

and politics, in *Ios* 10 (1980), 14-20; R. Firestone, *Jihād. The origin of holy war in Islam*, New York 1999; M.K. Haykal, *al-Jihād wa-l-ḡitāl fī l-siyāsati l-sharʿiyya*, Beirut 1996; A.A. Jannatī, Defense and jihad in the Qurʾān, in *al-Tawhīd* 1 (1984), 39-54; M.J. Kister, *An yadin* (Qurʾān IX/29). An attempt at interpretation, in *Arabica* 11 (1964), 272-8; A. Morabia, *Le Ğihād dans l'islam médiéval. Le "combat sacré" des origines au XII^e siècle*, Paris 1986; M. Muṭahhari, Jihad in the Qurʾān, in M. Abedi and G. Legenhausen (eds.), *Jihād and shahādāt. Struggle and martyrdom in Islam*, Houston 1986, 81-124; A. Noth, *Heiliger Krieg und heiliger Kampf in Islam und Christentum*, Bonn 1966; H.T. Obbink, *De heilige oorlog volgens den Koran*, Leiden 1901; Paret, *Kommentar*; id., Sure 9, 122, in *WI* 2 (1953), 232-6; R. Peters, *Islam and colonialism. The doctrine of jihad in modern history*, The Hague 1976; D. Powers, The exegetical genre *nāsikh al-Qurʾān wa-mansūkhuhu*, in Rippin, *Approaches*, 117-38; ʿAbdallāh b. Aḥmad al-Qādirī, *al-Jihād fī sabīli llāh. Ḥaḡīqatuhu wa-ḡhāyatuhu*, Jeddah 1992; U. Rubin, *Barāʿa*. A study of some qurʾānic passages, in *JSAI* 5 (1984), 13-32; A. Sachedina, The development of jihād in Islamic revelation and history, in J.T. Johnson and J. Kelsay (eds.), *Cross, crescent and sword*, New York 1990, 35-50; A. Schleifer, Jihād and traditional Islamic consciousness, in *IQ* 27 (1983), 173-203; id., Understanding *jihād*. Definition and methodology, in *IQ* 27 (1983), 118-31; F. Schwally, Der heilige Krieg des Islam in religionsgeschichtlicher und staatsrechtlicher Beleuchtung, in *Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* 6 (1916), 689-714; W.M. Watt, Islamic conceptions of the holy war, in T.P. Murphy (ed.), *The holy war*, Columbus, OH 1976, 141-56; A.L. Wismar, *A study in tolerance as practiced by Muhammad and his immediate successors*, New York 1966.

Jinn

A category of created beings believed to possess powers for evil and good. Although their existence is never doubted, the jinn (Eng. "genie") are presented in the Qurʾān as figures whose effective role has been considerably curtailed in comparison to that accorded to them by various forms of pre-Islamic religion.

Unlike their rivals, the *rabb* and the *rabba*, the "lords" and "ladies," supernatural protectors and "allies" (*awliyā*) of the tribes

(see TRIBES AND CLANS) that God, in the fullness of his lordship, succeeds in making disappear (Q 53:23, "They are but names which you have named"), the jinn survive at the heart of the new religion. The Qurʾān limits itself to denying them the greater part of their powers — those, at any rate, that they could have claimed from the lord of the Qurʾān. In particular, they are shorn of their primordial function relative to humankind, that of uncovering the secrets (q.v.) of destiny (*ḡhayb*), thereby possessing knowledge of the future and of the world of the invisible (see HIDDEN AND THE HIDDEN; DESTINY; FATE). In the account of the death of Solomon (q.v.; Q 34:14), the jinn, having failed to grasp that the king is dead, continue to serve him in humility and abasement — thus demonstrating their ignorance of the *ḡhayb*. But the very fact that the Qurʾān dispossesses them, allows, at the same time, for recognition of their former role as mediators between the invisible world and humankind. The Qurʾān finds itself in the surprising position of having to come to terms with the jinn, i.e. subjecting them to its God, so powerful is the image they conjure up in popular imagination and local beliefs. In doing this, the text of the Qurʾān permits us to confirm part of what has been suggested concerning the way in which the desert Arabs (see ARABS; BEDOUIN; PRE-ISLAMIC ARABIA AND THE QURʾĀN) of the sixth century C.E. viewed their relationship to the jinn.

