HISTORY OF THE CALIPHS

From The Death of the Messenger (s)
to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty
11-132 AH

Vol.2

By:
Ras£l Ja’far¢an

Translated by:
Ali Ebrahimi

Ja'far¢an, Ras£l, 1965 -
History of the Caliphs: From The Death of the Messenger (s) to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty 11-132 AH/ by Rasul Ja'fariyan; translated by Ali Ebrahimi.- Qum: Ansariyan, 2003.
664 P.
Original title: تاريخ خلفا
Including bibliographical references.
ISBN: 964-438-457-1
1. Islim – History – Early to 750. 2. Caliphs, orthodox. 3. Umayyads – History. 4. Caliphate. I.Ebrahimi, Ali tr. II.Title.
297.912
BP14.J2H5

HISTORY OF THE CALIPHS

From The Death of the Messenger (s) to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty 11-132 AH

Author: Ras£l Ja'far¢an
Translated by: Ali Ebrahimi
Publisher: Ansariyan Publications – Qum
First Edition 1382 – 1424 - 2003
Negheen Press Quantity: 2000
Number of Pages: 664 Size: 162X229
ISBN: 964-438-457-1

ALL RIGHTS RECORDED AND RESERVED FOR THE PUBLISHER

Ansariyan Publications
P.O. Box 187
22 Shohada St., Qum
Islamic Republic of Iran
Tel: ++89 251 7741744 Fax: 7742647
Email: ansarian@noornet.net
www.ansariyan.org & www.ansariyan.net

IN THE NAME OF ALLAH,
ALL-COMPASSIONATE AND ALL-MERCIFUL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HISTORY
OF THE CALIPHS.....1
From The Death of the Messenger (s) to the Decline of The Umayyad Dynasty
11-132 AH.....1
Vol.2.....1
By:
Ras£l Ja'far¢an.....1
Translated by:
Ali Ebrahimi.....2
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....6
TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.....11
CHAPTER I
AB¬ BAKR'S CALIPHATE.....12
Saq«fa.....12
Caliphate After the Prophet (s).....23
The Issue of Apostasy.....27
Ab¬ Bakr's Agents.....39
Conquest of Damascus.....44
Conquest of Iraq.....51
CHAPTER II
'UMAR'S CALIPHATE.....59
About Caliph II.....59
the Caliph's Character.....63
'Umar's Functionaries.....68
Thoughts of the Second Caliph.....78
'Umar's Murder.....100
Continued Conquests in Damascus and Egypt.....106
Continued Conquests in Iraq and the Conquest of Iran....113

About Iran’s Conquest.....124

CHAPTER III

‘UTHMªN’S CALIPHATE.....130

Caliphate Council and ‘Uthmªn’s Election.....130
‘Uthmªn’s Caliphate.....144
Reasons of Anti-‘Uthmªn Rebellion.....147
‘Uthmªn’s Opponents.....157
‘Uthmªn’s Contact with Dissenters.....166
‘Uthmªn and Mu‘ªwiya.....177
Imªm ‘Al¢ (a) and ‘Uthmªn.....180
Assassination of ‘Uthmªn.....187
Ongoing Victories.....192
Effects of Victories and Islamic Community.....193

CHAPTER VI

IMªM ‘AL¢’S IMAMATE.....201

Imªm ‘Al« alongside the Prophet.....201
Imªm ‘Al« and Caliphs.....207
Shi‘ism During Imªm’s caliphate.....214
People’s Allegiance to ‘Al« (a).....232
Imªm’s Problems.....246
Reformation, Imªm’s Fundamental Policy.....254
Imªm in the Face of Infidels (Djamal War).....261
Imªm Stays in K¬fa.....281
War with Oppressively perverse People in ¯iff«n.....284
War with Extremist Khªridjites.....316
The Khªridjites, Formation and Characteristics.....323
Invasions of Damascus Army.....332
Imªm ‘Al«’s Martyrdom.....343
Imªm ‘Al«’s Life.....345

CHAPTER V

IMªM °ASAN’S IMAMATE.....350

Acquaintance with the K¬fiyªns.....350
Imªm °asan’s Character.....354
Imªm Mudjtabª and Imamate.....359
First Actions of Imªm and Mu‘ªwiya.....366
Mu‘ªwiya and Request for Compromise.....374
Why the Compromise Was Accepted.....375
Imªm °usayn (a) and Compromise.....382
Peace Pact.....384
Imªm Mudjtabª’s Character.....390
Imªm °asan’s Martydom.....393

CHAPTER VI

MU‘ªWIYA’S MONARCHY.....397

Mu‘ªwiya, the Founder of the UmayyaD Monarchy.....397

Shi‘ite Muslims in Mu‘ªwiya’s time.....415

The Suppression of °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢’s Shi‘ite Movement...426

Repercussions of °udjr’s Martyrdom.....432

Conquests in Mu‘iwiya’s time.....435

The KhªridjItes in Mu‘ªwiya’s time.....436

Mu‘ªwiya’s Endeavor for Hereditary Caliphate.....442

CHAPTER VII

KARBALª MOVEMENT.....453

Imªmºusayn Before Karbalª’.....453

Imim °usayn’s Opposition to Yaz¢d’s Caliphate.....460

Dispatching Muslim to K£fa.....462

Imim’s Movement Towards Iraq.....468

The People of K£fa and Karbali Event.....470

K£fa Under the Pressure of Ibn Ziyid.....473

Assessing the Travel to Iraq.....478

Imim Versus Iraqi Army.....486

The Element of Invisibility in Karbalª.....496

The Role of Religious Deviations in Karbalª Event.....499

Political Impacts of the Event of Karbalª on Shi‘ism.....504

CHAPTER VIII

TRANSFER OF CALIPHATE TO THE MARWªNIDS.....507

Dispute Between °idjªz and Damascus.....507

The Battle of °arra WªqIm.....508

The Penitents’ Movement in 65 A.H.....515

Here Some Points Merit Attention as Regards to the penitents.....523

MukhtªrIs Uprising (66, 67 A.H.).....526

CHAPTER IX

IMªM SADJDJªD (A).....544

ImªmSadjdjªd(a).....544

ImªmSadjdjªd and Shi‘ite Muslims.....552

ImªmIs Encounter with the UmayyaDS.....557

ImªmSadjdjªd’s Profiting from Du‘ª (Prayer).....561

ImªmSadjdjªd and Slaves.....566

The HªshimItes after the Event of Karbalª’.....568

CHAPTER X

THE MARWªNIDS’ GOVERNMENT.....577

ªl MarwªnIs Rule.....577

°adjdjªdj in Iraq.....584
‘Abd al-Ra°mªn Ibn Ash‘ath’s Riot.....590
‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az«z’s Administration.....595
Encountering the Shi‘ite Muslims.....596
Encountering the Khªridjites.....599
Standing Against Cruelty and Public Extortion.....600
Yaz«d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik’s Succession.....604
Yaz«d Ibn Muhallab’s Uprising.....607
Hishªm Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik’s Succession.....611
Khªridjites’ Rebellion in time of the Marwªnids.....615
The Foundation of the Khªridjites’ Principles.....622

CHAPTER XI
SHI‘ITE MUSLIMS IN THE LAST DECADES OF THE UMAYYAD STATE.....625
The Shi‘ite Muslims Under the Pressure of the Umayyads 625
Internal Events of Shi‘ite Muslims.....629
Exaggeration and the Exaggerators.....630
Confrontation of Imªms with the Exaggerators.....633
Shi‘ism when Giving Superiority to ‘Al« (a).....641
Zayd Ibn ‘Al«’s Uprising and the Zayd«ds in Shi‘ism.....652
Zayd Ibn ‘Al« in K¬fa.....656
Zayd Ibn ‘Al«’s Clash with the Umayyads’ Forces.....662
Zaydism, Shi‘ism and Zayd Ibn ‘Al« (a).....668
The Twelve-Imªm Shi‘ite Muslims and Zayd.....677
Ya°yª Ibn Zayd’s Uprising.....690
‘Abd Allªh Ibn Mu‘ªwiya’s Uprising.....694
The Shi‘ite Muslims and the ‘Alawites’ Last Position in the Umayyads’s time.....699

CHAPTER XII
DECLINE OF THE MARWªNIDS.....702
°ªrith Ibn Suraydj in Khurªsªn.....702
The Murdji‘ites and the Djahmites in °ªrith’s Uprising.....707
Wal«d Ibn Yaz«d’s Caliphate and Extreme Corruption of the Umayyads.....710
The Impacts of Wal¢d’s Death on the Umayyads and Their Fall.....717
Marwªn Ibn Mu°ammad and the Decline of the Umayyads 719
Political Views of the Marwªnids.....723
Scholars Serve ªl Marwªn.....739

Circulation of Israelites and the Prevalence of Story-telling 743
Conquests by the Marwªnids Until Late FIRST Century....750
Oriental Conquests.....751
Occidental Conquests.....755

REFERENCES.....759

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

History of Caliphs manifests undeniable facts associated with History of Shiism, the facts every Shiite Muslim and those after Shiism find helpful to achieve on understanding of History of Islam. To this aim, the book is mainly written by the author and printed by the publisher, not to mention the translator, knowing that the task in its entirety is a heavy one with a grave responsibility shouldered upon. Certainly, there exists a mission and function before the Almighty God, his Messenger(s), his progeny and the Shiite followers after, part of which is encumbered here in this historically authentic publication. Motives behind the task are legion and great but whatsoever they may be, they lead every Ahl-e Bayt enthusiast to a long road with unending eternality.

Thanks to divine contributions first, accomplishment of such a heavy task, translation, needs plenty of time, energy, patience, knowledge, faith and aim without each one of which delivery and feasibility seemed improbable. It took a good deal of energy and time excluding other factors to bring this to an end but one thing drove me ahead and that was assistance granted by my Lord who removed all hindrances and obscurities and facilitated the task.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that knowledge, competence and performance are the divine blessings bestowed upon me to fulfil this mammoth task. Be it that the Muslim world and the ensuing generations greatly benefit and transfer it to others.

Diacritics applied in the book for the names come from the latest sources as to the encyclopedia. Any descrepancies shall come under the responsibility of the author of the book.

A. Ebrahimi
Translator

CHAPTER I
AB¬ BAKR'S CALIPHATE

SAQ«FA

It is impossible to study the incidents after the Prophet's demise in connection with the leadership of the society without paying attention to the then political parties in Medina. The An¥ir (Helpers) were one of the important political parties who were worried about problems and their future after the demise of the Prophet (s) since the fall of Mecca to Muslims. They gathered in Saq¢fa, fearing the rule of the Quraysh, although they had sworn allegiance to Imim 'Al¢ (a) – who was, they believed, less probable to assume power. °ubib Ibn Mundhir, one of the influential leaders of An¥ir, in his remarks in Saq¢fa, considered the An¥ir better than the Quraysh and said, "It was their sword that gained victory for Islam."

He addressed the An¥ir and said, "These people (Muhidjir£n (Immigrants)) are your booties and your subjects and dare not stand against you."[1] °ubib's words have to mean that whatever made the An¥ir do this unwise act, was their fear from and competition with the Quraysh. On the other hand, a number of the Muhidjir£n who had shown suspicious behavior two weeks before the Prophet's passing, hearing about the Saq¢fa gathering, wasted no time in attending the place and arguing with the An¥ir.

The news of the negotiations was revealed later in Medina by the second caliph in one of his sermons. He was in Mecca when he was told that someone had said, "Swearing allegiance to Ab£ Bakr happened all of a sudden." This made 'Umar very angry and he decided to talk to the people about it in Mecca.

[1] al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, pp.24-25

'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn 'Awf said to 'Umar, "You are in a city where all Arab tribes are present. If you say something now, it will be spread in all cities."

When 'Umar came to Medina, he went to the pulpit and addressed the people, "I have been told that some people have said swearing allegiance to Ab£ Bakr took place suddenly. I swear by my life that it was so. But God bestowed you its good and protected you against its bad side. After the Prophet's demise, we were told that the An¥ir had gathered with Sa'd Ibn 'Ubida in the vicinity of Ban£ Si'ida. Ab£ Bakr, Ab£ 'Ubayda and I went to them and on our way, we came across two men from the An¥ir. They assured us that the An¥ir did not intend to do something contrary to our views, but we decided to see for ourselves."

The spokesman of the An¥ir said, "We, the An¥ir, are the unified army of Islam and you, O Quraysh, were a small group of us and a minority among us!"

I wanted to respond to him but Ab£ Bakr prevented me and he himself said, "Whatever you say about the An¥ir is, of course, true but the Arabs do not recognize "caliphate" except for the Quraysh race. They are the best of Arabs in lineage and in noble birth. I propose swearing allegiance to 'Umar or Ab£ 'Ubayda (who were the only men of the Muhidjir£n in the gathering)."

The speaker of An¥ir said, "Let there be an emir from us and another from you."[1]

I responded, "Two swords cannot be put in a scabbard. Then, I raised Ab£ Bakr's hand and swore allegiance to him."

'Umar added, "The Muhidjir£n and the An¥ir swore allegiance to him. (Of course, there were only three men of the Muhidjir£n in the gathering.) We feared to leave the gathering lest they might swear allegiance to another one and force us to obey him! Or make a tumult with our opposition. Of course, swearing allegiance to Ab£ Bakr was impromptu, and it was not other than a divine blessing to repel a bad omen from us, and there is no likeness of. Therefore, whoever swears allegiance with a person without "Muslims' consultation", neither he nor the sworn one

[1] °ubib Ibn Mundhir said that neither Muhidjir£n nor An¥ir accepted each other. Masi'il al-imima, p.13

deserves obedience; otherwise, both will be in danger of assassination."[1]

The caliph gave a brief report on Saq¢fa, but it was enough for disclosing part of the realities. The comprehensive report on Saq¢fa is available in Ab£ Bakr Djuwhar¢'s (323 AD) al-Saq¢fa.[2]

Ibn A'tham writes, "Before the arrival of the Muhidjir£n, serious arguments were raised among the An¥ir. One of the An¥ir said, "Select someone whose countenance frightens the Quraysh and makes the An¥ir feel safe." A few proposed Sa'd Ibn 'Ubida.

Usayd Ibn °u¤ayr, one of the nobles of Aws, rose in objection and said, "Caliphate should remain in the Quraysh." Others spoke against him. Bash¢r Ibn Sa'd defended the Quraysh and 'Uwaym Ibn Si'ida said, "Caliphate will be exclusive to the Infallible Household of the Prophet(s). Put it where God has placed it."[3] Ibn A'tham's report shows the internal oppositions inside the An¥ir.

Usayd Ibn °u¤ayr from Aws and Bash¢r Ibn Sa'd who was Sa'd Ibn 'Ubida's cousin, were the first men of the An¥ir who swore allegiance to Ab£ Bakr in Saq¢fa. We all know that later on, the An¥ir became dissatisfied with the rule of the Quraysh.

According to Zubayr Ibn Bakkir, the people of Aws said, "It was Bash¢r Ibn Sa'd of Khazradj who swore allegiance first. And the people of Khazradj said it was Usayd Ibn °u¤ayr." [4]

---

[1]. Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.VII, p.431 ('Umar said, "فمن دعا إلى مثلها فهو الذي لا بيعة له ولا لمن بايعه" "Whoever calls on people do this, neither his allegiance nor that of someone's who calls to his obedience is acceptable." 'Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.V, pp.442-445 (briefly said); ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.344; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, pp.204-206; see distorted and disgraceful narrations of 'Umar's speech in, Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.581

[2]. This book is lost but major part of it is mentioned by Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d in Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha. These quotations have been collected by Mu¦ammad Hid¢ Am¢n¢ in a separate book titled "Al-Saq¢fa wa Fadak" and published.

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, pp.3-4; Wiqid¢, Kitib al-ridda, pp.32-33

[4]. al-Muwaffaqiyyit, p.578; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.II, p.272. °ubib Ibn Mundhir said to Bash¢r Ibn Sa'd in Saq¢fa, "You swore allegiance to Ab£ Bakr out of envy towards Sa'd Ibn

Ab£ Bakr knew about such a contention, so in Saq¢fa he said, "If the men of Aws assume power, the people of Khazradj will not accept it and there will be bloody fights among them all the time."[1]

According to Ya'q£b¢, 'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn 'Awf, too, was in Saq¢fa. This is not true. Whatever Ya'q£b¢ has quoted from him were told a day later in the mosque.

He addressed the An¥ir and said, "Although you are people of essential excellence but there is no likeness of Ab£ Bakr, 'Umar and 'Al¢ (a) among you."

Mundhir Ibn Arqam stood up and said, "We do not deny excellence of the people you named. If one of these people seeks caliphate (he meant Imim 'Al¢ (a)), there will be no objection to his request." Then Bash¢r Ibn Sa'd and Usayd Ibn °u¤ayr rose and swore allegiance; and many followed them so that Sa'd Ibn 'Ubida was about to be killed in the stampede.[2]

Bari' Ibn 'ªzib went to the The Hishimites and said, "They swore allegiance to Ab£ Bakr."

The men of the Hishimites said Muslims would never do that in their absence. "We are the offspring of Mu¦ammad (s)!"

'Abbis said, "I swear by the God of Ka'ba, they did."

Ya'q£b¢ adds, "The Muhidjir£n and the An¥ir had no doubts on Imim 'Al¢ (a)."[3]

'Ubida (Kitib al-ridda, p.42). When Usayd Ibn °u¤ayr passed away, 'Umar paid off all his debts (al-Fi'iq f¢ ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.I, p.108). °ubib Ibn Mundhir composed poem in Saq¢fa in reproaching those two men, part of which is so (Kitib al-ridda, p.38)

سعي ابن حضير في الفساد لجاجة وأسرع منه في الفساد بشير

Ibn °u¤ayr much embraced on evil-doings and Bash¢r did more than him.

[1]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.14; al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.III, p.298; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.27; Masi'il al-imima, p.13

[2]. Sa'd Ibn 'Ubida never paid allegiance to Ab£ Bakr and when he was in Damascus, caliph sent somebody to kill him and he was killed; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.250

[3]. Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, pp.123-124; one of the An¥ir is reported to have said, "If 'Al¢ and other people of the Hishimites had not been engaged in burying the Messenger (s) in the house and not been there in worry about him, no one would have had caprice of caliphate, Kitib al-ridda, pp.45-46. Wiqid¢'s report reveals

±abar¢ and Ibn Ath¢r have said the An¥ir or a number of them present in Saq¢fa said they swore allegiance only to ‘Al ¢ (a).[1]

According to Ibn Qutayba, °ubib Ibn Mundhir took his sword off its sheath when he saw the An¥ir swearing allegiance but they disarmed him.

He addressed the An¥ir, “You must wait and see your children begging for a bowl of water and a loaf of bread in the doorsteps of the Quraysh.”[2]

---

that ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf talked to the An¥ir after Saq¢fa event. Evidence of a good number indicates that nobody was present at Saq¢fa except three people of Muhidjir£n.

Later on, Bash¢r Ibn Sa‘d An¥iri, after hearing of Imim ‘Al¢’s reasoning said to him, “In case people had heard you speaking this way before, nobody would have disagreed with you and all would have paid allegiance to you. But you stayed home and people thought you were not in need of caliphate!

Imim responded, “O son of Bash¢r ! Should I have left the Messenger’s corpse at home and quarelling with people on succession?”

Ab£ Bakr said, “They have paid allegiance to me now and if I had known your will, I would have never sought after it myself. You’re free to swear allegiance to me.”

Imim paid allegiance to him seventy five days after departure of the Messenger (s) when Fi§ima (a) passed away, Kitib al-ridda, p.47

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p.208; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.II, p.325

[2]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.27; Kitib al-ridda, p.42. °arra event, Djuwhar¢ says, in 63 A.H. confirmed what °ubib said to Ab£ Bakr, “I fear not of you but of those after you (Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.I, p.313). About An¥ir’s repentance after Saq¢fa, al-Muwaffaqiyyit, p.583

°ubib said, “Since we killed their fathers in wars, they would take revenge on us.” (Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.580); al-Fi’iq f¢ ghar¢b al-¦ad ¢th, vol.III, p.166; Masi’il al-imima, p.135

In this case, we should see how Imim was treated. In Badr, they have murdered half of Quraysh totaling seventy people. Certainly, it has to be known that the An¥ir felt remorseful of what they had done and so they stood against defending ‘Al¢, Quraysh and its political party, from ‘Uthmin and Mu‘iw¢ya to ±al¦a, Zubayr and ‘ªyisha in Djamal, ¯iff¢n or before by having a hand in ‘Uthmin’s murder or staying silent towards it. Even a few days after Saq¢fa, their remorse was revealed and °assin Ibn Thibit’s then poems best prove that. Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, pp.127-128

According to all historians, the most important reasoning of Ab£ Bakr and 'Umar was Ab£ Bakr's kinship with the Prophet (s) and his age, although there are some references to his merits in some documents.

They addressed the An¥ir and said, "Arabs will only accept this race of Quraysh[1] and they will never accept prophethood in a family and caliphate in another family." [2]

Ab£ Bakr in Saq¢fa said, **"نحن قريش والأئمة منا** We are from the Quraysh and the Imims must be from us."[3]

Later on, when Imim 'Al¢ (a) expressed his objections to Ab£ Bakr and 'Umar about how they had relied on "kinship" knowing that he was closer to the Prophet (s), 'Umar said, "Arabs do not want to see prophethood and caliphate in a single family.[4] Prophethood belonged to you, so let the caliphate be for other families!"

There is no doubt that after avoiding allegiance to 'Al¢ (a) in Saq¢fa, tribal opposition began and finally, the Quraysh introduced its "tribal superiority" to make use of the internal conflicts of the An¥ir and win the caliphate despite their limited influence in Medina. Followers of Ab£ Bakr considered his age as a criterion at a time when Imim 'Al¢ (a) was young. When Salmin heard the news of the allegiance, he said, "You selected the most aged one but made a mistake about the Infallible Household of your

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.582

[2]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.II, p.38

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.583, والعرب لا ترضى أن يؤمّركم وبينها من غيركم ولكن يؤمرون من كانت النبوة فيهم **"**Arabs never appoint you as ruler but those who were in touch with prophethood." Kitib al-ridda, p.39; Ab£ Bakr in his speech relied on this, "قريش أوسط العــرب داراً وأكرمهــم أحســاباً **"**The Quraysh ites are the most outstanding and noble 'Arab dynasty." ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.II, p.269; Following above sentence quoted from Ab£ Bakr, in Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.13 it is added through Ab£ Bakr, "وأحسنهم وجوهاً أكثر الناس ولادة في العرب **"**The most good-looking people were more among those who were given birth among Arabs." Ab£ Bakr said, نحن قريش والأئمة منا **"**We are the Quraysh ites and Imims are from us" as a hadith although this was attributed to him later.

[4]. al-«¤i¦, p.87. 'Umar said to Ibn 'Abbis, "Your people did not want to have the prophethood and caliphate in your family because, in that case, pride elevated you to the sky; Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.28

prophet. If you swore allegiance to them, two people would not oppose you."[1]

It should be noted that no reliable and documented words were uttered on the issue of Saq¢fa and the way of the caliph's selection. Of course, we must ignore the false quotations made up to show Ab£ Bakr rightful[2] for the caliphate that said the Prophet (s) had chosen not only Ab£ Bakr, but also the succeeding caliphs.[3] What is important to us, is the Saq¢fa talks and the sideline incidents. The An¥ir considered caliphate to themselves; the Muhidjir£n - Ab£ Bakr, 'Umar and Ab£ 'Ubayda - went to Saq¢fa and said caliphate was exclusive to the Quraysh. They did not rely on any traditions such as "The Imims are from the Quraysh," and said Arabs would not obey any other race than the Quraysh. Among them, some great companions of the Prophet (s) such as Zubayr and ±al¦a[4] did not consider Ab£ Bakr the right one to assume power.

Therefore, there was no recognized method or preconditions for selecting Ab£ Bakr except his kinship with the Prophet (s), "tribal superiority" of the Quraysh and tribal criteria. Being from the Quraysh was in no sense a prerequisite for assuming the title of caliph. Many years after his caliphate, 'Umar wished "Silim" Mawli °udhayfa Ibn

---

[1]. al-Saq¢fa wa Fadak, p.43; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.II, p.49 and Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.590; Ab£ 'Ubayda Djarri¦ talked about 'Al¢'s younghood when Imim objected, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.II, pp.2-5

[2]. 'ªyisha is quoted to have been questioned, "Whom did the Messenger (s) find as his successor?"

"Ab£ Bakr", she replied.

"Who would be his successor?", she was asked.

"'Umar", she answered.

"And after 'Umar", she was questioned.

"Ab£ 'Ubayda Djarri¦", she replied.

(Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.VII, p.433)

The date of forging this hadith shall be found within the hadith proper.

[3]. al-Ghad¢r, vol.V (issue, Silsilat al-Maw¤£'it fi l-khilifa) pp.333-356. According to Waqid¢ in al-Ridda (pp.35-37) it seems that the Messenger (s) has placed Ab£ Bakr as his successor as clarified in Saq ¢fa several times!

[4]. Nihiyat al-'irab, vol.XIX, p.39

Yamin were alive to rule after him.[1] Silim was not a man of the Quraysh. Some believe that the prerequisite of being from the Quraysh by descent was introduced in the Sunnites political jurisprudence since the third century.[2] The only criteria in Saq¢fa were linkage to the Quraysh and Ab£ Bakr's age. These were the only criteria of the Dark Age along with the political conflicts that granted him caliphate, not a combination of the pagan and Islamic criteria that Dr. Khayr al-D¢n Saw¢ has stated.[3] There are other documents at hand that Ab£ Bakr attached special significance to the Quraysh and its nobility.

Ibn 'Asikir says, "Some time after the conversion of Ab£ Sufyin to Islam; Bilil; ¯uhayb R£m¢, and Salmin scorned him. Ab£ Bakr asked angrily why they behaved that way with "the Shiykh and master of the Quraysh". They complained about this in the presence of the Prophet (s) and he asked Ab£ Bakr to apologize.[4]

After the allegiance in Saq¢fa, they left the place. According to Bari' Ibn 'ªzib, they walked in the alleys and rubbed the hands of whoever they met to Ab£ Bakr's hands, not paying attention to the person's willingness or unwillingness.

Bara' adds, "I rushed to the door of the Hishimites to give the news."[5] Their interest in allegiance was so immense that according to Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, they did not attend the funeral ceremony of the Prophet (s) and returned to the city after the ceremony.[6]

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.I, p.190; al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.II, p.274, vol.III, p.407; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.881; Masi'il al-imima, p.63; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XII, p.69

[2]. Ta§awwur al-fikr al-siyis¢ 'Ind ahl al-Sunna, p.38

[3]. Ta§awwur al-fikr al-siyis¢, p.38, footnote IV

[4]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.V, p.261

[5]. al-Saq¢fa wa Fadak, p.46

[6]. Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.VII, p.432

Hishim Ibn 'Urwa quotes his father, ان ابا بكر وعمر لم يشهدا دفن النبي (ص) وكانا في الانصار فدفن قبل ان يرجعا Ab£ Bakr and 'Umar were with the An¥ir when the Prophet (s) was to be buried, and before they came back, the Prophet (s) had been buried

Wiqid¢ says, "What seems correct to me is that the Prophet (s) has been buried Saturday. (al-Bad' wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.47); therefore, it is

Finishing the allegiance swearing, ‘Umar stood up and apologized for whatever he had said the day before on the continuation of the Prophet's life until the death of his last companion, and indeed for his claim on offering guidance to the Prophet (s). He said he believed that the Prophet (s) would live long to organize the affairs, but now he witnessed that the Qur’in was left among them and the people swore allegiance to the best companion of the Prophet (s).[1] This shows that ‘Umar was waiting for the selection of the anticipated caliph and he had no problem after that.

Some people rose in objection. In addition to two distinguished personalities of the The Hishimites, i.e. Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and ‘Abbis, there were some other influential people such as Zubayr Ibn ‘Awim, Khilid Ibn Sa‘¢d, Miqdid Ibn ‘Amr, Salmin, Ab£dhar, ‘Ammir, Bari’ Ibn ‘ªzib, and Ubayy Ibn Ka‘b.[2]

Ab£ Bakr’s followers went to visit Ubayy Ibn Ka‘b but he did not open the door for them.[3] ‘Umar, Ab£ ‘Ubayda Djarri¦, Mugh¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba and Khilid Ibn Wal¢d were the chief organizers of this program. At Imim ‘Al¢’s doorstep, ‘Umar severely and seriously asked him to swear allegiance to Ab£ Bakr.

Imim said, “Your greed for Ab£ Bakr’s rule today is to have the caliphate tomorrow.”[4]

Those who had gathered in Imim ‘Al¢’s house faced the harsh behavior of ‘Umar and his followers. ‘Umar took Zubayr’s sword and broke it, then threatened the residents of the house that he would set the house on fire. For the list of those sitting in Imim ‘Al¢’s house and the names of those who broke into the house, refer to the following sources.[5]

---

clear that Ab£ Bakr and his fellow had been busy since Monday till tomorrow when the Prophet (s) passed away and they could not come by his dead body. These two people are hardly mentioned among those named in reports concerned with his burial.

[1]. al-Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, pp.65-66

[2]. Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.124

[3]. al-Saq¢fa wa Fadak, p.47

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.587. According to Ibn Qutayba, ‘Al¢ said to him, “Milk in a way you can have part of it; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.29

According to Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, 'Umar who had a brand of fire in his hand, threatened to set the house on fire. When Fi§ima (a) asked him whether he was serious, he said he was unless they accepted whatever the nation had accepted.[1] Fi§ima asked the sit-in people to disperse because she was sure 'Umar would set the house ablaze.[2]

Getting allegiance by force and threatening to set the house on fire, which were followed later on by the other caliphs (such as Ibn Zubayr in his exacting allegiance from the Hishimites) [3] could have stemmed from here.

Of course, the Quraysh started talks in addition to using force. Upon Mughh¢ra's advice, they went to 'Abbis to include him and his family, too, in the allegiance move and alleviate their problems by pleasing the Prophet's uncle, but 'Abbis rejected their invitation.[4]

Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n and Fi§ima did their best to return the right of caliphate from Ab£ Bakr to Imim 'Al¢ (a) but it was fruitless. Their efforts have been recorded in the books of Ab£ Bakr Djuwhar¢ and others.[5] There is no doubt that Fi§ima (a) was angry with Ab£ Bakr and 'Umar for trampling on her right in the issue of the Prophet's heritage, the Fadak

---

[5]. Ma'ilim al-madrisatayn, vol.II, pp.163-166; Talkh¢¥ al-shif¢, pp.76, 156

[1]. al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.III, p.64; Tir¢kh 'Abi l-fidi', vol.I, p.156 quoted from, Ma'ilim al-madrisatayn, vol.II, p.167

About other sources talking about threat, Ma'ilim al-madrisatayn, vol.II, pp.167-168

Ab£ Bakr in his time of death was concerned about a few things, one was that he wished he had never opened Fi§ima's house door even if they had closed it with the aim of war (Ma'ilim al-madrisatayn,, vol.II, p.165, footnote LXV from various sources)

[2]. al-Mudhakkar wa l-tadhk¢r wa l-dhikr, p.91; Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, al-Mu¥annaf, vol. VII, p.432

The Shi'ite Muslims believed in such an action.

[3]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.XX, p.147

[4]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.I, p.220; Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, pp.124-125

[5]. Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.126; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.II, pp.5-28 and 67; Waq'at al-¥iff¢n, p.182; Kitib al-ridda, p.46

case[1] and the Imamate of Muslims and she passed away sore in the heart.[2]

Zuhr¢ says, “Imim ‘Al¢ (a) buried Fi§ima’s body at night and did not let Ab£ Bakr know it. Until before her death, Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and none of the Hishimites men swore allegiance to Ab£ Bakr.[3] Later on, Imim ‘Al¢ (a) swore allegiance to protect the unity of Muslims against the idolaters and infidels.”[4]

In his response to Ab£ Sufyin’s request who asked him not to let caliphate remain in the hands of the Ban£ Taym, Imim ‘Al¢ said, “You have always been an enemy of Islam and Muslims.”[5]

At any rate, there is no doubt that Imim ‘Al¢ (a) did not swear allegiance to Ab£ Bakr until after the death of Fi§ima (a).[6]

Madi’in¢ has written that with the beginning of the war against the infidels, ‘Uthmin came to Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and said, “No one will join you in your fight against infidels unless you swear allegiance to Ab£ Bakr.” He insisted and took Imim to Ab£ Bakr’s place and ‘Al¢ (a) swore allegiance and it made Muslims very happy.[7]

Mas‘£d¢ says, “Fi§ima, sitting at the side of the Prophet’s grave, recited the following poem”,

قدكان بعدك انباء وهينمة لوكنت شاهدها لم تكثر الخطب[8]

---

[1]. About what happened to Fadak during the Umayya and the ‘Abbisids, al-Kharidj wa ¯ani‘at al-kitiba, pp.259-260

[2]. ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.V, p.472. The same quotation comes from Zuhr¢ in Bukhir¢, vol.VI, p.122.Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.VI, pp.49-50; vol.XVI, pp.253,281,282; al-Bidiya wa l-Nihiya, vol.V, pp.285,287

[3]. ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.V, p.472

[4]. It was for the same reason Imim opposed to Ab£ Sufyin who had been willing to pay allegiance to Imim, Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.400

[5]. Nihiyat al-’irab, vol.XIX, p.40

[6]. Aside from false narrations against the chronicles, Imim swore allegiance just when ‘Umar and Ab£ Bakr stopped by him in his house, Nihiyat al-’irab, vol.XIX, pp.39,40

[7]. Talkh¢¥ al-shif¢, vol.III, p.77

[8]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.304; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.II, p.50, vol.VI, p.43, vol.XVI, pp.212, 251; al-Bad’ wa l-tir

"After you, there appeared events that if you had been alive to see them, you would have never made so many speeches."

Fi§ima's opposition was very important to the caliph as far as his public prestige was concerned. Ab£ Bakr did his best to come to terms with her but she never accepted. This made the caliph express his deep regret in the final years of his life for invading Fi§ima's house. Many historians have quoted him as wishing he had never inspected Zahri's house.[1]

Sa'd Ibn 'Ubida was another opponent of Ab£ Bakr.[2] He did not swear allegiance with Ab£ Bakr and went to Damascus, and as has been quoted, was assassinated there in the time of the second caliph. The common news in historical documents is that genies killed him and they composed two verses on this. But, fact according to Balidhur ¢ and Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, is that a man from Damascus was sent by 'Umar to ask him to swear allegiance and when 'Ubida did not accept, he killed him.[3]

Ab£ Bakr's policy differed from that of 'Umar in that 'Umar believed in using force to get allegiance from his opponents, but Ab£ Bakr did not recommend it although he also believed in this principle. Both had dual policies but 'Umar, according to authentic documents, used force while Ab£ Bakr said in one of his sermons, "**لا بيعة لي في عنقه وهو بالخيار من أمره**"'Al¢ has no obligation or commitment to swear allegiance to me and he is free in his choice."[4]

CALIPHATE AFTER THE PROPHET (S)

¢kh, vol.V, pp.68-69, there, "Wahaynama" is replaced with "Wahanbatha"; in addition, another line is added too.

[1]. °ayit al-¥a¦aba, vol.II, p.24; Kanz al-'Ummil, vol.V, No.14113; Ibn Sallim, al-Amwil, p.194

[2]. Nihiyat al-'irab, vol.XIX, p.38; it is cited there a group of Khazradj¢s failed to pay allegiance in Saq¢fa.

[3]. al-Mi'yir wa l-Muwizana, p.232 (quoted from Balidhur¢ and Ibn 'Abdirabbih in the footnote). Interestingly, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d (XVII, 223-224) says that some knew Ab£ Bakr as his murderer but he has not found a historical report concerningly. This is while the aforesaid report is cited in two historical sources, of course about caliph II.

[4]. al-S¢rat al-¦alabiyya, vol.III, p.389 (al-Ghad¢r, vol.V, p.368)

Ab£ Bakr, son of Ab£ Qu¦ifa, was the first caliph after the Prophet's demise. There are different views on his name being 'Abd Allih or 'At¢q.[1] Apparently, they have insisted on saying that his name was 'Abd Allih but he used to be called 'At¢q. He belonged to the Ban£ Taym tribe, one of the tribes of the Quraysh. During the Dark Age, the tribe had no special standing among the other tribes. A solid evidence for this claim is Ab£ Sufyin's words when Ab£ Bakr assumed power.

He said, "How come the government has fallen to the least populated and meanest tribes of the Quraysh?"[2]

There is a story that says one day, Ab£ Bakr was speaking with Dhaghfal about his lineage and both agreed that Ban£ Taym was one of the weakest tribes of the Quraysh.[3] Another time, Ab£ Bakr asked Qays Ibn 'ª¥im why he buried his daughters alive.

He replied, "So that they do not give birth to children like you."[4]

There are different views also on his occupation in the days of ignorance. Those who intended to attribute a high position to him in the Dark Age, said he was a merchant. On the other hand, there are documents that say he had menial jobs such as milking and the like.[5] Another story says Ab£ Bakr had financial problems and was a teacher in the Dark Age and later, became a tailor after the advent of Islam.[6]

Two years younger than the Prophet of Islam, he is believed to be one of the first Muslims, although there are conflicting ideas on whether he was the first or the fifty-first Muslim as one quotation has it.[7] Such notions about him, who was the first caliph, are natural. We have not heard about any special pressures he may have faced in the years of invitation to Islam in Mecca. He did not accompany the Muhidjir£n to Abyssinia, but he found an opportunity to be

---

[1]. al-Ma'rifa wa l-tir¢kh, vol.I, p.238, Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.298

[2]. 'Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.V, p.451; Mustadrak, vol.II, p.78

[3]. Madjma' al-amthil, vol.I, p.27

[4]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.XIII, p.177

[5]. al-Fi'iq f¢ ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.IV, p.12

[6]. al-If¥i¦, p.176

[7]. al-¯a¦¢¦ Min S¢ra al-Nab¢, vol.I, pp.247,289,290; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, (vol.II, p.60), in a weakened narration by Himself, says that fifty people embraced Islam before Ab£ Bakr.

with the Prophet (s) in the night of °idjra. According to our discussions about °idjra, after the Prophet left the house, Ab£ Bakr went to see Imim 'Al¢ (a) and when found out that Prophet Mu¦ammad (s) had gone, he set off and joined him.

Ab£ Bakr's relations with the Prophet (s) grew stronger after the Prophet's marriage with 'ªyisha. 'ªyisha was a clever woman who tried to have a role in all political developments of her time. This helped strengthen Ab£ Bakr's position to some extent. We said earlier that 'Al¢ (a) believed that 'ªyisha played the key role in Ab£ Bakr's prayers.

Ab£ Bakr did not have any political or military responsibility during his ten years of stay in Medina, but he could gain power by understanding the situation of the internal wings of the Quraysh and taking advantage of the Quraysh's enmity towards Imim 'Al¢ (a) as well as the collaboration of the middle wings of the Quraysh, those who were not among the Umayyads and the Hishimites.

Ab£ Bakr grasped a serious chance. When he took over the caliphate, a wave of apostasy and opposition to Islam swept across °idjiz and Muslims who all saw the principle of Islam endangered realized that opposing Ab£ Bakr was not to their interests. It is interesting to know that immediately after Ab£ Bakr's coming to power, rifts emerged between the An¥ir and the Quraysh over a sarcastic poem composed by Ab£ Bakr about the An¥ir. Afterwards, the An¥ir kept some distance from Ab£ Bakr and 'Amr Ibn 'ª¥, instigated by the Quraysh spoke against them. On the other hand, Fa¤l Ibn 'Abbis and then, Imim 'Al¢ (a) praised the An¥ir. °assin Ibn Thibit composed poems in praise of Imim 'Al¢ (a) for his support of the An¥ir and implicitly, referred to the efforts of some men of the Quraysh who wanted to take Imim 'Al¢'s position.[1] However, when oppositions heightened, the An¥ir moved towards the claimants of prophethood and other apostates.

About Ab£ Bakr, we have to admit that he had an eloquent language and we are sure that it was his clam words at the Saq¢fa more effective than 'Umar's harsh words, though they were complementary.

---

[1]. Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.128

Later, Ab£ Bakr once pointed to his tongue and said, “This is what helped me reach this rank.”[1]

Ab£ Bakr reiterated several times that there were some people who deserved the caliphate more than him. After the people swore allegiance to him, he said in a sermon, “I took over the rule over you while I’m not any better than you. If I behave well, help me; if not, guide me. Obey me as long as I am obedient to God; otherwise, you won’t need to obey me.”[2] This shows that Ab£ Bakr believed it was not necessary for a ruler to be the best of the people.

He has been quoted as saying, “ ‘Umar is stronger than me and Silim is more pious.”[3] But his emphasis on having the rule is surprising. Ab£ Bakr introduced his government as the “Caliphate of Prophethood” to convey the religious aspect of his caliphate. He considered his rule not as a caliphate from God, but a succession to the Prophet (s) and named himself the “Caliph of the Messenger of Allih”.[4]

His first measure was dispatching Usima’s army, an army that the Prophet (s) had prepared to send to Damascus in the final days of his life. Some political opposition caused delays in the deployment of the army under the pretext of Usima’s young age. But now that the issues seemed to have been settled, the same people who were opposed, decided

---

[1]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.13

[2]. ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.XI, p.326; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p.336; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.34

[3]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.15

[4]. Ab£ya‘li, al-A¦kim al-sul§iniyya, p.17. Despite what is said, caliph I, in his first oration, said, وقد استخلف الله عليكم خليفة God hath ordained a caliph to unify thee and to strengthen thy words, Al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.34. Damascus Muslims are quoted to have called Ab£ Bakr as "God’s Caliph".

Al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.38 (Damascus people were expected to say this but nothing else). Once he was called "God’s Viceroy", but he said, “I’m not vicegerent of God, I am caliph of the Prophet (s) and I am pleased with it! (Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.VII, p.433)

‘Ad¢ Ibn °itam told Ab£ Bakr, “We obeyed God’s Messenger (s) because of his obedience and you are obeyed for you obey the Propher (s) (Kitib al-ridda, p.66). His intention lies in the same word of caliph.

to send Usima's army in spite of the critical situation on °idjiz. Responding to opposition against the army's dispatch, they said they could not ignore doing something that the Prophet had wanted. Ab£ Bakr said he would send the army even if the beasts would tear him apart in Medina.[1] Usima's army left for Damascus and returned after forty days with no serious clashes. Since the Prophet (s) had included 'Umar in Usima's army, Ab£ Bakr asked Usima to let 'Umar stay with him.

THE ISSUE OF APOSTASY

The main problem of Muslims was a move known as "Apostasy". According to historians, after the Prophet's passing, some people claimed prophethood, some became apostates and put on the royal crown while others refused to pay their tax alms.

We all know that the Bedouin Arabs converted to Islam one after another following the conquest of Mecca. It was mostly due to the ever-expanding power of Islam and they feared that Muslims would confront them any time. Therefore, they had no way but accepting the new path, even if temporarily while they did not know enough about Islam, nor could they give up their old ideas of the Dark Age.

Another serious problem for them was paying the tax alms. In fact, they considered it an act of extortion by Muslims, muslims to them were only the people of the Quraysh, Aws and Khazradj. These currents each had its own motive, but the system of caliphate viewed all of them as apostasy and confronted them from this aspect. However, apostates can be classified into several groups given what has been said so far,

The first group was those who claimed prophethood. Some others gave up Islam and returned to their previous faith during the Dark Age. The third group did not recognize the Medina government, but said they abided by Islam.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayya§, pp.100-101

These people did not believe in the Medina administration so refused to pay tax alms. Among this group, there were people who did not recognize Ab£ Bakr's rule and did not believe in the Imamate of Prophet's Household, so they did not pay tax alms. Here, we will first discuss the claimants of prophethood.

The news of apostasy has been brought up in several books. ±abar¢ has used Sayf Ibn 'Umar's book as his major source. His book was "al-Futūh al-Kab¢r wa al-Radda". Biographers have all rejected Sayf's authenticity.[1] Another independent work is the book of al-Futūh by Ibn A'tham K£f¢ that fortunately remains to date. Wiqid¢ and Madi'in¢ had both books on apostasy. More recently, Wiqid¢'s "al-Radda" was published. It has many commonalties with the al-Futūh of Ibn A'tham. There are other sparse and scattered references to apostasy in other books.

As for the claimants of prophethood, there was a main motive. Some ambitious tribes or individuals thought that they could also rule others by claiming prophethood if others had done so. This move led to the emergence of many claimants of prophethood. Aswad 'Ansi was the first of these who staged a rebellion in Yemen and wrote to the representatives of the Prophet, ""**أمسكوا علينا ما أخذنا من أرضـنا "**Return to us whatever of our lands you have captured."[2]

Hearing this, Prophet Mu¦ammad (s) ordered him to be killed in "any way possible". It took three months for Muslims to quell the Aswad mutiny and he was killed finally. It is said that the news of his death reached Medina a few days after the demise of the Prophet (s). An Iranian-born man named F ¢r£z, belonging to the Yemen¢ tribe of Abni', had killed 'Ansi.[3] There is also another reference to another Muslim named Didhwayh who seems to be an Iranian.

Musaylima Ibn °ab¢b from the Ban£ °an¢fa tribe was another claimant of prophethood. He visited the Prophet of Islam in Medina along with the influential men of his tribe and said to have converted to Islam.

---

[1]. 'Abd Allih Ibn Saba', in his book, deals with narrations of the same person by considering narrations of Sayf by 'Allima 'Askar¢.

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.II, p.229

[3]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayya§, p.117

But, upon his return, he thought about claiming prophethood and said to the people of Ban£ °an¢fa, "I what to know how come the Quraysh is more deserving than you for caliphate and Imamate? I swear by God that their population is not more than yours. They are not braver than you. You have more lands and more properties."[1]

Then, he claimed prophethood and wrote to the Prophet of Islam, "I have become your partner in prophethood. Half of the lands belong to us and the other half to the Quraysh, but the Quraysh are aggressive people." The Prophet responded to him,

إِنَّ الْأَرْضَ لِلَّهِ يُورِثُهَا مَنْ يَشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ وَالْعَاقِبَةُ لِلْمُتَّقِينَ.

"The earth belongs to Him, He gives it to whomever He wishes and the eternality is for the pious people."[2]

This correspondence took place at the end of the 10th year from °idjra. When the Messenger of Allih passed away, Musaylima found an opportunity to gather some followers around himself. He used to compose rhythmic prose to imitate the Qur'in and recited the prose for his followers.[3] Furthermore, he had told people he had exempted them from saying morning and evening prayers.[4] Also, Sadji¦, the daughter of °irith Tam¢m¢[5], claimed prophethood but after meeting Musaylima, she married him. It is said that as Sadji¦'s marriage portion, he exempted the people from saying morning and evening prayers.

In al-Fut£¦ we read that when Sadji¦ met Musaylima, she said, "I heard about your excellent traits and chose you. I have come to be your wife so that we can both be prophets, and together, make the world obey us and be our subordinate."

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.23

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.II, p.149; al-Kharidj wa ¯ana'a al-kitiba, p.282

[3]. For example, لا اقسم بهذا البلد، ولا تبرح هذا البلد، حتي تكون ذا مال وولد، ووفر وصفد وخيل وعدد، الى آخر الآبد، علي رغـم مـن حسـد Kitib al-ridda, p.111; and another example in, al-Bad' wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, pp.161-162,164. These cases are morally ill.

[4]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VI, p.326

[5]. In some sources, she is called daughter of Aws Ibn °urayz, Djamharat al-nasab, p.226

Musaylima said, “For your marriage portion, I exempted your nation from saying prayers at dawn and dusk.”[6]

When Muslims went to Yamima with an army led by Khilid Ibn Wal¢d, they came across some of Musaylima’s followers and asked them what faith they were in.

They said, “**منا نبي ومنكم نبي ”** “We have our prophet and you have your prophet.”

It was then that a war broke out between them. The Yamima battle was one of the bloodiest wars of Muslims with claimants of prophethood and apostates. In this war, the Muslim army lost a great number of its men, 58 of whom were from the Muhidjir£n and the An¥ir and 13 men out of them, had fought in the Battle of Badr.[2] Ibn A‘tham has put the number of Muslim martyrs at 1200 people, 700 of whom had memorized the Qur’in.[3] In a text attributed to Wiqid¢, we read the details about the war and the many pre-battle bragging of the Prophet’s companions, including ‘Ammir Yisir. Immediately after the battle ended, Khilid married Mudji‘a Ibn Marira’s daughter, who was one of the conspiring heads of Ban£ °an¢fa, and indulged in his own lust and pleasure. Observing this, Muslims wrote a letter to Ab£ Bakr and said,

أترضى بأنا لا تجف دماءنا وهذا عروس باليمامة خالد

“Do you please with our blood in dryness and this man keeps on living in relief in Yamima.”

The news reached Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar said, “Khilid always does something which pains our heart.” Ab£ Bakr wrote a strong-worded letter to Khilid. When Khilid read the letter, he laughed and said he was sure it was ‘Umar’s work because he knew Ab£ Bakr was satisfied with him.[4]

Another claimant of prophethood was ±ulay¦a Ibn Khuwaylad Asad¢. He also gathered men from the tribes of Gha§afin and Ban£ Fazira and tried to compose rhythmic prose to claim prophethood and stand against the Medina government.

---

[6]. al-Fut£¦ (Persian translation), p.20-21; al-Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.165

[2]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayya§, vol.I, pp.111-115

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.40

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.43-44; Kitib al-ridda, pp.144-146

In a battle between his men and the Muslim's army, 'Uyayna Ibn °i¥n and his tribesmen from Ban£ Fazārah were defeated heavily and ±ulay¦a fled to Damascus. Thus, another revolt was suppressed.[1] 'Uyayna Ibn °i¥n had repeatedly shown his enmity towards Islam during the life of the Prophet (s) but had finally embraced Islam. However, his presence in this current showed that he, like many others, had never believed in Islam truly. When he was brought as a captive to Medina, people taunted him and said, "O, enemy of God! Did you become an infidel after converting to Islam?" But he swore he had not believed in Islam even for a moment.[2] Ab£ Bakr pardoned the captives of this war. ±ulay¦a, too, came to Medina at the time of 'Umar and repented.

'Umar told him, "How do you expect to save yourself from hell when you have killed Thibit Ibn Arqam An¥ir¢ and 'Ukkisha Ibn Mi¦¥an Asad¢?"

±ulay¦a said, "God had wanted martyrdom for them and I did not kill them with my own hand, so there will be no hell for me." 'Umar liked his reasoning and pardoned him.

Apart from claimants of prophethood, some other tribes became apostates in the basics. There is no doubt that the situation was prepared for apostasy but it is not clear for sure who were the real apostates and who are those who did not accept the Medina government merely for political or religious reasons.[3] For example, one such group was Milik Ibn Nuwayra's clan who were accused and killed mercilessly undoubtedly just because of Khilid's personal issues and his mean moral motives. This is a blot of shame for Khilid and those who defended him. They considered his crime in massacring a number of Muslims and his adultery with Milik's wife after her husband's murder as a wrong interpretation of Idjtihid.[4] Hearing about this, 'Umar was seriously incited against Khilid and asked Ab£ Bakr to oust

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, pp.14-15; Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayya§, pp.102-103

[2].Al-Fut£¦,ol.I,p.17; Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, ol.II,p.129

[3].The Shi'ite Muslims disagreed on saying that all people hae been atheist rebels. Kanz al-fawi'id, vol.II, p.346

[4]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.105, Ab£ Bakr was told هل يزيد خالد على ان يكون تأول فأخطأ Does Khilid want to express and go wrong Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.II,p.278; ±abaqit al-shu'ari',p.48

him but the caliph called him the “sword of God” and refused to do so.[1]

Among the tribes considered to be apostate, there were some people who did not believe in Ab£ Bakr’s caliphate and favored the government of the Prophet’s Household. They said Ab£ Bakr had no “allegiance” to them so there was no need to obey him. They believed that the Muhidjir£n and An¥ir had prevented the Prophet’s Household from coming to power out of jealousy.[2] According to Wiqid¢ and Ibn A‘tham, a clan from Kinda in °a¤ramawt was all apostates. Ziyid Ibn Lubayd was responsible for collecting tax alms in the region. Some men of the tribe agreed with paying tax alms while others did not. Once Ziyid chose a camel belonging to Ziyid Ibn Mu‘iwiya as tax alms, he asked for help from one of the influential men of Kinda named °iritha Ibn Suriqa and asked him to return his camel and take another one. °iritha made the request from Ziyid but he did not accept. So, °iritha himself went among the camels set aside as tax alms and brought back Zayd’s camel, saying, “We obeyed the Messenger of God as long as he was alive.” “**لو قام رجل من أهل بيتـه لأطعنـاه” “**Today, we will obey anyone from his Household who comes to power.” Ab£ Bakr has no right of rule and allegiance upon us.

It is said that Ziyid Ibn Lubayd fled from the region overnight and composed poems terming the tribe as apostate.

He said, “We will fight you to make you obey Ab£ Bakr until you give up infidelity and apostasy and say you shall never return to infidelity.”

Of course, not all tribesmen thought like °iritha. What is important is that all of them refused to pay tax alms to the Medina government because they considered it humiliation for themselves. They believed in distributing tax alms among the poor in their tribe.

Some people of this tribe used to say, “We swear by God that we have come to be enslaved by the Quraysh. Once,

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢,vol.II,p.279, al-Aghin¢,vol.xv,p.302

[2]. al-Fut£¦,vol.I,pp.58,60 and 61; al-Ridda,pp.171,176 and 177 والله مأ زلتموها عن أهلها الاّ حسداً منكم لهـم By God you seized caliphate away from them just out of envy

they send Muhidjir Ibn Ab¢ Umayya or Ziyid Ibn Lubayd to collect tax alms. Then, they threaten to fight against us."[1]

Ash'ath Ibn Qays, from this tribe, said, "I don't think Arabs would accept the rule of the Ban£ Taym and leave the men of the Hishimites."

He said in his poems, "If the Quraysh are to leave the power into the hands of Ban£ Taym and distance themselves from Mu¦ammad's Household, of course, we are prior to it because we are the descendants of kings."

Elsewhere in the above narration, we read that Ziyid sent the tax alms camels to Medina along with someone and he, himself, went to a tribe of Kinda named Ban£ Zuhal.

An influential man of Kinda named °irith Ibn Mu'iwiya said, "O, Ziyid! You ask us to obey someone who has no accord with us."

Ziyid said, "You are right. He has signed no agreement with you, but we have selected him to rule."

°irith asked, "Why did you take the government away from the Prophet's Household when they deserved it, because God has said, "**وَأُوْلُوا الْأَرْحَامِ بَعْضُهُمْ أَوْلَى بِبَعْضٍ فِي كِتَابِ اللَّهِ**." "Some relatives are given more priority over others."

Ziyid answered, "The Muhidjir£n and the An¥ir know the interests of their government better than you."

°irith stated, "I swear by God, it is not so. You did it out of your jealousy. I cannot accept that the Messenger of Allih has passed away without assigning a successor for himself. Go away from here."

'Urfadja Ibn 'Abd Allih, another man of the tribe, said, "I swear by God, °irith is right. Expel this man from this place. His master is not eligible to be the caliph and the Muhidjir£n and An¥ir are not better than the Prophet (s) in knowing the expediency of the government."

Ziyid went to Medina and said, "The people of Kinda have revolted and have become apostate."[2]

Ibn A'tham's further explanations on the disputes among the people of Kinda and Ab£ Bakr reveal their problem was Ab£ Bakr's caliphate. Making his mind to fight the Kinda

---

[1]. al-Ridda,pp.169-174

[2]. al-Ridda,pp.173-179; al-Fut£¦,ol.I,pp.57-61

tribes, Ab£ Bakr summoned ‘Umar and said, “I want to send ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib to fight them because, **فانه عدل رضا عند اكثر الناس لفضله وشجاعته وقرابته وعلمه وفهمه ورفقه بما يحاول من الامـور** He is just and acceptable more to the public because of his excellence, valour, kinship and knowledge as well as his handling of affairs.

‘Umar said, “You are right. ‘Al¢ is as you say but I fear one thing. I fear he may refuse to fight them. If he does not go to war, no one else will do so unless with disgust.”[1]

This discussion and ‘Umar’s consultation with Ab£ Ayy£b show that there were some people among them who opposed fighting Muslims.

The caliph considered these things instances of apostasy, and historians have recorded these fights as the battles of Radda. These wars may be justified as necessary tactics for safeguarding the government but it is hard to prove the tribes’ apostasy. When Ab£ Bakr decided to fight these tribes, some of his men, including ‘Umar, objected to his decision. Later on, ‘Umar said he opposed Ab£ Bakr’s decision in the beginning but after some time, he learnt that caliph was right.

The question is whether these tribes were apostate or fighting them was permissible or not? Ab£ Bakr believed in their apostasy, so he even took their women and children captive and brought them to Medina.[2] It seems that ‘Umar, like many Muslims, agreed with fighting them in principle but did not believe in their apostasy. According to Shahristin¢, it was because of this belief that ‘Umar freed their captives[3] when he became the second caliph.

Another problem was that even if the tribes were apostate, many believed that it was illegitimate to take captives from apostates.[4]

There are numerous documents at hand indicating that some tribes were considered apostate because they refused to pay tax alms. For instance, a group of Yamima people

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦,vol.I,p.71-72

[2]. al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq,vol.x, p.176; Ab£ Bakr once ordered his men to set atheists on fire and fall them down the mountain.

Al-Dja¥¥i¥, A¦kim al-qur’in, vol.III, pp.67 and 81

[3]. al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.I, p.31; Djimi‘ al-bayin al-‘ilm, vol. II, p.129

[4]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.III, p.151

believed in the principle of paying tax alms but refused to pay tax alms to Ab£ Bakr.

They used to say, "We collect tax alms from the rich in our tribes and distribute it among the poor and needy among ourselves, but we will pay nothing to whom the Book and traditions have not recommended him."[1] Ya'q£b¢, too, writes, "Some people only refused to pay tax alms to Ab£ Bakr."[2]

As mentioned earlier, 'Umar opposed the idea of apostasy of these tribes. According to Ibn A'tham, when Ab£ Bakr wanted to kill the captives of the battles of Radda,[3] 'Umar said, "These people believe in Islam and they swear about it. Imprison them for the time being to see what happens next."

Ab£ Bakr jailed them in the house of Ramla, daughter of °irith. After Ab£ Bakr's death, 'Umar told them, "You know what my opinion was about you. Now, you are all free without any ransom. Go wherever you want."[4]

Qays on behalf of 'ª¥im Minqar¢ was commissioned by the Prophet (s) to collect tax alms from his tribe. After the Prophet's demise, he collected the tax alms but instead of giving it to Ab£ Bakr, he distributed them among the poor in his tribe. This was considered as a criminal act. Even a proverb was made in this regard which said "More criminal than Qays be 'ª¥im."[5]

Ibn Kath¢r, too, has reiterated that many Muslims refused to pay their tax alms to Ab£ Bakr.[6] Mawbakht¢ writes a group said they would not pay tax alms until it was known who was holding the government; therefore, they distributed the tax alms among the poor.[7]

---

[1]. al-If¥i¦, p.121

[2]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.128

[3]. Maqdis¢ says, "Ab£ Bakr sent Khilid to sword-kill people of Ridda, set fire to them, hold their children and women captive and share their properties.

Al-Bad' wa l-tir¢kh, vol.v, p.157

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.75; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VII, PP.101-102

[5]. al-durra al-fikhira, p.324; Madjma' al-amthil, vol.II, p.65

[6]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VI, p.311

[7]. Firaq al-sh¢'a, p.4

Maqdis¢, too, says, “A group of them refused to pay tax alms while others opposed rejected the principle of tax alms.”[1]

Besides not recognizing Ab£ Bakr’s rule, another problem of the tribes was that after hearing the news of the Prophet’s passing, they severed their relations with Medina. They only believed in having a religious connection with Medina, and when the Prophet of Islam passed away, they felt no need for accepting the rule of someone else. Therefore, as they refused to pay tax alms to Medina, they were labeled apostate.[2] These tribes believed there was no need to assign a single ruler for all Muslims and that if they obeyed Mu¦ammad, it was because he was a prophet. But, after his demise, there would be no need to obey others. They said,

أطعنـا رسول الله ما كان بيننا فيـــا لعباد الله ما لأبي بكر

إذا مات بكر قام بكر مكانـه وتلكم لعمر الله قاصمة الظهر[3]

We obeyed the Messenger when he was alive but why shall we obey Ab£ Bakr?

When Ab£ Bakr died, a man like him came to power, that is – by God – backbreaking.

---

[1]. al-Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.151

[2]. Tir¢kh al-‘arab wa l-islim, p.71

°asan Ibrih¢m °asan says, “The atheists were those who refused to pay Zakit, tax alms, thinking that the Messenger(s) blackmails them. It is to be noted that they never challenged and loathed Islam.....they agreed on monotheism, foundation of Islam but they thought they had to pay tax alms only to the Prophet(s)”.

Tir¢kh Siyis¢ Islim, vol.I, p.216

‘Aqqid also says, “A group of others believed in mere tax alms but they never took faith in those who had to pay tax alms.”

‘Abqariyya al-¥idd¢q, pp.124-125

[3].Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.II, p.246; Masi’il al-imima, p.14; Kitib al-ridda, pp.171-172; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.III, p.409; al-Aghin¢, vol.II, p.157; al-Djamal, p.181; al-Shi‘r wa l-shu‘ari’, p.65; al-Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.156; Ta§awwur al-fikr al-siyis¢ ‘Ind ahl al-Sunna, p.38, footnoteII,; Muqaddama f¢ tir¢kh ¥adr al-islim, p.51

Thus, they did not deem it necessary to obey the rule of Medina and the rulers of Medina counted them among apostates.[4]

Mu¦ammad Ibn Idr¢s Shifi'¢ writes, "This was because Arabs living in the outskirts of Mecca knew no rule and resented being ruled by others. The reason they accepted to obey the Messenger of God, was because they did not consider anyone else deserving obedience."[2]

This reasoning has been brought in the poetry of Milik Ibn Nuwayra. Addressing his tribe, he said,

وقلت خذوا أموالكم غير خائف ولا ناظـر فيما يجئ من الغد

فـإن قام بالأمر المخوّف قائم منعنا وقلنا: الدين دين محمد[3]

"I told you to take your money (tax alms) with no fear and no worries of what happens tomorrow, If someone assumes power, we will tell him, the only religion is the religion of Mu¦ammad."

Ab£ Bakr's insistence on collecting tax alms from all tribes was to strengthen his government in Medina.

He said, "If they do not pay me the tax alms they used to pay to the Prophet (s) every year, I will fight them."[4]

There is no doubt that the majority of the Prophet's companions did not like Ab£ Bakr's idea of war[5] but they obeyed him because he was the ruler.

---

[4]. Tir¢kh al-'arab wa l-islim, p.71; Ta§awwur al-fikr al-siyis¢ 'Ind ahl al-Sunna, p.38

Nishi' Akbar says, "Some believed they were not atheist but they refused to pay poll tax, saying that the poor are superior to that, They would pay that to the agents of the Prophet(s) just for the sake of the Prophet and now that he has passed away, people would give it to any poor one they wished.

Masi'il al-imima, p.14

[2]. al-Risila, p.80

[3]. ±abaqat fu¦£l al-shu'ari', vol.I,p.206; ±abaqat fu¦£l al-shu'ari', 1400 H; word of religion in the subject poem means government as footnoted by the proofreader.

[4]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.35

[5]. Djimi' al-bayin al-'ilm, vol.II, pp.104 and 125

Maqdis¢ said the first dispute among Muslims was leadership while the second was fighting those who refused to pay tax alms. Muslims opposed Ab£ Bakr's view of tax alms collection but after a while, the majority of them accepted his rule. The opposition remained and some Muslims believed fighting them was a mistake.[1]

We quoted 'Umar as saying that 'Al¢ (a) might avoid fighting the Kinda people. Elsewhere, we said Ab£ Bakr was ready to fight them himself, but Imim 'Al¢ (a) asked him to stay in Medina[2] and send another one to fight them. Obviously, a group of those the caliph fought against were real apostates.

Another quotation from Madi'in¢ says after Imim 'Al¢ (a) opposed Ab£ Bakr, 'Uthmin told Imim, "Nobody will join the Muslim army to fight the apostates if you do not swear allegiance to Ab£ Bakr." 'Uthmin's insistence made Imim 'Al ¢ swear allegiance to Ab£ Bakr.[3] On the other hand, there were some people in Medina who wished for the success of apostates to once again maintain their infidel beliefs of the Dark Age. One day, a man of the Umayya and another man from the An¥ir were boasting for each other.

The former said, "When the Prophet of Islam passed away, the majority of his companions were from the the Umayya."

The An¥ir¢ man replied, "Yes." **و لكنهم حالفوا أهل الردة على هدم الاسلام**[4] **"**They allied with the atheists to destroy Islim."

'ªyisha, too, has said about wide-scale discord in Medina in the first days of his father's caliphate.[5] Also, Mecca was about to return to absolute apostasy after the Prophet's demise, but Suhayl Ibn 'Amr's remarks stabilized Mecca's situation.

---

[1]. al-Bad' wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.123

[2]. al-Mi'yir wa l-muwizana, p.94

[3]. Talkh¢¥ al-shif¢, vol.III,p.77

[4]. Rab¢' al-abrir, vol.I, pp.708-709

They allied with the atheists to destroy Islam.

[5]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.102; al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, vol.VII, p.434

Ibn Ath¢r writes, "After the Prophet's passing, Mecca was on the verge of apostasy and 'Attib Ibn As¢d sought a hiding."

Suhayl Ibn 'Amr stood up and addressed the people of Mecca, **لاتكونوا آخر من اسلم وأول من ارتد**[1] **"**Do not be the last one to embrace Islam and the first one to become an apostate."

At any rate, we must not ignore the fact that Medina's resistance against apostasy helped the administration in the city to be stronger and bring other lands under its control after passing through this tortuous period. Khil¢fa Ibn Khayyi§ has listed the apostates as follows,

±ulay¦a Ibn Khuwaylad, Ban£ Silim, Ban£ Tam¢m, Ban£ Yamima, Ban£ Ba¦rayn, Ban£ Ummin, Ban£ Nadj¢r, °a¤ramawt and Ban£ Yemen, Ban£ Radda.[2]

AB¬ BAKR'S AGENTS

It is known to all that 'Umar was Ab£ Bakr's closest companion and old friend. The Prophet of Islam had spelled their brotherhood union along with the Muhidjir£n.[3] Although Ab£ Bakr was a major architect of the issue of caliphate and showed he was better than 'Umar in his battles against apostates, accepted 'Umar's views in many cases due to 'Umar's seriousness and toughness. These two were complementary to each other. We wrote that during the Saq ¢fa developments, too, they were always together. It was due to this insistence that during the Saq¢fa issue, Imim 'Al¢ (a) accused 'Umar of trying to secure his own future.[4]

Ab£ Bakr said about 'Umar, "He is the dearest of people to me."[5]

---

[1]. Usd al-ghiba, vol.II, pp.371-372

[2]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, pp.102-117

[3]. Sahm¢, Tir¢kh Djurdjin, p.96

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.567; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.VI, p.11; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.11; Anas Ibn Milik says, "On Saq¢fa, I saw 'Umar forcing Ab£ Bakr to go on pulpit. al-Mu¥annaf, 'Abd al-Razziq, vol.V, p.438

[5]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.17; Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.III, p.222; al-adab al-mufrad, p.29

Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d says, “Ab£ Bakr could not gain caliphate if ‘Umar had not helped him.”[1]

It is said that Ab£ Bakr appointed ‘Umar as a judge.[2] Also, he used to lead congregational prayers when Ab£ Bakr was absent.[3] It was in the 11th °idjra year that Ab£ Bakr appointed him “emir of the pilgrims to Mecca”.[4] Khil¢fa Ibn Khayyi§, listing Ab£ Bakr’s emirs, writes, **وعلى أمره كله والقضاء عمر بن الخطاب**[5] **“**Every affair including judiciary one of ‘Umar Ibn Kha§§ib.”

‘Umar’s influence on Ab£ Bakr was so immense that he dissuaded the caliph from appointing Khilid Ibn Sa‘¢d as the commander of the Muslim army dispatched to Damascus and instead, sent Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin. After returning to Medina and seeing Ab£ Bakr’s choice, Khilid Ibn Sa‘¢d refused to swear allegiance to the caliph for some time.[6] ‘Umar, himself, was aware of his power so he made use of his rank and divided the properties of Mu‘idh Ibn Djabal into two halves and took one half for Bayt al-Mil, the Treasury of Muslims.[7] He did the same thing later to the governors of cities when he assumed caliphate. Ab£ Bakr could not do anything in the absence of ‘Umar, so when he wanted to send Usima’s army to Damascus, he asked Usima, the commander of the army, to let ‘Umar stay with the caliph and help him in the administration of affairs.[8] Also, once when Khilid had made a mistake and Ab£ Bakr would not agree to write a letter of protest to him, ‘Umar wrote a letter himself, but Khilid paid to attention to it and said he knew ‘Umar had done it.[9]

At any rate, ‘Umar’s influence and the strong link between the two, made Ab£ Bakr appoint him as his

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.174

[2]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.665; Ibn Dj£z¢, Maniqib ‘Umar, p.48; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, ol.II, p.420; al-Tanb¢h wa l-ishrif, p.249

[3]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.186; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.II, p.425

[4]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.187

[5]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.123

[6]. al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.V, p.454; °ayit al-¥a¦iba, ol.II, p.20

[7]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, pp.585-588

[8]. Ibid. vol.I, pp.29-30; °ayat al-¦ayawin, vol.I, p.48

[9]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.44; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, ol.I, p.179

successor. In other words, basically, people did not consider their caliphate two separate things and from the very beginning, they saw one of them as successor to the other one.[1] For the same reason, when Ab£ Bakr was in coma and wanted to write an agreement about his successor, his scribe, 'Uthmin, wrote 'Umar's name in the agreement because he knew whom the caliph was thinking of.

Khilid Ibn Wal¢d was another functionary of Ab£ Bakr. He belonged to the tribe of Ban£ Makhz£m, a family of the Quraysh, who converted to Islam on ¯afar 1st, 8th AH.[2] He was physically a powerful man but void of ethical values. He committed various faults when the Prophet (s) was alive. Some documents have said it was the Prophet (s) who named him "God's sword" but Ibn Durayd and others say Ab£ Bakr gave him the title.[3] He got the title when he killed Milik Ibn Nuwayra unfairly and when people like 'Umar asked Ab£ Bakr to punish him. But the caliph said he was a sword hoisted by God and he would never bring it down.[4] According to Ibn A'tham, Khilid named himself "Sayf Allih or God's sword" and Ab£ Bakr approved it.[5]

It is said that Khilid was a supporter of Ab£ Bakr and an opponent of Imim 'Al¢ (a).[6] He also accompanied the group who invaded Imim 'Al¢'s house to force him into swearing allegiance with Ab£ Bakr.[7] He is also believed to be a person who prepared the ground for Ab£ Bakr's caliphate.[8]

The story of Milik Ibn Nuwayra's murder, and the subsequent rape of his wife which Ibn A'tham said he did upon the consensus of people of knowledge, shows the weak moral character of Khilid. However, Ab£ Bakr insisted on

---

1. Maqdis¢ says, "People raised no doubt that 'Umar would become Ab£ Bakr's caliph

al-Bad' wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.167

2. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VII, p.394

3. al-Ishtiqiq, p.149; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XVI, pp.158-159

4. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.23; al-Mu¥annaf, 'Abd al-Razziq, vol.V, p.212; al-«¤i¦, pp.72-73; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.179

5. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.149

6. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.III, p.22

7. Ibid. vol.VI, p.48-49

8. Ibid. vol.XVIII, p.306-307

keeping him the commander of his army and sending him to crack down on apostates and false prophets. Ab£ Bakr defended Khilid with the justification that Khilid had acted on Idjtihid so he did not deserve punishment. One day Khilid burnt some of the captives of apostates with fire. When ‘Umar objected, Ab£ Bakr said he was God’s sword.[1] ‘Umar’s objection was why he had appointed a commander who killed people and tortured them with fire.[2] Apparently, despite all his attention to ‘Umar, the caliph was unwilling to stop backing Khilid, and still, it is interesting to know that when ‘Umar, himself, took power as the second caliph, unlike his earlier emphasis on stoning Khilid for raping Milik Ibn Nuwayra’s wife, he sufficed to sacking him.[3] Khilid was sure his acts would meet no objection on the part of Ab£ Bakr and if he received a letter of punishment from the caliph, it was from ‘Umar; otherwise, Ab£ Bakr trusted him.[4] Sometimes, he committed self-authorized acts because he was sure of Ab£ Bakr’s support.[5]

Ab£ Bakr once said, “No mother can give birth to someone like Khilid.”[6] Once when he killed two people who had letters of clemency from Ab£ Bakr, some people complained about it, but Ab£ Bakr defended Khilid as usual.[7] When ‘Umar sat on the throne as the second caliphate, he immediately fired Khilid from the command of Damascus’s army and replaced him with Ab£ ‘Ubayda Djarri¦.

He said, “I sacked Khilid to show that God helps His religion.”[8]

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VII, P.369

[2]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.107

[3]. According to Tadhkirat al-khawi¥(p.160), ‘Umar separated Milik from his wife after her pregnancy with Khilid and her delivery.

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, P.44

[5]. Ibn °adjar quotes Zubayr Ibn Bakkir saying when Khilid took one fifth of booties, he never submitted any account to Ab£ Bakr. He always did things, including attempted murder of Milik without informing Ab£ Bakr.

Al-I¥iba, vol.I, p.414-415

[6]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.II, p.389

[7]. Ibid. vol.II, p.398

[8]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.122

When Khilid was busy fighting in Iraq and received his letter of abdication to Damascus, he said, "'Umar's jealousy did not allow me to achieve the conquest of Iraq."[1]

According to Anas Ibn Milik, 'Umar used to tell Ab£ Bakr, "Write to Khilid to ask for your permission before doing anything."

Ab£ Bakr wrote but Khilid responded, "You must leave me free in whatever I do; otherwise, I will resign."

'Umar said, "Dismiss him", but the caliph did not accept.[2] Khilid died in Medina or Damascus[3] in the 21st AH and accidentally, he appointed 'Umar as guardian of his will.

Ibn Sa'd quoted 'Umar as saying, "We had ill thoughts about Khilid, but we were wrong."[4]

'Umar opposed crying over the dead and said he had heard from the Prophet (s) that, **إن الميت ليعذب ببكاء اهله** **"**The dead person suffers when his family cries for him."

However, he allowed the women of Ban£ Makhz£m to cry for Khilid.[5] More surprising, 'Umar said at the time of his death, "If Khilid Ibn Wal¢d were alive, I would appoint him as my successor."[6]

Ab£ 'Ubayda Djarri¦ was another pillar of power for Ab£ Bakr's caliphate. He, along with 'Umar and Ab£ Bakr, were the only men of the Quraysh who were present in Saq¢fa Ban£ Si'ida. He had an oath of brotherhood with Silim Mawli °udhayfa[7] who was also influential in the issue of caliphate.

'Umar said about him, "If Silim were alive, I would make him my successor."[8]

---

1. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.II, p.397
2. al-I¥iba, vol.I, p.415
3. Ibid. Ibn °adjar says they believe he has died in Damascus(°im¥)
4. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VII, p.397-398; al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VII, p.115
5. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VII, p.116
6. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.887; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.42
7. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.410
8. Ibid. ol.III, p.343; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.86

It should be noted that ‘Umar said the same thing about Ab£ ‘Ubayda at the time of his death.[1] Ab£ ‘Ubayda was first appointed in charge of the Treasury of Muslims but later, became the commander of the Damascus army[2] and served until his death in 18th °idjra year when he died in Amawas plague.

The commanders and functionaries of Ab£ Bakr were Yaz ¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin, ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, Shura¦b¢l Ibn °asana(18 H)[3] and ‘Akrama Ibn Ab¢ Djahl. Among his appointees, there were some people serving since the Prophet's time. Mu‘adh Ibn Djabal in Yemen, ‘Attib Ibn As¢d in Mecca and ‘Ali’ Ibn °a¤ram¢ in Ba¦rayn were some of these people. According to some documents, Ab£ Bakr appointed Anas as the ruler of Ba¦rayn. Perhaps, it was another part of Ba¦rayn. Muhidjir Ibn Ab¢ Umayya ruled in ¯an‘i, Ziyid Ibn Lubayd in the coastal regions of Yemen, Ya‘li Ibn Umayya in Khawlin, ‘Uthmin Ibn Abi l-‘ª¥ in ±i’if, and Sulay§ Ibn Qays ruled in Yamima. Also, it is said that ‘Uthmin was Ab£ Bakr’s scribe.[4]

It is evident that the list does not include important figures of the Prophet’s companions, especially from the An¥ir. Apparently, this can be suitable evidence on the caliphate’s neglect of the An¥ir.

CONQUEST OF DAMASCUS

The greater Syria was a land bounded by the Mediterranean Sea, the Western banks of the Euphrates, the northern border of °idjiz, the southern border of the ancient Eastern Rome and modern-day Turkey. Presently, this land includes the countries of Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Palestine. The new border demarcation was made during the developments after World War I. The name of Syria has always existed since ancient times and Herodot(425 AD) has called this land Syria. Probably, the name Syria has been

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.16; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.42; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.412 and 343; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.227

[2]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.123

[3]. al-Mu¥annaf, vol.V, p.454; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.II, p.394

[4]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.123

taken from the word "'Ash£r¢yya" attributed to Assyrians, although some have rejected this idea.[1]

Before falling to Muslims, the region of greater Syria was a colony of the Eastern Roman Empire. Centuries before the advent of Islam, big tribes of Arabs migrated from °idjiz - mostly from south- to this land. The most important tribes recorded in the early advent of Islam, were, Qu¤i'a, ¯ili¦, Ghasisina, Djudhim, Lakhm, Kalb, Tanūkh, and Bahri'. These tribes were sparse and scattered in the developed land of ancient Syria and each settled in a city or village.

These tribes forgot their Arab rites and rituals due to the many years of life with the Romans and the majority of them converted to Christianity.

However, they had kept parts of their Arab nature. The first sign of their conversion to Christianity was mixing their Arab language with Syriac, and basically, Syriac had become their scientific language. Therefore, it was recommended later that Arabic should not be learnt from Qa¤i'a and Ghassin because they read books in Syriac and naturally, their language had become mixed.[2] Shaykh£ insists in showing that all Arabs living in the greater Syria had converted to Christianity before the advent of Islam. We believe he is overstating this fact. Earlier, we negated his views on the Christianity of the tribes of Aws and Khazradj. At any rate – true of false – he has provided a list of Arab tribes who converted to Christianity.[3]

Years before the advent of Islam, the Arabs of this land were allies of Romans in their battle against Iranians and fought the Iranian army and its allied Arabs from Iraq. In those years, the Roman army consisted of Arabs and Romans.

Damascus Arabs held different views with Arabs living on °idjiz and they had different social behavior as well. The Arabs of Damascus had left their Bedouin life because they lived in a developed area and had become city dwellers in Damascus, °alab (Aleppo), °im¥, etc. Their commonalities with the Romans made some of them migrate to Rome after

---

[1]. Tir¢kh S£riya and Lubnin and Filis§¢n, pp.62-63

[2]. Suy£§¢, al-Muzhir, quoted from, al-Na¥riniyya wa ªdibuhi, p.31

[3]. al-Na¥riniyya wa ªdibuhi, pp.124-141

the advent of Islam.[1] Of course, Romans always feared that racial commonality would urge the Arab tribes of Damascus to accept Islam. A more serious problem was difference in religion between the Christians of Damascus and the church of Constantinople in a way that they were greatly persecuted by the Eastern Church.

The Christians of Damascus believed in the Ya'q£b¢ sect[2] and it was a heretical practice in view of the Eastern Church. They believed that Damascus Christianity was excellent in innovation![3] The religious difference of Damascus's Arab Christians with the Eastern Roman Church, to many, was one of the reasons for the consecutive Islamic conquests in the greater Syria.[4]

In addition to the Arab residents of the greater Syria, numerous Nib§iyin, too, who were descendants of the earlier tribes and rulers in the region, lived in that land. Also, many Jews who are said to be between 100 to 200 thousands lived in that land.[5]

We mentioned earlier that at the time of the advent of Islam, the greater Syria was under the domination of the Eastern Roman empire. However, since centuries ago, local rulers had the power in that land. The Nib§iyin government ruled first, followed by the Tadmur government and finally, the government of Ghassinid who were from the tribe of Ghasisina. These came from Yemen apparently after the

---

[1]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, pp.128 and 137

[2]. Ya'q£b¢'s creed is ascribed to Ya'q£b Bardi'¢(b.578AD). his followers are called monophysicist. The said creed is about the Christ believing in one divine nature rather than two divine human natures. Ya'q£b¢ expanded the sect throughout Syria, so named after the sect. It spread through Syria in the north to Armenia and to Egypt in the south and that is why the Armenians and Egyptians still keep this belief. Parallel to this, in Mesopotamia, there emerged Nestorian sect adopting two natures in Messiah though finding them not unified. The founder is Nestorius and it emerged several decades before Ya'q£b¢'s creed.

Tir¢kh S£riya and Lubnin and Filis§¢n, pp.412-413; Will Durant's Tir ¢kh Tamaddun, vol.IV(Age of Faith, part I)pp.63-64

[3]. al-Na¥riniyya wa ªdibuhi, p.38

[4]. concerning different views in this respect, al-Shim f¢ ¥adr al-islim, pp.63-64; Tir¢kh Tamaddun, vol.IV, P.64

[5]. al-Shim f¢ ¥adr al-islim, p.62

destruction of the Ma'rab Dam. This tribe converted to Christianity in the 4th century AD. Djafna Ibn 'Amr, from the elders of the tribe, was the founder of the Ghassin¢ dynasty and there are ambiguous quotations that between 11 to 32 rulers of this dynasty ruled in Damascus. There is little we know about a limited number of these more recent rulers. °irith Ibn Djabala was one of their renowned personalities who ruled between the years 529-569. He fought the Lakhmids –the Arab rivals of the Ghasisina who ruled Iraq – and helped his tribe rise to fame. He won the title of "Philark" meaning chieftain and also Bi§r¢q (Patrick) from the Roman emperor for his services. The Ya'q£biyya sect spread in Damascus in his time. After °irith, his son, Mundhir, replaced him and ruled until 581, when crisis engulfed Damascus.[1] Between the years 611 and 614, Iranians fiercely invaded these regions and captured Jerusalem. Later, (Hiraql) Heraclitus could regain Jerusalem from Iranians. The names of Ghassin¢ princes ruling some cities and their command of the battle between the Roman-Arab army and the army of Islam indicates that the Ghasasinah still had great influence in Damascus and Constantinople. Djabala Ibn 'Ayham Ghassin¢, a commander of the Roman army at Yarm£k, was one of these influential princes who converted to Islam but became an apostate and went to the Roman emperor for certain reasons mentioned elsewhere.

Heraclitus was the son of Herakleios, whose father ruled in Christian Africa on behalf of the Roman Empire. The Eastern Empire Roman Empire experienced serious crises in the closing years of the sixth century AD and the early years of the 7th century.

The attacks of ªwirs and Isliws from the West caused problems for this vast land, but most pressing were the civil wars. A sergeant named F£kis united people and revolted against the government of the aristocrats and killed Emperor Mavrikius and all his children. This civil unrest prompted Khusraw Parv¢z to invade the greater Syria and capture Jerusalem in 614. He continued his assaults on Asia Minor. The aristocrats of Constantinople sought help from Heraclitos, the ruler of Africa. He sent his son, who was also named Heraclitos, to Rome. The son who was a brave man,

[1]. Tir¢kh S£riya and Lubnin and Filis§¢n, pp.447-450

succeeded in defeating F£kis and put on the crown of emperor. The capture of Jerusalem was a good pretext for inciting Christians to fight Iranians. After restoring calm, Heraclitos set off to fight Iranians in the year 622 and after six years of sustaining consecutive defeats, he finally managed to pursue Iranians as far as the gate of Ctesiphon and made them accept peace.[1] These incidents took place in the 7th and 8th years of °idjra.

When Heraclitos was busy reorganizing his affairs, Muslims made their first attacks on Damascus and captured the city after a while. The last days of the empire coincided with the conquest of Egypt in 640 AD.[2]

The greater Syria was the first priority for Muslims because they had managed to make the Quraysh sign the °udaybiyya peace accord after years and get ready for spreading Islam outside °idjiz.

The Prophet of Islam sent a few messengers to these regions. °irith Ibn 'Umayr was one of these messengers who took a letter to the ruler of Ba¥ra. He was killed by Shura¦b¢l Ibn 'Amr of the Ghassini dynasty. Then, the Prophet of Islam sent his 3,000-strong army under the command of Dja'far Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib, Zayd Ibn °iritha and 'Abd Allih Ibn-Rawi¦a to Muta in southern Damascus. The army prepared to fight Muslims in Damascus- according to Ibn Is¦iq - was a combination of the Roman army and the Arab tribes of Lakhm, Djudhim, Balqi, Buhra´, and Bali.[3] Muslims were unsuccessful and after the martyrdom of their commanders and a number of others, they could only return to Medina. The Tab£k operations were the Prophet's next measure. This operation, likewise, entailed nothing for Muslims except several accords with some Arab tribes. The Prophet mobilized another army in the final days of his life under Usima Ibn Zayd but it was sent to Damascus after his death and returned home empty-handed. All these army deployments show the importance of Damascus in view of the Prophet. Damascus was close to Medina and Muslims

---

[1]. The beginning Verses of R£m S£ra referring to defeat of Romans and promising their imminent victory are concerned with the same events.

[2]. About life of Heraclitos and the events in his time, Tir¢kh Tamaddun, vol.IV(Age of Faith, part I)pp.543-545

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.I, p.37

were quite familiar with its importance. It came out in the following years that Damascus was more important than Iraq to the succeeding caliphs.

With the end of the Radda operations, Ab£ Bakr wrote letters to the people of Mecca, ±i'if, Yemen and all Arabs in °idjiz and Nadjd and summoned them for Djihid or holy war.

In his letters, he promised the booties in Rome. Numerous people rushed to Medina from tribes across °idjiz.[1] A strong army of Muslims left for Damascus in the 12th AH (633 AD). Ab£ Bakr divided the army of Islam into three armies with three commanders. The first army commanded by 'Amr Ibn 'ª¥, was to leave for 'Ayla in the Gulf of 'Uqba. The second army's commander was Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin and the third commander was Shura¦b¢l Ibn °asana. These two commanders were sent to a region between Tab£k and Mu'in. Khilid Ibn Sa'¢d was supposed to command one of these armies, but due to his objection to Ab£ Bakr's caliphate, upon 'Umar's emphasis, they replaced him with Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin.[2] A short while later, Ab£ 'Ubayda Djarri¦ joined them with his auxiliary men and he commanded all forces when they all operated in the same region. Some people believe he commanded an army from the beginning.

The first clashes of Muslims with Romans occurred in a region called "Wid¢ al-'Araba", south of the Dead Sea. Palestinian governor, Sergius, was the commander of the Roman army. He was killed in this war and his army was defeated. The Muslims advanced along the Mediterranean coasts[3] and each of the armies fought in a region and joined others wherever necessary.[4] In the beginning, the Muslim armies had 3000 men each, but Ab£ Bakr sent fresh forces and the number of Muslim fighters in each army rose to 7500.

Shortly after, the total number of the army of Islam increased to 24000 men.[5]

---

[1]. Fut£¦ al-buldin,p.115

[2]. Ibid.p.116

[3]. Tir¢kh S£riya and Lubnin and Filis§¢n, vol.II, p.6

[4]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.123

[5]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.116

After the ‘Araba battle, the second encounter was made in a village of district of Ghazza called Dithin. This battle which took place in the month of Mu¦arram of the 13th year of °idjra,[1] ended in Muslims’ victory.

Balidhur¢ has written about the war of Dithin first and then, about the ‘Araba battle, but he has mentioned a narration saying the battle of Dithin happened in the beginning. According to historians, the Muslim army did not face any obstacles which required them to use their weapons on their way from °idjiz to Wid¢ ‘Araba. These sweeping victories frightened Heraclitos and made him recruit forces. The news of the Roman army’s recruitment reached Medina and the caliph ordered stopping the operations temporarily on the Iraqi border. He sent Khilid Ibn Wal¢d and his army to Damascus. The Muslims captured Ba¥ra and Ma’ib after Dithin in Rabi‘ al-Awwal of the 13th °idjra year. Then, they moved towards Damascus. Hearing the news of the enemy’s concentration in Udjnidayn, Muslims moved towards that place first. This bloody battle ended in the victory of Muslims in the Djamid¢ al-Awwal or Djamid¢ al-Thin¢ of the 13th °idjra year although many Muslims, too, were martyred.[2] It was after this defeat of the Romans that Heraclitos who was in °im¥, left for Antioch. While Muslims were on their way to Damascus, the enemy regrouped and encountered the army of Islam in Mardj al-¯afar. This war took place in the month of Mu¦arram of the 14th °idjra year and once again, Muslims defeated the enemy. After that, Damascus was totally besieged by the army of Islam.

It is said that while Ab£ ‘Ubayda had managed to open his way into the city, the archbishop of the city signed a peace accord with Khilid Ibn Wal¢d on the other hand and Ab£ ‘Ubayda, too, had to accept it despite Muslims’ objection. The conquest of Damascus forced many residents of the city who were mostly Roman or Arabs affiliated to them, into leaving for Antioch and joining Heraclitos. After their departure, Muslims settled in their unsettled houses.[3] Damascus fell to Muslims in Radjab of 14th °idjra year, but Ab£ Bakr had died in Djamid¢ al-Thin¢ of the 13th °idjra

---

[1]. A§las tir¢kh Islim, p.126

[2]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.121

[3]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, pp.128-129

year after two years and three months and a few days of caliphate.

