

*rule in black Africa: prince, autocrat, prophet, tyrant*, Berkeley, Calif. 1982; Donna V. Jones, *The racial discourses of life philosophy: négritude, vitalism, and modernity*, New York 2010; Vladimir Klima, Karel Frantisek Růžicka, and Petr Zima, *Black Africa: literature and language*, Dordrecht, Holland 1976; Thomas Patrick Melady and Margaret Badum Melady, *Ten African heroes: the sweep of independence in black Africa*, New York 2011; *The Political economy of risk and choice in Senegal*, ed. Mark Gersovitz and John Waterbury, London: Frank Cass, 2005; Janet G. Vaillant, *Vie de Léopold Sédar Senghor*, tr. Roger Meunier, Paris 2006; Sylvia Washington Bâ, *The concept of negritude in the poetry of Léopold Sédar Senghor*, Princeton, N. J. 1973.

/ اصغر صادقی یکتا /

### سنگ یهود ← سنگ

سینن، نوعی از آثار حدیثی اهل سنت. سنن جمع سنّة و در لغت به معنای راهها و روشها است (← جوهری، ذیل واژه؛ ابن منظور، ج ۶، ص ۳۹۹). در اصطلاح علوم حدیث، «سنن» نوعی از نگارشهای حدیثی مشتمل بر احادیثی در ابواب مختلف است و چون هدف از تألیف آنها گردآوری روایات منحصراً به سنت پیامبر صلی الله علیه و آله وسلم است، عنوان «سنن» بر آنها اطلاق شده است. کتابهای سنن معمولاً احادیث احکام را دربردارند و بر اساس ابواب فقهی مرتب شده اند (کتابی، ص ۳۲؛ اعظمی، ص ۱۸۳). تعبیر «السنن فی الفقه» که ابن ندیم درباره بسیاری از کتابهای کهن سنن به کار برده است (← ج ۲، جزء ۲، ص ۶۱۸-۶۱۹، نیز ← ج ۲، جزء ۱، ص ۷، که از کتابی با عنوان *السنة فی الفقه* نام می برد که عبدالله بن عبدالحکم مصری روایات آن را از مالک بن انس نقل کرده است)، شاید گویای این باشد که برخی از این کتابها فقط حاوی روایات فقهی بوده اند. بنابین خال، بعضی از کتابهای موجود سنن یکسره از روایات غیرفقهی تهی نیستند و ابواب یا احادیثی با موضوعات فضائل و آداب و تفسیر و مانند اینها را نیز شامل می شوند (برای نمونه ← ابن ماجه، ج ۲، ص ۱۳۹۴-۱۴۵۳؛ ترمذی، ج ۵، ص ۱۲۲-۳، ۴۱۷-۱۲۵؛ نسائی، ج ۸، ص ۱۷۲-۱۸۱).

مؤلفان سنن در هر باب روایات صحیح، حسن و ضعیف را متناسب با موضوع آن باب گرد آورده اند (← توی، ص ۳۰؛ نیز

طبقاتی وجود ندارد. زیرا طبقه کارگر و سرمایه دار در این کشورها شکل نگرفته است. در واقع، سوسیالیسم مورد نظر سنگور بهینه سازی سوسیالیسم قبیله ای است، به گونه ای که دولت ملی جایگزین رهبران قبیله ای و سنتی شود (محمد عدنان مراد، ص ۲۸۵-۲۸۶؛ احمد فارس عبدالممنعم، ص ۱۱۵؛ نیز ← چپ / چپگرایی\*).

این سیاست اقتصادی او، پس از استقلال، بر اساس نظام سوسیالیستی تعاونی در بخش کشاورزی اعمال شد؛ در حالی که بخش صنعت و تجارت با اصول نظام سرمایه داری مطابقت داشت. در عرصه فرهنگی، فرهنگ فرانسوی بر افکار و دیدگاههای سیاسی، فلسفی و ادبی سنگور حاکم بود و او منادی گسترش فرهنگ فرانسوی به شمار می آمد. در سیاست خارجی، سنگور به سیاست عدم تعهد اعتقاد داشت و در پرتو مناسبات خاص سنگال با فرانسه، با غرب و شرق مناسبات مطلوبی داشت. در دوره سنگور، سنگال به اصول مبارزه با استعمار، حق تعیین سرنوشت ملتها، حسن همجواری و وحدت افریقا پایبند بود (احمد فارس عبدالممنعم، ص ۱۱۶؛ محمد عدنان مراد، ص ۲۸۷).

