and Morgan, 145). As a result of this purge, Bātū's authority may have been extended into Transoxiana. The empire was now effectively divided into two great spheres of influence, that of Bātū and that of Möngke. Rubruck, who appears to locate the frontier between them a few days' journey east of Talas (Ṭarāz), observed that Möngke's representatives were treated with slightly less respect in Bātū's territories than were Bātū's in those of the *qaghan* (Rubruck, 225; trans. Jackson and Morgan, 146). When Möngke's brother Hülegü headed a great expedition to Iran and Iraq in the early 1250s, contingents representing Bātū and his brothers accompanied him.

Juwaynī (1:223; trans. Boyle, 1:268) suggests that Bātū died in about 653/1255–6; the date 650, supplied by sources from Mamlūk Egypt and Syria, is clearly erroneous. He was briefly succeeded first by his eldest son, Sartaq, and then by a son or grandson, Ulaghchi, before his younger brother, the Muslim convert Berke, became head of Jochī's *ulus*. Jūzjānī (2:176; trans. Raverty, 2:1172) reports a rumour that Bātū too had become a Muslim, although secretly. At the very least he is said to have been well disposed towards Muslims, and an *imām* and *muʾadhdhin* resided at his headquarters, where regular worship was conducted. In all likelihood, this reflects simply the habitual concern of the Mongol imperial dynasty, in conformity with Chinggis Khān's decree to honour and favour holy men of all creeds in return for their prayers. Juwaynī (1:222; trans. Boyle, 1: 267) asserts that, despite his beneficence towards Muslims, Bātū inclined towards no particular faith. Clearly, however, the spread of Islam among the subject Qipchāq population began during his reign.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCES

ʿAṭā-Malik Juwaynī, *Taʾrīkh-i jahān-gushā*, ed. Mīrzā Muḥammad Qazwīnī, 3 vols., Leiden and London 1912–37; ʿAṭā-Malik Juwaynī, *The history of the world-conqueror*, trans. John Andrew Boyle, 2 vols., Manchester 1958 (repr. Manchester 1997, in 1 vol.); Minhāj-i Sirāj Jūzjānī, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥayy Ḥabībī, 2 vols., Kabul 1342–3 sh./1963–4²; Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmiʿ al-tavārīkh*, ed. Muḥammad Rawshan and Muṣṭafā Mūsavī, Tehran 1373 sh./1994, 1:666–9, 720–1, 734–7; Sayfī Haravī, *Taʾrīkh-nāma-yi Harāt*, ed. Muḥammad Zubayr al-Ṣiddīqī, Calcutta 1944; William of Rubruck, *Itinerarium*, ed. A. Van den Wyngaert, *Sinica Franciscana*, vol. 1, *Itinera et relationes fratrum minorum saeculi XIII et XIV* (Florence 1929), 164–332; William of Rubruck *The mission of Friar William of Rubruck. His journey to the court of the Great Khan Möngke, 1253–1255*, trans. Peter Jackson, ed. Peter Jackson with David Morgan, London 1990.

STUDIES

Leo de Hartog, *Russia and the Mongol yoke. The history of the Russian principalities and the Golden Horde, 1221–1502* (London and New York 1996), index; Peter Jackson, The dissolution of the Mongol empire, *CAJ* 22 (1978), 186–244; Peter Jackson, *The Mongols and the West, 1221–1410* (Harlow 2005), index; R. A. Skelton, Thomas E. Marston, and George D. Painter (eds.), *The Vinland map and the Tartar relation*, New Haven and London 1995²; Bertold Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde. Die Mongolen in Russland 1223–1502* (Wiesbaden 1965²), 10–32 and passim.