CONQUEST OF IRAQ

Iraq is an ancient land with an ancient civilization, known to the world as the Mesopotamian civilization. It is located in the north of °idjiz, East of the greater Syria and West of Iran (behind the Djibil region). Centuries before the advent of Islam, Arab tribes residing on °idjiz immigrated northwards to Syria and Iraq to escape the ever-increasing population.[1]

Their massive immigration and their many young forces gave them dominance over the native people of the regions and gradually, created an Arab environment. The Nib§iyin of Iraq and Syria were the descendants of the ancient settlers of this land.[2] Iraq is known as "Sawid" for its fertile lands. Sawid means abundant farming.[3] During the advent of Islam, the Arab settlers of Damascus were said to be from the tribes of Tan£kh, 'Ibidiyy¢n and A¦lif (different allied tribes). The Euphrates river was the border between Arabs of Damascus and Iraq. The Iraqi Arabs were called "Firs Arab" and Arabs of Damascus were called "Roman Arab".[4]

The immigrant Bedouin Arabs began to dwell in cities due to the vastness of fertile lands in Iraq and many of them converted to Christianity under the pressure imposed from the West. The 'Ibidiyy¢n, the majority of whom lived in °¢ra, were Christians at large.[5] They believed in Nestorian Christianity and they were, indeed, a cultural tribe taught reading and writing to Arabs of °idjiz during the Dark Age.[6]

°¢ra was the chief city of Iraq that time. It is said that the word "°¢ra" had been taken from °arti, °¢rti and °¢rt£ in Syriac, meaning military camp. According to Arab literature in the Dark Age, this city was highly important in Iraq and was the seat of Lakhmids kings. After the advent of Islam

---

[1]. There is a disagreement on departure time of these tribes. al-Mufa¥¥al f¢ tir¢kh al-'arab qabl al-islim, vol.III, p.162

[2]. al-Mufa¥¥al, vol.III, pp.172-173

[3]. al-±ar¢q 'Ili al-Madi'in, p.132

[4]. al-Mufa¥¥al, vol.III, p.165

[5]. Ibid.vol.III, pp.169-171

[6]. Tir¢kh Irin, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, p.712

and the establishment of the city of K£fa in the vicinity of ° ¢ra, the city turned to ruin and its building materials were used for constructing K£fa.[1] °¢ra was one league (six kms) away from K£fa and before Islam it was a center for interaction of various cultures such as the Persian Sassanids culture, the culture of Byzantium, Nestorian Christianity and local idolatry.[2] Remnants of this city still remain today.[3]

The pre-Islamic history of Iraq is part of the history of Iran from the political aspect. That is why two historians, i.e. ±abar¢ and D¢nwar¢, have mixed the history of this period of Iraq with the story of developments in Iran. The reason for this is the meaning of 'Arab Firs or Persian Arab, similar to the situation of Damascus whose history was mixed with the history of the Roman Empire. The ªl Lakhm dynasty, known also as ªl Na¥r, ªl Nu'min[4] and Dawlat al- Manidhara, had a situation like that of the Ghassin¢ds or ªl Djafna. Accidentally, both had similar fates, i.e. losing power in the early years of Islam. Iran and Rome jointly imposed pressure on them. Information existing about the ªl Lakhm dynasty is ambiguous in history books and Djawid 'Al¢ has tried to organize these pieces of information.[5] The first Lakhm¢ ruler was Djudhayma al-Abrash also known as Shih Tan£kh in some inscriptions.

Other famous kings of this dynasty were Imra' al-Qays (d. 328 AD) overstated as the "king of all Arab world".[6] Lakhm¢ kings were mostly idolaters but due to being influenced by the Zoroastrian culture from the East and the Christian culture from the West, every now and then, they tended towards either direction. What is certain is that Nu'min III of this dynasty who reigned until 602, was a Christian. We wrote that Nestorian Christianity was predominant in Iraq and Western Iran. The Sassanids kings supported this sect

---

[1]. al-Mufa¥¥al, vol.III, p.159

[2]. Tir¢kh Irin, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, p.710

[3]. About that, U¥£l Asmi' al-mudun wa l-mawiqi' al-'Ariqiyya, vol.I, pp.100-101

[4]. it seems the reason is that there are several people named "Nu'min" among kings of this dynasty as well as several people named " Mundhir ".

[5]. al-Mufa¥¥al, vol.III, from p.177 on

[6]. Tir¢kh Irin, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, p.712

because the government of Byzantium was fighting it and it was politically in favor of Iran to defend this sect of Christianity.[1]

During this period, the political fate of Iran and Iraq were intertwined because the Iraqi government had practically been installed by Iran and it could not resist the ªl Ghassin or powerful Arab rivals from northern Saudi Arabia (like Kinda who claimed to rule the entire region and managed to wrest control of °¢ra from Lakhm for three years.[2]) Iran, on the other hand, had to defend Iraq against its enemies because Iraq was a barrier on the way of the invasion of Bedouin Arabs and the Byzantium government and its puppet government in Damascus. This necessity made the Iranian government deploy soldiers to °¢ra and its surrounding regions to guard Iranian borders there. Iran had contacts with Arabs not only in Iraq but it was also their neighbor on the eastern Saudi borders in the southern shores of the Persian Gulf. Some historians have reported of Iran's influence in Yathrib[3] one or two centuries before the advent of Islam. Sometimes, Iran had to give control of a region like Ubulla to a powerful tribe such as Ban£ Shaybin to defend the invasion of Bakr Ibn Wi'il.

Due to its many interests in Saudi Arabia, Iran once accepted to interfere in Yemen, the southernmost point of °idjiz. In the early sixth century AD, Jews gained some power in Yemen and persecuted Christians. This made the Negus of Abyssinia, Yust¢ Niyin£s, invade Yemen in the year 525 AD. He suppressed the Jews and established a Christian rule there. Abraha, the commander of the operations and his son, Masr£q, ruled for fifty years in Abyssinia until Sayf Ibn Dh¢ Yazan put an end to their rule over Yemen with an 8000-soldier Iranian army. Many of the Iranian remained in Yemen[4] and formed the Abni' or Persian generation of Yemen. Their number grew to the extent that they joined the army of Islam in the conquest of Egypt. They had a district and a mosque in the name of Persians in Fas§i§ that still existed until the third century.[5] When the Messenger of Allih invited

---

[1]. al-Na¥riniyya wa ªdibuhi bayn 'Arab al-djihiliyya, p.87

[2]. Tir¢kh Irin, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, p.715

[3]. Tir¢kh Irin.vol.III, p.713-714

[4]. Tir¢kh Irin, vol.III, p.720

the heads of states to convert to Islam, famed Bizin ruled Yemen. He had been installed by the Sassanids in Iran.

At any rate, Iran had important interests in Arab lands, especially in Iraq located on the border between Iran and Rome. Iran's interference in these regions was to the degree that in the year 602, Khusraw Parv¢z ordered Nu'min III, the last king of the Lakhm¢ dynasty, to step down step down. After him, the Iranian government replaced him with a local Christian named Iyis Ibn Qubay¥a to rule °¢ra and with him, an Iranian border guard was appointed.[1] During a period of 30 years between the resignation of ªl Lakhm and the first attacks of Muslims on °¢ra, drastic upheavals occurred in the relations of Iran and Byzantium, that required Iran's more direct interference in Iraqi affairs. In the years 611 to 614, Khusraw Parv¢z launched a lengthy attack against Byzantium and captured a major part of the greater Syria including Quds. For many years, this created problems for the Byzantium government. This defeat is referred to in Qur'in as the "Conquest of Rome". After a few years, Heraclitos succeeded in reinforcing his army and during six consecutive years of war, defeated the Iranian government until the year 628, when Khusraw Parv¢z was killed and Iran had to accept peace. It is clear that Iran's defeat opened the way for the invasion of Iraq by the Byzantium government and the most important of all, by the Bedouin rebels. In the early years of the fourth decade of the seventh century AD, some chieftains of Arab tribes pleaded to the first caliph of Muslims to retake Iraq from Iran. They organized the first attack against Iran in 633 AD or 12th AH.

Muslim Arabs lived in the Western part of °idjiz, but they had some links with the east of the peninsula as well. Especially, they exchanged visits with Nadjd and the tribes residing in it. Some time before the Prophet's demise, a large number of these tribes converted to Islam though it was not serious; therefore, after the Prophet's passing, apostasy spread in the eastern parts of °idjiz, particularly in the land of Nadjd. The new government had no option but to quell them; otherwise, the same tribes would soon move toward Medina, too. So, Muslims were dispatched to those regionsto support the riots. The attack was partly

---

[5]. Fut£¦ mi¥r wa akhbiruhi, p.129

[1]. Tir¢kh Irin, Cambridge (persian translation), vol. III, p.720

commanded by Khilid Ibn Wal¢d. As he gradually advanced to supress these tribes, he came to the southern parts of Iraq. Some of the apostates had fled to Iraq and some of them, like Ban£ Tam¢m, lived in that region. The consecutive victories of the Muslim army in those regions made the tribal chieftains of southern Iraq think of using these forces to capture °¢ra. This was the first attempt for conquests in Iraq and then, in Iran.

One of the influential tribes in southern Iraq was Ban£ Shaybin, a branch of Bakr Ibn Wi'il tribe., Wi'il itself, was a branch of Rabi'a tribe. The region where Bakr Ibn Wi'il resided, started from Iraq and extended as far as Ba¦rayn in the Persian Gulf.[1] Ban£ Shaybin was a rival of ªl Lakhm and one of those tribes whom Iranian had to give concessions to in the lands under their rule. One of the last Arabian-Iranian battles was Dh¢ Qir, in which Ban£ Shaybin fought against Iranians and are said to have defeated them. One of this tribe's leaders was Muthanni Ibn °iritha who must be considered the main instigator of Muslims in the conquest of Iraq and then, Iran.

According to D¢nwar¢, ever since P£rin sat on the throne in Iran, rumors spread that there was nothing left of the Iranian glorious kingdom. Hearing about this, two people from Bakr Ibn Wi'il, Muthanni Ibn °iritha and Suwayd Ibn Qu§ba 'Idjal¢, attacked the land of Iranians with their men (the first attacked °¢ra and the second one invaded Ubulla). They would raid farmers and plunder them. After that, Muthanni wrote a letter to Ab£ Bakr and noted Iran's weakness.[2]

Ab£ Bakr who had heard about his assaults on the Iranians, said, "Who is this man, whose "news" reaches us before his "name"?" He was told the man was not an unknown person. After ending the war against apostates, Muthanni came to Medina and asked Ab£ Bakr's permission to fight the Iranians. Ab£ Bakr wrote an agreement for him. A few months later, he dispatched his brother to Medina to ask Ab£ Bakr to send forces to him and the caliph sent Khilid Ibn Wal¢d to Iraq.[3] According to Balidhur¢, after getting the

---

[1]. al-±ar¢q 'Ili al-Madi'in, p.202

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.111

[3]. al-I¥iba, vol.III, p.361

permission for war from Medina, Muthanni returned to his tribe in Khiffin and invited them to convert to Islam and they all accepted. Then, Ab£ Bakr sent Khilid to Iraq and asked Muthanni to obey him.[1] Muthanni did his best to expand Islam in Iraq for some years until his death. It has been said that he and his tribe had come to the Prophet (s) and therefore, was considered one of the companions.[2] The Muslim army in these attacks is said to have been numbered at around 18000.[3]

It should be noted here that the Iranians' war in the conquest of Iraq was not against Arabs. What has been reported about he conquests indicates that the Iranian armies were the main side of these clashes, although it has been said that some men from °idjiz and Arab Christians. In the conquest of Ubulla, the commander of the enemy's army was a man named Hurmuz whose part of army was commanded by Qubid and the other part, by An£shdjin.[4] In fact, after the collapse of the Lakhmids, Iranians guarded this land and it was natural that in the Arabic environment of Iraq, Lakhmids could do this better than the Iranians. Therefore, it has been said that due to the fall of the Lakhmids, the southern wing of the Sassanids government was left almost without any support.[5]

We must also add that there are different versions about these conquests. One of the best-known narrators was Sayf Ibn 'Umar who was notorious for lying and fabricating stories. He tried to portray Khilid as an unnatural human being who even sometimes, did some supernatural tasks! Stories of the conquest of Iraq in the Tir¢kh ±abar¢, have been taken from his reports.

It is said that Khilid first captured Ubulla, although Wiqid¢ rejects it.[6] Another source says this city was captured by 'Utba Ibn Ghazwin. Also, we read that the city of 'Ullays was conquered based on a peace accord and then, Muslims

---

[1]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.242

[2]. al-Ist¢'ib (on the margin of al-I¥iba) vol.III, p.522; al-I¥iba, vol.III, p.362

[3]. al-±ar¢q 'Ili al-Madi'in, pp.209-211

[4]. Ibid. pp.215-216

[5]. Spuler, Tir¢kh Irin, vol.I, p.6

[6]. Mu'djam al-buldin, vol.I, p.431

moved toward °¢ra from there. There are contradictory views on whether °¢ra resisted Arab Muslims or not.[1] The nobles of °¢ra have said that Ayis Ibn Qubay¥a was among them and they gave up the city peacefully provided that they would not destroy churches and palaces. °¢ra's tributes were the first sent to Medina.[2] °¢ra fell in Dh¢ Qa'da, 12th AH.

Anbir was another major city of Iraq that fell to Muslims. It had been named Anbir (storehouse) because in the past, it used to be a place for Iranians to store their cereals. In fact, many Iranian forces and border patrols served in this region, and the city was naturally, a warehouse for their food. The city was famous until the second AH century and the establishment of Baghdid. It should be noted that before the conquest of the city by Muslims, Romans had burnt the city.[3] This indicates that a year before Iraq's conquest, Romans had done serious damage to the region. 'Ayn al-Tamr, in addition to Ubulla and Khurayba, were the places used for the stationing of Iranian border guards. They were either captured by force or peace. One of the captives of this city was Yasir, the ancestor of Mu¦ammad Ibn Is¦iq, the author of "S¢ra Nabaw¢."[4]

The consecutive victories of Muslims which all came within at most a year on the one hand and lack of any serious resistance and fight on the part of Iranians against Muslim Arabs, show how disorganized the state of Iranian forces was in the region. Perhaps, some may say that Iranians did not take these attacks seriously and this may be true to some extent. But Iranians were aware of the changes in °idjiz and the battles against apostasy, because they had too much influence on Ba¦rayn and Yamima and it is illogical to accept that they were unaware of these incidents and of the state of Muslims. Secondly, Iranians could not do anything even after taking Arabs' assaults seriously. Therefore, the Iranian army was not in a good shape at that time. This army suffered from the disorders that had beset the Iranian ruling system after its defeat from the Romans. It

---

[1]. Spuler, Tir¢kh Irin, vol.I, p.8

[2]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.244

[3]. U¥£l Asmi' al-mudun wa l-mawiqi' al-'Ariqiyya, vol.I, p.31

[4]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.248

had seriously damaged the credibility of the Sassanids government among Iranians, themselves.

Spuler writes on the speedy withdrawal of the Iranian army from Iraq, “The speedy victories of Arabs and fast retreat of Iranian forces from the region had more deep-rooted reasons. On the one hand, Mesopotamia, with its Aramaic or Aramaic–turned settlers which was largely populated by Christians and besides them, followers of Baptism and Jews and limited number of Manicheans, opposed the rule of Iran in the region. On the other hand, there were few Iranians in the region and villagers showed no resistance against the advance of Arabs, although they did not welcome the invading Arabs as it was done simultaneously in Egypt extremely excited by the acts of Byzantium. However, the situation in Mesopotamia was similar to that of Egypt.”[1]

[1]. Spuler, Tir¢kh Irin, vol.I, p.13

CHAPTER II
‘UMAR’S CALIPHATE

ABOUT CALIPH II

‘Umar was from the Ban£ ‘Ad¢ tribe, one of the branches of the Quraysh. His mother, °antama, was the daughter of Hishim Ibn Mughc¢ra from the Ban£ Makhz£m clan. Ban£ Makhz£m was another branch of the Quraysh and an ally of the Umayya in the Dark Age. Unlike Ab£ Bakr, ‘Umar converted to Islam years after the ordainment of Prophet Mu¦ammad (s). Many sources say he converted in the sixth °idjra year. Mas‘£d¢ says he converted four years before °idjra, i.e. the 9th °idjra year.[1] ‘Umar was present in wars and events in Medina, although history has recorded no specific memory about him. When his daughter, °af¥a, became the Prophet’s wife, his relations with the Messenger of God were reinforced. In this connection, he was like Ab£ Bakr. We wrote that the Prophet (s) made them brothers by contract.[2] They were inseparable throughout the entire life of the Prophet (s). They held common stances in the developments of Saq¢fa and it was because of ‘Umar’s insistence on stabilizing Ab£ Bakr’s caliphate that Imim ‘Al¢ (a) accused him of working for his own future.[3] This was well justified for others.

When Ab£ Bakr handed over the oath of caliphate to him and asked him to read it for the people, someone asked him, “What is in this letter?”

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.321

[2]. Sahm¢, Tir¢kh Djurdjin, p.96

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.587; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.VI, p.11; Anas Ibn Milik says, “On Saq¢fa, I saw ‘Umar forcing Ab£ Bakr to sit on the pulpit.

al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.V, p.438

He replied, “I do not know for sure, but I shall be the first one to obey it!” The person said, “But I know what it is.” **أمّرته عام أوّل وأمّرك العـام “**The first year you appointed him caliph and the second year, he installed you as the caliph of Muslims.”[1]

The above quotation shows that people were aware of the political bond between these two. Apparently, people saw one way of thinking throughout the caliphate of Ab£ Bakr in these two persons. In other words, they believed that ‘Umar’s caliphate was the continuation of Ab£ Bakr’s and that their caliphate was a single administration.

Qays Ibn Ab¢ °izim says, “I saw ‘Umar in the mosque, with a stick of date branch in his hand trying to make people sit down. Ab£ Bakr’s servant, named Shudayd, came to the mosque and read a message from Ab£ Bakr and then, ‘Umar mounted the pulpit.”[2] “It is true to say that Ab£ Bakr would not be a caliph if it were not for ‘Umar.[3] When Ab£ Bakr wanted to appoint Khilid Ibn Sa‘¢d as commander of the army, ‘Umar managed to change his mind because Khilid swore allegiance to Ab£ Bakr only three months after the Saq¢fa gathering.[4] Ab£ Bakr used to say he loved ‘Umar more than others.”[5]

‘Umar addressed Ibn ‘Abbis and said, “Indeed, if Ab£ Bakr did not believe me, he would set aside your share of the government, and in that case, your tribesmen (Quraysh)

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.174. Once Ab£ Bakr transferred a piece of land to someone with a title deed registered under his name, but ‘Umar took the deed and destroyed it.

°ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.II, p.47. Interesting to know is that they call them " ‘Umarayn" meaning two ‘Umars.

[2]. Ab£ Bakr Khallil, al-Sunna, p.277

[3]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.38 Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d writes, (عمر) هو الذي شيد بيعة ابي بكر ورقم المخالفين فيها وكسر سـيف زبيـر.... ودفـع صدر مقداد.... ولولاه لم يثبت لأبي بكر أمره ولا قامت لـه قـائمته ‘Umar was someone who straightened Ab£ Bakr’s allegiance and removed the dissenters, spit apart Zubayr’s sword, beat chest of Miqdid, if he had not helped, Ab£ Bakr’s caliphate would never be organized; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.I, p.174

[4]. al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.V, P.254

[5]. Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.II, p.222; Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.17; al-Fi’iq f¢ Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.III, p.333; al-Adab al-mufrad, Bukhir¢, p.29

would hate you.”[1] It was this belief in ‘Umar that made Ab£ Bakr write an accord appointing ‘Umar as his successor. Once he said, “I appointed ‘Umar to succeed me because I was afraid of eruption of any tension.”[2]

Before the appointment of ‘Umar, Ab£ Bakr consulted ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf. He praised the caliph and said ‘Umar was a quick-tempered man. Ab£ Bakr said, “He shows to be so in contrast with my tender-heartedness. He will calm down when he takes power.” Ab£ Bakr consulted ‘Uthmin, too.

He said, “‘Umar’s nature is better than his countenance.”[3] This is all the consultation Ab£ Bakr made with the nobles of the Quraysh before appointing ‘Umar.

‘Uthmin was always present in the caliph’s bedside during his sickness. Ab£ Bakr asked him to write the contract of succession on his behalf. After the beginning of the contract was written, Ab£ Bakr fell into coma and ‘Uthmin who knew his assignment, finished the oath and wrote the name of ‘Umar in it. After regaining consciousness, Ab£ Bakr asked ‘Uthmin to read what he had written. He did so and Ab£ Bakr approved it.[4] Following this, ±al¦a came to Ab£ Bakr and said, “You witnessed how ‘Umar behaves beside you and with your presence. Then, we do not know what he will do without you.” Ab£ Bakr was angered by his objection.[5] Another quotation says the people objected to Ab£ Bakr for appointing a bad-tempered man to rule them.[6] According to

---

[1]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.28

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.200

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, P.428; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.199

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p.429; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, vol.I, pp.163-165; Nathr al-durr, ol.II, pp.15 and 23; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.II, p.425; °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.II, p.26; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.200

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p.433

‘ªyisha mentions objection of "so and so", ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.274. Ab£ Bakr was told, “When he was not "caliph", he harshly treated us.” “Oh, if he becomes a ruler, what will he do to us?”

al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.V, p.449. Others complained of his "tongue and stick".

al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.38. ‘Al¢ also objected to Ab£ Bakr, ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.274; °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.II, p.26

[6]. Ab£ Bakr Khallil, al-Sunna, p.275

Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Ab£ Bakr asked Mu‘ayqab al-R£s¢ about the people’s opinion regarding the appointment of ‘Umar and he replied, “Some are satisfied, some are not.”

Ab£ Bakr said, “Which group is greater in number?”

He said, “Those who are dissatisfied.”

Ab£ Bakr said, “The truth always shows its ugly face first, but it is finally the winner.”[1] ‘Umar, himself, in his first sermon said he was aware of the fact that some people hated his caliphate.[2] Ibn Qutayba has said that after hearing the news of Ab£ Bakr’s death, Muslims in Damascus expressed their concern over ‘Umar’s likely coming to power and said, “If ‘Umar assumes power, he will not be our “master” and we will topple him.”[3] Ab£ Bakr did not make any serious consultations about ‘Umar’s caliphate.[4] He believed that many of the Muhidjir£n were thinking about occupying the seat of caliphate. Once he told ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf that many men of Muhidjir£n were yearning for the seat of caliphate since the start of his caliphate.[5] In his deathbed, Ab£ Bakr warned ‘Umar about the Muhidjir£n and their greed for ruling.[6]

Ab£ Bakr’s act of setting an age for caliphate, the principle of “succession” became legitimate in the political jurisprudence of the Sunnites sect. However, according to Sunnites sources, this had no background in the Prophet’s biography. The succession rule shares two pillars of hereditary government. In a hereditary government, the first

---

[1]. Bahdjat al-madjilis, vol.I, p.579 and about other objections, Ma‘rifat al-¥a¦iba, vol.I, p.183; al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.152; al-Fi’iq f¢ Ghar¢b al-¦ad ¢th, vol.I, pp.99-100

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.61. He, in the same speech, asked God to make him "good-tempered". ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.274

[3]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.38

[4]. Khayr al-D¢n Saw¢ writes, “Ab£ Bakr consulted with the companions before selecting ‘Umar(Ta§awwur al-fikr al-siyis¢, p.40). Such a viewpoint clashes with historical facts and consultation with Ibn ‘Awf and ‘Uthmin is only knowm to us. Of course, disagreements are more informative to us. Fir£q Nabhin, too, claimed that Ab£ Bakr always received advice from the faithful people (Ni³im al-¦ukm fi l-islim, p.93)

[5]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.16

[6]. Ibid.vol.II, P.22

pillar is succession and the second pillar is family and hereditary advantages. Its first pillar in the caliphate’s biography took on a legitimate form. Just as Mu¦ammad Rash ¢d Ri¤i has noted, this brought about hereditary caliphate in the time of the Umayya.[1]

Ab£ Bakr’s written oath practically appointed ‘Umar as the caliph. Therefore, the people’s allegiance could not be influential in his reign. Finally, we should say that the people’s disagreement did not mean he could not be a caliph. This was indeed a sort of swearing obedience and loyalty to caliph. ‘Umar, himself, believed that Ab£ Bakr’s selection as the caliph of Muslims was impromptu and that the government had to be undertaken at the consultation of the believers, but he sat on the seat of caliphate based on an oath. He criticized the way of selecting Ab£ Bakr but did not say anything about his odd way of assuming power.

THE CALIPH’S CHARACTER

The caliph was a quick-tempered man[2] and an extremist[3] and both characteristics seriously affected his political and administrative career. Management to him was some kind of strictness by which he did his best to control the Bedouin Arabs. His inner being was easily detectable in his thoughts and deeds during the lifetime of the Prophet of Islam. We know that in the war of Badr, he asked the Prophet (s) to kill all captives. His harsh treatment with Suhayl Ibn ‘Amr, in the

---

[1]. al-khilifa wa l-Imima, al-‘U³mi quoted from, And¢shih siyis¢ dar Islim mu‘i¥ir, p.150; before Rash¢d Ri¤i, Marwin Ibn °akam referred to Ab£ Bakr’s measure of making caliphate hereditary!

[2]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d writes,وكان في اخلاق عمر والفاظه جفاء وعنجهية ظاهرة ‘Umar’s ethics and words represented self-pride of some kind Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.I, p.183

[3]. The caliph, in appearance, was tall and had a brown-colored face and on front part of head, he was hairless, "A¥la‘". According to Mu¦ammad Ibn °ab¢b, he had deceitful eyes.al-Mu¦abbar p.303; al-Munammaq, p.405

case of the °udaybiyya peace deal, has been recorded in history. He also held extreme stances against the °udaybiyya peace accord. On his first day of caliphate, he said, “O God! I am hot-tempered. Soften my behavior!”[1]

He knew he could not live without his lash. Therefore, he was the first one in Islam who took the lash of “Dirra” in his hand.[2] They have said his cane was more horrendous than the sword of °adjdjidj.[3]

As said, ±al¦a objected to Ab£ Bakr as to why he imposed ‘Umar upon them knowing that he is hot-tempered.[4]

According to Ibn Shubba, a man told ‘Umar, “People are mad at you; they hate you.”

‘Umar asked, “ why.”

He replied, “They complain of your tongue and cane!”[5] One day, Zubayr’s slave was standing in prayers after evening prayers when he saw ‘Umar approaching him with his Dirra (cane). The slave fled right then but ‘Umar caught him. The slave said, “I'll never do so again!”[6]

After the death of Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin, ‘Umar proposed marrying his wife but she did not accept because she believed ‘Umar was bad-tempered when both leaving and entering the house.[7] Even ‘ªyisha who had close relations with the caliph, prevented his marriage with her sister for

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.274; Ab£ Bakr Khallil, al-Sunna اللهم إني غليظ فليّني O God! I am hot-tempered, make me soft-tempered.

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, P.209; Tir¢kh al-khulafi’, p.137; °ayat al-¦ayawin, vol.I, p.346; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.282. The first one to be lashed by Dirrah was Umm Farwa, Ab£ Bakr’s sister when she was crying for Ab£ Bakr after his death and ‘Umar deemed crying for the dead unrightful.

Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.181

[3]. Rab¢‘ al-abrir, vol.III, p.188; °ayat al-¦ayawin, vol.I, p.51; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.188; al-Tarit¢b al-idiriyya, vol.II, p.376; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.281

[4]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.VI, p.343, vol.I, p.164; °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.II, pp.128 and 130

[5]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.858

[6]. al-Ma‘rifa wa l-tir¢kh, vol.I, pp.364-365

[7]. Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.61 يدخل عابساً ويخرج عابساً He entered with sullen face and went out in the same way.

the same reason.[1] ‘Abd al-Razzāq ¯an‘in¢ quoted Ibrih¢m Nakha‘¢ as saying that some day ‘Umar was passing near a group of women when he smelled a perfume.

He said, “If only I knew whose perfume this is. Then, I would know what to do with her. Women should wear perfume for their husbands only.” According to the same story, the woman who had worn perfume urinated out of fear[2] and another woman who saw her had a miscarriage.[3]

As a matter of fact, no one dared ask a question from ‘Umar and he preferred to do it through ‘Uthmin or someone else.[4]

‘Umar considered the criterion of strictness in selecting his rulers for the states.[5] He did not show mercy to offenders, no matter what tribe they belonged to. This made Djabala Ibn ’Ayham, a ruler of Damascus, who had committed a fault flee from Mecca to Damascus and turn away from Islam.[6] Even governors and the caliph’s children were not immune to his wrath. One day, he beat up one of his sons for the exquisite garment he had put on and the son burst into tears. When °af¥a objected, ‘Umar said, “He was acting proudly and I punished him to belittle him.”[7] He beat one of his children to death for drinking wine.[8] Apparently, ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ had lashed him in Egypt for the same reason and on his return to Medina, his father beat him to death. When he was about to die, he told his father, “You killed me!”

---

[1]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XVI, p.93; al-Ist¢‘ib, vol.I, p.273

[2]. al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.IV,pp.343-344

[3]. Djimi‘ al-bayin al-‘ilm, vol.II, p.103; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.I, p.174

[4]. al-Fakhr¢., p.106(Persian Translation)

[5]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.I, p.15

[6]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.I,p.265; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.302-304; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.183. About him, different stories are said of ‘Umar’s treatment and his repentance in manner of treating him. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.147

[7]. al-Mu¥annaf, vol.I, p.416

[8]. °ayat al-¦ayawin, vol.I, p.49; Mu¥‘ab Zubayr¢, Nasab Quraysh, p.356

‘Umar said, “If you should see God, tell Him we observe his punishment (°add) on earth.”[9] His severe treatment raised public hatred and dissatisfaction. The people asked ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf to talk to him in this regard and tell him that girls fear him even in their houses.

‘Umar replied, “People will not be reformed except with this method; otherwise, they will even strip me of my clothes.”[2] He, himself, admitted that people feared him because of his harshness.[3] In essence, the same treatments could stop public disagreement on his approach.[4] When the Prophet (s) ordered men not to beat their wives, ‘Umar asked the Prophet (s) to let men beat their wives like in the past but he did not accept.[5]

We said that ‘Umar’s concept of religion had made an extremist out of him. Punishing his son to death for drinking wine was one example. He was very strict towards women and did not let them attend morning and evening congregational prayers. He did not have sensible military courage but he attached special significance to Djihid.[6] This is why he omitted “°ayya ‘Ali Khayr al-‘Amal” (Rush to the best deed) from Adhin (the call to prayers, under the pretext that people would not go to the holy war. Of course, he added a good part to Adhin and that was saying, “Prayer is better than sleep”. Imim Sadjdjid and ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar considered “°ayya ‘Ali Khayr al-‘Amal” (hasten to good deed) obligatory in Adhin[7] and Ab£ °an¢fa believed that “al-¯alit Khayr min al-Nawm” (Prayer is better than sleep) should be told after Adhin because it is not part of it.[8]

At any rate, ‘Umar was harsh in his contacts with people. This was contrary to the fact that he tried to rule as a caliph, not as a Sultan. It is good to retell a part of ‘Utba Ibn Ghazwin’s speech who served as ruler of Ba¥ra for six

---

[9]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.841

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.35; ‘Uy£n al-akhbir, vol.I, p.12

[3]. °ayat al-¦ayawin, vol.I, p.49

[4]. Nathr al-durr, vol.IV, PP.34-35

[5]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VIII, p.205

[6]. al-Aghin¢, vol.VI, p.279

[7]. Huwiyyat al-tashayyu‘, p.47 from, al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, Sunan Biyhaq¢

[8]. Ibid. p.46 from, Tays¢r al-u¥£l

months only, and who was indeed commander of Muslim forces in Ba¥ra. Pointing to the economic problems in the time of the Prophet of Islam and the poverty of his companions, he drew a comparison with the time of ‘Umar and said each one of the companions had become an emir of a city. “There is no prophethood not to be abolished by the “land”. I will take refuge in God when prophets turn to be “kings” and I will seek God’s shelter when I feel a great man in myself but be despicable in view of people. You will soon see emirs coming after us, and you will know them soon and will deny them.”[1] It was a general attitude that time and many people were sure that the caliphate would turn into kingdom. ‘Umar, himself, used to say he wondered whether he was a caliph or a king. Ka‘b al-A¦bir assured him he was a caliph and that he had found his name in the divine books![2] Apparently, Ab£ Bakr imagined himself a king.[3] Despite ‘Umar’s harsh behavior, many dared criticize him. When Bilil was getting ready to say the Adhin, ‘Umar objected to him, saying it was not time for prayers, but Bilil responded, “I knew the time when you were more astray than the ass of your tribe.”[4]

‘Umar used to say, “Guide me if you see a fault in me.”

A Bedouin Arab replied, “We will guide you with sword if we see a fault in you.” Hearing this, ‘Umar thanked God that there was somebody in the tribe to guide him by force.[5] On the contrary, ‘ªyisha, daughter of ‘Uthmin, believed that ‘Umar’s roughness prevented ordinary people from criticizing him.[6] ‘Umar, himself, believed that the best policy for leading Mu¦ammad’s nation was to act with power and not by force, to be soft but not lax, to bestow but not go to extremes, and to have abstinence but without stinginess.[7]

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VII, pp.6-7

[2]. °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.II, p.36; al-Tarit¢b al-idiriyya, vol.I, p.13; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.211; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.306

[3]. °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.III, pp.475-476

[4]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq vol.XI, p.276

[5]. Tafs¢r al-manir, vol.XI, p.266

[6]. Nathr al-durr, vol.IV, p.34

[7]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.879; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, pp.344-345

We must admit that ruling Bedouin Arabs was not an easy task at all.

His strictness showed its signs in economy as well. He preferred a simple life for himself and for his functionaries and family. It seems that the Prophet's lifestyle was still common among people and some of the emirs. 'Umar had an extremist pious understanding of religion. A sign of this was his understanding of the verses, "**أَذْهَبْتُمْ طَيِّبَاتِكُمْ فِي حَيَاتِكُمْ الدُّنْيَا**." "You selfishly used your pure gifts in your worldly life," that allows Muslims to be so. Of course, he was objected to for this and when he learned that the verse concerned infidels,[1] he accepted it. His pious life did not mean that he had no wealth during his caliphate; rather, it has been mentioned in sources that 'Umar was among the wealthiest of the Quraysh.[2]

Someone asked Nifi', "Was 'Umar in debt?"

Nifi' said, "How could he be in debt when one of his inheritors, alone, sold his inheritance at 100000 dhms (Dirham or D¢nir?)?[3] 'Umar had set his wife's marriage portion at 4000 dhms.[4] Also once, he bestowed tens of thousands of dhms from his original wealth to his son-in-law.[5] More pious than 'Umar was Salmin who warned him against luxury life.[6]

'UMAR'S FUNCTIONARIES

With the expansion of this period's conquests, vast lands fell under the rule of the Medina government. Running these lands needed managers with new values who could open the way for more conquests. In fact, the most important point for the caliph and Muslims in those conditions was further

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.182

[2]. Kashf al-astir, vol.II, p.303; °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.I, p.347

[3]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.935; Djimi' al-bayin al-'ilm, vol.II, p.17

[4]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VIII, p.464; al-Tarit¢b al-idiriyya, vol.II, p.405; al-Ba¦r al-zakhkhir, vol.III, p.101; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.190; al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, vol.IV, p.190

[5]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi', p.120; Kanz al-'Ummil, vol.II, p.317; °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.II, p.356

[6]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.X, p.46

enlarging the conquered lands. For running the affairs of border regions, mostly those people were chosen who had enough military capability and experience. Thus, one of the main criteria of the caliph for selecting a functionary was someone with such an ability who could properly run the city and the region under his control. A list of ‘Umar’s functionaries in the cities was as follows, Mecca, Mu¦riz Ibn °iritha Ibn ‘Abd Shams; Qunfudh Ibn ‘Umayr Taym¢; Nifi‘ Ibn ‘Abd al-°irith Khuzi‘¢; Khilid Ibn ‘ª¥ Makhzum¢;

Yemen, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Ab¢ Rabi‘a Makhzum¢

Ba¦rayn, ‘Ali’ °a¤ram¢, Qudimat Ibn Ma¨‘£n, ‘Uthmin Ibn Abi l-‘ª¥, Ab£ Hurayrah, Ayyish Ibn Ab¢ Thawr

‘Ammin, Someone from the An¥ir and then ‘Uthmin Ibn Abi l-‘ª¥

Ba¥ra, Shuray¦ Ibn ‘ªmir, ‘Utba Ibn Ghazwin, Mughª¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba, Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢

Yamima, Salama Ibn Sallima An¥ir¢

K£fa, Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥, ‘Ammir Ibn Yisir, Djubayr Ibn Mu§‘im, Mughª¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba

±i’if, ‘Uthmin Ibn Abi l-‘ª¥, Sufyin Ibn ‘Abd Allih Thaqaf¢

Greater Syria, Ab£ ‘Ubayda Djarri¦, Mu‘idh Ibn Djabal, Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin, Mu‘iwiya Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin[1]

Palestine, Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin, ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥

Egypt, ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥

°idjiz and ªdharbiydjin, ‘Ayi¤ Ibn Ghanam, °ab¢b Ibn Maslama Fihr¢, ‘Umayr Ibn Sa‘d An¥ir¢ [2]

It is said that for some time, Salmin used to rule Ctesiphon.[3]

As indicated by the above-mentioned names, ‘Umar chose fewer people from among the companions to run the affairs. This issue was evident even in those days. Once he was asked about it, ‘Umar answered he did not intend to corrupt them with executive affairs.[4] This has been quoted by several historians. Most answers are the same as

---

[1]. Khal¢fa Ibn Khayyi§ makes it clear that Mu‘iwiya ruled Greater Syria in ending years of ‘Umar’s caliphate.

[2]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, pp.153-156

[3]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.306

[4]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.499

mentioned.[1] But, Sha'b¢ who is the reliable source of the Sunnis, says, "'Umar did not allow the Muhidjir s to leave Medina and told them, "What I fear most is that you will become scattered in towns and cities." He has added, "If any of them asked permission to go to war, 'Umar would say, "As you have fought alongside the Prophet, that should suffice you."[2]

Also, °asan Ba¥r¢ says, "If any of the companions wanted to leave Medina, he had to seek 'Umar's permission."[3] Preventing the companions's exit, as some people have said, was not limited to the Quraysh; rather, he basically prevented the exit of those companions who could turn into a pivotal figure in any city and could somehow stand against the caliph. There was also another reason, 'Umar wanted to prevent the spread of the Prophet's hadiths in different towns and cities. Kha§¢b Baghdid¢ has narrated that 'Umar sent messages to Abu l-Dardi' Ab£ Mas'£d An¥ir¢ and 'Abd Allih Ibn Mas'£d, saying, "What are all these hadiths you are quoting from Prophet Mu¦ammad?" Later, these people were not allowed to leave Medina[4] until 'Umar was killed. According to the same quote, Qar¤at Ibn Ka'b says, "When we were leaving Medina, 'Umar saw us off. Then, he asked, "Do you know why I am seeing you off? I wanted to tell you not to narrate the hadiths of the Prophet for the people in the cities you go. I, too, am your partner." Qar¤at says, "Afterwards, I did not narrate any more hadiths."[5]

Preventing the exit of the companions and not employing them was a policy 'Umar followed carefully. People such as Sha'b¢ sought the problem of 'Uthmin in his policy which was exactly the opposite of 'Umar's. It is said that once, Zubayr asked 'Umar to let him take part in wars.

'Umar responded, "I will not allow the companions of the Prophet to go to different cities and mislead the people."[6] Also, it was once protested to him, "Why do you give the

---

[1]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.II, p.361; Tir¢kh al-khulafi', p.106

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p.397; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.II, pp.159-160

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p.396

[4]. Sharaf A¥¦ib al-¦ad¢th, p.87

[5]. Sharaf A¥¦ib al-¦ad¢th, p.88

[6]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XX, p.20

affairs to people such as Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin, Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘ª¥, Mu‘iwiya and the like who are from the ״״**مؤلفـة قلـوبهم و״طلقا״** “Those whose hearts are captured as well as those who are the liberated ones.”

But you avoid using ‘Al¢, ‘Abbis, Zubayr and ±al¦a?” ‘Umar said he was afraid they would go stir trouble in cities.[1] Also, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf asked ‘Umar, “Why don’t you allow them to go to Djihid?” ‘Umar said, “If I remain silent and refrain from answering your question, it would be better.”[2] The unacceptable justification of A¦mad Am¢n is that it was due to the importance of Medina that ‘Umar kept the An¥ir in the city.[3] This viewpoint is different from those of Sha‘b¢ and °asan Ba¥r¢!

Ibn Sa‘d says, “‘Umar appointed people such as ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, Mu‘iwiya and Mugh¢ra, but not people like ‘Uthmin, ‘Umar, ±al¦a, Zubayr and ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf because the formers were strong and well-informed in executive affairs. Moreover, ‘Umar dominated them and was an awful figure for them. When he was asked why he did not use the great companions of the Prophet, he would say,**أكـره أن أدنّسَهم بالعمل**[4] **“**I please not to taint them with action.”

We previously referred to the caliph’s behavior. He preferred strict managers, even if they were not so virtuous. One of the problematic cities for ‘Umar was the newly established city of K£fa. For a period, it was ruled by Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ who was removed following the people’s protests. After him, ‘Ammir Yisir came to power, but he, too, was accused of impotence and ‘Umar removed him. The next person was Djubayr Ibn Mu§‘im who again failed to stay in office. At this time, when ‘Umar was greatly baffled, he asked Mugh¢ra who he saw suitable for ruling K£fa.

Mugh¢ra said, “Appoint me as the city’s governor.”

‘Umar answered, “You are a lewd man!”

Mugh¢ra said, “My efficiency is for you and my lewdness for myself.” ‘Umar liked his response and appointed him as

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.IX, pp.29-30; al-Fitnat al-kubri, pp.80-81

[2]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.158; there, he said that if Quraysh were permitted to leave, they would be led to the left and right wings.

[3]. Fadjr al-islim, p.172

[4]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.183and 283

governor of K£fa.[1] Before that, Mughº¢ra had ruled Ba¥ra for a while. There, he had illicit relations with a married woman named Umm Djam¢l. This affair was so explicit that four people saw him during adultery. But, only one of them gave false testimony and that saved Mughº¢ra from being stoned. Different sources are unanimous that ‘Umar had asked the fourth person to testify so.[2] ‘Umar’s policy of choosing such people caused °udhayfa Ibn Yamin to protest to the caliph about his appointment of corrupt people.

‘Umar answered, “I use his power (in running the affairs).”[3] Also, once, someone ho was a governor of Ab£ M£si Ashº‘ar¢ in a region of Ba¦rayn, came to Medina.

He asked Yarfa’ °idjib, “What character does ‘Umar like best?”

He answered, “Toughness.”

That man said, “When I attended the caliph’s court, I took on a serious expression. It was then that I realized ‘Umar paid more attention to me,” after a while, he asked me.

“Where are you working now?” I answered.

‘Umar said, “From now on, you are appointed in that region directly by me.”[4]

One important point about ‘Umar’s functionaries was his supervision over their way of treating people and the Bayt al-Mil or the public treasury. ‘Umar maintained a special control over them and recorded their wealth at the start of their term in office. In this concern, ‘Umar considered almost all his functionaries[5] to be guilty and halved their belongings when they returned from the region of service. He gave half of the wealth to them and gave the other half to the Bayt al-Mil. This act is called the dividing in two halves of the wealth. It was natural for ‘Umar to believe that his functionaries had gathered the wealth illegally, but as he did

---

[1]. Tir¢khº al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.155; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.I, p.22; Nathº r al-durr, vol.II, p.80

[2]. Tir¢khº al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.146; al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.VII, pp.384-385; al-Aghº in¢, vol.XVI, P.94. about other cases, al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.VIII, p.217-219

[3]. Ghº ar¢b al-¦ad¢thº, vol.III, p.239; al-Fi’iq, vol.III, p.215

[4]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.I, pp.14-15

[5]. For example, he accused Ab£ Hurayra of theft. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.IV, p.335

not know a particular way for separating the legal from the illegal, he had decided to divide the wealth as mentioned except in a few cases. One of these governors was Ab£ Hurayra who ruled Ba¦rayn. When he returned from his mission, ‘Umar divided his wealth and ordered him to be punished. Then, ‘Umar asked him to go back to work! Ab£ Hurayra said he would not accept to return because his money had been seized, he had been disgraced and he had been beaten as well![1]

‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, too, saw his wealth divided.[2] Other people to have the same fate were Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢, °irith Ibn Ka‘b and ‘Utba Ibn Sufyin who were in charge of collecting alms in ±i’if.[3]

Ab£ Bakra was another governor whose wealth was divided. He protested to ‘Umar and said, “If all these riches belong to God, who don’t you take them all and if they are mine, why are you doing so, then?”[4] As we said earlier, after dividing the wealth of his functionaries, ‘Umar re-appointed them to their posts. Imim ‘Al¢ has been quoted as having the same protest of Ab£ Bakr about why the functionaries were returned to work. One such instance was that one of ‘Umar’s functionaries had returned from Yemen, wearing an exquisite robe. But, ‘Umar ordered his attire to be taken off and ordered him to go back to his post.[5] Also, ‘Umar once heard that his governor in the city of °im¥ had built a nice house and had set a door- keeper for it. ‘Umar sent someone to burn the door of his house, but after a while, sent him back to work.[6] This act even trapped people such as Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥. Balidhur¢ has provided a list of those governors whose wealth was divided, Nifi‘ Ibn °irith, Nafi‘ Ibn °irith, Bushr Ibn Mu¦tafar, Djaz Ibn Mu‘iwiya, Khilid Ibn °irith, Qays Ibn ‘ª¥im, Samura Ibn Djundab, Mudjishi‘ Ibn Mas‘£d, Shibl Ibn Ma‘bad and Ab£ Maryam Ibn Mu¦rash. These people, as said by Balidhur¢, were mostly responsible

---

[1]. ‘Uy£n al-akhbir, vol.I, pp.53-54; Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.93; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.I, p.45

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.IV, p.335

[3]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.175

[4]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.I, p.46

[5]. Ibid.vol.I, p.46

[6]. Nahdj al-sa‘ida, vol.I, p.112

for collecting alms in the cities.[1] Of course, the names of people such as Salmin and ‘Ammir Ibn Yisir are included on the list.

Controlling his functionaries was a principle in ‘Umar’s policies. This supervision mostly focused on the financial aspect. When ‘Umar heard that ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ had taken some money from the Bayt al-Mil, he wrote to him, “I knew people from the Muhidjir£n who were much better than you, but I appointed you thinking that you had little need.” After that, ‘Umar sent Mu¦ammad Ibn Maslama to divide the wealth of ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥.[2] Another quotation says once ‘Umar heard that ‘Aya¤ Ibn Ghanam was living a luxurious life, wearing exquisite clothes and eating delicious meals. He sent Mu¦ammad Ibn Maslama to fetch him. When ‘Aya¤ came, ‘Umar gave him a walking stick and a robe. Then, he tasked him with taking three hundred sheep to the pasture. He was looking after the sheep for two months. Once, ‘Ayi¤ decided to get rid of his situation with the mediation of ‘Umar’s wife. When ‘Umar found out, he harshly told his wife, “This is not your business! You are a mere means of joy that is discarded after having fun.[3] Now, you are meddling in the affairs of me and Muslims?” Then, with ‘Uthmin’s arbitration, ‘Umar sent ‘Aya¤ back to his post and committed him not to return to his previous situation.[4]

Sometimes, ‘Umar would go to the house of his agents, accompanied by someone. He would remain silent and his friend would ask permission for entry. Then, he entered the house unexpectedly and this way, he tried to supervise their way of life.[5] In one occasion, he heard that Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ had built a palace and had set a portal for the building. ‘Umar sent someone to K£fa to set the gate on fire.[6] Of course, some of ‘Umar’s functionaries lived luxurious lives, but ‘Umar was not strict with them. two instances were

---

[1]. °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.II, p.210; from, Kanz al-‘Ummil, vol.III, p.166

[2]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, pp.90,299 and 396

[3]. انما انت لعبته يلعب بك، ثم تتركين No doubt, you are his plaything and finally thrown away

[4]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.817; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, P.178(with a little difference)

[5]. Ibid.vol.III, p.836

[6]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.124; Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.277

‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ and Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin.[1] This could have been due to his trust in their management skills. In some cases, too, he had special interest in certain persons. For example, he was greatly fond of Zayd Ibn Thibit. Once, Ab£ Bakr asked ‘Umar to appoint Zayd, then a teenager, to a post in financial affairs. When ‘Umar came to power and Zayd returned to him with some money, ‘Umar bestowed on Zayd all the money he had brought with him.[2] One day, ‘Umar heard that Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢ had lashed one of the fighters of the army and had shaved his head. He wrote to Ab£ M£si that if he had done this in public, he must receive Qi¥i¥ or get retaliatory punishment in public. And, if he had done it secretly, again he would have to be punished in the same manner. When Ab£ M£si was getting ready for Qi¥i¥, the lashed man forgave him.[3]

At any rate, ‘Umar’s orders and letters to the governors of different lands, his questioning of the emirs of cities and his urging them to observe justice, have been mentioned in numerous occasions by various sources.[4] This situation, whatever reason it had, did not last after ‘Umar. ‘Uthmin, during his years of caliphate, left his functionaries to themselves. This prevented a personality such as Imim ‘Al¢ from controlling the situation.

The narrator says, “Once, some money was brought to ‘Umar. His child took one dhm, put it in its mouth and went away. ‘Umar went after him and took the money.” The narrator adds, “I was sitting with ‘Uthmin when some money was brought to him, His child took a coin and then, his servant took one, but he did not protest. I burst into tears. When ‘Uthmin asked the reason, I told him the story.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.8333

[2]. Ibid.vol.III, pp.854-855; al-I¥iba, vol.I, p.85

[3]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara.vol.III, p.809

[4]. See a collection of commands, letters and speeches in,

Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XII, pp.194-196. He wrote to the people of cities, “I have not sent my agents to oppress you or seize your property. I’ve sent them to teach you religion and tradition. Anyone iolated this, complain to me for retaliating him because I saw the Prophet(s) doing so, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XII, p.22 and for treating harshly that is because of lack of understanding the Qur’inic verses, Ibid.vol.XII, pp.15 and 17

‘Uthmin said, “‘Umar did not give to his relatives for God’s sake, but I am giving to my folks for God’s sake.”[1]

Among his functionaries, ‘Umar did not question one particular person. He was Mu‘iwiya, son of Ab£ Sufyin who had converted to Islam even later than his father. Appointing Mu‘iwiya as the governor of Damascus during the last six years of ‘Umar’s caliphate was one of the sensitive issues of that time. The caliph was accused of playing a major role in stabilizing the status of the Umayya in Damascus.

‘Umar did not remove Mu‘iwiya from office when he called him the Arab Caesar.[2] Once, ‘Umar told Mu‘iwiya that he did not abide by enjoining to good and forbidding from evil.[3] During ‘Umar’s rule, the entire Damascus was under Mu‘iwiya’s control.[4] Even at the time of death, ‘Umar told the six-man council, “Do not have differences with each other because Mu‘iwiya is in Damascus![5]

---

[1]. al-Amil¢ fi ªthir al-¥a¦iba, pp.53-54; the heritage the Sunnites know as biography of "Orthodox Caliphs" excluding what Imim ‘Al¢ said and reflected more in culture of Shia belongs not to Ab£ Bakr and ‘Uthmin but to ‘Umar. What history tells of this heritage is legion and the Sunnites typically adopted its acceptability through ‘Umar’s letters and catch phrases. It is to admitted that, apart from caliph’s certain matters concerned with Imamate, the Hishimites and some juriprudic rulers as well as religious values, what persists has had and still has a high place in contrast to ‘Umar’s, the Umayya’s and the ‘Abbisids’s biography. The Sunnites refomists portrayed this considerably and undeniably. See, Tir¢kh falsafih dar islim, vol.II, article on "Tafakkur siyis¢ dar ¥adr islim" is maily vested upon the same acceptability transferred from ‘Umar and presented an idealistic image of the Islamic government and principles of Islamic policy. The caliph held that the assets of Bayt al-Mil are not privately owned but it is divine property,"Mil Allih" at his disposal(±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, pp.275-276) while ‘Uthmin regarded it as personal propewrty, ‘Umar Himself moved around the city as a "night guard"(±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.281)

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.61; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.III, p.365

[3]. Dali’il al-¥idq, vol.III, p.312 quoted from Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, p.184

[4]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, vol.I, p.157. This is against the idea of Ibn Kath¢r who believes that ‘Umar had him control some parts of greater Syria. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.III, p.124

[5]. Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.37

Also, Qi¤¢ ‘Abd al-Djabbir, a fanatic Sunnites, says, “Although ‘Umar strictly controlled his agents and sometimes changed them, he never had such a behavior towards Mu‘iwiya.”[1]

Ab£ Bakr A¥am said, “Mu‘iwiya was rightful in his war against ‘Al¢ because ‘Umar had appointed him.”[2] Later, ‘Umar’s political and religious conduct turned into a tradition. Once, when there was a dispute between ±al¦a and Imim ‘Al¢ over a pitcher at the presence of ‘Uthmin.

Mu‘iwiya asked, “Did it exist at the time of ‘Umar?”

They said, “Yes.”

He answered, “Can you change something which was fixed during ‘Umar’s period?”[3]

Before Mu‘iwiya, his brother, Yaz¢d, was the governor of parts of Damascus. This issue began at the time of Ab£ Bakr. When he appointed Khilid Ibn Sa‘¢d as the commander of an army in Damascus, ‘Umar insisted that he be replaced with Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin because Khilid Ibn Sa‘¢d who was in Yemen on behalf of Prophet Mu¦ammad, returned after the Prophet’s demise and complained to Imim ‘Al¢ about Ab£ Bakr’s coming to power. That was why ‘Umar preferred Yaz ¢d Ibn Sufyin to him.[4] After Yaz¢d’s death, Mu‘iwiya succeeded him and ruled Damascus during the last four years of ‘Umar’s caliphate.[5] Dji¦i¨ has interesting interpretations about the gradual reinforcement of Mu‘iwiya’s position in Damascus from the time of Ab£ Bakr until ‘Uthmin.[6]

Among the caliph’s agents, apart from Mughra, there were other lewd people, too. One of them was Qudima Ibn Ma¨‘£n who was a drunkard and was lashed for this.[7]

---

[1]. Tathb¢t Dali’il al-nubuwwa, p.593

[2]. Masi’il al-imima, p.60

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. IV, p.499, No.1286; Ibn ‘ª¥ikir mentions various evidence concerningly. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.18-25 and 44-73

[4]. al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.V, p.454

[5]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.838

[6]. Rasi’il al-dji¦i¨, al-Rasiil al-siyisiyya, p.344

[7]. al-Ishtiqiq, p.13; al-Fi’iq, vol.I, P.431; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p.560-561

Another governor of ‘Umar, Nu‘min Ibn ‘Ad¢, wrote poems on wine and drunkenness.[1] It was reported to ‘Umar that Nu‘min ran the affairs in the best possible way, but did not say his prayers on time.[2]

At the end of this part, it would be suitable to mention some other points considered by the caliph in choosing his agents. During his early years in Iraq and Damascus, ‘Umar showed that if he did not choose his commanders from among the noble companions, he could not go beyond the limits of the Quraysh and their allies such as the Thaq¢f and sometimes, the An¥ir who were trusted by the Quraysh. Therefore, despite the fact that Muthanni Ibn °irtha had grown his power in Iraq and was apparently trusted, ‘Umar did not appoint him as commander in the war against Iranians. Also, when ‘Utba Ibn Ghazwin, the founder of the city of Ba¥ra, complained to ‘Umar about the way Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ was enjoining to good and forbidding from evil, ‘Umar told him why he was not willing to accept the rule of someone from the Quraysh. Moreover, ‘Umar tried to choose his agents from the cities not from nomadic tribes. Once ‘Umar heard from Utba that he had appointed Mudjishi‘ Ibn Mas‘£d as his successor in Ba¥ra and as Mudjishi‘ had not been available then, had appointed Mughc¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba.

In response, ‘Umar said, “It is better that Mughc¢ra rules Ba¥ra, not Mudjishi‘ because Mudjishi‘ is from nomads and Mughc¢ra is a city-dweller.”[3] Mughc¢ra was a Thaqaf¢ residing in ±i’if.

THOUGHTS OF THE SECOND CALIPH

The second caliph, more than any other personality, influenced the Sunnites thoughts and ideas. As his period of caliphate was a highly crucial juncture in the history of Islam, his thoughts and deeds, too, were of great significance for Sunnites Muslims. This is to the extent that he is considered as a role model who made no mistakes and every word or act of him can be trusted as a religious tradition. Therefore, it is necessary to talk about him here.

---

[1]. Mu¥‘ab Zubayr¢, Nasab Quraysh, p.382

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p.560

[3]. Mu‘djam al-buldin, vol.I, p.432

The high status of ‘Umar in Sunnites thinking, can not be compared to anyone else. In the narrations told about ‘Umar’s good traits, the ranking attributed to him is a little lower than prophethood! This status has been interpreted as “Mu¦addath”. Mu¦addath is said to be someone who receives “revelations”.

In a narration by Bukhir¢, Muslim and others, Ab£ Hurayra has been quoted as saying Prophet Mu¦ammad said, “There were people among the Israelian tribe who received revelations without being a prophet. If there is anyone in my Umma who is such, that person is certainly ‘Umar.” According to Qas§alin¢, the commentator of the book of Bukhir¢, the “if” in the above-mentioned sentence, does not mean “hesitation” but means “emphasis”.

Besides such quotations, there is, on the whole, a certain idea about the caliph’s measures at the Prophet’s time, indicating that before God revealed something, ‘Umar had ordered that and then, God had sent down some verses in that regard. These instances are known as “‘Umar’s Muwifiqit”, ‘Umar’s agreement. It is interesting that in some cases, the viewpoint of the Prophet was in conflict with ‘Umar’s, but God has sent down verses agreeing with ‘Umar’s idea! ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar has been quoted as saying that all the verses God sent down about something discussed by ‘Umar and others, were in accordance with ‘Umar’s idea. Some of such examples are saying prayers for Ibrih¢m, the verse of °idjib, the Badr captives, banning drinking, not saying prayers for hypocrites and so on. It is evident, then, why ‘Umar’s status was close to prophethood and later, his way of behavior was regarded superior even to that of the Prophet.

Here, we must note the point that ‘Umar was as strong in practice as he was weak in thought. He, himself, had admitted this several times and had sought help from others in solving his problems. ‘Allama Am¢n¢ has allocated almost half of the sixth volume of the book of al-Ghad¢r entitled, **“نوادر الاثر في علم عمر** Rare reports about knowledge of ‘Umar,” on these issues. It was due to this weakness in knowledge that ‘Umar did not like religious discussions and debates and once, when someone asked him the meaning of

وَالذَّارِيَاتِ ذَرْوًا. "I Swear to pollinating winds," 'Umar beat him up.[1]

One of the main features of the second caliph's thinking was that he saw himself entitled to vast authorities as a ruler. He considered a special right for himself, not only in political and executive affairs, but also in divine legislation and making laws. Relying on the same authorities during his caliphate, 'Umar made innovations and changes and did not deem himself obliged to anything except having a general knowledge of the Qur'in and the Shar¢'a. In cases where he found himself incompetent, he would hold consultations and deliberations with the Companions to get things done. Narrating an interesting story told by ±abar¢ is appropriate here to realize the caliph's idea about his authorities, "'Imrin Ibn Sawid says, "I said the morning prayers with 'Umar and then, followed him."

He asked, "You have a request?"

I said, "Yes, advice!"

He said, "Bravo! Go on!"

I said, "People find faults with you in several things."

Holding his lash under his chin, 'Umar said, "Well?"

I said, "You have forbidden the lesser pilgrimage (the 'Umra °adjdj) during the months of °adjdj while Prophet Mu¦ammad said it was permitted; neither did Ab£ Bakr act like you."

'Umar said, "This was to show people that they were not exempt from the main °adjdj by doing the 'Umra."

I asked, "You have banned the temporary marriage of women while the Prophet had allowed it?"

'Umar said, "I am equal to Mu¦ammad; I make them full and do so and so for them. If I do not do so (harsh behavior), I'll abandon the truth (this is ironical of his having right to do so)."[2]

---

[1]. al-Ibina 'An shar¢'a al-firqa al-nidjiya, vol.I, p.415; 'Aq¢da al-salaf A¥¦ib al-¦ad¢th, Ab£ 'Uthmin Ismi'¢l Ibn 'Abd al-Ra¦min al-¯ib£n¢, pp.67-68

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.225; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.XII, pp.121-122; al-Fi'iq f¢ ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.I, pp.433-434(above translation in brief)

There are two basic points in this quotation containing plenty of proof for approving its inclusion, One is that ‘Umar, in response to ‘Imrin, confirmed his disagreement with the Prophet (s) and also justified it. Second, his response to ‘Imrin’s last objection started with this sentence, **أنا زميل (محمّد ص)** “I am equal to the Prophet.” “Zam¢l” commonly means “classmate” and its old usage is referred to two people who ride on camels each of whom takes seat on one side or two people ride on two camels separately.

In the above statement, there is an opposite sentence that says, **‘‘وكان زامله في غزوة قرقـرة الكـدر** ‘Umar has ‘Umar been equal to the Prophet in Qarqarat al-Kudr war.”

This sentence had no relation with ‘Umar’s response to the questions raised[1] but on the contrary, it was really misleading and was intentionally aimed at misleading the minds. ‘Umar says he is equal to the Prophet, meaning he could enjoin to or forbid from something or label things as lawful or unlawful just as the Prophet could. Thus, the caliph considered his authorities as vast as the Prophet and pretended to believe in nothing but the Qur’in.

What has been said about the caliph’s ban on narrating hadith and writing it[2] exactly conforms to this idea of the caliph. It seems the caliph believed that only the Qur’in could remain unchanged, but not hadith and the ruler can act at any time based on his expedience. In other words, what has been quoted from Prophet Mu¦ammad, only refer to his authorities as a ruler and these are authorities ‘Umar, too, had as a ruler. It is unlikely to find any caliph other than ‘Umar and ‘Uthmin who considered their authorities to include divine legislation and interference in religious affairs. Na¥r Allih Munsh¢, in the preface to “Kel¢lih wa Dimnih”, quotes ‘Umar as saying, “What the “state” bans people from is prior to what the “Qur’in” prohibits.”[3] ‘Umar cut the share of **المؤلفة قلوبهم “**Those whose hearts are captured,” that God paid from the tax alms, saying, Islam has no fear of them any more.[4] He believed an unclean person who needs

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d presents a worse justification, vol.XII, p.124

[2]. Muqaddamihy¢ bar tir¢kh tadw¢n ¦ad¢th (An Introduction to History of Compiling Hadith) by the author of the same context

[3]. M¢naw¢, Translation of Kil¢lih wa Dimnih, p.4

[4]. al-Tarit¢b al-idiriyya, vol.I, p.228; al-«¤i¦, p.97

water should not say prayers if he cannot find water. When ‘Ammir Yisir taught him the Prophet’s tradition in Tayammum (making ablution with earth or sand), **اتق الله يا عمار** “O ‘Ammir! Fear God!”

‘Ammir answered, “If you please so, I will not tell you the hadith of the Prophet!”[1]

It is interesting that ‘Umar hated Tayammum even during the Prophet’s life. Once during a trip, someone from ‘Umar’s companions got impure at dawn and had to make Tayammum. ‘Umar objected to him.

When they got to Medina, ‘Umar complained about him to the Prophet, but the Prophet said, “I would have done the same if I were in his conditions.”[2] Of course, if nothing occurred to his mind, ‘Umar would follow the Prophet’s Sunna.[3]

Ibn ‘Abbis says, “During the time of the Prophet and Ab£ Bakr and in two years of ‘Umar’s caliphate, if someone divorced his wife three times, it would be considered once. But, ‘Umar considered it three divorces.[4] Milik Ibn Anas, Imim of Milikiyya, narrates, “‘Umar was afraid that a non-Arab would receive inheritance from an Arab unless he was born among Arabs!”[5]

These were the caliph’s personal Idjtihids which were mostly based on his favored “interests”. Temporary marriage during °adjdj and temporary marriage of women are among the main religious affairs allowed by Prophet Mu¦ammad, but banned by the caliph.[6] As we mentioned,

---

[1]. al-Ghad¢r, vol.VI, pp.83-85 from, Sunan Ab£ Diw£d, vol.I, p.53; Sunan Ibn Midja, vol.I, p.200; Musnad A¦mad, vol.IV, p.265; Sunan Nasi’¢, vol.I, pp.59 and 61; Sunan Biyhaq¢, voil.I, p.209 and other sources

[2]. Fut£¦ Mi¥r wa Akhbiruhi, p.249

[3]. Musnad A¦mad, vol.I, pp.190 and 195

[4]. al-Ghad¢r, vol.VIU, pp.178-180 from, Musnad A¦mad, vol.I, p.314; ¯a¦¢¦ Mulsim, vol.I, p.574; Sunan Biyhaq¢, ol.VII, P.336; Mustadrak °ikim, vol.II, p.196; Tafs¢r Qurub¢, vol.III, p.130; Irshid al-sir¢, vol.VIII, p.127; Durr al-manth£r, vol.I, p.279 and other sources

[5]. al-Muwa§§a’, ol.II, p.12

[6]. See the sources in works of the Sunnites in, al-Ghad¢r, vol.VI, pp.198-213 and more, Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.I, pp.716-720

‘Umar believed these affairs were permissible at the time of the Prophet due to certain necessity. Another example is dropping the line “°ayya ‘Ali Khayr al-‘Amal” (Rush to the best deed) from the Adhin[1] whereas people such as ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar and Imim Sadjdjād always said this line in the call to prayers.[2] Word has it that ‘Umar was the first person to initiate the rising of Rama¤in. He did it in the 14th year of °idjra and ordered all towns and cities to do so.[3] This is the same nightly prayers of Rama¤in still common among Sunnis. Because ‘Umar saw himself entitled to such authorities, he issued contradictory rulings in some cases. Such instances can be found in the issue of inheritance.[4]

Such freedom of action in religious affairs could entail more claim of authority in non-religious domains. The caliph did not avoid innovation. The Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n, too, had innovations in solving the mentioned issues but his faithfulness to the wording came first. The sudden expansion of Islamic countries at the time of ‘Umar brought him face to face with numerous problems, so he often tried to find a solution to his problems even if through consultation with the Companions. The collection of such solutions which were first based on the Prophet’s heritage, second on consultations with the Companions and third, on the caliph’s innovations, led to the enlargement of the state authority.

Comparing the successful policy of ‘Umar and Mu‘iwiya with that of Imim ‘Al¢, A¦mad Am¢n says the former two considered themselves free in interpreting religious texts while ‘Al¢ believed in them.[5] Also, Suhayl Zakkir has referred to the point that ‘Umar saw himself entitled to interpret new issues.[6] His instructions to Shuray¦ are also considerable for following the rules.[7]

---

[1]. Imim Sadjdjid(a) said,, “Due to people remaining strong in Dji¦id, ‘Umar removed the sentence, حي علي خيرالعمل “Haste for good deed” From Azin; Kitib al-‘ul£m, vol.I, p.92

[2]. al-S¢rat al-¦alabiyya, vol.II, p.110

[3]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.281

[4]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, vol.I, p.181

[5]. ²ahr al-islim,vol.IV, p.38

[6]. Tir¢kh al-‘arab wa l-islim, p.88

[7]. Djimi‘ al-bayin al-‘ilm wa Fa¤la, vol.II, pp.79-72

As mentioned earlier, one principle of the caliph's thoughts was that he tried to only rely on the Qur'in as proof, so he ignored hadiths. His remark which said, **حسبنا كتاب الله**[1] **"**We relied on the Book of Allih."

This has been cited in many historical and hadith sources and implies nothing other than there is no need for hadith. Of course, this has no contradiction with 'Umar's use of the Prophet's quotations if he could not think of a certain solution. However, in return, he would do something if it were to his interest even if Prophet Mu¦ammad had a special belief in that regard.

One such clear example was a wording about the Imamate of Imim 'Al¢ that was said by the Prophet. Not only 'Umar, but other people from the companions, too, set aside the words due to some expediency they claimed.

Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d says, "I asked my master about texts on the Imamate of 'Al¢ and said, "Is it really possible that they have set aside the Prophet's words?"

He answered, "Those people do not consider caliphate among religious decrees such as daily prayers and fasting, but consider it a worldly affair and an issue like running the land, planning the war and ruling the subjects. In these cases, too, if they saw it to their benefit, they would oppose the word of the Prophet. For example, the Prophet ordered Ab£ Bakr and 'Umar to join the army of Usima, but they refused to do so as they did not see it agreeable to the state interests. These happened during Prophet Mu¦ammad's lifetime, he saw them and did not deny them!... The companions, collectively and individually, neglected many words of Prophet Mu¦ammad and this was due to the interests they saw in doing so such as the shares of **ذوي**

---

[1]. 'Umar said this on Yawm al-kham¢s event when the Prophet asked for pen and paper to write something to prevent people from going astray after he is dead.

About the sources, 'Al¢-Bukhir¢, Kitib al-'Ul£m, Bib Kitib al-'Ul£m; Kitib al-Dji¦id, Bib Hal yastashfa' Ili ahl al-dhamma wa bib Ikhridj al-yah£d min djaz¢ra al-'arab; Kitib hglaghiz¢; Bib mara¤ al-Nab¢; Kitib al-mar¤i, Bib qawl al-mar¢¤: Q£m£ 'Ann¢, kitib hg-l'ti¥im, Bib kirihiyya al-khalif, al-Mu¥annaf, 'Abd al-Razziq, vol.V, p.438 and 439; Musnad A¦mad, vol.I, p.336; Dali'il al-nubuwwa, vol.VII,p.183; Djimi' al-bayin al-'ilm, vol.I, p.77; Kanz al-'Ummil, vol.X,p.292, hadith, 29475; for more sources, Tadw¢n al-sunna al-shar¢fa, Fihrist Mu¥§ala¦it, under, °asbuni kitib Allih

القربى والمؤلفة قلوبهم “Relatives and those whose hearts are captured.”

They acted according to their own will in many issues not mentioned by the Qur’in and the Sunna such as the limit of drinking wine,.... They preferred their interests to the Prophet’s words, saying, “If you find it right, do it...”

As for the Prophet’s words about ‘Al¢, they (in fact, Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar) said that Arabs would not accept his rule due to several reasons. Therefore, they agreed not to give him the power because they saw that Arabs would not obey him. So, they interpreted the Prophet’s words; however, they did not deny the word. They just said someone present can see something which the absent person cannot. The An¥ir’s act, too, helped them. So, they made allegiance with Ab£ Bakr to eliminate the An¥ir’s conspiracy. And later, in the face of ‘Al¢’s protests, they said that he was too young, Arabs would not accept him, ...and that Ab£ Bakr was an old man, he was experienced, Arabs love him, etc. They said if they had chosen ‘Al¢, Arabs would have turned apostate and ...Which way was to their interests? Following the Prophet’s words and getting ready for Arabs’ apostasy and the return of the Dark Age or deviating from the Prophet’s words and safeguarding Islam...People, too, remained silent...

Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d says, “My master, Ab£ Dja‘far Naq¢b, did not believe in Imim and did not obey them. Neither did he accept the words of Shi‘ites fanatics. Yet, he had such an analysis.[1]

At any rate, this point must be taken into consideration that when ‘Umar took the reins of caliphate, it was necessary to expand the administrative organization of the new government. Further conquests and enlargement of the lands under his rule as well as wars and peace deals forced him to forge some laws in order to run his affairs. These measures are listed by Kattin¢ in the book of “al-Tarit¢b al-Idiriyya “ (Administrative Arrangements). Many of his measures took on a jurisprudent aura and in later texts of Sunnis, were used as the basis of Sunnites jurisprudence. Most of his edicts have been collected in the book of “al-Mu¥annaf” by ‘Abd al-Razziq ¯anin¢. Ibn Kath¢r, too, has gathered these edicts in a book entitled “Musnad ‘Umar” (‘Umar’s Throne).

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XII, pp.82-90

It was during his period that for the first time, the title of "Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n" or "Commander of the Faithful" became a common term to refer to the caliph. Before that, he was called "Khil¢fa Ras£l Allih" or the "Caliph of the Prophet". But, according to quotations, he got the title of Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n in the year 17 A.H. from either Mughº¢ra Ibn Shu'ba, Ab£ M£si Ash'ar¢ or 'Ad¢ Ibn °itim.[1]

One the caliph's measures which had an important role in organizing the ruling system and establishing the government was the formation of "D¢wins" in the year 20 A.H.[2] Prophet Mu¦ammad was a pioneer in registering the names of Muslims, especially fighters.[3] 'Umar ordered the registration of the Companions and classified them based on tribal origins and religious records.[4] Then, he divided the huge booties gained during conquests. 'Umar began with the Hishimites and among them, with 'Abd al-Mu§§alib.[5] The policy of the Prophet and Ab£ Bakr differed with 'Umar's policy[6] in that they divided the riches equally while 'Umar's division was based on different tribes and the people's record in Islam. It is said that 'Umar objected to Ab£ Bakr for observing equality.[7] This act of the caliph led to the reinforcement of tribal strata among Arabs based on which, some tribes claimed superiority over others. This remark of Maqdis¢ who has quoted 'Umar as saying that he had learnt justice from Chosroe[8] gives strength to the probability that he had been somehow influenced by the Iranian system of

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.150; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.305; al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.157

[2]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.153

[3]. Tarit¢b al-idiriyya, vol.I, p.227. Some believe the Prophet has initiated preparing administrative tribunal. Ibid. p.228. Some others consider 'Umar's policy in preparing it affected by monarchy system

Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.209. Some people regard it to be influenced by the Sassanid government; al-Fakhr¢, p.38

[4]. Kattin¢ writes in defining administrative tribunal, دفتر يكتب فيه أسماء اهل العطاء والعساكر على القبائل والبطون He had an account book in which he registered names of those who deserve to be gifted according to tribes. Tarit¢b al-idiriyya, vol.I, p.225

[5]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.153

[6]. Tarit¢b al-idiriyya, vol. I, p.226

[7]. °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.II, p.222

[8]. A¦san al-taqis¢m, p.18 .

social classification, though there is no other evidence to prove this claim. Word has said that towards the end of his life, ‘Umar doubted the rightfulness of this method and said if he lived more, he would act equally towards all people.[1]

Also, an accurate date that was necessary for administrative affair was set in ‘Umar’s time. We mentioned elsewhere that during consultations with the companions, he acted according to the opinion of Imim ‘Al¢ based on choosing the date of the Prophet’s °idjra as the beginning date of Muslims’ history. This was a significant step towards creating administrative discipline.

About the sources of the second caliph’s religious and political thoughts, we must note another point. Besides what he had gained from Islamic teachings, ‘Umar tried to enrich his thoughts from other sources, too. One of these sources was the knowledge of the people of the book and Jews had plenty of such knowledge in °idjiz. First of all, we must admit that among different Islamic sects, there is a common accusation about ‘Umar’s use of Jewish knowledge, mostly due to the reason that Jews were greatly despised by the Qur’in and naturally, by Muslims. We should know that the people of the book in general and Jews, in particular, have left some traces in the historical texts and hadiths of Muslims. This influence is more or less seen among almost all sects. Any way, there are some texts available that indicate the people of the book tried to grab a position for themselves in the new society by relying on the knowledge they already possessed and the cultural influence they had inherited from the era of ignorance. Their religious texts had many things in common with Islam and it was on this basis that they claimed to have some knowledge about the interpretation of the Qur’in. Moreover, they said that in the earlier texts, the Prophet’s ordainment had been announced. They went on as far as claiming that in divine books, there had a lot of information about the trend of developments in the Islamic society, the story of caliphs, events and wars. Muslims’ belief in this issue made it much easier for the people of the book. We had better set aside our general discussion in this regard, which has also been reiterated by Ibn Khadl£n[2] and return to our main topic.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.154

[2]. al-Muqaddama, Chapter of the ‘Ilm al-tafs¢r

When the Muslim Muhidjir s came to Medina and Islam spread in the city, the ground was prepared for a cultural relation between Islam and Judaism due to their common origins.

A quotation says, **كانت اليهود يحدثون اصحاب رسول الله** **"**The Jews spoke with the companions of the Prophet (s)." When Prophet Mu¦ammad heard of that, he said, "Do not confirm or deny them."[1] But, it seems that gradually, things got more serious until the Prophet banned the companions from listening to Jews or copying their works.

When he came to Medina, the second caliph decided to use the people of the book to increase his religious and historical knowledge.

He says, "I copied one of the works of the people of the book so as to add to my knowledge." The Prophet was really angered to the extent that the An¥ir shouted, "al-Sili¦! al-Sili¦!", meaning "Weapon! Weapon!"

Then, the Prophet said, "I have brought everything for you."[2] Elsewhere, 'Umar has been quoted as telling Prophet Mu¦ammad, "I came across a "brother from Quray¨a" who copied the Torah for me. Shall I offer it to you?" This question angered the Prophet.[3]

Zuhr¢ says, "°af¥a, 'Umar's daughter and the Prophet's wife, brought to the Prophet a book of stories about Joseph and read out the book. At the same moment, the Prophet's face turned red with anger and he said, "I swear by God that if Joseph and I were among you and you followed him and abandoned me, you would be mistaken."[4] The fact that 'Umar and his daughter tried at the time of the Prophet to read the texts of other religions could not have been a mere incidence. This issue is clarified with the point told by Ibn

---

[1]. al-Mu¥annaf, 'Abd al-Razziq, vol.VI, p.111

[2]. Ibid. vol.XI, p.111; Lisin al-m¢zin, vol.II, p.408; Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.207; Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.IV, pp.48-49; Sunan al-Dirim¢, vol.I, p.116; al-Mu¥annaf, 'Abd al-Razziq, vol.VI, pp.112-113; Madjma' al-zawi'id, vol.I, pp.172-173; Taqy¢d al-'ilm, p.52(in the footnote), Djimi' al-bayin al-'ilm, vol.II, p.42; Usd al-ghiba, vol.IU, p.235; vol.III, p.126; Zamm al-Kalim, p.64

[3]. al-Mu¥annaf, 'Abd al-Razziq, vol.VI, p.113

[4]. al-Mu¥annaf, 'Abd al-Razziq, vol.VI, p.114; vol.XI, p.110

Shahib Zuhr¢ about ‘Umar’s naming as Fir£q, the distinguisher.

He says, “The first people to call ‘Umar as Fir£q were the people of the book while no news has reached us to indicate that the Prophet called him so.”[1]

When ‘Umar came to power, he pondered in this regard with more peace of mind and right at the time when he encountered a Muslim-turned Jew from Yemen, he could benefit from him more. This person was Ka‘b Ibn Miti‘ °imyar ¢ known as Ka‘b al-A¦bir.[2] He converted to Islam after the Prophet’s demise at the time of Ab£ Bakr or ‘Umar and then came to Medina. Later, he took permission from the caliph and headed to Damascus. It seems that his departure to Damascus and at the time of the second caliph, to Bayt al-Muqaddas, was to sign a peace deal with Christians and Ka‘b accompanied him. Ka‘b al-A¦bir died during ‘Uthmin’s caliphate in the year 32 or 33 A.H in the town of °im¥.[3] This is while a tomb with a high dome was built for him in Egypt. Ka‘b al-A¦bir was a trusted and reliable source for centuries and his quotations have filled books of history and interpretation.[4] But currently, given the new researches carried out, the image of Ka‘b al-A¦bir has been shrouded in mystery and has made decision-making difficult for Sunnites scholars and religious men.

Ka‘b al-A¦bir, on the one hand, received the second caliph’s attention and on the other, is an important source for texts known as Israelite in the Islamic culture. These are quotations about the Torah and other Jewish scriptures that have a determining presence in Muslims’ books of history, interpretation, Gnosticism and literature. Ka‘b al-A¦bir and Wahb Ibn Munabba are two main sources of the spread of

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.I, p.66; al-Muntakhab Min Dhiyl al-mudhayyal, p.504, It is quoted from Ka‘b al-A¦bir sayting to Mu‘iwiya, "‘Umar al-Fir£q " is titled in Torah.

Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXI, P.186

[2]. About his life, ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VII, pp.446-447; Tahdh¢b al-kamil, vol.XXIV, p.193; °ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.VI, p.45; Mukhta¥ar Tir ¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXI, pp.181-182; Siyar ’A‘lim al-nubali’, vol.III, p.489

[3]. A¤wi’ ‘ala l-sunna al-mu¦ammadiyya, p.148, footnoteIII

[4]. More than others, Ab£ Na‘¢m I¥fahin¢ has quoted one hundred pages from him under his biography section in °ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.V and VI

Israelite in the Islamic culture. Since the anti-Israelite current gained force among Sunnis, the task of deciding about Ka'b has been made difficult.[1] We should not forget here that twice as much what Ka'b has quoted from earlier books, has been falsely attributed to him by others and he has been exaggerated.

Dhahab¢ says about him, "He had knowledge of Jewish books and had a special talent in recognizing false and true texts."[2] Here, the second caliph's trust in him, despite sufficient evidence, has not been trusted by those who did not believe the Israelites in general and Ka'b, in particular. Ibn Kath¢r says Ka'b al-A¦bir was the best of them (Muslim-turned Jews) who are quoted. He embraced Islam at the time of 'Umar and quoted the people of the book. 'Umar approved some of his quotations because they were truthful.[3] Moreover, 'Umar tried to absorb him. Afterwards, the people quoted many things from him in so far as there were exaggerations and he, too, quoted much falsehood while some of his words were true. Ibn Kath¢r has implicitly admitted that 'Umar helped Ka'b find a place among the people who turned to him. Due to the cultural power of the people of the book, as soon as Ka'b arrived in Medina, people gathered around him and asked him to read them some news about the future events from the books of the predecessors.[4] What made people trust him was that he claimed his words were all based on "the Revealed Book of God". Here, book means the Torah about which Ka'b had told Qays Ibn Kharasha, "The Torah says there is no inch of land other than what happens on it until the Day of Judgment."[5]

Ka'b spread his words among the people by underlining that he was quoting from the "Book of God". Above all, the

---

[1]. In recent times, Ma¦m£d Ab£riyya more than any other researcher has talked about negative role of Ka'b al-A¦bir and the like on outbreak of the Israelites. A¤wi' 'ala l-sunna al-mu¦ammadiyya, pp.145-194

[2]. Siyar 'A'lim al-nubali', vol.II, p.490

[3]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.II, p.123

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, pp.326-328; Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXV, p.315

[5]. A¤wi' 'ala l-sunna al-mu¦ammadiyya, p.148; quoted from Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Biyhaq¢ as well as al-Ist¢'ib, vol.II, p.533; al-islim wa l-°i¤ira al-'arabiyya, p.164

second caliph benefited from him and his knowledge. There are several instances to prove this. Hishim Kalb¢ says, “There was famine at the time of ‘Umar. Ka‘b al-A¦bir told him, “When the same situation occurred for the Israelian tribe, they resorted to their prophet’s Household and said the prayer for rain.

This advice led ‘Umar to ask ‘Abbis to say this prayer.”[1] Another quotation says ‘Umar asked Ka‘b to talk about “death” for him. While Ka‘b was elaborating on death, tears rolled down the caliph’s cheeks.[2] In another case, ‘Umar asked him, which of Adam’s sons had offspring and he talked in this regard in detail.[3]

When ‘Umar wanted to travel to Iraq, Ka‘b told him, “Do not go to Iraq because the genies are there, as are their men and nine-tenth of sorcery, too.”[4]

The quotation of Sayf Ibn ‘Umar says that during the outbreak of plague, ‘Umar called on his courtiers to guide him about different cities. Ka‘b said the following about Iraq in response to ‘Umar’s seeking consultation.[5]

According to ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mas‘£d who met ‘Umar with Ka‘b, Ka‘b said, “Allow me to tell you the sweetest thing which I have read in “The Books of Prophets”. With ‘Umar’s approval, Ka‘b al-A¦bir quoted parts of the book which is more than a page.[6] ‘Umar asked Ka‘b to tell him about Ka‘ba and he said, “God sent down to earth a hollow sapphire[7] and …” In another occasion, Ka‘b was sitting in the mosque when ‘Umar entered and asked him to intimidate him and others.

He said, “O Ka‘b! Frighten us!”[8]

‘Umar said, “Prophet Mu¦ammad told me, “My greatest fear for my Umma is from the side of misleading Imim.”

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, al-djuz’ al-thilith, p.7

[2]. °ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.VI, p.44 vol.V, p.365

[3]. al-Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.26

[4]. °ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.VI, p.23; al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.XI, p.251

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp.59-60

[6]. °ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.V, p.391

[7]. Tir¢kh makka, vol.I, p.40

[8]. °ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.V, pp.391, 381 and 371; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXI, p.185

Ka‘b said, “I swear by God that fear for the Umma is from no one other than them.”[1] Another quotation says once at the time of ‘Umar, Ka‘b stood up and asked, “What was the last word of your Prophet?”

‘Umar said, “Ask ‘Al¢.”

And ‘Al¢ answered, “While his blessed head was resting on my shoulder, he said, “Prayers, prayers.”

Ka‘b said, “This is the last oath of all prophets to which they have been obliged and ordained.”[2]

Ka‘b wanted to show himself well-versed in all books of prophets and in other cases, to make people accept what he said. Apparently later, some people noticed the problem that they could not rely on the distorted Torah. Therefore, how could they accept the words of Ka‘b? To solve this issue, it was made up that Ka‘b used a Torah which had not been distorted. In the final hours of his life, Ka‘b ordered someone to throw that book of Torah into the sea. His justification was that he was afraid some people would use that book as a base for their reasoning. After narrating this story, Dhahab¢ says, “Now, this Torah is not in our hands and after that, we cannot rely on the existing book of Torah.”[3] However at the same time, Ibn ‘Abbis rejected the Torah as distorted and cautioned people against asking questions from the people of the book.[4]

Another narration says ‘Umar had ordered someone to be lashed as punishment. When he was being lashed, he said, “Sub¦in Allih” or “Praise be to God”. ‘Umar told the executioner to stop the lashing. Ka‘b al-A¦bir burst into laughter.

‘Umar said, “Why do you laugh?”

Ka‘b answered, “I swear by God that Sub¦in Allih is a mitigation of divine punishment.”[5] In another case, ‘Umar and Ka‘b were standing.

---

[1]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXI, p.181; Ma‘rifat al-¥a¦iba, vol.I, p.233

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.II, p.262

[3]. Siyar ’A‘lim al-nubali’, vol.III, pp.393-394 quoted from Tir¢kh Ibn Abi l-Khaythama

[4]. al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.VI, pp.110 and 112

[5]. °ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.V, p.390

°u§ay’a, the poet, recited a poem which said, “Someone who does a good deed, his reward will never be wasted because “the good deed” is ever lasting between God and his people.”

Ka‘b said, “By God that it says the same thing in the Torah.”[1]

Once, ‘Umar asked Ka‘b al-A¦bir about different cities.

He said, “When God created the word and what is in it, Wisdom said, “I shall go to Iraq.” Knowledge said, “I shall be with you.” Wealth said, “I go to Damascus.” Trouble said, “I am with you.”[2]

In another occasion, Ka‘b al-A¦bir entered the court of ‘Umar and sat down at some distance from him. ‘Umar asked him why he had done so. Ka‘b pointed to the wisdom of Luqmin and said, “One should not sit close to a person of power because someone else may enter the assembly who is more endeared; then, you will have to sit back a little. This way, you will be belittled.”[3]

‘Umar asked Ka‘b, “How does knowledge leave the mind of someone who has learnt it?”

Ka‘b responded, “Through greed and stretching one’s hand out to the people.”[4]

Once again, Ka‘b told ‘Umar, “Woe unto the “Sultan of the Earth” from the “Sultan of the Heaven”?”

‘Umar said, “Unless for someone who checks himself.”

Ka‘b said, “I swear by God that this has been mentioned in the Torah exactly.”[5] In another occasion, ‘Umar asked Ka‘b

---

[1]. °ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.I, p.44; Al_Ma¦isin wa l-masiw¢, vol.,I, p.123

[2]. Mu‘djam al-buldin, vol.,I, p.48; al-Munta¨am, vol.VIII, P.70

[3]. Bahdjat al-madjilis, vol.I, p.48; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXI, p.185; al-Djawhar al-naf¢s f¢ siyisa al-ri’¢s, p.114

[4]. Bahdjat al-madjilis, vol.I, p.159

[5]. Bahdjat al-madjilis, ol.I, p.368; °ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.V, p.389; Tir¢kh al-khulafi’, p.125

Ka‘b’s policy was that when ‘Umar or Ab£ Hurayra or others spoke against his taste, he said, “The very word is cited in the Torah. He said about Ab£ Hurayra, “I have never seen anyone like Ab£ Hurayra who has not read the Torah but his words accord with it this much.

´A¤wi’ ‘ala l-sunna al-mu¦ammadiyya, p.207 from Ta¤kira al-¦uffi¨

al-A¦bir to tell him about virtue.[1] Once ‘Umar told Ka‘b who was seeking permission to go to Damascus, “Do not leave Medina which is the place of the Prophet’s °idjra and his city of burial.” Ka‘b said he had read in the Revealed Book of Allih that Damascus was God’s treasure upon the earth.[2] In another case, a verse was discussed, **كُلَّمَا نَضِجَتْ جُلُودُهُمْ بَدَّلْنَاهُمْ جُلُودًا غَيْرَهَا**.[3] “Whatsoever their skin is fried, it is replaced with a new one to taste the pain.”

Ka‘b said, “I have an interpretation about this verse which dates back to the period before the advent of Islam.”

‘Umar said, “Say it, but we will confirm your words only when they conform to those of the Prophet (s).”

Ka‘b said, “It means I will change their skin a hundred times each hour.”

‘Umar said, “I heard the same thing from the Prophet (s)!”[4]

In Bayt al-Muqaddas, ‘Umar asked Ka‘b about the location of the “¯akhra” and he talked in this regard in detail.[5]

Despite these examples, only Ab£ Zur‘a Dimashq¢ has quoted ‘Umar as telling Ka‘b, “Quit the narration of “°ad¢th al-Uwal”)the first hadith(or I shall banish you to the land of apes!”[6] In another case, in continuation of a report from a follower of another religion talking about the traits of the caliphs in the Torah, ‘Umar has been quoted as having cautioned people against quoting the people of the book.[7] Also, once ‘Umar heard that someone in K£fa had the book

---

[1]. Maqimit al-‘Ulami’ bayn yaday al-khulafi’ wa l-’Umari’, p.163

[2]. al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.XI, p.251

Ka‘b praised Damascus very much in front of Medina and Mecca. This is somewhat religiously and Jewishly rooted and is of a political motive to some extent for strengthening Mu‘iwiya. They may have been later fabricated by the Umayya.

[3]. Nisi’, p.56

[4]. °ilyat al-awliyi’, vol.V, p.375

[5]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VII, p.59

[6]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya vol.VIII, p.110, Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXI, p.187

Ab£riyya has said accordingly, “‘Umar initially paid attention to his speech but later he found his weakness. ‘A¤wi’, p.152-153. As mentioned in the context, there are plenty of examples showing ‘Umar’s giving him freedom of speech.

of Daniel. ‘Umar called him to Medina and afterwards, that person agreed to burn whatever he had.[1] Such a position, even if existed, was not so firm towards Ka‘b and the instances mentioned earlier, are proofs to our opinion. Once Ka‘b came to ‘Umar and asked permission to read the Torah. ‘Umar answered, “If you know that this is the same Torah sent down by God upon Moses in Mount Sinai, then read it day and night.”[2]

During these consultations, once ‘Umar noticed that Ka‘b had not given up his Jewish thoughts yet. In the year that ‘Umar went to Bayt al-Muqaddas, Ka‘b accompanied him. On this journey when there were talks with others including a monk,[3] ‘Umar asked Ka‘b to determine the place of the mosque of Bayt al-Muqaddas. So, he asked Ka‘b, “In your opinion, in which direction should we place the altar?”