منابع: احمد فارس عبدالممنعم، «السنغال ما بعد سنغور»، *السیاسة الدولية*، ش ۶۵ (ولوی ۱۹۸۱)؛ عبدالعزیز چلو، «سیاسات الدول الافریقایة تجاه الوطن العربی، دراسة عامة»، *المستقبل العربی*، ش ۲۲ (کانون الاول ۱۹۸۰)؛ لئوپولد سدار سنگور، «الزنجیة و العروبة»، *المجلة*، ش ۱۲۳ (آذار ۱۹۶۷)؛ محمد عدنان مراد، «لئوپولد سیدار سنغور: القومية الزنجیة»، *الفکر السیاسی*، ش ۲۴-۲۵ (صیف و خریف ۲۰۰۹)؛ عبدالله واد، *حیة من اجل افریقا: مذكرات رئیس جمهوریة السنغال*، حواریات مع جان - مارک کالیش و جیل دولافون، بیروت ۲۰۱۱؛

Hakim Adi and Marika Sherwood, *Pan-African history: political figures from Africa and the diaspora since 1787*, London 2003; Molefi Kete Asante, *The history of Africa: the quest for eternal harmony*, New York 2015; Elizabeth L. Berg and Ruth Wan, *Senegal*, New York 2010; Sebastian Elischer, *Political parties in Africa: ethnicity and party formation*, New York 2013; Parker English, *What we say, who we are: Leopold Senghor, Zora Neale Hurston, and the philosophy of language*, Lanham, Md. 2010; Elizabeth Harney, *In Senghor's shadow: art, politics, and the avant-garde in Senegal, 1960-1995*, Durham 2004; Christof Hartmann, "Senegal's party system: the limits of formal regulation", *Democratization*, vol.17, no.4 (Aug. 2010); Gerti Hesselting, *Histoire politique du Sénégal: institutions, droit et société*, Paris 1985; Robert H. Jackson and Carl G. Rosberg, *Personal*

07 OCAK 1995

Sünen, SF, 310 - - -

bk (index 1087)

2548. Auzā'i, 'Abd-ār-Raḥmān Ibn-'Amr al-: [Sunan] Sunan al-Auzā'i / li-'Abd-ār-Raḥmān Ibn-'Amr Abi-'Amr al-Auzā'i. Taṣnīf Marwān Muḥammad aš-Ša''ār. - Ṭab'a 1. - Bairūt: Dār an-Nafā'is, 1993 = 1413 h. - 806 S.  
In arab. Schrift, arab.

34 A 1693

25 EKİM 1995

07 OCAK 1995

Sünenü'l-kebyān, G II, 246, S II, 344

not more than 24 km/15 miles). SunĀur might therefore correspond to the district of Māybahradġ (al-Balādhurī, *Futūh*, 310), which was detached from Dīnawar under the caliph al-Mahdī and joined to Sīsar [q.v.]; cf. Schwarz, *Iran im Mittelalter*, iv, 477-9. If, however, we are to recognise in the name of the Kurd tribe Payrawand (Pahrawand) a reminiscence of the old name Pahradġ ("custodia, vigilia"), this tribe must have been driven westwards for it now occupies the west face of Mount Parrau (= Bīsūtūn), lying to the southwest of Dīnawar (cf. Rabino, *Kermanschah*, in *RM*, xxxviii [1920], 36).

The easy pass of Mele-mās on the line of heights from Dālakhānī to Amrula separates SunĀur from Dīnawar. On the northeast, SunĀur is bordered by mount Pandġa-'Alī (Mustawfī, *Nuẓhat al-kulūb*, ed. Le Strange, 217: Pandġ-Angusht), behind which runs the direct road from Hamadān to Sanandāġ. SunĀur is watered by the upper tributaries of the river of Dīnawar, which ultimately joins the Gamas-āb (Karkha). SunĀur in the strict sense is adjoined by the more northern district of Kulyā'ī on the upper course of the Gāwa-rūd, the western dependencies of which are Bīlawar and Niyābat (on the Kirmānshāh-Sanandāġ road; cf. Rabino, *op. cit.*, 12, 35). The importance of SunĀur lay in the fact that it was on the road followed by Muslim pilgrims from Tabrīz to Kirmānshāh; to avoid the Kurdish territory of Sanandāġ the road made a detour by Bīdġār (Garrūs) and SunĀur, from which Kirmānshāh could be reached in a day's march.

The population of the district is made up of two distinct elements. The town (1991 population figure: 37,772) is peopled by Turks, who are said to have come there in the Mongol period. Their chief SunĀur was a vassal of the Mongols of Shīrāz (?).

