and Morgan, 145). As a result of this purge, Bāttū’s authority may have been extended into Transoxiana. The empire was now effectively divided into two great spheres of influence, that of Bāttū and that of Möngke. Rubruck, who appears to locate the frontier between them a few days’ journey east of Talas (Ţarăz), observed that Möngke’s representatives were treated with slightly less respect in Bāttū’s territories than were Bāttū’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 Bāttū and his brothers accompanied him.

Juwaynī (1:223; trans. Boyle, 1:268) suggests that Bāttū died in about 653/1255–6; the date 650, supplied by sources from Manililk 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 Jochi’s ulus. Jūźjānī (2:176; trans. Raverty, 2:1172) reports a rumour that Bāttū 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 mu’addhin 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, Bāttū inclined towards no particular faith. Clearly, however, the spread of Islam among the subject Qipchaq population began during his reign.
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**Bayān in Persian**

In **Persian**, the term **bayān** has traditionally a series of meanings, ranging from the simple idea of discourse (sukhan) or speech (guft), to the more complex description or explanation (sharḥ, tawādth), and, by way of eloquence (zabānāwari) and...
clarity of description (fasāhat), to the “use of comparison and metaphor” (istifjāda az tashbīh va istī‘āra) (Anvari). The latter definition is usually followed by that of īlm-i bāyān (science of bāyān) as a technical term of balāghat (rhetoric) (e.g., Mu‘īn’s Farhang-i Fārsī reproduces word for word the definition of īlm-i bāyān 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 īlm-i ma‘ānī, the science of meaning, and īlm-i bādī, the science of the figures of speech), īlm-i bāyān 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

Īlm-i bāyān 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), istī‘āra (metaphor), kināya (metonymy, allusion), and majāz (metonymy, allegory) (in some treatises, kināya and majāz are considered to constitute a single device). The Persian īlm-i bāyān shares its terminology and framework and much of its theoretical approach with the Arabic īlm al-bayān.

Lying within the broad limits of balāghat—even though some writers of antiquity considered it to belong to fasāhat—bāyān 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): “Bāyān is the expression of a meaning (ma‘ānī) 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 ma‘ānī—a subject—by means of bāyān, eloquence) should differ from one other, by way of a process of the imagination” (Shamsā, 19).

The devices studied in the īlm-i bāyān 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 (Shamsā, 189–226, 257–62).

The study of īlm-i bāyān as separate from īlm-i bādī 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 Vāṭvāṭ (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-Mu‘īn fi ma‘āyīr ash‘ār al-‘Ajām (“A compendium of standards of Persian poetry,” completed c. 629/1232), the undisputed model of Persian poetic theory, has no section dedicated to īlm-i bāyān, although it reflects, directly or indirectly, the arrangement of the science of language used by his contemporary al-Sakkārī (d. 626/1228) in his Mīfīḥ al-‘ulūm (“The key of sciences”). In this work and the later commentaries by Jalāl al-Dīn Muhammad Qazvīnī (d. 739/1338) and Sa‘d al-Dīn Taftazānī (d. 792/1390), the īlm-i bāyān was codified as the science dedicated to tashbīh, istī‘āra, 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 bādī’, 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 Anwār al-balāğha (“Lights on rhetoric”) by Muḥammad Ḥādī Māzandarānī (d. 1134/1721–2). Before it was published in 1977, Anwār al-balāğha was considered a simple translation of al-Mutawâl (“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 Anwār. Anwār 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 Sharbatdar Isfahānī (c. twelfth/seventeenth century) is said to have composed a treatise entitled Risāla dar balāğhat (“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 bādī’, 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 balāğhat that concentrated on the more technical aspects of poetry, such as qâfiya (rhyme), ‘arūd (prosody), and bādī (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 ‘Atiya-yi kubrā (“Long poem in †”), a work that, according to Shamīṣā, the editor of the Persian edition, enjoyed a widespread readership at that time and later. The editor reports that ‘Atiya-yi kubrā is the first text in Persian to deal with bayān separately from bādī. 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 bādī, on the other hand, which is another of the parts of balāğhat, some books, such as Hādā’iq al-sīhr by Rashīd al-Dīn Vatvāt, 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 (laʃz) that ‘tells of’ a thing (ḥilāyat-i chāz-i) 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 ilm-i bayān (see J. T. P. De Bruijn, Bayān, Efr). For the period between the composition of Aṭṭiya-yi kubrā and the 1930s, the major catalogues of Persian manuscripts cite only about ten works, which seems to indicate little interest in ilm-i bayān during that period. A fresh impulse was given to the publication of manuals containing sections on ilm-i bayān after the foundation of Tehran University, in 1935, and the establishment of the curriculum on ma’āni 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 ilm-i bayān and its revisitation and adaptation in the Persian context, features often in the introductions to major scholarly works (e.g., Safā, Āhant, Humāyīn, and Jalāl Taḏjīl) and has encouraged some to reexamine its principles on the basis of new linguistic and theoretical categories (Shamlīsā) and to modernise the specialised lexicon of this art (Kazzāzī).
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Bāydū

Bāydū Khān (d. 694/1295) was the fifth Mongol Ilkhanid ruler of Iran, Iraq, and Anatolia, and the grandson of Hulegu Khān. He ruled for less than six months, in 694/1295. After the death of his father, Taraqiy, Bāydū passed into the household of Hulegu’s wife, Qutuy Khātūn.