Ka‘b said, “Towards the ¯akhra (Jewish Qibla).”

‘Umar said, “You speak in favor of Jews! I also saw that upon entering the mosque, you took off your shoes.”[4] However, even after that, Ka‘b’s position remained the same to the caliph.

One interesting point here is the claim of Ka‘b al-A¦bir and the people of the book about finding the name and characteristics of the second caliph in previous divine books. ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mas‘£d has been quoted as saying, “‘Umar was riding a horse when it suddenly threw him off. At that moment, ‘Umar’s thigh was revealed. The people of Nadjrin who saw a black mole on his thigh said, “This is the same person who, our books say, drives us out of our homeland.”[5]

---

[7]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.,III, p.1081

[1]. al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.,VI, p.114

[2]. Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.IV, p.262; al-Fi’iq f¢ Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.I, p.651, إن كنت تعلم أن فيه التوراة التي أنزلها الله على موسى عليه السلام بطور سيناء فاقرأها آناء الليل والنهار

[3]. °ilyat al-awliyi’, vol.VI, p.7

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VII, pp.57 and 650, al-Manir al-mun¢f, pp.89-90; ‘A¤wi’, pp.166-167. Once Ibn ‘Abbis hearing Ka‘b speak, اما تركت اليهودية؟ Al-Kif al-shif, p.139 quoted from, ‘A¤wi’, p.165

[5]. Ma‘rifat al-¥a¦iba, vol.I, p.205(in its footnote); al-Mu‘djam al-kab¢r, vol.I, p.20; Madjma‘ al-zawi’id, vol.IX, p.61; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.336

Later, Wahb Ibn Munabba claimed that ‘Umar’s description had been mentioned in the Torah.[1] Aqra‘ who was ‘Umar’s Mu’adhdhin, says, “The caliph sent me to fetch the bishop. I brought him so that he sat under the same shade with ‘Umar.

‘Umar asked the bishop, “Have you seen my name in your books?”

The bishop replied, “Yes.”

‘Umar inquired, “How?”

The bishop answered, “Like a horn!”

‘Umar lifted his lash and said, “What is on my horn?”

The bishop said, “An iron horn, reliable and strong.”

‘Umar asked, “Who succeeds to caliphate after me?”

The bishop answered, “A righteous caliph who sacrifices his life for his relatives.”

‘Umar asked, “Who is next after him?”

The bishop said, “A righteous caliph who has drawn out his sword has shed blood!”[2] Although this narration is unknown, first of all, it is likely that its beginning part is correct and the bishop said these things only about ‘Umar. Second, even despite being an entire fabrication, those people have been mentioned by other bishops and those familiar with the pre-Islamic books.

Ibn Shubba say s, “During ‘Umar’s journey to Damascus, an old man approached the army on the way and complained about heavy taxes. He asked to talk to the caliph.

±al¦a asked him, “Have you found the news of the caliph’s descent in your books?”

He said, “Yes, we know the descriptions of your chief and the one before him as well as your prophet.” Then, he

---

[1]. Ma‘rifat al-¥a¦iba, vol.I, p.213

[2]. Tir¢khh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1078-1079; Tir¢khh al-khulafi’, p.121

Someone who forged the news had a moderate belief towards ‘Uthmin and ‘Al¢ (a). In a similar quotation we read, ‘Umar sent for Ka‘b al-A¦bir and he was asked, “How do find my attributes in Torah?”

°ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.VI, pp.25-26

mentioned those traits one by one![1] Amil¢ Mu¦ammad Ibn °ab¢b has been quoted as saying that Ibn ‘Abbis said, “Towards the end of his caliphate, ‘Umar wished death for himself.

One day when I was with him, he asked Ka‘b al-A¦bir, “I see my death close. First, what is your opinion about ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib and second, what do you find in this regard in your books, because you believe that our affairs have been written in your books?”

Ka‘b said, “In my opinion, ‘Al¢ is not suitable for his job because he is a strictly religious man. He does not overlook any mistake, does not act to his Idjtihid and this way, he cannot control his subjects. But, what we find in our books is that the government does not fall to him or his sons.”

‘Umar said, “Then, who gets the rule?”

Ka‘b al-A¦bir said, “We find it so that after the believer in Shar¢‘a and two of his companions, the government will reach those people with whom the Prophet (s) has fought over the principle of religion,[2] that is the Umayya.” Also in another occasion, someone from the people of the book came to ‘Umar and said, “ Oh, King of Arab, greetings upon you.”

‘Umar asked, “Has such a thing been mentioned in your books? Has it not been said that the “Prophet” comes, then the “caliph” and then “Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n”?”

He said, “Yes.”[3] This quotation is evidently a mere lie. At the time of ‘Uthmin, Ka‘b al-A¦bir responded to someone who had said in a poem that after ‘Uthmin, ‘Al¢ would come to power.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp.1079-1080

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XII, pp.80-81; elsewhere it is quoted that the Jews came to ‘Umar and said, “A verse has been called to you, if it were called to us, we would celebrate the day of call. The verse reads, **الْيَوْمَ** أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ... I complemented your religion.

‘Umar said, “Yes, I do remember that thr verse was sent on the day of "‘Arafa"(9th of Dh¢ °adjdja) to the Prophet!!

al-Qand f¢ tirikh Samarqand, pp.434-435

[3]. al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, vol.VII, p.529

He said, “You are lying. The caliphate will go to Mu‘iwiya.”[4]

According to historians, Ka‘b deviated from Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and Imim, too, introduced him as a “Liar.”[2] Ka‘b said he had read the news of the cities’ conquests in the Torah and that these conquests would take place at the hands of a righteous man.[3]

‘Umar’s familiarity with the people of the book, especially his friendship with Ka‘b, caused him to sometimes say something or take an action by relying on what the people of the book said.

One of the companions says, “Prophet Mu¦ammad (s) had said the afternoon prayers. After that, a man stood up to say prayers. ‘Umar grasped him by his clothes and said, “Sit down.” The people of the book were lost because there was no rest between their prayers.”[4] Also, the caliph’s important decision in preventing the Prophet’s hadiths from being written down was made under the influence of the people of the book.[5]

Zuhr¢ quotes ‘Urwa Ibn Zubayr as saying, “‘Umar decided to write down the hadiths and Sunna of the Prophet (s). He consulted the companions in this regard. They all agreed. ‘Umar thought about the decision for a month and then said, “I have thought about it. I saw that before you, the people of the book had written books on the book of God and relied on them. As a result, they abandoned the book of God. But, I will not cover the book of God with anything else.”[6]

---

[4]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.24-25; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV., p.434; al-Nizi‘ wa l-takhi¥um, p.78; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.495, No.1278; al-Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.208; al-Kimil wa l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.123

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.77

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.228

[4]. Usd al-ghiba, vcol.V, p.199

[5]. Bu¦£th ma‘a ahl al-sunna wa l-salafiyya, p.97; al-¯a¦¢¦ Min S¢ra al-Nab¢ ’A‘¨am (s), vol.I, p.27

[6]. Taqy¢d al-‘ilm, p.50(in its footnote); Djimi‘ al-bayin al-‘ilm, vol.I, p.64; Kanz al-‘Ummil, vol.V, p.239; Dham al-kalim, p.63; in another manner in, Taqy¢d al-‘ilm, p.51; Ta¤kira al-¦uffi¨, vol.I, p.5; Kanz al-‘Ummil, vol.I, p.174

Another quotation says ‘Umar gathered what others had written and set them all on fire and said,**أمنية كأمنية أهل الكتاب** He aspires as people of the Book do.[1] And in another quotation, **مثناة كمثناة أهل الكتـاب**his deviation resembles that of people’s of the Book. [2]

At any rate, despite the Prophet’s clear ban on reading the works of the people of the book – obvious example of which was addressed to ‘Umar, himself[3] – unfortunately some people freely spread these ideas. It is interesting that besides spreading these thoughts, the writing and narration of the hadiths was prevented.[4] In order to complete this plan one side of which was the permission for spreading Jewish thoughts and the other one was blocking the narration of the hadith, a hadith was narrated, or in better words, was fabricated which quoted Prophet Mu¦ammad as saying, “Do not write any of my words and instead, narrate anything you want from the people of Israel.”[5] This is while people such as Ibn ‘Abbis and Ibn Mas‘£d openly voiced concern over the accessibility of the works of the people of the book for Muslims and rejected them.[6]

One of the phenomena which was created in this period and whose origin should be considered as a consequence of the spread of the Israelite, was story telling. Certain people known as “Qi¥”, the story- tellers quoted the historical-religious stories of Jews and used them as the interpretation of the historical verses of the Qur’in. Their main source for these stories was the Torah and the verbal quotations common among Jewish and Christian scribes. These people made speeches for the people before and after the public

---

[1]. Taqy¢d al-‘ilm, p.52

[2]. Haraw¢ says, “ One of the people of the book was asked about the meaning of "Mathnit". He said, “The Jewish scribes made up a book, after Moses, and called it "Mathnit".

Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.IV, p.282

[3]. Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.IV, pp.48-49; vol.III, pp.28-29

[4]. Ab£ Hurayra says, “As long as ‘Umar lived, we never dared say, قال رسول الله The Prophet(s) said, al-Bidiya wa’l-nihiya, vol.VIII, p.110

[5]. Taqy¢d al-‘ilm, p.31 لا تكتبوا عني شيئاً الا القرآن... وحدثوا عن بني اسرائيل ولا حرج Quote me just about Quran and unworriedly speak about Ban£ Isri‘¢l

[6]. Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.IV, p.48; ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.VI, pp.110,112

prayers. This phenomenon did not exist at the time of the Prophet (s) and Ab£ Bakr, but became common at the time of the second caliph, with his permission and continued later on. The phenomenon of story-telling raised positive and negative reactions among the companions (¯a¦iba) and the followers (Tibi‘¢n) which we have elaborated on in a special book.[1] What is concerned here is that for the first time, Tam ¢m al-Dir¢ began story-telling with the permission of the second caliph.[2] ‘Umar allowed him to preach through story-telling before the Friday prayers sermons. Later, ‘Uthmin allowed him to do so twice a week.[3] Tam¢m al-Dir¢ was a Christian-turned-Muslim and many stories have been narrated about his virtue. This became the basis of a kind of Christian-style piety later greatly spread in the Islamic society.

Examples of these pious people who constantly quoted news from Jews and Christian monks, are abundant in the book of “°il¢yat al-Awl¢ya” by Ab£ Na‘¢m l¥fahin¢. It has been said that Tam¢m al-Dir¢ had learnt his stories in the synagogues of Damascus and from the preachers of that land.[4] Also, another person named ‘Ubayd Ibn ‘Umayr was permitted to tell stories at the time of ‘Umar.[5] We will see later that Imim ‘Al¢ (a) was seriously opposed to story-telling.

‘UMAR’S MURDER

According to some quotations, especially what has been narrated by ±abar¢, some people have claimed that ‘Umar was murdered with the plot of Ka‘b al-A¦bir. This news has been raised in different forms and it seems that anyone has changed it in a particular way. Historians and narrators of

---

[1].Pazh£hish¢ darbiriyi naqshih d¢n¢ wa ldjtimi‘¢ qi¥¥l khinin dar tir ¢kh Islam, Qum, 1991

[2]. Musnad A¦mad, vol.III, p.449; al-Qu¥¥i¥ wa l-mudhakkir¢n, p.22; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.V, p.321; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.I, p.186

[3]. al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.III, p.219; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.I, p.11; al-Khi§a§ al-maqr¢ziyya, vol.II, p.253; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.V, p.321

[4]. al-Mufa¥¥al f¢ tir¢kh al-‘arab qabl al-islim, vol.VIII, p.378

[5]. al-Qu¥¥i¥ wa l-mudhakkir¢n, p.22

Sunnites hadiths brought this news in their books for centuries, but they believed so much in the predictions and reports of Ka‘b and people like him that they did not have the least suspicion about Ka‘b’s role in the caliph’s murder. Djiɬi¨ who is a rationalist critic, has this opinion about what Ka‘b has narrated from the Torah (although there is no such thing in the Torah), I believe that many of these reports which have been quoted with phrases such as “We find them in the books” or “written in the Torah”, have in fact been taken from the “Book of prophets” and works from the books of Solomon and Isaiah, the prophet. If the stories quoted from him about the characteristics of ‘Umar, are from him (because he, himself, did not fabricate news), the problem cannot be solved unless with our justification.[1] Therefore, Djiɬi¨ Mu‘tazil¢, too, has not been able to have any doubts about Ka‘b al-Aɬbir. At any rate, forecasting ‘Umar’s murder before the actual incident and the opinion that Ka‘b had seen the news in previous books did not attract the attention of the Prophet’s companions and other Muslims and it is only in recent years that something has been said in this regard.

In our opinion, there is doubt about the truthfulness of what has been said by Ka‘b. What has led to the linking of this fabricated news to Ka‘b was nothing but the interest of some simple-minded people in the point that the caliph’s martyrdom has been mentioned in the Torah or other books, especially that the title of “martyr” has been particularly emphasized. Moreover, many stories have been quoted in different sources saying that others had reported on ‘Umar’s murder. Some of them have been collected by Ibn Sa‘d and most of them have been related to “the invisible voice” or “genie”. They said, for example, a voice could be heard reading a poem and saying the news but no one could be seen.[2] What has come in certain texts is that Ka‘b had told the caliph before his murder that he had found him a just and martyred Imim in the Torah.

‘Umar had said, “How will he be martyred in Medina?” [3]

---

[1]. al-°ayawin, vol.IV, pp.202-203

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, pp.334-374, Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp.888-891

[3]. °ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.V, p.388, vol.VI, p.13; See the detailed form in, Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.392; Tir¢kh al-khulafi’, p.133

After ‘Umar received a deadly blow at the mosque, Ka‘b came to him and said, “Didn’t I tell you that you are a martyr?” [1]

If the news ended here, there would be no problem, but Ibn Sa‘d has another quotation from Sa‘d al-Djir¢, ‘Umar’s freed slave, Umm Kulth£m told ‘Umar, “Ka‘b, the Jew, says, “‘Umar is standing at one of the doors of hell.” ‘Umar sent for Ka‘b. Ka‘b came to him and said, “I swear by God that Dhi l-°adjdja will not pass unless you are in heaven.”

‘Umar said, “How is it that once I am standing at the gate of hell and the other time, I’m in heaven?”

Ka‘b said, “We have found in the Book of God that you are standing at the door of hell and do not let anyone in, but after you die, people will again go to hell!” [2]

We think what reveals the importance of the matter is a narration by Ibn Sa‘d. He has quoted Ka‘b as telling ‘Umar, “In the tribe of Israel, there was a king who reminds us of you when we think of him. There was a prophet at the time of the king.

Once he told the king, “Write down your will. You will die three days later.”

The king said, “God! If you see that I am doing justice in my rule and obey you in the affairs, increase my life until my son grows up and my Umma increases in number.”

God conveyed these words to his prophet and said, “I added fifteen years to his life.”

After ‘Umar was wounded, Ka‘b told him, “If you ask, God will keep you alive.”

The news reached ‘Umar but ‘Umar said, “God, take my life at a time when I am not blamed and disabled.” [3]

In our opinion, this news has been distorted and it seems as if three days before ‘Umar’s murder (which in fact was three days before ‘Umar’s death and after his being wounded), Ka‘b had told him, “You will die within three days, so ask God not to die.” Interestingly, it has been said that

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.342; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.XII, p.191; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.40

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.322; Tir¢kh al-khulafi’, p.140; °ilyat al-awl¢yi’, vol.VI, p.23

[3]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.354; Tir¢kh al-Khulafi’, p.154

Ka‘b came on the second day and said, “One day is left.” This news seems to be right.

Now, let’s go to ±abar¢’s report which is the distorted form of the original news and has been quoted from Miswar Ibn Makhrama. He says, “After Ab£ Lu’lu’’s negotiations with ‘Umar over his taxes and ‘Umar’s request from him for building a mill, Ab£ Lu’lu’ threatened him sarcastically.

The day after that, Ka‘b al-A¦bir went to the caliph and said, “Make your will; you will die three days from now.”

‘Umar asked, “Have you seen my name in the Torah?”

Ka‘b said, “No, but I’ve seen your description and that your life has come to its end.”

‘Umar did not feel any pain.

The next day, Ka‘b came and said, “One day of the three days has passed and two days remain.” Again, Ka‘b came the other day and said, “Two days are gone and one day and one day are left.” The next morning, Ab£ Lu’lu’ attacked ‘Umar at the mosque and dealt six blows on him.[1]

The above news is evident in that Ka‘b knew of ‘Umar’s murder beforehand, but when this news is compared with that of Ibn Sa‘d, we realize that the story was such, Having adopted the news of the Israelian king and the prophet of his time, Ka‘b came to ‘Umar after he had been wounded and told him that story from the Torah and the three days. Incidentally, ‘Umar passed away on the third day after being injured. However later, the news underwent some changes to sound unnatural. This could have been intentional to gain some credit for the caliph by relying on Muslims’ fascination with the divine news of the people of scriptures. The quotation that after ‘Umar’s injury, Ka‘b had told him if he called on God to delay his death, He would do so[2], is a proof to the comparison made by Ka‘b between ‘Umar and the

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.191; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.26; Nihiyat al-’irab, vol.XIX, p.374.

The same report is quoted by Ibn Shabba with a little difference. ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z Ibn ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf

is the person commonly mentioned in Tir¢kh al-§abar¢’s and Ibn Shabba’s references.

Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.891

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.361; ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.X, p.225

Israelian king. Out of his interests in the caliph, Ka‘b advised him to ask God to delay his death so that he could live for fifteen more years.

As said earlier, despite the existence of quotations from ±abar¢ and others, historians did not have any suspicions about Ka‘b al-A¦bir. We believe that the true story was something else but the reason for the historian’s belief in Ka‘b was their real trust in him and the caliph’s virtues. Meanwhile, some of the new Sunnites researchers who are influenced by anti-Israelism have ignored ‘Umar’s trust in Ka‘b and have interpreted the above-mentioned news as a Jewish plot to murder ‘Umar.[1] One of these writers has named Ka‘b al-A¦bir as the mastermind of ‘Umar’s murder, saying he had instigated Ab£ Lu’lu’ to kill ‘Umar. His sources are the news of ±abar¢ and the quotation mentioned by Ibn Ath¢r from ±abar¢.[2]

About the caliph’s murder, what has been clearly reported in history indicates that this issue was solely related to ‘Umar and Ab£ Lu’lu’ and the motive behind the act was, at least it appears so, that the murderer felt some injustice had been done to him and he had been overcharged. He complained to ‘Umar in this regard. But, the caliph said that the money taken from him was not so much compared to his abilities and skills and naturally, his income. Some time later, the assassination occurred and it could be natural that the incident was totally related to the argument which had taken place earlier between the murderer and the caliph.

Mas‘£d¢ reports the incident as such, ‘Umar did not allow non-Arabs to arrive in Medina.[3]

---

[1]. It seems Ab£riyya, before everyone else, has mentioned this thanks to Tir¢kh al-§abar¢’s reports. ’A¤wi’ ‘ala l-sunna al-Mu¦ammadiyya, pp.153-155; Fi l-‘ub£r al-¦i¤ir¢ "Ka‘b al-A¦bir", pp.200-204

[2].Athar ahl al-kitib fi l-fitan wa l-¦ur£b al-ahliyya, pp.237,240

[3]. According to sources, ‘Umar never let mature Arabs enter Medina. As a matter of fact, the same man who was permitted to enter Medina, embraced on killing the caliph. Afterwards, ‘Umar reproached those who agreed on entering of these people into Medina and called them his murder.

Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.889,903,904; al-Nihiya f¢ Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.III, p.286.

Those disagreeing with him said that Medina would be renewed just because of entry of the ‘Alwadj.

Mugh¢ra wrote to him, “I have a servant who has been a painter, blacksmith and carpenter and can be useful for the people of Medina. If you agree, I shall send him to you.” ‘Umar agreed and Ab£ Lu’lu’ came to Medina. Mugh¢ra got two dhms from him per day. Once, Ab£ Lu’lu’ went to ‘Umar and complained about the heavy tax.

‘Umar said, “What works do you do?”

Ab£ Lu’lu’ explained his works as a painter, ironsmith and carpenter.

‘Umar said, “Considering the jobs you do, your tax is not so much.”

After a few days, ‘Umar asked Ab£ Lu’lu’ to build a windmill for him. Ab£ Lu’lu’ said he would build such a windmill for ‘Umar that all people would talk about it! ‘Umar smelled threat from these words but said nothing. It was after this encounter that Ab£ Lu’lu’ murdered ‘Umar at dawn in a mosque. He injured twelve others six of whom died later. Then, he killed himself with a sword.[1] Mas‘£d¢ said Ab£ Lu’lu’ was a Jew but some sources have termed him as a Christian.[2] This story shows that the murder was personally motivated.[3]

Ab£ Lu’lu’ has been quoted as saying that apparently, after ‘Umar did not respond to his protest, he said, “How is it that the caliph’s justice covers everyone except me?”[4] Among his motives, one can also notice the point that Ab£ Lu’lu’ wanted to take revenge in this way because Iranians felt defeated at the hands of Muslims. However, there is no proof for this claim.

There are several possibilities about who had incited Ab£ Lu’lu’. One is ‘Ubayd Allih, the son of ‘Umar. Claiming that Hurmuzin was Ab£ Lu’lu’ accomplice in the incident and he had seen them together the previous day, ‘Ubayd Allih killed Hurmuzin as well as Ab£ Lu’lu’’s wife and daughter. He had

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, pp.320-321; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.888; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.345; Ibn Dj£z¢, Maniqib ‘Umar, p.210

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p.190

[3]. Therefore, it seems unjust for any sect to defend him, although some traditionally knew him a Muslim, believing that his murder arises from religious differences. al-Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.194

[4]. °ayat al-¦ayawin, vol.I, p.51

no reason for this act and naturally, had to be killed as Qi¥ i¥, retaliation for the murder of three people for whose blood there was no supporter but the government. Even Ya‘qub¢ says ‘Umar had recommended that ‘Ubayd Allih receive the Qi¥i¥![1] But ‘Uthmin did not agree and said, “People will say, yesterday they killed the father and today, the son.[2]

The second guess coming from the caliph, himself, was that maybe some of the Muhidjir£n were involved in the murder. So, he sent Ibn ‘Abbis to them and asked, **أعن ملأ منكم؟** “Did you order my murder?” And they said, **معاذ الله! ما علمنا وما اطلعنا** [3] **“**God forbid! We did not know and were not aware of it.”

The date of the caliph’s passing has been reported as the 26th or 27th of Dhi l-°adjdja in the year 23 A.H whereas, he was only 55 years old.[4] Although elsewhere, Mu‘iwiya! has been quoted as saying that he was 63 years old.[5] This forging may have been done to show that he died at the same age of Prophet Mu¦ammad (s).

In his last days when he had been wounded, ‘Umar seemed not be so satisfied with his worldly life. He repeatedly said, **يا ليتني لم أك شيئاً، ليت لم تلدني أمي، ليتني كنت نسياً، يا ليتني كنت حائكاً اعيش من عمل يدي** [6]**“** I wish I were nothing. I wish my mother had not given birth to me. I wish I had been forsaken. I wish I were a weaver and would earn my own living.”

CONTINUED CONQUESTS IN DAMASCUS AND EGYPT

---

[1]. Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.161

[2]. Tir¢kh Guz¢dih, p.186

[3]. Tir¢kh Guz¢dih, p.184; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.348; ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.VI, p.52; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.904

[4]. Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma‘irif, p.183; For other sources, Ma‘rifat al-¥a¦iba, vol.I, from 194 on.

[5]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayya§, p.53

[6]. al-zuhd wa l-raqi’iq, pp.79-80,145,146; Bahdjat al-madjilis, vol.II, p.399; °ayit al-¥a¦aba, vol.II, p.115; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, pp.360-361; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.920; Shiykh Muf¢d, al-Amil¢, p.50

After conquering Damascus, the conquests continued in Damascus. The consecutive victories of Muslim Arabs forced many cities to ask for peace beforehand as they could gain more concessions. The city of Ba‘labakk was peacefully conquered in the year 15th A.H. After that, in the month of Rab¢‘ al-Thin¢ the same year, the city of °im¥ which was considered one of the biggest cities of Damascus, was invaded by Muslims. According to Balidhur¢, the people of °im¥ who witnessed the escape of Heraclitos from their city and were aware of the repeated victories of Muslims and their patience and perseverance, took refuge inside the city after a brief encounter outside the town and called for mercy from Muslims. In the peace deal concluded, in addition to guarantees for their life and properties, it was agreed that the city wall and churches would remain intact. Only a quarter of the Johannes church was excluded for the construction of a mosque. Muslims, too, settled down in deserted areas and in houses abandoned by their owners.[1]

At that time, Ab£ ‘Ubayda divided the governorship of different regions among army commanders. Yaz¢d Ab¢ Sufyin was chosen for ruling Damascus, Shura¦b¢l Ibn °asana for Jordan, ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ for Palestine and ‘Ubayda Ibn ¯imit for °im¥. Ab£ ‘Ubayda, himself, set off towards °umit and Shayzar for expanding the conquests. Heraclitos who had now lost key centers in Damascus, once again tried to organize a huge army of Romans, Damascus people, the people of °idjiz and Armenians besides the Arab tribes of Djudhim, Lakhm and others to fight Muslims. In historical sources, these tribes have been named as “al-Musta‘raba”.[2] This big war took place at the Yarm£k region which was the name of a river. Muslims are said to have numbered at 24000 and the Roman army and its allies at 200000. But, one should not forget that Heraclitos did a last-ditch effort to keep Damascus. This war was so tough for Muslims that even Muslim women had to fight.[3]

The Yarm£k battle ended in Muslims’ victory and following his defeat, Heraclitos left for Constantinople. In this

---

[1]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.137

[2]. Ibid. p.140

[3]. Ibid. p.141

war, Djabala Ibn 'Ayham commanded the frontline army of Rome. There are different stories in various sources about whether he had converted to Islam or not, why he had taken offence from 'Umar and why 'Umar had repented from his treatment of him.[1]

One year after the Yarm£k battle, Muslims succeeded in surrounding Bayt al-Muqaddas. Ab£ 'Ubayda first invited them to either accept Islam or pay Djaz¢yya (poll tax paid in lieu of conversion to Islam). But, when they refused, they had to lay a siege on the city. The Nazarene community of the city, who found the situation critical, gave in to a compromise, provided that the caliph would come to al-Quds and sign the contract personally.[2] 'Umar was doubtful about going to Quds. So, he consulted some of the Companions. 'Uthmin was opposed to the idea, but in the presence of Imim 'Al¢ (a), he encouraged 'Umar to go, saying it was to the benefit of Islam and Muslims. 'Umar accepted his idea. After appointing 'Uthmin as his vicegerent in Medina, he headed for Quds.[3] He moved towards Damascus arguably in the year 16th or 17th A.H.[4]

A variety of agreements were mentioned in the peace accord 'Umar signed with Damascus's Nazarene community. They received assurances that their lives would be spared. They were also assured that no church would be damaged nor any swastika broken. One of the key conditions of the accord was that Muslims should not allow Jews to live in Quds, nor should there any obligation in faith. The residents of al-Quds also pledged to pay toll like the people of Ctesiphon. Additionally, the Romans had to leave the city. The people were also free to move their belongings to Rome or anywhere else.[5] It was on this trip that 'Umar entered the mosque and inquired Ka'b al-A¦bir about the site of the altar.

"The altar should be built towards the cliff which used to be the Qibla of Jews," said he.

---

[1]. Ibid. p.141-142

[2]. al-Uns al-djal¢l, vol.I, p.126

[3]. al-Uns al-djal¢l. p.250

[4]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.145 (some people have said that 'Umar traveled to Damascus four times during his caliphate.) Fut£¦ Mi¥r wa Akhbiruhi, p.56 (footnote)

[5]. al-Uns al-djal¢l, vol.I, pp.253-254

‘Umar was infuriated at the response, saying, “Your response resembles the words of Jews.”[1]

Some time after the return of ‘Umar from Damascus, a dreadful epidemic of plague dubbed “‘Amwis” swept Damascus in 18 A.H. The plague claimed the lives of several Muslims including the top governor of Damascus. Chief among the victims were Ab£ ‘Ubayda Ibn Djarri¦, Mu‘idh Ibn Djabal, Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin, Shura¦b¢l Ibn °asana, Fa¤l Ibn ‘Abbis and Suhayl Ibn ‘Amr. Yaz¢d died a few while after Ab£ ‘Ubayda as he had replaced him. After his death, ‘Umar appointed Mu‘iwiya. Ab£ Sufyin, who had lost his eyesight at that time, appreciated ‘Umar for visiting him.[2] In the last few years of ‘Umar’s caliphate, Mu‘iwiya was the governor of the Greater Syria.[3]

One of the key towns conquered in the reign of Mu‘iwiya was Caesarea. It was arguably conquered in 18 or 19 A.H.[4] The Arab troops were conquering further territories in the Greater Syria. In the meantime, the small towns accepted the peace treaty on their own. Many Arabs and Nazarenes adopted Islam.[5]

When ‘Umar was in Damascus, ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ asked for his permission to expedite towards Egypt to conquer it. It is said that in the Dark Age, he had gone to Egypt for business. So, he was somewhat familiar with it.[6] ‘Umar was afraid of launching such a bid. As a result of ‘Amr’s insistence and his efforts in playing down the risk of the attack, he eventually gave in. Amro, headed by a troop of between 3500 to 4000 men, headed for Egypt. It has been narrated that after the expedition of ‘Amr, ‘Umar withdrew his support and told ‘Amr that if he had not yet entered Egypt, eh should return. However, ‘Amr had entered Egypt. It seems ‘Uthmin had accused ‘Amr of expansionism, and had magnified the danger of the elimination of Arab troops before ‘Umar.[7]

---

[1]. Ibid. pp.256-257

[2]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.146

[3]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayya§, p.157

[4]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.148

[5]. Ibid. p.151

[6]. Fut£¦ Mi¥r wa Akhbiruhi, p.53

[7]. Fut£¦ Mi¥r wa Akhbiruhi, pp.57-58

Egypt's governor whom Arabs called "Muqawqis" had been appointed by Romans to rule the country. He was Coptic. Hence, Prophet Mu¦ammad (s), in a letter to him, had called him the "Chief Coptic". The war between Muslims and the Muqawqis army lasted two years. In the meantime, Muslims conquered many areas and towns. The main reason behind the conquest of Egypt was the difference between Egyptian Coptics and Romans. So, the Coptics were not so willing to defend the Romans. Muqawqis, himself, was doubtful over this matter and waited to see what would happen. His brother, Benjamin, was the bishop of Alexandria. In the meantime, Cyrus, the envoy of the Roman emperor, had arrived in Egypt to reform the affairs. The stringent behavior further distanced the Coptics from the Romans.[1] The news of the consecutive conquests of the Arab troops in the Greater Syria encouraged further people to surrender.[2]

The prolonged conquest of Alexandria, which dragged on for four months, necessitated the dispatch of auxiliary forces to Egypt.[3] The town eventually fell to Muslims in 20 A.H. There is debate as to whether Egypt gave in through force or peace. The same doubt exists for many other towns. After the deployment of Muslims, they turned the town of Fus§i§, which was their military base, to their administration center and left Alexandria. This was interesting from political and militarily viewpoints.

Among the troops of 'Amr Ibn 'ª¥, there were some non-Arab fighters, some of whom were ethnic Romans and were called "'°amri'". The other group was the Yemen¢-based Persians, who had moved, along with the Arab tribes, to these regions. Following the conquest of Egypt, Iranians were accommodated in a certain place. According to Ibn 'Abd al-°akam, the mosque raised by Muslims at the site was famous until his age in the 3rd century A.H.[4]

A variety of matters have been mentioned over the reasons for the escalation of Arab conquests. The conquest

---

[1]. A§las tir¢kh al-islim, p.133

[2]. One said to another, ان هؤلاء القوم لا يتوجهون الى أحد الا ظهـروا عليــه **"**These people declare war with no one but when they overcome" Fut£¦ Mi¥r wa Akhbiruhi, pp.59

[3]. Ibid. p.61

[4]. Fut£¦ Mi¥r wa Akhbiruhi. p.129

of every region had certain reasons. The conquest of Iran, for instance, had a totally different reason from that of Damascus. These conquests were entirely achieved by Arab Muslims. So, it is evident that their will was the first reason for these conquests. This will stemmed, on the one hand, from their faith, and on the other from their leadership and the Muslims’ administrative and legal systems over war booties. Islam allocated a large portion for the warriors and it was natural for the needy and the hungry Arabs to go the battlefield to earn something for their families, provided that they would emerge alive from the battlefield. As a matter of fact, Muslims had no concern whatsoever of being killed, because they saw martyrdom in the path of Allih as a great achievement.

The staggering point about their will and determination was that Muslims had a high sense of self-confidence. Prophet Mu¦ammad (s) promised Muslims victory over the Roman Empire and Iran, saying, “The treasures of Caesar and Chosroe will fall to you”. Therefore, Muslims moved towards the battlefield with an iron will and full confidence in the forecast of the Prophet. Initial gains made them stronger, livelier and more confident for later conquests. Another point is that the power of Muslims did no depend on a particular caliph, because a survey of these conquests from their start to the end of the first century A.H indicates that every caliph who had the chance of conquest, managed to capture several lands. The people’s belief in the administration was a driving force of these conquests. No opposition was raised from the side of Medina rulers. The rulers under the caliph were totally obedient. It should be noted that the caliphs picked their appointees from among the people of the second generation of the Companions who were totally submissive to them. Yet, the significance of the conquests crated an atmosphere in which even potential opponents abandoned their dream of a political rebellion. Under these circumstances, the masses of troops pressed ahead with their conquests more comfortably.

The success of Arabs in Damascus had several reasons, one of which was that the majority of the Damascus residents were Arabs, and in spite of being Christians, they were racially linked to °idjiz. Meantime, they maintained their distance from the Romans. In the early years of the conquests, some tribes including Lakhm and Djudhim joined

Muslims, but when they found out that the war was serious, they fled to the nearby villages and left Muslims alone.[1] According to Djabala Ibn 'Ayham, the relationship of the An¥ ir, who originally came from the southern tribes, to him was, **أنتم اخوتنا وبنو أبينا** "You are our brethren and children of our fathers."

During the conquest of Qinnasr¢n, the residents of the town hinted that they were also Arabs and did not want to fight against the conquerors. So, Khilid accepted their peace overture.[2] The Taghlab tribe, who had teamed up with the Romans and fought along with them, said in the 13th century A.H that they would fight along with their tribe.[3] There were, however, a number of other tribes who remained allied with the Romans till the end, and immigrated to the Roman territories after the conquest of the Greater Syria by Muslims. Apart from the Arab residents of Damascus disassociated themselves from the Romans, others including Jews, the Nib§¢ community and the Egyptian Coptics, had the same situation. Faced with the mild dealing of Muslims, they felt they could live up with Muslims and see their rights met. As soon as Muslims captured °im¥, they found themselves involved elsewhere in the Yarm£k war. As they thought they might not emerge victorious out of the Yarm£k battle, they decided to return the money received from the people of °im¥ to provide for their security. Faced with such a conduct, the people of °im¥ said, "Your friendship and justice is more likeable to us than the oppression which we are living under. We will defend our town along with you."[4]

It has been said that the Nib§is aggressively cooperated with Muslims, and as the Romans did not suspect them, they spied for Muslims.[5]

The other point is that the there were religious differences between Damascus and Rome. Considering the fact that the Romans did not treat these people properly from both economic and political viewpoints, the remarks of Will Durant will come true, "As the conqueror Arabs invaded

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p.570

[2]. Ibid. vol.III, p.601

[3]. Ibid. vol.III, p.464

[4]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.143

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, pp.143-144

Egypt and the Far East, half the people of those regions welcomed their arrival, because they viewed them as their liberator from the clutches of religious, political and economic oppression of the Byzantine capital.”[1] At any rate, after the expansion of conquests, several towns followed the line of surrender.[2]

CONTINUED CONQUESTS IN IRAQ AND THE CONQUEST OF IRAN

‘Umar’s caliphate was accompanied with several conquests of Muslim troops in Syria, which started with the conquest of Damascus. In these circumstances, some measures had to be adopted in Iraq, firstly, to stabilize its situation in favor of Muslims and, secondly, to expand the conquests. In the meantime, the town of °¢ra was freed from the Iranian control. Hence, Iranians were waiting for an opportunity to repel the new threat. Arab troops were led by Muthanni Ibn °iritha. Yet, Medina’s caliph, like the era of Ab£ Bakr, was determined to dispatch a commander from the known Saudi clans to Iraq. The nominee was Ab£ ‘Ubayd Ibn Mas‘£d Thaqaf¢, the father of Mukhtir, from the Thaqaf¢ clan, which used to be an ally of the Quraysh. Heading a 5000-strong troop[3], Ab£ ‘Ubayd encouraged many tribes on his way to conduct Djihid and win booties. A large number of people joined him.[4] It was decided that Muthanni work under the command of Ab£ ‘Ubayd. Iranians amassed a troop headed by Bahman Djidiwayh (Men of Shih °idjib) east of the Euphrates, whereas Ab£ ‘Ubayd’s forces lined up on the western side of the Euphrates. The Arabs crossed the bridge and launched the battle.

According to sources, despite the bravery of Muslims, the mammoth elephants existing in the Iranian army frightened the horses of Arab forces. As the Arabs had damaged the bridge, they had no way back. So, they sustained heavy losses and casualties. At any rate, a temporary bridge was built over the river and the Arabs lost out the war to Iran,

---

[1]. Tir¢kh Tamaddun, vol.IV, p.64; al-Shim f¢ ¥adr al-islim, pp.63-64, footnote

[2]. See the list in, al-Shim f¢ ¥adr al-islim, pp.60-70

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.165

[4]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.251; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.113

which was dubbed “Yawm al-Djisr” or the Day of the Bridge, with a death toll of 4000 people.[1] Ibn A‘tham, however, has narrated this event in a manner that it seems Muslims could defeat the Iranians and return to their army base.[2] Yet, the fact that the Iranians did not chase the Muslims indicates that they lacked the necessary readiness to do so. This even probably occurred in Sha‘bin or Rama¤in 13 A.H.[3]

Ab£ Mikhnaf and others say ‘Umar was upset even until one year after the Djisr event. In the meantime, Muthanni Ibn °iritha called the Arabs to Djihid. ‘Umar gradually thought of continuing the operation. Afterwards, around 700 people headed by Mikhnaf Ibn Silim, thousands headed by ‘Ad¢ Ibn °itim, and a number of people from the Ban£ Tam¢m tribe joined the Arab troops in Iraq.[4] The Budjayla tribe also joined the Arab force, under the condition that one-fourth of the booties would be given to them.[5] The Arabs clashed with the 12000-strong Iranian troops, headed by Mihrin Ibn Mihrbandid (Mihrwayh Hamadin¢)[6] at the Buwayb, a river branching out from the Euphrates River. Mihrin was killed in the battle and the Iranian army suffered a crushing defeat. Several Iranians were captured and Muslims earned large amounts of booties. Muthanni displayed noticeable bravery in the battle. The poems of ‘Urwa Ibn Zayd al-khayl about the command of Muthanni are notably exaggerating, “Among the commanders of Iraq, we have not seen anybody like Muthanni who belongs to al-Shaybin.”[7] Some time after the

---

[1]. Tir¢kh Irin, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.IV, p.15

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.170

[3]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.114; A§las tir¢kh al-islim, p.128. The author made a mistake about the fact that the king, in this time, regarded Iran as the city of Buriz, next, Sh¢riwayh and then B£rin. In essence, Yazdgard, since 632, succeeded them and conquering Iraq began from his time.

[4]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.114

[5]. In time of war, Djar¢r Ibn ‘Abd Allih Bidjil¢ promised his tribesmen that they would be the only Arabs to be benefited much in case this city were to be entered.

Akhbir al-§iwil, p.115

[6]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.114; Ibn A‘tham (Al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.168) says that Mihrdid has been king of ªdharbiydjin.

event, Muthanni Ibn °iritha died from the wounds he had sustained in the Djisr battle.

The battle occurred arguably in the 13th or 14th A.H. As ‘Umar did not take any action for battle until a year later, this event should have not taken place sooner than 14 A.H. The victory boosted the morale and courage of Muslims and they constantly invaded the Iraqi lands which were still under the control of the Iranians. They also invaded a large market place set up near Baghdid. This issue indicated that Iran was not capable of providing the security of Iraq and had to think of a solution as soon as possible.

According to D¢nwar¢, when Suwayd Ibn Qu§ba (who had some power around Ba¥ra) heard the news of these wars from Muthanni Ibn °iritha, he demanded ‘Umar to strengthen the weak situation of southern Iraq and dispatch some forces to the region. ‘Umar who seemingly did not have much trust in Suwayd to transfer the military command to him, sent a contingent of 1000 people, headed by ‘Utba Ibn Ghazwin, to the region. ‘Umar accompanied ‘Utba out of Medina. Referring to the passage of Muslims forces from the Euphrates through °¢ra to Ctesiphon, he told him to move towards Ahwiz and dissuade its residents from helping the Iranian army. ‘Utba reached the place nowadays called Ba¥ra where there were only a number of ruined houses. It was the residence of Iranian border guards, who were commissioned with preventing the aggression of Bedouin Arabs.

The first region attacked was Ubulla, on the outskirts of Baghdid. ‘Utba wrote the news of this victory to the caliph, describing the town as a harbor of ships coming from ‘Ummin, Ba¦rayn, Firs, India and China.[1] When the news of the victory reached Medina, the people asked ‘Utba’s envoy about the situation of the region. He told them about the amounts of gold and silver which Muslims had obtained. The news triggered an influx of Arabs towards the region.[2] Ubulla was located four leagues from Ba¥ra. It apparently existed until the 7th century A.H.[3] With the development of Ba¥ra,

---

7. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.115

1. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.116

2. Ibid. p.117

3. al-±ar¢q Ila l-Madi’in, p.213

Ubulla lost its grandeur. Ubulla and other towns like Khurayba which was conquered shortly later, were said to be the concentration center of Iranian border guards.

Yiq£t says, “Ba¥ra was built beside an ancient Iranian city named Vahishtibid Ardish¢r. This city was ruined in the attacks of Muthanni Ibn °iritha, so when Muslims went to that region to build Ba¥ra, they called the city “Khurayba” (ruin).[1] Afterwards, Khurayba became a district of Ba¥ra.

According to D¢nwar¢, the conquest and establishment of Ba¥ra took place before the Qidisiyya war. The fact that Ba¥ra was constructed before K£fa indicates that ‘Utba had reached southern Iraq before reaching Qidisiyya. Noting this issue, Yiq£t has mentioned that after reaching Qidisiyya, ‘Utba moved to southern Iraq and to Ba¥ra.[2] What is important is that around 15 and 16 A.H, two war fronts were opened against Iran, one in K£fa where some troops were advancing towards Ctesiphon, and the other in Ba¥ra from where the Arabs were moving to capture the southern Iranian lands in Kh£zistin. The two fronts led to the establishment of the two important towns of Ba¥ra and K£fa in Iraq, which later laid the cornerstone of the Islamic Iraq, in addition to Baghdid which was built in the 2nd century A.H. It is said Ba¥ra refers to a land which has black pebbles.[3] Quoting °amza I¥fahin¢, Yiq£t says that according to M£badh Ibn Asawhasht, Ba¥ra is the Arabic form of “Bas Rih”, meaning so many roads, because several routed led to this town.[4]

After the conquest of Ubulla, ‘Utba Ibn Ghazwin asked the caliph to set up a town for Arab immigrants. After studying the regional situation, ‘Umar authorized the construction of the town. Thus, Ba¥ra was founded. After a while, ‘Utba felt that Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ was exceeding his limits in giving him unrelated orders. ‘Utba, who considered himself an appointee of ‘Umar, protested to Sa‘d and left for Medina.

As soon as ‘Umar heard the news, he asked, “Why is he not ready to accept the rule of a man from the Quraysh who has been a ¯a¦ib¢, too?” ‘Utba protested that he, too, was a

---

[1]. Mu‘djam al-buldin, vol.II, p.363

[2]. Ibid. vol.I, p.432

[3]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.117

[4]. Mu‘djam al-buldin, vol.I, p.430

ruler from the Quraysh and that Prophet Mu¦ammad (s) had said, **مولى القوم منهم** “Lord of people is from Ahl al-Bayt.”

It seems that ‘Umar had asked ‘Utba him to return to Ba¥ra, but ‘Utba died shortly.[1]

In an address to the people of Ba¥ra, ‘Utba said in 17 A.H that, **إنه لم تكن النبوة إلا تناسخها مُلك، فأعوذ بالله أن يُدركنا ذلك الزمان الذي يكون فيه السلطان مُلكاً** “There is no prophethood not to have been rejected by a king. I seek refuge in that the Allih from the day Sultan becomes the king.”[2]

We said that the Buwayb event frightened the Iranians. This time, the Iranians mobilized a larger army led by Rustam Farrukhzid—the commander of Iranian forces in ªdharbiydjin—to prevent Arabs’ invasion. Ibn A‘tham has described the way Bahrim, the governor of Hamadin; Sh¢rzid, the governor of Qum and Kishin; Banduwin, the provincial governor of I¥fahin and Khursh¢d, the governor of Riy, dispatched their forces to the battlefield.[3] In return, the caliph had to find a powerful commander for his troops. ‘Umar initially thought he would travel to Iraq, but the Medina notables advised him against it. A number of people were nominated for the command, one of them Imim ‘Al¢ (a). Advised by ‘Umar, ‘Uthmin talked with Imim ‘Al¢ (a). Yet, Imim shunned accepting the responsibility. The next choice was Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ who was suffering from a thigh injury.[4] He could not even mount on the horseback.[5] So, he did not attend the battle. The battle ever marked the worst defeat of the Iranians was called the “Qidisiyya war”. Qidisiyya was the name of a small border town located amid the ±aff Desert, 50 miles from K£fa. The town had a fortress and some palm groves and plantations. Around 4-6 miles from Qidisiyya, there was a resort named ‘Udhayb which had a spring, and was virtually the end of the desert. Sa‘d set up his camp at ‘Udhayb, whereas Rustam camped outside Qidisiyya.[6]

---

[1]. Mu‘djam al-buldin, vol.I, p.432

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VII, p.7

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.201

[4]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.310

[5]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.121

[6]. Tir¢kh Irin, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.IV, p.17

Wild conjectures have been given over the number of Iranian and Arab forces. Yet, it can be guessed that that the Arab forces numbered between 20 to 30 thousand[1] and the Iranians were between 3 to 4 thousand more. Meanwhile, Ibn A'tham has put the number of Arab forces at 60 thousand.[2] Rustam remained at Diyr A'war[3] for four months to settle the matter peacefully. Rustam tried to satisfy the Arabs, whom he thought, were fighting for food.[4] Additionally, the four months of stay at the camp could weaken the power of Arab forces. On the other hand, Muslims did not abandon their condition that the Iranians should accept Islam and pay toll or engage in war. Acceptance of the first two proposals of the Arabs was impossible, because Iran was a superpower. So, Rustam had to give in to war.

Ibn A'tham writes, "At the request of Yazdgard, Sa'd sent some envoys including Mughra h to Ctesiphon to Yazdgard's court. As they entered the court, they sat on the ground except Mughra h who sat by the king on his seat.

The king asked him, "What are these clothes? What are you wearing?"

Mughrah replied, "It is Yemen silk."

Yazdgard took this as bad omen and said in Persian, "Burdand Djahin ri," meaning "They plundered the world".[5] So, he ordered the start of the war. The Qidisiyya battle lasted only four days, with each day having a specific name. They were called Armith, Aghwith, 'Ammis and Qidisiyya.[6] The battle ended in favor of Arabs and Rustam was killed during the war. The Iranian forces withdrew as far as Diyr Ka'b where new forces under the command of Nukhirijin helped them. Therefore, the Iranians refurbished their army

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.119 (he mentions the forces to be twenty thousand people but he further refers to the troops joining him from Ba¥ra and other places.)

Al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.175 (there, there is a census of tribal people)

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.201

[3]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.120

[4]. Ibid. pp.120-121 (This was exactly referred when Rostam spoke with Mughra)

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.197 (Ibn A'tham mentions the exact speech of the king in Persian)

[6]. Ibn A'tham cites the names in a different way. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.20

and made a new onslaught. D¢nwar¢ says as Nukhiridjin entered the battlefield, he began crying out “any man, any man” to invite a contender.[1] Nukhiridjin was, however, killed by Zuhayr Ibn Sulaym (Mikhnaf Ibn Sulaym’s brother). This time, too, the Iranians were defeated and withdrew as far as Ctesiphon. The Arabs achieved the win very hard, because they suffered huge losses. It is said that a group of Iranians gathered around Iran’s black flag, saying, “We will not abandon our place unless we are killed.” and they did so.[2] The bravery of the Iranians made it difficult for the Arabs to defeat them. Ab£ Radji’ Firs¢ quoted his grandfather, who had been in the Iranian army at the Qidisiyya war, as saying that the Arabs had to spray many arrows on the Iranians and the battle had become so tough for them.[3]

There are differences of opinion on the year of this war. Wiqid¢ has conceded that it took place in 16 A.H.[4] Armenian historian, Ilyis Nu¥ayb¢n¢, has cited Djamid¢ al-Awwal 16 A.H as the date of the war. Meanwhile, Ibn Is¦iq has mentioned 15 A.H as the year of the war.[5] A researcher has said that the war occurred in the month of Sha‘bin, 15 A.H.[6] During the war, the emblem of the Sassanids troops fell to Muslims;[7] an issue which indicates the crushing blow that the Iranian government suffered in the war.

In the aftermath of the war, Sa‘d found out the necessity for establishing a town named “Dir al-°idjra” for the tribes who had immigrated to the region from °idjiz for war. Had Ba¥ra been established by then, it could have been a model for K£fa. Yiq£t has cited ten reasons for the naming of K£fa.[8] It is said that a number of places were surveyed. As the site was suitable for the raising of sheep, horses and camels, ‘Umar preferred K£fa[9], which was previously called S£rastin.[1] After the site of the mosque and the palace of administration

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.123 (D¢nwar¢ mentions his very calling "a man of challenge" in Persian.)

[2]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.259

[3]. Ibid. p.260

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p.590; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.319

[5]. Tir¢kh Irin, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.IV, p.17

[6]. al-Qidisiyya, pp.216-232

[7]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.319

[8]. Mu‘djam al-buldin, vol.IV, pp.490-491

were determined, the nearby regions were divided between the northern and southern tribes.

The town initially seemed transient because the tribes set up their houses from reed. So, at times of Djihid, they removed the reed framework and ceded them to others. As they took their wives with themselves to the war, they had to build new quarters after their return. It was only at the time of Mugh¢ra that people began to build clay structures. Yet, they did not build any rooms inside. Under the reign of Ziyid Ibn Ab¢h, brick houses became popular. Yiq£t writes that the caliph wrote to Sa'd, saying the mosque should have enough space to accommodate the participants in the war. So, it was built with a capacity of 40 thousand people.[2] Hence, K£fa became one of the most important Islamic towns. At the same time, 'Umar sent a letter to the people of K£fa, writing, "To the people of K£fa, to the center of Islam." He also said of K£fa that it was, **إلى أهل الكوفة، إلى رأس الإسلام "**To K£fiyins, to center of Islim." And saying about that, **هم رمح الله وكنـز الإيمـان وجمجمـة العـرب** "They are divine spear, treasure of faith and renowned among Arabs."

Salmin has also called K£fa as the place "where there is Islam".[3]

After the Qidisiyya war, Muslims chased the Iranians and set up a military camp on the western rim of the Euphrates n front of Ctesiphon. According to D¢nwar¢, they stayed there for 28 months, so long that they could eat dates of the palm trees twice![4] By that time, Muslims had dominated parts of Ctesiphon or Ctesiphon—meaning towns in Arabic. Ctesiphon consisted of seven nearby towns, protected by barracks. Entry into the greater town was possible through symmetrical gates designed around the city. On the Western side of the Tigris, were the cities of Bih Ardish¢r (Arabic, Bihras¢r), Seleucids (Sul£kiyya), Darz¢djin, Sibi§ and Mi¦£zi while on the river's eastern side were the cities of

---

[9]. 'Umar wrote to Sa'd, Arabs resemble camels, wherever camels lay well, Arabs find it well too.

Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.275

[1]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.275

[2]. Mu'djam al-buldin, vol.IV, p.491

[3]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.287; al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.288

[4]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.126; Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.262

Ctesiphon, Asbinbar and R£miyya which was called Wiya Andy£ Khusraw. The king resided at Ctesiphon’s white palace and the palace of Madi’in where the banquets and parties were held, was located in Asbinbar.[1]

Muslims captured the Western area after a brief clash and were stationed in Bihras¢r. The destruction of bridges by Iranians[2] kept Arabs behind the Tigris for a long time but they finally managed to cross the river and enter the town. When Iranians saw the Arabs, they cried out, “The devils came! The devils came!”[3] Kharihzid was initially supposed to stay in Madi’in as long as possible. However, when Arab crossed the Tigris and reached behind the city gates, fled from the town’s eastern side and retreated towards western Iran.[4] The Arab’s entry into the city was as a big victory for them. Now, the capital of the Sassanids kingdom had been conquered and numerous booties were available to Arabs. Among them, were things Arab had never seen until then. For instance, they poured camphor into their food, thinking it was salt![5]

Before that, Yazdgard had taken the royal family along with the treasures and other portable belongings and had fled to Qa¥r Sh¢r¢n[6] in Iran’s western mountains. From there, he went to the town of °ulwin near the present-day town of Sar Pul Dhahib. Kharihzid, too, who had failed to keep Ctesiphon, set off in the same direction and settled in Djal£li. In order to keep Ctesiphon, Arabs had no way but to chase this army. Therefore, Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ sent an army led by Hishim Ibn ‘Utba to follow them. Iranians dug a

---

[1]. Tir¢kh Irin, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.IV, p.18. Yiq£t speaks of seven-fold cities of Madi’in this way, Isfib£r (Isfinbar), Wah Ardish¢r (Bihrs¢r), Hanb£shif£r (Djund¢shib£r), Darzn¢din (Darz ¢djin), Wah Djundy£ Khusruw (R£miyya), N£nyifidj and Kirdifidh. (His mentioned names slightly differ from what has been quoted from Tir ¢kh Irin.) He adds, Madi’in, in our time, is a village six leagues far from Baghdid. Citizens are mainly farmers and followers of Imim ‘Al¢ (a). Salmin Firs¢’s tombstone rests in eastern Medina. Mu‘djam al-buldin, vol.V, p.75

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.212

[3]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.216; Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.262

[4]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.127

[5]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.263

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.278

ditch around them in Djal£li, waiting for the arrival of backup forces from Yazdgard, Djibil and I¥fahin. But, Muslims did not wait for these forces and launched the offensive. In this battle, °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢ commanded the left wing of the army of Islam. Iranian forces were defeated in the war and had to retreat to °ulwin. After that, Yazdgard did not see it right to stay any longer in °ulwin, so he fled towards the region of Djibil in Qum and Kishin. A 4000-strong force of Muslim Arabs was tasked with protecting Iraq against the infiltration of Iranians in Djal£li.[1] Now, Muslims were on the eastern side of the Tigris as well and were conquering those regions. Mihr£d and Khiniqayn were in that part. Finally, Muslims dominated all regions around the Tigris.[2]

Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ was no longer interested in extending the war towards °ulwin and this annoyed some of his troops. So, he ordered an advance as far as °ulwin.[3] Then, he returned to K£fa and ruled the city for more than three years until he was replaced with ‘Ammir Ibn Yisir. According to Ya‘qub¢, after conquering Ctesiphon, Sa‘d came to K£fa and the Djal£li attack took place three years later in 19 A.H.[4] Balidhur¢, too, has mentioned the same date[5], so it seems to be correct.

Now, Muslims had entered Iran from three fronts, on one side, Ctesiphon was in their hands. On the other side, Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢ has come towards Ahwiz from Ba¥ra. And the third front which had opened by ‘Ali’ Ibn al-°a¤ram¢ in the beginning of ‘Umar’s rule in Ba¦rayn and had achieved some success[6], now had initiated a new move and had made some penetrations in some parts of Firs.[7]

Given the two latter fronts, Firs which was one Iran’s important regions, was now threatened by invasion. Hurmuzin asked Yazdgard to dispatch him to Kh£zistin and Firs for protecting those regions so that he could serve as a barrier on the way of Arabs’ advance and even gather forces

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.129

[2]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.264

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.279-280

[4]. Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.151

[5]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.265

[6]. al-Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.183

[7]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.133

to help Yazdgard. Hurmuzin, along with an army, set off for Tustar (Sh£shtar). The news of this army reached Muslims and they started a lot of activities to prepare troops. ‘Ammir was tasked with joining Ab£ M£si along with half of the people of K£fa. Before that, Nu‘min Ibn Muqarran and thousands of his men had joined Ab£ M£si. Even 3000 of the 4000-strong Arab border guards who had stayed in Djal£li rushed to help. The army of Islam set off towards Tustar. At first, some clashes erupted outside the city and after 1600 Iranians were killed, Hurmuzin was forced to go inside the city and close the gates. There were also some martyrs on the side of Muslims. One of the well-known martyrs was Bari’ Ibn Milik. The city was besieged for some time until one of the city’s nobles showed them a secret way to enter the city. 200 Muslims forces broke into the city from that way and after killing the guards, opened the gates on Muslims. The city was conquered and Hurmuzin took refuge in a palace. He only gave himself up after getting life assurance and under the condition that he would be sent to Medina to the caliph. ‘Umar forgave him in Medina until after ‘Umar’s murder, hi son, ‘Ubayd Allih, killed Hurmuzin under the baseless pretext that he had been seen with ‘Umar’s murderer, Ab£ Lu’lu’, the day before.

After the end of the war, ‘Ammir returned to K£fa and Ab£ M£si continued conquering other cities of Kh£zistin such as Susa (Sh£sh).[1]

At that time, Yazdgard was in Qum, according to D¢nwar ¢. He called on all people of Iran to assist him against Arabs who were getting closer every moment. People from Q£mis (Dimghin), ±abaristin, Gurgin, Damiwand, Riy and I¥fahin rushed to his help. They gathered a huge army and set off for war against Arab conquerors. ‘Ammir wrote the news of this army to ‘Umar who called on the people from the pulpit to head for Iraq. There, ‘Uthmin asked ‘Umar to send the Muslim army from Yemen and Damascus to Iraq. Moreover, he said the caliph, too, should go to Iraq. However, Imim ‘Al¢ opposed this suggestion and said, “This will prompt the Romans to attack Damascus. Also, if Muslims soldiers from Yemen, there will be the threat of an assault from Abyssinia.” Imim opposed the caliph’s trip to Iraq because

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, pp.130-132

he said Iranians would fight with more fervor if they heard the Arab king's presence.[1]

At any rate, an army was prepared and its command was given to Nu'min Ibn Muqarran, one of the Companions of Prophet Mu¦ammad (s). It was decided that if he were martyred, °udhayfa Ibn Yamin, Djar¢r Ibn 'Abd Allih, Mugh ¢ra Ibn Shu'ba and Ash'ath Ibn Qays would replace him respectively. Two armies were stationed near Nahiwand. Nahiwand was located between two fronts of Arabs' war against Iranians, one from Ctesiphon and the other from Ahwiz. The two armies clashed with each other and fought intensely for four days, from Tuesday to Friday. On the last day, the confrontation was really heavy and despite the martyrdom of Nu'min Ibn Muqarran, the Iranian army was defeated.[2] This victory was of great significance for Arabs, so it was named "Fath al-Fut£¦" (the victory of victories).[3] This battle probably occurred in the year 20 A.H. In this war, a number of Muslim Arabs including their commander was martyred. They were all buried in a graveyard remained in Nahiwand's history in memory of the battle's martyrs.

During the years 16 to 20 A.H, conquests continued in northern Iraq as well Muslims advanced as far as M£¥il, bringing Iraq under their entire control. Among the conquered regions were the cities of °arrin, Nu¥ayb¢n, Qirq ¢siyi' and Sam¢si§ and many regions around the Euphrates and the Tigris.

ABOUT IRAN'S CONQUEST

The quick conquest of Iran and the fall of the Sassanids dynasty with all its grandeur was a surprising event that cannot be easily explained. Although similar events have occurred in Iran and other world countries and a comparative study of them can help further understanding of realities. In Iraq and Iran, many governments and dynasties, even the long-lived 'Abbisids dynasty, collapsed at the hands of Mongol nomads. For instance, the ¯afawids stable and firm for more than 200 years was overthrown by several

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, pp.134-135

[2]. Ibid. pp.136-137

[3]. al-Bad' wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.182

thousand Ghalziy¢ Afghans who had come at least 12000 kilometers to reach I¥fahin. However, each of these developments must have its particular reasons. Here, it is suitable to quote a source about the political situation of Iran’s government after the defeat of Iranian forces against the Roman government in the year 428 A.D.

After Iran’s defeat in the war against Rome, Khusraw Parv ¢z looking for scapegoats to blame them for his failure and among them, he decided to execute Shahrbariz. But before he could carry out his intention, there was a rebellion and Khusraw was imprisoned and then murdered in late February, 628 A.D. Khusraw’s son, Sh¢rwayh, ascended to the throne with the title of Kuwid II. He had joined the insurgents and had agreed with his father’s murder. The new king immediately called for peace with Heraclius and accepted to recall the Sassanids armies from Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor and western Mesopotamia and recognize the pre-war borders. It was also agreed that all prisoners of war be extradited and the Swastika and other emblems be returned. Both sides were happy with the end of the war operations which had worn out the two empires for several years. But, Shahrbariz was dissatisfied over the establishment of peace and he was dangerous as he commanded a large army. Kuwid II passed away after less than a year in power possibly due to plague and his son, Ardish¢r III, who was a little child, ascended to the throne. Shahrbariz decided to claim the throne himself. So, in June of 629 A.D, backed by Heraclius, he went to Ctesiphon, defeated Ardish¢r’s forces and murdered him along with several of his prominent figures. Shahrbariz sat on the throne, but his rule didn’t last long and he, too, was murdered in less than two months. Also, another claimant in the eastern part of the empire who was Khusraw’s nephew, was killed before he could come to the capital with the title of Khusraw III. As none of Khusraw’s sons was left alive, the nobles named his daughter, P£rin, as the ruler. P£rin was the first woman to ascend to the throne, but she, too, passed away after less than a year in power. A group of kings took power one after the other and each stayed for only a few months. The only thing we know about them is their names as follows, P£rin’s sister, ªdharm¢dukht; P¢r£z II, Hurmuz V and Khusraw IV. Finally, in the year 632 A.D, the nobles named Yazdgard III, the son of Shahriyir and the grandson of

Khusraw II, who was almost the last survival of the Sassanids dynasty, to take the throne. Yazdgard lived in virtual hiding in the I¥§akhr of Fırs and it was there that the last Sassanids king was crowned in a fire temple which was named after the first Sassanids king.[1]

These developments occurred before the start of Iraq's conquest and naturally, they destroyed Iran's political and military structures. It is clear that Yazdgard needed years to put the situation of Iran, which was under domestic and foreign pressure, back on track. But, Arabs' assaults stripped him from such an opportunity and further dealt fatal blows on Iran. The conquest of Iraq located near Ctesiphon, the Sassanids capital, was the first deadly incident which rang the alarm bell for the Sassanids rulers. Those consecutive blows disintegrated that hollow government and shattered it into pieces.

Despite the weakness of the Sassanids government, Iran's defeat cannot be entirely blamed on this incompetence. The Sassanids government did its best, as far as it could. From the Qidisiyya battle to Nahiwand's Fath al-Fut£¦, it tried hard to stop the advancing Arabs. Each time, massive troops were prepared, multiplying the Arabs, but the Iranians' bravery and courage could not resist the will of Arabs who were sure of their victory. The most important point was Arab's faith and their full confidence in the victory of their religion because spreading Islam was their main goal.

Spuler writes, "Today, there is no doubt that the religion of monotheism was the strongest driving force behind Arabs' conquest of lands."[2] We should also remember that while fighting for monotheism, Arabs expected booties, too, after victory. They headed for battlefronts after hearing Prophet Mu¦ammad's words who had promised them, the treasures of Caesar and Chosroe. When 'Umar wanted to provoke them, he said, **أيها الناس! إن الله عز وجل وعد نبيه محمداً صلي الله عليه واله وسلم، أن يفتح عليه فارس والروم، والله لا يخلف وعده ولا يخذل جنده، فسارعوا رحمكم الله إلي جهاد أعدائكم من الفرس، فإنكم بالحجاز في غير دار مقام وقد وعدكم الله عز وجل كنوز كسرى وقيصر، والمواعيد من الله عز وجل مضمونة وأمر الله تعالي مفعول، والقول من رسول**

[1]. Tir¢kh Irin, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, p.267

[2]. Tir¢kh Irin, vol.I, p.7

الله صلي الله عليه مقبول، وما لـم يورثكمـوه اللـه عـز وجـل اليـوم، يورثكمـوه غـداً وانكـم لـن تغنمـوا حـتي تغيـروا ولـن تسشـهدوا حـتي تقـاتلوا.[1] “O people! The Almighty God certainly promised His Messenger, brought Iran and Rome under his conquest. He keeps His promise and never abandons His troops. God bless thee! Perform a Djihid with Iran’s enemies knowing that °idjiz is not a place to stay as He, the Exalted, promised thee riches of Chosroes and Caesaer and be aware that His promises are assured and His decrees are achieved. His Messenger’s words are approved as well and what He leaves thee inherited today shall be inherited tomorrow too; thou never attain booties unless thou art changed and never do thou welcome martyrdom unless thou challenge the foes.”

The tyranny and oppression of the Sassanids government was more or less effective in arousing the people’s resentment or in other words, destroying their motivation for defending the Sassanids dynasty. It led to a reduction of military activities of the Iranian army in the battlefield. Apart from temporary collaboration which may be deemed as treason such as the cooperation of some nobles of Tustar[2] and Nahiwand[3] in showing the way into the city, the joining of 4000 men from the Qidisiyya army to Arabs cannot be justified as treason.

Balidhur¢ writes, “4000 men (who were considered among the king’s army) from Diylamin who were at the service of the Sassanids government, were in Qidisiyya with Rustam. When the Iranian army was defeated, they were standing at a corner. Feeling they had no shelter, they decided to embrace Islam. After that, they called on Muslims to let them live wherever they wished and to ally with any tribe they wanted. Sa‘d accepted their demand. A chief was chosen for them who were called °amri’ Diylam. Basically, Arabs called non-Arabs “°amri’”, meaning having a white complexion. These people took part in the conquest of Ctesiphon and the Djal£li battle.[4] There are other examples

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.165

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.131

[3]. Ibid. p.137

[4]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.279

as well which show that right after Muslims' attacks, some peasants and farmers converted to Islam.[1]

Qazw¢n¢ has written, "Treacherous and Arabized Iranians! From the provinces' officials and nearby border guards, threw themselves into the arms of Arabs as soon as they felt the Sassanids dynasty was shaky and the Iranian army had been defeated several times at the hands of the Arab troops. These Iranians not only helped Arabs in their conquests, but also called on Arab commanders to occupy other Iranian lands which were in their territory and had not been attacked by Arabs yet. They submitted the keys of castles and treasuries to Arabs provided that Arabs would let them stay in power in some regions."[2]

The late Djalil ªl A¦mad writes, "Before Islam came to confront us, we invited it. Let's forget about Rustam Farrukhzid¢ who desperately defended the Sassanids ferocity and the Zoroastrians' backward traditions. But, the people, Ctesiphon went into their alleys with bread and dates to welcome the Arabs who went to plunder the king's palace and the carpet of Bahiristin.[3]

The proper treatment of victorious Arabs with the people of the cities they conquered, could encourage the people towards the sincerity of Muslims. Peace accords did not force the people into abandoning their religion and traditions. Even there was no emphasis on destroying the fire temples. The tax paid was, in most cases, less than what was received by the Sassanids government and the provincial governors from the people. So, what reason could they have to sacrifice their lives for the Sassanids rulers. It has been said in this regard, "The peace accords of Arab armies with different town and cities, which in many cases, entailed much lighter obligations for the people compared to the taxes paid previously to the central Sassanids government, urged many Iranian to give up. They were not interested in fighting for a court that did not pay any attention to them. We should welcome the new gods who take lower taxes

---

[1]. Spuler, Tir¢kh Irin, vol.I, p.17

[2]. B¢st Maqilih Qazw¢n quoted from, Khadamit Mutaqibil Irin wa Islim, p.79

[3]. Gharbzadig¢, p.48

instead of fighting against them. This was the psychology of many Iranians.”[1]

[1]. Tirɕkh Irin, Cambridge (persian translation), vol.III, part.I, p.271

CHAPTER III
‘UTHMªN’S CALIPHATE

CALIPHATE COUNCIL AND ‘UTHMªN’S ELECTION

‘Umar consulted with Prophet’s (s) campanions in several cases while never compelling himself to fulfill their notions. It should be said when ‘Umar had no idea in some cases, he benefited others’. In judicial issues, he preferred Imim ‘Al¢’s idea tens of times. He consulted with campanions about °idjra calendering and conceded Imim’s opinion on determining “Prophet’s °idjra” as the beginning (era) of Islamic date.[1] Another example of consulting with Imim leading to his approved idea was about lands of Iraq.[2] The other one is about going out of Medina during the war with Iranians and defining a leader for Iranian troops.[3] In his suggesting to do some things, ‘Umar cited favoring companions and consulting with them.[4]

Considering these counsellings, some have said that basically a consultative assembly was regularly taking place in a mosque and the political system during ‘Umar’s rule was a kind of democracy, even close to a republic.[5] This view fails to comply with the truth of that time and what history has reported. Occasional counsels are parted from parliaments that adopt the majority of votes and regularly interfere with the affairs. The source of Am¢r ‘Al¢’s utterance is what Qi¤¢

---

[1]. There is a disagreement on whether the Messenger (s) set °idjra as the originating history or such an action has been taken in time of ‘Umar. Seemingly, due to significance of °idjra, Muslims had been using °idjra as one origin in the very beginning years of it but this has been formalized in ‘Umar’s time.

[2]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, pp.151-152

[3]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, pp.309-310

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.4, p.227

[5]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh al-‘arab wa l-tamaddun al-islim¢, Am¢r ‘Al¢, p.90

Ab£ Y£suf [1] said as in the mosque there was the meeting of upper class among whom were the heads of tribes coming to Medina. He has named this group “people of Shuwri.” Mentioning Am¢r ‘Al¢’s inaccuracy in using words like “parliament,” about the current meaning of this word, and Ibrih¢m Bay¤£n says, “There was nothing called “parliament” as an established and influential board in the regime in that age.” As ‘Umar had a great influence in domestic and foreign political and all governmental affairs, this issue is more applicable in ‘Umar’s time. In fact, the afore-mentioned is the extension of the same thing in the Prophet’s age.[2] It has been quoted from Imim ¯idiq (a) that emigrants usually sat in the mosque and ‘Umar confided the events in them, e.g. he asked them how to treat Magi (Madj£s), then “Prophet treated them as Muslims”, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf said.[3]

As said, ‘Umar also consulted with the companions about writing traditions and ‘Al¢, unlike their approval, refused to do so.

In caliph’s opinion, another example of consultation is matter of caliphate. For the first time, he confessed the truth of Ab£ Bakr’s election, in his speech in Medina he said that election was without consulting the Muslims, thereafter caliphate should be based on Muslims’ consultation; if anyone swore allegiance to someone without consulting, both should be killed.[4] This speech led to the idea of one principle in choosing the caliph as outlined in this brief narrated phrase of caliph “al-Imira Shuwri”.[5] What ‘Umar said about the matter of succession shows that he himself was perplexed. In the beginning, he wished his old friends were alive to make them caliphs. One of them was Mu‘adh

---

[1]. Kitib al-kharidj, p.30

[2]. Min Dawlat ‘Umar Ili Dawlat ‘Abd al-Malik, p.89-91

[3]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.853; Fut£¦ al-buldin, pp.266-267

[4]. Previously the sources of the quotation have been mentioned in detail. ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.5, p.445; Fat¦ al-bar¢, vol.12, p.124; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.344; Masi’il al-imima, p.63; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.881; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.12, p.69; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.4, p.227

[5]. ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.5, p.446; vol.7, p.278; vol.10, p.103

Ibn Djabal.[1] The second person was Ab£ ‘Ubayda Djarri¦, third, present emigrants in Saq¢fa,[2] and the forth one Silim Mawli °udhayfa who was not of Quraysh.[3] Surprisingly, despite all ‘Umar’s disagreements with Khilid Ibn Wal¢d,[4] he had been quoted saying, “If Khilid Ibn Wal¢d were alive, he would be my successor.” [5] Thus, it becomes obvious if one of these people were alive, it would not be a turn for Shuwri.[6]

In fact, all of his candidates for caliphate had passed away. Thus, it was the turn for those alive.

“‘Umar was with an An¥ir¢ (one campanion),” says ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Qir¢ “when he got assured that the present people were confidant, he asked him about public opinion about his successor. He named some emigrants without mentioning ‘Al¢’s. ‘Umar objected and said, “Why not Ab al-°asan? If he comes to power, he will lead people to the truth.”[7]

Mugh¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba says, “‘Umar asked me, who is qualified to be the successor?” I responded, “‘Uthmin!”

He criticised ‘Uthmin. I also named five people of the council, on each of whom he placed an imperfection and accused Imim of being witty.”[8] Though he said, “If he comes to power, he will lead all to the Truth.”[9]

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.590; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.42

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.16; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.42; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.412; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.4, p.227

[3]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.343; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.86

[4]. When ‘Umar came to power, he said, “I depose Khilid to make known if God helps his religion, Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayya§, vol.I, p.106

[5]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.887; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.42

[6]. He explicitly interpreted that, “If Silim had been alive, I would have not made Shuwri responsible for the affairs; Tir¢kh Ab¢ Zar‘a al-dimashq¢, vol.I, p.272; and he added, “If he had been alive, I would have never doubted his supremacy over the Prophet’s companions; al-muqni‘ fi l-Imima, p.59

[7]. ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.5, p.446

[8]. Ibid. vol.5, pp.447-448; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.880; al-A¦kim al-sul§iniyya, vol.12, Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.49; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.4, p.501, No.1291; Kitib al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.85-86

[9]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.4, p.501, No.1290

‘Umar asked Ka‘b al-A¦bir (who ‘Umar believed was dealing with Scriptures)[1] about his successor, he replied, “‘Al ¢ is not qualified for it and as he had read in the books, those who have quarrelled with the prophet (s) over faith could be caliphs.[2] It seems that he had meant no one but the Umayyads and ahead of them ‘Uthmin. ‘Uthmin had a great influence during the ages of Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar.

“In your opinion, once he asked °udhayfa, who was known as prophet’s confidant, whom will people accept as the ruler after me?”

°udhayfa replied, “I think people would leave themselves to ‘Uthmin Ibn ‘Affin.”[3] °udhayfa’s perception was right because the Quraysh ites were all ‘Uthmin’s advocates.

It should be mentioned that ‘Umar was annoyed by the Hishimites. The discussion between ‘Umar and Ibn ‘Abbis contains notable points.

‘Umar, ±abar¢ writes, told Ibn ‘Abbis, “Do you know why your tribe, (Quraysh) banned you from being prophet’s successor?”

I answered “No.”

Because they detested, ‘Umar said, your caliphate and prophecy, then you would have so much vanity and glory. So Quraysh seized caliphate and it was the right thing to do.

“May I speak?” says Ibn ‘Abbis.

‘Umar said, “Yes.”

I said, Ibn ‘Abbis says, about what you say Quraysh seized the caliphate, I should say that if Quraysh had picked what God had chosen, it was on the right path without being involved in any denial and envy. But what you say about their reluctancy of prophecy and caliphate in one family, God has defined hideously such a tribe, **ذَلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ كَرِهُوا مَا أَنزَلَ**

---

[1]. See, Caliph’s Thoughts.

[2]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.XII, p.81; Ghar¢b al-¦ad ¢th, vol.III, p.239; al-Fi’iq f¢ Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.II, p.16; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.87; The Umayya meant that ‘Uthmin was among them although he imself never fought with the Prophet over religion. Later on, Ka‘b al-A¦bir said Mu‘iw¢ya basically possessed succession after ‘Uthmin as if heavenly books reported this way. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.495, No.1278

[3]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.333

اللَّهُ فَأَحْبَطَ أَعْمَالَهُمْ. "Such they attested what God had sent, then their deeds faded away."

O, son of 'Abbis, 'Umar said, I've heard things about you I don't want to believe, if so, you'll be underrated.

If I'm saying the truth, Ibn 'Abbis replied, why my status would be underrated, and if you think it's credal error as wrong egoism he has kept away from himself. "I've heard you said they divested 'Al¢ of caliphate for (their) envy and oppression", 'Umar said.

As for oppression, replied Ibn 'Abbis, any ignorant and wise man knows, and as for envy, devil envied Adam, and we who are being envied, are his offsprings too. Also, said 'Umar, By God, O Hishimites! Your hearts are filled with an indelible jealousy.

O 'Umar!, replied Ibn 'Abbis, don't charge the hearts, impurified by God, with having envy and alloy. Prophet (s)'s heart is of Hishimites'.[1] Some time, it was him who refused to recruit Khilid Ibn Sa'¢d because of his scruple objection with Ab£ Bakr's caliphate, it was obvious that he couldn't be contented with Imim 'Al¢ (a) who had sidestepped all this time and also, in the beginning, had withheld to swear allegiance for several months.

However, 'Umar was demoralized in choosing his successor. When °af¥a heard his father thinking of putting no one as the caliph, he told his father, "If you had a shepherd looking after your sheep and if he had left his duty, you would have regarded him as a waster, so considering people becomes worse."

'Umar said that if he did not put anyone as the caliph, he had treated like Prophet (s) and if he chose someone, then he had done like Ab£ Bakr[2] both seemed to him religious traditions. 'Umar stated that during his life he had been shouldering the responsibility which he wouldn't want to do so after death.[3] However, he couldn't leave the caliphate.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.223

[2]. 'Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.V, pp.448-449; °af¥a's reasoning is the simplest one in Sh¢'a for the necessity of succession by the Messenger (s). Others also with the same reasoning asked 'Umar to designate a successor, ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.343

[3]. al-A¦kim al-sul§iniyya, p.13; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.342; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.501, No.1290

‘Umar said, “Some people, according to Balidhur¢, have said (and he himself accepted that) swearing allegiance to Ab£ Bakr was unbased and without cosultation. This would be done in “Shuwri” after me.[1] ‘Umar chose six people instead of one, putting the responsibility on ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf[2] to consult with each other and choose one of themselves.

I found, ‘Umar said, you are public headmen and this should be done by no one but you. Caliph, as said, placed an imperfection on each of them except Ibn ‘Awf whom he praised.[3] ‘Umar determined the council members as well as saying its quality of task. They were supposed to gather in a house where fifty companions guarded them till they would choose a caliph. It seemed that ±al¦a was not in Medina; (Balidhur¢ says this is true) if five people chose someone with whom one person disagreed, he had to be decapitated; if two of them disagreed with four people’s decision, they had to be killed; if three people were on one side and three on the other side, they had to agree with ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar’s arbitration and if they didn’t accept it, the group in which was ‘Abd al-Ra¦min ‘Awf, was preferred. And if the other three people disagreed with them, they had to be killed.[4] ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar’s role in this council of six people, had a consultative aspect, but he himself couldn’t be as a candidate for caliphate because in his father’s opinion, he couldn’t even decide about divorcing his wife much less that.[5] Beyond all this, ‘Umar had said this affair was for “people of Badr” as long as one of them survives, after them came people of “U¦ud” as long as one of them survives. As for the released ones and their offsprings and the people who became Muslims in Mecca’s conquest, they have no

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.500, No.1288

[2]. Ibid. vol.IV, p.505, No.1303; °ayit al-¥a¦aba, vol.II, p.33

[3]. Ibid. vol.IV, p.229; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.I2, pp.258-259

[4]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.42; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.229; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.504, No.1300,1301

[5] ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.343; Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.160. An imagination that is not so unbased is that ‘Umar feared heriditary caliphate and he had this as a principle in his mind that ruler should not use his relatives in handling the affairs or assigning them as his successors. He mentioned this as an advice to ‘Al¢ (a) and ‘Uthmin adding, “If you became caliph, lest you might have the Hishimites or family of Ab¢ Mu‘ay§ dominate people, al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.43

rights.[1] ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ also tried hard to become a member of the Shuwri.

But ‘Umar told him he would not leave the task to someone who had fought against Prophet (s) [2] and he meant when ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ was an infidel.

In the beginning, ‘Abbis asked ‘Al¢ (a) not to enter Shuwri. But Imim said that first he was afraid of schism, second, what ‘Umar had said, “Your tribe doesn’t agree with the prophecy and caliphate in the same lineage”, should be proved wrong.[3] When Shuwri was shaped of members, Imim ‘Al¢ (a)’s opinion was that ‘Uthmin would be chosen.

Imim’s analysis was that “‘Uthmin and I are in this congress and we should obey the majority.” Sa‘d would not object to his cousin, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf (who both were of Ban£ Zuhra). Besides, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min is ‘Uthmin’s brother-in-law and they wouldn’t disagree with each other, so ‘Abd al-Ra¦min would choose him;[4] therefore, if there are only two persons remained, that is ±al¦a and Zubayr staying with me, it is of no benefit because of Ibn ‘Awf they would be preferred.[5] Moreover, since Prophet’s time there was a pledge of brotherhood between ‘Uthmin and ‘Abd al-Ra¦min’Awf. [6]

‘Abd al-Ra¦min announced that he favored not caliphate, others normally were not disposed to caliphate, Sa‘d left the task to Ibn ‘Awf, but he said that in his opinion, ‘Al¢ was superior to ‘Uthmin.[7] Thus, caliphate was exclusive to ‘Al¢

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.342

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.503, No.1295; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.230

[3]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.189

[4]. Imim says in Nahdj al-baligha, **ومال الآخر لصهره** Ibn Abi l-°ad ¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha,, vol.I, p.184. After ‘Abd al-Ra¦min payed allegiance to ‘Uthmin, ‘Al¢ (a) said, **مال الرجل إلى صهره ونبذ دينه وراء ظهره** “He tilted towards his kins and set religion aside” Al-Djamal, p.123; ‘Uthmin’s sister was Ibn ‘Awf’s wife merely on the part of his mother Umm Kulth£m, daughter of ‘Uqba Ibn Ab¢ Mu‘ay§. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d,Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.I, p.189

[5]. Tir¢kh Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.230; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.191; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.505, No.1304

[6]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.955

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.506, No.1308; Mak¦£l Shim¢ says, “Sa‘d was not in Shuwri because of his abdication. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.507, No.1309

(a) and ‘Uthmin. Now, schism in society, Quraysh and non-Quraysh came to be real.

One should know that, here, Quraysh is “political Quraysh” which excludes the Hishimites. According to ±abar ¢, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min had been consulting several nights. All emirs, noblemen and people recommended him to choose ‘Uthmin.[1] After three days, people gathered in a mosque in the morning. According to Zuhr¢, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min attended the meeting and Ibn ‘Awf said that he had asked people and they had qualified no one but ‘Uthmin.[2]

“Then ‘Ammir Ibn Yisir, ±abar¢ says, cried,”If you don’t want “Muslims” to get involved in conflicts, choose ‘Al¢.”

“He is right “ Miqdid Ibn Aswad ratified.

“If you don’t want, said ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Sar¦ (whom the Prophet ostracized), Quraysh to come into conflict with each other, choose ‘Uthmin.” ±abar¢ adds that “the Umayyads” and “ the Hishimites” negotiated.[3] ‘Ammir and Miqdid were on the Hashimithes’ side.

“O, people!” ‘Ammir said in the mosque, “God graced us by his Prophet and by his religion, He endeared us. Why do you divest it from his “Household”?”

A man of Ban£ Makhz£m (he was ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d and was allied, in ignorance, with the Umayyads and Abu l- Djahl and Khilid Ibn Wal¢d were of them) replied, “O ‘Ammir! You have stepped off your limits! How does the emirate of Quraysh relate to you?” [4]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.928; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.230; Zuhr¢ says, “That night Ibn ‘Awf consulted the outstanding people of Mu¦idjir and An¥ir”, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.V, p.482. But we know even if he had consulted all of them, he would have observed only what Quraysh had said; ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z, al-D£r¢ says, “This supportive counselling of ‘Uthmin indicates that the Umayya were active from conquest of Mecca on in achieving a landslide so far as all agreed on ‘Uthmin’s coming to power. Muqadama f¢ tir¢kh ¯adr al-islim, p.59

[2]. ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.IV, p.477

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.233; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad ¢d, vol.I2, p.194

[4]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. II, pp.929-930; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.233; According to Muf¢d (al-Djamal, p.122), Miqdid shouted, “Do not swear allegiance to someone who was present in Badr, escaped U¦ud and was absent in Ri¤win alleginace (he meant

Then ‘Abd al-Ra¦min called ‘Al¢, “Do you swear, saying that, if you come to power, you would follow the Book, the biography of Prophet and Shiykhs!”

“I hope I behave in the bounds of my knowledge and ability (Balidhur¢, Idjtihid)”, Imim said.[1] ‘Abd al-Ra¦min called ‘Uthmin and he accepted Ibn ‘Awf’s conditions. Thus, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min chose ‘Uthmin as the caliph and swore allegiance to him. “You chose ‘Uthmin to return you to the caliphate”, ‘Al¢ (a) said.[2]

The evidence of Imim’s speech was when ‘Uthmin got sick, then he called his scribe to write a letter of allegiance for ‘Abd al-Ra¦min’s caliphate after him.[3] Later, ‘Uthmin recuperated, the treaty dissolved and evoked hostility between Ibn ‘Awf and him.

I haven’t seen, Miqdid said, the Prophet (s)’s Household behaves like this after him. I wonder how “Quraysh” leaves a man whom I know no one wiser and more just. People look, ‘Al¢ (a) said, at “Quraysh” and Quraysh does at his “lineage”. If the Hishimites comes to power, they would stay in power forever, but they can rotate caliphate in their lineage.

±al¦a who came to Medina the same day asked, “Is Quraysh pleased with ‘Uthmin? “

“Yes!” they replied. So he swore allegiance.

‘Uthmin)”; ‘Uthmin said, “By God, if I come to power, I’ll return you to your previous conditions, al-Amil¢, Shiykh Muf¢d, pp.114-115

Amil¢, Shiykh Muf¢d, pp.114-115

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp.233,238; Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.162; Ya‘qub¢ says, “In front of the condition of practising according to biography of Shiykhs, Imim said, “Following Book of God and tradition of the Messenger requires hiring of nobody; you’re trying to make me overlook caliphate, Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.508, No.1311; **al-**Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.192; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.I, p.188, vol.I2, pp.194,264. Zuhr¢ fails to mention anything about Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and only suffices to say, “‘Abd al-Ra¦min set this condition for ‘Uthmin and he approved.”; ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.V, p.477

[2]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.930; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp.233-234; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.III, p.76

[3]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.1028,1029; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.VII, p.254

“You did the right thing to choose ‘Uthmin”, Mughc¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba told Ibn ‘Awf. “We would not be consent if you were not elected”, he told ‘Uthmin.

‘Abd al-Ra¦min accused him of lying.[1] Another account of ±abarc¢ says about what Shuwri members said in the mosque.

“We are the lineage of Nabuwwat, mine of theosophy, refuge of earth people and redemptive for those who seek salvation,”[2] Imim ‘Alc¢ (a) says. Imim regarded Ibn ‘Awf’s deal in posing conduct of Shiykhs as a ″deceit″.[3] The narrator has considered that ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥’s had a hand in this craft but it’s clear that it could not be done without Ibn ‘Awf.

‘Abbis believed Shuwri is settled in a way that it would result in ‘Uthmin’s caliphate. Because of this, he asked ‘Alc¢ not to join Shuwri.[4] According to Ibn Abi l-°adc¢d, ‘Umar asked the six people, “Is everyone favored in caliphate?”

Zubayr replied, “Yes. If you become a caliph, our rank and acquaintances would not be less than you in ″Qurayish″.”

Dji¦i¨ says, “If Zubayr was not certain of ‘Umar’s death, he wouldn’t dare say it in front of him.”[5] He further says, “Zubayr supported ‘Alc¢[6] and because ±al¦a was of Ban£ Tam ¢m and Ab£ Bakr’s causin, he was on the side of ‘Uthmin who was against the Hishimites.” [7]

According to Ibn ‘Abbis, ‘Umar threatened Shuwri members, saying that if they are at odds, Mu‘iwiya

---

[1]. Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol.IV, pp.233-234,239; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.502, No.1294; and concerning ±al¦a, p.504, No.1300. ±al¦a was rewarded although he was ranked as the worst enemy of ‘Uthmin in the course of his seige. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.506, No.1306; Regarding position of Miqdid, Tarc¢kh al-ya‘q£bc¢, vol.II, p.163; Tirc¢kh al-madc¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.930-931

[2]. Kitib al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.96-97; Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol.IV, p.237, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.I2, p.195

[3]. Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol.IV, pp.238-239; perhaps deceit ment the same quotation of Imim by Ya‘qubc¢ as Ibn ‘Awf set the condition to keep him away from caliphate. Tarc¢kh al-ya‘q£bc¢, vol.II, p.162

[4]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°adc¢d, vol.I, p.189

[5]. Ibid. vol.I, p.185

[6]. Ibid. vol.I, p.187

[7]. Ibid. vol.I, pp.187-188; Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.37

would overcome them. He was then in Damascus.[1] After allegiance was sworn, Imim (a) returned home. However, ‘Ammir said,

يا ناعي السلام قم فانعه قد مات عرف وأتى منكر[2]

‘O thou who declare death of religion, rise up because goodness vanished and badness ruled.”

Here, some points should be noted:

First, since then the Umayyads who were politicians of Quraysh, owned caliphate. This time, ‘Uthmin represented them and they favored him a lot. It goes to say that, **أحبك والرحمن حبّ قريش عثمان** [3] **“**By the Merciful God, I like you as much as Quraysh liked ‘Uthmin.”