PETER JACKSON

Bayān in Persian

In **Persian**, the term ***bayān*** has traditionally a series of meanings, ranging from the simple idea of discourse *(sukhan)* or speech *(guftār)*, to the more complex description or explanation *(sharḥ, tawḍīḥ)*, and, by way of eloquence *(zabānāvarī)* and

clarity of description *(fasāḥat)*, to the "use of comparison and metaphor" *(istifāda az tashbīh va istiʿāra)* (Anvarī). The latter definition is usually followed by that of *ʿilm-i bayān* (science of *bayān*) as a technical term of *balāghat* (rhetoric) (e.g., Muʿīn's *Farhang-i Fārsī* reproduces word for word the definition of *ʿilm-i bayān* given by Ṣafā in his *Āyīn-i sukhan*, 48).

In practice, these various meanings grade continuously, one into the other. Considered a division of *balāghat* (alongside *ʿilm-i maʿānī*, the science of meaning, and *ʿilm-i badīʿ*, the science of the figures of speech), *ʿilm-i bayān* theorises, analyses, and describes those elements of discourse that, by means of analogy (whether of substance or concept), help to clarify or highlight the characteristics of a "something."

1. DESCRIPTION

ʿIlm-i bayān therefore constitutes, by convention, that part of rhetoric that pertains to figurative language, and the term is reserved specifically for the rhetorical devices called *tashbīh* (comparison), *istiʿāra* (metaphor), *kināya* (metonymy, allusion), and *majāz* (metonymy, allegory) (in some treatises, *kināya* and *majāz* are considered to constitute a single device). The Persian *ʿilm-i bayān* shares its terminology and framework and much of its theoretical approach with the Arabic *ʿilm al-bayān*.

Lying within the broad limits of *balāghat*—even though some writers of antiquity considered it to belong to *fasāḥat*—*bayān* is a means of increasing clarity, eloquence, and efficacy in discourse by means of an iconic/metaphorical use of language aimed at expressing a non-literal meaning that goes beyond the standard denotation. It is the science of investigating the various possibilities that language offers for expressing an idea in a more or less direct way (tropes): "*Bayān*

is the expression of a meaning *(maʿnī)* in another fashion, on condition that the diversity inherent in this (different) way is based on the imagination or, rather, that the words and phrases (that express a *maʿnī*—a subject—by means of *bayān*, eloquence) should differ from one other, by way of a process of the imagination" (Shamīsā, 19).

The devices studied in the *ʿilm-i bayān* traditionally were comparison, metaphor, metonymy, allusion and allegory, but today the range has extended to the use of symbols, myths, and, in some cases, also hyperbole and others figures of speech (Shamīsā, 189–226, 257–62).

The study of *ʿilm-i bayān* as separate from *ʿilm-i badīʿ* is relatively recent in the Persian-speaking domain. The three oldest treatises on Persian rhetoric—by Muḥammad Rādūyānī (writing between 481/1088 and 507/1114), Rashīd al-Dīn Vaṭvāṭ (d. c. 578/1182–3), and Shams-i Qays (fl. first half of the seventh/thirteenth century)—and all works on poetry up to the twelfth/eighteenth century contain no such subdivision. The text of Shams-i Qays, *al-Muʿjam fī maʿāyīr ashʿār al-ʿAjam* ("A compendium of standards of Persian poetry," completed c. 629/1232), the undisputed model of Persian poetic theory, has no section dedicated to *ʿilm-i bayān*, although it reflects, directly or indirectly, the arrangement of the science of language used by his contemporary al-Sakkākī (d. 626/1228) in his *Miftāḥ al-ʿulūm* ("The key of sciences"). In this work and the later commentaries by Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Qazvīnī (d. 739/1338) and Saʿd al-Dīn Taftazānī (d. 792/1390), the *ʿilm-i bayān* was codified as the science dedicated to *tashbīh*, *istiʿāra*, *kināya*, and *majāz*. In the text of Shams-i Qays, as in the earlier manuals and up to the twelfth/eighteenth century, *tashbīh*,

isti'āra, kināya, and majāz do not constitute a separate chapter and are dealt with within 'ilm-i badī', that is, within the science that studies and describes the embellishment of discourse.