Regarded as having lost their faculty of familiarity with the invisible, the jinn were also seen as having lost their "power" or "faculty of action" (*sulṭān*, e.g. Q 55:33). *Sulṭān* is the exclusive preserve of the God of the Qurʾān, who dispenses it to whomsoever he wishes (Q 14:11; 59:6; etc.; see POWER AND IMPOTENCE). He never delegates complete mastery to anyone, however, since omnipotence remains one of

his exclusive properties (see GOD AND HIS ATTRIBUTES). One should consider this assertion about the reduction of the jinn's powers in the light of the qur'ānic denial of the powers attributed to magic (q.v.; *sihr*). The qur'ānic allusions to magic seem to demand the presence of an initiator (himself human and dependent on a supernatural being) who "teaches" (*yu'allimu*) it, that is — in this context — gives "guidelines" (*al-lām*; cf. Q 2:102; 20:71). The people of Mecca called Muḥammad the "lying sorcerer" (*sāḥir kadhdhāb*, Q 38:4); he is denounced as "bewitched" (*mashū*; Q 17:47); he is said to be "possessed by jinn" (*majnūn*, Q 15:6; see INSANITY; LIE). In another passage it is the "satans, devils" (*shayāṭīn*, the equivalent of the jinn in the Qur'ān — see below) who "teach magic to men" (*yu'allimūna l-nāsa l-siḥar*, Q 2:102). Nonetheless, a pervasive sentiment that the jinn still need to be appeased can be seen in the persistent ritual sacrifices to the jinn, which have been more or less openly admitted until very recently among the desert shepherds. This demonstrates that the powers denied the jinn are nevertheless understood to remain vital despite the passage of centuries (e.g. the sacrifice of the tent reported by Jaussen, *Coutumes*, 339; Wellhausen, *Reste*, 151 also quotes the slightly earlier observations made by Doughty in *Travels*, ii, 629).

Ethnographic research indicates that, despite the qur'ānic statements to the contrary, people continue to believe in the quietly disconcerting presence of these beings, who haunt the spaces to which people do not belong but through which they are nevertheless constrained to pass whenever going from place to place. Their vague hordes appear to be contained, rather than reduced to impotence, in those territories which belong to them and where humans are at constant risk of encountering them. An acknowledgment of divine omnipotence coexists in uneasy tension, within the

minds of many Muslims, with the fear that the jinn remain as dangerous and as unpredictable to access as ever.

The jinn most often figure in the Qur'ān in the form of a collectivity. The other name applied to them is *shayāṭīn*, "satans, devils" (associated with the Eng. "demons"), a name whose semantic evolution from classical Greek is worthy of particular attention (see FOREIGN VOCABULARY). The equivalence between the terms jinn and *shayāṭīn*, already familiar in pre-Islamic Arabia, is confirmed in the Qur'ān with reference to the supernatural beings who are said to be in Solomon's service. They are indicated — indiscriminately — by both these terms: in Q 27:17, 39 and 34:12, 14 it is the jinn who serve Solomon; but in Q 21:82 and 38:37 they are called *shayāṭīn*. Parallel to the use of their designation in the plural, the "satans" come to acquire the status of a proper name, "the Satan" (*al-shayṭān*), a rebel against God (Q 17:27; 19:44) and an enemy (*aduww*) of people (e.g. Q 17:53, and numerous other places in the Qur'ān; see DEVIL).

As regards Iblīs, the qur'ānic *diabolos* (lit. the Gk. term means "he who divides [by calumny]"; this is the Septuagint's translation of the Heb. *sāṭān* [derived from *Job* 1, "the adversary" or "the accuser" — in fact, he who proposes to put the just person to "the test"]), his qur'ānic attestations are far less significant than either the singular or the plural occurrences of *shayāṭīn*. Iblīs is of immediate interest in the context of the jinn, however, because he is identified as one of them in Q 18:50. Iblīs enters the qur'ānic discourse in the context of a particular narrative, that of his refusal to prostrate himself before Adam (see BOWING AND PROSTRATION; ADAM AND EVE). A.J. Wensinck (Iblīs) sees an origin of this account in the *Life of Adam and Eve* (Kautsch, *Apokryphen*, § 15; also in Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum*). It should be noted, though, that the more ancient "Vie Grecque d'Adam et