In contrast, Quraysh was hostile to ‘Al¢ and it was ‘Uthmin who told ‘Al¢, “It is not my fault that Quraysh dislikes you.” [4] But this time, a noble branch of Quraysh came to power while it was not so during Ab£ Bakr and ‘Uthmin. Although ‘Umar was wealthy [5], he did not lead an aristocratic life. Yet, ‘Uthmin was a nobleman with an Islamic past.[6] Then, the government gradually moved towards the aristocratic rulership of Quraysh and extremely used tribal norms overly in choosing the caliph.[7] It is said that at the very moment of election, Ab£ Sufyin told ‘Uthmin, **اجعل الأمر أمر الجاهلية**, by which he meant to say, “Revive the customs of the pre-Islamic era.” And he, of course, meant nothing but caliphate.[8] As mentioned earlier, being a

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I, p.187

[2]. al-Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.193

[3]. al-Ma‘irif, p.192

[4]. Ma‘rifat al-¥a¦iba, vol.I, p.1301; this statement is attributed to ‘Umar that ‘Uthmin may probably be named rather than ‘Umar, al-Muqanna‘, p.110; Maniqib, vol.III, p.220

[5]. °ayit al-¥a¦aba, vol.I, p.347,

Kashf al-astir, vol.II0, p.303; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.935

[6]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.I1, p.67

[7]. Muqadama f¢ tir¢kh ¯adr al-islim, pp.58-59

[8]. When ‘Umar asked Ibn ‘Abbis about ‘Uthmin, he said, “He keeps love of this world and the world hereafter in his heart and if he comes

member of Quraysh was not a constitutional prerequisite for caliphate and the tradition **الأئمة من قريش** had not yet become the basis of justify the rule of Quraysh, as it is not consistent with ‘Umar’s idea of making Silim Mawli °udhayfa his successor, so he wished his survival and being a Qurayshite as an invalid condition, as ‘Umar says, is what Sh¢‘a since long has remained critical of. [1]

Second, Shuwri and deliberation about caliphate came to be posed for the first time. This Shuwri had two aspects, one was the six-member council framework of heads of Quraysh and the caliphate was in hands of no one but them. ‘Umar had determined the rules of election and based it on the majority and the minority[2] and if equal, set the balance heavier on the part of three people among whom was Ibn ‘Awf. Another is Ibn ‘Awf’s consultation with people lasting several nights according to what is said. Of course, Ibn ‘Awf was blamed for choosing ‘Uthmin because of his kinship and this consultation could cover it. Moreover, just like Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar, they had made a pledge of brotherhood. It should be noted that later there appeared a conflict between ‘Uthmin and Ibn ‘Awf and when Ibn ‘Awf was badly thrashed by ‘Uthmin’s agents, he passed away while being discontented with ‘Uthmin.[3] What is important is the role of

---

to power, he’ll have family of Ab¢ Mu‘ay§ rule people; al-«¤i¦, p.86. In the very night of succession (beginning of Mu¦arram, 24 H.), when ‘Uthmin was on his way to the mosque to say night prayers, there were people ahead of him carrying candles and Miqdid said, “What innovation this is!” (Ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.163); he referred to starting point of ceremonial functions! Ibn A‘tham quoted Ibn ‘Awf as saying that, “I am pleased with the succession of the doyen of the Umayya.”; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.909

[1]. al-«¤i¦, pp.127-128; as said, the condition of being a member of Quraysh was because of dominating nature of tribalism. ‘Umar appointed ¯uhayb R£m¢ as congregational leader just for the three days Shuwri is engaged in talks and said, “He is of Mawil¢ (freed slaves) and will not be in conflict with you over succession; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.42

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.503, No.1298 ليتّبع الأقل الاكثر فمن خالفكم فاضربوا عنقه The minority must follow the majority and whosoever opposes, he shall be dicapitated.

[3]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, vol.I, p.196; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.1033; ‘Al¢ (a) is said to have cursed Ibn ‘Awf when selecting ‘Uthmin and Ab£ Hilil ‘Askar¢ says, “‘Uthmin and

Shuwri. However, Shuwri consisted of six chosen people and this number could resolve choosing one person out of six. This was a kind of limited Shuwri among a few Quraysh elites, so no one could interfere save them. This effective method was seen, in the next periods, among some of Imim's opponents as well as among the Zubayrids who were against the Umayyads. This will be dealt with later.

The **third** point concerned was allegiance. After Ibn 'Awf and other Shuwri members swore allegiance, 'Al¢ (a) still avoided doing so.

"Swear allegiance", Ibn 'Awf told him, "or I will decapitate you."

Imim left the house. Shuwri companions followed him and said, **"بايع وإلّا جاهدناك** Swear an allegiance or we will Djihid with you."

Imim (a) followed them and swore an allegiance to 'Uthmin.[1] This is something that is criticized.[2]

"If you are a man of fighting, we will help you." Miqdid asked 'Al¢ (a).

Imim said, "Who will help me to fight them?"

'Ammir also said the same thing.[3]

This was based on what 'Umar had said, "If anyone refused to swear allegiance, he should be beheaded."

As mentioned before, 'Umar was one of those who believed in securing allegiance by force [4]- despite what is ascribed to Ab£ Bakr. 'Umar could not believe some people were trying for schism.

Ibn 'Awf were in disagreement over fulfilment of 'Al¢'s invokation; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.XII, p.196

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.508, No.1311; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.IX, p.55; vol.I2, p.265; al-Bad' wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.193; °ab¢b al-siyar, vol.I, p.496; Imim Himself expressed his statement that he has been told If he failed to swear allegiance, he would be fought. He also says, "I unwillingly pledged allegiance; al-Ghirit, vol.I, p.318. However, fanatic narrators have said that 'Al¢ was the first one to swear allegiance after Ibn'Awf! ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.63

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I2, p.259 (according to Sayyid Murta¤i)

[3]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.I2, pp.265-266; al-Amil¢, Muf¢d, p.115

[4]. al-«¤i¦, pp.187-188

At first, when he appointed Shuwri members, he said, “If you all choose one person and one of you disagrees with them, you could kill him.”[1] Later, it remains to be seen that after Imim (a) came to power, he ceased to agree to secure allegiance by force from those who refused to do so.

The last point is that one of marginal effects of Shuwri was the members caprice for caliphate. In ‘Umar’s opinion, they all had the privilege to seize caliphate and this aroused their expectations.

As said, “When you become a caliph”, Zubayr told him at the presence of ‘Umar. “we could also be caliphs because we are not lower in rank than you from the viewpoint of being a Quraysh and our precedence.” [2] Normally, this Shuwri would make them expect more. There was a reason why ‘Amr Ibn ‘a¥ and Mughra Ibn Shu‘ba were trying to join this council. Such an expectation resulted in provoking next revolts and also objections against ‘Uthmin and later against ‘Al¢ (a).

Mu‘iwiya’s analysis was that since ±al¦a, Zubayr and Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ supposed that they are eligible for caliphate, ‘Umar’s Shuwri raised differences among Muslims.[3] Shiykh Muf¢d also writes about Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥, “Personally, he didn’t identify himself equal to ‘Al¢ (a) but as he joined Shuwri, he came to this feeling that he has the authority of caliphate, and this ruined his faith and life.”[4] Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d has quoted his professor’s analysis that each of Shuwri members, inside themselves, had this feeling that they were capable of caliphate.This preoccupied them till the next differences appeared.[5] In Djamal battle, ±al¦a told ‘Al¢ (a), “Resign from caliphate, then we leave it to ″Shuwri″.” “We were also in Shuwri, two people who didn’t want you, now have passed away, we are also three”, he added.

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.91; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.61

[2]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.I, p.185; Ab£ Bakr said to ‘Umar that he had to be careful of Mu¦idjir£n because many of them were capricious of succession; Nathr al-durr, vol.II, pp.16,22

[3]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.IV, p.281; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.85

[4]. al-Djamal, p.97

[5]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.IX, pp.28-29

“You should have said that before swearing an allegiance but now that you have swore, you should be faithful”,[1] ‘Al¢ replied.

‘UTHMªN’S CALIPHATE

‘Uthmin was one of those Muslims who became a Muslim as called by Ab£ Bakr in the first years. He was one of the Umayyads and his Islam was strange in a family most of whom were anti-Islam people. He was one of those who migrated to Ethiopia, but soon he returned Mecca and migrated to Medina. There, he married two of the Prophet (s)’s daughters respectively who died soon. Because of his wife’s sickness, ‘Uthmin did not attend Badr. Also, in U¦ud he was with the fugitives who, indeed, were blessed. Later, there is no memory of him except in the issue of °udayb ¢yya.[2]

In Ab£ Bakr’s time, he was close to him and was his scribe. It was him who wrote ‘Umar’s allegiance – Ab£ Bakr said – while he was unconscious. Also, he had a great influence in ‘Umar’s time and was the Umayyads’ envoy in that situation. Afterwards, ‘Uthmin as Umayyads’ envoy and Imim ‘Al¢ (a) as the Hishimites’ seemed to be atop of those who will lead the society in the future. ‘Umar had probably realized or practically had the inclination that ‘Uthmin was more capable of leading an Islamic society because of his influence and Popularity in Quraysh. Whatever his opinion was, it can’t be neglected that Quraysh wanted him. When he rather came in grips with Imim in the time of ‘Uthmin’s succession, he told Imim, **“ما ذنبي إن لم يحبك قريش** Is it my fault that Quraysh doesn’t like you?”[3]

Ibn Qutayba also declares that ‘Uthmin was favored by Quraysh, so it was said, **أحبك والرحمن حب قريش عثمان**[4] **“**By the Compassionate God, I love thee as Quraysh loved ‘Uthmin.”

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.95

[2]. See, issue of °udaybiyya in Tir¢kh Siyis¢ Islim, vol.I, "Biography of the Messenger (s)"

[3]. Ma‘rifat al-¥a¦iba, vol.I, p.301

[4]. al-Ma‘irif, p.192; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.11

As swearing allegiance to ‘Uthmin ended in the last day of Dhi l-°adjdja, 23 A.H., he sat on the Messenger’s (s) rostrum. The difference between him and previous caliphs was that Ab£ Bakr sat one step down where the Prophet (s) used to sit, ‘Umar one step down Ab£ Bakr and unlike them, ‘Uthmin sat where Prophet sat.[1] WThen he mounted the rostrum, he couldn’t speak. He thought a bit and then, “you need a just Imim more than a lecturer”, he said. Then he came down the rostrum and went home.[2]

His first action was to overlook ‘Ubayd Allih Ibn ‘Umar’s punishment. He killed three people, Iranian Hurmuzin and Ab£ Lu’lu’ ’s family who were accused of murdering his father, ‘Umar. ‘Uthmin as the ruler dispensed with his Qi¥i¥, retaliation, and changed it to blood money and stood against protesters.[3] ‘Uthmin’s caliphate must be considered as the beginning of the Umayyads’ caliphate. Ibn A‘tham has named him ″Doyen of the Umayyads″ quoting from Ibn ‘Awf.[4] The Umayyads thought of lordship since they were ignorant.

When people, Ab£ Bakr Djuwhar¢ says, swore allegiance to ‘Uthmin, “this”, said Ab£ Sufyin, “was in Taym’s hands (Ab£ Bakr’s tribe) while it didn’t concern them; thereafter, ″‘Ad¢″ (tribe) took hold that was much farther.” “Now it has returned to its reservation.”

“Leave it hereditary among your offsprings, there is neither a heaven nor a hell”, he told ‘Uthmin and the Umayyads.”[5]

According to Mas‘£d¢, ‘Ammir who had heard Ab£ Sufyin in the mosque, stood up and began to protest. Miqdid also did the same after him and said he was worried about turning Ahl al-Bayt from this affair.[6] Ibn ‘Asikir has also narrated that Ab£ Sufyin told ‘Uthmin, **اجعل الأمر أمر الجاهلية** [7] **“**Settle the case out of ignorance.”

---

[1]. Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.163

[2]. al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.I, p.345

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.294-295

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.99

[5]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.II, pp.44-45; from al-Saq¢fa by Ab£ Bakr Djuwhar¢; al-Aghin¢, vol.VI, p.356; al-Fi’iq, vol.II, p.117; al-Nizi‘ wa l-takhi¥um, p.56

[6]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.343

[7]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.I1, p.67

Of course, this evidence only specifies Ab£ Sufyin's idea not 'Uthmin's; however, 'Uthmin's caliphate is Ab£ Sufyin's hope for the throwback of the Umayyads' dominance. His caliphate begins with mightiness of Quraysh's nobleness. Therefore, it is said that he was more favored by Quraysh than 'Umar.[1] The strife of Muslim world after the Prophet (s) was indeed the conflict between the Islamic norms and tribal ones. Quraysh's victory was regarded as the triumph of tribal norms; however, in the time of the first two caliphs, this victory was tempered with the Islamic norms but it should not be considered permanent, for Quraysh actually came to power by 'Uthmin's caliphate.

'Uthmin had never been a weak caliph despite rumors and robustly handled the affairs from scratch. His murder by Prophet (s)'s companions and other protesters did not mean his lack of enough power but because the protest against him was so much that he and his companions could not control it. Besides, leaving the tasks to people like Marwin or other Sufyan¢ members was not his weakness but he was basically thinking of reposing the caliphate to the Umayyads and he did all this as an introduction to Umayyidize all political affairs. Accidentally as he supposed, he acted intelligently because during the first six years of caliphate, he acted peacefully and tried to consolidate his position. Later, during the second half of the caliphate, he manifested his radical policies and gradually began to change political structure of various regions. In his initiatives, he had the support of Quraysh. He tried to consider their portion instead. But in the second half, his task was to empower the particular tribe of the Umayyads. This infuriated some people of Quraysh. He disentitled people like 'Amr Ibn 'ª¥ and empowered 'Abd Allih Ibn Sa'd Ibn Ab¢ Sar¦. Umayyads's members ruling over people spurred anger of many and instigated people to openly revolt against him.

The main point of his regime was one, the victories and the other, more important, was to study this revolt against him, that had a great influence in the Islamic world and most of the subsequent conflicts in Muslim world were arisen from Muslim's approach towards 'Uthmin and his opponents.

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.64

REASONS OF ANTI-‘UTHMªN REBELLION

There are so many reasons for rebelling against ‘Uthmin mentioned in historical books. ±abar¢ and et.al did not want to record these facts.

“There is something said about this which I hesitate to narrate”, ±abar¢ says.[1] Narrating all of what the companions have said about ‘Uthmin may cause the Sunnites to have problematic vciews about companions, especially caliphs. Regarding what is said about reasons of rebeling against ‘Uthmin, they can be divided into three categories,

(1) The first type of objections concerns the issues through which the caliph was accused of religious heresy.

“How soon you apostatized your Prophet’s tradition!” It’s quoted from ‘ªyisha who told ‘Uthmin.[2] “His deeds burnt him, he set fire to God’s book and abandoned the Prophet’s tradition”, said ‘ªyisha when she heard about ‘Uthmin’s death.[3] ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf claimed ‘Uthmin had also violated tradition of Shiykhs. When he objected to him, he was thrashed.[4] In a letter written to provoke people against ‘Uthmin, it was said that the Book and the Prophet’s tradition have been changed, so has Shiykhs’ tradition.[5] ‘Uthmin’s disregarding Hurmuzin’s murder by ‘Ubayd Allih raised public anger. ‘Uthmin forgave ‘Ubayd Allih instead of retaliating him for the death of three people.[6]

For doing this, Imim blamed ‘Uthmin and said, “You will be upbraided in Dooms Day for Hurmuzin.” “If I see ‘Ubayd Allih, I will let him obey divine rule even if some people do not like it.”[7]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp.356,365; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.167

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.48; al-Aghin¢, vol.V, p.130

[3]. al-Djamal, p.161; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.VI, p.216

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.57; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.70; al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, vol.I5, p.223, (India); al-Fut£¦, p.2151

[5]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.53

[6]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VII, p.147; Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.141

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.24

When ‘Uthmin saw this, he forced ‘Ubayd Allih away K£fa at night and there, he gave him a land named Kuwayfa Ibn ‘Umar.[8]

People said when ‘Uthmin was enlarging the Prophet’s mosque. **يوسِّع مسجد رسول الله ويُغيِّر سنَّته**[2] **“**He expands the mosque of the Messenger but changes his Sunna.”

Another clear example was that unlike the Prophet (s), ‘Uthmin prayed completely in Mini, that instigated some people against him.

“This is my belief”, said ‘Uthmin when they objected.[3]

‘Ammir, who was one of his known opponents, said, **قتلناه كافراً**[4] **“**We killed him while being an unbeliever.”

He stood against rebels in the day of Djamal and asked them, “Why do you fight with us?”

“Because ‘Uthmin was murdered while he was a Muslim”, they replied.

“We fight with you because he was a pagan when he was killed”, ‘Ammir said.[5]

“Why did you anathematize ‘Uthmin?” Zayd Ibn Arqam was asked.

“We had three reasons one of which was not following the Book”, he replied.[6]

I¥fahini has mentioned some opponents who told ‘Uthmin, “Fear God and do not exceed divine limits.”[7]

“He had changed the Book”, said Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr explaining his reason of opposing ‘Uthmin.[8]

---

[8]. al-Djamal, p.176; Mu‘djam al-buldin, vol.IV, p.496; Nahdj al-sa‘ida, vol.I, p.146

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.38

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.39; al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VII, pp.154,171; Sunan Nasi’¢, vol.III, p.12; al-Muwa§§a’, vol.I, p.282

[4]. al-Mi‘yir wa l-muwizana, p.71

[5]. al-Djamal, p.336

[6]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.III, p.51; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d says this speech is quoted from Zayd in different ways.

[7]. al-Aghin¢, vol.V, p.131

[8]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VII, p.175

And it’s quoted from him, “‘Uthmin has treated unrightfully and distorted Qur’in’s word.”

وَمَنْ لَمْ يَحْكُمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُوْلَئِكَ هُمْ الْكَافِرُونَ.[1]

“Whosoever judges not as to what God has said, he shall be an infidel.”

After public objections, he repented in front of them and promised to follow the Book and the Prophet’s tradition.[2]

It is quoted from ‘ªyisha who named ‘Uthmin ″Na‘thal″, old stupid man. **اقتلوا نعثلاً فقد كفر**.[3] “Murder ‘Uthmin who has sought infidelity.”

“At first, ‘Uthmin behaved as to God’s consent but later he changed his path”, is also quoted from Mu‘iwiya.[4]

One of the objections to ‘Uthmin was his unifying the existing Qur’ins. At that time, a scatter of companions in cities and Arabic accents problem in reading Qur’in escalated the difference among reciters.

It’s said that °udhayfa wrote to ‘Uthmin, “If it continues to be so, Qur’in will be distorted.” ‘Uthmin decided to collect all Qur’ins and eliminate them after arranging a version. He did not consult with some of the people who considered themselves as experts of the job. One of them was ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mas‘£d. He was chosen for this job instead of Zayd Ibn Thibit who was young at the Prophet’s time. No matter what help ‘Uthmin should get from people like Ibn Mas‘£d and no matter how he treated other

versions, (burnt them or ruined in other ways), his original action was right and Imim ‘Al¢ (a) had highly ratified it.[5]

(2) Another objection to ‘Uthmin was devolving upon people of the Umayyads governing the cities. Concerning Ab£ Sufyin’s suggestion in the beginning of caliphate, this

---

[1]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, p.284

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.216

[3]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.206

[4]. Tir¢kh Ibn al-ward¢, p.203; It should be said, ويل لمن كفّره نمرود Woe unto someone whom Namr£d excommunicates.

[5]. Concerning this, see, Ukdh£ba ta¦r¢f al-qur’in bayn al-sh¢‘a wa l-Sunna, pp.89-90

seemed normal unless he did not deem it right to do so in his first six years of caliphate. But during the second half, he tried to increase the Umayyads' political and administrative power. The routine was that he had certainly considered Mu'iwiya or another person of the Umayyads as his successor. The problem was not just using these people but people of this family who had other problems. Typically, °akam Ibn Abi l-'ª¥ whom the Prophet (s) exiled and Shiykhs did not repatriate, was called back to Medina and was employed to collect charity of Khuzi'a's tribe.[1] He also employed °irith Ibn °akam to work in Medina market.[2] He also gave the rulership of K£fa to Wal¢d Ibn 'Uqba Ibn Ab¢ Mu'ay§ who was his uncle.[3] Wal¢d whom God called evil-doer[4] and the Prophet (s) promised him hell[5], was obviously a man of sin and iniquity. He deserved punishment because he was a winebibber according to the testament of witnesses. First, 'Uthmin did not accept the testament and Imim 'Al¢ (a) blamed him saying, **"دفعت الشهود وابطلت الحدود** You led away the witnesses and abandoned divine limits."

When he accepted, people were afraid of 'Uthmin to punish him. Imim 'Al¢ rose, dropped him on the ground and exerted whip punishment on him.[6]

"Five years in K£fa", writes a Persian historian about Wal¢d's drinking wine, "Wal¢d lived in serendipity, had pleasurful nights, drank by draughts and in the morning reveled in bodily pleasure from red wine, he went to the mosque witlessly and said four units of prayers instead of two as the morning prayers."

And according to a narration he said, "I'm very cheerful today, I can say more prayers if you want."[7]

Wal¢d Ibn 'Uqba's successor was Sa'¢d Ibn 'ª¥ who was also of this tribe. At first, he tried to behave peacefully. But a little later, he was fulminated by people because of insulting

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.235; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.151

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.151

[3]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.347

[4]. See, Tafs¢r books in commentary of the verse, يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِنْ جَاءَكُمْ فَاسِقٌ بِنَبَإٍ فَتَبَيَّنُوا أَنْ تُصِيبُوا قَوْمًا بِجَهَالَةٍ فَتُصْبِحُوا عَلَى مَا فَعَلْتُمْ نَادِمِينَ.

[5]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.235

[6]. Ibid. vol.II, pp.235-236; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.168

[7]. °ab¢b al-siyar, vol.II, pp.171-173

Hishim Ibn ‘Utba who had lost his eye in Yarm£k and ironically was called him one-eyed man.

But the serious problem was Iraq – which is fertile lands of Iraq – all belong to Qurayshˮ, he said in K£fa. Milik Ashtar was seething with this word. Sa‘¢d wrote ‘Uthmin about Milik’s objection and “people who named themselves readers of Qur’in are indeed crazy doing such and such”, he said. The result was that ‘Uthmin exiled Milik and some others to Damascus.[1] Later, when K£fa faced escalated riot, ‘Uthmin said that Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢ who was there for ‘Umar to be given a rulership.[2]

Ba¥ra had not a better situation, there after deposing Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢ he placed ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir, only twenty five, who was caliph’s cousin. According to Ibn A‘tham, on Friday, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir Ibn Kurayz wanted to preach. He sat on the rostrum and meeting the crowd he was horrified, so he couldn’t talk. **ألحمد لله الـذي خلـق السـماوات والأ رض فـي ست سـنين** “Praise be to God (the Exalted) who created heaven and earth in six years”, he said as the prologue. [3]

Another ‘Uthmin’s measure was to depose ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ form ruling Egypt and leaving him to ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Sar¦. Tyranny of this man who was outcast by the Prophet (s) towards people of Egypt was one of the causes of these people rebelling against ‘Uthmin, their coming to Medina to murder him.

“Don’t you want”, Imim ‘Al¢ (a) told ‘Uthmin, “to leave off the Umayyads doing with Muslims’ honor and property? I swear if one of your agents tyrannizes people till the sunset, you’ll share his sin too.”[4] This was the same thing some had said about ‘Uthmin, that is to say he was the first one who began to tyrannize[5] because he did not his agents oppressing people. At the same level, Mu‘iwiya’s reinstatement in Damascus should be mentioned. Damascus was basically considered as ‘Uthmin’s safe region so he sent

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.171-173

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.238

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.101 (the proofreader in the footnote quoted this part from the Persian translation.) al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.II, p.251

[4]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.IX, p.15 from "Kitib al-Shuwri" by Wiqid¢.

[5]. al-Aghin¢, vol.I7, p.152

his exiles there. The difference between Damascus and Iraq was that Mu‘iwiya himself had trained them from the beginning but in K£fa people like ‘Ammir and ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mas‘£d had fostered them. Thus, Iraq revolted against ‘Uthmin while Damascus did not move at all.

According to Ibn Kath¢r, people protested why he had unseated the Prophet (s)’s companions.[1]

“You have assigned ignorant rulers for us”, was ‘Ammir’s objection.[2]

‘Uthmin’s policy in employing the Umayyads to handle the country affairs revealed a kind of “Lineal Monarchy” in Islamic caliphate. This way of ruling was the negation of the Islamic values and the settlement of tribal habitudes as well as marking the hereditariness of caliphate. In this kind of statehood, each of the princes came to power in a province. Anywhere the found a fertile land, they possessed. Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘ª¥ of the Umayyads, ruler of K£fa, named the lands of Iraq “Garden of Qurayshi”[3] so people’s protest against ‘Uthmin began here.[4]

(3) The third objection of rebells to ‘Uthmin was, his prodigality to the Umayyads’ family. These prodigality which at first to all Qurayshi eminent people and then just to the Umayyads, was at a very large extent. The opposition of ±al¦a and Zubayr was because of this recent thorough turnabout of ‘Uthmin for the Umayyads.

Thus, “If he gives money to you, you will be satisfied, but if he gives it to his own kinsmen, you’ll offend him”[5], ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Amr truly said about some of the opponents. Moreover, lavishing and aristocracy in ‘Uthmin’s government versus the past, spurred opposition. In Medina, ‘Uthmin built a sturdy house of stone with elegant wooden doors[6] and this dazzled a lot of people, comparing financial policy of ‘Umar.

---

[1]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VII, p.170

[2]. al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, vol.I5, p.221

[3]. Ansib al-Ashrāf, vol.IV, p.529, No.1376

[4]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.308

[5]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1115

[6]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.332

When he was objected, “I’ve made this house using Bayt al-Mil (public property), won’t it belong to you after me?”[1] he replied.

He conferred °irith Ibn °akam (Marwin’s brother) the land which is said to be of the Prophet (s)’s charity. Also, Fadak over which Zahri (a) and Ab£ Bakr had a disagreement and had taken it as public belonging was granted to Marwin Ibn °akam, caliph’s son-in-law.[2] A poet compared Shiykhs’ dealing with ‘Uthmin about Bayt al-Mil in his poem and in the end, he mentioned about granting to Marwin the fifth share of African booties which were nearly equal to five thousands of D¢nirs.

وأعطيت مروان خمس العباد فهيهات شأوك ممن سعى[3]

“Thou granted Marwin a share fifth of Allih’s servants, thy ideals are actually far from those in pursuit of virtues.”

According to Ibn Qutayba, ‘Uthmin paid °akam Ibn Abi l-‘a¥ one hundred thousand dhms[4] and according to other sources, three hundred thousand dhms.[5] Also, he conferred Khilid Ibn Usayd four hundred thousands dhms.[6] ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Sar¦ had also benefited from African booties.[7] ‘Uthmin set high marriage portion for his wives too.[8] Considering the given historical information, ‘Allama Am¢n¢ has tabulated these grants to the mentioned people as well as to people like Zubayr, Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥, Ya‘li Ibn Umayya, Zayd Ibn Thibit and the like.[9]

Concerning financial affairs, ‘Uthmin struggled with some people of whom Ab£dhar was the most important one. It is said that Ab£dhar attaked hard on ‘Uthmin citing “verse of Kanz”. According to Suy£§¢, ‘Uthmin tried to omit “and” (

---

[1]. al-Muwaffaqiyyit, p.602

[2]. al-Ma‘irif, p.195

[3]. Ibid. p.195; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.27,38

[4]. al-Ma‘irif, p.194

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.28. This money came from the poll tax ruled to be received.

[6]. al-Ma‘irif, pp.194,195

[7]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VII, p.172

[8]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.13

[9]. al-Ghad¢r, vol.VIII, p.286

واو) from the beginning of the verse so that it just refers to the people of Book. But because of Ubayy Ibn Ka‘b’s strong objection, he turned.[1] Also, ‘Uthmin had a difference with Ab£dhar over other financial affairs.[2] The result of ‘Uthmin’s opinion which he had gained by asking Ka‘b al-A¦bir’s legal opinion, was that Bayt al-Mil belongs to the caliph and he can use it in whatever way he wishes.

“You are our “stockman” !” said ‘Uthmin to Ibn Mas‘£d who had the Bayt al-Mil of K£fa.

“I thought”, Ibn Mas‘£d replied, “I was “Muslims’ stockman”. Now, if I’m supposed to be your stockman, this is the key all yours.”

When Ibn Mas‘£d came to Medina from K£fa and gave him the key of Bayt al-Mil in such a way, after outraging, ‘Uthmin ordered to wallop him and dump him from the mosque. Objecting to ‘Uthmin, Imim ‘Al¢ (a) took Ibn Mas‘£d to his house. Ibn Mas‘£d died two years before ‘Uthmin and had made a will stating that ‘Ammir should pray on his body rather than ‘Uthmin.[3] The same thing happened to ‘Abd Allih Ibn Arqam and he also said he thought he was the Muslims’ stockman, but now that it was determined he was the caliph’s stockman, he didn’t want to take the responsibility.[4]

“O Abā Is¦iq!”, ‘Uthmin asked Ka‘b Ibn al-A¦bir in the presence of Ab£dhar, “ what do you think about collecting the money which is given as offerings, spent for desolate people and used for piety (be given to relative).”

“I wish charity for its possessor”, Ka‘b Ibn Abi l-A¦bir replied. Ab£dhar boiled and raised his stick to beat his head.[5]

Ab£dhar told ‘Uthmin quoting from the Prophet (s) “The dearest of you to me is the one who keeps the promise given

---

[1]. al-durr al-manth£r, vol. III, p 232

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, pp.339-340

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, pp 31, 36, 37; Tir¢kh Ya‘qub¢, vol. II, p 171

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, pp 58,88

[5]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.1306-1307 and in its footnote, ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.IV, p.232; al-°ilyat al-’awliyi’, vol.I, p.160; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.2860; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.II, p.376; vol.III, p.54; Nihiyat al-’irab, vol.I9, p.443; al-Tamh¢d wa l-bayin, sheet, 70

to me, so that he will join me; you are all involved in earthly things except me who have kept my promise.” [1]

Mu‘iwiya called the property of Bayt al-Mil “Mil Allih” (divine property) to confine possession to himself or basically limit it to himself. Ab£dhar objected why he called “Mil al-Muslim¢n” as “Mil Allih”.[2] Perchance, this was proved by another story. According to Zuhr¢, in the treasury of Bayt al-Mil, there was so much remittance ‘Uthmin had granted some to his kinsmen. Thus, some people quipped him.

“This is “Mil Allih” which is given to anyone I wish”, he said after being told.

When ‘Ammir opposed him, they walloped him to fall in a faint.[3] In practical policy of ‘Uthmin and his agents, there can be seen a strong mammonism. Mu‘iwiya led these activities and was in power in Damascus. Later, he will be talked about more.

Mawd£d¢ begins to discuss ‘Uthmin’s leaving to his kinsmen the important provinces in his book under the title of “from the leading caliphate to emperorship”. In his opinion, the rule of these agents who were mostly of “suburbs”, had been a kind of tribal reign over Muslim society.[4] ‘Uthmin entrusted Damascus to Mu‘iwiya and kept him as the ruler for that region for several years, considering this as one of his faults. He considers it as the result of Mu‘iwiya’s independence and not obeying the headquarters.[5] ‘Uthmin’s justification for this prodigality was that unlike ‘Umar who was not interested in piety, he had decided to do so![6]

As far as dealing of ‘Uthmin and his companions with Bayt al-Mil is concerned, one of the main reasons of rebelling against ‘Uthmin should go to the tribes’ eminent

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.1040

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.83

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.580, No.1485. Ab£dhar said, “Mu‘iw¢ya intends to name Muslims off everything.” This is an interesting idea. It will be considered that the reason for attaching caliph to God is for naming off people as well as removing his responsibility in front of the people and God.

[4]. Khilifat wa Mul£kiyyat, pp.119-121

[5]. Ibid. pp.129-130

[6]. Rabi‘ al-abrir, vol.III, p.575

people who got some property for themselves and other Muslims by force of sword and now seeing that Quraysh, especially the tribe of Umayyads, was ready to seize it. This challenge actually appeared between the ruling townsmen of Quraysh and warrior nomadic tribes. A scholar[1] indicating this theory, regards the central reign as a sign of Islamic orientation! and consider the protests of cities as crystallizing nationalism of tribes and tribal norms. He regards murdering of 'Uthmin as the victory of "cities" and in fact, victory of tribalism. What seems right is that Quraysh was up to domineer on the fate of Islamic nation resulting in instigation of the tribes. In fact, 'Uthmin, in one sense, is the crystallization of departing Islamic orientations towards tribal norms and his killing fails to stand for the end of Islamic orientation and dominating tribalism.

In our opinion, the right view is that the control of Quraysh over the caliphate caused the protest of the tribes which had taken the whole weight of the conquests while watching that Quraysh had confined two things to itself, one was the reign and the other was wealth; in this situation, Iraqi tribes were tricked.

"The city of Iraq", when Sa'¢d Ibn 'ª¥ Umaw¢ said in K£fa, "which is the rich lands of it, is the garden of Quraysh."

"Do you consider what God has given us by means of our swords, as a garden for yourself and your tribe?"[2] replied Milik Ashtar.

According to al-D£r¢[3], this financial distinction between Quraysh and non-Quraysh was somewhat originated from 'Umar's financial policy; however, Ab£ Bakr had equally divided the property and conditioned people's records just as to their divine return. 'Umar divided the property of Bayt al-Mil as to the their records. This caused the priority of emigrants (Muhidjirūn) and helpers (An¥ir) over Arabs and tribes which shouldered the whole weight of conquests after the Prophet (s). The assets of the headmen of the helpers

---

[1]. Khayr al-d¢n saw¢ influenced by his professor, 'Abd al-'Az¢z al-D£r¢ in the book, Ta§awwur al-fikr al-siyisi 'Ind ahl al-Sunna, pp.42-43

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.337; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp.469-470. Concerning the opinion of one of the people in Muhidjir£n's ruling for selecting caliph and monopolizing caliphate.

[3]. Muqaddama f¢ tir¢kh ¥adr al-islim, pp.50-58

represent the effects of ‘Umar’s financial policy which ‘Uthmin followed. When ‘Uthmin sent Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘ª¥ to K£fa as the ruler, he wrote to ‘Uthmin that, in the city, noble families and pedigree families with a record were subdued and Arabs (tribes) had overcome them.

“Advantage those with a precedence over them”, ‘Uthmin wrote him back, “and make others follow them, ... dedicate to each, his particular status.”[1]

To al-D£r¢, the main reason of uprising against ‘Uthmin was primarily anti-Quraysh tribes. It should be mentioned that ‘Uthmin was the crystallization of tribal orientation towards advantaging Quraysh dominance, especially the Umayyads, over the whole Islamic world. However, most of the rebels were the idealists who wanted the victory of true Islam. Imim ‘Al¢ (a)’s coming to power is proof of that. Also, Mr. Bay¤£n finds measure of protesters a kind of Islamic orientation and that of ‘Uthmin’s a tribal one.[2] Of course, it can be said that one of the results of this rioting was to weaken the central government, one main problem of Imim ‘Al¢ (a).

The last word is that a list of ‘Uthmin’s wrongs can be found in a letter the helpers had written to him.[3]

‘UTHMªN’S OPPONENTS

The dominating ‘Uthmin¢ view of Islamic society since the reign of the Umayyads (41 H.) resulted in acquitting and purifying ‘Uthmin from any kind of charge. The Umayyads imposed this view on the Islamic society except Iraq which slightly stood up against it. Thus, the Sunnites assented ‘Uthmin’s oppressedness and rightfulness against the dissenters. With this view, how did they judge dissenters? One way was that they realistically knew his dissenters and considered them as their religion enemies. If they had chosen to do so, the leading companions would be exposed to accusation. Another way was to consider his dissenters people, with no companions among them, who had come

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.279

[2]. See, Min Dawlat ‘Umar Ili Dawlat ‘Abd al-malik, P.107

[3]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.50

from Iraq and Egypt. They chose this way and when some companions were said to be among ‘Uthmin’s opponents, falsely saying that he had sent their sons to ‘Uthmin’s house to defend him (and it is not apparent why they did not go themselves), they began to support the companions in order not to be accused of being ‘Uthmin’s enemies.

It should be noted that “Sunnites historians” deemed it necessary to avoid mentioning companions’ imperfection.[1] If any one narrated their imperfection**,** it meant that he was a Shi‘ites Muslim. Clearly, the implication of one of the companions in killing ‘Uthmin was obviously regarded as his imperfection**.** With this compiled policy, most of the historical facts related to political positions of companions faded away. Here, forgery happened in two forms, first, not to right the truths of history, second, to make fake news. During the events of this era, Sayf Ibn ‘Umar, the lie-maker, radically denied the presence of companions and knew an unknown person called ‘Abd Allih Ibn Saba’ responsible for all these months-long serious events in which all of Islamic cities, especially the caliphate center in Medina played a great role. According to Sayf, traveling to different cities, this man had provoked people against ‘Uthmin[2] and had been able to arouse K£fa and Egypt. In Sayf’s opinion, ‘Abd Allih was also the founder of Sh¢‘a religion. If Sayf is true, it is not clear what should be said about a society so fragile that a

---

[1]. A¦mad Ibn °anbal seriously banned Sunnites narrators to narrate the companions’ imperfection. He believed if anyone narrated these things about companions, he should be avoided. Some time, he Himself listened to traditions through ‘Abd al-Razziq ¯an‘in¢. When ‘Abd al-Razziq retold these kinds of narrations, A¦mad kept away and he was back to class sessions when he began new subjects. In other cases, when the companions imperfection were discussed, A¦mad covered his ears with two fingers. “It can not be quoted from ‘Ubayd Allih Ibn M£si ‘Abas¢”, he said because يحدث باحاديث فيها تنقص لاصحاب رسول الله (ص) He narrated hadiths which lowered rank of the Prophet’s companions. Also he did not allow any one to quote a person who imprecated Mu‘iw¢ya. Some times, accounting that companions had said these words while they were angry, he did not permit their narrations. It is said that Silim Ibn Ab¢ Mu§¢‘ took Ab£ ‘Awina’s book and ruined the main traditions which were concerned with imperfection of companions. As for these words and similar narrations, al-Sana, Ab£ Khallil, pp.500-511

[2]. Tir¢kh Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, pp.378-379

Jewish can induce it against the caliph and it ends up murdering him? What is certain is that first in all scholastic books Sayf is accused of lying and heresy. Second, there is not such a thing in any of the books which were the first sources of Islamic history and even the name of ‘Abd Allih Ibn Saba’ is not mentioned. In other words, from all sources of 3rd and 4th centuries remained, ±abar¢ had just used Sayf’s books and for this he kept his forgery. However, in some books like Akhbir al-±iwil, al-Imimat wa al-S¢yisa, Ansib al-ashrif and Tir¢kh Khil¢fat Ibn Khayyi§, there is nothing mentioned about these events. Unfortunately, the next books like al-Bidiyat wa l-nihiya and Kimil Ibn Ath¢r which used ±abar¢ have cited these forgeries and in recent years this has been accepted since it is mostly consistent with the Sunnites beliefs.

Now, a lot of Sunnites and Shi‘ites researchers and orientalists seriously remain doubtful about it and do not concede it. Of the Shi‘ites researchers is Murta¤i Askar¢ [1] and of the Sunnites ones is ±ihi °usayn.[2] The forgery is also revealed to the orientalists.

Most of the Muslim historians[3], Bernard Lewis writes, attribute the commencement of revolutionary Shi‘ism to ‘Abd Allih Ibn Saba’ who co-lived with ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib (a). He was a Yemen¢ Jewish and had been publicizing ‘Al¢’s divinity and finally was burnt because of his deeds.

In this way, the starting point of hard-line Shi‘ite Muslims and exaggerators is ascribed to him and to a Jewish principle through him. Yet, new investigations show that this is some sort of circumstances and second century thoughts into the past rendered by “hadith-writers”. Wellhausen and Friedlander by means of narration and looking into sources have demonstrated that the conspiracy attributed to Ibn Saba’ is heresy coming after. Kietani, in a substantiated chapter, has shown that an intrigue with an ideology and organization ascribed to Ibn Saba’ is beyond imagination in

---

[1]. In his three books, this researcher has studied Sayf’s narrations and has correctly shown his style of writing which is a kind of story telling.

[2]. al-Fitnat al-kubri, the chapter on ‘Abd Allih Ibn Saba’

[3]. As mentioned, "this majority" is the people who used Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, otherwise the first rate books of the third century had not basically cited these events.

an Arabially patriarchal and tribal community in 35 A.H..[1] Anyhow, in so far as it is related to ‘Uthmin’s opponents, a great deal of facts can be obtained through the quest for historical and literary sources. With regard to what has been mentioned in these sources, the companions of the prophet, especially the An¥ir, have played a leading role in instigating the people against ‘Uthmin. By probing into various sources, ‘Allima Am¢n¢ has stated that more than 80 names of the companions are included among ‘Uthmin’s opponents, such as, ±al¦a, Zubayr, ‘ªyisha, ‘Ammir, Ab£dhar, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mas‘£d, Miqdid, °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢, Hishim Ibn ‘Utba, Sahl Ibn °unayf, Ab£ Ayy£b An¥ir¢, Djibir Ibn ‘Abd Allih An¥ir¢ whose oppositions against ‘Uthmin have benn quoted by ‘Allima Am¢n¢.[2] It should be taken into consideration that all of them did not believe in the murder of ‘Uthmin or nor did they deem it advisable, yet they criticized his political- religious actions sharply. Ab£ Sa‘¢d Khudr¢ said, About 800 companions have implicated in ‘Uthmin’s killing.[3] Busr Ibn Ar§it’s bitter talk to the Medinans in 40 A.H. is evidence that An¥ir were strongly implicated in killing ‘Uthmin.[4]

±al¦a and Zubayr were ranked among the most hardline critics of ‘Uthmin. Imim ‘Al¢ (a) used to say about them, they are demanding of me a right which they have abandoned, and a blood that they have themselves shed.[5] Numerous sources have revealed ±al¦a’s strong enmity towards ‘Uthmin.[6] Due to this very fact, Marwin Ibn °akam, who stayed alongside ±al¦a in the battle of Djamal, observing that the war was coming to an end put an arrow in the bow and killed ±al¦a. In this way, he took ‘Uthmin’s revenge against ±al¦a.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh Ismi‘¢liyin, p.33

[2]. al-Ghad¢r, vol.VIII and IX

[3]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1175

[4]. al-Ghirit, p.219 (Persian translation)

[5]. Nahdj al-sa‘ida, vol.I, pp.247-248

[6]. al-Ma‘irif, p.228; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.80; Tir¢kh al-madina al-munawwara, vol.III,p.1169 كان أشد الصحابة على عثمان طلحة بن عبيد الله ±al¦a Ibn ‘Abd Allih among the companions treated ‘Uthmin most harshly.

Afterwards, ‘Abd al-Malik Marwin said, “Unless my father had told me that he has killed ±al¦a, I would murder all ±al¦a’s progeny in revenge for ‘Uthmin’s blood.”[1] While laying siege to ‘Uthmin’s house, ±al¦a was reportedly the head of house guards and he did not let people, food and water in the house.[2]

Yet, becoming informed of the delivery of food and water, he said, “What sort of siege is this one in which food and water are delivered?”[3] When ‘Uthmin was stopped having water, Imim met ±al¦a and spoke to him about letting water in ‘Uthmin’s house, however, ±al¦a was unwilling to do so.[4] Some day ‘Uthmin sent somebody after Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and told him that ±al¦a was killing him through thirst, while it’s more worthwhile to be killed with the sword.[5] Shiykh Muf¢d has devoted a full chapter to his stances against ‘Uthmin.[6]

‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ was also ranked among bitter dissenters of ‘Uthmin.[7] ‘ªyisha also attacked ‘Uthmin strongly,[8] when her grant of bounty was cut under ‘Uthmin’s order.[9] It was she who called ‘Uthmin Na‘thal, an old stupid man due to his bushy beard.[10]

According to a witness, I was in mosque when ‘Uthmin entered, then ‘ªyisha yelled, “O traitor! O sinner! You spoiled the servants through breach of trust; if five units of prayer never existed, people would come to you and thereby, you were slaughtered as if you were a sheep.”

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.223; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.1170

[2]. al-Djamal, p.141, see, Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.385; al-‘Iqd al-far ¢d, vol.IV, p.290

[3]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.57

[4]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1169

[5]. Ibid, vol.III, p.1202

[6]. al-Djamal, pp. 145-146

[7]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1089

[8]. al-Mi‘yir wa l-muwizana, p.27; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.37

[9]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.123

[10]. al-Mi‘yir wa l-muwizana, p.27

‘Uthmin revealed to her[11] the verse related to Noah’s wife.[12] It seeds that in these last days, every time when ‘Uthmin came to mosque for prayer, he was rebuked by ‘ªyisha whose house was adjacent to the mosque. As to Balidhur¢, once this objection led to a clash between those for and against ‘ªyisha and ‘Uthmin so that they thrashed each other with shoes.

Balidhur¢ further says, **تلك أوّل قتال وقع بين المسلمين بعد النبي (ص)**) “It was the first clash occurred between Muslims after the Prophet (s).”[3]

Mu¦ammad, the son of ±al¦a, maintained that ‘ªyisha is responsible for one-third of ‘Uthmin’s blood.[4]

Sa‘d Waqqi¥ also has been quoted as saying, “‘Uthmin was killed with ‘ªyisha’s unshielded swords.”[5]

There is historically much to tell about ‘Ammir, Ab£dhar and ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf and many others, insofar as there will be no room for doubt.

At the time when the revolt was kicked against ‘Uthmin, there were few who would agree with him. Specifically when the Medinans received a letter sealed by ‘Uthmin to Egypt’s ruler in which murder of people was ordered, public anger was fired up.[6] When Mu‘iwiya put a question to ‘Uthmin, Umm al-Khayr answered, People selected him as a caliph, which they actually hated him. Afterwards, they killed him, while being pleased to do so.[7]

An¥ir were considered to be the main residents of Medina. Their disagreement with Quraysh was the motive behind the first mistake they made in Saq¢fa. In the event of the assassination of ‘Uthmin, beloved to Quraysh, most of An¥ir were numbered among ‘Uthmin’s dissenters, whereas a few where among ‘Uthmin’s assenters. The anti-‘Uthmin movement was led by An¥ir, Muhidjir£n and a number of the

---

[11]. al-Djamal, p.148; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.225; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.VI, p.215

[12]. Ta¦r¢m, verse 10

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.34

[4]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1173

[5]. Ibid, p.1174

[6]. Tir¢kh al-kham¢s, vol.II, p.261

[7]. ¯ub¦ al-a‘shi, vol.I, p.251

K£fiyins and Egyptians. Yet, in as much as Medina was An¥ir’s place of abode, the Umayya put the blame for this event on An¥ir. It was then they decided to take revenge of them. As far as Yaz¢d is concerned, the cruel suppression of Medina in °arra event by Muslim Ibn ‘Uqba, branded as prodigal due to his abundant massacre, is regarded as ‘Uthmin’s retaliation against the Medinans.[1]

Thibit, the son of ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr used to say to ‘Abd al-Malik, “The Medinans downgraded ‘Uthmin in as much as he was killed among them, and they did not support him.”[2] Some time, Thibit insulted the Syrians.

‘Uthmin’s son told him, “You insult them, for your father was killed by them.”

He replied, “Yes!” But O ‘Uthmin’s son! Beware. Your father has been killed by Muhidjir£n and An¥ir.[3]

Sa‘d Ibn ‘Abd al-Ra¦min said to °assin, “A group of An¥ir went to Mu‘iwiya in Syria.

Mu‘iwiya asked them, “Which one, Quraysh or you, are more helpful?... You humiliated ‘Uthmin when he was under siege and killed his followes in Djamal.”[4]

After ‘Uthmin’s murder, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir, Ba¥ra’s ruler, considered his killing as an unjust action. In Djir¢ya Ibn Qudima’s opinion, ‘Uthmin was killed in the presence of An¥ir and Muhidjir£n, yet they showed no reaction against murderers.[5] In this respect, a poet has said,

إن ابن عفان أصيب وحوله إخوانه وجماعة من الأنصار

“‘Uthmin Ibn ‘Affin was murdered when his brothers and a group of An¥ir surrounded him.”[6]

In continuation, this poet regrets that how is it possible for those who call themselves the companions of the Prophet (s) not to support ‘Uthmin. Mu‘iwiya asked Ab£ ±ufayl, were you one of killers of ‘Uthmin? He replied, “No, I was present over there, however, I did not advocated him.”

---

[1]. al-Aghin¢, vol.I, p.26

[2]. al-Muwaffaqiyyit, p.152; al-Imti‘ wa l-Mu’inisa, vol.III, p.165

[3]. al-Imti‘ wa l-Mu’inisa, vol.III, p.165

[4]. Ibid, vol.III, pp.168-169

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp 269-270

[6] Rabi‘ al-abrir, vol.III, p.341; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.263

Mu‘iwiya further asked, “Why?”

Ab£ ±ufayl answered, “Since Muhidjir£n and An¥ir didn’t came to his help.”[1]

Thereafter, Sa‘d Ibn Musayyib was questioned by people as why did the companions of the prophet (s) downgrade ‘Uthmin?[2]

‘Abd al-Malik used to say to the Medinans, “As long as we recall the Umayya’s killing and you remembered °arra, nor can we like each other.”[3]

So due to the Umayya’s animosity towards An¥ir the Umayya were obliged to induce Akh§al, the poet to, satirize An¥ir.[4] Concerning the role of An¥ir in ‘Uthmin’s murder, it’s interesting to mention ‘Uthmin’s letter to Mu‘iwiya when bringing him under siege, in which is was written, The Medinans have become atheist, have baulked at following their Imim and have broken their promise.[5] °assin Ibn Thibit, being one of the tenacious supporters of ‘Uthmin in these days, points out the matter of An¥ir’s downgrading ‘Uthmin in his poems. In fact, in addition to the following interpretation,

خذلته الأنصار اذ حضر الموت وكانت ولاته الأنصار

“An¥ir, even though having sainthood, was present when ‘Uthmin was killed, but they left him alone.”[6]

He further mentions the implication of ±al¦a, Zubayr, Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr and ‘Ammir in the assassination of ‘Uthmin. The Umayya’s hostility to An¥ir, the ‘Uthminids preferred Syria to Medina.[7] Afterwards, Ya¦yi, the son of °akam Ibn Abi l-‘ª¥ called Medina as an “evil land” and Syria as a “sacred land”.[8] This interpretation reveals their aversion to Islam.

---

[1]. al-Muwaffaqiyyit, p.154

[2]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.IV, p.287

[3]. al-Ba¥i’ír wa l-dhaki’ir, vol.I, p.18

[4]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XV, p.107

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p.402

[6] Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.347

[7]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.42; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.71; Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.LXX, pp.204,205,212,223,227; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p.421

[8]. al-Aghin¢, vol.LXXX, p.334

The evidence indicates that Muhidjir£n and An¥ir have played a central role in opposition to ‘Uthmin. Historians have quoted the content of the letter Muhidjir£n wrote to the cities (aiming at) asking them to go to Medina for the reform of circumstances. This letter contained, Form the early Muhidjir£n and the remaining members of council to the Egyptians including An¥ir and followers (Tibi‘¢n). Come to us and find out Caliphate, before it brings the people to an end. Verily, Qur’in has been distorted, the tradition of the Prophet has been changed and the Shiykhs’ rules have been altered. We hereby adjure all the remaining of and Tibi‘¢n by Allih to return to us if they believe in Allih and the Resurrection Day... the caliphate coming after the Prophet was the caliphate of Prophet hood and blessing, whereas it’s already become kingdom and sovereignty.[1] Based on another narration, a group of the companions of the prophet (s) assembled and after discussion determined on writing a letter to ‘Uthmin in order to remind him of his violating the Sunna. This letter, a highly significant document was given to ‘Uthmin by ‘Ammir, yet it was answered in no way but thrashing ‘Ammir.[2] It is appropriate to quote a remark from Hishim Ibn ‘Utba known as Ab£ Mirqil on his answer to a Syrian in ¯iff¢n who said that your Imim does not say prayer and has killed our caliph; what do you have to do with Ibn ‘Affin? **إنمـا قتلـه أصـحاب محمـد وقـرّاء الناس**[3] **“**Verily Mu¦ammad’s companions as well as public Qur’in-reciters killed him.”

‘Uthmin had a scarcity of assenters in Medina, each financially benefited from ‘Uthmin in one way or another. Among them was ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sallim. He was amongst the Muslim-turned Jews who went up the ‘Uthmin’s roof in the course of the siege of his house and said, “I found ‘Uthmin’s name is Torah in which it’s been mentioned, Your caliph is the oppressed, the martyr.”

People shouted, O the Jew! He’s fed you up and dressed your body.[4] This very narration should have been made at a

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, pp. 53-54

[2]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.50

[3] Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.354

[4]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.61. Most probably this remark, “... I found ‘Uthmin’s name in Torah” has been ascribed to ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sallim afterwards. Yet, he has been amongst ‘Uthmin’s assenters.

later time by those who were apt to label ‘Uthmin as martyr in Torah. Elsewhere it goes to say that such an issue has also been touched upon in terms of the second caliph. Anyhow, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sallim has been ranked among the tenacious assenters of ‘Uthmin.[1] Zayd Ibn Thibit was another supporter of ‘Uthmin once he began to advocate ‘Uthmin, people accused him of a support which was due to being fed up by ‘Uthmin. Zayd was keeper of ‘Uthmin’s treasury.[2] He was later on profited by Mu‘iwiya’s treasury.[3]

Wiqid¢ says, “Among the companions of the Prophet (s) no one supported ‘Uthmin but Zayd Ibn Thibit, Ab£ Usayd Si‘id¢, Ka‘b Ibn Milik and °assin Ibn Thibit.”[4]

According to Ibn Is¦iq, when ‘Uthmin migrated to Medina, he went to Aws Ibn Thibit, °assin’s brother. Thereafter, ‘Uthmin appealed to °assin. Then, after his killing, °assin cried for him.[5]

To Mas‘£d¢, **وكان حسان عثمانياً منحرفاً** [6] “°assin was both a supporter of ‘Uthmin and a deviator.”

In addition to the persons mentioned by Wiqid¢, Ab£ Hurayra has also been reckoned among ‘Uthmin’s supporters.[7]

Apart from a handful of supporters, ‘Uthmin died in Medina in such a stranger hood that no one dared to bury him in Baq¢‘. Only few of them buried him by night in a place called “°ashsh Kawkab”, a garden which was later on attached to Baq¢‘ by Mu‘iwiya.[8]

‘UTHMªN’S CONTACT WITH DISSENTERS

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp.1175-1186

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.222

[3]. Tir¢kh Ab£zar‘a al-dimashq¢, vol.I, p.190

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.60

[5]. Ibn Hishim, al-S¢rat al-nabawiyya, vol.II, p.479

[6]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.I, p.347

[7]. See, ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. III, pp. 89-170 and vol. IV, p.340

[8]. al-Ma‘irif, p.197. Ibn Qutayba says, °ash means garden and Kawkab is the name of a man from An¥ir.

As long as ‘Uthmin found himself in high position, he did not surrender to dissenters’ criticisms by no means whatsoever. Yet, he treated harshly to them and tried to render them obedient and calm through trashing and exile. The Umayya was all ‘Uthmin’s concern. Indeed, ‘Uthmin was yielded and, in a sense, feeble towards the members of this family; however, he treated the great companions of the Prophet (s) having a longer precedence bitterly and with asperity. This was highly influential in inciting the people once more. Contact with Ab£dhar who had a morally and spiritually special position in community can be mentioned typically. Ab£dhar strived to keep ‘Uthmin away from extravagance. It was indeed all Ab£dhar’s concern. Yet, ‘Uthmin brought a charge of sedition against him saying, “You are a man fond of sedition.”[1]

Then, Ab£dhar being forbidden from indulging said to ‘Uthmin, “Even if I am put to the sword, I won’t refrain from narrating what the Prophet (s) has said.”

Ab£dhar supported Imim ‘Al¢ explicitly. He used to quote the Prophet (s) as saying, “There will be a sedition thereafter, if you were entrapped by it, so adhere to Allih’s Book and ‘Al¢.”

He further quotes the Prophet (s) as saying, “The first who shakes hands with me in the Day of Judgment.”[2] ‘Uthmin consulted with Ka‘b al-A¦bir whether it is permissible for Imim to withdraw whatever he wants of the public treasury and return it whenever he wishes.

Ka‘b replied him, “Yes.”

Then, he was objected by Ab£dhar, “O you the son of Jew! Are you teaching us our religion?”[3] After viewing such a situation, ‘Uthmin sent Ab£dhar to Syria on exile. There, Ab£dhar did not desist from objecting and criticizing. Thus, through a letter, Mu‘iwiya deemed his presence dangerous for Syria and even for Iraq and asked ‘Uthmin to let him return to Medina and so did ‘Uthmin. Then, Ab£dhar was exiled to Medina on a hard horseback,[4] while his thigh run

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol. II, p.158

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.118

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.52

[4]. al-Ma‘irif, p.195; al-Ist¢‘ib, vol.I, p.214; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.1580-189; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1038. According to Ibn

out of flesh. Afterwards, his objection to ‘Uthmin resulted in his exile to Raba¤a where he died in isolation.

Ab£dhar, about whom the Prophet (s) had told, “Ab£dhar is the most truthful under shadow of sky, was accused by ‘Uthmin of being a liar.”[1]

Accordingly, Imim ‘Al¢ was inclined to back Ab£dhar inexorably. At the time of exiling Ab£dhar, ‘Uthmin ordered people not to see Ab£dhar off, however. Imim ‘Al¢ together with his descendants did so. Although, he objected Imim ‘Al ¢,

Imim said to Ab£dhar, “O Ab£dhar! You become angry with them for the sake of Allih and they were afraid of themselves for the fear of their worldly life.” At the time when Ab£dhar was seen off by ‘Al¢ (a) and his descendants, he cast a look at Imim and said, “Seeing you and your descendants reminds me of the Prophet (s)’s remark about you and makes me burst into tears.”[2] He passed away in Raba¤a, while according to his will, nobody including commander, leader and mail had the right to shroud and bury him.[3]

‘Uthmin’s contact with Ab£dhar was so bitter and provocative that afterwards Djі¦і¨ wrote, “People killed ‘Uthmin, for he had exiled Ab£dhar.”[4] It is a ridiculous point to write that, afterwards, Ab£dhar went to Raba¤a through his own will, not on exile.

Not only Ab£dhar, but also most of the K£fiyins who objected to Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘ª¥ were sent to Syria on exile by order of caliph. In caliph’s opinion, Syria was too a secure place. It should be said principally that ‘Uthmin did the chief part of Mu‘iwiya.

A‘tham, ‘Uthmin said to Ab£dhar, “Go out of Medina.” Ab£dhar answered, “I want to go to Syria.” ‘Uthmin did not accept. Ab£dhar proposed Iraq, but then again ‘Uthmin rejected it, and said to him, “ I said you to the worst city, that is, Raba¤a. So go over there and never return here.”

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.157

[2]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.173; see al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.159-160;Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.54

[3]. Nath al-durr, vol.II, p.78

[4]. al-°ayawin, vol.IV, p.277

The on-exile persons, well-known as K£fa’s “readers” are as follows, Milik Ashtar, Zayd, ¯a‘¥a‘a (¯£¦in’s children), Shuray¦ Ibn ‘Awf¢, °urq£¥ Ibn Zuhayr, Djundab Ibn Zuhayr, Ka‘b Ibn ‘Abada, ‘Ad¢ Ibn °itim, Kidim Ibn °adhr¢, Milik Ibn °ab¢b, Qays Ibn ‘U§irud, Ziyid Ibn °af¥a, Yaz¢d Ibn Qays and some others.[1] They all opposed Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘ª¥’s remarks, inasmuch as he considered Iraq’s lands as belonging to Quraysh. However, after their return to K£fa, they were led by Milik, whereupon Milik hindered Sa‘¢d from entering K£fa, Moreover, he himself called Friday prayer. ‘Uthmin regarded all these people and their actions as being prompted by ‘Al¢.[2] ‘ªmir Ibn ‘Abd Qays who went to ‘Uthmin in order to criticize was also sent on exile.[3]

The companions and followers of K£fa had a key role in the developments of this period. ‘Amr Ibn Zurira Ibn Qays Nakha‘¢ along with Kumayl Ibn Ziyid and a man from Ban£ ¯ahbin were reportedly the first who spoke of dethroning ‘Uthmin and enthroning the Imim.[4]

Another figure who come to grips with ‘Uthmin was ‘Ammir Ibn Yisir. According to Ibn Qutayba and others, a number of companions convened and decided to inform ‘Uthmin of his faults through a letter. After the letter was written, ‘Ammir was supposed to hand it over to ‘Uthmin. But ‘Uthmin averted taking the letter.

Thereafter, ‘Ammir told him, “This letter is written by number of the companions as an advice to you.”

‘Uthmin answered, “O the son of Sumayya! You are lying.” Whereupon, ‘Uthmin ordered him to be sent out of the house through thrashing, with some of his chest ribs broken. After being knocked unconscious, he was dragged out of the house.

Then, Marwin Ibn °akam being the major element behind all stimulations said to ‘Uthmin, “If you kill ‘Uthmin, you will get rid of others.”[5]

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, pp.39 -43

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, pp.45-46; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.337

[3]. al-I¥iba, vol.III, p.85

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.30

[5]. See al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, pp.50-51; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.153-155; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 49

One of the impacts of ‘Uthmin’s thrashing ‘Ammir was that ‘Ammir was unable to control his urine up to the end of his life.[1] It appears that ‘Ammir had been thrashed before Ab£dhar has reportedly recalled such a thing in his criticisms.[2]

‘Abd Allih Ibn Mas‘£d was the other opponent. He got the grips with Wal¢d Ibn ‘Uqba, the sinful, in K£fa. Then, through a letter Wal¢d instigated ‘Uthmin against him. In answer to his letter, ‘Uthmin called for sending him on exile from K£fa to Medina. When being in K£fa, he was deprived of getting his due from the public treasury for a period of three years.[3] Based on the will Ibn Mas‘£d made at the time of death, ‘Ammir rather than ‘Uthmin was requested to say prayer over his corpse.[4]

To solve the matter with these objections, ‘Uthmin assembled the members of his own family and consulted with them. Some of them proposed him to send the companions and other protesters to the outlying battlefields so long as he become free of their criticisms. Some others recommended him to be more benevolent towards people intending to calm them. He along with his family took it for granted that every thing is possible save surrounding to opponents. Mu‘iwiya urged ‘Uthmin to set same former agent to work without paying any attention to the opponents.[5] Once ‘Uthmin tried to send a commodity to Ab£dhar, yet Ab£dhar sent it back.[6] Mu‘iwiya also sent some money to Ab£dhar in order to deceive him.[7] Furthermore, ‘Uthmin sent 30000 drachmae enclosed with some garments to Ibn Ab¢ °udhayfa who was one of the bitter critics of

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp.1099-1100; ‘Ammir may have been thrashed once again. See Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.48

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.155

[3]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. III, p.1049

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, pp.31,36,37; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol. II, p. 171; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.III, pp.42-43. There, ‘Abd Allih’s thrashing and his objections of ‘Uthmin have been explained in detail.

[5]. See al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.178-179; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, pp.237-238; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.II, p.135; al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya vol.VII, p.167; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.44

[6]. Lubib al-adab, p.305

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.53

Caliph. Then, ‘Al¢ °udhayfa put the sum of money and the garment in the middle of the mosque saying, O, Muslims! Do you see that ‘Uthmin is intending to deceive me in the case of my religion?[1]

‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir also recommended ‘Uthmin to satisfy opposers through granting money.[2] K£fa’s ruler, Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘ª¥, also bade his emissary to send Imim ‘Al¢ (a) a gift and tell him that he is given preference over others in this regard whereupon, Imim got the emissary away through a bitter reaction.[3] ‘Uthmin assumed that he should ravish like ‘Umar. Thus, he’d rather behave harshly. Unaware of the fact that ‘Umar did not lead such a tranquil life like him. So it was this very fact which got in the way of his opponents. ‘Uthmin unrightfully believed that ‘Umar was not objected by anyone, despite of doing what he did, yet I am objected due to my flexibility.[4] Of course, ‘Umar had also some religious innovations, yet, as stated previously he obstructed opponents financially and even behaved very strictly towards all of his agents. Moreover, he did not set his kindreds to work. By all accounts, ‘Uthmin was not soft-natured by no means whatsoever, and he had Prophet as well. Once Imim ‘Al¢ (a) objected to ‘Uthmin concerning Ab£dhar’s exiling, caliph said to him, “You yourself are more deserving of exile!”

A noteworthy point in these incidents is that it was not only allowable but also necessary for the companions to protest against the anti-government measures. They resisted the government hardly as long as they and their caliph could survive. This issue labeled as ‘Revolt Against Ruler,’ later on became a highly momentous issue and drew the attention of all political and religious sects in the world of Islam. It’s suitable here to center upon the aforesaid issue.

A question of a great significance was, in what case the people can come to oppose their ruler? Or principally, whether or not they have the right to do so. In this respect, much has been mentioned in political opinions of Islamic sects. Besides, the opinions of groups such as Shi‘ites

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.V, p.51; vol.II, p.388

[2]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1095

[3]. Shar¦ mi yaqa‘ fih l-Ta¥¦¢f wa l-Ta¦r¢f, p.107

[4]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VIII, p.113; al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.I, p.377

Khiridjites and large groups of Mu‘tazilites are totally different from the ruling Sunnites. On the whole, what has been reported in this regard, like other issues, derives largely from the objectives realities and political events of the advent of Islam. In this regard, there are two various and, in a sense, contradictory issue which ought to be solved. The first issue is that, if an emir orders against Allih’s Judgment, whether or not people ought to obey him? Based on the known religious principles, if obedience to ruler’s order leads to disobedience to Allih, it will be inadmissible. A narration supports this, The Messenger of Allih (s) sent ‘Abd Allih Ibn °udhifa, a humorist, to a tribe under the command of a group. After traversing a short distance, they stopped to rest and kindled a fire.

Then ‘Abd Allih said to them, “Am I not rightful to be obeyed by you?”

They answered, “Yes!”

He further added, “If it is so, you ought to obey whatever I order.”

They accepted. Then, he ordered them, “According to my right. I order you to throw yourself into fire.” Yet, thereafter he imparted that he was just pulling their leg.

Once the Messenger of Allih(s) was informed of ‘Abd Allih’s attitude, he said, “Don’t obey someone who orders you to disobey Allih.”[1]

This was the Messenger of Allih’s conduct which is condensed into the short statement, **لا طاعة لمخلوق في معصية الخالق** “Where a sin is committed, never ever should a creature be obeyed.”

Thereafter, Ab£ Bakr notified in his first speech that the Messenger was kept infallible through inspiration and he was given care by an angel, yet, to me he seems as a devil who has subdued me occasionally, when I get angry, get away from me ... As long as I obey Allih and his Messenger, obey me; however, at the time of disobedience to Allih and his Messenger I am not rightful to be obeyed by you.[2] ‘Umar had

---

[1]. Ibn Hishim, al-S¢rat al-nabawiyya, vol.IV, p.640; ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.XI, p.335; ¯a¦¢¦ al-bukhir¢, Kitib al-A¦kim °ad¢th, vol.IV; Musnad A¦mad, vol.III, p.67; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.V p.171; vol.XII, p.104

[2]. ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.XI, p.336

a harshly daring treatment to the extent that few people had power or courage to oppose him. Anyhow, some people have been reported to oppose him, and in some cases he responded them positively.

Another point lay behind the principle, **لا طاعة لمخلوق في معصية الخالق** Which was contrary to it.

According to this point, a person’s opposition to an emir will pave the way for the disunity of the community or the so-called Congregation. While “the order to maintain congregation” being the most vital principle for solidifying the community is quite contrary to the expression of opposition. Naturally, in non-critical situations, this issue can somewhat be solved through toleration on the part of two parties. However, in case of an unusual circumstance or if the objection gives rise to a critical condition, this issue will be more intricate. In books of Hadith a full section has been devoted to the maintenance of congregation, which is mainly based on obedience to ruler.[1] Of course, it is clear that ruler’s benefits lie more in observing the principle of “Congregation” than that of “lack of obedience at the time of disobedience”.

‘Abd al-Razziq ¯an‘in¢, in his book entitled as “Mu¥annaf” has mentioned some narrations labeled as “the section on the necessity of the community” some of which are to be expounded.

Quoting from the Messenger of Allih(s), Ab£ Hurayra said, “The one who dies while he has become separately apart from congregation, and does not obey, indeed he has died in ignorance. The one who has revolted against my people with the sword and strikes good and bad … he’s not among my people. According to Ibn ‘Abbis, the one who goes out of obedience by an inch, he has died in ignorance.”

It’s been quoted that the Messenger of Allih(s) has ordered five things, compliance, obedience, congregation, immigration and Djihid in the way of Allih; The one who distances himself from congregation by an inch, he will be no longer a Muslim.

‘Umar has also quoted the Prophet(s) as saying, “The one who longs for paradise, maybe maintains the congregation.”

---

[1]. See al-Mu‘djam al-mufahras Lialfi¨ al-¦ad¢th al-nabaw¢, vol.IV, below the word "±aw‘", obedience

Furthermore, he's been quoted as saying, "The one who rebels against any people while they are united intending to divide them, kill him in any possible case."

°udhayfa has reportedly said that the people who tried to downgrade "Allih's Sultan on earth", should be humiliated by Allih. Moreover, the Messenger of Allih(s) has said about the Emirate of the insane people that some emirs will come after me who are not guided by me and do not comply with my Sunna; the one who affirms their lie is helping them with their oppression, so we are not from each other and he won't come on me in the Pond of Abundance (Kawthar).

In another hadith he said, "Nothing is better than speaking in justice before a tyrant Sultan. Avoiding people should not hinder you from speaking in truth."

The narrator of this hadith, Ab£ Sa'¢d Khudr¢, after narrating it, burst into tears and said, "By God! We refrained from so doing."

One day Ab£dhar came to 'Uthmin and found fault with him. Thereafter, while reclining on stick 'Al¢ (a) joined them.

'Uthmin asked, "What should I do with him?"

'Al¢ (a) answered, "Allih has said about him that, if he be a liar, on him will be his lie, and if he be truthful, there will befall you some of that which he threatens you with (The Believer, (Ghifir) 28)."

Then 'Uthmin said to 'Al¢ (a), "Keep quiet, woe back onto you! You asked me something and I answered you."[1]

'Abd Allih Ibn Mas'£d has also quoted the Messenger of Allih(s) as saying to him, "What do you do while seeing emirs who do not comply with my Sunna and never say prayer on time."

Ibn Mas'£d answered, "I asked what to do?"

Then, the Messenger of Allih(s) said, "You are asking me what to do!" **لا طاعة لمخلوق في معصية الله**[2]

In continuation of this narration and before that numerous narrations have been mentioned concerning these emirs who never say prayer on time. Once seeing that Wal¢d Ibn 'Uqba has refrained from timely prayer, Ibn Mas'£d requested Mu'adhdhin to recite Adhin.

---

[1]. 'Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.XI, pp.339-349

[2]. Ibid, vol.II, p.384

Then, he himself began to say prayer. Thereafter, answering to Wal¢d’s objection, he said, “Allih and His Messenger do not accept us to wait for you while you are going about your business.”[1]

Some Scholar as °asan Ba¥r¢, Zuhr¢ and Qatida has reportedly said prayer alongside emirs, even if these emirs did not do it on its due time.[2] Concerning ‘Uthmin, it’s been stated that °asan Ba¥r¢ was questioned in this way, who did say prayer after sermon (in feast of prayer)?

He answered, “‘Uthmin always says prayer at the outset and then he makes a sermon.” However, seeing that many people do not stay for sermon, he decided to make sermon at first and say prayer thereafter.[3]

These were samples of narrations quoted by ‘Abd al-Razziq ¯an‘in¢ in this regard. It should be said, however, that opposition to bid for disobedience was once considered as prescription of criticism and the other time as revolt. The second not the first is more momentous concerning separation of community. Many issues are available as regards ‘Uthmin as well as historical experience of his caliphate, e.g. for him, opposition and criticism were beyond endurance. Once in 26 A.H, ‘Uthmin merged some neighboring houses together to develop the sacred Mosque and tried to sponsor for it by public treasury, some people burst into objection.

Hence, ordering to imprison them, ‘Uthmin said, “What dared you stand against me is your forbearance; otherwise, ‘Umar himself did so.”

Eventually, prisoners were all released under the mediation of ‘Abd Allih Ibn Khilid Ibn Usayd.[4] However, having remembered the prior conduct in which any criticism was permissible, the comparisons and the followers criticized ‘Uthmin whenever the ground was prepared. He resisted these objections and never surrendered to them, in cases of a sever pressure-due to the siege of his house-he admitted

---

[1]. ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.II, p.384

[2]. Ibid, vol.II, p.385; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VII, p.402

[3]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, p.385; Musnad Ab¢ Diw£d, vol.I, p.297

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.259

objections temporarily, yet, as soon as the pressure was removed he acted cruelly.

At the time when Imim ‘Al¢ (a) was accompanying Ab£dhar, ‘Uthmin said, “Didn’t you hear that I ordered not to accompany Ab£dhar?”

Then, Imim answered, “Must we obey your orders, while we find them contrary to Allih’s Judgment? By Allih, we don’t do so.”

‘Uthmin became angry with Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and told him that Marwin has been given superiority over him. The next day, ‘Uthmin went to Muhidjir£n and An¥ir so as to grumble about Imim ‘Al¢ (a). He noted that ‘Al¢ finds faults with him and supports those raising difficulty, that is, ‘Ammir, Ab£dhar and others. Thereafter, people brought about a compromise between ‘Al¢ (a) and ‘Uthmin, and ‘Al¢ (a) stated that his accompanying of Ab£dhar had been merely for the sake of Allih.[1]

Marwin Ibn °akam says, “In midway of Mecca and Medina, I witnessed the contact between ‘Al¢ and ‘Uthmin, in which ‘Uthmin banned performing lesser pilgrimage in °adjdj months (or both lesser and greater pilgrimage).”

Seeing such a thing, ‘Al¢ (a) said, “I become clothed in a pilgrimage state, then he said Labbayk for both of them.”

‘Uthmin objected to him asking, “Are you doing what I forbid?”

Imim answered, “I do not give up the Sunna of the Messenger(s) on behalf of anybody.”[2]

Ibn Mas‘£d was also one of the tenacious dissenters of ‘Uthmin. He was some time among those who said, “If ‘Uthmin says a four rak‘at-prayer rather than a two rak‘at one in Mini, he is to be obeyed, since opposition is considered as an evil.[3]

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, pp.341-342; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.173

[2]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.1043-1044

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.268; al-Ghad¢r, vol.VIII, p.99, quoted from, Sunan Ab¢ Diw£d, vol.I, p.308; Qi¤¢ Ab£ Y£suf, al-athir, p.30; Shifi‘¢, Kitib al-Umm, vol.I, p.159; vol.VII, p.175; Biyhaq¢, Sunnan al-kubri, vol.III, p.144

Elsewhere he has said, “‘Uthmin is Imim, so I do not oppose him, for opposition is considered as an evil.”[1] Though, later on he acted so intensely against ‘Uthmin.[2]

A large number of companions were unanimous in opposition to ‘Uthmin. Later, the Sunnis disbelieved the companions under the auspices of disagreeing with the ruler as legitimate political conduct and mainly pretended that a bunch of rascals rose in revolt against ‘Uthmin. ‘Uthmin was objected by Imim ‘Al¢ (a) when he said a four rak‘at-prayer in 29 A.H. in Mini, because it was contrary to the Messenger(s) and former caliphs’ conducts.

In answer to Imim presenting the Messenger(s)’s conduct, ‘Uthmin said,”This is what I believed in.”[3]

‘Uthmin’s despotism established a modern process in the course of despotism in caliphate organizations. Anyway, due to the relative strength of Islamic values in the community, ‘Uthmin with all his importunity could not suppress the oppositions; on the contrary, he was removed by increasingly growing opposition. This was a new experience for the history of Islamic caliphate which became later on an essential theoretical issue in Islamic political jurisprudence.

‘UTHMªN AND MU‘ªWIYA

Damascus gained victory with the help of Ab£ ‘Ubayda Djarri¦, Khilid Ibn Wal¢d and Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin. After extinction of this genwration, ‘Umar left their legacy to Mu‘iwiya from that time on Mu‘iwiya thought of caliphate. When ‘Uthmin was enthroned, Mu‘iwiya’s position became thoroughly firm. He intended to bring ‘Uthmin to Syria in a tumult of anti-‘Uthmin objections so as to settle every thing fine for himself. However, ‘Uthmin rejected him.[4] Anyway, with regard to ‘Uthmin’s policies in employing the Umayya,

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.III, p.42

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, pp.524 -527; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.II, pp.1049-1054

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.267

[4]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.157

it seems unlikely for caliph himself to be unmindful of this tendency that caliphate should remain in the Umayya.

Anti-'Uthmin revolt was equivocal for Mu'iwiya. What should he have done against the companions of the prophet(s)? He opted to neglect 'Uthmin's repeated invitations, his humble requests for support and the dispatch of troops as well as wait for the consequence of domestic quarrel between 'Uthmin and the companions. Put it another way, if 'Uthmin reinstated, Mu'iwiya could come on power once more, however, 'Uthmin's killing would pave the way for a domestic war in which Mu'iwiya hoped for victory, that is, a war waged under the pretext of vengeance on 'Uthmin. It was currently quite clear to many companions that Mu'iwiya looked forward to 'Uthmin's killing. Realizing this very fact, though 'Uthmin was unable to resolve it seriously. As soon as 'Uthmin was killed, his dress was sent to Mu'iwiya by his wife, Ni'ila.[1]

Meanwhile, Mu'iwiya started his efforts to stupefy Syrians against Medinans and the companions of the Prophet(s). He further determined to marry 'Uthmin's wife to himself in order to revenge himself on 'Uthmin more readily. Anyhow, 'Uthmin's wife refused such a thing, and even she broke her teeth to dissuade Mu'iwiya.[2]

According to Ya'q£b¢, 'Uthmin when under siege wrote letters to Mu'iwiya over and over to request help, yet Mu'iwiya refrained from dispatching troops. This negligence was to such an extent that 'Uthmin realized the fact of the matter. In last days, Mu'iwiya launched 1200 soldiers to Syria and notified their commander to stay over there until they are ordered. In the meantime, he sent someone to 'Uthmin; seeing Mu'iwiya's emissary, 'Uthmin asked, "Have you got any help?"

The emissary replied, "I've come to become aware of your situation."

'Uthmin said, "No, you've come here in order to kill me."[3]

---

[1]. Balidhur¢ has been quoted as saying, Umm °ab¢ba, Mu'iwiya's sister and the Prophet(s)'s wife, had brought this bloody dress. See Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.291

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.IV, p.62; Balighit al-nisi', p.139; al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.VI, p.90

[3]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.165

After some days, Syrians were informed of 'Uthmin's killing, so an army was turned back to Syria. Based on Djuwayriyya, following 'Uthmin's asking for help, Mu'iwiya dispatched an army and declared their commander to stay at Dh¢ Khushub. They stayed there till 'Uthmin was killed. Djuwayriyya says that Mu'iwiya deliberately did so in order for 'Uthmin to be killed.[1]

Imim 'Al¢ (a) wrote to Mu'iwiya, "You came to 'Uthmin's assistance when it was for the benefit of yourself, and humiliated him when it brought about your victory."[2] And in another letter it was written, "Did I kill 'Uthmin or you? Since I helped him in any case, while you neglected helping him, despite his request for help, until you heard of his killing."[3]

According to another letter by Imim to Mu'iwiya, "By Allih! O Mu'iwiya! No one but you killed 'Uthmin and downgraded him."[4]

Ab£ ±ufayl also said to Mu'iwiya, "Why didn't you stand by 'Uthmin while people were along with you?"[5]

In ¯iff¢n, Ab£ Ayy£b An¥ir¢ wrote a letter to Mu'iwiya as an answer to his blaming of An¥ir for 'Uthmin's killing saying, "He was killed by Yaz¢d Ibn Asad whom you sent in an attempt to back 'Uthmin, yet he being stopped in his way, wasn't of any help to 'Uthmin."[6] In fact, the afore-mentioned person was ordered by Mu'iwiya not to go over there.

In a letter to Mu'iwiya, Shabath Ibn Rib'¢ accused him of failing to support 'Uthmin saying, "You liked 'Uthmin to be killed, for his killing would give you an excuse."[7]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1289

[2]. Nahdj al-sa'ida, vol.IV, p.169; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.IV, p.57; al-°ayit al-siyisiya li l-Imim al-°asan(a), p.146, from, al-Na¥iyi¦ al-kifiya, p.20; Bu¦rin¢, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.V, p.81

[3]. Nahdj al-baligha, letter 28

[4]. Nahdj al-sa'ida, vol.IV, p.212

[5]. al-Muwaffaqiyyit, p.154; al-°ayit al-siyisiya li l-Imim al-°asan(a), p.147, from, various sources.

[6]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, p.368; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.131; Ibn Abi l-°ad ¢d, Shar¦ Nahdj al-baligha, vol.VIII, p.44; al-Ghad¢r, vol.IX, p.151

[7]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, p.187; al-Ghad¢r, vol.IX, p.151; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. III, p.270

Ibn ‘Abbis also wrote a letter to ‘Uthmin saying, “You were interested in killing ‘Uthmin.”[1]

Afterwards, being accused by Yaz¢d of implication in the assassination of ‘Uthmin Ibn ‘Abbis answered, “ I did not play any role in this event; however, it was your father who neglected to support him and prevented his troops from helping him when requested.”[2]

Shahristin¢ says, “In essence, all Mu‘iwiya’s agents in different cities avoided helping him.[3] Letters by different persons are pieces of evidence for this matter.[4]

Mu‘iwiya says, “I myself feel sorry for (about) not helping ‘Uthmin when demanded.”[5]

‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ also induced Mu‘iwiya for disgracing ‘Uthmin through failing to support him.[6] Coming together in Ba¥ra, Djamal companions remembered to go to Syria and joined Mu‘iwiya. However, they became frightened of Mu‘iwiya’s failure to help ‘Uthmin when requested, accordingly they didn’t go to Syria. The last point in this regard is that ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sar¦, ‘Uthmin’s killing and resided over there, since he was unwilling to be alongside ‘Uthmin. According to him, he hated to be along with a man (Mu‘iwiya) who liked ‘Uthmin to be killed.[7]

IMªM ‘AL¢ (A) AND ‘UTHMªN

After Imim ‘Al¢ was withdrawn with power in Saq¢fa; besides, Imim’s efforts to bring power back came to a deadlock, he tried to maintain roots and branches of Islam as well as to keep down through his own religious knowledge. Meanwhile, he remembered his forgotten right in every appropriate atmosphere. The second caliph in spite of

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.XVI, p.155

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.19

[3]. al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.I, p.26

[4]. al-Ghad¢r, vol.IX, pp.149-150; vol.X, p.333; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.223; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol. IV, p. 334; Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, pp.85,201; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.353

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.287

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.287

[7]. al-Ma’rifa wa l-tir¢kh, vol. I, p.254; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, p.1153

strictly employing his opponents attempted to solve judicial and in some cases political problems by using Imim’s scientific ability. Some examples of caliph’s consultation with Imim were previously mentioned. There are numerous narrations in sources concerning judicial problems, some of which are compiled by ‘Allima Am¢n¢ in the sixth version of al-Ghad¢r under the title of “Nawidir al-Athar f¢ ‘Ilm ‘Umar”. In this regard, a scripture is in hand showing ‘Umar’s emphasis in judicial issue on acting Imim’s orders.[1]

In this respect, ‘Uthmin’s pride was so much so that we can hardly find any model for it in ‘Umar’s time. Previous enmities of the Umayyads and Hishimites together with Badr, U¦ud and killers of the Umayyads might have been influential in this case. Especially, ‘Uthmin’s enthroning was just followed by removal of Imim ‘Al¢. ‘Uthmin’s distraction from the proper way and Imim’s insistence on defending right caused ‘Uthmin to be more hostile towards Imim ‘Al¢ (a).

Once ‘Uthmin determined to exile ‘Ammir, yet being objected by Imim, he answered, “You yourself are more deserving of exile!”[2] There are other examples of ‘Uthmin’s bitter treatment with Imim in sources.[3] According to Sa‘¢d Ibn Musayyib, “I witnessed that a verbal clash occurred between ‘Al¢ and ‘Uthmin. ‘Uthmin held up the lash to knock ‘Al¢, but I hindered.”[4] It’s been repeatedly quoted that ‘Uthmin would have objected Imim before ‘Abbis.[5] Imim’s resistance to ‘Uthmin’s wrong response induced ‘Uthmin to object Imim’s saying, **انـك لكـثير الخلاف علينـا**[6] **“**You put yourself in trouble for us again.”

Imim Sadjdjid quoted Marwin as saying, “I saw ‘Uthmin in the pilgrimage banning from performing the lesser pilgrimage in pilgrimage days. Consequently, such a thing caused Imim ‘Al¢ to become clothed in pilgrim garment for both lesser and greater pilgrimage.

‘Uthmin said, “There you do again while I’m forbidding.”

---

[1]. Sayyid Ra¤¢, al-kha¥i’i¥, p.59

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, pp. 54 -55

[3]. al-Kimil fi l-adab, vol I, p. 22

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 132

[5]. al-Muwaffaqiyyit, p. 611; ‘Uy£n al-akhbir, vol. III, p. 92

[6]. Musnad A¦mad, vol. I, p. 100

Imim replied, “I do not desist from the Messenger(s)’s Sunna for the sake of anyone.”[1] Apparently, the political conditions of ‘Uthmin’s time gave rise to more public criticisms. Perhaps, public accompaniment with these criticizing movements is one main reason. When Wal¢d Ibn ‘Uqba was brought to Medina to be punished, Imim allowing no one to punish him threw him on the ground, thereafter facing ‘Uthmin’s objection to his very action Imim began to punish ‘Uthmin in Wal¢d’s stead.[2] It can be found out from the whole events of anti-‘Uthmin revolts that opponents, for the most part, supported Imim in his candidacy for caliphate. Although some of them such as ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, ±al¦a and Zubayr were not willing to do so, Imim’s influence over opponents induced ‘Uthmin to take a dual line against him. On one part, ‘Uthmin believed Imim to be the major motive behind these incidents; on the other part, he having no alternative asked Imim to mediate and calm opponents, in so far as they listened to him.[3] According to some accounts, Imim was recognized as “the spokesman of opponents”.[4] Anyway, this fact neither meant that they were totally under the control of Imim, nor did it mean that Imim was for all their actions. The key question to be posed here is concerning Imim’s opinion on ‘Uthmin. It should be taken into account that Imim living among people who killed ‘Uthmin couldn’t speak freely.

Regarding Imim’s political opinion, it can simply be said that neither was Imim for ‘Uthmin’s killing, nor did he deem his killing advisable. Due to realizing that this was not but an action for Mu‘iwiya’s benefit, Imim tried to prevent from ‘Uthmin’s killing in any case. Even, at the outset, he made effort to reconciliate people with him and suppress the revolt. Once he said about his political supports, I backed ‘Uthmin to such an extent that I am afraid of committing any sin in this regard.[5] Later on he said that you killed ‘Uthmin while I was in my house.[6]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1043

[2]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol. II, p. 165; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, p. 33

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, p. 61

[4]. Ibid, p. V, p. 26

[5]. ¯ub¦¢, Nahdj al-baligha, p. 358

[6]. al-Djamal, p. 417

It’s better, though, to make a distinction between Imim’s “religious view” and “political view”. It’s likely that Imim believed ‘Uthmin to be deserving of such a treatment by people due to making deliberate errors regarding Islam and its rules together with destructing the circumstances of the community, although it’s impossible to comment precisely on this case. Yet some interpretations are possibly put on Imim’s explanations in this regard. Imim was once asked whether he implicated in killing ‘Uthmin or not. He replied, Allih killed ‘Uthmin and I’m with Allih.[1]

He further said, “Neither I liked ‘Uthmin to be killed, nor did I loathe his killing.”[2] He also added, I am neither happy nor sad about ‘Uthmin’s killing.[3]

Elsewhere Imim called ‘Uthmin “the element of all wrongdoers”.[4] When he was asked whether ‘Uthmin was killed in an oppressed manner or not, Imim answered, He sacrificed himself to the people of house in a very bad manner, and you treated him very badly.[5] Imim wrote to K£fiyins about his contact with ‘Uthmin, Now, I am appraising you of what befell ‘Uthmin so (correctly) that its hearing maybe like its seeing. People criticized him, and I was the only man from among the Muhidjir£n who asked him to seek to satisfy (the Muslims) the most and to offend them the least; Furthermore, ±al¦a and Zubayr rushed, teased and debilitated ‘Uthmin very easily. Then, ‘ªyisha who was in a rage with him appeared as well and vented her wrath on him, in so doing she gave people an opportunity to overpower and kill him.[6]

At the time when being selected as an ambassador by people, Imim said to ‘Uthmin, “People are behind me and

---

[1]. ‘Uy£n al-akhbir, vol. II, p. 207

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, p. 101; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. III, p. 82

[3]. al-Ghad¢r, vol. IX, p. 29; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 12633 ما امرت ولانهيت ولاسرني ولا ساءني قتـل عثمـان I neither ordered nor hindered anyone, he neither respected me nor did wrong to me.

[4]. al-Muwaffaqiyyit, vol. XIII; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol. IX, p. 17

[5]. Nathr al-durr, vol. I, p. 274; al-Aghin¢, vol. VI, p. 233; ‘Abd, Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 27

[6]. Nahdj al-baligha, letter 1

they have made me an ambassador between you and themselves. But by Allih! I do not know what to say. I know nothing (in this matter) which you do not know, nor can I lead you to any matter of which you are not aware .... You should not behave as the carrying beast for Marwin so that he may drag you wherever he likes, despite your seniority of age and length of life." 'Uthmin answered, "Don't ask people to grant me respite in order that I can compensate for my oppressive treatment towards them."

Whereupon Imim said, "So far as Medina is concerned here is no question of time. As for remoter areas you can have the time needed for your order to reach there."[1]

According to historians,[2] Imim considered Marwin as the major factor behind these movements.[3] Anyway, Imim was opposed to the murder of 'Uthmin, primarily due to the dominance of people over their ruler which was, in itself, followed by a brawl. Inasmuch as it's a tremendously risky task to have the mere feeling that it's very simple to kill every ruler. Muslims recently heard of Sassanids' experience concerning reigning of some kings in about several years and their immediate killing. Hence, 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar warned them, "Are you doing it heraclitusly, killing any king whenever growing angry with him?"