2. HISTORY

The oldest known treatise in Persian that has a section on 'ilm-i bayān is Anvār al-balāgha ("Lights on rhetoric") by Muḥammad Hādī Māzandarānī (d. 1134/1721–2). Before it was published in 1977, Anvār al-balāgha was considered a simple translation of al-Mutavval ("Long commentary") by al-Taftazānī (d. 792/1390), but the editor of the Persian edition, M. 'A. Ghulāmīnezhād, contradicts this hypothesis and emphasises the novel elements in Anvār. Anvār is, however, a text that, although written in Persian, describes bayān following the framework of and citing examples from the Arabic discipline. According to the catalogue of Persian Manuscripts of Munzavī (2129–30), a contemporary of Māzandirānī, Ibrāhīm Sharbatdār Iṣfahānī (c. twelfth/seventeenth century) is said to have composed a treatise entitled Risāla dar balāghat ("Treatise on rhetoric"), in which there are three chapters dedicated to bayān. The work, not yet published, is not described in Munzavī's catalogue in sufficient detail to clarify whether it deals with Persian or Arabic bayān.

In fact, when Persians began to study their own literature, they specialised in 'ilm-i badī', that is, the cataloguing, definition, and exemplification of the rhetorical devices of speech. Persian prosodists abandoned the academic approach codified by Arabic rhetoricians between the third/ninth and sixth/twelfth centuries, as they gradually undertook the study and criticism of their own poetry. Within the Persian-speaking area, critics dedicated themselves, for the most part, to composing manuals on balāghat that concentrated on the more technical aspects of poetry, such as qāfiya (rhyme), 'aruḍ (prosody), and badī' (figures of speech).

The first work dealing unequivocally with Persian 'ilm-i bayān, written in India in 1147–8/1734–5, was Sirāj al-Dīn Akbarābādī Ārzū's (d. 1169/1755) treatise 'Aṭiya-yi kubrā ("Long poem in ṭ"), a work that, according to Shamisā, the editor of the Persian edition, enjoyed a widespread readership at that time and later. The editor reports that 'Aṭiya-yi kubrā is the first text in Persian to deal with bayān separately from badī'. The text is the product of Persian treatise-writing in India, which flourished in the Mughal era (923–1274/1526–1858). The author himself—in a part of his introduction that follows a description of his ample literary erudition as legitimisation for the text that he is about to compose—asserts that, "Wherever one looks among the texts of the ancient and modern writers, a book on 'ilm-i bayān (which is one part of fasāḥat) written in Persian is not to be found. On 'ilm-i badī', on the other hand, which is another of the parts of balāghat, some books, such as Hadā'iq al-siḥr by Rashīd al-Dīn Vaṭvāṭ, have been composed…In truth, in these lands there is no unlettered man who does not desire that a book be written on this art, perfect in form and complete in contents, so that the scholars become informed by means of examples that cause poetry to be understood and gather in the meaning from this.… This treatise is the first book to have descended from that heaven that is the elevated way of thinking on earth that is Persian poetry." Despite the fact that assertions of this sort constitute a widespread literary convention, critics

tend to consider this text a foundation stone of this science in the Persian world. Having asserted the primacy of his text, Akbarābādī Ārzū proceeds to what today appears to be one of the earliest definitions of *bayān* in Persian: "*bayān* is a science within which a word *(lafẓ)* that 'tells of' a thing *(ḥikāyat-i chīz-ī)* using another thing is discussed" (Ārzū, 51).