Ève,” presented in Dupont-Sommer and Philonenko (*La Bible*), does not contain the passage in question; in the Latin version, however, the “devil” (*der Teufel*) does reject any obligation to prostrate himself before Adam and refuses to obey the command of the archangel Michael (q.v.). The incident is placed after the account of the fall of man from the garden of Eden. In the account contained in the Qur’ān, the order to prostrate comes directly from God without the archangel’s (see ANGEL) intervention. Iblīs incurs divine wrath (see ANGER) upon his refusal and sees, at his own request, his punishment “deferred” (*inzār* or *ta’khīr*). He is appointed the “great tempter” (*mughawwī* or *mughwī*, see TRIAL) of humankind until the resurrection (q.v.). In several passages in the Qur’ān this sequence is placed before the account of the fall (*hubūt*) of Adam, which is told only subsequently (see FALL OF MAN; GARDEN). This is a reversal of the order of the pseudo-epigraphical texts noted above, in which the fall precedes the devil’s confrontation with God. Finally, it should be noted that the qur’ānic tempter of Adam in the garden of paradise (q.v.) is always called *shayṭān* and never Iblīs.

Does the juxtaposition of the two texts (that of the refusal on the part of Iblīs and that of the fall of Adam) imply a continuity of the account or its re-working in the canonical text? The question should at least be asked. In several cases, passages dealing with Iblīs are followed by the account of the fall (Q 2:34; 7:11; 15:31, 32; 17:61; 20:116; 26:95; 34:20; 38:74, 75). It is only in the single verse of Q 18:50 that Iblīs is designated expressly as a jinn. In the other passages he is depicted as a rebellious angel without, however, any explicit mention of his angelic nature; in fact, the text essentially states the following: the angels (*malā’ika*) prostrated themselves except Iblīs (*illā Iblīs*) who refused. In Q 38:76, Iblīs, of whom it has just been said (Q 38:73-4) that

he alone among the angels refused, justifies his disobedience (q.v.) saying that he was created from *nār* (the usual translation, but not necessarily appropriate here, is “fire”), and therefore he should not have to prostrate himself before a creature “of clay” (q.v.; *ṭīn*). Does this mean that it justifies his status as a jinn? According to local traditions, the *nār* from which the jinn are created (see below) most certainly does not correspond to “fire” (q.v.), while in the ancient tradition of the Near East — and, *a fortiori*, in the Bible — angelic nature is clearly “igneous” (cf. the Seraphim, etc.); if this meaning prevails, then Iblīs could well be identified as an “angel,” in the Near Eastern sense of the term.

The Qur’ān says nothing about the material from which the angels are created. The Islamic tradition regards them as being made from *nūr*, the “cold light of the night,” that of the moon (q.v.), which is also the light of guidance and of knowledge (see KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING), precisely the opposite of *nār*, which is diurnal and solar. As opposed to the jinn, who are incontestably figures from local beliefs, angels (*malak*, pl. *malā’ika*, lit. “envoys,” from the root *l-’k*) are not a local construct: they are attested in Ethiopic and Hebrew, as well as in inscriptions from northeastern Arabia. Although there may have been particular, local understandings of “angels,” the qur’ānic discourse on the subject is highly polemical. Perhaps, therefore, the qur’ānic “angels” should not be taken as referring to a local religion, as has sometimes been said in connection with a cult of the “daughters of Allāh” — alleged to be the angels (see below).

Despite the single occurrence in which Iblīs, the “devil” of the Qur’ān, is designated a jinn — could this be an interpolation? — he would seem, thanks to his specific narrative insertion (i.e. his refusal to prostrate to Adam; his corrupting mission is also biblical), to have origins clearly

distinct from those of the local jinn/*shayṭān*. It is only at a later date, in the post-qur'anic Islamic tradition, that he is finally completely assimilated into *al-shayṭān*, the “Satan” of the Qur'ān as the prototype of all beings hostile to humankind. The two diabolical representations live on in Islamic tradition, enacting a complex destiny often in combination, or encounter, with other negative figures such as various sorts of dragons derived from the ancient Near Eastern traditions. The adventures ascribed to them subsequently have little to do with their itinerary as stated in the Qur'ān.