The selection of Imim by Medinans, those who entered Medina and some who played a crucial role in anti-'Uthmin revolt induced the Umayyads to accuse Imim of killing 'Uthmin. 'Amr Ibn °amiq Khuzi'¢ assuming to be one of the four who attacked 'Uthmin's house was ranked among the pure Shi'ite Muslims.[4] The same is true with Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr. Likewise, once 'Uthmin's house was under siege, Imim said feast prayer. And when 'Uthmin came in power, initially he said prayers and then he made sermon just like before. Yet, noting that people leave great mosque after sermon, he decided to make sermon at the outset, and say

---

[1]. Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 164

[2]. al-Fakhr¢, p. 98

[3]. Nahdj al-sa'ida, vol. IV, p. 27

[4]. Usd al-ghiba, vol. IV, p. 100. he was martyred by Mu'iwiya's agents in 50 A.H. and his head was sent to Syria. His tomb was made by °amdiniyin in M£¥il. Thereafter, an ample clash befell between Shi'ite Muslims and 'Uthminids.

prayer in the end.[1] However, while saying feast prayer, Imim said prayer firstly and made sermon secondly.[2] It appears that Imim has said feast prayer without ‘Uthmin’s permission. Anyway, ‘Uthmin had confessed that he prefers ‘Al¢ to take charge rather than any body else.[3] When ‘Uthmin’s house was under siege, Sahl Ibn °unayf said congregational prayer, perhaps by ‘Uthmin’s permission.[4] Imim was accused due to his presence in Medina in these circumstances. Thus, it’s been said that Usima insisted on Imim’s going to Mecca or Yanbu‘.[5] Of course, in as much as Imim was a crucial factor for coping with the situations, his leaving of Medina did not seem to be reasonable.

Imim repeatedly rejected the blame for ‘Uthmin’s killing attributed to him, anyhow, ‘Uthminids’ propagation was to the extent that it occasioned Djamal and ¯iff¢n. Wal¢d Ibn ‘Uqba, the wrongdoer, addressed Ban£ Hishim in a poem, **“هم قتلوه حتى يكونوا مكانه** Ban£ Hishim killed ‘Uthmin so as to take his place.[6]“

He further said, “Wal¢d had the most hostile manner towards Imim”; moreover, according to Na¥r Ibn Muzi¦im’s poems, Wal¢d instigated Mu‘iwiya to wage a war against Imim ‘Al¢ (a). this apart from his father’s murder in Badr was due to enforcing punishment of drinking on him by Imim in front of people and ‘Uthmin.[7] ‘Uthmin himself put the blame on Imim, on account of opponents’ attention to him. He has even revealed ironically in his poem that he is looking forward to Imim’s killing.[8] This was suggested to him by Marwin Ibn °akam, the sinner, the evildoer. Marwin has been quoted as saying to people, “At the outset, a handful of people came from Egypt, yet they were ordered to come back and assemble a large multitude.”[9]

---

1. Musnad Ab¢ Diw£d, vol. I, p. 297; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 964

2. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1216

3. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1206

4. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1218

5. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1211

6. al-Kimil fi l-adab, vol. III, p. 38; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, p. 104

7. al-Fut£¦, vol. II, p. 350

8. Nathr al-durr, vol. I, p. 63; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, p. 62

9. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, p. 89

Imim repeatedly refused to have any role in ‘Uthmin’s murder saying, “If I know that the Umayyads believe something through swearing, I would swear to the Black Stone and the status of Ibrih¢m that I did not kill ‘Uthmin.”[1]

Imim wrote to Mu‘iwiya, “If one judges me, he will certainly imagine that I am the purest man.”[2]

He further said, “I did not kill ‘Uthmin, nor did I order to kill him.”[3]

Verily, Ibn S¢r¢n said, “‘Al¢ was accused of ‘Uthmin’s assassination while being selected as caliph.”[4] Ibn Shubba has allocated a full chapter to Imim’s statements concerning his refusal of any implication in killing ‘Uthmin.[5]

It seems interesting to note that despite all these remarks, ‘Uthmin sought assistance just from Imim and no one else.[6] Typically, when ‘Uthmin was stopped having water by ±al¦a, he asked Imim for help. Accordingly, Imim came to ±al¦a and requested him to let water into ‘Uthmin’s house. Then, he got his son to take a bowl of water to ‘Uthmin.[7] Afterwards, in Karbali Ibn Ziyid ordered not to let Imim °usayn drink any water, as regards ‘Uthmin was stopped having water when under siege. Under these circumstances in which no one was able to help ‘Uthmin, nor did he dare to do so, it was Imim who came to his assistance. Ibn Shubba has labeled a chapter as ‘Uthmin’s asking Imim ‘Al¢ for help.[8] Another good-to-know note is that Milik, as one of the extreme adherents of Imim, attempted to release ‘Uthmin from (being under) siege with the help of H£dadj Umm °ab ¢ba, while his house was under siege.[9] Though, not being allowed to enter the house by the besiegers, he seemingly intended to save him from the besiegers in secret. The final

---

[1]. Ibid, vol. V, p. 81

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p. 29

[3]. Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, al-Mu¥annaf, vol. XV, p. 228; see Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, p. 100

[4]. Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, al-Mu¥annaf, vol. XV, p. 229

[5]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1285

[6]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. III, p. 82; Rabi‘ al-abrir, vol. I, p. 415

[7]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1202

[8]. Ibid, vol. III, pp. 1219-1223

[9]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1313

word of Ibn Shubba in his chapter is that, in ¯iff¢n, Imim did not accept in the presence of ‘Uthmin’s representatives that ‘Uthmin has been killed oppressively.[1] Consequently, his very statement meant that Imim seems to be guilty at any rate.

ASSASSINATION OF ‘UTHMªN

As objections against ‘Uthmin were gradually intensified, some men explicitly used to stand up before ‘Uthmin in mosque and object to him. ‘Uthmin was obliged to use violence so as to calm them and this, in turn, would lead to more clash on the part of them. To ‘Urwa Ibn Zubayr, I witnessed that ‘Uthmin entered the mosque. Some people surrounded him and called him Na‘thal, old stupid man. Then, ‘Uthmin went up the pulpit and began to speak. Djahdjih Ibn Sa‘d Ghifir¢ who was among those who swore allegiance to his family began to object. At the same time, the circumstances turned in a way that ‘Uthmin could not continue to speak, so he came down the pulpit and Sahl Ibn °unayf said Friday prayer on that day.[2] Once objections against ‘Uthmin heightened, some K£fiyins and Egyptians departed for Medina at the request of the companions alongside in protest against the Umayya rulers of these cities. This crowd was beaded by ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Udays Balaw¢ who was among those who swore allegiance to his family,[3]together with Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ °udhayfa. Ibn Shubba also carried a letter written by the Egyptians to ‘Uthmin prior to going to Medina. They notified the necessity for implementing the divine orders with regard to the Qur’inic verses saying, You are claimant for being rightful to be obeyed by us, whereas based on Qur’in, obedience to the one who disobeys Allih is not permissible. If you obey Allih, in consequence, we’ll soon find out that you have it in mind to perish yourself along with.[4] ‘Uthmin sent ‘Ammir there in order to calm the Egyptians. However, he was unaware that ‘Ammir himself after being sent to Egypt instigated people against ‘Uthmin. In the wake of ‘Ammir’s driving out, some

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp. 201-202

[2]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1111

[3]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1155

[4]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1121

people reckoned to be about 400 to 700 came into Medina. This group visited ‘Uthmin and his representative and set forth their demands as follows. Firstly, to return on-exile persons. Secondly, to pay the deprived’s rights. Thirdly, to act upon Qur’in and the deprived’s rights. ‘Uthmin repented officially towards them and warned them to avert disunity.[1] In terms of ‘Uthmin’s agreements, a mutual treaty was written between ‘Uthmin and Imim ‘Al¢ who was made as an ambassador between people and caliph. Five clauses were laid out in this very treaty, among which three have been mentioned above, and the forth one is to observe justice in distributing and employing people who are worthy and strong enough to manage the affairs. Then, a number of the companions attested to this treaty.[2] This very action resulted in the Egyptians’ return.

Another cultural city for opponents was K£fa. Sa‘d Ibn ‘ª¥ wrote to ‘Uthmin saying that some people who call themselves “readers” and are indeed stupid have thrashed my chief-police and thereby looked down on me.

‘Uthmin answered, “Send them to Syria in order that they might fight a war.”

After being sent to Syria, they got to grips with Mu‘iwiya. Hence, this induced Mu‘iwiya to send them to °im¥. Yet, after a while since Sa‘d Ibn ‘ª¥ was sent away from K£fa by people, they came back to K£fa. It was then the K£fiyins enumerated ‘Uthmins’ mistakes through a letter. This very letter together with the Egyptians’ letter is an indicative of the extent to which people made effort to shed light on caliph’s mind not withstanding that ‘Uthmin never catch on the fact. The K£fiyins’ letter was brought to Medina by Ab£ Rabi‘ at al-‘Anz¢. Thereafter through a letter by ‘Uthmin, Sa‘d was ordered to give him twenty lashes and exile him to Damiwand mount.[3] Once the Egyptians returned to their own city, they met a horsman called Yu¦anna and was ‘Uthmin’s slave who was riding rapidly to Egypt, they hold him and grabbed a letter from him. The letter had been sealed by ‘Uthmin and addressed to ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d. as a matter of fact, he was ordered by ‘Uthmin to kill some protesters and

---

[1]. Ibid, vol. III, pp. 1135-1137

[2]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, pp. 1137-1140

[3]. Ibid, vol. III, pp. 1142-1143

put some others into prison and … This provoked protesters to return to Medina angrily. After coming back to Medina, first of all they went to Imim ‘Al¢ (a) who was the mediator of peace. Imim took their letter to ‘Uthmin. But ‘Uthmin swore that he has not written the letters; besides, he is kept uninformed of it. It is interesting to mention that the Umayyads and even ‘Uthmin himself blamed Imim by stating, He has written the letter so as to incite the people against caliph.[1] Word came that the Egyptians have K£fa and 100 people from Ba¥ra came to Medina and besieged ‘Uthmin.

As Zuhr¢ states, “I asked Sa‘d Ibn Musayyib, How was ‘Uthmin killed and why did the companions downgrade him?”

He replied, “Once ‘Uthmin was in power, a discontent befell some of the companions, for he liked his own family, typically, he set an abundance of those who were not reckoned among the companions to work.” In consequence, his action gave rise to a hatred among the companions. In the second six-year term of caliphate, ‘Uthmin got the Umayya to take control of affairs; furthermore, he appointed ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d to Egypt. Yet, the latter created an obligation on the part of the Egyptians. As a matter of fact, prior to this, ‘Uthmin had also some contacts with ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mas‘£d, Ab£dhar and ‘Ammir which resulted in discontent on part of their tribes. Then, the Egyptians arrived in Medina. Imim ‘Al¢ (a) acted as an intermediary between them, thus it was determined that another figure will take the position of ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d, namely Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab ¢ Bakr. ‘Uthmin signed for his sainthood and then they left the place. They met a horseman on the way who was carrying a letter concerning caliph’s bitter instruction to ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d. it was then all the protesters returned to Medina angrily. Then, all the Medinans vented their wrath on ‘Uthmin; moreover, as for the people, public complex concerning what befell ‘Ammir, Ab£dhar and ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mas‘£d developed. Imim ‘Al¢ along with a number of people went to ‘Uthmin. The handwriting indicated that the letter had been written by Marwin. Then, the protesters asked ‘Uthmin to hand over Marwin who is ordering to carnage so dauntlessly. However, ‘Uthmin avoided doing so. This very

---

[1]. Ibid, vol. III, pp. 1150-1151, 1155

action caused people to besiege ‘Uthmin and shop him having water.[1]

A noteworthy point is that dissenters did not think of caliph’s assassination from the beginning. Rather, in the list stage they pled him to be dethroned. However, ‘Uthmin refused to be dethroned. It was the first time that caliph’s dethronement was spoken. The caliph, in what case, can dethrone himself or do the others have the right to do so? Such an issue was repeatedly posed during the caliphate history. But historically it was first raised when rebels asked ‘Uthmin to dethrone. ‘Uthmin, in response to their suggestion, said that God has granted caliphate to him and he is not willing to abdicate.

Quoting him, the Messenger(s) said to him, “O ‘Uthmin! God will put a garment on you and hypocrites of dethronement will ask you for it, don’t take it off until you join me.”[2]

This hadith is definitely a forged one and ascribed to ‘Uthmin and the Messenger(s). But ‘Uthmin, in essence, believed that caliphate is garment God put him on and he is not willing to take it off. Such a thing indicated that ‘Uthmin, by linking Caliphate to God, intends to deny public vole and their decision upon his dethronement.

When ‘Uthmin was suggested dethronement, he said, “Even if I’m beheaded, I’ll never abdicate.”[3]

‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar said, “He asked me in the time of ‘Uthmin’s siege, “What do you think of Mughc¢ra Ibn ªkhnas’s suggestion?”

He said, “They want you to dethrone unless you’ll be murdered so you should leave it to them.”

‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar said, “I told ‘Uthmin, is there anything more important than your murder unless you dethrone?”

He replied, “No.”

---

[1]. Tirc¢kh al-madc¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp.1159-1161; Ibn Abi l-°adc¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.I, p.229; al-Ghadc¢r, vol. IX, p.180.

[2]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol. I, p. 61 ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. III, p. 66

[3]. Tirc¢kh khalc¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p. 170, see Tirc¢kh al-islim, ‘Ahd al-khulafi’ al-rishidc¢n, p. 445

I said, “To me, you’d better not include such an innovation in Islam that every time a group of rebels revolt in an aim to dethrone their emir; don’t take the garment of God has put you on!” [1]

Some who laid siege are heard to say that we just intend to dethrone him not to murder him; ‘Uthmin said, “Not my dethronement but my murder.”[2]

When Egyptian opponents, on their way back, found ‘Uthmin’s letter to ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d, in which he was ordered to bother, annoy and murder opposes, they turned back to Medina. ‘Uthmin said that the letter writer was not him and then the fact that the main culpable was Marwin Ibn °akam was cleared up. He was asked by the opponents to dethrone due to his incapability in government administration, but he rejected. [3]

Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr, later on, confirmed, “We wanted him to dethrone but he rejected.” [4]

According to another narration, ‘Uthmin sent for Milik Ashtar and asked him, “What do people want me?”

Milik said, “One of the two things, either to dethrone yourself and leave the caliphate for people or to retaliate yourself maybe it refers to the retaliation of annoyance done to Ibn Mas‘£d, ‘Ammir and others; otherwise, you’ll be fighted.”

‘Uthmin said, “I shan’t take the garment off God put me on. Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar were doing chastisement concerning retaliation and such a thing didn’t exist. But in the case of my murder, you’ll be in a lot of trouble.”[5]

During this time, ‘Uthmin asked different cities for help. He wrote a letter to people of Mecca to be read in ‘Arafa Day. In aforesaid letter, he wrote, “I’m under siege and I’ve

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. IV, p. 567, num. 1445. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p. 170. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. III, p. 66.

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. IV, p. 567 num. 1446

[3]. Tathb¢t Dali’il al-nubuwwa, p. 573

[4]. al-Ghirit, p. 104

[5]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. III, pp. 72-73; Tir¢kh Ibn Khayyi§, p. 170; al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba,vol. VII, p. 441, 514; Tir¢kh al-islim, ‘Ahd al-khulafi’ al-rishid¢n, p. 446; see Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. II, p. 1286

got no food but a trivial supply. I adjure everyone to whom my letter is read to hasten for my help." [1]

ª'ayisha was on her way to °adjdj. Marwin was sent by 'Uthmin to help him in people dispersion but she rejected.[2]

For forty days, 'Uthmin was under siege and at last Friday early evening, the 18th Dhi l-°adjdja, 35 A.H. he was murdered. His murderer's name is not exactly specified. Someone's name as Aswadin Ibn °amrin from Tudj¢b in Egypt was cited.[3]

Kunina said, "I heard on Egyptian crying around 'Uthmin's house that he murdered Na'thal but no one had anything to do with him."[4]

Quoting 'Urwa, 'Uthmin's corpse was in °ashsh Kawkab for three days but no one did prayer on it.[5] Afterwards, four people among whom were Djubayr Ibn Mu§'im and °ukaym Ibn °izim assembled and buried him there out of Baq¢' by night.[6]

ONGOING VICTORIES

Geographical extension of Islamic country was the major aim of second caliph. All the tribes were mobilized for this purpose and a great deal were sent to different areas. In this era, stabilization of Arab's rule over conquered areas in east and partly in west was the major action of victories. Alexandria, in 25 A.H., started revolution and made effort to rise up against Muslims by a hidden connection to Romans. Arabs, once more, obliged to conquer this city. Riy citizens rebelled as well as ªdharbiydjin so °udhayfa obliged to calm these areas by force. The gate of Ifr¢qiya was westerly opened in 26-7 A.H. and Islam was expanded to the heart of Africa. These areas were easily opened and their booties brought Islam a great capital. In 33 A.H., after the renewed

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1166; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol. I, pp. 54-56; al-Fut£¦, vol. II, p. 217

[2]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1172

[3]. Ibid, vol. III, p. 1231

[4]. Ma'rifat al-¥a¦iba, vol. I, p. 253; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1308

[5]. Ma'rifat al-¥a¦iba, vol. I, p. 259

[6]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. III, p. 1166

revolution in this area and its renewed opening, its people became calm and tractable. But in Umayya’s time, due to excessive pressure on them-in Hishim ‘Abd al-Malik time-they rebelled.[1] First in 29 A.H., Muslims were allowed to pass the sea and open the gate of Cyprus. People of Firs and I¥§akhr, in the year 29 A.H. started revolution and once more its gate was opened, in an attack, by Muslims. Muslims’ first attacks on ±abaristin launched in 30 A.H. and through them, Gurgin was occupied. Yazdgard, the last Sassanids king after a lot of vagrancy in 32 A.H. was murdered by a miller in Marw and his dynasty was overwhelmed forever. The gate of Khurisin, part of which has been conquered and once again rebelled, was opened. Iranian people being still inclined to accept Arab’s rule, due to the lack of a definite leadership, rebelled temporarily. But such revolutions comparing to Arab’s strong and well-organized forces lacked resistance. In other words, since Iranian religious, tribal, and citizenship solidarity has been lost, it couldn’t resist seriously. In the same years, people of Khurisin and Kirmin violating their peace, were defeated in no time.

EFFECTS OF VICTORIES AND ISLAMIC COMMUNITY

Victories were undoubtedly considered as great changes for both Muslims and human world. This movement and its consequences induced great ethnic and religious changes in human world during 100 years and some centuries respectively. Great immigrations changed some areas ethnically and great religions were exposed to restriction. In addition to nearly a full- scale defeat of Zoroastrian religion, in west Christianity and in east Buddhist were grounded. But the new religion conquered the inhabited quarter of the earth and its particular effect. In this regard, some issues should be taken into consideration. When the effects of victories for victorious Arabs are considered, we observe that the majority of Bedouins left their homes in °idjiz for conquered areas. Their only offering for these country was holy Qur’in and to some extent hadith. Apart from these two, we face Arabs who got used to Bedouin but now have

[1]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol. III, pp. 92 – 93

extreme money and wealth. In Peninsula, they lacked any government but now inherit Sassanids extensive government. Culturally, possessing strict ethnic customs but, for the time being, Arabs in conquered regions encounter a new social and aristocratic life. Hereafter, in conquered lands, there is a sort of cultural duality and Arabs should stake out a clear stand against it. These people's existence cannot naturally be denied or compelled to endure Arabian life. 'Umar dissuated Arabs from imitation and turning into non-Arabs. Such a thing was difficult since most of the Arabs possessed Roman and Iranian slave-girls, they brought them children and a new generation was gradually forming.

'Umar made effort not only to keep them away from fighting against non-Arabs. The residents of conquered lands in Iraq and Iran were allowed to keep them but just pay their land-taxes to 'Umar. Not only leaving the lands for Arabs wasn't technically a right thing due to their lack of expertise, but it brought them about some political problems. 'Umar tried to back non-Arab aristocrats up. Like Arabs, a grant of bounty was determined for non-Arab aristocrats. Some shares like F¢r£z Ibn Yazddjird, Full£djа farmers, Hurmuzin, and Bibul's farmer, Bas§im Ibn Nars¢ have been mentioned. 'Umar considered his aim of doing this as the combination of people's (Iranian's) hearts through attracting aristocrats.[1] But Arabs as a victorious and rightful nation were considered superior to others and 'Umar made every possible effort not to mix them with others. The presence of non-Arabs (considered as non-Arab unbelievers by 'Umar) by no means was allowed in Medina, the capital of Islamic country.[2] 'Umar was accidentally murdered by a non-Arab unbeliever had come to Medina through Mughra's intercession. His complaint when he was almost to die was, "Didn't I tell you not to have entrance of non-Arabs into Medina".[3] Additionally, he was to set free all the captives of wars against Arabs like Radda or the conquest of Iraq and Syria

---

[1]. Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol. II, pp. 153 – 154; al-Ma'irif, p. 361

[2]. 'Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.V, p.474, vol.VI, pp.51-54; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. III, p.345

[3]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. IV, pp. 349 – 350

when the number of non-Arab captives was high.[1] He said, “Since God has opened the gates of non-Arab lands to us, it isn’t worthwhile having Arab captives for we’ve got enough non Arab ones.”[2] For this, a great deal of money was paid from public treasury to set non-Arab captives free.[3] For Arabs not to imitate non-Arabs, ‘Umar ordered that no one had the right to speak in any language but Arabic.[4] It was forbidden for an Arab to dress in a non-Arab garment and for Arabs not to be mistaken with non-Arabs.[5] To ‘Umar, Arab Christians should be treated differently from non-Arab ones.[6] In his opinion, Arab was Islam substance [7] and in that time, it was certainly a true thing to be said. ‘Umar wanted his rulers not to bother Arabs in their areas in one way or another to bring about their humiliation.[8] The marriage of Arab women and non-Arabs were severely prohibited by ‘Umar.[9] It disturbed him a lot when he learnt Nifi‘ Ibn °iri<u>th</u> placed a non-Arab instead of himself to come to Medina.[10] Ma’m£n said to a Nabataean (Nib§¢) who cried “Alas! ‘Umar” in his time, “‘Umar believed that if an Arab is in lack of money and his neighbor is a Nabataean, he can sell him! This is ‘Umar’s

---

[1]. ‘Umar’s first measure was to return Arab captives, he said, أول فعل عمر رد سبايا العرب. قال: كرهت أن يسير سنة على العرب What ‘Umar did first was to expatriate ‘Umar’s captives saying, “I am happy! This becomes a tradition degrading Arabs

Tar¢<u>kh</u> al-ya‘q£b¢, vol. II, p. 139; ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol. VII, p. 380

[2]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢<u>kh</u>, vol. II, p. 382

[3]. Ab£ ‘Ubayd, al-Amwil, p. 133; Fut£¦ al-buldin, p. 104

[4]. Rabi‘ al-abrir,vol.I, p.796; ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.V, pp. 496- 497; Tir¢<u>kh</u> <u>Dj</u>ur<u>dj</u>in, p. 486

[5]. °ayit ¥a¦iba, vol. II, p. 802

[6]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, pp.185-186; ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf,vol.VI, p.99, al-<u>Kh</u>ari<u>dj</u>, p. 221

[7]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. IV, pp. 337 – 339; ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf,vol. I, p. 325

[8]. Tir¢<u>kh</u> al-§abar¢, vol. I,p.2741; Imtidid al-‘arab, p. 22

[9]. Imtidid al-‘arab, p. 22

[10]. ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf,vol. XI, p. 439; °ayit ¥a¦iba,vol.II, p. 150

biography, do you like to treat you according to it?" [1] One time, made up his mind to propose marriage to 'Umar's daughter. It wasn't done for 'Umar's family came and wanted him to abdicate.[2] Meeting people, 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar said, "Peace be upon you." But visiting a Negro, he said, "O Frog, peace be upon you."[3] It was natural that later on, Khilid Ibn ¯afwin in the marriage contract of his slave-girl and a slave said, "God's name is superior than being mentioned in the marriage sermon of these two dogs. I announce this adulteress and adulterer, man and wife!"[4]

'Uthmin, to some extent, followed the same policy. The most important factors bringing about destruction of Islamic Community, to 'Uthmin, are as follow, **تكامل النعم، بلوغ أولادكم من السبايا، قراءة الأعراب والأعاجم للقرآن "**Abundance, the new generation of captive mothers, and Qur'in recitation by non-Arabs."[5]

Ethnic mixture in Arab brought some effects about which cannot be prevented. Arabs' possession of some tribal customs and their lack of a disciplined and regular culture were considered the major reasons. Meanwhile, Arab tribal structure strengthened through 'Umar's measure in forming D¢win based on ethnic system played a key role in the protection of Arab culture. Setting Arab tribes was the aim of stabilization of pure Arab cities however very soon, captives of war and non-Arab immigrants settled there. These cities internally possessed some divided tribes and non-Arabs in there had got special parishes. These cities were distinctive from those in the past for they have been formed through Islamic and Arab features.

The number of Arab immigrants most of whom left Iraq for Iran was excessive. It is said that in K£fa, fifty thousand and twenty-four thousand houses were allocated to Rabi'a, Mu¤ar and other Arabs respectively. In Imim 'Al¢ (a) time, the number of people whose names existed in Ba¥ra administration tribunal touched sixty thousands.[6]

---

[1]. 'Uy£n al-akhbir, vol. I, p. 230; see al-Ma¦isin wa l-masiw¢, vol. II, p. 227

[2]. °ilyat al-awl¢yi', vol. I, p.186; Lu§f al-tadb¢r, p. 199; al-zuhd wa l-Raqi'iq, Djuz' Nu'aym Ibn °ammid, p. 52

[3]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. IV, p. 160

[4]. al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n,vol.II, p.250

[5]. al-Fitnat al-kubri, p. 72

[6]. Imtidid al-'arab, p. 26

The quick regional influence of Islam was considered as one of the important effects of Arab residence in Iran. In ªdharbiydjin, the expansion of Islam was the result of Arab residence there. Arabs bought a great deal of lands there and started a permanent residence. It is said that going to ªdharbiydjin, Ash‘ath Ibn Qays observed a lot of Muslims reciting Qur’in.[1] Arabs’ other residence was Riy due to its significance. Arab cities were few, according to Ya‘q£b¢.[2] Qazw¢n, because of its frontier significance with Diylam, was the residence of Arabs who left K£fa for this region. In al-Buldin, Ya‘q£b¢ considered human geography of cities, which is of great importance, in regard to Arab and non-Arab.[3] According to some narrations, Qum was basically on Arab residence and some tribes like Ash‘ar¢ and Midh¦adj settled there. After repeated victories different regions of Iran were permanent residences of Arabs. Meanwhile, unlike Egypt and north of Africa, Iran didn’t turn into Arabian, on the contrary, its Arab residents gradually turned into Iranian.

Financially, victories greatly affected Muslims. Arabs, before Islam, severely suffered from economic deprivation. But after victories, they had a comfortable life resulted from booties abundance. This issue brought about some particular ethnical consequences from which in Islamic community resulted constant corruption due to the lack of continuous training. Figuring out such conditions, ‘Umar strictly made effort to keep noble men of companions away from comfort and extravagance. However, in ‘Uthmin’s time, the society severely suffered from sedition and corruption for ‘Uthmin himself was an aristocrat and unable to control the situation. The natural point was new community’s lack of forces for religious teaching and learning. This problem was to some extent solved by companions but neither their number nor their knowledge can cover such an extensive land.

In ‘Uthmin’s time, companions obtained a lot of wealth and clever Muslims kept the limit of their wealth. Mas‘£d¢ made some useful information available to us.[4] In spite of

---

[1]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p. 329; Imtidid al-‘arab, p. 23

[2]. al-Buldin, p. 269

[3]. Dr. ¯ili¦ al-‘Al¢, in "Imtidid al-‘arab f¢ ¯adr al-islim", studied the Arabs’ jouney and their settlement in cities of Iran based on Ya‘qub¢’s source and other books.

[4]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol. II, pp. 332-333.

‘Umar’s carefulness in this regard, he caused Badr¢ companions to obtain a great wealth in no time through his system for distribution of “grant of bounty”. Forming an aristocratic life, ‘Uthmin later on, was a typical of aristocracy prevalence among people. This aristocracy, for the most part, existed among the Muhidjir£n for their superiority to the An¥ir in the arrangement of tribunal based on ‘Umar’s policy.[1] And this policy of Quraysh’s superiority to non-Quraysh, was followed by ‘Uthmin as well.[2] While religiously comparing An¥ir were in a better position than Quraysh.

Ibn ‘Abbis said, “Most of the Messenger(s)’ hadiths were available to An¥ir.”[3]

It is said that An¥ir’s women in religion obtained understanding[4] and were more religious than the Muhidjir£n.[5] Also, in Quraysh, just one person who knew Qur’in by heart existed according to the narration.[6]

±ihi °usayn studied ‘Uthmin’s Quraysh¢ policies and its effect on An¥ir’s seclusion and the rule of Quraysh over other Arabs.[7] Policy of the Muhidjir£n’s superiority to the An¥ir and Quraysh to non-Quraysh was, to some extent, accepted in the community so that its settlement by Imim ‘Al¢ (a), with all his influence, was not possible. Their objection to Imim was why didn’t he, like ‘Umar, consider them superior to others?[8]

Aristocracy along with the lack of religious training intensified the community problem so that K£fa witnessed adultery of Mughh¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba and drinking of Wal¢d Ibn ‘Uqba, governors of such an important city. Mu‘iwiya was also a typical of that and not wanting to be included in Kanz verse, he made up his mind to omit the first “v” letter so that it might include the people of The Book.[9] The names of

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol. VIII, p.111.

[2]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. II, p. 989.

[3]. Sunnan al-Dirim¢, introduction, section 46

[4]. ‘Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol. I, pp. 314 -315

[5]. °ayit ¥a¦iba, vol. II, p. 87

[6]. Ibn Dj£z¢, al-Adhkiyi’, p. 102

[7]. al-Fitnat al-kubri, pp. 68-85-86

[8]. Nahdj al-sa‘ida, vol. I. pp. 199, 200, 207, 272, 228, 229; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol. VII, pp. 41-43

[9]. See al-durr al-manth£r, vol. III, p. 232

some Quraysh been punished by whip are mentioned by Mu¦ammad Ibn °ab¢b. Among them is ‘Umar’s son, Ab£ Sha¦ma, who committed adultery to ‘Umar’s step-daughter and he was punished by a whip. ‘Ubayd Allih and ‘ª¥im, ‘Umar’s offsprings were whipped by ‘Umar and ‘Uthmin respectively for drinking.[1] Imim °usayn (a) witnessed the latter and this caused, accordingly to Mu¦ammad Ibn °ab¢b, enmity between family of ‘Umar and that of ‘Al¢. Suhayl Ibn ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf was whipped for drinking.[2] Among these, the names of other companions’ sons had been mentioned. The lack of punishment in the case of others didn’t mean that they were in a better position. Take the example of ‘Umar, son of Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥, who martyred Imim °usayn (a) Karbali. Karbali’s event principally indicates the depth of mental and ethical corruption and deviation in the Islamic community.

To caliphs, victories were considered a sacred Djihid which not only had a lot of booties but can save Arabs from hunger. This Djihid is considered sacred even if it is accompanied by some mistakes like that of Khilid Ibn Wal¢d with Milik Ibn Nuwayra. Such mistakes don’t bring about the lack of his title, i.e. God’s sword.

In second caliph’s opinion, if the sentence, **حي على خير العمل** **“**Hasten to good deeds,” was omitted from the prayer call, Djihid would be most important to people than prayer, people’s concern about victories and not having anything to do with the internal affairs was another feature of victories. For ‘Uthmin, being entangled in revolution, one of the solutions was to send opposers to the borders to fight there against enemies.[3] But those aware of the reality wrote to the frontier controllers that Djihid exists in Medina not Diylam.[4] Mu‘iwiya benefited from this weapon for opponents dispersion.[5]

---

[1]. al-Munammaq, pp. 367-395

[2]. Ibid, p. 397

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol. II, pp. 178- 179; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol. II, p. 237; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol. III, p. 149; Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol. II, p. 1096

[4]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol. III, p. 150

[5]. Ya‘qub¢ says, “Mu‘iw¢ya by dint of money made the opponents quiet, sometimes he was sent to the war especially the front.” Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol. II, p. 238

In order to recognize deviations made in the community, in fact, difficulties of Imim ‘Al¢ (a) who made his Messengership the community reform should be recognized.

People depended on public treasury and their grants of bounty to the extent that ‘Umar said, “If I want, I can make these people unbelievers.”

They asked, “How?”

He replied, “I’ll cut their shares.”[1]

Also Ab£ Djaʻfar Naq¢b said, “No one would object to ‘Umar if he changed their Qibla from Kaʻba to Jerusalem or omitted one of the five unit prayers for people made every effort to obtain money and wealth and they kept still when they reached it.” [2]

To Imim ‘Al¢ (a) on the threshold of his caliphate, the situation of the community was like that of pre-Islam.[3]

---

[1]. al-Miʻyir wa l-muwizina, p. 87

[2]. Sharɨ nahdj al-balighha, vol. XII, p. 96

[3]. Nahdj al-saʻida, vol. I, p. 189

CHAPTER VI
IMªM ‘AL¢’S IMAMATE

IMªM ‘AL« ALONGSIDE THE PROPHET

In the first version of the book, we proportionately and briefly discussed about Imim ‘Al¢ (a)’s role in the changes of Prophet’s significant time. Imim’s position and his reliability to the Messenger (s) is briefly discussed. Imim ‘Al¢ (a) had the honor to be brought up in the house of Messenger (s).[1] In this regard, a great deal of attractive narrations collected by Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d exist. Among them, in a narration by Zayd Ibn ‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn, he said that in that time the Messenger made meat and date soft by putting it in his mouth for being easily eaten and then it was put in Imim ‘Al¢’s mouth.[2] Imim ‘Al¢ (a) was the first one who believed in the Messenger (s) due to this kinship.

He said, “No one but the Messenger took me the lead in prayer.”[3]

Since, in this regard, a great deal of witnesses and evidence exists; therefore, there is no room for doubts of equitable people. Concerning Imim’s embrace Islam, it is reportedly said that he was invited by the Messenger (s) to embrace Islam and this indicates Imim’s mental maturity.[4]

Mas‘£d¢ says, “Some said that Imim in the time of his embrace Islam was not old enough so he was only an infant in that time.”[5]

The prophet truly knew the value of devoted companions, while Imim’s self-sacrifice in all the fields was observed, hoe the prophet can consider him like the others. This triggered

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 90

[2]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balighha, vol. XII, pp. 198-201

[3]. Nahdj al-balighha, sermon 131

[4]. al-Mi‘yir wa l-muwizina, pp. 68-69; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. I, p.112

[5]. al-Tanb¢h wa l-ishrif, p. 198

that in every right time, Imim's reliability and value was expresses to people through the prophet's remarks about Imim's features and characteristics. These are the issues available to us in reliable sources of history and hadith under the title of Imim's virtues. Later on when in second century, the books of hadith were compiled, their compilers and narrators were to the most part influenced by tendencies of 'Uthmin's followers who couldn't tolerate any virtue for Imim. Additionally what the Umayyads and 'Uthmin supporters in the Umayya time made about caliphs and companion defenders was narrated. Some of these fakes ascribed to caliphs were, in essence, Imim's virtues. These distortions came to a deadlock for Imim's narrated virtues and their narrators were respectively serious and reliable to be remained in books. Narrators of K£fa, in this regard, played a significant role in keeping these virtues.

A¦mad Ibn °anbal said, "'Al¢ is the one for whom a great deal of true virtues is said."[1]

He said, **إن ابـن أبـي طـالب لا يقـاس بـه أحـد**[2] **"**No noe deserves being compared to 'Al¢."

Among these virtues, some narrations for whose correctness there is no doubt can be mentioned. Significance of some is to the extent that through them Imim's personality in the Messenger's eyes can be imagined.

Ab£ Sa'¢d Khudr¢ said, **كان لعلي من النـبي (ص) دخلـة ليست لأحد وكان للنبي (ص) من علي دخلة ليست لأحـد غيـره فكانت دخلة النبي (ص) مـن علـي ان النـبي (ص) كـان يـدخل عليهم كل يوم**[3] **"**No one met the prophet more than 'Al¢, so did the Prophet. The Prophet's meeting was to come up to them every day."

Also Zayd Ibn Thibit said to Imim, **أنت من رسول الله (ص) بالمكان الذي لا يعدله أحد**[4] **"**No one owns thy dignity in front of the Messenger (s)."

---

[1]. Ibn Dj£z¢, Maniqib A¦mad Ibn °anbal, p. 160; ±abaqit al-¦anibili, vol. I, p. 319

[2]. Maniqib A¦mad Ibn °anbal, pp. 163

[3]. 'Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol. X, p. 140; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 98 and in the footnote of Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXXVIII, p. 33; Amil¢ Ibn al-Shiykh, p. 33; Hadith III, section 27

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol. II, p. 165

These words were said by Zayd when he used to tenaciously support ‘Uthmin. This caused Imim to know the Prophet (s) as long as none of the other companions did so.[1] One evidence indicating the Prophet’s heed to Imim was that he married Fi§ima (s), world selected women, to him. Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar had popped the question to Fi§ima before but they were rejected by the Prophet.

But Imim (a) proposing marriage to Fi§ima was accepted and said, **لست بدجال**[2] “I’m not deceiver.” “Fi§ima is yours.”

Having married Fi§ima, Imim (a) was asked to find a house but it was far from the Prophet’s. And this was done through °irith Ibn Nu‘min’s devotion and leaving his house for ‘Al¢.[3]

Perhaps due to such a reason, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar said, “ For knowing ‘Al¢’s status to the prophet, you’d better see location of his house to that of the prophet.”[4]

In the course of the brotherhood, the Messenger selected ‘Al¢ (a) as his “brother”.[5] When the Messenger made sermon, Imim ‘Al¢ (a) used to repeat his remarks in a farther distance.[6] And in the time of the Prophet’s anger, no one but ‘Al¢ (a) dared to talk to him.[7] People made ‘Al¢ (a) as their mediator in solving their problems.[8]

---

[1]. See Subul al-hudi wa l-Rishid, vol. VI, p. 642

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. VIII, p. 22. this can be read in two ways “ **لست’** lastu” and “ **لست´** lasta”. Ibn Sa‘d considered the first one and interpreted as I am not deceiver. It means that the prophet had pledged ‘Al¢ of his marriage to Fi§ima. A research in the narration of proposal, show there existed no promise. So what does the Prophet’s remark mean? Hence the reading lasta seems to be more probable, implying a reference to the previous suitors.

[3]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. VIII, p. 22

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, pp. 180-181

[5]. ¯a¦¢¦ Tirmidh¢, vol. XIII, p. 170; Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, al-Mu¥annaf, vol. XII, pp. 62 – 82; al-Mustadrak, vol. III, p.14; Rab¢‘ al-abrir, vol. I, p. 807; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. I, p. 270, vol. II, p. 145

[6]. Rab¢‘ al-abrir, vol. III, p. 732

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 107; al-Mustadrak, vol. III, p.130

[8]. al-Tarit¢b al-idiriyya, vol. I, pp. 56-58

Quoting ‘ayisha, the Sunnites said, “Fi§ima among the women and ‘Al¢ among the men were the most beloved to the Messenger.” [9]

In Manzalat tradition which is one of the most definite merits of Imim, the Messenger regarded his relationship with ‘Al¢ (a) as that of Moses with Aaron.[2] In case of any problem, when someone was to be sent for settling things, The Messenger sent ‘Al¢ (a).[3] Once Imim was asked, why is it that you quote traditions more than the other companions? He answered, **لأني كنت إذا سألته أنبأني وإذا سكتّ ابتـدأني** “Because When I asked the Messenger a question, He taught me the knowledge and when I kept silent, he started to speak himself.”[4]

Imim used to say, I faced nothing unknown unless I asked of the Messenger about it and committed the answer to my memory[5]. I memorized everything he said and never forgot anything.[6]

In a letter he wrote, **وأنا من رسول الله كالصنو من الصنو والذراع من العضد “**My relation with the Messenger is that of one branch with another or of the wrist with the arm.”[7]

He said, “I followed the Messenger just as a baby camel follows its mother.”[8]

إني لم أردّ على الله ولا على رسوله ساعة قطّ

“I never disobeyed God or his Messenger at all.”[9]

Concerning the declaration of aquittance, God told His Messenger, This message must be delivered either by you or someone on behalf of you. That is why he made Ab£ Bakr return midway and handed the message to Imim ‘Al¢ so that it might be read on “Greater Pilgrimage”.[10] There are

---

[9]. al-Ist¢‘ib, vol.I, p.378; Tir¢kh Djurdjin, p.218

[2]. As mentioned in the text, no one doubts this tradition

[3]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. VII, p. 435; al-Tarit¢b al-Idariyya, vol. I, p.p 443,444;3

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol II, p. 98

[5]. Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 208

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 121

[7]. Nahdj al-baligha, Letter 45

[8]. Ta¥n¢f Nahdj al-baligha, p. 355

[9]. Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 195

[10]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. I, p. 382; vol. II, p.p. 123,155

beautiful sentences, in Qi¥i‘a sermon, about Imim's intimacy with the Messenger. Here are some of his remarks,

“You know my position of close kinship and special relationship with the Prophet. From the very beginning of my life he took me in his lap and kept me embraced to his chest. He used to lay me beside him in his bed, bring his body close to mine and make me smell his fragrance. He used to feed me with his hands often chewing something for me. He never heard me lying nor did he see me doing something wrong. When he was weaned, God appointed his greatest angel to be with him day and night so that he might cover the paths of greatness and avail himself of the worldly virtues. And I used to follow him like a young camel following in the footprints of its mother. Every day he showed me in the form of a banner some of his high traits and commanded me to follow them. Every year he used to go in seclusion in °ari’.I saw him and no one did so but me. In those days, Islam was the religion of Holy Prophet and his wife, Khad¢dja exclusively. I was the third of the trio. I beheld the divine light of revelation and prophethood and smelled the heavenly fragrance of messngership.”[1]

Being on such intimate terms with the Messenger, Imim said, “By God, there is no verse revealed unless I know about what and where in it was sent.[2] According to Ibn ‘Abbis, no verse was sent by God unless ‘Al¢ (a) was Am¢r and noble. God reproved Mu¦ammad’s companions but always spoke highly of ‘Al¢ (a).[3] Regarding those who wondered at ‘Al¢ (a) being the divider of Heaven and Hell, A¦mad Ibn °anbal said, “Hasn't this been narrated that the Messenger told ‘Al¢ (a), **لا يحبـك إلا مـؤمن ولا يبغضـك إلا منافق** “Only the believer loes thee and only the hypocrite loathes thee.” “Yes”, they said. Continued he, “As the believer abides in the heaven and the hypocrite abides in the Hell, ‘Al¢ (a) is the divider of the Heaven and the Hell.”[4]

---

[1]. Nahdj al-balighha, Sermon192

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 99

[3]. Ma‘rifat al-¥a¦iba, vol. I, p. 298; al-Mu‘djam al-Kab¢r, vol. XI, p. 264; °ilyat

al-awliyi’, vol. I, p. 64

[4]. ±abaqit al-¦anibila, vol. I, p. 320

‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z used to say, “If this ignorant people were informed of what we knew about ‘Al¢ (a), not two of them would obey us.”[1]

As Salmin states, “Should ‘Al¢ (a) leave you, there would remain nobody to inform you of the prophet's secrets.”[2] How right Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d is to say, “No one helped the Prophet as much as Ab£ ±ilib and his sons,’Al¢ (a) and Dja‘far did.”[3]Once somebody complained to the Prophet about ‘Al¢ (a) and he stated three times, Leave ‘Al¢ (a) alone.[4]

فإن علياً مني وأنا منه وهو ولي كل مومن

“‘Al¢ is from me and I am from him; he is guardian of every faithful.”

At the night of immigration, ‘Al¢ (a) saved prophet's life [5]. In the battle of Badr 30 polytheists were put to death by him. In the battle of U¦ud, where many escaped the battle, he remained with prophet and saved his life. One stroke of ‘Al ¢'s sword inflicted on ‘Amr Ibn ‘Abdiwad in Khandaq was considered by the Prophet to be worth more than the worship of Jinn and mankind. This blow put the enemy to rout.[6] In most battles, Imim was the flag bearer of Muslim's army.[7]

Undoubtedly, Imim’s knowledge had no parallel in Prophet's companions. This is an issue cited by the prophet and his companions, and testified by history. This word of the Messenger, **انا مدينه العلم وعلي بابها “**I am the city of knowledge and ‘Al¢ (a) is its door,” bears abundant evidence of this. Uttered on the pulpit, Imim 's remark, **سلوني قبل ان**

---

[1]. Rabi‘ al-abrir, vol. I, p. 499

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 183

[3]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol. VII, p. 174

[4]. al-Amil¢ f¢ athir al-¥a¦iba, p. 80, footnote of Musnad A¦mad, vol. IV, p. 437, ¯a¦¢¦ Tirmidh¢, no.3796; Musnad ±ayilis¢ No.829; Traits of ‘Al ¢ (a), Nasi’¢, p. 65; al-°ilyat al-’awliyi’, vol. VI, p. 294; al-Mustadrak, vol. III, p. 110; al-Mu‘djam al-Kab¢r, vol. XVIII, p. 128; and see→, vol. IV, p. 322

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. I, p. 260

[6]. Tir¢kh Mukhta¥ar al-duwal, p. 95; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha

vol. V, p. 7

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 91,94; °ayit ¥a¦iba, vol. II, p.p. 514-515

تفقدوني **“**Ask me before you miss me,”[1] was also indicative of the superiority of his knowledge. This claim, according to Sa‘¢d Ibn Musayyib, was laid by no one but Imim.[2]

The prophet charged him with the duty of teaching ablution and tradition to people.[3] ‘ªyisha, whose animosity toward Fi§ima and ‘Al¢ (a) dated back to prophet's time, said, **علي أعلم الناس بالسنة** [4] “**‘**Al¢ is most conscious of Sunna.”

According to one of the well-known successors called ‘A§i’, ‘Al¢ is the most impoverished one among the Prophet’s companions.[5]

‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z also called him the most devout of the companions.[6] Hundreds of pages can be written about Imim's virtues but this amount will suffice our book which is a short review of Islam's history.

IMªM ‘AL« AND CALIPHS

If it is true to assume that at Messenger’s time, Muhidjir£n were of two different political fronts and some were trying to win the caliphate, then one must accept that the relations between Imim and Shiykhs were rather strained. Reports say nothing to prove their disputes, but nor does any reminiscence show their friendship. On ‘ªyisha's own confession, her being at enmity with Imim went back to Prophet's time and this can be considered as bearing witness to the differences between the families of ‘Al¢ and Ab£ Bakr. It has been said that when Fi§ima passed away, all Messenger's wives attended the Hishimites mourning ceremony except for ‘ªyisha who feigning illness, didn’t participate and even was told to be expressing joy of that.[7] Anyway, Immediately after Ab£ Bakr's caliphacy and Imim's insistence on proving his rightfulness, unfriendly relations between them were developed. Attacking Imim’s house,

1. Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 189
2. Tir¢kh Ya¦yi Ibn Mu‘ayn,vol.III,p. 143
3. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. IV, p. 52
4. Tir¢kh al-Kab¢r, Bukhir¢,vol.II, p. 255
5. Maqtal al-imim al-Am¢r al-Mu‘min¢n (ā)
6. Ibid, p.107
7. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha,, vol. IX, p. 198

Fi§ima's being in sulk as well as not permitting Shiykhs to attend Imim's funeral,[1] all aggravated the differneces.following that, Imim secluded and went on with his own life.

The administration expected Imim, in addition to taking the oath of allegiance, to refrain from assertion of rightfulness and embark on consolidating their authoritative realm while having swords in hand but

He refused to do so. Naturally, adopting such a position Imim was to be humiliated by the administration in front of people. This policy could result in Imim's further solitude.

Cursing Quraysh, Imim said,"Oh God, I seek your help against the Quraysh and those supporting them." **فإنهم قطعو رحمي وصغروا عظيم منـزلتي وأجمعوا علـى منـازعتي أمراً هو لي "**They have cut asunder my kinship,lowered my high position and joined together to contest the right to which I was entitled."[2]

Continues he, "I looked around but found no one to shield and help me except the members of my family. I refrained from fighting them to death, so I overlooked with grieved eyes"[3]

This remark refers to Caliphs' policy of humiliating Imim. In sermon of Shiqshiqiyya, referring to the consultation Imim states, "When he ('Umar) was due to die, he selected a group of candidates and included me among them. Oh, good Heavens! What had I to do with this consultation? I wonder why they never equaled me to the first of them but to these people while I was as competent as him."[4]

It was intolerable for Imim to be among ±al¦a, Zubayr and 'Uthmin who held him in contempt. Strange to say, 'Umar blamed all 6 men chosen by him for some wrongdoings. What Imim was blamed for, in this regard, was extremely unfounded and humiliating. He was blamed for

---

[1]. See, al-Mustadrak, vol. III, p. 162; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. VIII, p.p. 29-30; al-Tanb¢h

al-ashrif, p. 250; Wafi' al-wafi', p.p. 995-996,1000

[2]. Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 172; al-Ghirit, vol. I, p. 309

[3]. Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 217; some parts have been added to this sermon of Nahdj al-baligha; See,al-Djamal, p. 123;Ibid.footnote of, al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol. I, p. 155; al-Ghirit, p. 204

[4]. Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 3

being kind of a joker, **فيه دعابة**[1]**.** Later, based on this very remark of ‘Umar, Mu‘iwiya[2] and ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ told about Imim, **فيه تلعابة**[3] **“**He is a humorous man.”

Seroiusly rejecting this accusation laid against him by ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, Imim in fact rejected ‘Umar's remark. [4] The life of Imim who was secluded in Medina caused him to remain unknown. The time went by fast, and the Imim, by himself, in Medina, particularly among the old companions of Prophet(s) seemed as acquaintance. Yet, no one knew Imim in Iraq and Damascus. Just a few Yemen¢ tribes seeing him since his few-month-long trip to Yemen were acquaintance to him.

Djundab Ibn ‘Abd Allih said, “Once after swearing (on oath of) allegiance to ‘Uthmin I went to Iraq, therein I quoted ‘Al¢’s virtues for the people. The best answer I heard from the people was, “Discard these remarks. Think of something of your benefit.”

I answered, “These issues are beneficial for both of us.” Yet, after my statement, he was to stand up and leave.[5]

According to Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Mu¦ammad Ibn Sulaymin’s interpretation was that one of the factors leading to discard in ‘Uthmin’s era was the constitution of council. For, each member of the council had serious aspiration for caliphate. Typically, ±al¦a was among those who looked forward to caliphate. Besides, Zubayr not only helped him but also regarded himself as deserving of governing. Their hope for the caliphate was more than that of Imim ‘Al¢ (a). Inasmuch as the two Shiykhs discredited him and held him in low esteem. Hence, he was forgotten. Most of those knowing his virtues had been died at the time of the Prophet(s), and a new generation was found that deemed him the same as other Muslims. What merely left among his honors was that he is the cousin of the Prophet(s), his daughter’s husband and his grandchildren’s father. The remainder of facts was forgotten. Quraysh also felt such a hatred for him that was

---

[1]. Tir¢kh Mukhta¥ar al-duwal, p. 103

[2]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol. I, p. 25

[3]. al-Imti‘ wa l-mu’inisa, vol. III, p. 183

[4] Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 84; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 127,145,151; Nahdj al-sa‘ida, vol. II, p. 88

[5]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol. IX, p. 58

never felt for anyone. To the same extent, Quraysh loved ±al¦a and Zubayr, since there was no reason for abhorring them.[1]

Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d himself, having pointed out that the people in ¯iff¢n were waiting to regard ‘Ammir’s presence in a front as the rightfulness of that front, said, “How surprising the peoples are! Since they accept ‘Ammir as the criterion of truth and error; however, they don’t regard the very ‘Al¢ (a) as a criterion about whom the Prophet(s) has cited the hadith of sainthood and also said, **لا يحبـك إلا مـؤمن ولا يبغضك إلا منافق** “Only the believer loves thee, and only the hypocrite loathes thee.”

This is because all Quraysh tried to, from the very beginning, cover his virtues, remove public memory from him, ruin his features and eliminate his high status in the hearts of people.[2] Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d nicely analyzes the reasons behind the Quraysh’s grudge against Imim ‘Al¢(a).[3]

Once Imim was asked:”Do you think if the Messenger(s) had a mature son, Arabs would hand the governorship over to him?”

Imim responded: “If he had done something different from what I did, he would have been killed.”

Arabs hated what Mu¦ammad (s) did and felt envious of what God had granted him… they from that time attempted to disentitle Ahl al-Bayt after his departure. Quraysh found his name a means of domination and ladder of promotion and if other wise, they never worshipped God even one day after him and would become apostate. A while after, conquests, come one after another, no hunger and poverty remained after starvation and destitution. This led to popularity of Islam and they kept religion in their many a heart because, however, truth brought this about. Afterwards, these conquests were attributed to strategy and thought of emirs. Among them, some were magnified and some others were forgotten, **فكنا ممن خمل ذكره وخبت ناره وانقطع صوته وصيته، حتى أكل الدهر علينـا وشـرب، ومضـت السنون والاحقاب بما فيها، ومات كثير ممن يعرف ونشأ كـثير ممن لا يعرف** “We were from someone whose memory was

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol. IX, p. 28

[2]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.VIII, p.18

[3]. Ibid. vol.XIII, p.299-300

last whose luminosity was cut and whose outcry was stopped as if time swallowed us. Years passed this way, many known figures were dead and those unknown came into stage. Under these conditions, what curled the son’s son do? You know that the Messenger(s) never kept me close to himself for his kinship, with me but he did it in time of Djihid ad and advice.[1] It was just for the same reason of Imim being forgotten in Muslim community he, in his caliphate time, tried to use every chase to introduce himself and speak about his efforts for Islam in the Messenger’s time.[2]

Imim held cold relationship with Ab£ Bakr with no seemingly left memory. In his contact with ‘Umar, Imim’s memories are many available, that mainly relied upon his judiciary assistance to ‘Umar as well as response to some consultations discussed earlier. ‘Umar refused to blatantly slander Imim and probably Imim did so.

But ‘Uthmin was different and never did he bear Imim’s ideas and once he told Imim:”You are not better than Marwin Ibn °akam to me?”[3]

‘Abbis asked ‘Uthmin to stand by Imim.

‘Uthmin said:”What I first fell you is that if ‘Al¢ wants, no one stands dearer to me than him.[4] Of course, Imim was unwilling to overlook deviations for his friendship with him. For this, Imim’s relationship with ‘Uthmin was partly closer and partly harsher.”[5]

Once an An¥ir¢ woman had a quarrel with one of the Hishimites women and when she was acquitted, she was told by ‘Uthmin, “This is your cousin, ‘Al¢’s decision!”[6]

Opposition to government was difficult for Imim. He attempted, in early years, to resort to seclusion to avoid faring the government. Sa‘d Ibn ‘Ubida was a good experiment. He failed to pay allegiance and immediately in time of caliph I or II, he was told to have been killed by

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, vol.XX, p.298-299.

[2]. For example, Nahdj al-sa‘ida, vol.II, pp.222,314

[3]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.342

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.14

[5]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, vol.III, pp. 1045-1046

[6]. Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara. vol.III, p.967; Muntakhab Kanz al-‘Ummil, vol.II, p.204

Djinns. Previously mention was made from some sources that his murder had been politically planned.[1]

According to Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Ab£ Dja'far Naq¢b (Ya¦yi Ibn Ab¢ Zayd) was asked:"I am amazed how 'Al¢ survived this long after the Messenger's demise, from all Quraysh's vengeance."

Ab£ Dja'far said:"Had he not belittled and isolated himself, he might have been killed."

He let himself off memories and became engaged in worshipping, Qur'in reading and prayer, leaving his first state of mind and sword as if he were like a sinner who had repented, probing the earth and living on the mountains like a monk. He survived because he obeyed rulers of the time; other wise he would have been killed".

He then refers to Khilid's action to kill Imim.[2] Mu'min al-±iq also believe that Imim made no political effort in this time because he feared being murdered by jinns (like Sa'd).[3]

Of course, this did not mean that Imim never tried to use chances to take back his rights. From the very outset, he refused to swear allegiance for a few months.[4] Further, from early times, he joined his family to homes of An¥ir to revert back his rights. He insisted so much that he was blamed for having a greedy eye on caliphate.

Imim quoting someone said:"O son of Ab£ ±ilib! You raise a greed on this!

He said:"No, by God, you are greedier than I am. You are for from the Messenger(s) and I'm closer to him. I asked for the right I possessed, but you refrain me from having it".[5]

Imim made reasoning of this kind a lot, **يا معشر قريش! إنا أهل البيت أحق بهذا الامر منكم، أما كان فينا من يقرء القرآن ويعرف السنّة ويدين بدين الحق؟"** O Quraysh people! We, Ahl al-Bayt deserve more than you in caliphate! Are there no people among us who read Qur'in and follow Sunna and true religion."[6]

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.XVII, p.62

[2]. Ibid. vol.XIII, p.301-302

[3]. Ibid. vol.XVII, p.62

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol 1, p. 585; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol 2, p. 325

[5]. Nahdj al-balighha, sermon 172, al-Ghirit, vol.I, p.307

[6]. Al-Ghirit, vol 1, p.307

On Imim’s evaluating successorship of three caliphs, it is to be said that he was in no time free to offer his appraisal of Shiykhs. Unlike ‘Uthmin, what he believed, he found a chance to retell it. It was why his troops in K£fa were included of those, except a few, had approved of Shiykhs and he could not talk freely about them. Once he found a chance to talk some part of his sufferings but he was stopped talking. Upon ‘Abbis’s insistence, he kept on talking, **“تلك شقشقة هدرت** No, Ibn ‘Abbis! What you heard was flame of grief that rose.”[1]

Imim with all caution was never prepared to adopt conditions of ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf for caliphate during council of caliphate. Ibn’Awf conditioned that if Imim were willing to act upon conduct of Shiykhs, he would place him caliph.

Imim said:”I would act according to my Idjtihid”.

Imim openly rejected conduct of Shiykhs and believed that it was in the most part against conduct of the Messenger(s) and based on improper Idjtihid. Imim says he has obeyed Ab£ Bakr in affairs he obeyed God.[2] Imim’s words and his approach here show that he never admired past manners.

In later times, Mu‘iwiya wrote to Imim that he felt envious of early caliphs and rebelled against them!

Imim wrote back, “you think I am against them an dwant to take revenge. If so, why are you worried to be inquired? You are not blamed... and you said you found me like a camel harnessed to swear allegiance. By God, you wanted to scold, praise and scandalize but you’re scandalized yourself. What belittles a Muslim who is oppressed and assured of his religion. His certainty is strong and his hesitation is aside? ... And I never apologize for caviling ‘Uthmin because of innovations.[3]

Despite Imim’s explicit criticism, particularly his attitude in council, one cannot refer to Imim’s familial relationships with ‘Umar, or ‘Uthmin for his belief in their proper rule. Even his praise of some caliphs compared to others cannot

---

[1]. Nahdj al-balighha, sermon 3, Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.274

[2]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, p.307

[3]. Nahdj al-balighha, letter 28; Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.86-91. Here, Mu‘iwiya’s letter to Imim and Imim’s reply are fully mentioned.

be a reason for his basic approval of them. When he learned that he could not face the party and a campaign waged is not beneficial to Islam, he chose to compromise. Imim justified his allegiance to Ab£ Bakr and his approval according to Muhidjir and An¥ir as to a necessity and preservation of unity among Muslims.[1]

Imim referred to Aaron's speech in front of Moses(a) for justifying his silence, Aaron said,

إِنِّي خَشِيتُ أَنْ تَقُولَ فَرَّقْتَ بَيْنَ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ.

"I feared lest thou shouldst say: Thou hast caused division among the Children of Israel."[2]

Imim said of Saq¢fa, **بل عرفت أنّ حقي هو المأخوذ وقد تركته لهم، تجاوز الله عنهم "**When I learned I am withdrawn with my rights, I left to them, may God punish them."[3]

In the past, Sunnis never accepted that Ahl al-Bayt found themselves more qualified for caliphate than others, that is early caliphs. Yet, now somewhat broad-minded factions of Sunnis admit that 'Al¢(a) simply pledged allegiance just for unison with Ab£ Bakr while knowing himself rightful for caliphate.[4]

Anyway, Imim's isolated life in that society indicates that both Imim and caliphs knew they can not treat others in such a way that it might mean confirmation of their view, particularly about caliphate. Meanwhile, frequenting to the mosque and even establishing familial links like 'Umar's marriage to Umm Kulth£m had been usual. This marriage was insisted by 'Umar and Imim agreed in spite of his early opposition. Not to mention, Imim married Ab£ Bakr's wife, that is Asmi', daughter of 'Umays to himself after Ab£ Bakr died and brought up Mu¦ammad, Ab£ Bakr's son in his house.

SHI'ISM DURING IMªM'S CALIPHATE

Muslims' disagreements over caliphacy as well as other fields were dealt with in previous parts in detail. Now in the

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.281; al-Ghirit, pp.110-111

[2]. ±ihi, verse 94; al-Muqni', p.109

[3]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, p.91

[4]. Tafs¢r al-manir, vol.VIII, p.224

light of carrying out more precise researches, it is not fair of anyone to deny the existence of the ‘Alawites and Quraysh parties in Messenger’s time let alone denying it from Saq¢fa on. al-D£r¢ approves the two parties being present earlier than Saq¢fa.[1] This political disagreement which, from the very beginning, had a religious root, fomented the religious differences. For example, it was of great importance that initially, some companions considered merely Qur’in as proof.In other words, not deeming the decrees of prophet as proof and prohibiting people from writing and quoting traditions did influence theology.’Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf’s laying it down that caliphate will be turned over to anyone accepting to act according to the conduct of Shiykhs, and Imim's stating that he will act only in accordance with his own individual reasoning, indicate the aggravation of religious differences.

As long as ‘Umar was in power, the majority of people, excluding Imim's supporters, believed in rulership.

But when ‘Uthmin, because of heretical religious deeds, was denied by a large number of companions, the problematic question was it that whose words should people regard as the religion and whom should they imitate.

Imim ‘Al¢ replaced ‘Uthmin. In the very beginning he was not accepted by the people of Damascus. Little by little, though temporarily, Ba¥ra went a different way as well. In Medina proper, though few, some companions balked at obeying or swearing allegiance to Imim. Apart from political issues, the important case was elucidating the religion especially in the case of differences or novel matters. Here two political and naturally religious parties began to emerge. The first group consisted of those having accepted Imim and deeming it necessary to obey him. The second group, motivated by ‘Uthmin’s oppressedness, didn't accept Imim’s leadership and opposed him.

In this regard, Apostates and Deviators had no difference. At this point two terms, religious and political, were coined “‘Al¢'s Sh¢‘a and ‘Uthmin’s Sh¢‘a” were gradually distinguished as respectively “Sh¢‘a or al- Sh¢‘a” and “Uthmin¢ or al-’Uthminiyya”.

---

[1]. Muqadama f¢ tir¢kh ¯adr al-islim, p.48

Generally “Sh¢‘a” was in opposition to “Uthmin¢”. But this title was not applicable to all individuals. There were some Shi‘ite Muslims who were called so merely because they opposed ‘Uthmin or stood for Imim as the Shi‘istically legitimate caliph.

There were also some who regarded Imim as basically appointed by the Messenger and believed in a kind of divine right for his leadership.

Of course this doesn't necessarily mean that they should have refrained to cooperate with the early caliphs. Conditions being so, Imim himself had kept silent for Muslim interests and had repeatedly notified this point. What should be told about ‘Uthminids is that upholding the idea of Imim's illegitimacy, the Umayyads managed to dominate this view over a great part of Muslim community. But except for Ba¥ra, this opinion was not favored in Iraq. By contrast, in every appropriate accasion, the belief in ‘Alaw¢'s rightfulness emerged in the field of politics. °idjiz also did not fully surrender to the Umayyads, but tried to maintain another idea, content with Shiykhs. During the first to third century, religious and political changes triggered a great transition in that classification. Now, the matter related to our discussion is to show that the group known to us as Shi‘ite Muslims did believe in ‘Al¢'s divine designation. After swearing allegiance to ‘Al¢, Khuzayma Ibn Thibit said,” We chose one whom God chose for us.”[1]

In response to ‘Umar who said, “Quraysh refrained from choosing ‘Al¢ because they abominated both prophethood and caliphate being in my family.”

Ibn ‘Abbis replied, “They abominated what God had sent down.”[2]

Opposing Mu‘iwiya, Dirimiyya °adj£niyya said, **واليت عليًا على حبّه المساكين وإعطائه أهل السبيل وفقهه في الدين وبذله الحق من نفسه وما عقد له رسول الله من الولاية”** He loved ‘Al¢ because the Messenger confined the sainthood to him.”[3]

According to ±abar¢, once ‘Al¢ returned to K£fa from ¯iff ¢n and Khiridjites parted with him, The Shi‘ite Muslims

[1]. al-Mi‘yir wa l-muwizina, p.51

[2]. al-«¤i¦, p.88; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.XII, p.53

[3]. al-Wifidit min l-nisi’ Ali Mu‘iw¢ya, p.41

remained with him saying that they are charged with another allegiance, **نحن أولياء من واليت وأعداء من عـاديت** **“**We are amiable to your friends and opposed to your enemies.”[1]

According to Iskif¢, the majority of people, based on the Book and tradition, and Imim's Shi‘ite Muslims, on being amiable to the friends and enemies with the enemies, swore allegiance to ‘Al¢.[2]The emphasis on such an allegiance as the second allegiance and its content implies that allegiance-swearers tended toward Sh¢‘a. In the original tradition, the emphasis is put on the allegiance of “‘Al¢'s Sh ¢‘a”. Ab£dhar,passed away at ‘Uthmin's time, called people toward the People of House and commemorated Prophet's family this way, **ايها الناس! إن آل محمد هم الأسرة من نوح والآل من إبراهيم والصفوة والسلالة من إسماعيل والعترة الطيبة الهادية من محمد، فأنزلوا آل محمد بمنزلة الرأس من الجسد بل بمنزلة العينين من الرأس فانهم منكم كالسماء المرفوعة وكالجبال المنصوبة والشمس الضاحية وكالشجرة الزيتونة اضاء زيتها وبورك زندها** “The family of Mu¦ammad(s), is the family of Noah and Ibraham and the selected progeny of Ismi‘¢l and saint posterity. Regard them as the head attached to body and the eyes attached to head, the high sky, firm mountains, shining sun and olive tree.” Added he**,** **“**Mu¦ammad(s) is the heir of Adam, other prophets are not superior to him and ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib is the legatee of him and the heir of his knowledge.”

Addressing people he said,” If you, the folk astounded after the Prophet had preferred whom God had preferred, deferred whom God had deferred and confined sainthood and heritage to the People of the House, you would have benefited from all blessings.”[3]

Elsewhere Ab£dhar has been quoted, “Oh, people! In case of being involved in prospective seditions, resort to Imim ‘Al ¢ and the Book.[4]When he was to be exiled to Raba¤a and Imim and his children went to see him off, having a look at

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. V, p. 64; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 348

[2]. al-Mi‘yir wa l-muwizina, p. 194

[3]. Nathr al-durr, vol. V, p. 77; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol. II, p. 171

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 118

Imim, Ab£dhar said, seeing you and your children reminds me of what Prophet told about you and makes me cry.[1]

Expressing regret for people not benefiting from Imim while he lives, Salmin said," I swear by God, after him, no one will inform you of the secrets of your Prophet."[2]Quoting the Messenger of God, Miqdid said, "knowing the family of Mu¦ammad(s) is the released from fire, loving his family is the pass from the Path and sainthood of his family is the security from chastisement.[3]'Ammir also narrated a tradition from the Messenger, I advice the one believing in God and admitting me with the guardianship of 'Al¢, son of Ab¢ ±ilib, "Anyone loving 'Al¢, loves me and anyone loving me, loves God."[4] There are lots of these quotations from Ab£dhar, Salmin, 'Ammir, Miqdid indicating their Shi'istic beliefs. Ab£ °itim Riz¢ puts the definition of "Sh¢'a" this way," This is the title of those who loved 'Al¢ during the Messenger's time, for instance, Salmin, Ab£dhar, Miqdid Ibn Aswad, 'Ammir Ibn Yisir and etc.

Commenting on these four, The Messenger stated, "The Heaven looks forward to four men, Salmin, Ab£dhar, Miqdid and 'Ammir.[5]

Describing 'Al¢, Umm Sanin, the daughter of Khaythama Ibn Kharasha, composed this,

قدكنت بعد محمد خلفاً لنا أوصى إليك بنا فكنت وفيا

"Thou art Mu¦ammad's remainder to us, He made his will to thee about us and thou art the faithful."[6]

Inciting 'Al¢'s troops at ¯iff¢n,Umm al-Khayr said, **هلموا رحمكم الله إلى الإمام العدل والتقي الوفي والصديق الوصـي** "May God bless thee. Hasten toward the sincere, pious and just successor."[7]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol. II, p. 173

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 183

[3]. Sunan Ibn Midja, vol. II, p. 1270; 3862

[4]. al-Muwifiqiyyit, p. 312; Dhakhi'ir al-'Uqbi, p. 95

[5]. Kitib al-z¢na, p. 259

[6]. al-Wifidit, p. 24

[7]. al-Wifidit, p. 29; Balighit al-nisi', p. 67; Tir¢kh Dimashq, Taridjim al-nisi', p.531

The point that Imim ‘Al¢ is regarded by these and many of his companions as “the Successor”, shows that they imagined him far beyond a caliph who has gained the caliphacy through public allegiance.

The sources contain lots of poems indicating the use of this comment by °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢, Ibn Tayyihin, Ibn ‘Idjlin and other Shi‘ites companions of Imim.[1]

Inviting the people to swear allegiance to ‘Al¢, Milik Ashtar stated, **هـذا وصـيّ الأوصـياء ووارث علـم الأنبيـاء** “O people! He is “the successor of the successors” and “The heir of Prophets’ knowledge.”[2]

In ¯iff¢n, he composed this,

من رآى عزة الوصيّ عليّ إنه في دجى الحنادس نور[3]

“Everyone knows ‘Al¢, the chief successor, he is the very man who illuminates dark night.”

Lamenting over ‘Al¢'s martyrdom, Umm ‘Irbin said,

وكنا قبل مقتله بخير نرى مولى رسول الله فينا[4]

“We had a good life before he was killed because we stayed with the Messenger(s).”

A lot of poems composed by the Messenger's companions some of which were ‘Al¢’s supporters, interpret Ghad¢r tradition as sainthood and leadership. For instance, the poems of Qays Ibn Sa‘d Ibn

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.18,23,24,46,381,385,416,436; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, vol.I, pp.143-150; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XI, p.229; al-Fu¥£l Mukhtira, pp.217-218; See, Nahdj al-¥abighа,vol. III, p.p. 55-57; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p.246; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.484; vol. III, pp.246,270 246,270

[2]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol. II, p. 179.

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol. III, p. 226.

[4]. Maqtal al-imim al-Am¢r al-Mu‘min¢n (a), Ibn Abi l-Dunyi, Turithuni Magazine,no.12; p. 126.

‘Ubida, °assin Ibn Thibit as well as Imim ‘Al¢ himself.[1] Qays Ibn Sa‘d composed this about Ghad¢r:

وعـليّ إمامـنا وإمـام لسـوانا أتى به التنـزيل

يوم قال النبي من كنت مولا ه فهذا مولاه خطب جليل

انّ ما قاله النبيّ على الأمـ ة حتم ما فيـه قال وقيل [2]

“‘Al¢ is our Imim and everyone’s, he is the one who has introduced Qur’in

It was on a great day when the Prophet(s) said, “‘Al¢ is the lord of whomever I am his lord”

What the Prophet(s) said to Umma ends up all babbles”

°assin Ibn Thibit also composed this one about the same,

يناديهـم يوم الغدير نبيهم بخــم واسمع بالرسول مناديا

فقال له قم يا علي فانني جعلتك من بعدي اماما وهاديا [3]

“Their Prophet called them to obey God at Ghad¢r Khum, a great herald whose call must be heard

‘Al¢ was told, “O rise up! For I placed thee an Imim after myself.”

The combination of these quotations indicates the recognition of ‘Al¢ as an Imim introduced by the Messenger. They regarded Imim's rightfulness in his legation on the part of Messenger and asked the others to follow him as the legatee of the Messenger.

---

[1]. See, al-Ghad¢r, vol. II, p.p. 25,34,78 from different sources, al-Muqni‘ fi l-Imima, p.p. 75-76 and in the footnote of different sources. This has been quoted from °assin, in Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢ (vol.II, p.128) and al-Muqni‘ (p.133) as well as other sources,

حفظت رسول الله فينا وعهده إليك ومن أولى به منك، من ومن

ألست اخاه في الاخاء ووصيه وأعلــم فهرا بالكتاب وبالسنن

Thou safeguarded the Prophet ‘s religion left to thee. After all, who transcends thee in front of him. Are you not his brother and successor and not the most learned one of Ban£ Fahr about the Book ans Sunna.

[2]. al-Ghad¢r, vol. II, p. 68

[3]. al-Ghad¢r, vol.II, p.34

According to Ibn Tayyihin, verily our Imim and guardian, is the legatee of the Messenger.

Ibn ‘Idjlin used to say, “How possibly can we separate while the guardian is our Imim.”[1]

According to °udjr, the son of ‘Ad¢, he is the guardian after the Messenger, and the prophet consented to his being the legatee.[2]

A newly converted man called Zidin Farrukh came upon Khiridjites on his way. They asked him about ‘Al¢, he said, “The Commander of the Faithful is the legatee of the Messenger and the lord of mankind”.[3]

They killed him. In his well-known letter to Mu‘iwiya, Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr mentioned Imim as **وارث رسول الله ووصيه “**The Heir of the Messenger and his successor.”[4]

There is also a poem quoted from ‘Ubayda Ibn ¯imit which is composed during Saq¢fa.[5]

The measures taken by Imim for propagating the idea of “Divine leadership” are among the most important reasons of Shi‘istic propagation and its distinction from his caliphate. He himself has composed a poem about the content of Ghad ¢r Tradition, in which he has interpreted the mentioned tradition as indicating the necessity of sainthood over people.

فأوجب لي ولايته عليكم رسول الله يوم غدير خم

“The Messenger(s) deemed his sainthood for you obligatory on the of Ghad¢r Khum.”[6]

In a lengthy letter to Mu‘iwiya, Imim has explained this issue in detail. The letter contains significant points about Imim's contribution to the propagation of Shi‘istic sainthood.

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol. I, p. 143,149

[2]. Ibid,vol. I, p. 145

[3]. al-Ghirit, p. 123

[4]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.p. 118-119.for more uses of the word "Legation",see,Ma‘ilim al-madrisatayn,vol.I,p.p.295-328

[5]. al-Muqni‘ fi l-Imima, p. 125.for more poems about the same, see, Ibid, pp. 126-127

[6]. al-Ghad¢r, vol. II, p. 25 of Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol. II, p. 377; Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, p. 62 and other sources

Some major parts of the letter are quoted here for its great importance in terms of “Imamate Thought”.

“The Almighty God says, “Obey God and execute the commands of the Messenger as well as Holders of Authority”. This verse addresses us, The People of the House, not you. Then, Qur’in forbade affray and disunity and ordered surrender and unity. You are the folk acknowledging God and his prophet and admitting them. God informed you that” Mu¦ammad(s) is the father of none of your men, he is the God's Messenger and the Seal of The Prophets “and also said, “Retreat if he is killed or dead “,and Mu‘iwiya, you and your companion retreated, apostatized and broke your pledge to God as well as your allegiance, and all these will not harm God. Oh, Mu‘iwiya! don't you know that Imims are from among us not you. God informed you that Holders of Authority must be capable of deducing the knowledge and you must refer to God, his Messenger and Holders of Authority, the bearers of knowledge, in all that you disagree. So anyone keeping his pledge to God, shall find Him faithful to His promise. We are the family of Ibrih¢m envied by all and you are those who envy us. There was a party of Ban£ Isri‘¢l who told their prophet, “Send us a king; we will fight for God's sake.”[1]And when God sent Saul as a king for them, they envied him and said,” How can he hold control over us?” [2]and deemed themselves more deserving of kingdom.These all are the past happenings and now we narrate them to you and their interpretation and esoteric exegesis are available to us, and anyone ascribing lies to us will fall into despair. You are typical of that... Let it be known to you that we, the People of House, are the envied family of Ibrih¢m. We were envied as our fathers were envied before.

The Almighty God said, “The family of Ibrih¢m, the family of Lot, the family of Jacob, the family of Moses, the family of Aaron and the family of David; we, too, are the family of our prophet, Mu¦ammad(s). “Oh, Mu‘iwiya, don’t you know that Allih says, “The closest people to Ibrih¢m are those who follow him as well as this prophet and the believers, God is the believer’s patron.” [3] We are kins by blood cited in this verse,”The prophet merits more than the believers to themselves and his wives are the mothers of believers and according to the holy Qur’in the genealogical relatives are

---

[1]. al-Baghara,/246

[2]. Ibid./247

[3]. [a]l Imrin,/68

merited over Muhidjir£n and An¥ir (Helpers).”[1]We are the People of House, God has chosen us “Nabuwwat”, prophethood, is ordained to us the Book, wisdom and knowledge belong to us and Ka‘ba and Ismi‘¢l’s House and Ibrih¢m's abode belong to us. So we deserve sovereignty. Woe is to you Mu‘iwiya. We are more deserving of Ibrih¢m, we are his family and the family of ‘Imrin are more deserving of Him... and the family of Mu¦ammad(s) are more deserving of him...We are the people of house from whom God has removed all impurity.[2] Every prophet has an invitation exclusive to him, his progeny and family and every prophet leaves a testament for his family. Don’t you know that Ibrih¢m gave his last testament to his son Jacob and when Jacob was due to die, he also left a will and Mu¦ammad(s) made a will.This was the tradition of Ibrih¢m and other prophets and Mu¦ammad(s) followed them by order of God. The Book is sent down to us and the Messenger has been raised up from among us and the verses have been read to us. We depend on, witness, call to and uphold the Book.Oh, Mu‘iwiya! Do you seek another God but Allih or another book except Allih's Book? Or another Qibla but Ka‘ba, the House of God, home of Ismi‘¢l and abode of our father, Ibrih¢m. Do you want another religion but that of Ibrih¢m or another sovereign and commander but God? God has placed this sovereignty and commandership in us.You revealed your animosity toward us, well showed your spite and jealousy and proved that you break your pledge to God and distort his verses as this one revealed to Ibrih¢m, “God has selected your religion for you.”[3] Do you turn away from Ibrih¢m's religion while God has selected him in this world and he is from among the virtues in the Hereafter. Do you seek another decree but that of Allih? Or another Imim not from our family? The leadership belongs to Ibrih¢m, his progeny and the believers who follow them and do not turn away from his religion. It was also said, anyone who follows me is from me.”[4]

Agitated at Imim’s calling himself the relative of all prophets, Mu‘iwiya wrote in response,

---

[1]. al-’A¦zib/60

[2]. "Ta§h¢r" verse, see, al-’A¦zib/33

[3]. al-Baghara/132

[4]. Ibrih¢m/36

“Not content with your kinship with the Messenger, now you relate yourself to all the prophets. Beware that Mu¦ammad(s) was one of the prophets raised up for all, he delivered God’s messages and had nothing more. Now tell us what is the merit of your kinship and the superiority of your right and where in the Book did you find your name? Wherein is your sovergnity, leadership and superiority mentioned?

Yes, you as well as us, follow the previous Imims and caliphs.”

Then he mentioned his being ‘Uthmin’s heir. Repelling him, Imim accused him of animosity toward the prophets and interest in his unbelieving forefathers and added,

“Beware that we are the People of Messenger's House. The infidel dislikes us and the believer bears us no grudge. You have denied Mu¦ammad’s leadership and regarded him as Messenger not Imim. This denial makes you deny the leadership of all prophet’s. But we testify that he was both Messenger and Imim. And about your denying my kinship with the Messenger and my right, verily our due and right is mentioned in the Holy Book, and God mentions us as having an equal share with the Prophet where he says,” A fifth of anything that you acquire as spoils belongs to God, the Messenger and the relatives.”[1] And elsewhere is said, “so give the relative his due.”[2] Don’t you see that our due is mentioned with that of God and Messenger and yours is mentioned with the strangers...you deny my leadership and sovereignty. Haven’t you seen that in the Book, the almighty God says he has made the family of Ibrih¢m superior to the world.[3] He is God who has exalted us over all mortals.If you can, separate us from Ibrih¢m, Ismi‘¢l, Mu¦ammad(s) and his family, in the Holy Book.[4]

The aforesaid letter is quoted by Ab£ Is¦iq Thaqaf¢, a Shi‘ites historian of the third century A.H.(283 A.D.) The belief in “divine leadership” of the Commander of the Faithful is completely obvious in the letter and different deductive aspects of it are outstanding. The most important

---

[1]. al-’Anfil/ 41

[2]. R£m/ 38

[3]. Referring to the ªl Imrin/ 33

[4]. al-Ghirit, p.p. 67-71; al-Ghirit, Urmaw¢, vol. I, p.p. 195-204

part is the relation and link between prophethood, succession, and leadership as a noble course of action in the history of prophets. Mu‘iwiya’s denial of the Messenger’s leadership is also remarkable in this letter. Anyhow,in his words, Imim has tried his very best in proving the superiority of “The People of House “over others and having a “divine right.”

Proving such a right, Imim considers leadership as an integral part of it, to which the other caliphs are not entitled. There are also some other proofs indicating the Shi‘istic thought in works handed down by Imim. In a sermon about the People of the House, Imim says, “They (the descendants of Mu¦ammad) are the trustees of his secret. Anyone taking refuge to them will be led towards God.They are the center of knowledge about him, the preachers of his religious commandments, the protectors of Qur’in and Sunna, and mountain -like citadels which guard the religion and make the Islam stable, firm and powerful.”[1]

Elsewhere he states, **فأين تذهبون وأنى توفكون والأعلام قائمة والآيات واضحة والمنار منصوبة فأين يتاه بكم بل كيف تعمهون وبينكم عترة نبيكم وهم أزمة الحق وأعلام الدين وألسنة الصدق فأنزلوهم بأحسن منازل القرآن وردوهم ورود الهيم العطاش** “Where are you going and when are you due to return? The landmarks are fixed, beacons are lighted and direction indicators are set up. To what extent are you being misled and confused? The descendants of the holy prophet(s) are amongst you. They are the reins of right, ensigns of faith and speakers in the language of truth. Place them in the best Qur’inic positions turn to them as thirsty camels gather round water springs.”[2]

“We are the tree of prophethood, the centers which receive the messages of God and descending place of blessing angels.

We are mines of knowledge and springs of wisdom. Our friend awaits blessings of God and our enemy awaits punishment and wrath.” [3]

---

[1]. Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 3; Rabi‘al-abrir, vol. III, p. 536

[2]. Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 87

[3]. Ibid, sermon 109

Elsewhere it is said, “Mu¦ammad’s progeny revives the knowledge and kills the ignorance; you are informed of their knowledge because of their prudence, their appearance out of their inward, and their silence because of their philosophy of expression. They are neither at odds with the gospel truth nor render it wrong. They are pillars of religion and the shelter that harbor the people; upon their return, the gospel truth re-settled and the credal error, from there, was driven away and cut off with tongue. They knew, learned and applied the religion as they had to, not just lending an ear to it. Religion narrators are legion but its protectors are few in number.”[1]

Elsewhere it has been stated, “Beware, when infant, my saint progeny is the most patient and when adult they are the most knowledgeable of all. Beware that we are from among the People of House whose knowledge and decree is rooted in God’s knowledge and decree. In case, you follow us, you will be guided through our wisdom and if not, God will have you brought to ruin.”

Elsewhere it goes to say, “They embarked on seas of sedition, adopted heresies and abandoned traditions. The faithful were isolated and wicked liars got loud in declaring their views. We are particular people, companions, the treasures of prophethood and the pearls of prophetic mission. Houses should be entered through their doors and whoever stepping into the house not through their doors should be called a thief. They are true applications of long Qur’inic verses and treasures of beneficent Allih; Once they speak, they tell naught but the truth and in case they remain quiet, they are not outpaced.”[2]

Elsewhere he states this way, “Where are those, who falsely and unjustly deemed themselves and not us as the most knowledgeable. God raised us in position and kept them inferior to us. He has conferred on us the eminence of which he deprived them. He allowed us the entry to sphere of divine favor from which he dismissed them. With us guidance is to be sought and blindness (of misguidance) is to be changed into brightness. Verily Imims are from among the Quraysh, the tree of which is planted in the family of

---

[1]. Ibid, sermon 239

[2]. Nahdj al-balighha,sermon 154

Hishim.The others do not deserve it nor would others be suitable as heads of affairs.”[1]

In these sentences as well as the previously mentioned letter, a kind of prophetic inheritance for transfering the right of leadership is put forth by Imim. This is not the inheritance used for transferring the material rights but the one accompanied by executorship, knowledge, wisdom, purity and inerrancy.

This is the culture raised up by Qur’in among prophets and the right Ibrih¢m wants for his progeny. God says,” The despots never access to my mission.” Despite the key role that “selection” plays, God considers the prophets as each other’s descendants.[2]Treating it as an ordinary heritage The Sunnites accuse the Shi‘ite Muslims of having such an idea about leadership while Sh¢‘a approves of the text which is within the framework of divine heritage existing in Qur’inic culture. In a letter indicating his dispute with Quraysh, Imim wrote about his being insistent on caliphacy, “Am I greedy to ask for my inheritance and the right granted to me by the Messenger and God?”[3] In this phrase, inheritance and divine right are cited together.

More important is Imim's reference to the Ghad¢r tradition at the threshold of entering K£fa- After suppressing those who broke their allegiance in the battle of Djamal. As several Sunnites sources specify, The people of K£fa as well as Messenger’s companions were brought together by Imim at the mosque of K£fa and all those who had witnessed and heard the Messenger uttering the Ghad¢r tradition were asked to stand up and give evidence of that. A large number, only twelve of which had participated the battle of Badr, bore witness.[4]Referring to this tradition publicly in fact implied his reference to “divine right “on “Sainthood”.[5] The culture of “Proof” in Qur’in confirms the leading attitude of

---

[1]. iIbid, semon 144

[2]. See, al-’An‘im/84-87;ªl Imran/38;Maryam/58;’Ankab£t /27;°ad¢d/26

[3]. al-Ghirit, p. 111

[4]. al-Ghad¢r, vol. I, p. 66; from various Sunnites sources; see,. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 156

[5]. Facing ±al¦a in the battle of Djamal, Imim referred to this tradition;Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol. XI, p. 204

Imim. This concept is applicable only to the prophet and those chosen by God and resembling them in rank.

Imim has stated, “God never allowed the creation to remain without a prophet deputed by Him or a Book sent down from Him or a binding argument.”[1]

Elsewhere he said, “Verily the earth is never devoid of those who maintain God’s binding argument either openly and reputedly or fearfully and secretly so that God’s binding argument and proof should not be rebutted or his signs overlooked.”[2]

In a letter to the one in charge of collecting alms, Imim included instructions for treating people and telling them, **عباد الله! أرسلني ولي الله وخليفته لآخذ منكم حق الله في أموالكم** “O servants of God! The vicegerent of God and His caliph sent me to you for collecting God’s share in your properties.”[3]

The comments “The vicegerent of God and His caliph” Imim attributed to himself are totally Shi‘istic concepts. Anyhow, having been formed during the caliphate of Imim, this theory constitutes the main identity of Shi‘ites thought about Imamate.[4]During his caliphate, by referring to upcoming incidents entitled “Mali¦im wa Fitan” in various sermons, he turned out to be a figure not rivaling an ordinary caliph, he foretold the future but not as a political analyst. The charisma of Imim’s personality in the eyes of gnostics and sufis, was deeply rooted in the conception leading the public to deem him deserving of “sainthood” in its full sense and also in remarks and conducts of him who officially claimed to be omniscient and asked all people to question him before they miss him.[5]

At the end of these proofs, it will be proper to mention another important narration. When ‘ayisha was ready to revolt against ‘Al¢, the Messenger’s graceful wife, Umm Salama, tried to stop her going.

---

[1]. Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 1

[2]. Ibid, sayings, No. 147

[3]. Ibid, letter 25

[4]. Sh¢‘a believes that this theory was at issue in Prophet’s time.

[5]. See Nahdj al-sa‘ida f¢ Mustadrak Nahdj al-baligha, vol. II, p.p. 314,627

‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr said objectingly, “You harbor old animosity towards the family of Zubayr.”

Umm Salama answered, “Do you think people will turn to ±al¦a and your father while ‘Al¢ about whom God said, **عليّ وليّ كل مؤمن ومؤمنة “’**Al¢ is the guardian of all believing men and women” is present.

‘Abd Allih said, “We haven't heard him saying such a thing.”

Umm Salama replied, “You may have not, but your aunt, ‘ªyisha, has.”

I myself heard the Messenger saying, **عليّ خليفتي عليكم في حياتي ومماتي فمن عصاه فقد عصاني “**Alive or dead, I place ‘Al¢ as my caliph to you, so whoever disobeys him, he has disobeyed me.” ‘ªyisha has also confirmed this.[1] Based on things mentioned, what should be said about the interpretation of comments written in Nahdj al-Balighha on the allegiance of Muhidjir£n and An¥ir is that at that time, the allegiance of these two was the principle behind selecting a caliph, and Imim enjoyed this principle. Facing the opposition of deviators and apostates Imim had to refer to this principle. With this deduction of Imim lots of people followed him and fought his enemies. There is a poem quoted from one of Imim’s adherents who compared his pledge to that of early caliphs to prove his rightfulness and public commitments to him,

له في رقاب النـاس عهد وذمـة كعهد ابي حفص وعهد أبي بكر
فبايع ولا ترجع علي العقب كافراً أعـيذك بالله العزيز من الكفر[2]

“People owe him just as ‘Umar and Ab£ Bakr do. So swear an allegiance and avoid infidelity, do you excuse yourself in atheism!”

But neither Imim considered this as a legitimate way of leadership nor did his close companions who deemed his leadership far beyond the allegiance of Muhidjir£n and An¥ir, accept such a basis. In conclusion, the differences from Saq¢fa to the martyrdom of Imim have been influential in

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol. II, pp. 282-283

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p. 46

many of the Islamic thoughts, But related to our discussion are issues concerning ruler ship and caliphate.