The district, on the other hand, is inhabited by Kurd agriculturists whose chiefs belong to the tribe of Kulyā'ī. The Khāns in control there until the early 20th century were said to be the descendants in the eighth generation from Šafī Khān who lived in the time of the latter Šafawids. In 1213/1798, 'Alī Himmat Khān and his brother Bābā Khān (of the Nānakalī tribe) supported the pretender Sulaymān Khān and were executed by Fath 'Alī Shāh (Sir Harford Jones Brydges, *History of the Kajars*, London 1833, 58-9, 67). The Kulyā'ī speak a Kurd dialect resembling Kirmānshāhī and are suspected of Ahl-i Ḥakḵ [q.v.] religious tendencies.

*Bibliography:* Given in the article, but see also Razmārā (ed.). *Farhang-i dġuġhrāfiyā-yi Irān-zāmīn*. (V. MINORSKY\*)

✓ **SUNNA** (A. pl. *sunan*; see above, s.v. **SUNAN**, for a different connotation), an ancient Arabian concept that was to play an increasingly important role during the formative centuries of Islam, acquiring a range of interrelated nuances. Eventually, some time after the preaching of Islam had begun, the term *sunna* came to stand for the generally approved standard or practice introduced by the Prophet as well as the pious Muslims of olden days, and at the instigation of al-Shāfi'ī, the *sunna* of the Prophet was awarded the position of the second root (*asḥl*) of Islamic law, the *sharī'a*, after the Qur'ān. Not long after that, *sunna* came to stand for the all-encompassing concept orthodoxy, which is still in use today. Out of this there grew the dichotomy between Sunnī (orthodox) and Shī'ī (heterodox) Islam. During the first three centuries of Islam, the term *sunna*, standing alone or in various genitive constructions with other words, displays an evolution in meaning which will be sketched in more detail in the following. For

the technical *sharī'a* term, see 2. below.

1. In classical Islam.

In the *Dġāhiliyya*, the concept *sunna* originally stood for a way or manner of acting, whether good or bad; hence (dis)approved custom or norm of previous generations, *al-awwālūn*, cf. esp. Bravmann, in *Bibl.* The verbs used for laying down a *sunna* are *sanna* and *istanna*. During the 1st/7th century when, after the death of Muḥammad, the Muslim community was ruled first by the *khulafā' rāshidūn* and then the Umayyads, the term *sunna* was used in debates on legal and ritual issues to indicate any good precedent set by people of the past, including the Prophet. Moreover, various pre-Islamic *sunnas* were accepted into Islam with or without modification. In certain ancient texts, the term was occasionally also used for any bad or indifferent precedent. It turned up in political debates too, for which see further down.

During Muḥammad's lifetime and immediately after that, when faced with problems to solve, people reminded each other in their discourse (*ḥadīth*) of how the Prophet and his first faithful followers had acted under particular circumstances. This resulted in an as yet unstructured, oral transmission of more or less correctly remembered practices and customs, *sunnas*. Towards the end of the 1st/7th century, when the need thereto arose, these memories began to be transmitted in a more standardised manner after the introduction of a newly-developed authentication device, the *isnād* [q.v.]. The first reports (*ḥadīths*) of *sunnas* that eventually found their way to one or more of the *ḥadīth* collections compiled in the course of the 2nd/8th century and later, originated in the final quarter of the 1st/7th century.

Recent *isnād* analytical research has established that, initially, these first *sunnas* were on the whole few and disparate. Next to *ḥadīths* of *sunnas* supported by *isnāds* that allegedly went back all the way to the Prophet, which in other words were *marfū'* [see RAF. 2], there circulated hordes of other ones whose *isnāds* ended in a Companion, the *mauḳūf* strands, or even a Successor [see MURSAL]. These three types of *sunna* reports existed side-by-side and were supposed to register more or less faithfully what the pious forebears, *al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ*, during and since the lifetime of the Prophet had said or done. But the Companion reports, as well as the Successor reports, did not necessarily contain opinions exclusively modelled on what the Prophet was supposed to have decided in a given situation, but often represented what these authorities thought about a particular issue themselves. They were the *fukahā'*. Rather than basing themselves all the time upon a pious practice attributed to someone from the past, they sometimes preferred to exercise their own judgment, their *ra'y*, and their personal opinions, *ārā'*, were occasionally also granted the status of *sunna*. Personal *ad hoc* problem-solving, without recourse to precedent, developed alongside searching for precedents, for which the general term *'ilm*, lit. knowledge, was used. Thus *'ilm* consisted of *sunnas* which had originated at the hands of pious forebears and which were eventually moulded into *ḥadīths*. *'Ilm* seekers, *'ulamā'* (pl. of *'ālim*), were often antagonistic towards those who resorted to their *ra'y*, the *ahl al-ra'y*, and this gave way to an ongoing dialogue, or bitter dispute, between, on the one hand, a basically religious, precedent-centred point of view and, on the other hand, a somewhat secular stance with, according to some *'ulamā'*, far too little religion mixed in with it. It is clear that, at least during the first three centuries of Islam, *ḥadīth* and *sunna* cannot be equated