Even if the jinn of the Qur'ān are shown as deprived of part of their powers because they no longer manage to uncover the secrets of heaven, they can nonetheless raise themselves up to heaven's gates (cf. Q 15:18; 37:10; 72:8-9; see HEAVEN AND SKY). The account of the heavenly ascension of the jinn is obviously not commanded by God — unlike the routes taken by the angels, which, just like those taken by men, must be marked with signposts (e.g. Q 15:14; see also the term *sabab*, pl. *asbāb*, used to designate the obligatory routes for both men and angels at Q 18:84-5, 89, 92; 40:36-7; it should be noted that, for the angels, the *'urūj* is specifically a movement of “descending and re-ascending” at Q 15:14; 32:5; 34:2; 57:4; 70:4). But Islamic tradition has continued to recognize the jinn's ability to move in all spaces without needing to follow a trail. This mobility probably corresponds to an ancient local belief that has remained deeply embedded, namely that of the notion — vital in the society of sixth and seventh century Arabia — of movement from place to place and the concept of a route.

Can it therefore be said that the representation of the jinn contained in the Qur'ān

is essentially defensive and, in some ways, in continuity with the past? The Qur'ān confirms the division of the earth into two territories — that of humankind and that of the jinn. The formula contained in the Qur'ān, *al-ins wa-l-jinn*, “the humans and the jinn” (also, *al-jinn wa-l-ins*), is clearly dominant in the statements the Qur'ān makes concerning the jinn for there are twenty examples of this conjunction of jinn and humanity (using the collective noun *jinn*: Q 6:112, 128, 130; 7:38, 179; 17:88; 27:17; 41:25, 29; 46:18; 51:56; 55:33; 72:5, 6; using the singular *jānn* employed as a collective noun: Q 55:39, 56, 74; using the plural form *al-jinna wa-l-nās*, “jinn and people [or tribes]”: Q 11:119; 32:13; 114:6). The God of the Qur'ān is presented as master of the two spaces. But the ancient representation of the co-existence of this fundamentally bipartite division of the earth (q.v.) remains intact.

With regard to *shayṭān al-insi wa-l-jinni* at Q 6:112, “satanic men and jinn,” it could be asked to what the “satanization” here evoked corresponds. Since the verse probably belongs to the Medinan period (see CHRONOLOGY AND THE QUR'ĀN) it can doubtless be compared to the various passages denouncing an “alliance” (*walā*) between humans and the “demons” (*shayṭān*), a designation that should be regarded as another name for the jinn: the infidels adopt these “demons” as allies (Q 7:27, 30; cf. 17:27), but the alliance will in no case benefit them (Q 2:16; see CONTRACTS AND ALLIANCES; CLIENTS AND CLIENTAGE). There is also a series of occurrences where the alliance is with “the Satan,” the term being used as a proper name. He is as much a betrayer of the cause of humankind as are the “demons,” and will lead people to their damnation (see REWARD AND PUNISHMENT): Q 25:29 reflects this theme, that of *khadhūl*, the “abandonment”

of humanity by its pseudo-ally, the Satan (see ENEMIES). The same theme is to be found in Q 25:18 with the earlier deities designated periphrastically as “that which is adored apart from God” (see POLYTHEISM AND ATHEISM). These passages correspond to the evolution of the demonology proper to the Qurʾān, which ends up individualizing the satanic figure in a symbolic role that seems to condense together all the negative aspects of the “demons,” variously named. Like an unavoidable figure of the anti-god he seems to remain capable of trapping humans (e.g. Q 27:24 or 58:19).

The theme of demonization and the accusation of pacts with the jinn apply specifically to the Medinan enemies of Muḥammad (see MEDINA; OPPOSITION TO MUḤAMMAD), the “impious” (*kāfirūn*, the ancient “ingrates” of tribal Arabia, “those who fail to recognize a benefit received”; see BELIEF AND UNBELIEF; GRATITUDE AND INGRATITUDE; BLESSING), the “hypocrites” (*munāfiqūn*, formerly used of “cowards,” and, as noted by Watt, also the term used to designate Muḥammad’s political enemies in Medina; see HYPOCRITES AND HYPOCRISY), or however they are named. It is a technique of qurʾānic polemical discourse (see POLEMIC AND POLEMICAL LANGUAGE) typical of the Medinan era, corresponding to conflict situations in which the religious argument often comes to the aid of the political (see POLITICS AND THE QURʾĀN; LANGUAGE AND STYLE OF THE QURʾĀN). This is in contrast to the Meccan period, in which Muḥammad is accused by his own of being “possessed by the jinn.” The antithetical relationship between the jinn as negative allies and God as the only positive ally (*walī*, e.g. Q 4:45) lends itself to conjecture about a “cult” alleged to be devoted to the jinn. In particular, some qurʾānic passages that discuss the jinn