Here, a brief conclusion is drawn from the effects these events had on forming of political views. Obviously, as mentioned earlier, in the course of murdering ‘Uthmin and ‘Al¢'s caliphacy, Shi‘ism changed both in quality and quantity. Previous to this, only a few companions tended towards Sh¢‘a but because of aforesaid reasons it spread in Iraq. This trend is called “‘Alawites and Shi‘ites”. Its full version can be regarded in ‘Uthmin's rejection and the proof of ‘Al¢’s caliphate.The full version of it includes ‘Al¢’s Imamate after the Messenger and his superiority over the other caliphs. There has been some controversy over the quality and quantity of some exaggerated trends emerging at that time.[1]

The other trend was called “‘Uthminids”. This trend was crystallized during to wars of Djamal and ¯iff¢n.The aforesaid course of action came to a dead end in Djamal but its impacts on Ba¥ra remained to be seen and the people of that city were reckoned as “‘Uthminids”.[2]The second trend prevailed over Damascus and Iraq during the Umayyads. The Umayyads ruling was the manifestation of ‘Uthmin¢ds sect's prevalence. This sect deemed no legitimacy for ‘Al¢'s caliphacy on the pretext of the third caliph being murdered either by ‘Al¢ himself or at his instigation. They also said not all of the people had approved of him. This has been a common belief among the ancestors of Sunnites who were called the ‘Uthminids. During that period “Shi‘ite Muslims” and “‘Uthminids” were opposed to each other. The ‘Uthminids believed that ‘Uthmin was to replace Mu‘iwiya in caliphate. Their legitimacy was based on Mu‘iwiya 's claim to be a relative of ‘Uthmin and consequently his blood-wit.[3] Ba¥ra and K£fa, tending towards ‘Uthminids and Sh¢‘a respectively, were rivals to each other. The distinction between Shi‘ism and ‘Uthmin¢'s sect was the interesting point about the battle of Djamal.

The murderer of one of Imim's companions called Zayd Ibn ¯£¦in said he had killed him while he believed in ‘Al¢.

---

[1]. See Ibn Ab¢ Dunyi,, Maqtal al-imim Am¢r al-Mu‘min¢n,,p.92

[2]. This has been stated about Ba¥ra, قطعة من الشام نزلت بيننا ±abaqit al-kubri,vol.VI,p.333

[3]. al-Ghirit,p.70

Opposing ‘Ammir he composed this:

لا تبرح العرصة يا بن اليثربي حتى اقاتلك على دين علي[1]

“O Yathrib-born! Leave not the battlefield so that I might fight you by relying on ‘Al¢’s religion.”

“‘Uthmin's religion” was coined versus “‘Al¢'s religion”. A poet from Damascus, told about the Damascus army:

ثمانين الف "دين عثمان" دينهم كتائب فيها جبرئيل يقودها[2]

“80 thousands are those whose religion is that of ‘Uthmin’s, troops who are led by Gabriel.”

A poet participating in ¯iff¢n, introduced himself this way,

انا ابن ارباب الملوك غسان والدائن اليوم به دين عثمان[3]

“I am son of king of kings and today I follow ‘Uthmin’s religion.”

In a poem Rufi‘a Ibn shaddid told,

انا ابن شداد على "دين علي" لست لعثمان بن اروى بولي[4]

“I am Ibn Shaddid, a follower of ‘Al¢’s religion and never am I guardian of ‘Uthmin Ibn ‘Arwi.”

It has been said that 80 thousand of Damascus army believed in “‘Uthmin's religion “.[5] There was also a third trend, in addition to Sh¢‘a and ‘Uthmin¢, called “Qi‘id¢n”. Nishi’ Akbar recognizes this group in two different names and trends. The first one was “°ulaysiyya” who believed that when a sedition is raised one must stay around his/her house.

They deemed both groups as misled and infernal.To them religion was seen as tarry to war and sedition as getting involved in it. ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar, Mu¦ammad Ibn Maslama and Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ belonged to this group. They believed that only one of the two groups was right but the righteous group was unknown to them. Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢,

---

[1]. al-Djamal,p.346

[2]. al-Djamal, p. 346

[3]. Tir¢kh Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. V, p. 43

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, p. 233

[5]. Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol. VIII, p. 52

Ab£ Sa‘¢d Khudr¢ and Ab£ Mas‘£d An¥ir¢ were from among this group.

As... Nishi’ Akbar clarifies,these were called “Mu‘tazilites”. Later, Wi¥il Ibn ‘A§i’ and ‘Amr Ibn ‘Ubayd also thought the same about ±al¦a and Zubayr.[1]Considering the situation of that time, these groups put the emphasis on the concept of “Sedition”, to them, being “‘Abd Allih, the murdered” was preferable to being “‘Abd Allih, the murderer”.[2]

PEOPLE’S ALLEGIANCE TO ‘AL« (A)

Without doubt, during the caliphacy of the first three caliphs, Imim was not politically active in the current affairs and except for counseling some Judicial cases and, to a lesser extent political issues, did not take an active part in politics. In other words, he did not take part in the ruling system of caliphs, but just led the opposition party indirectly. His victory after ‘Uthmin, in large measures, indicated the domination of anti-Quraysh and anti-Umayyads. These opponents enjoyed the support of Iraqi tribes, Egyption migrants and also the assistance of An¥ir and native Medinans.Some of Muhidjir£n at the head of which was ‘Ammir Ibn Yisir, were reckoned among this group. These formed a part of ‘Uthmin's adversaries. But because of ‘Uthmin's being inattentive to a group of Quraysh itself and his overattention to Umayyads, the former had also joined the opposition party. ±al¦a, Zubayr and ‘ªyisha were presiding over this group. ‘Amr Ibn ‘ªy who was deposed from Egyptian rule, opposed ‘Uthmin. Of course all these claimed that ‘Uthmin had stood aloof from the practice of Prophet. Therefore the overall direction of the rebellion was returning to the Prophet's conduct, fostering justice and not being cruel or unjust to people. The head companions who had lived up to that time, and participated in ‘Umar's election council- especially ±al¦a who was supported by ‘ªyisha were candidates for caliphate. Their joining to the opposition party was a glimmer of hope for caliphate. Despite their fame in Iraq and °idjiz, concerning records,

---

[1]. Masi’il al-imima, p.p. 16-17; See, Murdji’a, Tir¢kh wa And¢shih, 19-26; al-z¢na, p. 273; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. V, p.p. 57-58

[2]. Masi’il al-imima,p.16

knowledge and piety none of them could hold a candle to ‘Al ¢; moreover, ‘Uthmin's failure as the representative of Quraysh naturally resulted in the power of ‘Al¢, the representative of the opposition party who had opposed the ruler's policy from the very beginning.[1]

From the starting-point of public opposition to ‘Uthmin, Imim ‘Al¢ (a) was as the mediator of the two parties or on the other hand, opponents’ spokesman and he transferred people’s oppositions to ‘Uthmin. Although being considered as the mediator, Imim (a) acted moderately. Having objected to ‘Uthmin’s some indecent behaviors[2], Imim (a) under the conditions of being mediator obeyed ‘Uthmin’s rights, took him on oath of promise and calm opponents along with obeying opponents’ conditions. It was natural that although Imim (a) didn’t play any role in ‘Uthmin’s murder and his coming to power, the Umayyads and some parties of Quraysh accused him of doing so. In spite of it, most of those being of Imim’s close companions ranked among the opponents and even being accused of having a hand in ‘Uthmin’s murder. Imim’s supporters were all anti-‘Uthmin. And as indicated before, this was the starting-point of Shi‘ism forming among people of K£fa whose important political activity was opposition to the ruling caliphate. They were indeed satisfied with Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar.

At any rate, Imim’s supporting party consisting of An¥ir, the majority of companions as well as K£fa’s Qur’in reciters was strong to the extent that ±al¦a and Zubayr weren’t allowed any appearance. Also there existed no reference to Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥[3]. In continuation of Sa‘¢d Ibn Musayyib’s long narrations concerning ‘Uthmin’s murder, it’s mentioned that after that ‘Al¢ (a) came to his house and all the people rushing to his house asserted ‘Al¢ (a)’s caliphate.

They wanted him to reach out his hand to people for allegiance but Imim (a) said, “Allegiance is Badr’s

---

[1]. From fabricated narrations in Tir¢kh al-§abar¢

[2]. Sa‘¢d Ibn Musayyib said, “I witnessed ‘Al¢ (s)’s rebel contention and that of Uthmin until Uthmin wanted to scourge ‘Al¢ (a) and I caused them to make up with each other. See Ansib al-ashrif, vol. IV, p.132, No.112

[3]. Sa‘¢d in the conflict of arbitration claimed that no one but he is of superior quality in caliphate, for having no hand in Uthmin’s murder and the recent seditions. See Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 344

companions' not yours. And the caliph is the one they choose."

After that, all the people of Badr who were alive came to 'Al¢ (a) and called for allegiance to Imim (a).[1]

Confronted by the insistence of the Prophet(s)'s companions, Imim averted the admission of caliphate. ±abar ¢ quoted from Mu¦ammad Ibn °unayf that after 'Uthmin's murder, a number of companions came to my father, saying that we know no body more deserving of caliphate than you.

'Al¢ (a) said, "It's better for me to be your vizier rather than your emir".

They answered, "We admit nothing but swearing allegiance to you."[2]

Imim said that his allegiance ought to be in mosque rather than in secrecy.

According to Ibn 'Abbis, "I feared lest a problem might be arisen in the mosque."[3] When he went to the mosque, Muhidjir£n and An¥ir went there and pledged allegiance to him. Besides, Ab£ Bash¢r 'ªbid¢ has been quoted as saying that after the assassination of 'Uthmin, the people went repeatedly to 'Al¢ (a) till they managed to compel him admit the caliphate.

Imim ascended the pulpit and said, "He was not in want of caliphate and he admitted it reluctantly, and shall accept to govern them providing that people will adhere thoroughly to him."

It's been noted in the narrations that ±al¦a and Zubayr were within this throng of the people as well. When all gathered in the mosque, ±al¦a was the first to swear allegiance. Averting allegiance, Sa'd Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ said that he won't swear allegiance as well. ±abar¢ points out a narration with respect to the belief that ±al¦a and Zubayr's allegiance arose from their fear of Milik's sword. However, the narration is not in conformity with the other ones. Imim asked them to be caliph themselves, and he shall swear

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, al-Djuz' al-ribi', pp.559-560, No.1419

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. IV, p. 429; see Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 219

[3]. In Iskif¢'s narration it's been cited, I was afraid that some of the ignorants might say something in mosque or the ones who have lost their own fathers or uncles in the Prophet's Maghiz¢ might object, al-Mi'yir Wa l-Muwizina, p.50

allegiance to them. Yet, in so far as, by no means, they found themselves apt, they were satisfied with swearing allegiance to Imim, in order that they hereby find a position for themselves. By chance, their later remarks made it known that by compelled allegiance they meant that they didn’t have anybody at Medina to whom they swear allegiance, whereas Imim ‘Al¢ (a) has had abundant number of supporters.

Previously, in our discussion on allegiance, we’ve pointed out that, in principle, Imim was among those compelling others to swear allegiance. As after the riot of Djamal rebels, he never forced Marwin to swear allegiance as quoted by him.[1]

Immediately after allegiance Imim was asked to turn over Ba¥ra and K£fa but he refused to do so.

Mu¦ammad Ibn °an¢fa says, “All An¥irs except a few, swore the oath of allegiance to ‘Al¢. The opponents consisted of °assin Ibn Thibit, Ka‘b Ibn Milik, Maslama Ibn Mukhallad, Mu¦ammad Ibn Maslama and some others reckoned among the ‘Uthmin¢ds, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar, Zayd Ibn Thibit and Usima Ibn Yaz¢d were among non-An¥ir opponents who all benefited from generosity of ‘Uthmin's caliphate.

±abar¢ says, “As far as we know, not even one of An¥irs infringed the allegiance to ‘Al¢.[2]Hence, some, who allegedly did not swear allegiance to ‘Al¢ were probably those not taking part in battles of Djamal, ¯iff¢n and Nahrawin not those not taking the oath of allegiance to ‘Al¢.[3] As Diyir Bakr ¢ relates, All the Badr participants who had lived up to that time swore allegiance to ‘Al¢.[4]‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Abz¢ has been quoted, 800 of us who were present at Ri¤win allegiance, took part at ¯iff¢n 63 of whom including ‘Ammir

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.263

[2]. See, Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. IV, p.p. 427-431; about Imim’s conversation with ±al¦a see, p. 434; about ±al¦a and Zubayr’s demanding the ruler ship of K£fa and Ba¥ra see, Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 218

[3]. Herein some other evidence will be mentioned. According to Ya‘q£b ¢, All people took the oath except three of Qurayish one of whom swore the oath thereafter. See, Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol. II, p.p. 178-179

[4]. Tir¢kh al-khamis, vol. II, p. 261. About the allegiance of Mu¦idjir£n and An¥ir see, al-Djamal, p.p. 102-110

were killed.[1] As Ibn A'tham narrates, at first Imim rejected the allegiance saying, "I beheld in everything a profound disintegration which neither hearts can stand nor intelligence can accept."

Then, accompanied by people, he went to ±al¦a and asked him to accept the caliphate.

±al¦a said, "There is no one more deserving than you."

The same happened to Zubayr and both of them undertook not to do anything contrary to Imim's will.[2]

Ibn A'tham talks about the role of An¥ir in taking the oath of allegiance to 'Al¢ and about their deputies who addressed the people in the mosque some of whom where Iraqi and Egyptian migrants.

People said," You are "God's helpers" and we will do what you say."

They too introduced 'Al¢ as the caliph and the cheering people approved him as well. That day people left the mosque and next day Imim entered the mosque and said, choose someone that fits your purpose and I shall follow you.

They said, "We haven't changed our mind since yesterday."

At first, ±al¦a who was paralyzed in hand took the oath. This was considered as ill omen! Then Zubayr took the oath and following him Muhidjir£n and An¥ir and all Arabs, non-Arabs and kinsfolk present in Medina did so.[3]Imim's words, better than anything else, are expressive of why he refused to accept the burden of people's allegiance. The first reason was that to him, the society was so decadent that he couldn't either lead it or enforce his criterion and intentions.On the day of allegiance he told,

"Leave me alone and go in search of someone else. We are facing a matter with several faces and colors, which

---

[1]. Tir¢kh Khal¢fa Ibn Khayyi§, p. 196

[2]. These two were also tied to seizing caliphate and ±al¦a was supported by 'ªyisha. Balidhur¢ states, When 'Uthmin was murdered, 'ªyisha was on her way from Mecca to Medina. Hearing about people swearing allegiance to ±al¦a she cheered up, but being informed of 'Al ¢'s caliphate, she returned to Mecca and declared she would take revenge for 'Uthmin, Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 213.

[3]. al-Fut£¦,vol.II.p.p.243-245

neither hearts can stand nor intelligence can accept The clouds of sedition have darkened the skies thoroughly and the right path can't be discerened. Let it be known to you that if I accept your request I shall make you act according to my own judgments and will not care about the suggestions and blames of the reproachful.”[1]

Imim knew that amidst those seditions, leading the society properly was beyond the bounds of possibility. Once he got that people won't leave him to himself, he managed to place them under the obligation of obeying him fully and resigning themselves to his will.[2] Following happenings made the hardships of working within sedition and doubts dawn on Imim. Once he said, “If I knew the heightened situation, I would have never got involved in it from scratch.”[3]Later on, he wrote about the day of allegiance,

“When you revolted against ‘Uthmin and killed him, turning toward me you wanted to swear allegiance to me. I balked at doing so and held my hand back. You struggled to open my hand and I prevented it. You pulled my hand and I resisted. You crowded so densely round me that I thought you will either kill each other or me, you said” we swear allegiance to you for we find no one but you and will consent to no one except you and after the allegiance we will neither get separated nor will there be in any disagreement between us.” so I felt compelled to accept your request and called the people to take the oath of allegiance. I accepted the allegiance of any one swearing at will.Not taking aversion to the one not willing to take the oath, I left him to himself. ±al¦a and Zubayr were from among those swearing allegiance to me and if they didn’t want to do so, I would compel neither them nor any one else.”[4]

Once, in K£fa, Imim saw a man called Ab£ Maryam from whom he asked the reason for his coming there.

He answered,” I have come for my promise to you because you said if you had come to power, you would have done so and so.”

---

[1]. Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 92

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢,vol. IV,p.428

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif,vol.II,p.213

[4] al-Ghirit, p. 112

Imim said, “I have kept my word, but I am in grips with the most malignant people who do not obey me at all.”[1]

There are some significant points about ‘Al¢'s election as the Community leader. First, people’s participation in the first Caliph’s election was initially confined to the participants in Saq¢fa and evidence shows some sort of previous conspiracy or at least coordination of anti-Hishimites party earlier than allegiance.[2] ‘Umar was appointed through a will and ‘Uthmin, too,was selected by a confined council. By contrast, ‘Al¢’s election was largely demanded by Medinans.

As a matter of fact, this was the only allegiance and election which can be called a public one. The new point about this allegiance was the participation of Iraqi and Egyptian delegates in addition to Muhidjir£n and An¥ir. Of course, based on the common, well-establishd tradition of those days, according to which only Muhidjir£n and An¥ir were of good standing, no credence was attached to their choice. Despite of that, their presence did increase public turnout in Imim's election. This was not an unknown phenomenon for Imim and the others. During a sermon Imim said,

Your allegiance to me was not a hasty and precipitate action nor is my and your position the same. I seek you for Allih's sake and you seek me for your own benefits.[3]

This, according to Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d[4] is an allusion to Ab£ Bakr’s election. In order to prevent the idea of opportunism and conspiracy in public opinion, Imim didn’t allow people to take the oath at his house, stating that, “There can be no allegiance without Muslim’s consent.[5] The allegiance should not take place secretly. I go to the mosque, anyone who wishes can come there to take the oath to me.” Then he

---

[1] Akhbir al-Buldin, Ibn Faq¢h Hamadin¢, pp. 4-5 (Sezgin publication)

[2] ‘Abd al-Aziz al-D£r¢ denies Lammens’s belief considering Saq¢fa as the result of Ab£ Bakr,‘Umar and Ab£ ‘Ubayda’s conspiracy but confirms the former agreement of Anti-Hishimites party. Muqadama f ¢ tir¢kh ¯adr al-islim,p.56.

[3] Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 136

[4] Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol. IX, p. 31

[5] Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. IV, p. 427

entered the mosque and people took the oath to him. [1]This is one of the reasons of Imim’s delay in accepting people’s request.

Secondly, Apart from what was set forth about Imim and his true Shi‘ite Muslims’ belief in his Imamate, the “tradition of allegiance” was fully established and Imim could not trespass it. This was a good proof against Imim’s opponents and for him who was publicly selected. According to D¢nwar ¢, during a speech following allegiance Imim stated, “Oh, people! You took the oath of allegiance to me in accordance with the previous traditions. Prior to the allegiance, the choice was yours but after that you have no choice. Imim must be firm and the folk must resign themselves to his will. This was a public allegiance, anyone denying it, has in fact denied Islam, allegiance to me was not precipitate.[2]

Notwithstanding, Imim was determined not to force anyone to take the oath. He even didn't call to account those who had sworn the oath but were inattentive in settling the case of apostates. When Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar, Mu¦ammad Ibn Maslama and Usima Ibn Zayd made some excuse for not performing Imim's command, Milik Ashtar said, “Oh, the Commander of the Faithful! Although we are not from among the Muhidjir£n and An¥ir but we are from “The followers of righteousness”.[3] Despite Muhidjir£n and An¥ir’s superiority in Islam, they are not supreme in what they share with us. This has been a public allegiance, anyone going back upon it deserves to be reprimanded. Coax those who intend to violate the allegiance and imprison them in case they refuse.

Imim stated, “I call them but they are decided in their very votes.”[4]

°asan and °usayn told their father,” Marwin –who after ‘Uthmin’s murder, had sworn allegiance and now was taken into captivity in the battle of Djamal – will take the oath to you.”

---

[1] Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 210

[2] Akhbir al-§iwil, p. 140; See, al-Mi‘yir wa l-muwizina, p. 105

[3] This refers to the verse 100,Mu’min£n

[4] Akhbir al-§iwil, p. 143 See, al-Mi‘yir wa l-muwizina, p. 106

Imim answered, “Did he not swear me allegiance after ‘Uthmin's murder? I don't need the allegiance of such a treacherous person with a hand like that of Jews.[1]

According to Balidhur¢, following Djamal, Marwin told ‘Al ¢ (a), “Unless forced, I won't swear allegiance to you.” [2]

Obviously, not taking the oath differs form rebelling. Once according to the accepted standards the oath is taken and the public allegiance is accomplished anyone disobeying rebelliously or claiming caliphate, must be restrained;otherwise, what the caliphate would mean?[3] Despite this, Imim gloried in not forcing anyone to take the oath to him.[4]

‘Ad¢ Ibn °itim also told Mu‘iwiya, “‘Al¢ (a) compelled no one to take the oath.”[5]

The third point is that the accepted method of allegiance, was that of Muhidjir£n and An¥ir based on which, Imim was nationally accepted as the caliph and apostates were rejected.[6] Even it has been said that even if Imim were the one killing ‘Uthmin, he remains the caliph, for Muhidjir£n and An¥ir who dominate over people have taken the oath of allegiance to him.[7] Obviously, Imim relied on this method with the purpose of convincing his opponents who, based on the same method, approved Muhidjir£n and An¥ir and the legitimacy of previous caliphs. Not to mention that in addition to Muhidjir£n and An¥ir, the delegates from Iraqi tribes and some Egyptians had also sworn allegiance to ‘Al¢

---

[1] Nahdj al-baligha, Sermon 73.

[2] Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 262.

[3] In a letter to Mu‘iw¢ya, Imim wrote,...and now the fact about deeming yourself different from ±al¦a and Zubayr is that there exists no difference between you. Because mine has been a “public allegiance” to which no body disagreed. So necessarily it is to be accepted by all. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p. 58.

[4] al-Mi‘yir wa l-muwizina, p. 52; al-Djamal, p. 131.This has been stated in the first letter in Nahdj al-baligha,“People swore me allegiance freely and willingly.” Trying to emphasize the role of Milik, ‘Uthminids and Umayyads intend to prove that people took the oath for fear of him.

[5] Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p. 65.

[6] Ibid, p. 16

[7] Ibid, p.45

(a), and this point was taken into consideration by Milik Ashtar.[1] In a letter to Mu‘iwiya Imim wrote, “Those who took the oath of allegiance to Ab£ Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmin, have sworn allegiance to me in the same way.” Now he who was present at the election have no right to go back upon his oath and he who was absent has no right to deny the oath of participants. Consultation is confined to Muhidjir£n and An¥ir.God feels satisfaction at they gathering round a man and selecting him as their caliph. Should anybody go against such decision or fall into heresy, they will return him to the position from where he kept away and should he refuse to fall in line with others, then war is the only course left open to be adopted against him.[2]

As far as the initial caliphs were in power, this was deemed as an acceptable principle, except for the time when some ‘Uthminids relied on a few companions not swearing the oath and they also, making an excuse of Muslims fratricide, evaded to act in obedience to the orders of ‘Al¢ (a) in combating his enemies.[3] Mu‘tamir Ibn Sulaymin narrated, “I told my father, people say the allegiance to ‘Al¢ (a) was not accomplished. He answered, “My son, allegiance belongs to the people of Mecca and Medina who did take the oath.”[4]

Another point is that on what allegiance was sworn. ‘Uthmin was recognized as outcast because he violated divine rules and in early caliphs time, it was an acceptable principle to act upon the Book and the Prophet’s tradition. Although a few of them disregarded some dimensions of the Prophet’s biography and even Qur’in, after ‘Umar, condition of Shiykhs biography was included in allegiance that Imim ‘Al¢ rejected. According to ±abar¢, swearing allegiance to ‘Al¢ happened to say that Book of God has to be referred about the close, the mean, the endeared and the stranger.[5] This position reflects issues during ‘Uthmin.

An Egyptian, Ibn A‘tham says, named S£din Ibn °amrin Murid¢ who is to be murderer of ‘Uthmin said, “O Ab£

---

[1] Akhbir al-§iwil, p. 143, No.10.

[2] Nahdj al-balighha, Letter 6

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p. 207

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. II, p.208

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.435

°asan! we swear allegiance to you provided that if you acted like ‘Uthmin,you’ll be killed”.

That’s right, replied ‘Al¢ (a), then people acted according to Book of God and the Prophet’s tradition.[1]

One person insisted on including Shiykhs biography as terms of allegiance in addition to above two, yet Imim disapproved and saying that even if Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar act upon something except the Book and the tradition, they are untruthful.[2]

Imim merely found himself yielded to Qur’in and tradition and unwilling to disobey it and so were his companions and commanders.

O people!, said Qays Ibn Sa‘d, we swore allegiance to a man better of whom we never know after the Prophets(s). Rise up and swear allegiance to the Book and His Prophet.If we failed to do so, allegiance is withdrawn.[3] Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr, Egyptian ruler said if you observe in my deeds obedience and fear from God, I praise God because of this gift bestowed upon me and it has guided me. If not, I have to be scolded.[4] Imim himself disapproved those who wanted to condition the allegiance to make Imim overlook what they have in their hands and said the only right they have in front of him is to comply with the Book and the tradition and nothing else.[5]

Qi‘id¢n and No Congregation Formation

There emerged no agreement like that of Shiykhs time in the course of swearing allegiance to Imim and despite allegiance of the An¥ir and Muhidjir£n. A few people opposed in the course of allegiance to Ab£ Bakr but congregation formed since, later, opponents also swore allegiance. Then, ‘Umar claimed that the opponents must join "congregation". This congregation faced no problems in time of ‘Umar. It wasn’t first time when a rebellion shaped in time of ‘Umar and congregation split apart. ‘Uthmin’s improper attitude led to fragmentation in the Islamic

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.246-247

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.76

[3]. al-Ghirit, p.75

[4]. Ibid. p.83

[5]. Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, pp.178-179

community. In that time K£fiyins and a major part of Egyptians found ‘Uthmin a wrongdoer if not willing to kill him, they didn’t know him to be qualified for caliphate either. This idea wasn’t strongly rooted in K£fa and ‘Uthmin was never admitted by people. Later on, it wasn’t known that if anyone wants martyrdom, he shall go to Dir al-Bi§§ ¢kh in K£fa for compassion of ‘Uthmin.[1] Medinans were hesitant about this and they are said to be followers of Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar. They never approved ‘Uthmin.

There were people of Damascus and Umayyads who retained sanctity of ‘Uthmin and founded "‘Uthminids"[2], recalled as "anti-Sh¢‘a religion". As a matter of time, the Sunnites approved ‘Uthmin. From third century on, the ‘Uthminids with a gradual change of name into people of Sunnat and Djami‘at approved ‘Al¢ (a). Anyway, "Djami‘at" persisted till ‘Umar and up to mid-rule of ‘Uthmin[3] and broke up into branches. This congregation in a real sense ceased to return until Mu‘iwiya that strangled all opposition by force and trick. However, it is obvious that the congregation differed from that of the old one foundationally. Allegiance to Imim ‘Al¢ met the requirements of a proper one. Muhidjir£n and An¥ir in addition to emissaries of Iraq and Egypt swore allegiance to him. But due to disagreements continued by Qi‘id¢n, the wicked ones, the deviators and the apostates and that a full-scale congregation came not to be formed, the subject congregation wasn’t so legitimate in the eyes of the majority of the companions through support of which the disagreements can be challenged and their founders can be called "rebels". This wasn’t accepted by the Sunnites save the basis of the mentioned rebellions on the part of the companions that wasn’t regarded as "Idjtihid", exertion, and so they were exonerated. They didn’t analyze the Khiridjites this way calling them real rebels. The "legitimate congregation" resisted against "rebellion" through support of a Qur’inic verse in the chapter of Hidjrat that says, “If two groups of the faithful began to fight each other, try to bring them to a compromise. And if one offended the other, try to fight the offender to bring it back to bow to God. If it did so,

---

[1]. Tir¢kh Ya¦yi Ibn Mu‘ayn, vol.II, p.238

[2]. This sect was also called" Sufyiniya","Nibita" and" Nawi¥ib".

[3].Al-Risilat al-nibita dar Rasi’il al-Dji¦i¨ (al-Rasi’il al-kalimiyya),p.239

make a just peace between them and exert justice for God love just people".[1]

If, Ab£ °anafiyya said later, Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n(a) had no conduct of Djihid with the rebels, we didn't know the rules of fighting with them.[2]

The Commander of the Faithful held that the mere swearing no allegiance and even expressing dissent verbally can not justify armed campaigning against them. The first disagreement came from Qi'id¢n, those who likely swore allegiance to 'Al¢ but refrained from helping him in his war with the Infidels and the Deviators. Balidhur¢ narrates that they didn't swear allegiance.

Some of such as 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar said that they will be the last people to swear allegiance.[3]

These people believed that "congregation" is not organized.

Sa'd Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ said, "I will swear allegiance when I'm the last one".[4]

Imim left them alone in front of these oppositions. Here it is to be noted that there must be a distinction between the particular and general allegiance when a forcible allegiance is in question. In fact, when the "particular" people swear allegiance, caliphate is established, afterwards all must attend the general allegiance. Milik Ashtar's speech against the disagreement of Qi'id¢n denotes such a case. Imim rejected force too.[5] When the Khiridjites opposed, they were said to be silent, if they want to be safe. If they say something, they will be given reasons and in case they turn to swords, they will be resisted.

---

[1]. al-°udjurit, verse,9

[2].Shar¦ U¥£l al-Khamsa, p.141; al-Ba¦r al-ri'iq, vol.VI, pp.151,153; A¦kim al-qur'in, Dja¥¥i¥, vol.III, p.400, Djawihir al-kalim, vol.XXI,p.332

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.207

[4]. Ansib al-Ashrif, vol.II, p.207; Iskif¢ says that they said that they accept allegiance but they resent to war with the people of prayer. In return, Imim said, "Ab£ Bakr permitted war with them(Imim meant people who refused to pay tax alms). How didn't you oppose him? See al-Mi'yir wa l-muwizana,p.106

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, pp.72-73

And he further said, “As long as you remember Allih, we keep our mosques open to you and as long as you stay with us, we keep your share of booty but if you pull your swords out, we launch a war with you.”[1]

Anyway, Qi‘id¢n regarded "congregation" incomplete to justify their opposition and naturally questioned ‘Al¢’s caliphate. They said people of Damascus would complement this congregation whilst until then allegiance of people of °aram wasn’t considered sufficient. Mu‘iwiya too having a large number of Damascus people in his control denied forming of "congregation" along with ‘Al¢ and naturally rejected his caliphate.

In front of ‘Al¢’s call, Mu‘iwiya wrote to people of obedience and congregation, “The community you’re talking about is also available to us.” He accused ‘Al¢ of murdering their caliph and dispersing their community.[2] There is no reasonable justification about the Infidels. The evidence show that these people opposed merely because of authoritarianism despite the commitments they had in allegiance. Imim tried hard to rehabilitate peace and in no case he resorted to weapon. Imim regarded their launching war the only permit to wage war.[3]

Aside from all incentives and internal problems, the events in period of caliphate resulted in different sectarian and religious tilts that left behind works not only in jurisprudic-ideological matters but also in the field of Imamate issues. Later, "political community" came to posed again and the Sunnites calling themselves independent of "people of innovation" and devaluing their participation in or separation from "congregation" named themselves “people of congregation.”

Ab£ °itim Riz¢ writes about the term of congregation for the Sunnites, “Since the majority of people accepted caliphate of the Umayyads during Mu‘iwiya and after in Marwin¢ds time, people from the followers asserting this called themselves people of congregation.... And saying that “if anyone opposes us, he breaks apart the unity, opposes Umma and abandons the tradition. By "people of Sunnat and

---

[1]. al-Mi‘yir wa l-Muwizina, p.106; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.143

[2]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.35

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.240; al-Mi‘yir wa l-Muwizina, p.158

Djami‘at", they meant that they named themselves so because they were unanimous by the same Imim despite all sectarian differences they had.[1] The pivotal role in "congregation" is in fact the same Imamate. According to a Sunnites mind, community appears when all people generally agree on an Imim who is in power in whatever way. Such an Imim is entirely legitimate according to a Sunnites. In Sh¢‘a thinking, Imim is beyond a mere political consensus and community normally has its given sense.

Allegiance wasn’t sworn to Imim on Friday, Dhi l-°adjdja 18,36 H.

IMªM’S PROBLEMS

When Imim took charge of caliphate, he faced tremendous problems. These obstacles in addition to political disorder after death of ‘Uthmin darkly imaged the future. Here, problems are reviewed and the solutions ahead of Imim will be discussed. Before everything it is to known that these problems were important for a person like Imim who showed more sensitivity to observing principles and applications than anybody else. Some time earlier, every caliph had opened a way temporarily and just for the purpose of expanding the conquests. But now it wasn’t obvious that many of those ways were off the roads and time passed had shown this. Typically, ‘Umar considered tribal tenets in regulating chancery. Presently after fifteen years, its social and even political negative consequences have turned up. To arrange the issue more, Imim’s problems are multi-dimensionally dealt with,

(1) The first problem wasn’t to follow economic justice. Earlier referred that ‘Umar set the chancery in accordance with the Islamic records of people and tribal shape. Those of the companions who had embraced Islam sooner than others shared more. The same condition kept on during ‘Uthmin as well. He began his generosity leading to greater rich-poor distance in the community. All this property includes the fifth of booties and tributes that were annually received and came from the conquered territories belonging to all people. When Imim came to power, he raised equal sharing of this

---

[1] Kitib al-z¢na, p.225 .

property. His reason rested upon what the Prophet(s) had done.

Imim in his very speech referring to the point that he will act upon the Prophet’s biography spoke of his fiscal policy and called virtue of Muhidjir and An¥ir superior over others, that is kept and rewarded by God. **وإني حاملكم على منهج نبيكم صلى الله عليه وآله**

But in this world, anyone who accepts call of God and His Messenger(s) and becomes a Muslim and pray before Qibla, he will benefit from all rights and Islamic rules. You’re servants of God, Imim added, and property is God’s that will equally be divided among you. The pious people are well rewarded by God.

Underlining his policy, Imim said, “Lest someone tomorrow say”, **حرمنا علي بن ابي طالب حقوقنا** [1] Imim tomorrow that day ordered ‘Ubayd Allih Ibn Ab¢ Rifi‘, Anyone came, give him three D¢nirs.

In there Sahl Ibn °unayf said, This man wasn’t my slave who wasn’t set free yesterday.

Imim said, “All are given three D¢nirs and no one is over another.”

A group of Umayyads elites as well as ±al¦a and Zubayr did’nt turn up to get their share. Tomorrow that day, Wal¢d Ibn ‘Uqba with a number of people came to Imim and referring to his father’s murder by ‘Al¢ in U¦ud, murder of Sa‘d Ibn ‘ª¥ in there, humiliation of Marwin’s father in front of ‘Uthmin and…. Asked Imim not to take back at least what has been given to them of the property. Besides, ‘Uthmin’s murderers are retaliated. Imim turned him down and so they started to reveal their discords.

Tomorrow again, Imim made a sermon and based his sharing of property on the Book out of wrath. Imim came down the pulpit and after rendering two units of pray sat with ±al¦a and Zubayr on the corner of mosque. These two people spoke of first, Imim’s not consulting with them and second, **خلافك عمر بن الخطاب في القسم**

A major disadvantage is that you disagree on the way of division comparing ‘Umar. You gave our share just like that of others who took no sufferings for Islam.

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.VII, pp.36-37

Imim said, ‘‘As long as there is a rule in Qur’in, consultation is not required. Otherwise, I would’ve consulted with you. As for equal sharing, we all witnessed that the Messenger(s) did as the Book says.’’[1]

Zubayr said, “This is our reward? We acted in this way for him! To have ‘Uthmin killed and he today puts people over us whom we were over.”[2]

Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d regards public habit a major problem for disagreement of companions with Imim while Ab£ Bakr had the same manner as the Prophet’s and nobody opposed him.

Imim in response to companions who objected to his method and referred to ‘Umar’s manner said, **أفسنّة رسول الله أولى بالاتباع أم سنة عمر**[3] **‘‘**Does obeying the Prophet’s tradition stand first or that of ‘Umar’s.”

Serious disapproval of this manner induced some companions of Imim to go to Imim to ask him to prefer Arab and Quraysh noblemen than Mawil¢ and non-Arabs.

He rejected them and said, “Are you telling me that I gain victory through cruelty.”[4]

Later, Ibn ‘Abbis writing to Imim °asan said, “People left your father alone and went to Mu‘iwiya because he equally shared the property among them and they never endured this act of your father.”[5]Some people explicitly reasoned their opposition as that ‘Al¢ failed to observe their equal rights.[6]

Anyway, one feature Imim became known after wasn’t that, **قسم بالسوية وعدل في الرعية**[7]

(2) Elsewhere it wasn’t referred that one of the consequences of conquests wasn’t that different races of

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.VII, pp.37-42; al-Mi‘yir wa l-Muwizina, p.111-114; Da‘i’im al-islim, vol.I, p.384; Nahdj al-sa‘ida, vol.I, pp.200,415 and Ibid. from, Tu¦af al-‘Uq£l, p.125;Amil¢, Ibn al-Shiykh, section 44, p.91, No.5, Raw¤a al-kif¢, No.551

[2]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.VII, pp.37-42

[3]. Da‘i’im al-islim, vol.I, p.384; Nahdj al-sa‘ida, vol.I, p.229

[4]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, p.75; Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.318

[5]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.16, p.23; al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.149

[6]. Bahdj al-¥abiqa, vol.II, pp.197-203

[7]. al-Mi‘yir wa l-Muwizina, p.227; see,°ayit al-¥a¦aba, vol.II, p.113

Arab, Iran, Nabat, Byzantine and Barbar were intermingled with one another. Many of them were gone or taken to other regions by migration or for war. A large number of them were prisoners from Arab tribes brought to Damascus, Iraq and Saudi Arabia from different parts. The captives released were called “Mawil¢”. This meant that the prisoner belonged to this Arab tribe and now he is linked to that tribe in one way or another. It wasn’t natural that Mawil¢ were of lower class of Arabs and enjoyed less rights. One of the difficulties the government had wasn’t how it should treat this case. What is certain is when Imim came to power, the community had assumed Arab superiority over Mawil¢ a definite principle. This disturbed Imim’s justice-seeking morale that never found religiously a reason for veracity of the above-mentioned distinction but adversely equality of Muslims had clear reasons.

‘Umar had said that the Arab slaves be released by means of public property,[1] thus differentiating diverse races, Imim rejected the distinction. Two women are said to have come to Imim ‘Al¢ and expressed their destitution.

It is, Imim said, up to us to help you in case you tell the truth. Then he sent a man to market to buy them dress and food and pay them one hundred dhms.

One of them said in objection, “I’m an Arab while the other is Mawil¢, why should we be treated equally?”

Imim replied, “I read Qur’in and I thought, there I noticed no superiority, as small as a mosquito’s wing, of Ismi‘¢l children over those of Isaac.”[2]

Once Imim intending to divide some property said, “Rev.Adam gave birth to neither a male slave nor a female one, servants of God are all free.... now some property is with me and I’ll divide it among the black and white people equally with no distinction.”[3]

Treating Arabs and non-Arabs in parity was not something endurable for Arabs. Umm Hin¢, Imim ‘Al¢’s sister, came to Imim to get her grant and Imim granted her twenty dhms.

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.342

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.141; al-Ghirit. (And in footnote from Wasi‘il al-sh¢‘a, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Bi¦ir al-anwir). Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol II, p.183

[3]. Nahdj al-sa‘ida, vol I, p.189

Her non-Arab slave also came to Imim and he gave her twenty dhms. When Umm Hin¢ heard this, she went to see Imim in fury. Imim's response to her accorded with Qur'in that he has not seen any differentiation between Arabs and non-Arabs there.[1]

Imim elsewhere told Muhidjir£n and An¥ir that he never gives anybody anything aimlessly and, **لأسوين بين الأسود والأحمر "**The black and the white will be treated in parity."[2]

Imim's just treatment towards Mawil¢ and non-Arabs raised protest of prejudiced people like Ash'ath Ibn Qays.

When Imim wasn't up on pulpit, Ash'ath shouted, **غلبتنا عليك الحمراء "**The white Mawil¢ has overcome us and you see that." 'Al¢ became angry hearing that.

Ibn ¯£¦in said, "It'll become clear today what status Arabs are placed in."

'Al¢ said, "Who excuses me to penalize these sturdy-body people resting in their beds till mid-noon while a group of people stay away their beds because of vigil nights? Are you telling me that I should abandon them and become an oppressor. I swear to One that grew the seed and created the creatures and I heard Mu¦ammad (s) saying,

I swear to God they beat you (Arabs) to return to religion just as you did to them to accept Islam.[3] Mughra ®abb¢ says, 'Al¢ (a) was interested in Mawil¢ and was kind to them but 'Umar loathed them and kept away from them."[4]

Included in Imim's poetry, there is a piece of poem that talks about negating the effect of racial problems on divine and human honor,

لعمرك ما الإنسان إلاّ بدينه فلا تترك التقوى اتكالاً علي الحسب

فقد رفع الإسلام سلمان فارس وقد هجن الشرك الشريف أبا لهب

"Religion, swear by thy soul, brings value to man

---

[1]. Ibid, vol 1, p. 212

[2]. Ibid, vol1, p. 212 – 213; from: al-Ikhti¥i¥, p.151; Bi¦ir, vol 41, p. 106; Mustadrak al-wasi'il, vol 11, p.93

[3] al-Ghirit, p. 186 – 187; Gharc¢b al-¦ad¢th, Ab£ 'Ubayd, vol 3, p. 484; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol 19, p. 184

[4]. al-Ghirit, p.187 (Persian translation)

Thou not for a lineage seek divine piety Whilst Ab£ Lahab was down for no deity.”[1]

(3) More important problem ahead of Imim was religious deviations and the very thing companions accused ‘Uthmin of that under title of innovationism. Apart from the innovations, the other major problem was that many people were not well-informed about religion and no action was taken to religiously inform them. A few objective typical distortions Imim was engaged are mentioned herein,

One of the problems earlier talked about is that a group of companions and a number of caliphs brought up rules despite availability of Qur’in and tradition and merely based on “expediency”. Inter alia, this regarding tradition is more clearly and substantially is cited in historical and hadith sources. Perhaps what Ab£ Dja‘far Naq¢b said could be the clearest statement one moderate Sunnites has expressed about.

The companions, he says, unanimously rejected most of the verses (the words of the Messenger «s») and it was because of the interest they discovered in rejecting them such as sharing portion of ®aw¢ al-Qurbi and that of Mu’allafa Qul£buhum.[2]

Imim criticized this approach while making a detailed speech and at the same time showed his commitment to the tradition. Referring to the fact that for resolving one problem there has been given different views and the ruler has proved all those views, he says this is when their God is One, their prophet is one and their Book is one. God said to them to go a different direction and they have obeyed His command? Or they have been prohibited from disagreement and they have disobeyed Him? Or what God sent is an incomplete religion and He asked them to help for making it complete? Or they are His partners and they have right to say and God must be pleased of the path they seek? Or the religion God sent was complete and the Prophet (s) has failed in conveying it?

This is while God say, “We avoided not a thing in the Book”.[3]

---

[1] Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.10, p.46

[2] Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.12, pp.82-90

[3] Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 18

Imim expresses amazement in his another speech about the wrongs of different groups and that, “They neither receive a prophet nor the deed of a successor... they follow sceptisism and go after passion and lust. Well-known to them is something that they know and are pleased of and deny what they are not happy with. In tribulations they only rely on themselves and in undoing the problems they depend on their own ideas. It seems each of them is his Imim who finds, in his rule, to have snatched and used the sturdiest means.”[1]

What was interesting was that “according to caliph II and III” they had the right to have their own special divine legislation in some affairs and put aside the tradition (like ‘Uthmin who, unlike the prophet and his own pre-caliphs, performed completely his praying service in Mini). Yet, Muslims as a matter of time deemed the actions of caliphs unbreachable as a religious tradition.

‘Umar himself when dying said, “Assigning not a successor is a tradition (Prophet!) and assigning is also a tradition (Ab£ Bakr).”[2]

Therefore, to him, what Ab£ Bakr did had also been considered “tradition”. After his death, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min had conditioned that he would leave the caliphate to someone who practices the tradition of the Prophet and Shiykhs.

One clear typical response of Imim to these innovations was his approach towards nightly prayers of Rama¤in that ‘Umar set up accepting it to be an innovation-though he believed it was a good innovation. When Imim was in K£fa, some people came to ask him to designate an Imim to perform their nightly prayers of Rama¤in. He banned them doing so. At night they cried out, “O Rama¤in”.

°irith A‘war came to Imim and said, “People are moaning and are upset about what you said.”

Imim said, “Leave them alone to do whatever they want and whomever to choose for congregational Imim.”[3]

This quotation shows that what tribe Imim has been dealing with and how they have been following him.

---

[1]. Nahdj al-balighа, sermon 88

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.342

[3]. Musta§rafit al-sari’ir, p.146, and in its footnote, Bi¦ir, vol.96, p.38; Wasi’il al-sh¢‘a, vol.5, p.193; Tafs¢r ‘Ayyish¢, vol.I, p.175

Imim in a letter to Milik, referring to selection of righteous people and about the worldly-minded religious people said, **فإنّ هذا الدين كان أسيراً في أيدي الأشرار ، يعمل فيه بالهوى وتطلب به الدنيا**. “This religion has been in the shackles of the wrong people, they moved forward out of passion and captured the world under the name of religion.”[1]

One of the important deviations that essentially led to other ones was that scribing was prevented. Rash¢d Ri¤ i referred to point that this has irreparably damaged the Islamic culture.[2] Such an action as mentioned earlier was because of disregarding the tradition.

The action of caliphs to collect Qur’in and disregard the Qur’in ‘Al¢ brought as well as to comment and downgrade its verses indicated inattention to the Prophet’s speech Imim recorded.

Imim ‘Al¢ regarded doubt and scepticism among people a major cause for emerging civil wars among Muslims, **ولكنّا إنما أصبحنا نقاتل إخواننا في الاسلام على ما دخل فيه من الزيغ والإعوجاج والشبهة والتأويل “**We today fight our Muslim brethren because they mixed Islam with deviation, scepticism and distraction.”[3]

Imim underscored the concept of scepticism. He elsewhere said, “Scepticism is called scepticism for it resembles the right.”[4]

(4) Another problem Imim had wasn’t social corruption. Serious public welfare triggered loosening of religious ideals and values in society and religion wasn’t just valued in appearance. When caliph III turned to serious welfare, His subjects also turned to it and this created a problem for society in respect of religion. The society involved in sedition and corruption cannot simply turn back to moral balance. Imim in one of his speeches introduces his society like that of ignorant one.

He says, “Your condition today looks like the day God raised up His Messenger(s).”[5]

---

[1] Nahdj al-bal_gha, letter 53

[2] al-Manir, vol.6, p.288

[3] Nahdj al-bal_gha, sermon 123

[4] Ibid. sermon 38

[5] Ibid. sermon 16

Imim there spoke of reversed values in that society and of the necessity to change it. This society has to be screened, those moved forward be brought back and those left behind be driven ahead.

Know that, he also said, after °idjra –and learning from Shar¢‘a- you were back to nomadic nature and following compromise you were fragmented..... knowing that you cast off your link to Islam, went beyond its limits and failed to follow its rules.[1]

Imim also stated about corruption of the time, **واعلموا رحمكم الله أنكم في زمان القائل فيه بـالحق قليـل واللسـان عـن الصـدق كليـل واللازم للحـق ذليـل. أهلـه معتكفـون علـى العصيان، مصطلحون على الادهان، فتاهم عارم وشائبهم آثـم وعالمهم منافق وقـارئهم ممـاذق لا يعظـم ضـعيرهم كـبيرهم ولايعول غنيهم فقيرهم** “Know that may God bless you! You are living at a time the truth- seeker is little and tongue falls short of truth. Those following truth are humiliated and people are grappling with disobedience and ready to accept compromise. The young are bad-tempered and the old are sinful, the reciter is after profit. Neither the small respects the aged nor do the potent aid the destitute.[2]

Emergence of Mu‘iwiya as a deceitful and deviated man in the field of Islamic politics wasn’t itself the greatest element of sedition and corruption in society, so were the ‘Uthminids tendency in Ba¥ra as well as the Khiridjites in K£fa. These were ill currents that blocked the way of followers of truth at times by knowing that they were wrong and at other times imagining that they are going after truth.

Observing Mu‘iwiya’s sedition, Imim began to say, “I verified the case and I learned that I have no way but fighting or I stand infidel against what Mu¦ammad (s) said.”[3]

REFORMATION, IMªM’S FUNDAMENTAL POLICY

Imim considered his major mission a reformation. This was because he abided by religion and tradition. In addition, it is to be noted that Imim was basically brought to power by those who had murdered the former caliph due to his

---

[1] Nahdj al-baligha. sermon 192

[2] Ibid. sermon 233; Rabi‘ al-abrir, vol.1, p.96

[3] Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 54

corruption and hoped that the new caliph reform the shortcomings. The aim of this group in proportionate to character of Imim was one of the main reasons of their approach towards him. The policy of early caliphs was to expand the conquests. This also expanded Islam and naturally could be an advantage for caliphs, not to mention, it would fill the pockets of people with dhms and D¢nirs.

Imim now had to make up for the shortcomings of this time. It was very difficult for him to do so because he had to stand against many of the noblemen and influential people. Here, Imim’s reformational actions are reviewed. First, it is to be noted that these actions contained two parts. One part was to be done by means of speech and peaceful social actions, but the second part was to be carried out through war with those who were not ready to observe the rights of the legitimate ruler of society and had rebelled against him. Some of the actions taken in the first part are dealt with here.

One of the moral problems in the society Imim was engaged in was mammonism, welfarism and acquisitiveness of triumphant Arabs. This case had engaged them so much that it can be said Djamal war was resulted and Imim was not prepared to raise shares of ±al¦a and Zubayr more than the others. Under such circumstances, Imim was determined to speak in detail in his speeches about this and protract people from mammonism. By contrast, he prohibited them from sitting at the majestic entertainment tables by writing letters to his agents, something that was very natural in time of ‘Uthmin. In case Imim’s words about reproaching the world outright, it would become a detailed book.[1]

Nahdj al-Baligha is replete with these words and this, in great number, shows that Imim insisted very much in this regard. Presenting an outstanding paradigm of man with a piety is seen in the sermon known as

″Hammim″. In some of the sermons, Imim explicitly scolds people due to mammonism, “You have forgotten the death in your hearts and deceiving aspirations have been substituted. This world has captured you more than the other world.”[2]

---

[1] Zamakhshar¢ has mentioned some parts in Rabi‘ al-abrir, vol.1 from page 41 on.

Imim placed elucidation of religion atop of his reformational actions and tried to lead the society to improvement by raising up the Prophet's tradition as well as resuscitating the forgotten rules and positive laws of religion. Imim on explaining his activities for reforming the society says, **ألم أعمل فيكم بالثقل الأكبر وأترك فيكم الثقل الاصغر وركـزت فيكـم رايـة الايمـان ووقفتكـم علـى حـدود الحلال والحرام والبستكم العافية من عدلي وفرشتكم المعـروف مـن قولي وفعلي وأريتكم كرائم الأخلاق مـن نفسـي**. "Did I not raise rule of Qur'in among you and my two offsprings – who are the lamp of religion path after me – and did I not leave for you the selective jewels that is the Prophet's progeny. I set up banner of faith among you and separated you from limits of legal and illegal. I clad you in garment of health out of justice and spread the known among you through my word and deed and revealed to you the best ethics through my ethicality."[1]

Imim in his speech emphatically referred to practicing the Book and the Prophet's tradition. The Imim's faithfulness to the Messenger's tradition is an important point in his reformational policies. Basically, violating the tradition according to him, is one of the blatant signs of deviation.

In the early times when ±al¦a and Zubayr complained of Imim's not consulting with them, Imim said, "By God I had no inclination to caliphate and no need of rulership, but you made me be in charge of that. As I came to power, I looked at the Book and what it has prescribed to us and the rules we are bound to obey and I did so. I followed the tradition set by the Messenger (s). I required not to ask you of your idea about this but you."[2]

Imim in his contact with 'Uthmin about being clothed in a pilgrim state during °adjdj or about doing the same in the visitation and °adjdj together says on the tradition of the Messenger (s), **ما كنت لأدع سنّة رسول الله صلى اللـه عليـه وآله وسلم لأحد من النـاس "**I never leave tradition of the Messenger (s) because of anybody."[3]

---

[2] Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 113

[1] Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 87

[2] Nahdj al-baligha. sermon 205

[3] Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-Munawwara, vol.3, pp.1043-1044

‘Uthmin was sick one year of the years he used to perform his prayers in Mini so he asked Imim to perform prayers instead.

Imim said, “If I perform prayers, I’ll do it as the Prophet did.”

‘Uthmin said, “No. Do as I do.”

Imim rejected his request.[1]

Imim said, “If I’m absent, then who will be among you to act upon the Prophet’s conduct?”[2]

I was doing prayer service, Mu§rif Ibn ‘Abd Allih says, along with ‘Imrin Ibn °u¥ayn (one of the Prophet’s companions) behind Imim ‘Al¢. After the service ‘Imrin held my hand and said, **لقد صلى صلاة محمد، ولقد ذكّرني صلاة محمـد (ص)**) “He performed the service like that of the Prophet’s. He reminded me of how the Prophet said the prayers.”[3]

Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢ who performed the service just behind Imim said, **ذكرنا علي بن ابي طالب صلاة النـبي (ص)**) “‘Al¢ reminded us of the Prophet’s prayers.”[4]

It was very important to revive the Prophet(s)’s biography for Imim’s reformational policies. The pure companions of Imim realized this fact as well.

‘Ammir said about the constructie measures of Imim, **لو أن علياً لم يعمل عملاً ولم يصنع شـيئاً الا أنـه أحيـا التكـبيرتين عند السجود لكان قد أصاب بذلك فضلاً عظيماً**“‘Al¢ has done nothing but reviving two “Allih Akbar” when prostrating back, for this, he has achieved a high virtue.”[5]

Imim declared up on pulpit in the face of ‘Umar’s policy of not scribing hadith, “Those who are willing to put down knowledge, they can bring paper and pen”.

°irith A‘war provided means of writing and wrote what Imim said.[6] Afterwards, Imim °asan(a) also advised his

---

[1] al-Amil¢ f¢ ªthir ¥a¦iba, p.50

[2] al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.10, p.124

[3] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.2, p.180

[4] Tir¢kh al-Kab¢r, Bukhir¢, vol.4, p.33; al-Ghad¢r, vol.9, p.66, vol.10, p.201

[5] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.179; al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, vol.I, p.204(printed in India)

offsprings to write the Prophet(s)'s hadith.[1] We know that Imim 'Al¢ himself wrote the Messenger's hadiths. After that, his hadith booklets were available to Ahl al-Bayt and they regularly narrated hadith for Shi'ite Muslims from "'Al¢'s booklet".[2]

As seen in time of caliph II, the story reciters alongside preventing from scription of hadith were permitted to narrate for people in the mosque about the Jewish sagas on former prophets and Christian priests. Imim stood against the development of story reciting and banned it while spreading hadith scription. Imim in principle opposed narration of Jewish works.

He is quoted to say, "Whoever has a book from the antecedent, he shall ruin it".[3]

Imim stood against someone who had narrated story of Rev. David (a) with Awriya from Jewish sources and said, "If someone says it, he'll be executed °add, whipping".[4]

It is known that Rev. David is attributed to murder by intention and adultery in this fake story. When he came to Ba¥ra, the story reciters were expelled out of mosque.[5] After him, Imim °asan (a) was also hindered from story reciting.[6] Imim Sadjdjid (a) stopped °asan Ba¥r¢,once being a story reciter, reciting stories and he admitted to do so.[7]

---

[6] Taqy¢d al-'ilm, p.90; Rabi' al-abrir, vol.III, PP.226,294; Tir¢kh Baghdid, vol.8, p.357; al-Tarit¢b al-Idariyya, vol.II,p. 259; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.6, p.116

[1] Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan(a), Ibn Sa'd, p.156

[2] concerning " Kitib 'Al¢ bi Imli'al-Nab¢(s)",A¦mad¢ M¢yinidj¢, the master, completed a detailed research about "Makit¢b al-ras£l" and extracted some cases narrated by the Infallible Imims from 'Al¢'s booklet.

[3] concerning " Kitib 'Al¢ bi Imli'al-Nab¢(s)",A¦mad¢ M¢yinidj¢, the master, completed a detailed research about "Makit¢b al-ras£l" and extracted some cases narrated by the Infallible Imims from 'Al¢'s booklet.

[4] Madjma' al-bayin, vol.8, p.472

[5] Q£t al-qul£b, vol.II, p.302; Wasi'il al-sh¢'a, vol.II, P.515; al-Tahdh¢b, vol.II, p.486; al-Kif¢, vol.II, p.312; Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.312; Akhbir I¥bahin, vol.I,p. 89

[6] Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, pp.227-228

Imim in one of his first speeches said, **وإني حاملكم على منهج نبيكم صلي الله عليه وآله "**I will spread tradition of the Prophet(s) among you."[1]

One of the reasons that caused Imim ‘Al¢, more than the other companions, to describe the personality and morality of the Messenger(s) in historical books, is that he himself followed the Prophet’s manner. For the same reason, he kept in his mind all actions of the Prophet(s) from the very beginning and later he tried to delineate his personality most eloquently.[2]

°asan Ba¥r¢ in response to someone who asked him of Imim said, **أراهم السبيل وأقام لهم الدين اذا اعوجّ "**He showed the way to people and straightened religion when it went astray."[3]

This very well-considered statement made by °asan exactly accorded with the policy Imim adopted during his caliphate.

Another poet, addressing Imim, composed this,

أوضحت من ديننا ما كان مشتبها جزاك ربك عنا فيه إحسانا

"What was skeptical is now clarified by you, may God grant thee virtues and benevolence."[4]

Ab£dhar when describing Imim said, **"‘علي رز الدين** Al¢ strengthens religion."[5]

Imim himself insisted on matching his conduct with that of the Messenger(s)’s. After Djamal war, he talked about his attitude towards Ba¥rans, "I acted in treating Ba¥rans as the Prophet did to Meccans.[6] Imim mentions resuscitation of

---

[7] Wafayit al-a‘yin, vol.I, p.70. Concerning positions of other Imims, "Qi¥¥ih khinin dar tir¢kh Islim wa «rin",pp.93 - 102, Qum, 1999

[1] Shar¦ Nahdj al-baligha, vol.7, p.36

[2] See one detailed example of that in, Nahdj al-sa‘ida, vol.I, pp.74-79 and the sources in there. We mentioned other sources in the first volume of the book under the topic of " the historical role of the Messenger(s)".

[3] al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, vol.12, p.36

[4] Naq¤,p.496; Tu¦af al-‘Uq£l, pp.338-342; Musnad al-imim al-Hid¢, p.207; Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.38, p.245

[5] al-Fi’iq f¢ Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.II, p.108

[6] Ansib al-ashrif, ol.II, p.273

tradition as one of the functions of "Imim".[1] Elsewhere, he regards the best servant of God a just Imim who attempts to revive the tradition and the most evil-doing servant of God a cruel Imim who destroys it."[2]

In general, Imim 'Al¢ seriously avoids the concept of innovation and says, in this regard, that a tradition fades away when an innovation emerges.[3]

Imim poses two points as his testament, stop blasphemizing and preserving tradition of the Prophet(s).[4]

He considers the saints those people who, **يحيون سنن اللـه وسـنن رسـوله** "Revive traditions of God and His Messenger(s)."[5]

He says hypocrite dissidents are those who swim in the sea of sedition, use innovations and put aside traditions.[6]

Imim says people are divided in two groups,[7] **متبع شرعة ومبتدع بدعة**

These statements and the like in Nahdj al-Baligha reveal Imim's strong mind in following tradition and avoiding the innovation. This position was adopted in front of those who created innovations at least in some cases and when they were objected, they said, "If they are innovations, they are good ones".

Imim was not willing to cheat in the field of religion and he said, **والله لا أدهنت في ديني** "I swear by God I never cheated in the field of religion."[8]

Once a man of Ban£ Asad was brought to Imim for execution of whipping (retribution). Ban£ Asad asked Imim to dispense with his whipping.

Imim said, "Ask me to do something at my discretion."

They came out while being contented.

---

[1] Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 105

[2] Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 164

[3] Ibid. sermon 145

[4] Ibid. sermon 149

[5] Ibid. sermon 192

[6] Ibid. sermon 154

[7] Ibid. sermon 176

[8] Nahdj al-sa'ida, vol.II, p.537

Imim executed whipping for the man and said, “This was owned by God and I had no control over it.”[1]

Imim said about his role of guiding Umma, “O people! I gave you advice the prophets did to their Umma and I let out what the legatees spread out after themselves. I behaved you with the lash of “preaching”, but you rejected and I called you with the speech to bar you from disobeying, yet you failed to do so. By God! Do you expect an Imim but me to join you in the straight path?”[2]

Also, he said of himself, “Verily I look like a lamp in the dark among you; one who steps in the dark, he shall use light of that lamp.”[3]

Anyway, Imim insisted on exact compliance with the Prophet(s)’s tradition such that he even tried to act like the Prophet(s) in his actions.

When Imim objected why he serves people in the mosque with good food but he himself eats wheat germ with bread at home, he weepingly replied, “I swear by God I had never seen bread without wheat germ in the Prophet(s)’s home.[4] What Imim said meant that he attempted to have his food like that of the Prophet(s)’s.

IMªM IN THE FACE OF INFIDELS (DJAMAL WAR)

Only several months after Imim came to power in 36H., the first civil war happened in Djamid¢ al-Thin¢ of that year among Muslims instigated by a group of promise-breachers led by ±al¦a, Zubayr and ‘ªyisha. To further clarify the historical background of this bitter event, it is to review the political lines of then Medina.

It was mentioned in the post-demise of the Messenger(s) that there had been two tendencies of the Umayyads and the Hishimites none of which could attain caliphate after Imim, The Umayyads due to being long-standingly anti-Islam and the Hishimites because of Quraysh’s envy and problems they had with Imim ‘Al¢.

---

[1] Rabi‘ al-abrir, vol.I, p.530

[2] Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 182

[3] Ibid. sermon 187

[4] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.187

The middle faction of Quraysh, that is Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar, came to power leading to this group being set aside. No matter what happened during these two men, a suitable ground was prepared for ‘Uthmin, one of the Umayyads, among all Quraysh. As said in the section relating to selection of ‘Uthmin, he was so popular among Quraysh people. When ‘Uthmin dealt with just the Umayyads around Quraysh, the middle line once again was capricious of caliphate. Among them, ±al¦a, a fellow-tribe of Ab£ Bakr of Ban£ Taym, wanted to attain caliphate with the support of ‘ªyisha. Zubayr also helped him for a while and he himself was eager to grab caliphate.

When Djamal war was waged, Ibn ‘Abbis said to Zubayr, “‘ªyisha wants the government for ±al¦a, what are you doing here?”[1]

This middle line failed to find an opportunity in Medina and observed that ‘Al¢ of the Hishimites, after abdication of the Umayyads, assumed power. Now what had to be done? It first approved of the new government assuming that it can play a major role in the new government. ±al¦a and Zubayr suggested to rule over Ba¥ra, K£fa or Damascus. Imim smartly said that they were more needed in Medina.[2] This aim was not fulfilled and ±al¦a and Zubayr, leaders of the middle line, departed to Mecca to do the lesser pilgrimage and there they could talk to ‘ªyisha, gone to Mecca before the death of ‘Uthmin and was still there.

Up to now there are three political lines. The Hishimites, the Umayyads, and the middle line of Quraysh that long time after appeared as “Abni’ al-Muhidjir£n” in rebelling against ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr. Djamal movement crystallized showdown of Quraysh’s middle line knowing itself follower of Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar. ±al¦a and Zubayr could satisfy ‘ªyisha to join them and this was the greatest breakthrough for them. ‘ªyisha both had familial relationship with ±al¦a and showed mercy on her nephew. In this trip, ‘Abd Allih played a major role in accompanying ‘ªyisha. They could absorb three thousand people and move up to Ba¥ra.

---

[1] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.252(footnote)of, Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol. 28, p.67; Tahdh¢b Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.5, p.364

[2] Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.4, p.429; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.218

The infidels made excuse for three reasons. First, ‘Uthmin was oppressedly murdered. This was posed while ±al¦a, Zubayr and ‘ªyisha were among those who mostly contributed to rebellion resulting in ‘Uthmin’s murder. They recklessly said that they had repented and now they were ready to make up for what they have done by seeking revenge for oppressed caliph! Certainly, this was raised for stupefied Muslims who were unaware of the real story. Another point was that they were forced to swear allegiance in Medina; therefore, the allegiance is improper and Imim’s government is illegitimate at least to them as they are not committed to obey caliph because of the forcible allegiance according to what they said. The solution they brought up was that everything should be resolved in a way raised in the end of ‘Umar’s lifetime, that is “Shuwri”.

When ‘ªyisha asked ±al¦a and Zubayr of her duty, she was told, “Go and tell the people that ‘Uthmin was oppressedly killed and the affairs have to go back to council of Muslims meaning the situation created by ‘Umar.”[1]

The council in which ±al¦a and Zubayr took part raised a hope for their caliphate. This council caused ±al¦a, Zubayr and Waqqi¥ to imagine that they are fully illegible for caliphate. Zubayr in the midst of Djamal war told Imim ‘Al¢ that he was not more illegible for caliphate than them.[2]

The Umayyads residing in °idjiz rushed to help this group opportunistically. Marwin Ibn °akam, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir,’Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Attib Ibn Abi l-‘ª¥ and Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘ª¥ were among those who instigated people. A little while after, Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘ª¥ and Mughc¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba, initially one of the defenders, abdicated.[3]

The Umayyads’s assistance, at this time, was just because of opportunism and for believing in what ±al¦a and Zubayr said. We know that Marwin at the end of Djamal war spear-killed ±al¦a in revenge for ‘Uthmin.

---

[1] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.223.Major source on Djamal war is the book of “al-Djamal” by Shiykh Muf¢d who has prepared it out of tens of sources accessible to him in that time. We have used this book as well as others previously written.

[2] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.255

[3] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.222-223; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.5, p.34

More contemplation has to be made about ‘ªyisha, wife of the Prophet(s). ‘ªyisha had a high status during her father’s rule and ‘Umar’s, her father’s friend. ‘Umar gave her share more than the other wives of the Messenger(s) and this wasn’t because she played a leading role in changes of his caliphate.[1] ‘ªyisha is said to have owed a lot to ‘Umar.[2]

‘ªyisha said, “During mourning service of ‘Umar, she heard jinns[3] elegizing for him. Even in her sleep, she dreamed as if ‘Umar were endowed with prophethood.”[4]

By taking advantage of her talent in narrating hadith and credited with being the Prophet(s)’s wife, she maintained this to the end, although she and Mu‘iwiya could not get along well. ‘ªyisha, during these years, tried to recognize herself as the dearest wife of the Messenger(s) leaving behind an acceptable image of herself and her father. She said she was six or seven when engaged and nine when married.[5] Despite the news that the Prophet(s) at times excused her from Ab£ Bakr,[6] she said, “Her marriage to the Prophet(s) ordained from God.[7] This is while we know that Zaynab, daughter of Djaµsh, was the only wife of the Prophet(s) who was so proud of that.[8]

In the later times of ‘Uthmin’s caliphate, ‘ªyisha challenged him hard. Having been influenced by anti-‘Uthmin opposition as well as her own criticisms, she stood against him. Unlike other wives of the Prophet(s), ‘ªyisha primarily became involved in politics and naturally had a political personality. She could not remain silent in front of a wave of anti-‘Uthmin rebellion. The considerable point is that what compelled her to engage in such a venturous political action in spite of a lot of problems she

---

[1] As earlier said, when Ab£ Bakr said prayers, just one, instead of the Prophet(s), according to Imim ‘Al¢, ‘ªyisha was the one who, from inside of home, introduced Ab£ Bakr.

[2] °ayit al-¥aµiba, vol.II, P.300

[3] ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, P.274

[4] Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-Munawwara, vol.III, P.942

[5] Concerning different statements and what she herself said in contradiction to this idea, °ad¢th al-Ifk, from p.158 on

[6] ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.8, p.81

[7] Ibid., vol.8, p.68

[8] Ibid., vol.8, p.103

faced? To us, as far as her disagreement with Imim was concerned, the only incentive she had to take part in this was the vengeance she exerted against the Hishimites, Fi§ima and ‘Al¢ within the years of the Prophet(s)’s lifetime. Shiykh Muf¢d has mentioned a few examples of ‘ªyisha’s grudge.[1] Otherwise, we know that she wasn’t the most conscious people to be concerned with ‘Al¢’s exoneration from ‘Uthmin’s murder.[2]

In addition, she wasn’t interested in reversion of caliphate to Ban£ Taym. When anti-‘Uthmin opposition peaked, ‘ªyisha had gone to Mecca for the °adjdj. There, she heard that ‘Uthmin wasn’t murdered and ±al¦a succeeded him. She became happy and went up to Medina to reach Saraf. She wasn’t told there people have sworn allegiance to ‘Al¢.

Hearing this news, she returned to Mecca and cried out, “O the oppressed ‘Uthmin.”[3]

When ‘ªyisha heard that people swore allegiance to ‘Al¢, she said, “One night of ‘Uthmin equals the entire lifetime of ‘Al¢.”[4]

After Imim wasn’t martyred, ‘ªyisha named the child brought to her “‘Abd al-Ra¦min!”[5]

After Djamal war came to a defeat, ‘ªyisha said to Ibn ‘Abbis, “No town I’m more angry at than the one where you, the Hishimites, live in.”[6]

‘ªyisha also said when informing about the Prophet(s)’s arrival in ending days of his life, “Two people helped him by his arms. One of them wasn’t Qutham Ibn ‘Abbis and there wasn’t another man!” According to narrator, by another man she meant ‘Al¢.[7] Of course, she sometimes confessed that the dearest man to the Prophet(s) was ‘Al¢ and the dearest

---

[1] al-Djamal, pp.157-160

[2] See the section on "‘Uthmin’s Opponents"

[3] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.217-218; vol.5, p.91; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа of Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.6, p.215

[4] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.5, p.91

[5] al-Djamal,p.160 and in the footnote from,Al-Shif¢,vol.4, p.356; Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.32, p.341

[6] al-Fut£¦, vol.II, P.337; Nathr al-durr, vol.4, p.21

[7] Musnad A¦mad, vol.6, pp.34, 38

woman was Fi§ima. When she was questioned why she did so, she said with a brown face, “It was something done!”[1]

‘Al¢ himself mentions the reasons why she exerted vengeance against him. **First**, the Messenger(s) had preferred him than her father in different cases. **Second**, there wasn’t brotherhood between Imim and the Prophet(s) and so ‘Umar wasn’t selected for Ab£ Bakr. **Third**, keeping doors of companions’ houses closed into the mosque and leaving Imim’s house door open to it. **Fourth**, when Ab£ Bakr failed to do anything the day before, banner of triumph wasn’t handed to Imim in Khaybar war. **Fifth**, there wasn’t the story of declaring the exoneration for which the Prophet(s) firstly dispatched Ab£ Bakr, but he wasn’t brought back as ordered by God and Imim took charge of it. **Sixth**, it wasn’t ‘ªyisha’s grudge against Khad¢dja whose daughter, Fi§ima, also had experienced that. **Seventh**, there wasn’t popularity of Imim towards the Prophet(s) in such a way that once ‘Al¢ came up to the Prophet and he wasn’t given a seat next to him. The Prophet(s) praised him in response to ‘ªyisha’s objection. This greatly raised her vengeance against Imim.[2] Shiykh Muf¢d in his ending part of his book “al-Djamal” details another chapter on why ‘ªyisha rendered grudge against Imim.[3]

Later on, when Imim °asan (a) was to be buried near the Prophet(s), she opposed and said, “Why do you want to bury in my house someone whom I dislike?”[4]

A¦mad Am¢n explains about the reasons why ‘ªyisha exerted vengeance against Fi§ima(a).[5]

±al¦a and Zubayr came to Mecca and well learned that they cannot do anything without ‘ªyisha.[6]

They said to her, “If Ba¥rans meet you, they will be united with you.”[7]

---

[1] Rab¢‘ al-abrir, vol.I, p.821

[2] al-Djamal, pp.409-412

[3] Ibid., pp.425-434

[4] Ibid., p.438

[5] ²ahr al-islim, vol.4, pp.38-39

[6] Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.4, p.451

[7] Akhbir al-§iwil, p.144

Imim said about ‘ªyisha, “She is most obeyed among people.”[1]

Through various talks, ‘ªyisha was convinced to join them to Ba¥ra. It was not so easy to go because she had to, in the first place, respond to her blatant disagreement on this Qur’inic verse that obligates the Prophet(s)’s wives to stay in their homes, **وقرن في بيوتكن** .

This verse clearly bans the Prophet(s)’s wives from leaving their homes meaning their participation in political struggles. As said that ‘Umar even was doubtful about their going on the °adjdj and he only once permitted them to do this by setting a lot of restrictions. Some wives such as S£da and Zaynab were not willing to go on pilgrimage for the same reason.[2] Umm Salama tried hard to stop ‘ªyisha going. Interesting to know is that ‘ªyisha had asked her to join them to Ba¥ra. She said to Umm Salama quoting from ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir, “One hundred thousand swords are ready in Ba¥ra. Have you come to fix this?

In revenge for ‘Uthmin!, Said Umm Salama, were you not the hardest against him? Were you not the one who called him “Na‘thal”, the old stupid man?

Umm Salama described a few virtues of Imim ‘Al¢ and asked him not to oppose someone to whom Muhidjir and An¥ir have sworn allegiance.

She referred to this speech of the Prophet(s), **عليّ ولي كل مؤمن ومؤمنة.**

‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr standing at the door said, “We haven’t heard the Prophet say such a thing”.

But your aunt, said Umm Salama, has heard that and this speech of the Prophet who said, **علي خليفتي عليكم فـي حياتي ومماتي** . ‘ªyisha confirmed that she has heard such a thing[3].

‘ªyisha spoke of her action taken for the improvement of Muslims’ affairs! She attempted to absorb °af¥a.

---

[1] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.238

[2] al-Mu‘djam al-Kab¢r, vol.24, p.34

[3] al-Fut£¦, vol.II, PP.282-283

He has the same idea, °af¥a said, as ‘ªyisha’s. In this way, he decided to go to Ba¥ra but ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar stopped him helping Djamal companions.[4]

Umm Salama, one of Ahl al-Bayt enthusiasts, wrote to Imim telling about the action of rebels, “By God if the Prophet(s)’s wives had not been banned leaving their homes, I would have come with you. Now I let the most beloved of my loved ones, that is my son, ‘Umar Ibn Ab¢ Salama, come with you.”[2]

Umm Salama began to publicize Imim ‘Al¢ among Meccans and said to them, “I call you to seek after divine piety and in this time I know no one better than ‘Al¢.”[3]

When Maym£na, another wife the Prophet(s), heard about ±al¦a and Zubayr’s rebellion, she told the bearer of the news, “Join ‘Al¢ because he has never gone astray and nobody has been let astray by him”. She repeated this three times[4].

Umm Fa¤l, daughter of °irith, in a letter by a courier to Imim, told him about the readiness of rebels.[5]

Medina was already in control of the Hishimites and the rebels could not return. Damascus was also under the yoke of Mu‘iwiya and it was obvious that they would not benefit from going to Damascus.[6] Because Mu‘iwiya is obeyed there and they will become only his plaything. On the other hand, they had the common aim with Mu‘iwiya and that was they had to prevent from Imim’s caliphate. Now that Damascus is in the hands of Mu‘iwiya, Iraq must be decontrolled by Imim. People like ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir, who was after rule of Ba¥ra, insisted more on that. Wal¢d Ibn ‘Uqba is said to have stopped them from going to Damascus since Mu‘iwiya was not ready to help ‘Uthmin, then how could he leave everything to a guess?[7] Mu‘iwiya also faild to take any interest in their coming to Damascus, so he falsely wrote to

---

[4] Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.4, p.451; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.284

[2] al-Fut£¦, vol.II, P.284

[3] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.224

[4] al-Mu‘djam al-Kab¢r, vol.24, p.10; Madjma‘ al-Zawi’id, vol.9, p.135

[5] al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.286

[6] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.221

[7] al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.279-280

Zubayr that he has secured allegiance of Damascus people. He asked Zubayr to seize Iraq, Damascus will be ready for him. In that case, there remains nothing for ‘Al¢. These talks led to their moving on to Ba¥ra hoping that friends of ±al¦a and Zubayr in Ba¥ra and K£fa [1] to assist them. Ya‘li Ibn Umayya arriving with a lot of property from Yemen, gave them all to rebels and they mobilized a group and mounted them on Ya‘li Ibn Umayya’s horses and moved up to Ba¥ra.

Referring to the fact that she is Umm al-Mu‘min¢n and a rightful mother of Muslims, ‘ªyi<u>sh</u>a tried to attract people towards the rebels.[2] When the rebels came to Ba¥ra, Ka‘b Ibn S£r, leader of Azd tribe, intended to abdicate. ‘ªyi<u>sh</u>a came up to him and invited him. He initially insisting on his abdication said that he could not help but fulfilling what his mother said.[3] Anyway, ‘ªyi<u>sh</u>a’s name was very effective in attracting the people.

Later, ±al¦a in his speech in Ba¥ra said, “God has brought ‘ªyi<u>sh</u>a to you. You know that how dignified she was in front of the Prophet (s) and what status she had in Islam.”

Ba¥rans just for the sake of ‘ªyi<u>sh</u>a declared they would defend the rebels.[4]

When fighting began, ±al¦a said, “O people! ‘Al¢ has come to shed the blood of Muslims. Tell not that he is the Messenger’s cousin. Someone who is with you is wife of the Prophet and trustworthy Ab£ Bakr’s daughter, she is the one whose father was the most beloved to the Prophet.”[5]

On the day of attack, one of Ba¥ran companions of rebels said in a piece of poetry,

نحن نوالي أمّنا الرضية ونتصر الصّحابة المرضية [6]

“We hold sainthood of our contented mother and help Companions pleased by God.”

In Ba¥ra, ‘Abd Allih Ibn °ukaym Tam¢m¢, brought to Ba¥rans the letters ±al¦a wrote to them and used them

---

[1]. Ansib al-a<u>sh</u>rif, vol.II, pp.221-222

[2]. Na<u>th</u>r al-durr, vol.4, p.15-16

[3].A<u>kh</u>bir al-§iwil, p.144; al-<u>Dj</u>amal, p.322

[4]. al-<u>Dj</u>amal, p.304

[5]. al-<u>Dj</u>amal, p.329

[6]. Ibid. p.345

against ‘Uthmin and said to him, “Do you know these letters?”

±al¦a said, “Yes, but I knew repentance and revenging for ‘Uthmin the only way to compensate!”[1]

Djamal troops moved on. In midway, in °uw’ab region, ‘ªyisha heard dogs barking. She all of a sudden recalled a report from the Prophet (s) that he kept away his wives from a sedition trap when hearing barking of the dogs on the way. ‘ªyisha became determined to go back but ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr brought to her fifty people of Ban£ ‘ªmir to testify that the region was not called °uw’ab.[2]

‘Uthmin Ibn °unayf was ruler of Ba¥ra on behalf of Imim (a). He dispatched Abu al-Aswad Du’al¢ and ‘Imrin Ibn °u¥ayn to Djamal rebels near Ba¥ra. They asked Djamal companions why they had gone there.

They replied, “We have come in revenge for ‘Uthmin and that the caliphate be left to Shuwri.”

‘Uthmin Ibn °unayf ordered the people to bear arms. The rebels came to Ba¥ra reaching Mirbad region and in there ±al¦a first spoke of the oppressedness of ‘Uthmin.

He said, “People have sworn allegiance to ‘Al¢ only by force.” He further said that now he must abdicate the resign from caliphate and selection of caliph in Shuwri be the same tradition of ‘Umar Ibn Kha§§ib.[3]

Zubayr and after him ‘ªyisha made speech. Some people acknowledged him and some others shouted that he is telling lies. At this time the crowd parted in two and attacked each other with shoes. This resulted in an armed figting.[4]

One of the opponents, of ‘Abd al-Qays great men, cried out, “These people were the harshest against ‘Uthmin. After

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.229-230; al-Djamal, p.305

[2]. al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.11, p.365; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.224; al-Mustadrak, vol.III, p.120; al-Ist¢‘ib, vol.4, p.361; (Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr says, “This hadith is among the reasons of the Prophet’s prophethood and it is more correctly documented requiring no discussion.”)

Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.549; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.288; Nathr al-durr, vol.II, p.227; Madjma‘ al-Zawi’id, vol.7, p.234

[3]. al-Djamal, p.306

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.226-227

that they swore allegiance to ‘Al¢ and we were told about that and we too did so.”

±al¦a ordered to catch him and shaed his head and face.[1] According to Ibn Khayyi§, some of the people sheld them with stones when arriving in Ba¥ra.[2]

At any rate, after relatively controlling Ba¥ra, they signed a contract with Ibn °unayf saying that they wait for Imim ‘Al ¢ to come provided the royal residence, public property and mosque remain in the hands of ‘Uthmin Ibn °unayf. Despite the contract being signed, the rebels breached the contract fearing that Imim might come and they could not stand against him, so they nightly marched into the mosque and arrested ‘Uthmin Ibn °unayf while he was up at doing the night prayer. They shaved his head and face and overlooked killing him[3], instead expelled him out of the city merely because they feared his brother Sahl Ibn °unayf whom Imim had placed instead of himself. Observing him in this condition, Imim began to cry.[4]

The rebels looted the public property after killing about fifty people[5] as well as its watch-outs.

When ±al¦a and Zubayr saw the public property, they said, **هذا ما وعدنا الله ورسوله!** .[6]

According to a narration, ±al¦a at the very beginning of his arrival in Ba¥ra, asked about dhms that had been promised to him.[7]

With the relative control of rebels over Ba¥ra, there emerged a disagreement between ±al¦a and Zubayr over saying the prayers. This conflict temporarily came to an end with a compromise over their saying the prayers each on a day. At this time, °ukaym Ibn Djabala, commander of ‘Uthmin Ibn °unayf-led forces, began to fight with the rebels

---

[1]. al-Djamal, p.307

[2]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayya§, p.182

[3]. al-Djamal, p.284

[4]. Ibid. p.285

[5]. al-Ma‘irif, p.208

[6] al-Djamal, p.401

[7] al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, vol.15, p.283

with several hundred people. This fighting led to his martyrdom and his three brothers.[1]

From Ba¥ra, ‘ªyisha wrote letters to people of Medina and Yamima and called them to support Djamal rebels.

In her letter to people of Yamima, she wrote, “The deviated ‘Uthmin Ibn °unayf calls people on the way to hell while we call people to the Book of God.”

She had written this letter before Imim’s arrival for justifying the crimes of rebels in Ba¥ra event.[2] She also wrote to Medinans telling them about the victory of rebels in Ba¥ra. The letter dated Rabi‘ al-Awwal 5th, 36 H.[3]

When Imim (a) heard about the departure of rebels, he substituted Sahl Ibn °unayf in place of himself and quickly moved to Iraq accompanied by a large number of the Prophet’s companions and some other Medinans who are reportedly considered to be four thousand people.[4] According to Sa‘¢d Ibn Djubayr, eight hundred people of An¥ir and four hundred of those who attended the Ri¤win allegiance, joined Imim (a) in Djamal.[5]

When Imim sent Hishim Ibn ‘Utba Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ from Raba¤a to tell Ab£ M£si to mobilize people to join Imim. Ab£ M£si disagreed on K£fiyins support from Imim. By saying that this is a sedition and being absent in sedition is better than attending it[6], he did not allow people to rush to support Imim (a).

In addition, he threatened Hishim as well. Hishim came up to Imim and Imim sent ‘Abd Allih and Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr to mobilize people in K£fa, but they failed to do so. This time, Imim sent his son, Imim °asan (a) along with ‘Ammir to K£fa. Besides, he deposed Ab£ M£si and posed Qara¨a Ibn Ka‘b An¥ir¢ over K£fa.

The enthusiastic speech of Imim °asan (a) caused nine thousand six hundred and fifty people of K£fa to join Imim’s

---

[1] al-Djamal, pp.283-284

[2]. al-Djamal, pp.301-302

[3]. Ibid. pp.299-300

[4]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayya§, p.184

[5]. loc.cit.

[6].Akhbir al-§iwil, p.145

troops.[1] °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢, of K£fa pure and virtuous men called people to support Imim. Afterwards, people were set to back their Imim up under any circumstances.[2] Imim °asan (a) appearing as the Prophet’s descendant played a key role in inciting K£fiyins. Similarly, ‘Ammir, once ruller of K£fa, was known after piety and people recognized him as a criterion of credal error and gospel truth based on the narration,**الحق**[3] **مع عمّار يدور معه حيث دار**

K£fiyin troops joined Imim in Dh¢ Qir and moved towards Ba¥ra.

Ba¥ran tribes were subdivided in three groups. One group including Rabi‘a joined Imim. Another group such as Ban£ ®abba joined ‘ªyisha and the other one such as A¦naf Ibn Qays, of Ban£ Tam¢m leaders, resigned from the war.[4]

Abdication of a large number of tribes showed that it is very difficult for many to make decisions. Some of the tribes appearing in the two sides brought about to some extent tribal disputes.

±al¦a in his speech in time of war said, “Some of the Mu¤ar¢ hypocrite dissidents, Rabi‘a Christians and Yemen¢ foot soldiers helped Imim ‘Al¢ (a).

His speech raised objection of those who had come to war imagining defense of cause of rebels and this made them resign.[5]

Many people deemed rebellion right merely because it was led by ±al¦a, Zubayr and ‘ªyisha.

°irith Ibn °£§ told Imim, “Do you think that ±al¦a, Zubayr and ‘ªyisha are unrightful?”

---

[1]. Ibid. p.145; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.234-235

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.145

[3]. D¢nwar¢ (Akhbir al-§iwil, p.147) says, “when Zubayr heard that ‘Ammir is with Imim ‘Al¢, he remained doubtful due to hadith of « **الحق مع عمار**» and hadith «**تقتلك الفئة الباغية** ». This statement seems incorrect thanks to Zubayr’s spoiled soul. ‘Ammir was from the very beginning with Imim, how has Zubayr not thought of this so far?”

[4]. Concerning the tribes and their positions, Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.237

[5]. al-Djamal, p.330

Imim replied,[1] **اعرف الحق تعـرف اهلـه، واعـرف الباطـل تعرف اهله**

Apart from ten thousand K£fiyins with two thousand people from ‘Abd al-Qays and twelve thousand people comprising Imim’s troops,a large number of Ba¥ran tribes in addition to a great multitude of Medinans among whom there were scores of the Prophet (s)’s companions, accompanied Imim.[2]

Imim ‘Al¢ by no means was willing to wage this war. Hence, three days after arrival in Ba¥ra, by sending frequent massages, he asked the rebels to join back to “congregation” and “obedience”. But he received no positive response from them.[3]

Imim sent ¯a‘¥a‘a Ibn ¯£¦in with a letter to Ba¥ra. He spoke with ±al¦a and Zubayr but when he talked to ‘ªyi<u>sh</u>a, he felt that she intended to raise wrong doing more than the other two. After Imim’s return, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis was sent to Ba¥ra.

He said to ±al¦a, “Haven’t you sworn allegiance?”

±al¦a said, “I was forced by sword to do so.”

Ibn ‘Abbis said, “I myself observed that you voluntarily swore an allegiance.”

±al¦a spoke about ‘U<u>th</u>min’s blood.

Ibn ‘Abbis said, “Was it not true that ‘U<u>th</u>min drank water from his own house well for ten days? and you did not let him drink fresh water. Then ‘Al¢ came to you asking you to let him drink water.”

After that, Ibn ‘Abbis talked to ‘ªyi<u>sh</u>a and ±al¦a.

‘ªyi<u>sh</u>a was so confident about her victory that she did not show any flexibility.

Ibn ‘Abbis attempted by making sound reasoning to warn them of the danger waiting for them, yet they failed to accept it.[4]

---

[1]. Ansib al-a<u>sh</u>rif, vol.II, pp.239,274

[2]. About the attendance of the Prophet’s companions, Ansib al-a<u>sh</u>rif, vol.II, pp.267-269 (footnote)

[3]. A<u>kh</u>bir al-§iwil, p.147

[4]. al-<u>Dj</u>amal, pp.314-318

However, Imim insisted that war not take place. He stopped his companions launching the war and officially announced that no one has the right to launch war.[1] Even on the day of war, before noon, Imim (a) handed a Qur’in to Ibn ‘Abbis to go to ±al¦a and Zubayr and talk to them while calling them to Qur’in.

Ibn ‘Abbis talked to ±al¦a and Zubayr but ‘ªyisha even did not permit them to talk and said, “Go and tell your lord that sword will rule between us.”

Ibn ‘Abbis says, “I was not very far from them when they showered us with their spears.”[2]

On the morning of Djamid¢ al-Awwal 10th [3], Imim’s division was prepared. Khurayba was the region of fighting where existed before Ba¥ra and later it became a place of Ba¥ra. That day up to noon, Imim resisted against the rebellion troops and advised them.

Imim (a) said to ‘ªyisha, “God ordered you to stay at home, fear God and go back.”

Imim scolded ±al¦a and Zubayr for bringing ‘ªyisha. Milik was placed commander of the right wing, ‘Ammir Yisir as the commander of the left wing, Nu‘min Ibn Rib‘¢ An¥ir¢, according to some sources, Djundab Ibn Zuhayr Azd¢ was placed over the infantry and the banner was given to Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya Khariba.

Imim (a) with his fiery speech prepared the troops for battling the enemy.[4]

On the other side, ‘ªyisha rode on camel-litter covered with armor. She appeared in the battlefield and made speech regularly talking about the oppressedness of ‘Uthmin.

Imim primarily handed a Qur’in to one of the ‘Abd al-Qays people to go to the battlefield calling the rebels to Qur’in and warning them of disunity. The rebels speared him

---

[1]. Waq‘at al-Djamal, p.36

[2]. al-Djamal, pp.336-339

[3]. Ibid. p.336; According to Balidhur¢, war happened on Djamid¢ al-Thin¢ 10th. Ansib al-ashrif, p.238; Imim’s letter to K£f¢yins telling about the triumph over Djamal companions is dated Djamid¢ al-Awwal. al-Djamal, p.399

[4]. al-Djamal, p.334

martyred. Mother of this young man present there jumped herself over her son. The companions helped bring his body to Imim.[1]

Imim (a) who, until that time, had ordered his troops not to launch the war by observing martyrdom of that man commanded Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya to attack the enemy.[2] Fighting kept on from noon to night. It was most intense around ‘ªyisha’s camel and as said over seventy hands were amputated wanting to reach her camel’s reins. ‘ªyisha picked a handful of soil and tried to stupify people and did just as the Prophet (s) had done. She spattered the soil towards Imim’s troops and said, “Woe betide you!”