1991  
M. J. ROSE

Djamālī and afterwards under Abu 'l-Su'ūd, then *Shaykh al-Islām*, whom he served as *mu'īd* and through whom he became *mulāzim* [q.v.] in 977/1569-70. Because of his family connections, his first *madrasa* appointment (Ramaḍān 978/February 1571) was at the 40-*akḥes* level. He passed through the ranks of the *madrasas* until, with his appointment to the post of *kāḍī* of Bursa in *Dhu 'l-Ḳa'da* 998/September 1590, he entered the highest stream of learned offices, the *mawlewiyyats* [q.v.], in due course becoming *Rumeli kāḍī 'asker* in *Shawwāl* 1001/July 1593. Retiring with a pension in *Djumādā I* 1003/early 1595, he succeeded *Khōdja Efendi* [q.v.] as *Shaykh al-Islām* in *Rabī' I* 1008/October 1599, the first of an unprecedented four occasions on which he held that post.

*Ḳoçi Beg* [q.v.] notes admiringly that "though he was removed several times, he still spoke the truth and showed no compromise in the business of religion and the state" (A.K. Aksüt, *Koçi Bey risalesi*, Istanbul 1939, 35); and Şun' Allāh's first two periods of office were indeed marked by contentious involvement in state matters. His first came to an end when he persuaded *Meḥammed III* [q.v.] to order the unwilling Grand Vizier *Yemishdji Ḥasan Pasha* [q.v.] to go out on campaign, for which the latter, in revenge, secured Şun' Allāh's dismissal in *Şafar* 1010/August 1601. Brought back as *Shaykh al-Islām* in *Raġjab* 1011/January 1603 in an attempt to mollify the *sipāhīs*, then rebelling largely because of the deteriorating situation in Anatolia resulting from the revolts of the *Djalālīs* [q.v. in Supplement] but also because of *Ḥasan Pasha's* alleged military incompetence, Şun' Allāh—sympathetic to the *Djalālīs*, and in particular to *Ḳara Yazıdji* [q.v.]—issued a *fatwā* for the execution of *Ḥasan Pasha* but was himself ousted and forced to go into hiding (*Sha'bān* 1011/February 1603) (for these events, see *Na'imā, Ta'riḫ*, Istanbul 1281-3, i, 307 ff.).

Having held the office twice more, somewhat less eventfully (*Muḥarram* 1013/June 1604 to *Rabī' I* 1015/July 1606 and *Raġjab* 1015/November 1606 to *Şafar* 1017/June 1608), Şun' Allāh retired fully from public life with a pension of 750 *akḥes* daily and died in Istanbul on 8 *Şafar* 1021/10 April 1612.

*Bibliography:* *New'ī-zāde 'Atā'ī, Ḥadā'ik al-ḥakā'ik fi takmilat al-Şakā'ik*, Istanbul 1268, 136-7, 552-7, and the references in the article.

(R.C. REPP)

**SUNAN** (A.), pl. of *sunna* [q.v.], "norm", "custom", is used separately in the literature of *ḥadīth* and *fikh* [q.v.] as referring to several important collections of traditions and legal pronouncements (= *akwāl*), thus resulting in this plural being used as a generic book title of such works, as was the case with the term *Ṣaḥīḥ* [q.v.]. The oldest collections called *Sunan* or *Sunan fi 'l-fikh* have not come down to us, and are only known from references to them in a work like *Ibn al-Nadīm's Fihrist*, cf. ed. *Riḍā Taġjad-dud*, index vol., 123, right col., such as the *Sunans* by *Makhūl* (d. 112-16/730-4), *Ibn Ḍjuraydj* (d. 150/767) and *Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abī Ḍhi'b* (d. 159/776). *Sunan* works are arranged according to the *muṣannaf* [q.v.] principle, i.e. separate chapters divided into paragraphs on '*ibādāt* [q.v.] and *mu'āmalāt*, just as we find in *fikh* literature. The earliest such works available in printed editions are the pre-canonical collections by *Sa'īd b. Manşūr* (d. 227/842) and '*Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dārimī* (d. 255/869). Of the six canonical Books, four are entitled *Sunan*, namely the collections of *Abū Dāwūd al-Sidjīstānī* (d. 275/888); *Muḥammad b. 'Īsā al-Tirmidhī* (d. 279/892), whose collection acquired the title *al-Djāmi' al-*