utilize terminology similar to that concerning the “service” rendered to God: i.e. *ʿibādat al-jinn* (there is also a passage on the “service” devoted to Satan, Q 36:60). But, just like people, the jinn must adore God alone (Q 51:56). Just like humans they are subjected to the last judgment (q.v.; Q 37:158). Like the “people of the tribes” (*nās*), a number of them are destined for hell (q.v.; Q 11:119; for further references to the infernal destiny of the jinn, see Q 6:128; 7:38, 179; 32:13; 55:39).

In the Qurʾān, the theme of the nations that were destroyed because of their rebellion is also applied to the jinn (see PUNISHMENT STORIES). One passage (Q 6:130) attributes to the jinn, after the fashion of humans, “envoys from among you (*min-kum*)... who warned you” (see MESSENGER; WARNER), but this passage seems to have its origins in a form of rhetorical symmetry and nothing more is known about it (see FORM AND STRUCTURE OF THE QURʾĀN; RHETORIC OF THE QURʾĀN). The disappearance of the “nations” (*umam*) of the jinn is also associated — without providing any further detail — with that of the human “nations” that have disappeared (Q 41:25; 46:18; cf. Q 7:38, where disappearance is associated with “hell” (*nār*); see GENERATIONS). This is probably an extrapolation of the Qurʾān’s discourse, bringing the punishment of the impious, of the deniers and of those who fail to recognize the “signs” (q.v.; *āyāt*) of God to its logical conclusion. The jinn of the Qurʾān again lose ground with reference to their previous status. They are reduced to sharing the eschatological destiny of humankind (see ESCHATOLOGY).

In this type of passage it is impossible to distinguish that which has its origins in beliefs and practices evident in seventh-century Arabia from that which belongs to the Qurʾān’s polemical discourse and the

controversy pursued with enemies in an attempt to confuse them by the force of words (cf. Q 2:14, where the hypocrites are with their “demons”; in Q 6:121, it is these demons who push “their minions”, i.e. Muḥammad’s adversaries, to “controversy” or “disputation,” *mujādala*, see DEBATE AND DISPUTATION).

It is also no easy task to uncover the reality of the belief that is being fought over in the tangled Meccan passages about a “cult of angels” (*ibādat al-malā’ika*) — which seems to become confused with a cult of the jinn (Q 34:41; cf. also the “invocation,” *awdh*, addressed to the jinn in Q 72:6) — and about the representation of angels as “daughters” (*banāt*) of God (Q 6:100; 16:57; 37:149, 153; 43:16; 52:39). In Q 37:150-2 it is a question of a belief in the fact that the lord is said to have procreated angels of the female gender (q.v.), while in verse 158 of the same sūra, a form of “kinship” (*nasab*) is alleged between God and the jinn. In Q 6:100, the jinn are said to be “associates” (*shurakā*) of God while the “daughters of God” are once again evoked. It appears that in this polemic, pseudo-angelized figures are being reduced to jinn, the pseudo-angelized figures who, in the final analysis, would seem to be the tribes’ local protecting goddesses who are to disappear slowly but surely under a variety of disguises (see the remarks made by Wellhausen [*Reste*, 24] regarding the term “daughter of God,” which he compares to the representation of the *Benev Elohim*). In all likelihood it is also a way of reducing them to a minor, subordinate role by declaring that, just like humans, they are “created beings.” And yet their nature is stated to be different from that of humankind. The Qur’ān says that they are made from *nār*. The usual translation, “fire,” probably makes no sense in the context. The image conjured up is that of a repre-

sentation of wreaths of smoke and mirages of “the burning air of the solar day” and not that of flames. This metaphorical transposition could also be recognized in the numerous Qur’ānic uses of the concept of *nār* (regarding the nature of the jinn, see Q 15:27, “created from the fire of *al-samūm*”; and Q 55:15, *min mārijin min nārīn*, a difficult formulation which would make the jinn “unformed beings created from the reverberated heat” and not, as in some translations — such as that of Kazimirski — beings created from a “pure fire without smoke”; see, for an attempt at a more precise explanation of the two passages, Chabbi, *Seigneur*, 190 f.).