Imim said to her, **وَمَا رَمَيْتَ إِذْ رَمَيْتَ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّـهَ رَمَـى**.[3] “One who speared was not thee but the devil.”

When rebelling troops were defeated, Marwin Ibn °akam knowing that the murderer of ‘Uthmin is nobody but ±al¦a, speared him killed.[4]

Interestingly, Ibn Khayyi§ says, “Once the war was begun, the first one killed was ±al¦a.[5] This shows that Marwin mainly has come to war to kill ±al¦a. Later on, he felt proud of this such that he himself told the story to Imim Sadjdjid (a).[6]

It has been said that Imim (a) called ±al¦a in a battlefield and said to him, “Go Ab£ Mu¦ammad! Do you remember what the Prophet said about me?” **اللهم وال من والاه وعاد من عاداه** “O Allih! Love his friends and loathe his enemies.” ±al¦a replied, “I ask the repentance from God! If I had remembered that, I would have never risen up.[7]

Zubayr stayed with the troops to the insistence of his son, ‘Abd Allih and did not leave the battlefield even with the Imim’s speech. In one case, Imim (a) remembered what the

---

[1]. al-Djamal, pp.339-340; al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, vol.7, p.537; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.241

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.240-241

[3]. al-Djamal, p.348; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.I, p.257

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.246-247

[5]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.185

[6]. al-Djamal, p.383

[7]. Waq‘at al-Djamal, al-Ghallib¢, p.42; Tir¢kh Mukhta¥ar Dimashq, vol.11, p.204

Prophet had said, “Your aunt’s son, that is Zubayr, will rebel against you.”

Zubayr acknowledged the report.[1]

The sources saying that Zubayr anyway had run away from the stage of fighting[2] or had deserted the battlefield while being remorseful, are in clash with each other.

After Imim’s speech, Zubayr intended to go back, but returned to the battlefield by the insistence of his son, it is probable that this might have caused his last run away to be assumed as his repentance. While if he were really remorseful, he would make his serious decision to return in the very beginning. When he left the battlefield, a person named Ibn Djurm£z chased and killed him in the right occasion.

Imim said about him, “Zubayr was closer to me than ±al¦a. He was always from us, Ahl al-Bayt, so long as his son ‘Abd Allih grew up and separated us.”[3]

Milik played a role in Imim’s caliphate as much as when he came in grips with ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr, he was almost to kill him but in front of those of his troops whom he was separated from, ‘Abd Allih said, “Kill me with Milik Ashtar.”[4] His purpose was to have Milik killed.

‘Ad¢ Ibn °itim ±i’¢ was among Imim’s defenders who lost both one eye and one of his sons in this war. ‘Amr Ibn °imaq Khuzi‘¢ was another companion of the Prophet (s) who stayed close to Imim in this war. He was, according to D ¢nwar¢, among the pious people of K£fa and many pious people joined him.[5]

Observing the resistance of Ba¥rans around Djamal, Imim ordered the camel to be killed. Some of Imim’s companions surrounded the camel and killed it.

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.255; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.147

[2]. Ab£ Mikhnaf comments that Zubayr left the battlefield after troops failure and he was killed on his way to Medina. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.254; This means that he has left the battlefield and nothing else.

[3]. al-Djamal, p.389; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.9, p.24

[4]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.150

[5]. loc.cit.

Later on, ‘ªyisha said, “I could see ‘Al¢ from inside the camel litter who was engaged in war shouting, al-Djamal, al-Djamal.”[1]

Imim neared the camel litter and blamed ‘ªyisha addressing her, “Ya Shaq¢ri’.” [2]

One point is worth saying that ‘ªyisha watched outside from inside the camel litter through the hole made.

Once she asked a person who had the reins of the camel in hand, “Is ‘Al¢ present among the people?”

He replied, “Yes.”

‘ªyisha asked him to show ‘Al¢ to her. When ‘Al¢ was shown to her, she said, “How identical he is to his brother!”

The man questioned, “Whom do you mean?”

She said, “The Prophet.”

Once the man heard that, he let the camel’s reins loose and joined Imim’s troops.[3]

After the war came to an end, ‘ªyisha who was motionless like a stiff, was taken out and sent along with her brother, Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr, to Ba¥ra and after some days she could leave there. Afterwards, she was sent to Medina with a number of Ba¥ran men and women.[4] A long time after, ‘ªyisha frequently expressed remorse of what she had done.[5] When she read the verse, **وقرن في بيوتكن** she cried so much that her veil became wet.[6]

Ibn Qutayba says, “A woman came to ‘ªyisha and said, What do you say about the woman who has killed her little child?”

‘ªyisha said, “She must go to hell.”

The woman said, “What do you say about the woman who has killed (that is ‘ªyisha) twenty thousand of her elder children?”[7]

---

[1].Al-Djamal, p.379

[2]. Ibid. p.369

[3]. Sam§ al-Nudj£m al-’Awil¢, vol.II, p.440

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.249

[5]. Ibid. vol.II, p.265

[6]. Ibid. vol.II, p.266

[7]. ‘Uy£n al-akhbir, vol.I, p.202

‘ªyisha herself when dying, said, “I have created events after the Prophet. Bury me near other wives (rather than beside the Prophet).”[1]

According to another narration, ‘ªyisha said, “My absence in Djamal was better than having ten sons of the Prophet.”[2]

Many Ba¥rans from different tribes were killed in this war. According to Balidhur¢, only two thousand five hundred and fifty two people of Azd tribe were killed.

Eight hundred from Bakr Ibn Wi’il, five hundred from Ban£ ®abba and seven hundred people from Ban£ Tam¢m had been killed.[3]

There seem to be other exaggerative numbers given. For example, Djamal war victims are said to be totally twenty thousand people.[4]

‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr also says that there have been fifteen thousand people killed.

According to Shiykh Muf¢d, the same number of twenty thousand people seems correct.[5]

Ab£ °itim Nim¢ quoting from his grandfather that the people killed in Djamal numbered twenty thousand people.[6]

This number seems incorrect because in a war lasting only five to six hours, there could be not many casualties to this extent. Imim’s troops martyrs are said to number between four hundred to five hundred people.[7]

Known figures among martyrs of Imim’s companions number six. Among them, Zayd and Say¦in are children of ¯awhin. There are two more people called ¯aq‘ab and ‘Abd Allih, brothers of Silim Ibn Mikhnaf (Ab£ Mikhnaf’s grandfather) as well as two others named ‘Albi’ Ibn °irith Sad£s¢ and Hind Djamal¢.[8]

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.8, p.74

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.241; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.5, p.6

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.248

[4]. Ibid. vol.II, p.265

[5]. al-Djamal, p.419

[6]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.186

[7]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.186

[8]. Ibid. p.190

What is certain is that the immediate defeat of Ba¥ra troops (five hundred people killed compared to over nineteen thousand people of the rebels killed) shows that rebelling troops had no strong incentives although Umm al-Mu‘min¢n was present among them. Major problem was that ±al¦a and ‘ayisha despite the fame they won in the affair of ‘Uthmin, were more notorious than that they can deceive people of Ba¥ra considering themselves as avengers for ‘Uthmin.

After the war was put to an end, Imim (a) ordered his troops not to chase anybody. Whoever gave in, he shall not be killed and no wounded shall be murdered. Imim set free even people like Marwin and children of ‘Uthmin.

At that time, Marwin said, “He will not swear allegiance unless he is forced to do so.”

Imim said, “Even if he swears allegiance, like Jews, he will violate his allegiance.” [1]

Imim did not let people take advantage of private property of people except what the enemy had used in war. This was amazing to the people who up to now gained booties after any victorious war. Imim was objected concerningly, and he ashamed them by saying that who would take ‘ayisha if the property is to be shared?

However, simple-minded Arabs had this problem in mind that how it is rightly possible to kill people of a tribe but their property seizure is forbidden.[2]

Imim (a) began to search among those killed. When he saw Ka‘b Ibn Thur-former judge of Ba¥ra on behalf of ‘Umar-he had Qur’in hang from his neck. Imim said to take Qur’in off his neck.

He then ordered to have Ka‘b be seated in front of him, and talked to his dead body just as the prophet had done to Qurayshi’s killed people in U¦ud, “O Ka‘b! I found what my God had promised. You also found what your God had promised you!”[3]

After Djamal fracas came to an end, Imim (a) entered congregation mosque and began to reproach the Ba¥ran

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.263 (context and footnote)

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.151

[3]. al-Djamal, p.392

infidels who were the first people standing against their Imim.

Imim called them[1] womanish troops and animal followers جند المراةً واتباع البهيمةً .

Imim wrote in letters to Medina and K£fa about the story of Ba¥ra.[2] Then he ordered to have the public property shared among his companions who are said to number twelve thousand people. Unlike ±al¦a and Zubayr who said when observing Bayt al-Mil, “This is the same promise of God and his messenger”, this time Imim (a) said, “O white and yellow jewels, deceive people but me.”[3]

After some time, sojourning in Ba¥ra, Imim went up to K£fa on Monday, Radjab 12th or 16th, year 36 H.[4] after appointing ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis as the ruler of Ba¥ra. His arrival in K£fa is said to be on Monday, 12th of Radjab.[5]

IMªM STAYS IN K¬FA

Imim departed to K£fa after subsiding rebellion of infidels. Imim stayed over in K£fa until his martyrdom. It is outlandish to say that Imim generally decided to leave Medina, although it is even far from fact his return to Medina might have been possible after his stay in K£fa. His departure to K£fa has to be considered as some kind of action to safeguard religion from the harm of infidels such as Mu‘iwiya. Iraq was in a touchy situation. In principal, after beginning of conquests and expansion of Islamic realm, two points triggered increased importance of Damascus and Iraq over Medina and in other words °idjiz. First, a large number of tribes had come to Damascus and Iraq from °idjiz among whom there were seen many of companions. Second, the extent, possibilities and hidden talents in this regions had been incomparable to °idjiz. When infidel rebels began their movement in Mecca, they well came to this conclusion to

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.151; al-Djamal, p.407; Rabi‘ al-abrir, vol.I, p.308

[2]. al-Djamal, pp.395-399

[3]. Ibid. pp.401-402

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.374; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.152; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.273; It is to be said that Imim has written letter to Qara¨a Ibn Ka‘b, ruler of K£fa, to inform about the victory in Radjab 36 H. al-Djamal, p.404

[5]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.153

move towards Iraq before ‘Al¢ (a) captures it. In case they could succeed in seizing K£fa and Ba¥ra, °idjiz would come in their hands. The problem was that they first assumed power in Ba¥ra but an incomplete one. Second, K£fa was taken totally out of their control. In contrast, Imim could bring K£fa under his control, placing it as a base for his Shi‘ite Muslims in the future. Regretfully, the same action of the infidel rebels caused Ba¥ra not only to tilt towards ‘Uthmin¢ religion but there emerges a permanent enmity between Ba¥ra and K£fa in Iraq, fading out solidarity in this region.

It was not easy for Imim to get out of Mad¢nat al-Nab¢ and there was no way out just as when the Prophet (s) left Mecca with all sanctity and his sense of patriotism. In that time, he had not so many followers in Mecca. In contrast, Medina bowed to him knowing that it was economically reliable. Now Imim ‘Al¢ (a) had felt that his two strong enemies, one having Damascus in control and another Ba¥ra, trying to take K£fa out of his control. Seizure of these two cities meant that the whole Iran with all of its economic capacities has come under their control. Imim (a) was not the man to become discouraged in the face of these problems and to abdicate from caliphate, something the rebels thought of and imagined that Imim leaves the affairs to Shuwri by observing this condition. On the contrary, he was determined to fight with the rebels and for the same reason he swiftly moved towards Iraq.

The major reason was that Medina could not stand and resist for some factors.

First, economically speaking, °idjiz was unable to bear confrontation with Iraq or Damascus. Medina, the best region, could not properly meet the needs of its people. Now how could it feed a huge army?

Second, Medina was not able to endure an all-out war with Damascus in terms of human power. The maximum number of those Medinans who aided Imim (a) in Djamal war is four thousand people.[1] This population could not undo the problems of succession in facing his plenty of enemies.

Third, Medinans save An¥ir were not so much interested in Imim ‘Al¢ (a). Muhidjirun (immigrants), their children as

[1]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.184

well as Meccans were great number of people who had departed to this city after departure of the Prophet (s). Families of the Umayyads and those of Djamal rebels did not allow people to completely assist Imim (a). The people of this city, during ‘Uthmin period, suffering from increased desire of welfare took away their fighting spirit. Moreover, the citizens, particularly some companions, like ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar, Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥, Mu¦ammad Ibn Maslama, Usima Ibn Zayd, Zayd Ibn Thibit and many others did not show the least interest to Imim (a), knowing themselves more religious jurist than that they lend an ear to his speech. When Imim was in K£fa, Sahl Ibn °unayf, Imim’s ruler in K£fa, told Imim that many people are attracted by Mu‘iwiya.

Imim in a letter wrote to Sahl, I have been told that people staying with you some of whom secretly go to Mu‘iwiya. Do not feel sorry that number of your men is decreased and their assistance is stopped. Their deviation and your release from their suffering suffice to say that they are escaping from the truth and rushing to ignorance. They are people of this world and they are after it. They have seen and heard the justice and knew that people are equal in front of justice. So, they ran away to have their own ends meet alone. May they be far from the blessing of God.[1] Meccans had no better situation either. When Imim (a) wrote to Khilid Ibn ‘ª¥ to secure allegiance from Meccans but they refused to do so.[2]

K£fa in different ways and just in the face of Medina had an entirely good condition. In the first place, Iraq had no problem of population. There were many tribes living there, those who had shown their military power in conquering Iran. Iraq economically was the most important source for people of this land. Furthermore, there were a lot of tax and tribute from Iran and Iraq, an unlimited wealth, in the hands of Muslims. When ‘Uqba Ibn ‘ªmir asked Imim not to leave Medina and get somebody else to go.

Imim said, **إن الأموال والرجال بالعراق**[3] **“**The properties and the men are in Iraq.”

---

[1]. Nahdj al-balighha, letter 70

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.210-211

[3]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.143; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.268; al-Mi‘yir wa l-Muwizina, p.98

This was quite clear for others. ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir leaving Ba¥ra for Mecca after ‘Uthmin was murdered, he was told in a piece of poetry by Wal¢d Ibn ‘Uqba, “You left Iraq, center of men and came to a silent city!”[1]

Ibn A‘tham presents importance of Iraq as if Damascus has been only a corner of it.[2] Fundamental aim of Imim (a) was to face Mu‘iwiya after stifling of Djamal rebellion. It was impossible to do this without Imim’s appearance in Iraq that was near Damascus.[3] Besides, Imim had a lot of supporters from among Yemen¢ tribes who were actually his devotees. They played a very important role in the war when Imim assumed caliphate and they stood in all battle scenes to the very end.

Of course it is to be noted that Iraq had its own specific problems. Later on, more explanation will be given about Iraqis on the occasion of confusion in this city at the beginning of Imim °asan (a)’s succession. It is only to refer that K£fiyins were recognized the most controversial people over trifles. They were enthusiastic people and not showing moderation in this regard. Also, the strong force of tribes headmen was one of the serious problems of Imim during his caliphate.

WAR WITH OPPRESSIVELY PERVERSE PEOPLE IN ¯IFF«N

Upon his arrival in K£fa, Imim did not go to ruler’s palace. The palace, in many years, had been converted to an aristocratic one.

When Imim was asked to go there, he said, “I’ll never go to palace of the owls.”

He then went to altar of K£fa mosque and temporarily resided there. Afterwards, he went to Dju‘da’s house, son of his sister, Umm Hin¢.[4]

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.271

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.I, p.134

[3]. Mu‘djam al-buldin, vol.I, p.47

[4]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.3,5; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.349. It is to be said that the most comprehensive work on the event of ¯iff¢n is the valuable book “Waq‘at ¯iff¢n”, written by Na¥r Ibn Muzi¦im, dead in 212. Ibn A‘tham

K£fiyins as the victorious people in Ba¥ra warmly red-carpetted Imim.[1] At this time Damascus was the most important problem for Imim to think of.

From the years before Imim assumed caliphate, Damascus belonged to the Umayyads. Perhaps ‘Umar who had placed Damascus at the discretion of Yaz¢d and next Mu‘iwiya, children of Ab£ Sufyin, thought that the Umayyads deserve having Damascus if not rightful of seizing caliphate but because they were leaders of Quraysh. Henceforth, as earlier said, he did not make any changes to Damascus and even never remained critical of Mu‘iwiya. With the arrivel of ‘Uthmin, Mu‘iwiya was completely stabilized in situation. At this time, he regarded Damascus to be his own kinghood and mainly the imagination that he someday is deposed never occurred to him. Mu‘iwiya was very vigilant to have Damascus people be mentally fed by him and not by any other people. For the same reason he never let Ab£dhar stay there. Subsequently, whoever came to Damascus intending to effect the minds of the people as Mu‘iwiya thought, he would be expelled out of there.[2] Anti-‘Uthmin rebellion on the part of the companions and other people made him treat the case cautiously. On one hand, he never decided to stand against the companions. In this case, it was hoped that if someone came to power, he would have no pretext to demote Mu‘iwiya because of supporting the deviated caliph. On the other hand, with the confidence Mu‘iwiya took in Damascus people, he could count on this point that he would have an excuse for rebellion given the fact that he is being set aside. It happened to be so.

Having come to power, Imim (a) was up to send ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis to rule over Damascus. He primarily wrote a letter to Mu‘iwiya in which he asked Mu‘iwiya to accompany the aristocrats of Damascus to Medina, informing him that people murdered ‘Uthmin without his consultation but now they have selected him as caliph with consultation and consensus.

---

has mainly used this book in reporting about ¯iff¢n and he has condensed the book. Sources such as Tir¢kh al-§abar¢ and Balidhur¢ have quoted mainly from Ab£ Mikhnaf except a few sporadic reports.

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.347

[2]. Ibid. vol.II, pp.360-361

Mu‘iwiya failed to reply Imim’s letter and he only sent him a white letter writing, “From Mu‘iwiya to ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ± ilib.”

Someone who had carried the letter to Imim (a) said, “I am coming from the people who believe that you have murdered ‘Uthmin and they are pleased with nothing else but killing you.”[1]

This story was linked to the beginning affair of Djamal rebels that engaged Imim’s mind for some time. In this time, the story of Djamal provided Mu‘iwiya with another propagandistic chance. By referring to turbulence of ±al¦a, Zubayr and ‘ªyisha, as the Prophet’s wife, he could fix Imim’s having a hand in murder of ‘Uthmin in the minds of Damascus people better than before.

After Djamal story came to an end, Imim (a) settled in K£fa because it was obvious that he would soon fight with Damascus troops. In this case, it was only Iraq that could do such a thing. In the very moment Imim arrived in K£fa, Shann Ibn ‘Abd Qays composed, “Now we are relieved from war with the infidels, but there is a horrendous snake in Damascus that if stinks anyone, he’ll be filled with a dead fatal venom in his body; therefore, in order to remedy, before it stinks, smash its head and throw it aside.[2]

It is to be noted that challenge between Damascus and Iraq, in principle, predated the Sassanids period. Arabs of these two regions, each was engaged in fighting in support of one of the two great powers of that time, that is Romans and the Sassanids. Of course, presently new immigrants entered this region and had different incentives compared to the past, but the old grounds could also affect it. Damascus surrender meant that its people had yielded to Iraqis. This could be true in the other way round. Ka‘b Ibn Dju‘ayl composed,

أرى الشام تكره ملك العراق وأهل العراق لها كارهونا

وكل لـصاحبـه مبغـض يرى كلّ ما كان من ذاك دينا[3]

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.211-212

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p 8.

[3]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.56; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.432; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.160

“Damascus people dislike Iraq’s rulership and so do Iraqis, they call each other enemies and dismiss each other’s doings as bad.”

This was not an easy confrontation and it was clear from scratch that Iraqis and Damascus people will have hard days ahead.

‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, some time in the midst of ¯iff¢n war, wrote to Ibn ‘Abbis, “The situation has become very critical and know that, **إن الشام لا تملك الا بهلاك العراق، وأن العراق لا تملـك إلا بهلاك الشـام**.[1] “Damascus is only captured by destroying the Iraqis and so is Iraq by killing Damascus people.”

Shura¦b¢l Ibn Sim§ objected to Imim’s envoy saying that, “You have come to annex Damascus to Iraq?”[2]

In this time, other towns except Damascus and its suburbs swore allegiance to Imim [3] and Imim in K£fa designated rulers for different regions of Iraq and Iran.[4] Milik Ashatar was dispatched to Djaz¢ra (including M£¥il, Na¥¢bayn, Diri, Sindjir, ªmid, Hit and ‘ªnit). This region was specifically a key region because it was situated near Damascus and ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays was in power there on behalf of Mu‘iwiya. Djaz¢ra people held ‘Uthmin¢ religion[5] and those of “the ‘Uthminids” having fled from K£fa and Ba¥ra, had taken shelter in some parts of Djaz¢ra cominated by Mu‘iwiya.[6] ®a¦¦ik-controled regions included cities of Raqqa, Ruhi and Qirq¢siyi’. When Milik Ashtar went to Djaz¢ra, he prepared troops and attacked °arin. He had an intense fighting with ®a¦¦ik troops in this invasion. He could bring this region under his control.[7]

It goes to say that Imim (a) on his arrival in K£fa tried to brighten public minds about different matters and prepare them for supporting him in the subsequent developments. He talked to the great people and noblemen and asked their

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.411

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.403

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.212

[4]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.12-13

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.350

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.297

[7]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.350; Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.113; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.167

support for himself against Mu‘iwiya. Iraq was then dominated by the same noblemen. Headmen of tribes were more powerful than the ruler of the city and Imim (a) could not reorganize things without attracting their attention. At the same time, Imim’s procedure was not to make progress in the affairs without consultation of people. This for people with no political perception created more desire of cooperation. In response to Imim who said that he intended to write a letter to Mu‘iwiya calling to his obedience, people said, “Whatever you do, we obey you. We obey you just as we obeyed the Prophet.” [1] Imim also decided to reveal the fact to those rulers of the cities who were appointed by ‘Uthmin and had no certain problems. Included among them were Djar¢r Ibn ‘Abd Allih Badjal¢, ruler of Hamadin and Ash‘ath Ibn Qays, ruler of ªdharbiydjin.

According to D¢nwar¢, one of the reasons of anti-‘Uthmin rebellion was to give rulership of ªdharbiydjin to Ash‘ath. This happened after ‘Uthmin married Ash‘ath’s daughter to his son.[2] Ash‘ath decided to flee to Damascus and only the shame he had from the side of his friends and their opposition to this action he took caused him to stay there.[3] Noblemen of K£fa and other parts were given an audience by Imim and made excuses for justifying their no support of Imim in Djamal while strengthening their allegiance to him. Speaking about preparing to join Mu‘iwiya was something they were engaged in. for example, cooperation of A¦naf Ibn Qays on behalf of Imim led to coming of Ban£ Sa‘d and Ban£ Tam¢m tribes to K£fa from Ba¥ra and this largely affected consolidation of K£fa[4].

By sending a letter to Mu‘iwiya from K£fa, Imim attempted to convince him to obey Imim of Muslims. Imim in a letter told him that his caliphate was based on then criteria and he had to admit it. Imim wrote, “verily the allegiance people in Medina swore to me is mandatory for you in Damascus too. The same people who had sworn allegiance to Ab£ Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmin have done so to me similarly, so everybody present here has no way but to decide upon allegiance and everyone absent has no

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.352

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.156

[3]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.21; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.370-371

[4]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.27

alternative except abandoning it. Shuwri is the right of Muhidjir£n and An¥ir and when it is formed and the members agreed on leadership of a man called Imim, then this is the very consent of God[1]…if you are rebellious, I’ll fight you asking help of God. You’ve talked a lot about murderers of ‘Uthmin. First, go on the way Muslims cover and come with them to me for trial, so I oblige you and them to follow Book of God…and know that you’re released on parole and the liberated prisoners do not deserve caliphate and participating in Shuwri”.[2]

When Djar¢r Ibn ‘Abd Allih handed Imim’s letter to Mu‘iwiya in which he asked him to stop his seditious actions and join the community of Muslims, Mu‘iwiya asked people to assemble in the mosque.

While praising Damascus as “sacred territory”, he said, “I am your caliph on behalf of ‘Umar Ibn Kha§§ib and ‘Uthmin. I am guardian for blood of ‘Uthmin who has been oppressedly killed. What do you say about blood of ‘Uthmin?”

All people declared their support of his revenge for ‘Uthmin. This was Mu‘iwiya’s response to Imim (a). What was more interesting in Mu‘iwiya’s speech was that he said he had been appointed to rule Damascus on behalf of ‘Umar.[3]

‘Uthmin also said, “How should I depose Mu‘iwiya from Damascus while ‘Umar has appointed him?”

This was while he had demoted many of ‘Umar’s agents from different cities.[4] By deceiving Shura¦b¢l Sim§ Kind¢, one of Damascus noblemen and headman of Yemenis[5], Mu‘iwiya could draw support of many of Damascus people.[6] Mu‘iwiya

---

[1].‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Ghanm Azd¢ who was known as "Afqah ahl Shim"(Horizon of Damascus people) said to Shura¦b¢l in Damascus, “Even if ‘Al¢ has murdered ‘Uthmin, he would be caliph of Muslims since Mu¦idjir£n and An¥ir have sworn allegiance to him and they are "superior to people". Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.45

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.29; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.374-375; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.157

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.380

[4]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.32

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.411, he was proud not because of being from Damascus but because he was a Yemeni.

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.406-407; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.160

regularly sent people to him to give testimony that ‘Al¢ has murdered ‘Uthmin. Account of this deception shows stupidity of Shura¦b¢l and those who followed him and Mu‘iwiya.[1]

Mu‘iwiya told Djar¢r Ibn ‘Abd Allih, representative of Imim, “Write to ‘Al¢ to set Damascus and Egypt for me and when he passed away, he should not leave allegiance of anybody to me. In this case, I entrust everything to him and know him a caliph.” Djar¢r wrote this to Imim and Imim replied, “Mughr¢ra in Medina suggested this to me and I rejected. I do not do such a thing because, **لم يكن الله ليراني أتّخذ المضلين عضداً** “God never sees me in a position of taking advantage of the deviators as my arms.”[2]

In fact, Mu‘iwiya tended to capture Damascus unequivocally and even if Imim ‘Al¢ is caliph, the region should be in his control in the form of an independent emirate. When Mu‘iwiya made speech in Damascus, he said, “Why is ‘Al¢ in caliphate superior to me. If °idjiz people have sworn allegiance to him, Damascus people have done so to me. These two regions are equal in this regard.”

He also in a letter wrote to Imim, “As long as people of °idjiz observe the truth, they were more preferred than Damascus people. But now since they have abandoned the truth, the truth belongs to the Damascus people.”[3]

Replying him, Imim wrote, “As for what you said about “now people of Damascus are superior to people of °idjiz”, show me a man from Qurayish who can be approved in Shuwri or his caliphate can be legal. If you claim so, Muhidjir£n and An¥ir deny you … allegiance to me is generally sworn and nobody can oppose it and there will be no revision.” [4]

At this time, Mu‘iwiya was called emir rather than “Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n” in Damascus; nevertheless, there were people who applied this term to Mu‘iwiya. The first man to call Mu‘iwiya Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n was °adjdjadj Ibn Khuzayma

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.44-52; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.397-401; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.275-276 (footnote); Akhbir al-§iwil, p.159

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.52; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.392

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.429-430

[4]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.58; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.432

who in his first meeting with Mu‘iwiya said, “Your uncles descendants from Ban£ ‘Abd al-Mu§allib killed your Shiykh.” [1]

However, Djar¢r Ibn ‘Abd Allih Badjal¢ returned from Damascus to K£fa after four months.[2] Milik punished him hard and blamed him for selling his religion to Mu‘iwiya in Damascus. A short while later, Djar¢r left K£fa for Qirq¢sa while a large number of people from Badjala-excluding nineteen people–joined him. After Djar¢r along with Thuwayr Ibn ‘ªmir left for the place, Imim set ablaze their houses.[3]

This time, ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ lived in Palestine. He stood aside and went to Palestine after his opposition to ‘Uthmin that essentially emanated from ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Sar¦ who was put in his place in Egypt. From there, he provoked people and even serfs against ‘Uthmin.[4] He is said after murder of ‘Uthmin to have asked his children what he must do.

His son said, “Go to ‘Al¢.”

‘Amr said, “If I go to ‘Al¢ now, he’ll say, “You are like one of the Muslims enjoying equal rights as they do”, “but Mu‘iwiya considers me as his partner.”[5]

Mu‘iwiya felt that he could be of an important help to him. At the same time, Mu‘iwiya as in all cases, by touching ‘Amr’s weak point that is government of Egypt, asked his accompaniment. Mu‘iwiya, it is said, asked ‘Amr to rush to him after he received Imim’s letter through Djar¢r Ibn ‘Abd Allih.[6] It is also said that his son, ‘Abd Allih, bewared him of his action [7], but Mu¦ammad, his another son, induced him to

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.77

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.404

[3]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.61

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.283

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.284; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.157

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.382

[7]. In Sunnites sources ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, one of ¯a¦iba hadith-writers, is defended while ‘Abd Allih was present in ¯iff¢n arm in arm with his father. ‘Abd Allih commanded the left wing of Damascus troops. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.206. It goes to say that when his father asked him to hold the banner, he first rejected and said, “I’ll never fight anyone who has not been even one moment an atheist.” His father obligated him to hold the banner, he took it and said, “If the Prophet had not said, “Obey your father”, “I would have never done this!!” al-

do that. ‘Amr himself expressed his initial hesitation in a piece of poetry.[1]

However, ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ was more corrupt than to overlook government of Egypt. He was primarily one member of Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar’s band. He commanded the conquests and ‘Uthmin had set him aside because he used the help of his relatives in this regard. In essence, ‘Amr was one of the organs of Quraysh party who was at odds with the Hishimites. He quickly made his decision and joined hands with Mu‘iwiya after being assured that he could gain the world, that according to him was government of Egypt, by selling his religion. Talking to Mu‘iwiya, he composed,

معاوي لا اعطيك ديني ولم أنل بذلك دنيا فانظر كيف تصنع

فإن تعطني مصراً فأربح بصفقة أخذت بها شيخاً يضرّ وينفع[2]

“O Mu‘iwiya! I sell not my religion for you and I sought not a benefit from your world, now this is you and all this, so if you give rulership of Egypt to me, I am fully benefitted.”

It was a great success for Mu‘iwiya to see ‘Amr joining him. The first thing Mu‘iwiya consulted was about Roman troops. ‘Amr proposed a compromise and said that Romans would quickly accept it.[3] Mu‘iwiya put this into effect and Imim (a) mentioned it in one of his speeches.[4] ‘Ubayd Allih Ibn ‘Umar joining Mu‘iwiya in Damascus-that was because he feared Imim retaliating him for murder of Hurmuzin and two other people in Medina[5]-complemented Mu‘iwiya’s excuse in having son of caliph II in his hands and this was publicly and highly important to Mu‘iwiya who counted on this.[6]

Fut£¦, vol.II, p.35

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.35; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.285; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.185

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.39; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.288; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.186. ‘Amr lived only until 43 H. and was ruler of Egypt.

[3]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.37,44; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.386

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.441

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.294; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.161

[6]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.82-83; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.413

Mu‘iwiya began his propaganda for betraying people of Medina and Mecca as well as the renowned authorities in different cities. He wrote to Medinans that we have risen up in revenge for ‘Uthmin. If we become victorious, we will settle everything as Shuwri manipulated by ‘Umar and we are not after caliphate. Medinans were irritated by what Mu‘iwiya and ‘Amr said about caliphate and mentioned this important principle to them that “±ulaqi” (those released on parole) have no right to speak about caliphate.[1] Mu‘iwiya made an effort to deceive people like Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar, Mu¦ammad Ibn Maslama and Usima Ibn Zayd whom he heard had not sworn allegiance to Imim (a) or had been unwilling to obey him in his wars. He in these letters regularly talked about Shuwri. None of the people mentioned responded him favorably.

Sa‘d Waqqi¥ also wrote, “‘Umar let no body in Shuwri unless those who were rightful of the caliphate. Presently, there is some disagreement with ‘Al¢ on the fact that it would be good if ±al¦a and Zubayr stayed home.” [2]

We know that the bottom line of all Sa‘d’s speech was that he deserved caliphate because ‘Al¢ (a) has a problem and others are all dead. The only person remaining is Sa‘d Waqqi¥!

‘Al¢’s idea about “Qi‘id¢n” was that, **خذلوا الحـق ولـم ينصروا الباطل** “These people downgraded the gospel truth and assisted not the credal error.”[3]

Mu‘iwiya wrote to ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar, “He does not want caliphate for himself but he wants it for you. ‘Abd Allih rejected his suggestion.” [4]

This time, Imim (a) and Mu‘iwiya exchanged two detaile letters which contained important points.

Mu‘iwiya in his letter wrote to Imim that, “After the Prophet there were caliphs who came to power and you were envious of them and rebelled against them and we realized that rebellion in your wrathful look, your outcry, your sigh and in your delayed allegiance to caliphs, seeing that you

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.63; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.416-417

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, vol.75; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.187; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.421

[3]. Nahdj al-balighа, catchwords, No.18

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.418-419

were pulled like a male nose-ringed two-humped camel by force to reluctantly pay allegiance to them."

Further, Mu'iwiya spoke about Imim's enmity to 'Uthmin and the fact that he was killed in his house and he remained quiet.

Mu'iwiya also said that, "If 'Al¢ wanted to stop 'Uthmin's murder, he could do it, but he did not. Now if 'Al¢ tells he truth, he can leave 'Uthmin's murderers to me for allegiance."

In his response, 'Al¢ (a) by referring to the victory God bestowed on the Prophet (s) and that He suppressed his enemies, mentioned that, "The people who mostly insisted on provocation against him were his family." Imim further said that they, Ahl al-Bayt, was the first people who believed the Prophet (s) while his tribesmen were up to kill their Prophets, wanted to uproot them and leave them in their hearts with sorrow and did the intemperate things to them. He also added that, "We were banned from having good food and drinking fresh clean water and granted us dismay. We were placed spies and guards, were forced to climb up unevenly impassable mount and were waged war. They put down a treaty not to eat, drink, marry and trade with us and never join hands with us, leaving us unsafe unless we hand them the Prophet (s) to be killed." By mentioning what pains he had taken in the wars in time of the Prophet (s), Imim further said, "You spoke of my envy of caliphs of my belated allegiance to them and of my rebellion against them. As for rebellion, I invoke by God if that could be true. Concerning my delayed approval of them as well as being displeased with what they did, I never apologize anybody for this."

Imim (a) continued to say his reason for his rightfulness of caliphate. He also talked about his no implication in murdering of 'Uthmin, citing Ab£ Sufyin's idea about Saq¢fa event and that he asked Imim not to let Ab£ Bakr capture caliphate but to make him pay allegiance to him. "I refused, Imim added, to do so because people were almost close to days of infidelity and I strongly feared disunity among Muslims." [1]

---

[1]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, pp.86-91; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.277-282; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.15, p.73; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.474-475; Nahdj al-sa'ida, vol.4, p.185

This letter is a major proof of Imim’s attitude towards caliphs and his idea about his rightful caliphate. After this, he wrote letters to Mu‘iwiya and ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, trying to keep them away from the wrong way they were after.[1]

Imim (a) became determined to Djihid with Mu‘iwiya. He repetitively recited this to himself, **امـرت بقتـال النـاكثين والقاسطين والمارقين**[2] **“**Now, it is turn of the deviators, the apostates and the infidels to be launched a Djihid by Imim.”

Imim called his outstanding companions of Muhidjir£n and An¥ir, asking them to express their idea about going to Damascus. Hishim Ibn ‘Utba, nephew of Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ said that those people allegedly claim about revenge for ‘Uthmin. They seek after this world and they must be suppressed as soon as possible.

‘Ammir said that if they rushed one day earlier, it would be better. He composed,

سيروا إلى الأحزاب أعداء النبي سيروا فخير الناس أتباع علي[3]

“Move towards the parties and enemies of the Prophet because the best people are ‘Al¢’s followers.”

Qays Ibn Sa‘d said, “Making Djihid with them is more obligatory than the one with the Turks and Romans.

Sahl Ibn °unayf also declared An¥ir’s readiness for joining and obeying Imim (a). Among the people there, one person objected and said, “You want to dispatch us to kill our Damascus brethren as you took us, yesterday, to kill our Ba¥ran brothers!” People began to crack him down. The man ran away and the people after him leading to his murder in public turbulence in Bizir.[4]

Milik Ashtar said, “You shouldn’t be fretted with what this wretched traitor said. All people are your Shi‘ite Muslims.” [5]

K£fa environment was, at this time, so good that no one dared disagree or even express dissent. Among the people,

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.110-111; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.477-480

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.460

[3]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.101; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.460

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.293; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.362; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.164. Imim paid his blood money out of public property.

[5]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.92-96

one who raised such and idea was °an¨ala Ibn Rabi‘a. His tribesmen put him under so much pressure that he nightly fled and joined Mu‘iwiya though he seemed not to have taken part in the war.[1]

However, even people who were fairly decent more or less remained in doubt. Ab£ Zubayb Ibn ‘Awf asked Imim to officially testify that the way followed to cut off Wiliyat’s link to Damascus troops and replaced with enmity to them is a true one. Imim attested that. After Imim (a), ‘Ammir attested that and he became assured of his way, relying on the two testimonies.[2]

Some people from companions of ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mas‘£d – once in charge of K£fa’s Bayt al-Mil – came to Imim and said, “We come with you but our division base will be independent. This is because we want to see who is after the credal error and embarks on rebellion.”

Imim approved of their idea. One group of four hundred people led by Rabi‘a Ibn Khuthaym, expressing doubt about the war, asked Imim to send them to one of the borderlines. Imim sent them to Riy borderline and Bihila people who were displeased with Imim (a) and nor was Imim pleased with them were sent to Diylam frontier after he granted them their bounties.[3]

‘Abd Allih Ibn Bad¢l while in his speech confirming Imim’s position said to Imim, “Their opposition to you is because of your previous strikes against them.” He then said to people, “How should Mu‘iwiya pay allegiance to ‘Al¢ while his brother, °an¨ala, his uncle, Wal¢d and his grandfather, ‘Utba are all killed in one war?” [4]

°udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢ and ‘Amr Ibn °amiq marched and began to curse Damascus people. Imim summoned them and said that he did not like them to be known after curses. Instead, they could ask God to stop bloodshed and make peace.

‘Amr Ibn °amiq stressed over hid friendship with Imim and Imim prayed for him.[5] ‘Amr stood on his pledge until he

---

[1]. Ibid. pp.98-99; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.444

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.101

[3]. Ibid. p.115; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.165, he seems to be the same Khidjih Rabi‘ whose tombstone, in Mashhad is visited very much.

[4]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.102; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.447

[5]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.103; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.448, Akhbir al-§iwil, p.165

was martyred by Ibn Umm al-°akam, Mu‘iwiya’s ruler in Djaz ¢ra.

Imim in a public sermon called all people to Djihid after he was assured of the fact that Mu‘iwiya receives nothing but force and on the other hand, lords of K£fa defend him in war with Damascus.

After him, Imim °asan (a) began to speak, “God prepared for battling against your enemy, Mu‘iwiya and his troops because he is already in state of alert. Leave not your spirit of campaign that, if abandoned, casts off bonds of hearts and that careering of sword and spear assures assistance and prevention of defeat.”

After him, Imim °usayn (a) induced people, in a speech, to fight with Damascus people. [1]

Imim wrote to Ibn ‘Abbis to ask for Ba¥rans’ help. Many Ba¥rans, after being called by Imim, joined Ibn ‘Abbis to K£fa. Ibn ‘Abbis put Abu l-Aswad Du’al¢ in his place in Ba¥ra. He wrote to Mikhnaf Ibn Silim to put somebody in his place in I¥fahin and join Imim and he did so.

At this time, Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr was ruler of Egypt on behalf of Imim. Writing a detailed letter to Mu‘iwiya, he blamed Mu‘iwiya for countering with Imim.

Mu¦ammad wrote as to Imim ‘Al¢’s background,

“Now I see that you talk about being his counterpart while you’re you and he’s he who beats all with his unique record of all alms and virtues. He is from the people of the first man who has embraced Islam, more reliable in faith, more purified in family, having an honorable wife who stands higher than all people and he is of the best people to his cousin. Whilst you are damned of the cursed son. You and your father flamed seditions against religion of God and attempted to put out glow of Islam. You organized factions and parties, collected properties and for so doing, you held familiar company with anti-Islam tribes. Your father died after this way and you substituted him and the evidence is that the remaining groups, opposition parties, hypocrite leaders who have taken refuge in you are against the Prophet (s) and you have supported them. And the evidence for ‘Al¢, in addition to his public superiority and his Islamic initiative, is his companions of Muhidjir£n and An¥ir whose

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.114-115

virtues are cited in Qur'in and left in memories and God praised them .... Woe unto you! How do you parallel yourself to 'Al¢ whereas he is legatee of the Prophet (s) and his descendants and is the first man who obeyed him and stood up to his promise until his last days of life. The Messenger (s) kept him his confidant and his partner."

Replying him, Mu'iwiya wrote,

"To one who reproaches his father. Your letter is received ... You charged your father intemperately ... We and your father were together in the lifetime of the Prophet. We know that we have to respect the right of son of Ab£ ±ilib and his supremacy over us is apparent, ... After the Prophet in that time, your father and his discriminator were the first people who disentitled 'Al¢ of his right and opposed him and they both unanimously allied with each other in this regard ... They never let him in their works and never revealed their secrets to him as long as they passed away... Therefore, if what we are up to is true, your father initiated it and if it is cruelty, your father again founded it. We are his partners and we followed his guidelines. In case your father had not covered this way before us, we would have never opposed son of Ab£ ±ilib and would have surrendered ourselves. But we observed what your father did and we too followed his foot-prints and modeled his manner." [1]

K£fa poised for battle with Damascus. Imim ordered the warriors in Nukhayla, a military camp in K£fa, to come together. Decorating pulpit of K£fa with the bloody garment of 'Uthmin, while seventy thousand Shiykhs weeping around it, Mu'iwiya was made to prepare Damascus people for battling Iraqi troops.[2] Imim's uprising from Nukhayla happened on 5th of Shawwil, 36 H.[3] The first dispute raised in Imim's troops was conflict over headmanship of Yemen¢ tribes. Imim (a) deposed Ash'ath and posed °assin Ibn Makhd£dj. This spurred conflict between Kinda and Rabi'a. Upon hearing about this conflict, Mu'iwiya compelled one of Kinda poets to stimulate Ash'ath against Imim but he obtained no luck in that time and this was finished by

---

[1]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, pp.118-121; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.393-397 and in the footnote of Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.III, p.188; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.10; Sam§ al-Nudj£m al-'Awil¢, vol.II, p.465

[2]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, p.127

[3]. Ibid. p.131

placing him over the left wing of Iraqi troops.[1] Unfortunately, the enfeebled, spoiled and opportunist spirit of Ash‘ath caused him to stand against Imim. It has been said that he had been writing letters to Mu‘iwiya ever since Imim called him to ªdharbiydjin and ordered to have his properties appraised.[2] Ya‘q£b¢ has mentioned his relationship with Mu‘iwiya when Qur’ins were raised up.[3]

Imim (a) en route arrived in Ctesiphon and asked the citizens to join his troops. Behind Imim, eight hundred people along with Qays Ibn Sa‘d and a short while later about four hundred people along with his son, Yaz¢d, joined Imim’s troops. Imim on the way turned down all gifts of Iranian headmen and bewared them of welcoming emirs in such a way.[4] Upon request of his companions, Imim wrote another letter to Mu‘iwiya and called him to Book of God, tradition of the Prophet (s) and prevention of bloodshed but Mu‘iwiya poetically responded him that there rules sword between them.[5] On the way, Imim (a) demanded Raqqa ‘Uthmin¢ – religion people[6] who were supporters of Mu‘iwiya to install a bridge over the river for the troops to pass. Citizens refused to do so and they finally did it under the threat of Milik. Imim kept three thousand people with Milik until all the forces pass through. In the end, Milik was the last one who crossed the bridge.[7] On passing through Iraq, when Imim reached Karbali, he reported about the horrendous event that would happen to Ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet (s) in this land.[8]

In northern Iraq and Syria, front troops at Roman border, by passing through H¢t, Qirq¢siyi’ and Raqqa faced front forces of Damascus led by Abu l-A‘war Sulam¢.

Imim sent Milik forward to counter with them reaffirming to him that he, at any rate, should not initiate the war. Upon his arrival, Damascus troops launched fighting and the two

---

1. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, pp.105-107
2. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.296-297
3. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, pp.188-189
4. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, vol.II, p.144; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.468
5. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.150-151; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.297
6. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.187
7. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.298; al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.487-488
8. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.462-466; Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.140-142

sides were engaged in combat for some time. Afterwards, Damascus troops pulled back.

Concerning the time of ¯iff¢n war, there appear contradictory historical reports.

It seems that there exist two quotations. Bali<u>dh</u>ur¢ has cited Imim's arrival in ¯iff¢n to be on <u>Dh</u>i l-°a<u>dj</u>dja (36).[1] He reports the war from <u>Dh</u>i l-°a<u>dj</u>dja (in the year of 36), referring to fightings in this month and after in ¯afar when major war took place.[2] Ya'q£b¢ says water dilemma goes to <u>Dh</u>i l-°a<u>dj</u>dja, 36 H. and that war in the year of 37 H. lasted forty days. However, he says arbitration goes to Rama¤in, 38 H.[3] he means that the arbitration happened in ¯afar, 37 H. about one and a half year after ¯iff¢n war! Based on this report, a treaty was put down in ¯afar and as prescribed it will be brought to an end by Rama¤in.

Ibn A<u>th</u>¢r began events of ¯iff¢n from <u>Dh</u>i l-°a<u>dj</u>dja, 36 H. and ended in ¯afar, 37 H., referring to arbitration within events of the same year.[4]

According to <u>Kh</u>il¢fa Ibn <u>Kh</u>ayyi§, ¯iff¢n war intensely lasted from 7th to 10th of ¯afar, 37 H.[5] It seems war exceeded those days.

According to another report by Na¥r Ibn Muzi¦im, the first date specified is that when Imim (a) reached ¯iff¢n, he had correspondences with Damascus troops in the region of ¯iff ¢n during months of Rabi'a al-ª<u>kh</u>ir to <u>Dj</u>amid¢ al-<u>Th</u>in¢.[6] Following this, Ibn Muzi¦im mentions events of Ra<u>dj</u>ab. This condition continued up to <u>Dh</u>i l-°a<u>dj</u>dja during which forces from the two sides fought with each other. After that in Mu¦arram, hostilities came to a cessation and the main war was waged in ¯afar.[7] Naturally, months of Rabi' al-Awwal and the two months of <u>Dj</u>amid¢ can not be said to relate to the year of 36H. because Imim had arrived in K£fa in Ra<u>dj</u>ab of that year. As Na¥r said, ¯iff¢n war was launched from the

---

1. Ansib al-a<u>shr</u>if, vol.II, p.299
2. Ansib al-a<u>shr</u>if, vol.II, p.303
3. Tar¢<u>kh</u> al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, pp.188,190
4. al-Kimil f¢ l-tir¢<u>kh</u>, vol.III, pp.293,321
5. Tir¢<u>kh</u> <u>kh</u>al¢fat Ibn <u>kh</u>ayyi§, p.191
6. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, p.190
7. Ibid. p.196

second month of the year 37, lasting up to ¯afar of next year. In this way, Ibn Muzi¦im’s mention of dates exceed one year beyond those of Balidhur¢’s and some other historians. D¢nwar¢’s dates are exactly what Na¥r mentioned.[1] This is while D¢nwar¢ has set date of arbitration in ¯afar of the year 37[2] despite his reference to Rabi‘a al-Awwal and the two Djamid¢s and it can not be true according to his previous settings. As his book’s proofreader said, Mu¦arram of the year 37 H. is the month when war stopped.[3] It is to be said that Ibn A‘tham regards arrival of Imim’s troops to be in Mu¦arram of the year 38 H.[4] that seems untrue.

If this statement that Khiridjites selected ‘Abd Allih Ibn Wahb their leader in Zayd Ibn °u¥ayn’s house in the late Shawwil, 37 H. and that Imim ‘Al¢’s war with them happened in ¯afar of the year 38 H. is true[5], it is inevitably to be accepted that what Na¥r Ibn Muzi¦im said is not true. Overally, it is to be said that the majority agree on major fighting happening in ¯afar of the year 37 H.

The region of fighting was in ¯iff¢n after which the war was known. ¯iff¢n is a cramped village of Roman villages that stands at a rifle – shut of the Euphrates. Alongside the Euphrates, there rest trees around which water surround and in the wilderness of two Farsangs (leagues) and there was no passing way except the Euphrates that is restricted and paved. [6]

When Iraqi troops approached Damascus troops, they noticed that they had stationed in the region having the paved route, passing through swamp, under their control. They had positioned bowmen and horsemen to prevent Iraqis from frequenting to the coast of the Euphrates.

Number of Damascus troops is said to be amounting to one hundred twenty thousand people.[7] Imim’s troops moving out of K£fa also numbered eighty thousand people who were

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, pp.169-172

[2]. Ibid. p.196

[3]. Ibid. p.171

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.495

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.362

[6]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.168

[7]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.439

added by many of Ctesiphon people on the way.[1] Imim (a) sent ¯a‘¥a‘a to Mu‘iwiya to tell him that his troops launched the war whereas Imim was up to talk to him again make an ultimatum.

“Now, ¯a‘¥a‘a said, you have barred us from water and Iraqi troops can not remain silent, with all this, Imim doesn’t want to launch the war.”

Mu‘iwiya rejected what ¯a‘¥a‘a said. ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ opposed Mu‘iwiya’s decision. He spoke about ‘Al¢’s valor and also said that, “You – that is Mu‘iwiya – and I have heard ‘Al¢ when Fi§ima’s house was inspected saying if he had forty men … [2].”

But Mu‘iwiya could not admit that and fighting began. The story of banning the water, on one hand linked to that of the water not reaching ‘Uthmin[3] and on the other hand it was associated with the event of Karbali.

Iraqi troops dominated the water through fighting with the courage of Milik[4] and Imim ordered the troops not to ban Damascus forces from using water. By breaking out a news (through a spear on which there was a letter sent to Imim’s troops but the sender was anonymous, perhaps it was from a friend!) that Imim controlled region will be enundated, Mu‘iwiya displaced Iraqi troops. Imim who opposed the displacement of troops yielded to Iraqi’s decision and Iraqi troops could only control the water after re-fighting. What Ibn A‘tham said about these events slightly differ from Na¥r’s report.[5] In all these events, Milik played a pirotal role and strongly treated the Damascus troops.[6] Large numbers of forces had been killed in the fighting about which Na¥r has given an account in the form of boastful speeches and wars. A number of Qur’in reciters from Iraq and Damascus mediated between the two armies, trying to resolve the dispute through talks. These mediatory attempts continued for a long time.

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, pp.166-167

[2].Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.163

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.298; al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.2

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.13

[5]. Ibid. vol.III, p.15

[6]. Na¥r Ibn Muzi¦im says, وكان اكثر القوم حروباً الاشتر
Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.195

As referred, with Dhi l-°adjdja coming to an end, Mu¦arram came and war was supposed to come to a cessation.[1] Negotiations of Imim’s envoys with Mu‘iwiya came to a deadlock. Murdering of people such as ‘Ammir, ‘Ad¢ Ibn °itim, Milik and those who, according to him, had a hand in murder of ‘Uthmin, was set by him as his condition. This was something unacceptable both by Imim and by Iraqi tribes. Imim (a) once in front of Ab£ Muslim Khawlin¢ asked murderers of ‘Uthmin to be prepared. In that time, mosque became filled with crowds saying that they are murderers of ‘Uthmin.[2] In ¯iff¢n, the same thing happened and about twenty thousand people of Iraqi troops stood away and said that they were ‘Uthmin’s killers.[3] Mu‘iwiya’s insistence on this condition was because he knew they would never accept that. He attempted to deceive those who had come as representatives and had been apt to be deceived. He said to Ziyid Ibn °af¥a, “I want you to join us with your family and I make a pledge, after victory, to dispose you with each one of the two cities you want.”

Ziyid said, “I have an axiom from my God for what He betowed me and I want not to be patron of wrongdoers.” [4]

With the elapse of Mu¦arram, month of illegals came to an end and ¯iff¢n war was launched between Milik and °ab¢b Ibn Muslim in the first day of ¯afar, that as said, had been Wednesday! [5] In the night of war being launched, Imim advised all his forces, **لا تقاتلوا القوم حتى يبدءوكم** [6] **“**Avoid fighting these people until they launch the fighting.”

Imim (a) here intended to leave a chance for return of Damascus troops to truth. Imim advised his troops this way, “If they did not initiate war, you don’t fight them because you have full proof as to praise of God and as you leave them to launch the war, this is another proof for you and against them. If you fought and defeated the enemy, do not kill any fugitive and wounded, keep the pudenda veiled and do not mutilate any killed. In case you rushed into enemy

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.196

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.163

[3]. Ibid. p.170

[4]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.199

[5]. Ibid. p.214; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.303

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, pp.44-45

camp, disgrace not anybody and enter not any house unless under my order. Take not away any of their property save what exists in the division camp. No woman has to be harmed although your honor is abused and your commanders and good relatives are charged with abuse because those women are weak in respect of soul and wisdom. We had the duty (in time of the Prophet «s») not to harm them when they were pagan."[1]

However, war began on ¯afar 1st [2], and the two sides intensely fought with each other. It seemed that each day one of Imim's commanders led the frontline. Milik on first day, Hishim Ibn 'Utba on second day, 'Ammir Yisir on third day, Mu¦ammad °anafiyya on fourth day and 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Abbis on fifth day commanded the frontline.[3] War escalated in the next Thursday and the left wing of Iraqi army split apart but it was compensated with bravery of Imim himself.[4] Imim himself was present among the troops and regularly called them to resistance by praying and preaching.[5] Na¥r Ibn Muzi¦im carefully formulated most of his invocations and speeches and portrayed two-peopled war scenes as far as possible.

Qays Ibn Sa'd, each day, spoke for An¥ir and incited them against Damascus people[6], emphasizing that companions of the Messenger (s) are with them. Seventy people, he said, of those in Badr stay with us and our commander is cousin of the Prophet (s), "a trustworthy person of Badr."[7]

Ya'q£b¢ has put that seventy people of Badr¢s, seven hundred people of Ri¤win allegiance – prayers as well as four hundred people of Muhidjir and An¥ir stayed with Imim

---

[1]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, pp.203-204

[2]. Despite mention of the date in several sources, 12th of ¯afar is regarded by Balidhur¢ (Ansib, vol.II, p.323) to be on Friday that is inconsistent with this date. But regarding the report by Na¥r about the citation of arbitration agreement of Wednesday 17th of ¯afar, Balidhur¢'s reference to Friday 12th of ¯afar is approved.

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.303-305

[4]. Ibid. vol.II, pp.305-306

[5]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, pp.230-232

[6]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, p.447

[7]. Ibid. p.236; Ashtar in his speech said that roughly one hundred people from Badr stay with us. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, p.238

‘Al¢ (a). From An¥ir, there stayed nobody with Mu‘iwiya except Nu‘min Ibn Bash¢r and Maslama Ibn Mukhallad.[1] Just as Imim once brought An¥ir together, moving towards Damascus troops, so Mu‘iwiya readied those two people and moved ahead.[2]

‘Ammir Yisir was among the people who directly talked against Mu‘iwiya.

In response to some one who asked him how he would fight these Muslims while the Prophet (s) said, “I have a duty to fight as long as they declare monotheism, then their life and property is secure.” ‘Ammir said, “This is true, but these people have not embraced Islam. They inwardly rendered blasphemy until they found helpers today.”[3] In another speech in ¯iff¢n, he rightly stressed over the point that these people deceitfully posed blood of ‘Uthmin, yet their aim is, **ليكونوا بذ لك جبابرة وملوكاً** [4] **“**He may become a tyrant by doing this.”

In ¯iff¢n, ‘Ammir seemed to many a sign of distinguishing gospel truth from credal error. The Prophet (s) said about him, **تقتلــك الفئة الباغيــة** [5] **“**You will be killed by an aggressive group.”

This successive narration led some people to see in what front ‘Ammir stands and is martyred.

‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ himself had narrated this hadith. Mu‘iwiya objected why he had narrated that. ‘Amr composed a piece of poetry saying, “I didn’t know this would happen in ¯iff¢n.”[6]

This made a problem for Damascus troops as ‘Amr was supposed to arrange a face-to-face debate with ‘Ammir at the presence of a number of people from the two sides. ‘Ammir said to ‘Amr who, in the very beginning, made a profession of faith (Tashahhud), “You had abandoned this from time of the Prophet (s) and on.”

---

1. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.188

2. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, pp.180-181

3. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.215

4. Ibid. p.319

5. Concerning the sources, Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.312-313 (footnote) in the following pages ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ is quoted to have said the afore-mentioned hadith.

6. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.131

‘Amr who in deceit was saying, “What are we fighting for?”

Was told by ‘Ammir, “You are the most obeyed among the troops. Do something to stop bloodshed.”

He said, “Now I tell why I am fighting you.The Prophet (s) ordered me to fight with the infidels as well as with the deviators who are the very you, as for the apostates “Khiridjites” …. I wonder if I have to consider them or not.O You who are devoid of good qualities! Do you know not that the Messenger (s) said for ‘Al¢ (a), **من كنت مولاه فهذا عليّ مولاه ، اللّهم وال من والاه وعاد من عاداه** “I love God, his Messenger (s) and after him ‘Al¢.” ‘Ammir continued to talk about ‘Uthmin, “He opened to you gates of evils.” ‘Amr asked, “Did ‘Al¢ kill him?” ‘Ammir said, “No, but God of ‘Al¢ killed him.” He said, “Were you among the murderers?” ‘Ammir replied, “I helped those who killed him and this day I fight with enemy helping them.”[1] ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ said to accompanying Damascus troops, “He confesses to murder of ‘Uthmin.” ‘Ammir was martyred in one of the days of intense fighting. Several people of Damascus troops claimed responsibility for his murder.[2] It is also said that some Damascus people said prayers over his stiff ![3]

To Mu‘iwiya, murder of ‘Ammir Yisir was “conquering the conquests.”[4]

‘Ammir composed about war with Damascus troops in a poetic line, religious justification of which is said to be interesting,

نحن ضربناكم على تنـزيله فاليوم نضربكم على تأويله[5]

“Earlier, We beat thee for his descension and now we beat thee for his interpretation.”

It meant although Damascus people have embraced Qur’in and Islam, they really never confessed to it. Muslims also made use of sense of “rebellion”.

Mugh¢ra Ibn °irith Ibn ‘Abd al-Mu§§alib said in a poem,

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.239; al-Fut£¦, vol.III, pp.124-125

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.311-313

[3]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.5, p.236

[4]. al-Mu¦abbar, p.296

[5]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.340; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.310

أهل الصلاة قتلناهم ببغيهم والمشركون قتلناهم بما جحدوا [1]

“Prayer-holders are killed for their rebellion and the atheists are murdered for their denial.”

In the midst of fighting, Imim handed a Qur’in to one of his troops to go to Damascus troops and call them to Qur’inic arbitration, but they killed him.[2] Imim’s troops superiority was utterly apparent. Once, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Bad¢l neared Mu‘iwiya’s settlement and made him retreat. Another time, ‘Utba Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin suffered so much a defeat that he took aback as far as twenty leagues.[3]

Of course, in some cases, left or right wing of Iraqi army temporarily disintegrated. Reports say that Imim himself fought and killed different people, one of whom was °urayth, Mu‘iwiya’s Mawil¢ and a very strong man. He himself defied Imim and in the very beginning was sworded killed by Imim.[4] ‘Urwa Dimashq¢ asked Imim for a challenge and was split in halves by Imim.[5] Another report says that Imim had trace of three strikes on his head and two on his face.

Na¥r Ibn Muzi¦im reporting this says that Imim (a) was never wounded.[6] Imim asked Mu‘iwiya for a combat. Whoever wins the battle, he shall assume power. Mu‘iwiya turned down his request.[7] Imim once faced ‘Amr but he could run away the battle by unveiling his genitals because Imim was very ashamed of what he did.[8] The same thing happened to Busr Ibn Ar§it.[9]

Fighting was so intense that these days only in one battle over five hundred people (Ibn A‘tham, One thousand)

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.271

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.244

[3]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.360

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.41; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.176

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.187

[6]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.363

[7]. Ibid. p.274; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.176

[8]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.407; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.330; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.177

[9]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, pp.173-174

confronted with the same number of Damascus troops and none survived the battle![1]

¯iff¢n war was tribally formed. Many tribes half of whom in Iraq and another half in Damascus stood against each other. Rabi‘a[2] and Hamdin tribes, headman of the latter of which was Sa‘¢d Ibn Qays sacrificed in the most part in as much as Imim said in a piece of poetry,

فلوكنت بوّاباً على باب جنة لقلت لهمدان ادخلوا بسلام [3]

“If I were gate keeper of Heaven, I would tell Ban£ Hamdin people to enter there in goodness.”

Imim said about Rabi‘a as well, **وكان علي (ع) لا يعدل برىيعة أحداً من شدة محبته لهـم “‘**Al¢ never equaled Ban£ Rabi‘a to anyone for his love extended to them.”[4]

Mu‘iwiya advised Damascus troops to aim at no people but Hamdin¢s since they stand as ‘Uthmin’s adversary.[5] The truth is that Mu‘iwiya feared them and he was at weakening them. ‘Ubayd Allih Ibn ‘Umar, one of Damascus troops commanders, was murdered by one of Hamdin¢s in one of these battles. Dhi l-Kili‘, one of the greatest commanders of Damascus troops, was killed in ¯iff¢n. He is said to have heard through ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, in time of ‘Umar, (seemingly through a person named Ab£ N£¦ who quoted this to him from ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ in ¯iff¢n)[6] the Prophet (s) saying that ‘Ammir is killed by an aggressive tribe, so he used to fight while being in doubt. Mu‘iwiya liked very much to kill him fearing that he might be a trouble for Damascus troops. In contrast, a good many of marked troops of Imim (a) were also martyred. One of ¯iff¢n martyrs, Uwiys Qaran¢[7], is the noted Gnostic who was and, still is, highly ranked among Muslims. Ibn A‘tham while reporting his martyrdom in ¯iff¢n

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.293; al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.55

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.325; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.186

[3]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.437; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.322; al-Fut£¦, vol.III, pp. 43 – 44

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.163

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.163

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, pp.119-120

[7]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.324; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.320. Balidhur¢ hesitates to report about martyrdom of Uwiys. The proof reader mentions on pages 320-322 various sources in which this undeniable report is referred.

made an account of him.[1] Hishim Ibn ‘Utba, known as Hishim al-Mirqil, who had lost one eye in conquests, was the most devoted companions of Imim being martyred in ¯iff¢n. He was Sa‘d Waqqi¥’s nephew and unlike his position of being among Qi‘id¢n stayed with Imim with complete assurance until he was martyred.[2]

Khuzayma, another companion of Imim, was also martyred in ¯iff¢n and Imim approved his one testimony as two, for which he was known after “Dh£ al-Shahidatayn” meaning two witnesses.

After their martyrdom, there were still seen famous people in troops, like Ashtar (who was nicknamed by Mu‘iwiya as lion of army)[3], ‘Ad¢ Ibn °itim and Qays Ibn Sa‘d.

It is to be noted that a number of K£fiyin women also attended ¯iff¢n war, exhorting Iraqi forces against those of Damascus by making poems in which Imim was praised and his virtues were retold. Among them, there were S£da, daughter of ‘Umira Hamdin¢, Umm Sanin[4], Zarqi’, daughter of ‘Ad¢ Hamdin¢[5] and others whose biographies are mentioned in various sources.

Umm Sanin addressed ‘Al¢ in ¯iff¢n and said,

قد كنت بعد محمد خلفاً لنا أوصى اليك بنا وكنت وفيّا [6]

“After Mu¦ammad(s), he was his successor among us and he kept his promise well in front of us.”

One of these women named Umm al-Khayr said in ¯iff¢n, **إنها إحن بدريّة وضغائن جاهلية وأحقاد احديّة، وثب معاوية عند الغفلة ليدرك بها الفرصة من ثارات عبد شمس** [7] **“**Mu‘iwiya’s waging war comes from his vengeance in Badr, U¦ud and from his ignorant bigotry and it is because he wants to take revenge for ‘Abd-e Shams.”

Another woman was Djurwa, daughter of Murra Ibn Ghilib Tam¢m¢ who was later brought by Mu‘iwiya to Damascus.

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, pp.451-460

[2]. He is reported in detail in Waq‘at ¯iff¢n including, pp.346-356

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.67

[4]. Ibid. vol.II, p.101

[5]. Ibid. vol.III, p.142

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.103

[7] al-Wifidit min l-nisi’ ‘ali Mu‘iw¢ya, p.29

When she was asked by Mu‘iwiya about Imim ‘Al¢ (a), she said, **حاز والله الشرف حتى لا يوصف ، وغاية حتى لا تعرف**[1], “By God, he attained an indescribable nobility and reached a station beyond imagination.”

Mu‘iwiya tried to break apart Iraqi army in ways except war. Writing different letters to Ab£ Ayy£b An¥ir¢, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis and others under the pretext of stopping bloodshed and even of promising caliphate to Ibn ‘Abbis[2], he attempted to force them to oppose Imim (a). Besides, he changed the condition by frequently granting money to his troops, **لم يبق من أهل العراق أحد فى قلبه مرض إلاّ طمع فى معاوية** “There remained no one but the problematic Iraqis who joined Mu‘iwiya in his caprice and this was such that Imim was bothered.”[3]

Mu‘iwiya also wrote to Imim asking him to leave Damascus to him without wanting to obey him. This was the same thing he had demanded before and as mentioned, he intended to establish an independent emirate in Damascus. Imim turned him down.[4] This time, Damascus people strongly spoke about severe bloodshed and publicized their aim of ending the war. Such a measure was taken just to hinder Damascus conquest, and probably to bring about a gap and discard in Iraq’s army. This was what Mu‘iwiya failed to do repeatedly; yet as we shall wee later, he finally made it. In one of these days, one of the Damascus people came between the two armies and proposed that Iraq any return to Iraq and Damascus army to Damascus, so to avert a bloodshed.

Confirming his truthfulness, Imim said, “I know that you made this proposal out of benevolence and pity; however, I have considered well, contemplated carefully and assessed the dimensions of this deed haunting me, and I have found no way but submitting to was, or refuting what Allih has inspired the Prophet(s). Indeed, Allih, the blessed and exalted, doesn’t like His friends to remain reticent and submit while tyranny and mutiny are prevailing on the earth, and not to enjoin the good and forbid from the evil. That’s

---

[1] Ibid. p.36

[2] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.307

[3] Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.435; al-Fut£¦, vol.III, pp.221-222

[4] Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.470-471

why I realized that to me, the war (with all its hardship) is easier than enduring the hell with its chains.”[1]

In one of the last war days, the battle became so intense that it started by the morning prayer and continued up to the mid-night. During all this period, Ashtar was busy provoking the army. This night was called “Layli al-°ar¢r”, the night of clamor. Again the war started from the middle of that night and continued up to the noon of the next day.

“The enemy fought to its last grasp”, said Imim, in a sermon.

Mu‘iwiya and ‘Amr thinking that everything was finished and feeling that they cannot be so hopeful of Damascus army, embarked on a trick. The next day after the night of clamor, when the war lasted to the moon of that day,[2] 500 Qur’ins were raised above the spears of the Damascus people.

There were loud voices crying, “O group of Arabs! Think of your women and girls. If you’ll be killed, who will stand up to Romans, Turks and Persians tomorrow?” [3]

As a result of this measure, little by little, this proclamation was heard within the Iraqi army that the enemy has admitted the arbitration of Qur’in, and we don’t have the right to fight them. Imim defined this remarks strongly and announced that this deed is nothing but a trick. ¯a‘¥a‘a said that Mu‘iwiya took this measure after he heard Ash‘ath Ibn Qays reminding of the women and girls at the night of clamor, and that Arabs are collapsing.[4] Besides, Ash‘ath was the first person opposing Imim on the continuation of the war. We’ve previously pointed out that the account of his correspondence with Mu‘iwiya, since his dismissal from Adharbiydjin has been mentioned in historical records. Here, Ya‘q£b¢ as well clarified that Mu‘iwiya conciliating Ash‘ath wrote to him and invited him there.[5] Ash‘ath’s measure was supported by the Yemen¢.[6]

---

[1]. Ibid, p. 474; al-Fut£¦, vol.III, pp.264-65

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.323

[3]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.478

[4]. Ibid, p.481

[5]. Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, pp.188-89

[6]. Ibid, vol.II, p.189

The minimum problem concerning Ash‘ath was that he was apt to deviation from the outset, and was drawn to this path. In the thick of the clashes, we have in hand some of his remarks against Mu‘iwiya and with respect to instigating Iraq army.[1] It ought to be known that tribal obstinacy played a crucial role and in all likelihood, Imim’s true heed to Milik caused Ash‘ath to take umbrage.

The escalation of the discrepancy amongst the army of Imim, has induced much more hardships for him. Imim felt that he is no more the commander, and the people have tied his hands, and turned out to be his emir.

Even so, Imim stood up and said, “I deserve to admit the arbitration of Allih’s book more than the others; however, Mu‘iwiya and his companions are not the companions of religion and Qur’in. I know them better than you. I was with them since my childhood.”

At this moment, about 20000 of the Iraq army came to Imim, and without calling him “Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n”, asked him to accept the arbitration of Qur’in. Among these people were a group of Qur’in-reciters being contented with Qur’in recitation, and a number of whom joining the Khiridjites’s range.[2] At this time, Ashtar at the front line approached Mu‘iwiya division camp while fighting. War dissenters asked Imim to order Ashtar back. Imim sent Yaz¢d Ibn Hin¢ for him.

Ashtar sent a message that, “Now it is not the time for a return.”

“You’ve prompted him to fight, if Ashtar doesn’t return, we’ll kill you.” Said the dissenters.

As a result of this statement, Ashtar returned and he was stopped. In a letter to Mu‘iwiya, Imim noting that we know you’re not the follower of Qur’in, pointed out the acceptance of Qur’in arbitration.[3] Ash‘ath went to Mu‘iwiya asking him regarding the way of executing Qur’in precept. He said that it’s better that one of our people and one of yours sit together and express their opinion concerning Qur’in precept in this regard. He forwarded this opinion to Imim. Afterwards, a group of Damascus and Iraq Qur’in-reciters

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.II, p.74

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n

[3]. Ibid, pp.490-494

came between the two armies and recited Qur’in for some time and agreed to revive what the Qur’in has revived. Thereafter, Damascus people appointed ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥. Ash‘ath and a number of those joining the Khiridjites later, proposed Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢. Imim refused him on account of his opposition to him in Djamal battle, but they insisted in this regard. Imim’s proposal was either Ibn ‘Abbis or Ashtar, but they said that Ashtar believes in war, Ibn ‘Abbis shouldn’t be either, for ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ is from Mudhar tribe, so the other side should be Yemen¢. **لا والله لايحكم فيها مضريان حتى تقوم الساعة**[1] “By Allih, two persons from Mu¤rids won’t judge in that until the Day of Resurrection.”

Imim saw that insistence is out of place and said, “Do whatever you want.”[2]

Later on Ibn ‘Abbis said, “Had at that time some companions been patient, the victory would have been imminent.”[3]

So it was agreed that a convention will be written. In this convention pointing to the appointment of these two persons by Damascus and Iraq people, it was mentioned that these two persons are due to comment on the matter of their disagreement, “Provided that these two abide by the divine covenant and pledge in the firmest and greatest manner which Allih has extracted promise from each of his creatures. And that during the duty on which they were dispatched, they put Qur’in before themselves, and do not exceed, I their judgment, what has been written in the Qur’in, and if they don’t find, they will act on the basis of the comprehensive Sunna of the Prophet (s), and they should in no way, act in conformity with their desires, neither should they be entangled in suspicion.” Besides, it was agreed that in case of the death of one of these two, before judgment, the commander of the aforesaid side would be able to appoint somebody else. During this span of time, if one of the two commanders passed away, the people of that area will appoint another just person instead of him. Further, it was stated that, “it is compulsory for the judges to adhere to the divine treaty and pledge and not to offer an

[1]. Regrettably Mu¤r¢ and Yemen¢ competition induced problem at ¯iff ¢n battle.

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.499-500

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.331

interpretative judgment of their own in opposition to the Qur'inic text, and not to oppress deliberately and not to be entangled in suspicion and not to overlook the order of Qur'in and Sunna of the Prophet(s) in their judgment. And if they don't do so, the people won't submit to their judgment, neither will they admit the treaty and the liability approved by those two." In the convention, the date of the arbitration was sset on the end of the next Rama¤in (to wit eight months from ¯afar to Rama¤in) and it was agreed that the issue will be resolves anyhow up to the pilgrimage season. "If they don't judge on the basis of the Qur'in and Prophet's (s) Sunna till the end of the season, the Muslims will remain at war as they were from the onset, and there is no condition between the two groups in this regard." The aforesaid treaty was concluded on Wednesday (according th Ab£ Mikhnaf, on Friday)[1], on ¯afar 17, 37 A.H.[2]

In this convention, equal rights were been determined for Imim and Mu'iwiya. In the first stage, Imim's name was accompanied by the title "Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n", the Commander of the Faithful, but it was not acceptable for Mu'iwiya.

Ash'ath insisted on the elimination of this title, Imim said, "Glory be to Allih, A Sunna like The Prophet's (s) one, where Suhayl Ibn 'Amr, the representative of polytheists, insisted on the ommition of "Ras£l Allih", the Messenger of Allih, in °udaybiyyah peace pact."[3]

Anyhow, the convention was written, but among a group of Imim's companion, a riot broke out which paved the way for Khiridjites incidents later. Some disagreed with the convention there except for those being truly among the Shi'ite Muslims of Imim, and bearing the arbitration course for Imim's sake.

Milik was among them, when Imim (a) was told that Milik is not satisfied with this convention, Imim (a) said, "When I will be satisfied, Milik will be so as well, and I'm satisfied. You said he has kept himself aloof from me, but I don't reckon that he'll do so. There are not two persons or even

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.II, p.337; see, p.338

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, pp.194-196, Waq'at ¯iff¢n, pp.504-570, see, Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.334-335

[3]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, p.508; Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.189

one person amongst you like him, who think so about their foe.”[1]

Imim returned to K£fa along with the army on Rabi‘ al-Awwal 37 A.H.[2] In K£fa, loud voices of cries and weeps were heard from each house, and Imim confirming the martyrdom of their martyrs, offered his condolence to them. Finally, Imim sent Ab£ M£si to the arbitration site.

Imim dispatched 400 persons along with Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar ¢, accompanied by Shuray¦ Ibn Hin¢ as their commander, and ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis as their congregational prayer leader. Additionally, Imim notified Ab£ M£si of the defiled nature of Mu‘iwiya and advised him tremendously.[3] At this time, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar, Mugh¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr had to come to Mu‘iwiya and were present at the meeting incident of ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ and Ab£ M£si.[4] ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, when meeting Ab£ M£si, spoke of the virtues! of Mu‘iwiya and noted that Mu‘iwiya is the blood-wit of ‘Uthmin, and Allih has put a “Sultan” for blood-wit. Ab£ M£si relied on the revival of ‘Umar tradition concerning the issue of council. Once he spoke of ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar, but ‘Amr said that a weak person like him could not take the responsibility of such a deed. It was not only unclear under which principles this council being regarded as a pretext by the dissenters, ought to be shaped, but not obvious who should be the member of such a council. Once ‘Umar relying on his own power has placed caliphate among six persons so that they will choose one out of them. What was the connection of this matter to leaving the work to the “Council among Muslims”, so to select one for themselves? Ab£ M£si insisted on this matter and an account of that he was of the belief that firstly we ought to leave this belief aside that one of the two persons either Imim or Mu‘iwiya should be the caliph, so that thereupon we shall select some one. Hence, for Ab£ M£si’s part, the declaration of these two commands’ deposition of Imim’s commentary on the pulpit, ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ announced that he has just the right to depose ‘Al¢ (a); however, I have the caliphate to Mu‘iwiya! Ab£ M£si cried out in protest and insulted ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥. Ab£ M£si called

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.521; see, Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.236

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.237

[3]. Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.421

[4]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.540-541

‘Amr a dog, and ‘Amr called Ab£ M£si a donkey and the session turned out in chaos. So hereby, without speaking of the Qur’in and the Sunna of the Prophet (s), and merely under the pretext of ‘Umar tradition, the arbitration course itself gave rise to another disagreement between Damascus and Iraq.[1]

From that time on, the people of Damascus called Mu‘iwiya “Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n”, and this was the most significant outcome of the arbitration for the Damascus people. Ab£ Mikhnaf stated that when Iraqi people were going to ¯iff¢n, they were all amiable and kind towards each other. When they returned, however, they all had hostility and hatred towards each other.

The Khiridjites said, “You were flaccid in implementing Allih’s order”, and another group told them, “You disobeyed Imim and our group.” Imim became sorrowful on account of their remarks.[2]

WAR WITH EXTREMIST KHªRIDJITES

Exactly when Ash‘ath Ibn Qays read the arbitration convention for various groups of the army, a group of the army cried out in front of him, **لا حكم الا لله** “The only judgment is that of Allih’s.”[3]

According to Na¥r Ibn Muzi¦im, some people from Ban£ Murid, Ban£ Risib, and Ban£ Tam¢m chanting aloud, and expressing their disgust concerning the arbitration of men said, “Just Allih merits arbitration.”

Among the dissenters, ‘Amr Ibn Udayya (and in another narration ‘Urwa Ibn Djudayr)[4] attacked Ash‘ath. His sword was quietly dropped on Ash‘ath’s horse. Shortly after the coming of Ash‘ath to Imim and his declaring that all but few of the people were satisfied, the shouts of “the only judgment is that of Allih” grew louder. Their question was, “What about our murdered persons?” Allih has settled

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n. pp.545-546; Akhbir al-§iwil, pp.199-201; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.350-51

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.342

[3]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.196

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.339

Mu‘iwiya’s work, and Allih’s order is nothing but suppressing Damascus army. It is obvious that in front of some people like Ash‘ath, many people of Iraqi army were not ready to submit themselves to Damascus people whatever reason there might be when one group won’t do so? They asked Imim to forsake the issue of arbitration, and in principle, to report of his former opinion which has led to polytheism. Imim by referring to the verse, **اوفوا بالعقود** “Fulfill the obligations,” said that now the agreement has been reached and we have no remedy but patience up to the end of the duration of this convention.[1]

Imim said to them, “As you see, most of this crowd are not in line with war, and if you wage war these people will be together than Damascus people towards you.”[2]

In their way back to ¯iff¢n, the people were divided into two groups, a group protesting against the arbitration, and another group accusing them of being separated from the company.[3] Near to K£fa, a group was little by little separated from the army and went to °ar£ri’ area half a league away from K£fa.[4] That’s why later on these people were referred to as °ar£riyya.

The most outstanding persons of Khiridjites were as follows, °urq£¥ Ibn Zuhayr Tam¢m¢, Shuray¦ Ibn Awf¢ al-’Abs¢, Farwa Ibn Nawfal Ashdja‘¢, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Wahb Risib¢. These people came to Imim, after his entering K£fa, and asked him not to dispatch Ab£ M£si for the arbitration.

Imim said, “We have admitted something that we cannot violate.”[5] As it seems from the names of these persons, no one amongst them was from the renowned people of Iraq. In contrast, they belonged typically to a nomadic tribes such as Bakr Ibn Wi’il and Ban£ Tam¢m.[6] The Khiridjites, for the most part, were from nomads who, in principal, had no idea concerning Imamate and politics as being matters beyond tribal issue. They demonstrated this tendency of theirs

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.413-414; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.351

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.331-338

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.342

[4]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.191

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.359

[6]. Ibid, vol.II, p.350

within a framework out of a deviated interpretation from the slogan “the only judgment is that of Allih”. Amongst the Khiridjites was ‘Itr¢s Ibn ‘Arq£b Shaybin¢ who was from the companions of ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mas‘£d.[1]

Khiridjites put forward some crucial issues. Their first question was that how Imim consented to the arbitration of “men” in the act of “religion”. Their second question was that why Imim was contented to have his title of caliphate, to wit Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n, omitted. Their problem, as Ya‘q£b¢ puts it, was that Imim spoilt his executorship through this measure.[2]

Their another question was that why Imim didn’t give the permission of distributing booties after their triumph over the infidels. How is it that their killing was permissible, but taking their possessions was not lawful?[3]

With respect to the omission of the title “Am¢r al-Mu‘min ¢n”, Imim invoked the omission of the title “Ras£l Allih”, Allih’s Messenger, in the °udaybiyya peace pact.

Besides, he said regarding arbitration, “I disagreed with this arbitration from the outset, later, as well, when I yielded to it on account of the people’s compulsion, I stipulated that I will abide by their judgment provided that they judge on the basis of Allih’s book, inasmuch as we have originally admitted the arbitration of Qur’in rather than that of men.” Moreover, Imim announced his decision concerning the continuation of war against Damascus, after the collection of tribute. Thus hereby, many of those joining the Khiridjites, joined Imim’s adherents’ group.[4] Yet, there were a lot still sticking to their own beliefs. They disagreed with the arbitration by referring to the only judgment is that of Allih. Sticking to appearances, and drawing hardline deductions through **ضرب القرآن بعضه ببعض** “He put Qur’in aside,” were considered among Khiridjites’ peculiarities. Imim said in front of those chanting this slogan and protesting against him in the mosque, **كلمة حق يراد بها الباطل** “This is a

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.II, p.363

[2]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.192

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.360

[4]. Ibid, vol.II, p.349

truthful statement aimed at drawing an untruthful interpretation from it.”

Imim encountering his foreign dissenters said that if they remained reticent, we would leave them on their own. If they propagated and spoke in return, we would speak with them and if they revolted against us, we would wage war against them. At this moment, one of the Khiridjites stood up and said, “O Allih! We seek refuge with you from submitting to abjectness in your religion, this is a frailty and shall lead to Allih’s wrath.”[1]

According to another narration, it’s been pointed out that the continuation of Khiridjites protest lasting for six months after Imim’s return from ¯iff¢n resulted in Imim’s dispatch of ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis and ¯a‘¥a‘a Ibn ¯£¦in to them for the purpose of discussion. They didn’t submit to these two persons’ request concerning their return to the group. Imim asked them to select 12 persons and he himself separated this number and held talks with them.

Initially, Imim spoke with them about the Qur’in evidence with regard to arbitration and said, “I, ‘Al¢, despite disagreeing with their request, was fearful that they might invoke those verses concerning the admissibility of arbitration.”[2]

Khiridjites’ orator stood up and said, “We fought side with you so far as you were confident of your action at Djamal and ¯iff¢n battle; however, at present you are dubious. You must repent and attest to the fact that you’ve been misled. In that case, we will be with you.”

Imim said, “From the moment when I embraced Islam, I was not a bit doubtful about it. Allih has basically guided you and rescued you from infidelity, through us. I had said that two judges ought to judge on the basis of Allih’s book. If they didn’t do so, to me, their judgment will be of no value.”[3] Their leader, Ibn al-Kawwi’ detached himself from them along with 500 persons. Some have noted that he was with the Khiridjites in Nahrawin, and therein was involved in a

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.II, p.352

[2]. The verses, ªl Imrin / 23; al-Mi’ida / 95; al-nisi’ / 35

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.354

wrangle with Imim.[1] Khiridjites' problem was that they regarded the acceptance of arbitration as infidelity, and therefore they asked Imim to witness his infidelity and repent of it,[2] not that he has merely committed a sin. Hence, Imim said in a poem,

يا شاهد الله عليّ فاشهد آمنت بالله ولي احمد

من شك في الله فاني مهتد

"O thou, Allih's witness!

To me, thou be a witness!

I believed in Allih, the Master of A¦mad

Whoever doubts Allih

I have been guided"[3]

Anyhow, the repeated remarks of Imim and his companions failed to bring a number of Khiridjites back from the path they've chosen. On Shawwil, 31 A.H. the Khiridjites gathered at Zayd Ibn °usayn's house and selecting 'Abd Allih Ibn Wahb Risib¢ as their leader,[4] they resettled their political and military situation. This decision was made after Rama¤in month in which Ab£ M£si was dispatched for arbitration. Following the arbitration, they didn't allow staying in K£fa and decided to go to Madi'in. There from, they wrote to their Ba¥r¢ co-thinkers inviting them to come round to them. Some of them didn't deem it advisable to go to Madi'in on account of the presence of Imim 'Al¢'s (a) Shi'ite Muslims and chose Nahrawin. After the announcement of arbitration result, Imim 'Al¢ (a) declaring his opposition to the arbitration result, asked the people to congregate to the division camp for fighting the infidels.[5]

Imim sent for the Khiridjites and told them, "These two judges acted in opposition to the Qur'in, and I'm leaving for Damascus. You accompany me as well."[6]

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.209

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.361

[3] Ibid, vol.II, pp.356-369

[4] Ibid, vol. II, p. 364.

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.366, and in its footnote from, al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.143

[6]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.206

They said, “we are not allowed to appoint you as Imim.” After the congregation of people in Nukhayla, Iraq moved to Anbir city and left there for Shih¢ village, and therefore they went to Dabihi and to Dimimmi.[1]The Khiridjites gathering at Nahrawin by now, encountered ‘Abd Allih the son of Khabbib Ibn Arat on their way. They asked ‘Abd Allih’s opinion concerning Imim ‘Al¢ (a).

He said, “Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n and Imim of the Muslims.” They killed ‘Abd Allih along with his pregnant wife. It’s been said that the Khiridjites, on their way, asked everybody encountered by them, about his opinion regarding arbitration. They killed him in case of not being in line with them.[2] This movement led Imim to decide to confront them.[3] The reason behind this matter was that Imim was not able to leave K£fa alone with such criminals, while therein there were just the women and children. Imim went over to Madi’in and there from headed for Nahrawin. Imim, in a letter to Khiridjites invited them to return to the group. ‘Abd Allih Ibn Wahb, in the answer of Imim’s letter, pointing to what has so far taken place, notified of the same former remarks concerning Imim’s doubt in religion and the necessity of his repentance. Qays Ibn Sa‘d and Ab£ Ayy£b An¥ir¢ were against them and asked them to join them for fighting Mu‘iwiya. Khiridjites said that they don’t admit the Imamate of the Imim. They will be ready to accompany them, only if their leadership will be in the hands of some like ‘Umar.[4] As soon as Imim realized that these people are not submissive, he put his troops being 14000 in number, into array against Khiridjites. At this moment, Farwa Ibn Nawfal along with 500 persons of Khiridjites were separated from the Khiridjites and resided in Bandan¢djayn and Daskara.[5] Another number of them left gradually, to the extent that just 1800 cavalry men and 1500 infantry men remained alongside ‘Abd Allih Ibn Wahb.[6] At this time, Imim

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.367

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.206

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.362-368

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.370; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.207

[5]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.210

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.371

also asked his companions not to initiate the war.[1] Khiridjites started the war. They were overthrown, and their leader was very swiftly killed.[2] Apart from the fugitives, four hundreds of those having been fallen in the battlefield were delivered to their families. This clash took place on ¯afar 9, 38 A.H.[3]

When the war was terminated, Imim asked the people to head for Damascus to fight the infidels. The people, however, showed signs of fatigue, and the remarks of Ash‘ath Ibn Qays led Imim to return to Nukhayla, the people went to K£fa, and just 300 persons remained with the Imim.[4] Consequently, Imim returned to K£fa. From that time on, Imim invited the people for Djihid, holy was, against the Damascus people once in a while, but no one gave a favorable answer. It was here where Imim in his long sermons, reproached K£fa people and spoke repeatedly of their disloyalty up to the end.

Here another movement ought to be taken into account as well, a movement somewhat resembling that of Khiridjites. Khirr¢t Ibn Rash¢d, taking part in ¯iff¢n battle, in his way back to K£fa, objected to Imim and said that he won’t pray along with him anymore. His objection was similar to Khiridjites’ remarks. He considered arbitration a mistake. At night, he left K£fa together with his companions for Kaskar. Qaradha Ibn Ka‘b, the governor of Sawid areas, wrote a letter to Imim reporting that an army from K£fa has arrived this area and when encountering a person from the peasants of Euphrates areas namely Zidhin Farrukh, have asked him about his religion. He said that he is a Muslim. They asked his opinion concerning Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n (a). He replied he is the commander of the faithful and the successor of Allih’s Messenger(s). Hence, they cut him into

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.210

[2]. One of them is Yaz¢d Ibn Nuwayra An¥iri whose being a heavenly man was witnessed twice by The Prophet(s) (al-I¥iba, vol.II, p.348) The list of the martyrs of this war has been noted by Ibn A‘tham (vol.IV, p.121) and Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d (vol.II, p.29). See their narrations with martyrs’ names at Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.314, (footnote)

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.374-375. It’s been noted in Futūh (vol.III, p.277) that when Imim ended his war with Khiridjites and went to K£fa, 17 days were remained from Rama¤in.

[4]. Ibid, vol.I, p.319

pieces by their swords.[1] This measure of theirs was exactly the same as Khiridjites’ when encountering ‘Abd Allih Ibn Khabbib. Imim wrote to Ziyid Ibn Kha¥afa commissioning him to suppress Ban£ Nidjiya under the leadership of Khirr¢t Ibn Rash¢d. Subsequent to the sever clash during which five companions of Khirr¢t were killed and two persons of Imim’s army were martyred,[2] the rebels headed towards Ahwiz. Therein some natives as well as some Kurds joined them. Imim was compelled to dispatch a separate force to suppress them. Ma‘qil Ibn Qays Riyi¦¢ was selected for this commission, and he headed towards them along with some armies. When the rebels were moving towards Rimhurmuz, Ma‘qil, on his way reaches them and fought them. During this conflict, 70 persons from Ban£ Nidjiya and 300 of Kurds and the other natives accompanying him were killed. Khirr¢t headed hurriedly towards the coast, and therein he was able to deceive a number of people from Ban£ ‘Abd al-Qays.

Imim wrote a letter to the residents of that area calling them for “obedience”. They scattered from around Khirr¢t too. Once again, Ma‘qil clashed with him, and this time Khirr ¢t and most of those along with him were killed.