*ṣaḥīḥ*; *Aḥmad b. Shu'ayb al-Nasā'ī* (d. 303/915), whose *Kiṭāb al-Sunan al-kubrā* was later abbreviated by the author in his *K. al-Sunan*, also called *al-Muḍḍḍabā*; and *Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Ḳazwīnī Ibn Mādja* (d. 273/886). Other prestigious collections known by this title and available in print are those of '*Alī b. 'Umar al-Dāraḳuṭnī* (d. 385/995) and *Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayḥaqī* (d. 458/1066).

*Bibliography:* Given in the article.

(G.H.A. JUVNBOLL)

**SUNBĀDH** (also *Sunfādh*), Zoroastrian supporter of *Abū Muslim al-Ḳhurāsānī* [q.v.] and leader of a rebellion seeking to avenge his death.

He originated from a village near *Niṣhāpūr*, and is described as a man of wealth and a friend and associate of *Abū Muslim*. Two months after the murder of the latter by the caliph *al-Manşūr (Sha'bān* 137/February 755), he rose with the backing of *Abū Muslim's* followers and, according to the main historical tradition, seized *Niṣhāpūr*. According to another, probably more reliable tradition (*al-Madā'īnī*), he had been stationed in *Ḥulwān* and from there set out for *Ḳhurāsān*. *Abū 'Abda (Ubayda) al-Ḥanafī*, the governor of *Rayy*, who was under orders not to allow *Abū Muslim's* followers to return to *Ḳhurāsān*, detained him. He escaped, however, and rebelled. He defeated and killed the governor and seized control of *Rayy*. Returning to his Magian religion, he committed atrocities against the Muslims and adopted the title *Firūz Ispahbadh*. He seized *Abū Muslim's* arsenal and treasure in *Rayy* and sent part of it to the *Dābūyid Ḳhūrshīd*, the Zoroastrian Ispahbad of *Ṭabaristān*, with whom he formed an alliance. His following is said quickly to have swelled to 100,000 men, coming mostly from *Djibāl* and *Ṭabaristān*. The king of the *Daylamīs*, to whom he wrote that the reign of the Arabs had come to an end, joined him with his men. He defeated the governors of *Dastabā* and *Ḳūmis*. Then he set out with a massive army, predicting that he would destroy the *Ka'ba*. But at *Djardjānbān* between *Rayy* and *Hamadān*, he was heavily defeated by *Djahwar b. al-Marrār al-Iḳjīlī*, who was sent by *al-Manşūr*; 30,000 or 60,000 of his men are said to have been killed. *Sunbādh* fled, trying to join the Ispahbad *Ḳhūrshīd*. He was killed, however, by *Ḳhūrshīd's* cousin *Ṭūs*, allegedly because he did not show him due respect. *Ḳhūrshīd* sent the heads of *Sunbādh* and his brother to *Djahwar*, but refused to surrender his treasury to *al-Manşūr*. The revolt had lasted only seventy days.

According to *Nizām al-Mulk*, *Sunbādh* told his followers that *Abū Muslim* had not been killed but had, by reciting the greatest name of God, turned into a white dove and flown away. He was now dwelling in a brazen castle together with the *Mahdī* and *Mazdak*. All three would soon reappear and *Abū Muslim* would rule with *Mazdak* as his vizier. When the *Rafīḍīs (Shī'īs)* and the *Ḳhurramiyya* heard mention of the *Mahdī* and *Mazdak*, they joined *Sunbādh* in large numbers. He would tell the *Ḳhurramiyya* that *Mazdak* had become a *Shī'ī* and was ordering them to make common cause with the *Shī'a*. *Nizām al-Mulk's* account is evident fiction designed to establish a pedigree of *Mazdakite* teaching and activity for the *Ismā'īliyya*, whom he portrayed as a neo-*Mazdakite* subversive heresy. From the early reports, it is clear that *Sunbādh* was leader of an anti-Arab and anti-Islamic rebellion aiming at the restoration of Iranian kingship and religion, and not a sectarian chief teaching a syncretistic religious doctrine. The heresiographers, however, mention the *Sunbādhīyya* as the name of one of the