But this difference in nature that the Qur’ān is constrained to admit, can only permit the jinn to retain powers that enable them to outclass humans. Thus, although the jinn are no longer able to hear what heaven says about destiny, they are nonetheless still represented as being perfectly capable of rising up to heaven without divine assistance. The divine guard at the gates of heaven requires all of its powers, launching against them “fiery traces” (*shihāb*), to throw them back to earth and prevent them from collecting the secrets of the future (Q 37:10; 72:8-9). A further valiant deed could have been credited to a jinn of Solomon’s court who is said to be *ʿifrīt* (q.v.), “very skillful and crafty.” He suggested to his master that, in an instant, he could bring him the throne of the queen of Sheba (see BILQĪS); but the jinn does not have the time to demonstrate his powers (which are manifestly seen as effective) since his place is taken by a more suitable member of the king’s retinue — one who “knew the scripture” — who accomplished the mission “in the twinkling of an eye” (Q 27:39-40).

In fact, therefore, the approach taken by the Qur’ān to the jinn seems to be para-

doxical. A final quotation will demonstrate another way in which the Qurʾān treats them: their persistent power can be perceived as a constant theme when the Qurʾān itself appeals to their testimony (see WITNESSING AND TESTIFYING) in order to convince men who refuse to believe. These are the “believing jinn,” called to aid in attesting to the pre-eminence of a *qurʾān* (a verbal noun designating “the message faithfully transmitted” and not yet Qurʾān as a proper noun) that they have heard by chance and that they call “marvelous” (*ʿajab*, Q 72:1; see MARVELS; MIRACLE). If the jinn themselves are convinced, how could humans not be convinced? The reasoning must have been seen as incontestable.

A non-Arabic origin of the word *jinn* is not immediately traceable, even though it is cognate to the root *j-n-n*, present in most of the ancient Semitic languages, albeit as a designation of a garden or a cultivated place with trees (the Hebrew *gan*; this latter meaning is retained in Arabic, wherein the trilateral root *j-n-n* is used to designate a “cover” of vegetation). On the other hand, the Ethiopic *gānen* has the meaning of “demon, evil spirit.” Sometimes this Ethiopic term is said to be of Syriac origin (Leslau, *Dictionary*, 198), from the root *g-n-n*, “recover, reside in, descend upon” (this is used of the Holy Ghost, see Payne Smith, *Dictionary*, 73; see HOLY SPIRIT). But Syriac (see SYRIAC AND THE QURʾĀN) does not appear to provide the negative meaning “possessed,” a meaning well-attested in Arabic and Ethiopic. It is probable, therefore, that this latter meaning of *jinn* is a development specific to Arabic, which passed into Ethiopic. At any rate, the term *jinn*, with its derivatives *jānn*, *jinna*, *jinnī* (in the masculine, the feminine and the collective, respectively), is fully attested in the Arabic of the era of the Qurʾān. The rep-

resentation and perception of the permanent encounter with, and the otherness of, these metamorphic beings lend support to their imaginary existence in the minds of people. The Qurʾān strives to turn to its God’s advantage the fear inspired by the jinn and to annihilate the powers attributed to them by the pastoral and nomadic societies of western Arabia. Nevertheless, these strange creatures have continued to exist in a particularly intense manner in a wide variety of disguises in the collective imaginings of Islamic societies. They encountered and merged with other supernatural beings already long resident in the territories conquered by Islam. Some of these retained their original names such as, for instance, the *div* in Iran. Others would lose their identity, at least in appearance, and be assimilated with the figures, most surely negative, that can be definitively identified as jinn.

