "Greek fire", etc., see **NAṬṬ**; for the use of cannon in warfare generally see especially **BĀRŪD**, and also **ṬOṬĪ**. In view of the lack of substantial general monographs for many areas, this article covers only (i) the Western territories of the Islamic world, Spain and the Maghrib, (ii) Persia, (iii) Central Asia, and (iv) Indonesia and Malaysia. The Editors hope to make good the deficiencies in the Supplement, s.v. **ḤIṢN**. Readers will, however, find much information in the articles dealing with individual fortresses, e.g., the "Crusader castles" (**ḤIṢN AL-AKRĀD**, **MAṢKAB**, **ṢĀFITHĀ**, etc.), the citadels of major cities, Ottoman fortress-towns, etc. (ED.)

#### i.—MUSLIM WEST

The detailed forms, and the evolution, of military architecture in the Muslim West have been dealt with in the article **BURĠ**. In this article we shall see how the Muslim West solved the major problems of fortification, and how the various types of fortified works—town enceintes, isolated castles, fortified ports or arsenals—are laid out and organized; we shall see also how it overcame the difficulties of flanking, of gates, and, from the 8th/14th century, of modifications for guns.

**Town enceintes.** Since the period of the Late Empire, unfortified towns had become rare in the western world. Because of unrest caused by invasions, urban centres had been fortified with ramparts, thereby in many cases reducing their original extent. However,

many cities in the Berber country which were primarily agricultural markets remained unwallled.

The disturbed history of the Muslim dynasties, especially in the Berber country, led to the fortification of towns or the maintenance of their walls in good repair. From the very beginning dynastic foundations always provided for a rampart. The need for a fortified wall round every town of any size led to the maintenance of the Late Empire practice, perforce universal in the early Middle Ages.

The plan of the enceinte. In Spain and Africa Muslim walls sometimes adopted the general trace of a former enceinte, making use of the bases and other parts of it, as at Karmūna and at Cáceres. The prosperity of certain state or provincial capitals often led, in the Middle Ages, to the enlargement of town walls to take in important suburbs.

On level ground, town enceintes were often modelled on the trace of a pre-existent settlement. In new foundations they are more regular in shape, with long alignments of ramparts. On uneven sites modification to suit the terrain was effected very simply: the principle was to use towers sparingly while the curtain wall ran along rocky outcrops, following them as closely as possible; salients and marked re-entrants are rare. Most enceintes are in the form of an irregular, but convex, polygon.

In many cases, however, it was necessary that the nearest points of high ground, which could have commanded the ramparts, should also be held. The town wall of Granada, in the 5th/11th century, extended as far as two small fortresses guarding the slopes and the summit of the Alhambra hill. At **Shāṭiba** (Játiva) ramparts ran up to two small fortresses on the crests of high ground dominating the town from above. It was equally important to ensure protected access to water supplies: walls terminating in a bastion ran down to the river at Badajoz (**Baṭalyaws**). At Seville such a terminal tower has become, as the Golden Tower, a powerful bastion.

The **ḥaṣaba**, the residence of the ruler or his government, usually occupies the higher part of the town, from which it is separated by a rampart; but if its site is distinct from that of the town settlement, then walls join the two enceintes, as at Almería (al-Mariyya). At Malaga, where the Alcazaba was in the centre of the city, it had its own enceinte, and the town was connected by long ramparts to the outer citadel of Gibralfaro; similarly at Jaen (**Djāyyān**).

When the **ḥaṣaba** achieved the dimensions of a governmental town, it would have its own separate system of fortification, whether or not in contact with the residential and commercial quarters. The Alhambra was distinctly separated from Granada, as was Fās al-Djādīd from Fās al-Bāli. On the other hand, the Almohad **ḥaṣaba** at Marrākush, and the palaces of Mawlay Ismā'il at Meknès, while partly constituting a fortified whole, are in contact with the town itself. In every case, two fortified systems are either close to each other or are juxtaposed.

Certain **ḥaṣabas** were built to house garrisons to keep under surveillance a town where there was some apprehension of disturbances. Such was the case with the "Conventual" of Marida, built by 'Abd al-Rahmān II. In the 10th/16th century the Sa'dids kept such a watch over Fez by the north and south **burājes**.

**Plans of the enceinte.**—The double wall enclosing a narrow corridor is to be found at Madīnat al-Zahrā'. Long passages between high ramparts are