In the catalogues of Persian manuscripts, we find many as yet unpublished works composed between the end of the second/eighth and the early years of the twentieth century that seem to include sections devoted to the *ʿilm-i bayān* (see J. T. P. De Bruijn, Bayān, *EIr*). For the period between the composition of *ʿAṭiya-yi kubrā* and the 1930s, the major catalogues of Persian manuscripts cite only about ten works, which seems to indicate little interest in *ʿilm-i bayān* during that period. A fresh impulse was given to the publication of manuals containing sections on *ʿilm-i bayān* after the foundation of Tehran University, in 1935, and the establishment of the curriculum on *maʿānī* and *bayān*. From the 1940s to the present day, the number of publications has increased greatly. The main objective was to create a system uncoupled from Arabic and working towards the critical study of Persian literature, employing the study of *bayān* for the analysis of Persian texts, ancient and modern. This orientation, which concentrates on the relationship between the Arabic foundations of *ʿilm-i bayān* and its revisitation and adaptation in the Persian context, features often in the introductions to major scholarly works (e.g., Ṣafā, Āhanī, Humāyī, and Jalīl Tajlīl) and has encouraged some to reexamine its principles on the basis of new linguistic and theoretical categories (Shamīsā) and to modernise the specialised lexicon of this art (Kazzāzī).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ghulām Ḥusayn Āhanī, *Maʿānī bayān*, Tehran 1357sh/1978; Kāmil Aḥmad'nizhād, *Funūn-i adabī (ʿaruḍ, qāfiya, bayān, badīʿ)*, Tehran 1372sh/1993–4th repr. 1374sh/1995; Ḥasan Anvarī, *Farhang-i buzurg-i sukhan*, Tehran 1381sh/2002–3; Sirāj al-Dīn Akbarābādī Ārzū, *ʿAṭiya-yi kubrā va mawhibat-i ʿuzmā. Nukhustīn risālāt ba zabān-i Fārsī dar bayān va maʿānī*, Tehran 1381sh/2002; Natalia Chalisova, Persian rhetoric. *ʿIlm-i badīʿ and ʿilm-i bayān*, in Ehsan Yarshater (ed.), *A history of Persian literature* (London 2009), 1:139–71; Jalāl al-Dīn Humāyī, *Maʿānī va bayān, ba kushish-i Māhdukht Bānū Humāyī*, Tehran 1370sh/1991; Mīr Jalāl al-Dīn Kazzāzi, *Bayān*, Tehran 1368sh/1989–90; Muḥammad Hādī Māzandarānī, *Anvār al-balāgha. Dar funūn-i maʿānī, bayān va badīʿ*, Tehran 1375sh/1996–7; Aḥmad Munzavī, *Fihrist-i nuskha'hā-yi khaṭṭī-yi Fārsī*, 6 vols., Tehran 1348–51sh/1969–72; Muḥammad Jalīl Rajāyi, *Muʿālim al-balāgha dar ʿilm-i maʿānī va bayān va badīʿ*, Shiraz 1353sh/1974; Dhabihallāh Ṣafā, *Āyīn-i sukhan, mukhtaṣarī dar maʿānī va bayān-i Fārsī*, Tehran, 12th repr. 1364sh/1985; Sīrūs Shamīsā, *Bayān*, Tehran 1370sh/1991, 3rd repr. 1372sh/1993; Jalīl Tajlīl, *Maʿānī va bayān*, Tehran 1362sh/1983; Naṣrallāh Taqvī, *Hanjār-i guftār (dar fann-i maʿānī va bayān va badīʿ-i Fārsī)*, Isfahan, repr. 1363sh/1984; Bihrūz Thirvatiyyān, *Bayān dar shiʿr-i Fārsī*, Tehran 1369sh/1990–1; Geert Jan H. van Gelder, *Beyond the line. Classical Arabic literary critics on the coherence and unity of the poem*, Leiden 1982; Geert Jan H. van Gelder, Traditional literary theory. The Arabic background, in Ehsan Yarshater (ed.), *A history of Persian literature* (London 2009), 1:123–8.

DANIELA MENEGHINI

Bāydū

Bāydū Khān (d. 694/1295) was the fifth Mongol Īlkhānid ruler of Iran, Iraq, and Anatolia, and the grandson of Hülegü Khān. He ruled for less than six months, in 694/1295. After the death of his father, Taraqāy, Bāydū passed into the household of Hülegü's wife, Qutūy Khātūn