Jacqueline Chabbi

Bibliography

- A. Caquot, Anges et démons en Israël, in *Sources Orientales VIII. Génies anges et démons*, Paris 1971, 115-51; J. Chabbi, *Le Seigneur des tribus. L’islam de Mahomet*, Paris 1997, 185-232; Ch.M. Doughty, *Travels in Arabia deserta*, Cambridge 1888, New York 1979; A. Dupont-Sommer and M. Philonenko, *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires*, Paris 1987; P.A. Eichler, *Die Dschinn, Teufel und Engel im Koran*, Leipzig 1928; T. Fahd, Anges, démons et djinns en Islam, in *Sources Orientales VIII. Génies anges et démons*, Paris 1971, 155-213 (with important bibliography); A. Jaussen, *Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab*, Paris 1907, 1947; Jeffery, *For. vocab.*; E. Kautsch, *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, Tübingen 1900-21; W. Leslau, *Comparative dictionary of Geʿez*, Wiesbaden 1987; J. Payne Smith, *Compendious Syriac dictionary*, Oxford 1903; P. Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel*, Augsburg 1928; W.M. Watt, *Muhammad at Medina*, London 1956; A.T. Welch, Allah and other supernatural beings. The emergence of the qurʾānic doctrine of tawhīd, in *JAAAR* 47 (1980), 733-58; J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, Berlin 1887, 1927, 1961³, 148-59 (chap.

Geister und Gespenster; Wellhausen often depends on the observations made by Doughty in *Travels in Arabia deserta*; A.J. Wensinck/L. Gardet, *Iblīs*, in *ET*², iii, 668-9.

Jizya see POLL TAX; TAXATION

Job

One of the prophetic figures preceding Muḥammad common to the Jewish, Christian and Islamic traditions (see PROPHETS AND PROPHETHOOD). Job (Ayyūb) is mentioned in only four pericopes: Q 6:83-7 and 4:163 set him in the company of the prophets while Q 38:41-2 and Q 21:83-4 allude to his distinctive vocation and charisma.

In Q 6:83-90, together with Abraham (q.v.), Isaac (q.v.), Jacob (q.v.), Noah (q.v.), David (q.v.), Solomon (q.v.), Joseph (q.v.), Moses (q.v.) and Aaron (q.v.), Zechariah (q.v.), John (see JOHN THE BAPTIST), Jesus (q.v.), Elias (see ELIJAH), Ishmael (q.v.), Elisha (q.v.), Jonah (q.v.) and Lot (q.v.), he is included among those God has guided, chosen and preferred to ordinary humankind (see ELECTION), to whom he has given scripture (see BOOK; SCRIPTURE AND THE QUR'ĀN), authority (q.v.), prophethood and whose example is to be followed. In Q 4:163, Job is named among those to whom a revelation (see REVELATION AND INSPIRATION) has been given so that humans will not be able to claim ignorance (q.v.) of God's will. The names given include those mentioned in the pericope cited above — omitting Joseph, Zechariah, John, Elias, Elisha and Lot, but adding “the tribes” (*al-ashbāt*, see CHILDREN OF ISRAEL; TRIBES AND CLANS), and two general categories subsuming all the other prophets, those mentioned to Muḥammad, and those not mentioned to him.

As for Job's special character, Q 38:41-2

presents Job calling to his lord, “Satan (see DEVIL) has indeed touched me with hardship and pain (see TRIAL).” God responds to his cry, “Scuff [the earth] with your foot. Here is [water] a place to cleanse yourself, [it is] cooling, it is drink.” Job obeys. A spring appears in which he bathes and from which he drinks. His kin and “the like of them with them” are restored to him as an act of divine mercy (q.v.). God then (Q 38:44) commands him to strike “her” (the ellipsed pronoun in *fa-drib bihi* has no explicit referent) with a sprig of leaves in order to keep an oath he has made (see OATHS). The pericope ends with a formula of praise — “How excellent a servant! Constantly was he turned [to God]” (*ni'ma l-'abdu innahu awwāb*) — which, in Q 38:30, celebrates the virtues of Solomon, the only other prophet to be honored with this formula. Q 21:83-4 likewise tells of Job's call to his lord, God's hearing of him, removal of the hurt upon him, restoration of what he had lost, and his praise of God as “most merciful of the merciful.”

Both of the pericopes that indicate Job's special character are allusive, but the exegetical tradition (see EXEGESIS OF THE QUR'ĀN: CLASSICAL AND MEDIEVAL), as summarized by al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923; *Tafsīr*, ad loc.), supplies an inter-text in the light of which they may be understood. Job cried out because God had allowed Satan to put him to the test by destroying his livestock, slaying his kin, and afflicting him with a painful disease (see ILLNESS AND HEALTH). Because he remained faithful while put to the test, God heard his cry, healed him with a miraculous spring, and restored to him two-fold both his kin, and the property taken from him. The person to be struck with a sprig in Q 38:44 refers to his wife. She alone, during his illness, had not deserted him. But she was tempted by Satan, to whom she had urged Job to sacri-