According to Balidhur¢, Khirr¢t acted in such a way that the Khiridjites assumed that he is of their opinion.[3]

THE KHªRIDJITES, FORMATION AND CHARACTERISTICS

The Khiridjites’ emergence in religious sects arenas, is one of the significant political and mental alterations in the history of Islam. In fact, the advent of this group is the symbol of hard-line tendencies of the Islamic world in the political and mental areas. A sect which strived for having a place in the realm of politics along two or three countries through applying their extreme view points, but exactly due to this very extremity, were not able to gain a privilege. The important question is that how these incidents appeared. Generally, it ought to be said that when some discrepancies appeared in the Islamic society, various stands were adopted

---

[1]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, p.346

[2]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, p.346

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.413-418

to confront the disputable issues. Some stands had some principal aspects and some others were within the two extremes. If we separate the deviation of apostates and infidels from the Islamic current, the tarring of some people like ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar and Sa‘d Waqqas and some others in front of that stand deems a sort of extreme act. In opposition to that, Imim’s act was a realistic and principled one. In a stage where this movement failed to pursue its natural course on account of some people’s opposition, the hard-line tendency displayed itself. This tendency ought to resist all the currents. Apart from the infidels and fronting the principled movement of Imim, every moment such a stand had a tendency to more extremity and was obliged to separate all the dissenters from its front by the hallmark of infidelity, and to justify its holy war against them.

The tendency towards extremity amongst the Khiridjites was not merely due to the political and intellectual currents, but it had its own specific social and mental aspects as well. Some points should be taken into consideration for understanding the conditions leading, in principle, to such a branching in the society,

(1) During the years when the nomad immigrants had come to Iraq, every time, through participating in the conquest, they gained some noticeable victories, and took the possessions of some countless booties. The front being against them was that of fidelity, the war against which was lawful easily justifiable. They were the mere truth, and the opposite front was the mere error. Djamal battle was the first action during which the Muslims clashed with their coreligionists. In this war despite the victory, there was not any booty and this issue brought about a problem for the aforesaid. Their question was that how it was possible that shedding somebody’s blood was allowed, whereas taking his money was not so.[1] This problem demonstrated itself at Djamal battle and naturally caused the primary interpretation of the Muslim nomads to be altered from the holy war and the forces opposing them. The aforesaid problem was attributed to Imim ‘Al¢ (a) by Khiridjites through their objections. Later on, this issue caused the Khiridjites not to leave a medium between infidelity and faith (say unbeliever and infidel libertine, or even a Muslim

[1]. al-Fi’iq,vol.IV,p.129

libertine), rather to bring the problem to an end and to call some (including just themselves) believers and the opposite group unbeliever whose blood was allowed to be shed and whose money to be taken as well.

(2) The other problem arose from the reasons behind revolting against ‘Uthmin and finally his murdering. This caliph was accused of religious heresies and his stands caused two diverse deductions from Islam to be drawn among his dissenters and assenters. Such issue has not been recorded before then. In principle, this measure caused the monotonous religious attitude among Muslims to be changed and some suspicions regarding which one is the right of Islam to be induced. It is obvious that this issue itself called for positions against it, which inevitably showed itself within the two extremes. ‘Uthmin’s murdering caused the religious leadership to be out of the hands of the government and to be in the hands of some personally claiming to be theologians. One of these clans was K£fa and Damascus[1] “Qur’in reciters” that through relying on this Qur’in recitation, restrained themselves from taking part in the battle, and stood between the two armies to see which one is the rightful! The contribution of the Qur’in-reciters to the conversions leading to the Khiridjites’s appearance and even the presence of a number of them amongst the Khiridjites is indicative of this very point. Besides, the independent positions of ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mas‘£d refusing to follow the Imamate of the society have been pointed out. They observe that ‘Abd Allih himself has taken a stand against ‘Uthmin and has called ‘Uthmin’s legitimacy into a serious question, through not allowing ‘Uthmin to say his prayers. Through repudiating Imamate, the Khiridjites indicated that they have been impressed with this point. That is to say, they believed that they themselves ought to make decisions on the religion and even their other political affairs, and that, in principle, there is no need to have an Imim. The superficial justification of this matter was that Qur’in makes them dispense with the need for having an Imim. This arose from the hard-line attitude of the Qur’in reciters who considered themselves to surpass others and determine their way more properly.

---

[1]. See, Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, following al-Qurri’ at the list of tribes and clans

(3) The problem of tribes' domination over the central sovereignty is not an issue to be overlooked easily. This matter was crystallized firstly through the fact that the tribes were not content with Quraysh's domination. Even their admitting of Imim to this extent, was due t the fact that Imim himself was against rather than alongside Quraysh. This is well obvious from the Imim's remarks. Imim regarded Quraysh as his foe.[1] However, ultimately Iraq tribes refused to accept even the Imim, inasmuch as their animosity was far more sever than that permitting them to accept a person having a blood retaliation with Quraysh anyhow. It should be kept in mind that the Khiridjites were a sect not accepting being from Quraysh as a condition for caliphate. As it's been noted, one of the motives behind revolting against 'Uthmin was Egyptian and Iraqi tribes' concern over the indisputable domination of Quraysh, and the Umayya, in particular, over the Muslims' regulations, and specially their financial affairs. The tribal structure in the new Islamic community, had preserved its power. During the first years, the prevalence of central power via religion had somewhat outshined the tribal criteria. However, presently by the victories subsiding, the Iraq tribes have taken notice of themselves, and after revolting against 'Uthmin, their power has been enhanced. When one could dethrone a caliph on account of the crimes he has committed, one could stand up to the next caliph and threaten him with death. Imim (a) was exposed to this issue. He went to Iraq, so to suppress the infidels' riot. Thus he was naturally in need of K£fiyin tribes' forces. They assisted him to extinguish the sedition. Afterwards, the heads of the tribes having a worthy influence in their own tribe, benefited from this power as a lever in confronting Imim. Having undermined the central power, finally this issue led to the defeat of this power against Damascus enemy. At ¯iff¢n battle, each tribe resisted, in an orderly way, its enemy through preserving its own tribal structure. From the onset of the establishment, the composition of K£fiyin population was also on this basis. The influence of tribes' needs was very sweeping and was regarded as a government in a government. Tribes' mutiny against the first two caliphs was unprecedented. 'Uthmin as well withstood these tribes as before. However, his killing demonstrated that he has been

[1]. See, al-Irshid, vol.I, p.254

defeated against the tribes. It ought to be known that this situation was repeated in Imim ‘Al¢’s (a) caliphate. When the Qur’ins were raised above the spears, the head of Kinda tribes, Ash‘ath Ibn Qays said, “You have to send for Ashtar to stop fighting; otherwise, we will kill you as we killed ‘Uthmin.”[1] Both he and those later being ranked amongst the Khiridjites, compelled Imim to accept Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢ as his representative.[2] Another group known as Qur’in-reciters, and having a party under this title in ‘Uthmin killing incident, withstood ‘Al¢ (a) and asked him to accept Damascus army request concerning invitation to Qur’in. Those later on joining the Khiridjites, threatened him that if he won’t accept their request, they will kill him just like ‘Uthmin.[3] So hereby, the arbitration was imposed on Imim and Imim pointed out repeatedly his unwillingness in this regard,[4] and he regarded this that, **“لا امر لمن لايطاع** The one not obeyed, can give no order,”[5] as his problem.

When a man went out of the houses of his tribe and went to those of another tribe, and while shouting, sought help from his tribe, his target is to induce disturbance and sedition. The people of the tribe he was among whom, attacked him and beat him. He returned to his tribe and kicked a great disorder, a chaos in which the swords were drawn from the sheaths and a war was waged.[6] Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n himself introduced the “aged”, and the elders as the main foundation of obstinacy, and the chief pillars of sedition.[7] Thereafter, Imim was entangled with these tribes. Some groups from the Iraqi Arabs stood up to him, they were the Khiridjites who not only resisted him, but also wounded his son Imim °asan (a) after him. Supposing that, he has taken no notice of their request concerning the war against Mu‘iwiya.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.50

[2]. Ibid, vol.V, p.51

[3]. Ibid, vol.V, p.49, Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, pp.489-490, Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.X, pp.56,60,239; Ta§awwur al-Fikr al-Siyis¢ ‘Ind ahl al-Sunna, pp.43-44

[4]. Ibid, vol.V, pp.84-85

[5]. Nahdj al-balighha, Sermon 27

[6]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.XIII, pp.167-168

[7]. Nahdj al-balighha, Sermon 192

(4) All these incidents happened in an area where, before Islam, there were diverse Christian, Zoroastrian, Mazdaki and various Christian and Jewish tendencies that had crucial influence on the present mental disturbances in these areas. It is not strange to see that major sectarian trends appeared in Iraq. Even amongst the Sunnis, various theological and juristic trends are the fruits of scientific efforts of Iraqi cities. In this regard, Damascus can in no way be compared with Iraq. In contrast, Damascus under Umayya's control chose an easy way in accordance with what the Umayya propagated. As a result of this matter, Damascus dominated Iraq without any trouble and it owed this victory to its unity. Besides, this point should be taken into account that, that number of companions coming to Iraq didn't go to Damascus. This issue was influential in bringing about diverse and apposing courses in Iraq.

(5) The significant concept which can notify of these mental and political disturbances is that of sedition from which every group benefited for their own benefit. Imim 'Al¢ (a) dissenters, in Imim's was against apostates, believed that this war was nothing but sedition. They believed that in sedition, one ought to be "'Abd Allih, the murdered", rather than "'Abd Allih, the murderer".[1] For Imim 'Al¢'s (a) part, "sedition" title referred to a disturbance in the political circumstances, as well as disobedience to the former caliph of the Muslims. According to the application of sedition in Nahdj al-Baligha, Imim called those acts leading to Djamal, ¯iff¢n and Nahrawin battles seditious[2], and asked those being alongside it to be like an adolescent camel that has neither a back strong enough for ridding, nor udders for milking.[3] This means that lack of obedience on the part of a rebelling group is called sedition.[4] "Doubt" is the concept resembling sedition, in which the truth and error are intermingled together and remained unknown.[5] Thus, in this way, Djamal and ¯iff¢n battles ought to be regarded as one

[1]. Masi'il al-imima, p.16

[2]. See, Nahdj al-baligha, sermons 93,101,121,192; letters 1,65; Qi¥ir al-°ikam, No.1

[3]. Nahdj al-baligha, see, Kalamit Qi¥ir, No.1

[4]. For sedition, see, Bernard Lewis, article "Mafih¢m Inqilib dar Islim", Ta¦q¢qit Islim¢ Magezine, No.2/7, pp.93-97

[5]. Nahdj al-baligha, sermons 38,122, Qi¥ir al-°ikam, No.113

of the most basic incidents influencing Muslims’ political thoughts and making evaluation more difficult for the masses of people due to those doubts raised later on. The emergence of doubt and sedition had an important impact on the formation of hard-line sects trying to bring the work to an end and wipe sedition off the society by drawing clear lines. The application of equivocal concept made the work much more difficult. The extreme use of “infidelity” concept arose from this need.

(6) The main problem if this group’s formation is based on two interrelated implications. The first point is that “judgment” is merely confined to Allih and it is not correct to leave arbitration to “men”. The second point is that this incorrectness is not a simple one, rather it is at the extent of “infidelity” and those learning arbitration to “men” became “infidel”. At the outset, this infidelity was put forward with regard to Imim. Supposing that, as it was natural, ‘Uthmin should have been considered an infidel too. ±al¦a and Zubayr as well, were not immune to that. Hence, in this way, the concept of “infidelity” took a crucial role in their thought.

As for the issue of *the only judgment is that of Allih*, the problem lied in defining the term “judgment” According to the evidences, it seems that they have defined “judgment” as “judge”. As a result of this issue, not only the arbitration of Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢ was rejected, but also the “Islamic ruler” existence was doubted. Such a matter sounded unnatural, but it was declared and was repudiated by Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n (a).

Imim said, “They stated that there is no need for governance, whereas, there is no escape for men from “Imim” pure or impure.”

This sentence, (the only judgment is that of Allih) is a truthful statement, but what (they think) it means, is wrong.[1] Is it possible that the Khiridjites thought concerning not being in need of Imim, arose from their spirit of tribalism and pan-Arabism? It should be known that they had some Qur’inic reasons, however, their hasty interpretation, originally arising from their harsh morale, resulted in extremely unified meanings.[2] The Khiridjites, during the Imamate of Imim ‘Al¢ (a), didn’t have opportunity to put forward their other viewpoints. However, later on, they put

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp.361-377; Nahdj al-balighа

forth novel viewpoints in the arenas of political affairs and specifically Imamate. It's noteworthy that their belief concerning "infidelity" had had such a profound impact on the theological discussions that it forced the Islamic sects to react to the subtle definition of faith and infidelity. The Khiridjites extremity with regard to generalizing the concept of infidelity caused all the groups to express their opinion in this regard. One of these groups was Murdjiyin who said that it is not possible for them to clarify precisely the truth and error, and all ought to be deemed Muslims, and the Shi'ite Muslims and 'Uthmin¢ disputes as well as judging cardinal sinners should all be left to Allih.

Thibit Qu§na, a Murdji'¢ poet said,

نرجي الامور اذ كانت مشبهة ونصدق القول فيمن جار أو عندا

"We leave)to Allih(all the dubious affairs, and we judge correctly the oppressor or obstinate."[1]

This curse tried to regard all the opposing groups as Muslim, and hereby to decrease the differences.

Fighting the Khiridjites was not a simple measure. The Khiridjites, for the most part, were among the Qur'in reciters and those being apparently people of Qur'in and prayer, and their leader, 'Abd Allih Ibn Wahb was renowned as Dh£ al-Thafanit (the one whose forehead has been marked by prostration.) In spite of that, he was the most pious of all of them. Hence, he could easily persuade the people of K£fa and his Shi'ite followers into fighting them. Imim's opinion concerning the Khiridjites has been noted in various sermons. Amongst these remarks, there is an interesting narration. Imim was asked whether the Khiridjites are infidel.

---

[2]. For instance they regarded all those accepting arbitration, and subsequent to that, everyone not considering 'Al¢ (a) infidel, as infidel, by referring to the verse وَمَنْ لَمْ يَحْكُمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُوْلَئِكَ هُمْ الْكَافِرُونَ. "and whoever did not judge by what Allih revealed, those are they that are the unbelievers" and ordered their dissenters' women and children to be murdered by referring to this verse رَبِّ لَا تَذَرْ عَلَى الْأَرْضِ مِنْ الْكَافِرِينَ دَيَّارًا. "My Lord! Leave not upon the land any dweller from āmong the unbelievers" which was Noah's prayer. See, Masi'il al-imima, p.19

[1]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XIV, p.269; see, Murdji'a, Tir¢kh wa And¢shih, pp.32-39

Imim replied, “They have escaped infidelity.”

Again he was asked, “Are they hypocrite?”

Imim said, “The hypocrite remember Allih just a bit, whereas these people call Allih day and night.”

He was asked, “So what kind of people are they?”

Imim said, “They are a group who have been entangled in sedition and thereupon have become blind and deaf.”[1]

Imim ‘Al¢ narrated that once the Prophet of Allih (s) said, “O ‘Al¢, people will fall into sedition through their wealth, will show obligation on account of their religion, will desire his mercy, and will feel safe from his clout, and regard his unlawful matters as lawful by raising false doubts and by their misguiding desires. They will then hold lawful (the use of) wine by calling it barley water, a bribe by calling it a gift, and taking if usurious interest by calling it sale.”

Imim added, “I asked the Prophet of Allih(s), how should I deal with them at that time, whether to hold them have gone back in heresy or just in sedition?”

He said, “Sedition.”[2]

Perhaps this very remark of the Prophet of Allih (s), caused Imim’s attitude with respect to sedition to be so strong that he indeed regarded the incidents facing him as sedition. The Khiridjites themselves were unable to comprehend this meaning. They expected all to be either faithful or infidel. Anyhow, perhaps on account of the asceticism and the warship that the Khiridjites displayed out of themselves, fighting them was more difficult. However, Mu‘iwiya’s sedition was far stronger and more dreadful than them.

Hence, Imim said elsewhere, “I have put out the eye of sedition. No one except me advanced towards it when its gloom was swelling and its madness was intense … when seditions come they refuse (gospel truth against credal error) and when they clear away they leave a warning. They cannot be known at the time of approach but are recognized at the time of return. They blew like the blowing of winds, striking some cities and missing others. Beware that the

---

[1]. Lisin al-‘arab, vol.IV, p.461 (following religion)

[2]. Nahdj al-balighha, sermon 157

worst sedition for you in my view, is that of the Umayya, since it is blind dim."[1]

That's why Imim asked his Shi'ite Muslims not to waste their energy fighting the Khiridjites, **لا تقتلوا الخوارج من بعدي فليس من طلب الحق فاخطأه كمن طلب الباطل فأدركه** "Do not kill the Khiridjites after me, since the one seeking the gospel truth, but going the wrong path is not like the one seeking the credal error and finding it."[2]

By the second group, Imim exactly meant Mu'iwiya and Damascus people. Imim's remark concerning the Khiridjites was that you thought the Khiridjites have been eliminated, but they still exist in the loins of men and wombs of women. Whenever a chief would appear from among them, he would be cut down till the last of them would turn thieves and robbers.[3]

The Khiridjites remained, they went to remote cities, plundering everywhere under the pretext of infidelity. Finally, they went to Sidjistin, and were ranked among those calling themselves 'Ayyir, wanderer.

A point proved to be true regarding Khiridjites and other hardliners is that, their aims may sound more eminent from some aspects; however, their way if action is in such a manner that masses of people cannot be compatible with them. This issue that they regard every cardinal sinner as infidel, is, in itself, a matter that the society cannot admit. Even the Mu'tazilites who considered cardinal sinner neither a faithful nor infidel, rather a libertine person, couldn't influence masses of people. Superficialism is another Khiridjites characteristic. They were amongst the Qur'in-reciters and even some of K£fiyin worshipers. Such members of the society are always threatened with being entangled in the risk of extremity.

INVASIONS OF DAMASCUS ARMY

It was already discussed how Imim's endeavor was focused on re-mobilization of the Iraqis for a battle against Damascus; however, those declaring readiness were few.

---

[1]. Ibid, sermon 93

[2]. Ibid, sermon 61

[3]. Ibid, sermon 60

Though Imim, in his sermons, asked people for an aid, rarely ever did they follow.

In a sermon he has stated, “I come in grips with the crowd laying disobedient when ordered and remaining silent when called. O wrong crowd! Why on earth thou keep waiting? Why thou stand still in helping divine religion? Where is thy religion that prepares thee? Where is thy fervor that outrages thee? Cry I make and help I seek. Neither to my word thou lend an ear nor my order, thou obey until the end comes and the evility turns up. Neither a reprisal thou can join nor can thou lend a hand for an aim to stop thee leaving. Moan thou nipped and move thou never made.”[1] In another sermon, “O people in diversity with distressed hearts in reversity! In bodies thou are nude, in intellect thou are dude. In knowing the Truth I cherish thee like a foster-mother. From the Truth you trotter away as goats from a roaring lion. Alas! with thee off justice the darkness I clear, uncrooked path of Truth I gear.”[2] “O people laying disobedient if ordered and remaining silent if called! The provided chance never thou take, the challenge never thou dare, thou reproach when likely the crowd prepared behind an Imim, thou withdraw when unwillingly involved in a hard task. O cowards! Why on earth thou keep waiting? Why thou stand still in aiding and taking back thy rights? May thou be dead or despised! By Allih, far away from me thou shall remain if my hour comes, for thy company I hate. With thee when I am, without help really I am. Who on earth in truth art thou? Thou hast no religion to prepare thee? Thou hast no fervor to propel thee? Not a surprise rogues follow Mu‘iwiya when called enjoying no benefit a bit. Thee I call the survivors of Islam and piety to benefit thee a lot. On me thou turn back and with me thou art at odds… What I adore more is death to come forth”.[3]

Addressing the people these speeches were delivered by Imim in 39 and 40. They manifest his firm will before the Qisi§¢n (the oppressors). Mu‘iwiya, conscious of the prevailing state in Iraq as well as the resident’s weakness, was set to undermine Imim’s might and set the scene for entering Iraq through attacking on areas ruled by Imim in

---

[1]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, sermon 39

[2]. Ibid. sermon 131

[3]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, sermon 180

°idjiz and even in Iraq. He expressed his intention as follows, "The Iraqis will be overawed with such murders and plunder, the dissidents and the secessionists will become valorous and those saved of disputes will be absorbed".[1] The attacks known as "Ghirit" were repeated every now and then and martyred many a real Shi'ite Muslim_anywhere. Ab£ Is¦iq Thaqaf¢ Sh¢'¢ (born in 283) has presented a list of the Ghirit in his book authored in the third century under the same title. The reports of such attacks can be found in other historical sources too.

Egypt was the first attacked land. When elected as the caliph, Imim appointed Qays Ibn Sa'd Ibn 'Ubida to Egypt governorship. Nevertheless, when he left for Iraq to suppress the Nikith¢n, (allegiance breachers) he urged him to return from Egypt.[2] Qays set out to Medina and then to Iraq[3] to participate in ¯iff¢n. Subsequent to ¯iff¢n once Egypt was in unrest and an uprising against Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr was likely, Imim determined to dispatch Milik to Egypt.

Appointed for the second time as the governor of °idjiz after ¯iff¢n, Milik received a letter to go to Egypt. As soon as Mu'iwiya was informed, he wrote to the treasurer in Qulzum to remove Milik in any way possible and in exchange not to deliver the remainder of treasure. Accordingly, he martyred Milik with poisonous honey.[4] Where he was martyred was called 'Ayn Shams.

Upon learning Milik's muder, Mu'iwiya said, "'Al¢ had got two arms one of which was 'Ammir cut off in ¯iff¢n and the other was Milik cut off now."[5] On the other hand, when Imim heard the news, sorrow was visible on his face for a number of days stating, "What good features Allih had granted Milik!

---

[1]. al-Ghirit, p.176 (Persion version)

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp. 390-392

[3]. As reported by Balidhur¢ in Ashrif, vol.II, pp. 300-301 when Qays arrived in Medina, Imim had written to Sahl Ibn °unayf to go to K£fa. Meanwhile, Marwin and Aswad Ibn Abi l-Bakhtar¢ were active in acting against Imim in Medina. They threatened Qays with murder. Without a moment's hesitation he left there for Iraq. It proves that except An¥ir accompanying Imim to Iraq how much Medina was against Imim.

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, pp. 398-399

[5]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, p. 264; in Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p. 399 the name of Qays Ibn Sa'd is referred to mistakenly.

Who Milik really was! If a mountain, a great mountain he was. If a rock, a solid rock he was. O Milik! By Almighty Allih, over your demise many are grieved while many are thrilled. For such a person tears should be shed. Shall any one be ever re-born like Milik?”[1]

Now Damascus had access to Egypt, agitated. It not only was adjacent to Damascus but also had many from among the ‘Uthminids who could back the Damascus army. In addition, it was the time to fulfill the promise Mu‘iwiya had given to cunning ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, the governorship of Egypt. Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr was the governor in Egypt then. ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ who had led the Arabs’ army when conquering Egypt before advanced with a massive army. In a letter, he warned Mu¦ammad to surrender if willing to remain secure. Another threatening letter was sent by Mu‘iwiya reading, he knew no other enemy for ‘Uthmin but Mu¦ammad, so the time was ripe for a reprisal. Writing to Imim, he enclosed the two letters with his. Imim recommended him to resist and ordered him to send Kinina Ibn Bishr (allegedly the one who hit ‘Uthmin on the head with a mace[2]) to Damascus accompanied by an army but stay with another army in the city. Kinina left with two thousand soldiers and Mu¦ammad stayed there on alert with the same number. In bravely clashes with Damascus army, Kinina along with his troops were martyred. Mu¦ammad who was left all alone in Egypt took refuge in a ruined place. The commander of the vanguards in the army was Mu‘iwiya Ibn Khudaydj who traced Mu¦ammad, beheaded him, set him inside a carcass and then burned it.[3] It was the policy that Mu‘iwiya and his followers pursued in martyring the divine figures under the pretext of ‘Uthmin’s murder.

As soon as Imim was told, he turned so gloomy that he made very pungent remarks addressing K£fa people.

In his sermon, he pointed out, “It exceeded fifty days that I seek help. After such a long period the army recruited is the least mighty one.”[4]

---

[1]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, p. 265 (The Persion translation is adapted from ªyat ¢’s book)

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p. 401

[3]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, pp. 276-289

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p. 404

It was in this very sermon when Imim declaimed, **ألا دين يجمعكم ألا حميّة تغضبكم؟**[1] **"**Where is thy religion that prepares thee? Where is thy fervor that outrages thee? "

When asked for what his grief was Imim responded, "He was as dear as my sons".[2] Suffering the loss of Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr, one of his closest companions, as well as Egypt, Imim wrote to all Muslims in various spots recounting the agonies he had suffered since the Prophet's departure. He, in the letter, referred to the unjust attitude that there had been concerning the Prophet's household following his departure, nation's allegiance, how Nikith¢n breached their allegiance, how the war of ¯iff¢n was waged and how the Khiridjites stood against him. Then touching upon the excuses people made he added, "What thou nagged was Blunt art our swords and blank art our quiver. No bayonets do our spears hast and sticks at what we call spears. Let us return to get prepared with the best of horses and weapons…' I did order thee to dismount in Nukhayla, set up a camp and stay there on standby … A crowd of thee stayed with me making unjustifiable excuses and another group left me disobeying. Neither firm were those who stayed nor returned those who left. Once noticing the camp, less than fifty soldiers I found. I headed for K£fa disappointedly but as yet, out hast thou never stepped. Why on earth thou keep waiting? A blind eye hast thou turned to that thy lands get shrunk, thy towns get occupied and my Shi'ite Muslims get slayed? Not a border guard is seen on the borders but enemy's." Furthermore, Imim urged them to prepare against the rival.[3]

Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr's murder was considered as a triumph for the 'Uthminids around the globe in Mu'iwiya's view.[4] Egypt which was now out of Imim's hand was ruled by 'Amr Ibn 'ª¥ as late as his death in 43 for three or four years who preferred the worldly life in exchange for the abiding one in the Hereafter.

---

[1]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, p. 291

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p. 404. Mu¦ammad's mother, Asmi' Bint 'Umays, was first Dja'far's wife after whose martyrdom got married Ab£ Bakr. After Ab£ Bakr's demise she married Imim 'Al¢ (a), thus Mu¦ammad was cherished in Imim's family.

[3]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, pp.302-322

[4]. Ibid. vol.II, p. 377

About Ba¥ra also Mu‘iwiya was hopeful as Ba¥ra ‘Uthminids had written to him seeking for help. He was well aware of the grudge Ba¥ra people bore Imim ‘Al¢ (a) for they had lost many in Djamal war. According to Thaqaf¢, in order to consult ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ Mu‘iwiya wrote, “Nowhere can a belligerent and invincible crowd be found as many as Ba¥ra people.” Mu‘iwiya called upon ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir °a¤ram¢ to travel to Ba¥ra to mobilize Mu‘iwiya’s followers under the slogan of revenge for ‘Uthmin’s murder and occupy the town. Meeting the Tam¢m¢tes in Ba¥ra, ‘Abd Allih talked to the ‘Uthminids having gathered. On propounding his aim ®a¦¦ik Ibn ‘Abd Allih Hilil¢ objected to him as saying, “Do you order us to unsheathe our swords once again (after Nikith¢n) and battle with one another in order to let Mu‘iwiya still be on the throne and you be his minister and to breach the allegiance we have sworn to ‘Al¢ (a)? By Allih, one single day of ‘Al¢’s lifetime spent when the Prophet alive was far much better than whatsoever Mu‘iwiya and his lineage have ever carried out.” Some were in ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir’s side and some in ®a¦¦ik’s. As a rule, the majority backed Ibn Am¢r other than a few like A¦naf Ibn Qays. Between the Mu¤ar¢ and Yemen¢ Arabs there was a strife; however, Mu‘iwiya had previously advised ‘Abd Allih to trust the Mu¤ar¢ ones. It upset the Azd¢tes. At the same time Ziyid Ibn ‘Ubayd who was the vicegerent of Ba¥ra governor resorted to ¯abra Ibn Shaymin Azd¢ and wrote to ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis, Ba¥ra governor, in K£fa; as a result, the news of Ba¥ra spread. On the one hand Ziyid supported by the Azd¢tes led Friday prayer and urged then to back Am ¢r al-Mu’min¢n with whom An¥ir and Muhidjir£n were and stand against the Tam¢m¢tes. On the other hand Ibn ‘ªmir organized an army in Ba¥ra and took the possession of some properties. The news of the Azd¢tes’ support for Ziyid and the Tam¢m¢tes’ for Ibn ‘ªmir created chaos in K£fa. Imim was demanded by Shabath Ibn Rib‘¢ not to let the Azd¢tes overcome the Tam¢m¢tes. Nonetheless, Mikhnaf Ibn Sulaym advocated the Azd¢tes. Urging them to back the principles of the religion, Imim advised, “Thou should restrain from battling and insulting one another for the sake of Islam and its reputation and unite”. Imim sent Ziyid Ibn ®ubay‘a from the tribe of Tam¢m to Ba¥ra for hindering the Tam¢m¢tes to support Ibn ‘ªmir. His attempt was a little fruitful. Bu while

asleep at night, a number of the Khiridjites attacked him and killed him running away.

Sent by Imim together with fifty of the Tam¢m¢tes to Ba¥ra, Djiria Ibn Qudima met with the Shi'ite Muslims and read out Imim's letter to them. Regarding the allegiance people had sworn Imim had written, "If keep thy allegiance, if follow my advice and if obey my order, in line with the Divine Book and the Prophet's tradition I shall treat thee and the path of Truth I shall raise among thee. By Allih, no other ruler do I know to be well aware of his tradition but myself since Mu¦ammad passed away. The gospel truth is what I tell. I intend neither to reproach the deceased nor to find fault with their deeds." Then Imim had added that if they breached their allegiance, he would suppress them with his army. To make up the incident of Djamal, the Azd¢tes declared their readiness for a battle against Ibn 'ªmir. After a time of being under siege, the 'Uthminids's houses were razed to the ground at Djiria's behest. In a letter Ziyid notified Imim that a number were burned, a number who fled fell prey to swords and a number who surrendered were pardoned.[1]

The movement led by ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays, a well-known commander of Damascus army, is among Damascus invasions. As reported by Thaqaf¢ when the Khiridjites revolted against Imim, 'Umira Ibn 'Uqba Ibn Ab¢ Mu'ay§ wrote to Mu'iwiya, "A group of the Qur'in reciters and the devout from among 'Al¢'s followers have stood against him. Combating them, 'Al¢ has killed them. And now since his army and the inhabitants of his town have taken up arms against him, the seeds of discord are sowed among them." Mu'iwiya, extremely delighted, sent ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays along with a three - or four – thousand soldier army to Iraq and ordered him to loot anywhere he went, kill any Shi'ite Muslim he noticed and then leave there promptly for another place. ®a¦¦ik who went to K£fa not only plundered people's properties but also rushed a caravan of pilgrims and killed a number. Imim 'Al¢ (a) in K£fa called upon people to defend themselves.

When Imim found them that indifferent, he told them, "By Almighty Allih, I wish I had one of thee in lieu of a hundred men of thee." Once more Imim desired to be dead! Then

---

[1]. al-Ghirit, vol.II, pp.373-412

Imim sent °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢ with four thousand troops to stop ®a¦¦ik. °udjr encountered him in Tadmur and in their clash, nineteen soldiers from the rival army were killed and two people on °udjr’s side were martyred. With ®a¦¦ik’s overnight escape another invasion of Damascus was ended.

In the meanwhile ‘Aq¢l Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib wrote to Imim to be kept abreast of the latest developments. Describing ®a¦¦ik’s invasion abortive, Imim referred to the injustice Quraysh had done to him and wrote, “O Allih! A calamity thou descend for Quraysh to sever their kinship with me, for those allying and usurping my right of ruling left behind by my brother, Mu¦ammad. To the one they gave it whose neither kinship with the Prophet (s) nor record in Islam was like those of mine”. The letter indicates how Imim constantly mentioned his usurped right any chance he got.[1] The other invasion made by Damascus army to Iraq was the one headed by Nu‘min Ibn Bash¢r with two thousand soldiers. He was supposed to attack on ‘Ayn al-Tamr, on the outskirts of the Euphrates. He was the one and the only one from An¥ir who had joined the ‘Uthminids. Although there were a number of An¥ir who had balked at supporting Imim ‘Al¢ (a), never did they join Mu‘iwiya. When Milik Ibn Ka‘b deployed with a hundred heard about Bash¢r’s probable attack, he asked Sulaym for help who was the treasurer in that side of the Euphrates. Imim learning the news of Nu‘min’s attack on the one hand and observing the K£fiyins hesitant to rise on the other hand objected to them as uttering,”O K£fiyins! When the vanguards of Damascus army thou notice, the doors thou shut and into homes thou creep like a lizard in to its hole and a hyena in to its den. By Allih, how abject is the one whose helpers art thou!”

Sulaym sent fifty of his troops led by his son, ‘Abd Allih, for Milik’s aid. Damascus army afraid of the aid army upcoming fled after a short clash. Mu‘iwiya said his intention of sending the army had been “To jeopardize the Iraqis”. Anyhow, this attack was fruitless as well.

Following Imim’s remarks it was ‘Ad¢ Ibn °itim who accompanied a thousand people from the tribe of ±ayy to Nukhayla. Another a thousand also joined him and they

---

[1]. al-Ghirit, vol.II, pp.416-442

advanced towards the banks of Euphrates and made several attacks on southern part of Damascus.[1]

Mu‘iwiya sent an army to D£mat al-Djandal to have them, obedient to neither Damascus nor Iraq, pay tax alms (statutory Islamic levy on specified items to be used for Muslims’ welfare). Another army led by Milik Ibn Ka‘b was sent by Imim too. A fight was started between them which lasted a whole day long. Next day Damascus army returned while Milik stayed there for ten days inviting people to help. Not being helped, he returned disappointedly as well.[2]

One of the other invasions made against Iraq was led by Sufyin Ibn ‘Awf Ghimid¢ along with six thousand toward H¢t and then toward Anbir. Imim’s adherents were few there none of whom were willing helpers except a very small number with Ashras Ibn °assin Bakr¢ who resisted unit being martyred. After plundering Anbir, the invaders went back. On being informed, Imim on the pulpit of the mosque, summoned people to gather in Nukhayla and move to stop them. In the answer, nothing came up but silence. Imim left the mosque and sent Sa‘¢d Ibn Qays Hamdin¢ together with an eight-thousand army to stop them but they had already arrived in Damascus.

When Sa‘¢d returned, he found Imim so seriously sick that he could in no way stand on the pulpit. Imim therefore wrote a letter complaining about K£fiyin people, sat on the platform by the mosque gate and asked Sa‘d, one of his Mawil¢s (freed slaves) to read it out loud. “If any other option there were, never a word would I breath to blame thee … O people, Djihid (holy Islamic war) is a portal of the Heaven portals opened to Allih’s special friends, attire of piety, chain mail of solidity and a shield of inflexibility… Be informed, daily and nightly, overtly and covertly for a battle with thy foes I invited thee, to attack them before being attacked …? Enable thou remained and disobedient thou laid until the enemy occupied thy homeland. It was Ghimid¢ who assaulted Anbir, slayed Ashras Ibn °assin, plundered the weapons and massacred the righteous men. Even I heard no one stopped the man, from among thy foes, who invaded the house of a Muslim woman, under our protection, took her anklets off her ankles and her earrings off her ears. Yet, safe

[1]. al-Ghirit. vol.II, pp.445-459

[2]. al-Ghirit, vol.II, pp.459-461

and sound they returned with not a single injury. If this life a Muslim man departed ashamed and saddened of such an act, never should he be blamed for my part. Wonder! What grief I suffer and what pain I bear when in accord I find them in credal error and in discord I find thee gospel in Truth ...! O wrong crowd under the guise of right men! O gang of the foolish like the kids and the brides in bridal chambers! Allih solely knows how dejectedly I keep living amongst thee! I beg Him from thee to take me and toward Himself to ascend me...”.[1]

These remarks could merely persuade three hundred to gather in Nukhayla. Imim’s next sermons bore no fruit as well.[2]

Prior to °adjdj season in 39 AH. Mu‘iwiya dispatched an army to Mecca with Yaz¢d Ibn Shadjara Rahiw¢ as the head to absorb people to Mu‘iwiya during °adjdj period. On the other hand, Imim being told of his intention, sent a group commanded by Ma‘qal Ibn Qays Riyi¦¢ to Mecca. Qutham Ibn ‘Abbis who was the governor imagined that no one would defend him, so decided to leave Mecca first but they trusted its holiness and stayed. It was Dhi l-°adjdja 7th when Damascus army arrived in Mecca. To avoid clashes, the commander for whom observing the holiness of the city was allegedly significant sent a message to Qutham that both give up leading the congregational prayers and let people pick one out. As soon as °adjdj ritual terminated, Damascus army returned. Following the Damascus army, Ma‘qal Ibn Qays went to Mecca and moved as far as Wid¢ al-Quri. They could only capture a few numbers of the fatigued ones who were exchanged later for Iraqi captives. After the event, Imim told people,”Defeated thou hast become be this nation ... for the more active they get, the more passive thou go; the harder they try, the lazier thou become. I do behold disunity among thee as unity among them...”[3]

One of their most notorious attacks was Busr Ibn Ar§it’s on °idjiz and Yemen. He, a ruthless criminal, was ordered by Mu‘iwiya to massacre ‘Al¢’s Shi‘ite Muslims anywhere he traced. Why Busr was dispatched was the ‘Uthminids living

---

[1]. al-Ghirit, pp.179-181 (Persian version); Akhbir al-§iwil, pp.211-212

[2]. al-Ghirit, pp.464-503

[3]. Ibid. vol.II, pp. 504-516

in Yemen had revolted against ‘Ubayd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis, the governor, after realizing weakness within Iraqi troops. They had written to Mu‘iwiya seeking for help. First Busr entered Medina of which governor, Ab£ Ayy£b An¥ir¢, had been appointed by Imim. Having no troop he had to flee. Busr set fire to his and others’ houses, secured allegiance from people by force, designated Ab£ Hurayra as the governor and sent him to Mecca. Qutham Ibn ‘Abbis also left there and fled. Busr then set out to ±i’if where he sent a man from Quraysh to Tabila therein many a Shi‘ite Muslim resided. At his behest, all were slayed and their possessions were plundered. Mecca residents, panic-stricken, had to flee among whom were ‘Ubayd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis’s wife along with his two sons, Sulaymin and Diw£d captured and both beheaded. It is said that they were murdered in Yemen concealed in an Iranian-born man’s house. Keeping on his trip, he went to Nadjrin where he killed ‘Ubayd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis’s father in law, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abd al-Muddin. This very event is very considerable in Mu‘iwiya’s shameful political life. When Busr arrived in Yemen, ‘Ubayd Allih had already left. Although a number of Shi‘ite Muslims defied for a while many were martyred. Busr committed countless crimes. He beheaded one hundred Iranian-born Shi‘ite Muslims. Then he moved toward °a¤ramawt where allegedly numerous Shi‘ite Muslims resided. He had said he would kill one out of four. Upon being informed, Imim sent Djiria Ibn Qudima with an army to follow him. When Djiria heard that Busr had gone to Mecca, he went there but he had already left. When arriving in K£fa, Djiria found Imim ‘Al¢ (a) martyred, so he swore allegiance to Imim °asan (a).

Imim who was extremely annoyed with the K£fiyins, pronounced a malediction, for not only had they left Imim helpless but also they never protected their wives and daughters and allowed Damascus wicked men to access them. As an instance we narrate a malediction of Imim ‘Al¢’s here,”I saw ‘Al¢ (a) speaking to people”, Ab£ ¯ili¦ °anaf¢, “While having the Holy Qur’in on his head, the papers of which rustling”. ‘Al¢ was uttering, “O Allih! From whatever written in this Book they prevented me. Upon me thou bestow any what of this Book”.

O Allih! In disfavor I hold them as so they hold me and of them I hast become tried as of me they haste become so. Unlike my nature is what they force me to act, an action

unknown to me as yet. O Allih! Better than them grant me helpers but worse than me to them. O Allih! Dissolve their heart like salt in water.[1]

IMªM ‘AL«’S MARTYRDOM

In was Rama¤in, 19th 40 A.H. at dawn when Imim was preparing to head for ¯iff¢n to battle once again with Mu‘iwiya but he was wounded by the most black-hearted man in the world named ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Muldjam Murid¢ and martyred three days later on Rama¤in 21st.

As reported by Ibn Sa‘d, three Khiridjites called ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Muldjam, Burak Ibn ‘Abd Allih Tam¢m¢ and ‘Amr Ibn Bukayr Tam¢m¢ allied in Mecca to kill Imim ‘Al¢ (a), Mu‘iwiya and ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥. To visit his Khiridjites’ friends, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min went to K£fa. Once he went to meet a group from the tribe of “Taym al-Rabbib”, he saw a girl called Qu§im Bnt Shadjanna Ibn ‘Ad¢ whose father and brothers had been killed in Nahrawin. When Ibn Muldjam proposed to her, she declared that her marriage portion should be 3000 (D¢nir!) in addition to Imim ‘Al¢’s murder. He told that by accident with this very aim he had traveled to K£fa.[2] He smeared his sword with poison and attacked Imim on the head. The deepness of the wound as well as the poison of the sword martyred Imim. Reportedly, Ibn Muldjam had been in Ash‘ath Ibn Qays’s house that night.[3]

Various narrations indicate that Imim was attacked by Ibn Muldjam inside the mosque.[4] In accordance to other ones, he attacked Imim while he was waking people up for prayer.[5] Many historical sources have referred to the former although many reports recorded say Imim was attacked while doing prayer. Maytham Tammir had reported that Imim had started his Dawn Prayer and no sooner had he recited eleven verses of the S£ra of “the Prophets” than Ibn Muldjam wounded Imim on the head.[6] As narrated by one of Dju‘da

---

1. al-Ghirit. p. 174 (translated by ªyat¢)
2. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. 3, pp. 35-38
3. Maqtal al-imim Am¢r al-Mu‘min¢n, p. 36, No.13
4. Ibid. p.29, No.4; p. 35, No.12
5. Ibid. pp.28,33, No.11
6. Ibid. p. 30, No.5

Ibn Hubayra's descendants, Imim was wounded while doing his prayer.[1] The man above-mentioned, Djuʻda, had been Umm Hin¢'s son who every so often had led the prayers as a substitute leader and narratedly he had been the one who completed the prayer when Imim was attacked. Shiykh ±£s¢ has also confirmed the aforesaid narration.[2] Yet, Muttaq¢ Hind¢'s report had been that Ibn Muldjam had hit Imim when Imim was prostrating back.[3] Ibn °anbal[4] together with Ibn 'Asikir[5] has confirmed the report. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr stated that there had been no consensus on whether Imim was attacked while doing the prayer or before it and whether any one substituted him or he himself led the prayer to the end. Many are of the opinion that Imim had Djuʻda Ibn Hubayra lead the incomplete prayer.[6]

A great number of hadiths have been narrated by the Holy Prophet's Household and the Sunnis concerning how Imim felt during the night before being wounded. Ibn Abi l-Dunyi quoted Imim Biqir(a) as saying that Imim had been fully aware of his martyrdom.[7] As soon as being injured, Imim shouted out, **فزت ورب الكعبة** "By Allih of Kaʻba, to salvation I reached."[8]

Ibn Abi l-Dunyi has narrated Imim's will in different ways which included both financial and religious issues. The salient issues recommended by Imim were as follows,

Observation of kinship, heed to the orphans and the neighbors, following the guidelines of the Holy Qur'in, performing prayers as the pillar of the religion, °adjdj, fasting, Djihid, Zakit (tax alms) following the Holy Prophet's infallible Household, serving Allih's servants, enjoining to

---

[1]. Ibid. p.30, No.6

[2]. al-Amil¢, al-Djuzʻ al-thilith, No.18

[3]. Kanz al-'Ummil, vol.XV, p.170 (2nd edition); al-Amil¢ f¢ ªthir ¥a¦iba, pp. 103-104

[4]. al-Fa¤i'il, p.38, No.63 (published in Qum)

[5]. Tardjamat al-imim 'Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib (a), vol.III, p. 361 (2nd edition)

[6]. al-Ist¢'ib (in the margin of al-I¥iba), vol.III, p. 59

[7]. al-Ist¢'ib. pp. 33-34, No.12; Ab£ Nuʻaym along with many others have narrated that the Prophet had already foretold his martyrdom. Maʻrifat al-¥a¦iba, vol.I, pp. 295-296.

[8]. Ibid. p.39, No.20; footnote, al-Imima wa l-siyisa, p.160, Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p. 499

good and forbidding from evil. Reportedly, on Rama¤in 21st, while Imim was whispering, **لااله الا الله** “There is no God but Allih” and the verse of, **فمن يعمل مثقال ذرة خيراً يره ومن يعمل مثقـال ذرة شـراً يـره** “So he who has done an atom’s weight of good shall see it. And he who had done an atom’s weight of evil shall see it” Breathed his last.[1] According to another narration, after Imim’s martyrdom, Imim °asan (a) and Imim °usayn (a), Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Dja‘far as well as few numbers from the household took Imim (a) out of K£fa nightly and hiddenly from sight buried him. It was because the Khiridjites and the Umayyads might exhume Imim.[2]

Upon hearing the news of Imim ‘Al¢’s martyrdom, a group of the Exaggerators in Ctesiphon did never believe their ears. This group is the initiator of the exaggerating thoughts among the Shi‘ite Muslims whom we will address later. Ibn Abi l-Dunyi’s report in this respect referred to a person named Ibn al-Sawdi’ from the tribe of Hamdin know as ‘Abd Allih Ibn Saba’. Elsewhere, the name of ‘Abd Allih Ibn Wahb al-Sabi’¢, was mentioned and that such a claim had been made in Ctesiphon.[3] Both narrations reveal that the person had even been anonymous. See also ‘Uthmin’s Opponents.

IMªM ‘AL«’S LIFE

The analysis of Imim’s lifestyle as a paragon seems beyond the possibility here; yet, we refer to some aspects for luck in brief.

Imim’s political and social life is so exemplary that it can be deemed utopian. At times, so uniquely firm was he regarding divine decrees that not a single one could ever emulate him as he himself had pointed to it in a letter.[4] For those yearning to be faithful to it, his lifestyle is a perfect pattern. Every time we can learn from it but the way is still too long to go. In other wards, Imim’s lifestyle has been the best during man’s life. It belongs to a perfect man who can

---

[1]. Maqtal al-imim Am¢r al-Mu‘min¢n, pp. 45-46

[2]. Ibid. p.79, No.68

[3]. Ibid. p.92, No.85; p.96, No.91

[4]. Nahdj al-balighha, letter 45

indeed be called human and Allih's successor on the earth. Such an engrossing life did he have that it had his friends reach the zenith of amity and his enemies reach the zenith of enmity in front of him.

In this regard, the Prophet (s) has stated, **يهلك فيـك الرجلان محب مفرط ومبغض مفرط**[1] His withstanding for the sake of the path of Truth does incense the enemy that it makes him go to extremes whereas it does fan the blames of his friend's love that he may go to extremes.

The one feeling affection for him can ascend as highly as the rank to be called a devoted Shi'ite Muslim but if he neglected slightly he would be affected by the exaggerating tendency. Rarely ever has it be seen that divinity be attributed to a person. 'Al¢ (a), however, in a community where Allih had underscored the humanity of the prophet Mu¦ammad(s) was targeted by such attribution although Imim opposed it severely.

Imim's asceticism is what overshadowed all his life. He was an ascetic man who turned back on anything though he was entitled to possess everything. A group asked about the most ascetic man in the presence of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z. Some named Ab£dhar and 'Umar but 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z said,**أزهد الناس علي بن ابيطالب (ع)**) "No one is the most ascetic but 'Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib."[2]

Imim not only associated with the poor but also behaved kindly towards them.[3] He was sometimes seen doing prayer or delivering a sermon wearing his one and the only shirt wet.[4] Repeatedly, Imim has referred to his simple life in Nahdj al-Baligha. Noticing that Imim ate very frugal food, one of his disciples told him, **أبالعراق تصنع هذا؟ العراق أكثر خيراً وأكثر طعاماً ...** "Do you eat such food in Iraq where the best food can he found?"[5]

---

[1]. This Hadith is the one repeated many times. Imim also stated, يهلك فيك الرجلان، محب مفرط ومبغض مفرط Two people are murdered for me, extremist friend and hardline foe

Nahdj al-balighа, sermon 127

[2] al-Mi'yir wa l-muwizina, p.240

[3]. Ibid. p.240

[4]. Ibid. p.240

[5] Ibid. p.244

Imim was the first one who practiced what he peached objecting to ‘Uthmin Ibn °unayf in Nahdj al-Baligha or in his public sermons concerning this worldly life.

Aswad Ibn Qays recounted that Imim ‘Al¢ (a) fed the K£fiyins on the fertile land of the mosque but he himself ate the food in his house.

One of his disciples said, “I said to myself that ‘Al¢ eats more delicious food at home than what he gives people. So I left my food half eaten and followed him. He called Fi¤¤a and asked her to prepare the food. She brought a loaf of bread and yogurt diluted with water. He dipped the pieces of bread in the liquid while it was with bran. I asked him why he had not asked for bread baked with flour without bran. Shedding tears, he answered, “By Allih, neverever bread without bran was found in the Prophet’s house.”[1]

‘Uqba Ibn ‘Alqama narrated,”When I met Imim ‘Al¢ (a), there was sour yogurt diluted with water in front of him that was so sour and watery that it upset me. I asked him whether he would eat it.O Aba l-Khab£b, worse than this was the prophet’s food and rougher than mine was his clothes.

Imim answered, “I fear if I did not do what he had done, I would never join him”.[2] When a special food was brought for Imim, Imim stated, “Never do I eat what the Prophet (s) had never eaten”.[3]

It does not imply that eating such food is unlawful but sheer act of following Allih’s Messenger is of supreme importance for an Imim.

Presenting another example appears appropriate. As recounted by Abu l-Shiykh An¥ir¢, born in 369, Imim appointed ‘Amr Ibn Salama as the governor of I¥fahin. When setting out for K£fa, ‘Amr was intercepted by the Khiridjites. With the tributes and the gifts, he had to settle in °ulwin. As soon as the Khiridjites went away, he left the tributes in °ulwin and took the gifts with him to K£fa. Imim ordered him to lay them on the fertile land by K£fa Mosque and then distribute among Muslims. Umm Kulth£m, Imim’s daughter, sent for ‘Amr to send her some honey brought. He sent her two cans then. When Imim came to the mosque for prayer,

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II p.187; al-Ghirit, vol.I, pp.85,87,88

[2]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, p.85

[3]. Ibid. pp.88-89; the footnotes of the same pages

he realized that the honeys were two less. He called ‘Amr and asked where the two others were. He answered, “Do not ask what happened”, then he went and brought two cans of honey and added to them.

Imim repeated,”I only wanted to know what happened to those two”.

“Umm Kulth£m demanded to send honey to her”, answered ‘Amr.

“Not have I told you to distribute the gifts among people?” Imim asked.

He sent for her to send the honey back. When brought back a little was consumed. He sent for the traders to estimate the price of the subtracted amount. It was three or so dhms. Imim sent for Umm Kulth£m to pay for it. Then, the honey was distributed among Muslims.[1]

Numerous examples can be found in al-Ghirit and other books.

It is Imim’s own statement, **أنا الذي أهنت الدنيا**[2] **“**I am the one who despised this world.”

That manifests his stance against this worldly life. Imim’s behavior towards the agents is another dimension of his life addressed in historical sources. From any point of view, Imim supervised his agents and during his short term, many letters were written by him reprimanding them. After ‘Al¢’s martyrdom, S£da, ‘Umira Hamdin¢’s daughter, came up to Mu‘iwiya. She had participated in ¯iff¢n. For a short while, Mu‘iwiya talked her about ¯iff¢n. She requested him to depose Busr Ibn Ar§it oppressing them. He declined, however. S£da consequently prostrated and an hour later rose up. Mu‘iwiya asked her what it was for.

She responded,”When I went to ‘Al¢ to complain about the man responsible for our alms, he was busy with praying. After his prayer, he asked me what I wanted. On hearing with no delay he took a piece of skin out of his pocket and urging him to observe justice he wrote, “As soon as receiving the letter, do what ordered until I send one to replace you.

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-mu¦addith¢n bi-l¥bahin, vol.I, Akhbir l¥bahin, vol.I, p.72

[2]. °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.II, p.310

He gave the letter to me to hand in him. He was deposed accordingly.”[3]

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, pp.90-92

CHAPTER V
IMªM °ASAN'S IMAMATE

ACQUAINTANCE WITH THE K¬FIYªNS

Iraq has been an Islamic land that dominated over Islamic world throughout caliphate life for centuries and therein numerous important developments were embedded. With two cities of Ba¥ra and K£fa it initially appeared under the name of "'Ariqiyan" and later with the appearance of Baghdid it played a more important role. The time we talk about is when it is still a hundred years left to Baghdid emergence. Ba¥ra, for years after the event of Djamal, was 'Uthminids.[1] Although it was somewhat moderated with the Mu'tazilites' (schismatic) penetration later. On the other hand, K£fa has always been known as a Shi'ites center that did adhere to its belief during the Umayyads's authority and later on. On different occasions this city has been "reproached" on the one hand and admired on the other, thus different judgments have been passed about the K£fa people as follows,

A. These people on different occasions took different positions. Once they rose for defending Ahl al-Bayt and strengthened the 'Alawites with their courage and it was their assistance that helped Imim defeat Nikith¢n. Yet, it was the last years of Imim 'Al¢'s caliphate when they hesitated to help him, so the gospel. Truth was defeated and the credal error won. Though many[2], later they left °asan Ibn 'Al¢ (a) helpless on his own as well. Such a tragedy was also repeated in Mu¦arram 61. However, many of them under the name of Tawwib¢n (the Penitents) repended and in a

[1]. Musnad Ibn Dja'd, vol.I, p.527. the report was denied that Qatida in the second century heard that there be a number in Ba¥ra who claimed that they considered 'Al¢ superior to 'Uthmin. "By Allih, no resident before you had ever believed so", he said.

[2]. These Shi'ites Muslems were mostly political and they never believed that Imim °asan (a) was oppointed by Allih as an Imim.

movement were martyred. Another group allied with Mukhtir Ibn Ab¢ 'Ubayd to take revenge for Imim °usayn's assassin to show their Shi'ites stance. With not helping Zayd Ibn 'Al¢ in 122 H. they proved their unfaithfulness to the 'Alawites.

B. The why of such contradictory judgments is the existence of various political and religious groups in the city. One group was the Khiridjites, another was somehow the Umayyads' accomplice as the noble and the other group was the Shi'ite Muslims, Ahl al-Bayt's devotees from among whom the righteous were praised for their right deeds and the wicked kept on until they murdered the prophet's son.

C. The existence of the tribes was also influential in people's quick stance changing. They went to extremes in their tribal prejudice so irrationally that they made rash decisions on any trivial affair. Mostly in favor of the tribes were the decisions, so they threatened the K£fiyin's unity, exactly what the Umayyads took advantage of several times.

Here it looks essential that we get acquainted with the Iraqi's state on the threshold of °asan Ibn 'Al¢'s Imamate. Were these people familiarized, the next developments in Iraq would be well comprehended.

Doing research on Imim °asan's disciples, Shiykh Muf¢d classified people into categories. Imim 'Al¢'s Shi'ite Muslims; the Khiridjites who were intent on fighting Mu'iwiya and due to Imim Mudjtabi's intention of battling against Damascus allied with him. Those greedy for the booty; Common people negligent of what to do; and the group included those with tribal prejudice who obeyed their chiefs disregarding the religion.[1]

The number of those belonging to the third group exceeded all. As Iraq was the center of eastern conquests, they gained a great deal of booty in all wars. Yet, since Imim 'Al¢'s entrance to the land civil wars began; therefore, they assumed the 'Alawites as debtors.[2] After Nahrawin, they did not deem to the good of themselves to start a new war in the prevailing status. With the rumors spread by Mu'iwiya's spies in Iraq, doubt expanded among the Iraqis. The

---

[1]. al-Irshid,Vol.II,p.10;al-Fu¥£l al-muhimma,p.147;Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, pp.46, 56; Maniqib, Ibn Shahr ªsh£b, vol.IV, p.32; ¯ul¦ al-imim al-°asan (a), pp.68-69

[2]. Later you will see how Imim Mudjtabi has proved it.

Khiridjites' emergence added to their doubt and undermined them to understand the situation.

Regardless of what said above, the people of Iraq, as matter of fact, had expressed themselves encountering the rulers of a hundred years. The honor they had gained during the years of conquering Iran had made them dominant over the Prophet's Medina and when dissatisfied of any ruler, they compelled even 'Umar to depose him. The figures who were not among the tricksters seemed to be defeated. 'Ammir Ibn Yisir as a righteous man as well as Sa'd Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ as an un-political person could never tolerate the state of K£fa. In spite of it Mughh¢ra Ibn Shu'ba, a powerful debauchee (as described by 'Umar), could rule over K£fa for years.[1]

Later on, with Imim 'Al¢'s emigration from Medina to K£fa, it developed and the significance of its role in the Islamic world multiplied. His ethical and scientific background as well as his devotion during the life of Islam led people to rise up and help him. The Prophet's disciples and his own close followers joining to his army added to his might and allowed no one to overcome him for a time. but, after the issue of arbitration was broached in ¯iff¢n, they found a justification for standing against Imim 'Al¢ (a) and after suppressing the Khiridjites, they, under the pretext of fatigue, drew back from the internal affairs. Imim stated that although a ruler, he had been oppressed by people.[2] People's present state made Imim announce that he was by no means able to reform them. Though he could rule over them by force, it was never the way he did ever choose.

He himself has described them well enough, "O people of K£fa! With Qur'inic advice thee I reproached, fruitless it was. With rods thee I threatened, useless it was. With whips thee I punished, pointless if was. The only means to reform thee is sword, but at a cost of thy reforming never do I excite discord."[3] Sword was the one and the only thing that could make the people of Iraq obedient. This fact has been confirmed throughout history. If anyone like 'Al¢ (a) and his progeny had never desired to make use of force, that is to

---

[1]. See the section about "Caliph II's Agent"

[2]. Nahdj al-balighha, sermon 199

[3]. al-Irshid, vol.I, p.281 وما كنت متحرياً صلاحكم بفساد نفسي I sought not my ruin through thy reform.

impose something the people hated, neverever could he have succeeded.

Such rulers as Ziyid, his son, 'Ubayd Allih, or °adjdjidj could pacify Iraq. Despotism was what could remove the tensions. Mukhtir also could rule for a short time with his policy but because not despotic, he could never unite K£fa let alone Iraq.

Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n, the Commander of the Faithful, has expressively described this nation. He has likened them to a pregnant woman who aborts her baby at the very last moment after bearing the sever pain of pregnancy.[1] To camels without riders he also likened them that are gathered from one side but scattered on the other.[2]

It is quite natural that such morale can on no accounts tolerate a calm and reformist ruler who resorts to human and logical ways. At the end, the more Imim insisted on people's unity against Damascus, the less they even tried to defend Iraq.

It was then when Imim addressed them reproaching, **أيتها الفرقة التي إذا امرت لم تطع وإذا دعوت لم تجب، للـه أنتـم، أما دين يجمعكم، أما حمية تشخدكم؟ أوليـس عجبـاً أنَّ معاويـة يـدعو الجفـاة الطغـام فيتبعـونه غيـر معونـة ولا عطـاء وأنـا أدعوكم وأنتم تريكة الاسلام، أنه لايخرج إليكم من امـري رضـاَ ترضونه ولا سُخط فتجتمعون عليـه وإن احـبَّ مـا أنـا لاق إلـي الموت** [3] "O the crowd laying disobedient when ordered and remaining silent when called. Thou hast no religion to prepare thee? Thou hast no fervor to propel thee? Not a surprise rogues follow Mu'iwiya without expecting money and he is obeyed. I call you, the survivors of Islam, but you never follow me even I am not outraged for this. The only desire I seek is death."

These people treat 'Al¢ such while having brilliant records as far as he desires death. Of course, Imim could attract people, like Mu'iwiya, through non-Islamic ways or force them to war. But Imim behaved them this way now that they

---

[1]. Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 70

[2]. al-Irshid, vol.I, p.283 يا اشباه الإبل غاب عنها رعاتها، كلما اجتمعت من جانب تفرقت من جوانب أخرى Thou look like camels left unharnessed by camel drivers, if they are gathered on one side, they shall be dispersed on the other side.

[3]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.X, p.67

like staying and he never intended to force them to accept something they did not want[1] because if he did so, his leadership is not “Imamate “ but “Monarchy”. This was something Mu‘iwiya stayed proud of. Anyway, such people faced °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ (a)’s succession, the eople unwilling to admit their Imim’s command to defend Iraq and they went their homse from Nahrawin for rest and never returned.[2] Mu‘iwiya’s position in Damascus had strengthened as well. Damascus people who had already called Mu‘iwiya Am¢r now called him Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n. The Iraqi solidarity was not like that of ¯iff¢n time. The death toll in ¯iff¢n and Nahrawin had undermined the Iraqi’s spirit.[3] Since °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ was Imim ‘Al¢’s son, it had added to the difficulties. Yet, Iraq was afraid of being dominated by Damascus. Although they disobeyed their Imim, they were not contended with his murder. In other words, because they did not want to be under Mu‘iwiya’s dominance, they had no other alternative but swearing allegiance to Imim ‘Al¢’s son. Under those circumstances no one could lead Iraq but Imim °asan (a). Supposing that he did not exist, the Umayyads would naturally rule over Iraq. Nevertheless, the Iraqis’ allegiance was not so wholehearted to keep them faithful to their new Imim. As seen later, on the horns of a dilemma, they preferred to be beside the Umayyads, yet unwillingly. Therefore, among these people there was no room for Imim. He had to head for Medina.

IMªM °ASAN’S CHARACTER

Regarding Imim °asan’s virtues many narrations are recorded the narrators of which have been both Shi‘ite Muslims and Sunnites scholars.[4] Many historical books have been written containing his virtues but regretfully until recently no serious effort had been made about the events

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Sharĭ nahdj al-baligha, vol.XI, p.29 وقد أحببتم البقاء وليس لي أن أحملكم على مـا تكرهـون “Thou preferred to stay, so I have not the right to force thee to do something unpleasing to thee.”

[2]. Ibid. vol.II, p.193; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.418

[3]. Although the killed on Imim’s side were a few, many Khiridjites who were killed were from K£fa people’s relatives.

[4]. Such as Tardjamat al-°asan from Ibn ‘Asikir in Tir¢kh Dimashq and Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan from Ibn Sa‘d in ±abaqit al-kubri

in his life. Like any other time, the events are compiled with no serious research done nor is a detailed evaluation made. Most of the recorded virtues concerned with this magnanimous Imim reveal how much the two brothers were adored by Allih's Apostle who expressed his affection even publicly. Coming down the pulpit, kissing them and then going up the pulpit indicated that there was a reason behind the scenes.[1] It is additionally quoted from the prophet that he advised the present to recount to the absentees how he expressed affection for Imim °asan (a).[2]

He had also stated, "I do love him and the one loving him." [3]

Imim's presence in Mubihala (cursing each other) and among the people of Kasi' (covering) shows the credit the prophet had considered for him. Appealingly, when Imim Mudjtabi (a) took part in Ri¤win allegiance, the Prophet swore allegiance to him.[4]

In a narration he has stated, **لوكان العقل رجلاً لكان الحسن** "If wisdom was imagined in a man, he would be °asan."[5]

Imim °asan's power in persuading the K£fiyins, when Nikith¢n[6] revolted, manifests his importance and popularity among the people. As far as these hadiths are concerned, Muslims considered Fi§ima al-Zahri's descendants as the Apostle's, and despite the Umayyads's and later the 'Abbisids's denial there was no doubt for Muslims in this regard.[7]

It was due to his eminent characteristic that when Imim 'Al¢ introduced him publicly as his successor, the people of

---

[1]. N£r al-ab¥ir, pp.119-120, Maniqib Ibn Shahr ªsh£b, vol.IV, p.24; Na³m Durar al-sim§ayn, p.195

[2]. al-Mustadrak, °ukaym Niyshib£r¢, vol.III, pp.147, 173; al-It¦if bi-¦ubb al-ashrif, p.34

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan (a), Ibn Sa'd, p.134

[4]. al-°ayit al-siyisiya li l-Imim al-°asan, pp.24,44

[5]. Fari'id al-sim§ayn, vol.II, p.68

[6]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.49

[7]. al-°ayit al-siisiyya Li-Imim al-°asan, p.27. According to a narration in Kashf al-ghumma, vol.I, p.550, Mu'iw¢ya tried to call °asan (a) and °usayn (a) Imim 'Al¢'s sons not the Prophet's.

Iraq and other areas swore allegiance to him as an official caliph. Meanwhile, the spiteful around tried to mar his characteristic introducing him as the one with no policy and prudence on the one hand and a worldly figure with an opposite position to those of ‘Al¢ (a) and °usayn (a) on the other hand. For example, with recourse to a handful of counterfeited reports they tried to rumor that Imim Mudjtabi (a) had been constantly marrying and divorcing.[1] Related to the reports of the compromise, they claimed that he abdicated through a number of financial conditions. It implies that he had been after Diribdjird and Ahwiz revenues as well as the public found in K£fa.[2]

In such reports they have declared that since Imim did not deem caliphate his right, he submitted it to Mu‘iwiya. This utterance is nothing but an accusation because Imim had regularly made it clear that caliphate had been his right yet he had to give it up under duress.[3] In addition to blemishing his reputation mostly done by the ‘Abbisids under the pressure of the °asanides they abused Imim’s position to condemn ‘Al¢ (a) and even °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢ (a). They falsely quoted Imim as saying,”For the sake of kingdom, never will I fight Mu‘iwiya”.[4]

It could seem useful to Sunnites bigots to condemn Imim ‘Al¢’s wars. It is also narrated that when Imim °asan was born, his father liked to name him °arb (war)[5]. They implied that from the very beginning he did naturally love to fight.

Elsewhere they have quoted him as saying, “The entire Arab might is in my hand so it will be with me whether I fight or compromise.[6] One hundred thousand or forty thousand people swore allegiance to him and even loved him more than his father”.[7] Anyone who believes such untrue remarks,

---

[1]. al-It¦if, p.34

[2]. It will be discussed later.

[3]. al-Amil¢, Shiykh ±£s¢, vol.II, p.172; Bahdj al-¥abiqa, vol.III, p.448; °ayit al-°ayawin, vol.I, p.58; Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, pp.30,56; Maniqib Ibn Shahr ªsh£b, vol.IV, p.34

[4]. Dhakhi’ir al-‘uqbi, p.139; Na³m Durar al-sim§ayn, p.195

[5]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa‘d, p.126

[6]. Ibid. p.167; Dhakhi’ir al-‘uqbi, p.139

[7]. Tahdh¢b al-tahdh¢b, vol.II, p.299; Dhakhi’ir al-‘uqbi, pp.138-139; Tahdh¢b Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.IV, p.212; al-It¦if, p.35

he will inevitably assume that Imim left the authority of his own volition not by force. These two are worlds apart.

The other point was that this group of historians had been determined to prove in their historical reports that the two brothers had been in discord with different attitudes. In a narration they have quoted the Prophet as saying, "°asan is from me but °usayn from 'Al¢".[1]

Whereas as one of Imim °usayn's virtues repeated over and over is, **"حسين مني وانا من حسين** °usayn is from me and I am from °usayn."

Why this narration was counterfeited is to introduce 'Al¢ and his son, °usayn, both as the seekers of murder.

Concerning the differences between the two brothers, they have quoted Imim °usayn as saying to his brother, "I wish my heart were yours and your tongue mine".[2] They have also quoted Ab£ Bakr, upon seeing °asan Ibn 'Al¢, as saying, **"بابي شبيه بالنبي ليس شبيهاً بعلي**[3] By my father, he looks more like the Prophet than 'Al¢."

These are all narrated as virtue by the later generations while they had been counterfeited with the mentioned aim. Such a view could help the 'Uthminids to damage Imim 'Al ¢'s reputation and 'ªsh£ri.

One of the accusations made against Imim was his 'Uthminids stance, that is to say that he had been at odds with his father and refused to bloodshed in civil wars.

Misunderstanding the concept of compromise counted for the accusation. It was falsely claimed that although powerful enough, Imim relinquished authority to Mu'iwiya. But an unfounded accusation it is nothing. It was maintained to the extent that they narrated that he had accused his father of participating in 'Uthmin's assassination.[4]

Earlier it was discussed that no one but the Umayyads with political intention accused Imim 'Al¢ of being an

---

[1]. Dhakhi'ir al-'uqbi, p.132

[2]. Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p.243; Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn. Ibn 'Asikir, pp.145-146

[3]. Maniqib Ibn Shahr ªsh£b, vol.IV, p.121

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II,p.12. According to this narration, °asan has objected to Imim 'Al¢ (a). It is true but this °asan had been °asan Ba¥r¢ not Imim Mudjtabi.

accomplice in ‘Uthmin’s murder. By the same token how can it be ever possible for his son to accuse him of so? Surprisingly, a group of historians have said that Imim had sent his son to ‘Uthmin’s house to defend him. Given that it is true,[1] he had been set to prevent him from being killed. Furthermore, Imim °asan had been among the participants in Djamal war who played pivotal roles against the ‘Uthminidses. Imim ‘Al¢’s representative to persuade the K£fiyins to take part in war was he who could persuade some ten thousand people into the anti-’Uthminid war with his sermon in K£fa mosque.[2] Prior to that, he had defended Ab£dhar when in dispute with ‘Uthmin and when parting Ab£dhar at the time of being sent into exile he told him,”Put up with the difficulties they have made to you until you visit Allih’s Apostle while satisfied with you”[3] In the thick of ¯iff¢n war ‘Ubayd Allih, ‘Umar’s son, who had killed Hurmuzin, his wife and his Ab£ Lu’lu’ scared of Imim ‘Al¢’s retaliation tried foolishly in vain to have Imim °asan stand against his father. It was after he rejected him angrily that Mu‘iwiya said, “He is indeed his father’s son”.[4]

In ¯iff¢n, Imim Mudjtabi (a) provoked people against Qisi§ ¢n. Once he had addressed them, **فاحتشدوا في قتال عدّوكم معاوية وجنوده فإنه قد حضر ولاتخاذلوا فإن الخذلان يقطع نياط القلوب**[5] **“**Unite against your enemy, Mu‘iwiya and his army, and never droop for it does sever the nerves of your heart.”

He also, in a letter written to Mu‘iwiya at the beginning of his term, alluded to Ahl al-Bayt’s rightfulness and oppressedness after the Prophet’s departure. These are all convincing reasons for confirming what a great helper Imim had been to his father Under any circumstances.

---

[1]. Professor Sayyid Dja‘far Murta¤i is skeptical of this issue. al-°ayit al-siyisiya li l-Imim al-°asan, pp.149-150

[2]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.15; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p.63

[3]. al-°ayit al-siyisiya li l-Imim al-°asan (a), p.113; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.VIII, p.253; al-Ghad¢r, vol.VIII, p.301; Tir ¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.172

[4]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.297; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.V, p.233; Maniqib, Ibn Shahr ªsh£b, vol.III, pp.186,199

[5]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.114

In a narration when Imim Mudjtabi saw Ab£ Bakr on the pulpit he said, **إنزل عن منبر أبي "**Climb down my father's pulpit!"

Immediately Imim 'Al¢ (a) said,**إن هذا شيء عن غير ملاء منا**[1]**"**This is something exceptional in our tribe."

Imim °asan's strong position in fighting against Mu'iwiya after assuming the caliphate was exactly like that of his father. Imim's hostility towards the Umayyads was to the extent that Marwin did not allow his corpse to be buried next to the Prophet's grave, saying,"Why 'Uthmin was buried outside Baq¢' but °asan Ibn 'Al¢ next to the Prophet?"[2] It does manifest how strong had been Imim Mudjtabi's position against 'Uthminids's attitude. Yet, as mentioned earlier regarding the issue of compromise and in order to legitimize Mu'iwiya's rule, Imim's position was distorted.

IMªM MUDJTABª AND IMAMATE

The trace of the 'Uthminids's attitude in Sunnism proves that Imim Mudjtabi's six-month caliphate was neglected considered neither as the Orthodox caliphs' term nor as the monarch's.[3] In other words, his caliphate was not that legitimate. The survivors of Muhidjir£n and An¥ir in K£fa, yet along with the people of Iraq and the oriental lands of Islam had acquiesced to him as Muslim's caliph. Meanwhile Mu'iwiya had also claimed caliphate in Damascus though according to himself only one from among An¥ir had joined him, hence a wide gap was created among Muslims.[4] It was evident that not only the principle of analyzing caliphate was

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.160; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.26; Ibn Sa'd(219) has referred to such a reaction by Imim °usayn (a).

[2]. Na³m Durar al-sim§ayn, p.205; Raw¤a al-Wi'i³¢n, p.168; Maniqib, Ibn Shahr ªsh£b, vol.IV, p.44; Dhakhi'ir al-'uqbi, p.142

[3]. In historical books it is mentioned that after Imim 'Al¢'s martyrdom he took power with the allegiance of those present in K£fa. In Tir¢kh al-khulafi', Suy£§¢, Mas'£d¢ has said that considering Imim °asan's caliphate the narration of الخلافة بعدي ثلاثون سنة **"**The caliphate after me is thirty years**"** Would be right as seen in some historical books. Later, he referring to the duration of each caliph had confirmed the caliphate until the early third century.

[4]. ±abaqit al-shu'ari', p.109; al-Imti' wa l-Mu'inisa, vol.III, p.170

not accepted at that time but also to the end of the historical caliphate era it was assumed impossible to exist two caliphs simultaneously in the Islamic world. The present situation of Iraq when Imim °asan(a) assumed the power was far worse than that of Damascus. In addition to the defeat the Iraqi people had experienced concerning arbitration, the Khiridjites's revolt did severely undermine their morale and after three wars had gone weary. In very last days of his life, the more Imim 'Al¢ tried to mobilize them, the less they obeyed.[1] Now after Imim 'Al¢'s martyrdom and the Iraqi people's concern about Damascus domination, it looked probable that they resist. They should have chosen an Imim and as referred to previously, they had no other alternative. Qays Ibn Sa'd's and 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Abbis's allegiance to Imim paved the way for the Iraqis's allegiance. Following them, the residents of °idjiz after a while of delay swore allegiance.

Among the people the Shi'ite Muslims were found whose belief was profoundly in Imim Mudjtabi's Imamate and whose sworn allegiance was based on it as well. As a matter of fact, the tendency of the majority in K£fa was towards Shi'ism, namely denying 'Uthmin and approving 'Al¢ (a). They, during Imim's five-year term, being influenced by Imim and his disciples had become 'Alawites and hated the 'Uthminids. Opposition to 'Uthmin as well as his infamy in the city from the very time of Imim 'Al¢ (a) was to the extent that Djar¢r Ibn 'Abd Allih Badjal¢ had said that he would no longer stay where 'Uthmin was officially insulted.[2] Whom could people choose other than Imim Mudjtabi after 'Al¢'s martyrdom? Among Muhidjir£n and An¥ir or even the Qurayshites, of course, there were a group of the Prophet's disciples such as 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Abbis in K£fa who without a shadow of doubt had faith in Imim Mudjtabi and never ever did they think of someone else. The meaning was not that the Iraqi people liked °asan Ibn 'Al¢ more than his father,[3] it was owing to the fact that there was no other choice. It is pointed out because some are set to declare that the convenient opportunity was provided to Imim °asan but he himself declined to keep on his struggle.

---

[1]. Sharł nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.X, p.67

[2]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.VI, p.30; vol.VII, p.282

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn 'Asikir, p.171

As far as the theory of Shi'ites Imamate is concerned, there is evidence that Imim 'Al¢ had introduced his son as his successor though the Sunnis have not referred to such evidence for succession.[1] A narration is quoted from the Prophet in this respect in many a source as stating, **الحسن والحسين امامان، قاما أو قعدا** [2] **"** °asan and °usayn are the Imims whether they rise up or not."

This Hadith makes it clear that the two brothers' Imamate had been expressly stated. Historically, there are reports as proofs of Imim Mudjtabi's Imamate.

As reported by Na¥r Ibn Muzi¦im, A'war Shann¢ had addressed Imim 'Al¢ (a), "May Allih endow you more with success for a glance you have cast at divine light... The leader is you. Were you killed, the leaders would be these two, °asan and °usayn. Lend an ear to what I have composed, "O °asan's father! The dazzling sun of the midday is you and the shining moon is your sons. Until the Day of Judgement, thou and these two will go together as an ear with an eye. The generous are thou whose generosity is so sublime that no man can keep up with.[3]

Mundhir Ibn Ya'mur told Imim in ¯iff¢n, **فان تهلك فهذان الحسن والحسين أئمتنا من بعدك "** °asan and °usayn would be our Imims after you even if you were killed."

In a poem he had composed,

ابا حسن أنت شمس النهار وهذان في الداجيات القمر

وأنت وهذان حتي الممات بمنـزلة السمع بعد البصر[4]

O °asan's father, the midday sun dazzling is thee and the shining moon is these two. Until the Day of Judgement thou and these two will go together as an ear with an eye

It clarifies that Imim's disciples even from his time knew both Imim °asan and Imim °usayn as his successors as after

---

[1]. Maqtal Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n, p.61, Ibn Abi l-Dunyi has said that no successor 'Al¢ introduced.

[2]. Madjma' al-bayin, vol.II, p. 403; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p.159; al-Irshid, p.220

[3]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, pp.424-425 (¯iff¢n Battle, p.580); ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.34

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.147

Imim Mudjtabi's martyrdom K£fiyin Shi'ite Muslims went after Imim °usayn (a). 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Abbis also called the people to listen to Imim Mudjtabi who said, "Swear allegiance to him who is your Prophet's son and your Imim's successor".[1]

In a letter, Imim Mudjtabi also wrote to Mu'iwiya "On the threshold of demise, my father entrusted the power to me."[2]

Haytham Ibn 'Ad¢ has quoted his chiefs as saying, "°asan Ibn 'Al¢ is his father's successor".[3] When Abu l-Aswad Du'al¢ secured allegiance for Imim in Ba¥ra, said that, "Successorship and Imamate " had been entrusted to him by his father."[4]

People also told Imim, "You are our caliph and your father's successor and we are you followers".[5]

Anyhow it can be borne in mind that Imim 'Al¢ (a) had introduced his son as his successor.[6] One Friday when Imim did not feel fine, he asked °asan to lead the Prayer.[7] Heedless of the fact that K£fa Shi'ite Muslims had come up with Imim Mudjtabi based on their beliefs, the special Shi'ites concepts of Ahl al-Bayt and the dignity of Imim should be taken into account.

Imim's first-ever sermon as reported by all related sources is, "Anyone who knows me, all right but anyone who does not know me, I am °asan, Mu¦ammad's son. The son of the Bearer of good news and the Warner is I. I am the son of Allih's Apostle and with His permission the guidance light. I am from among Ahl al-Bayt from whom any filth and sin is kept away; whom are purified and whose affection Allih has made incumbent upon you in His Book, say, for my mission I

---

[1]. al-Irshid, vol.II, p.8. In a book by Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I6, pp.30-31 and Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.33 the word of successor is not referred to.

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.151;(in Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, I¥fahin¢, p.36 and) Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.I6, p.24, it is narrated, و لاتّي المسلمون الامر من بعده "After him, I am Muslims' leader" The difference between the two is clear.

[3]. al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.IV, p.474

[4]. al-Aghin¢, vol.I1, p.116

[5]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.IV4, p.43

[6]. al-°ayit al-Siyisiyya li l-Imim al-°asan, pp.48-49

[7]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.431

want thee naught but affection for my kinsfolk's.[1] And (anyone who does good, we do multiply his good), so this good is feeling affection for us, Ahl al-Bayt."[2]

Mas'£d¢ has presented a part of Imim °asan's one sermon as follows, "The saved Allih's party and close kin's of Allih's Apostle are we. We are the purified ones and one of the two weighty things left behind by the prophet. The other one is the divine Book to which no wrong can ever penetrate ... Obey us then, for our obedience is incumbent, for besides obeying Allih and His Apostle about the men of authorities it is ordered too. Anything which was in dispute, refer to Allih and His Apostle... If you referred to the Apostle and the authorities, they would surely figure it out, for they are the people of science inference".[3]

Hilil Ibn Yasif has recounted that he was present when °asan Ibn 'Al¢ delivered a sermon saying,

"O K£fiyins! Fear from Allih concerning us. We are your emirs and your guests. We are the ones about whom Allih has stated, **انما يريد الله ليذهب عنكم الرجس البيت ويطهركم تطهيراً**[4] **"**Allih only desires to keep away the uncleanness from you, O people of the House! And to give you a thorough purifying."

This sermon appears to be made after Imim °asan was wounded in Sibi§.

In spite of Muhidjir£n's and An¥ir's allegiance to the former caliphs, Imim Mudjtabi like his father deemed caliphate his right. His letter to Mu'iwiya like that of Imim 'Al ¢ (a) included censure for the former caliphs' designation. Pointing to Quraysh's reasoning in Saq¢fa, kinship to the Prophet (s) and Arabs' approval of such reasoning, Imim in his letter wrote,"Although such reasoning we also had, Quraysh never behaved justly towards us as were behaved by Arabs. They altogether oppressed us and stood against

---

[1]. It is the first part of the verse to the last part which only was referred in the narration.

[2]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.33; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XVI, pp.30-31; Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.167; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.28; °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.III, pp.526-527

[3]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, Vol.II, p.432. (The Women, 83)

[4]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan (a), Ibn Sa'd, p.167

us. Since we feared from the hypocrites and the parties, we had to bear them until we now come to grips with you who have no precedence in Islam and whose father had been the archenemy of Allih's Apostle and Book". Then Imim urged him to swear allegiance to him like people.

In his response, Mu'iwiya referred to his reaction against the event of Saq¢fa and wrote, "So you explicitly have denounced not only Ab£ Bakr, 'Umar and Ab£ 'Ubayda but Muhidjir£n and An¥ir. We never deny your virtues and precedence. That day they preferred them to you for protecting Islam. Today the discord between you and me is the same as that between Ab£ Bakr and you after the Prophet's departure. If I were certain that you were better than me as a lord of peasants and supporter of the nation or stronger than me in collecting properties and in encountering the enemies, I would swear allegiance to you. Since I am more experienced in ruling and older than you, you had better concede my sovereignty. If you do so, I will entrust the authority to you after myself, grant you a great quantity from Iraqi Bayt al-Mil (Public fund) and the revenues of anywhere you demanded in Iraq."[1]

The mention Mu'iwiya had made about the similarity between his dispute with 'Al¢ and his son and that of Ab£ Bakr and 'Al¢ was also seen in the letters exchanged between Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr and Mu'iwiya.[2]

Considering himself as the successor of Ab£ Bakr and 'Umar, Mu'iwiya insisted on it for he was pursuing a political intention as well.

Once he had written to Imim 'Al¢ (a),"You did injustice to the caliphs all".

If I did so, answered Imim, I should not apologize to you. The latter added,"I never did injustice. Only did I blame them and for what I did I will apologize to no one."[3]

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XVI, pp.33-36 (simplified); al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, pp.151-153; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, pp.64-68

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.31 Mu'iw¢ya wrote to Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab£ Bakr "You father and I knew well that 'Al¢ was superior but after the Prophet passed away", فكان أبوك وفاروقه أوّل من ابـتزّ حقّـه وخـالفه على أمره "Your father and his horrible friend were the first ones who usurped his right and opposed him" Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, pp.11-13

[3]. Nahdj al-baligha, letter 28

For whatever reason the people of Iraq and °idjiz swore allegiance to Imim °asan. It is said that when swearing allegiance, Qays Ibn Sa'd said, "For the sake of the Holy Book, the prophet's Sunna and Djihid against the oppressors I do swear allegiance to you."

Imim only preferred the first and the second ones saying, "These two are superior".[1] As recounted by Madi'in¢ after Imim 'Al¢ (a) died a martyr Ibn 'Abbis left home and cried out "One it left behind 'Al¢ (a) if willing, invite him to come out and you swear allegiance to him but if unwilling no one forces you". While they were weeping for Imim 'Al¢ (a), people showed satisfaction. Imim stepped out of home and after delivering a sermon and reciting the verse of Ta§h¢r (purification) and the crowd swore allegiance to him.[2] Later on Imim had addressed them, "Of your own volition you swore allegiance to me not under duress".[3]

According to what I¥fahin¢ has narrated, when Ibn 'Abbis called on the crowd to swear allegiance to him they announced that they knew no other one to be lovelier and more rightful than him, they announced that they knew no other one to be lovelier and more rightful than him, thus, they swore.[4]

Another point which merits to be taken into account is that the political principle agreed on caliphate is the allegiance of both Mecca and Medina. At the moment after about thirty years after the Prophet's departure, the majority of Prophet's disciples have been killed in conquests and also in Djamal and ¯iff¢n. Medina was no longer the center of caliphate. Therefore, the above-mentioned principle that was the allegiance of Muhidjir£n and An¥ir residing in Medina was called in to two questions. The problem per se foreboded how the situation was converted. It will be discussed later that the principle was not only dissolved but also substituted by the principle of succession on the part of Mu'iwiya. In addition, from among the chiefs of Quraysh a few survived to claim caliphate.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.158

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XVI, pp.22, 28

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.156

[4]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XVI, p.31

In a letter Mu‘iwiya had written to Ibn ‘Abbis, “Now you have to be concerned about Quraysh! Only six are alive, two in Damascus namely ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ and I, two in °idjiz, Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ and ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar and two in Iraq, you and °asan Ibn ‘Al¢”.[1]

Under such circumstances, Iraq could only trust Imim ‘Al ¢’s son. However there was a problem due to which the Iraqis were not able to be firm in their chosen way. When swearing allegiance to Imim a group was set to swear provided that Imim did battle with Mu‘iwiya. Imim Mudjtabi by no means approved their condition and said that he would not accept their allegiance unless they vowed to battle against anyone he battled and compromise with anyone he compromised.[2] It seems quite natural that no leader can swear allegiance under such a condition. He ought to be fully empowered to battle or compromise. Imim’s remark never implies that form the very beginning he was not intent on war[3], but his next actions showed that he was among the ones who insisted on war. The main reason for rejecting this condition was preserving his sovereignty as Imim of a community. If the condition had been approved, they indeed must have chosen a military commander not an Imim.

Shiykh Muf¢d has recorded that Imim was sworn allegiance on Friday Rama¤in 21st, 40.[4]

FIRST ACTIONS OF IMªM AND MU‘ªWIYA

Earlier we referred to one of Imim’s letters to Mu‘iwiya and its answer. The exchanged letters recorded by I¥fahin¢[5] bore no fruit. Imim himself was absolutely aware that would never surrender with such letters, yet, it is of great significance that these letters be recorded as evidence to

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.133; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.105, No.315

[2]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa‘d, pp 154-155; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.158; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.29

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.29

[4]. al-Irshid, vol.II, p.9

[5]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, pp.62-68

indicate explicitly what the reasoning of the both sides were for their legitimacy.

Mu'iwiya did his utmost to be kept abreast of the state in K£fa and Ba¥ra through his spies. But the spies were all identified and killed.[1] Both Imim and 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Abbis had written to Mu'iwiya admonishing him for his violation. For the last time Imim warned Mu'iwiya if he did not surrender, he with the Muslim army would attack, **فحاكمتك الى الله حتى يحكم الله بيننا وبينكم وهو خير الحـاكمين**[2] **"**We entrust the arbitration between you and me to Allih to judge and He is the best arbitrator."

When writing letters was fruitless, Imim wrote to Mu'iwiya, "Between you and I, sword will judge".[3]

In a letter, then, to his agents in various areas besides expressing his delight in Imim 'Al¢'s effortless murder, Mu'iwiya informed them of K£fa in chaos. "The nobles and the leaders in K£fa have written to me for guarantee of clemency for themselves and their families", added he truly or falsely, "as soon as you receive the letter, move to me with your armies because time is ripe for revenge". Accompanied by his army Mu'iwiya advanced towards Manbadj bridge. At the same time, Imim °asan (a) sent °udjr Ibn 'Ad¢ for people and his agents to get prepared for fighting.

In K£fa Imim after reciting the verse of, **واصبروا ان الله مـع الصـابرين**[4] **"**And be patient; surely Allih is with the patient," addressed the gathering, "O people, but through patience with what you dislike. You can never reach what you like. I learnt that Mu'iwiya is moving towards us. Hasten to Nukhayla you all".[5] I¥fahin¢ recounts that Imim was speaking as if doubtful about people's readiness. No one breathed a word.

All of a sudden 'Ad¢ Ibn °itim broke the silence saying, "I am °itim's son. Why on earth do you keep waiting? Do you not obey your Imim and your Prophet's son?" Then he

---

[1]. Ibid. p.62; Sharḥ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XVI, p.31; al-Irshid, vol.II, p.9

[2]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.66

[3]. Sharḥ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XVI, p.26

[4]. 'Anfil, p 46

[5]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.69

assured Imim and headed for Nukhayla. A number of people from the tribe of ±ayy whose chief was ‘Ad¢ Ibn °itim accompanied him. According to Ya‘q£b¢, there were a hundred fighters in ±ayy who never dared to disobey ‘Ad¢.[1] Later, Qays Ibn Sa‘d, Ma‘qal Ibn Qays and Ziyid Ibn ¯a‘¥a‘a gave speeches; therefore, around twelve thousand soldiers gathered in Nukhayla. Imim accompanied them up to ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Convent.[2]

It should not be ignored that the Iraqis’ morale had been undermined after the event of arbitration. They had prepared themselves for a compromise with Qisi§¢n. On the other hand, whenever they imagined to be dominated by Mu‘iwiya, their hair stood on end. At this juncture, a group feigned ignorance, another group was quite doubtful and only one group, the minority, joined Imim. Setting out for the camp, Imim left his paternal cousin, Mughra Ibn Nawfal, in K£fa to convince people to join. °irith Hamdin¢ has said that those willing to join Imim went to Nukhayla while many balked at going among whom some had already promised to cooperate.[3] As a result, Imim had to return to K£fa and mobilize support.

Imim’s such position-taking is despite what Zuhr¢ and others have said, **كان الحسن لايؤثر القتال ويميل إلى حقن الدماء**[4] **“**°asan is as a matter of fact reluctant to battle.” **ولم يكن في نية الحسن أن يقاتل أحداً ولكن غلبوه على رأيه**[5] **“**Since °asan was not determined to battle, he compromised.”

In addition, Imim had given people raises in order to strengthen their spirit.[6] They got the raise form the very beginning of caliphate to get ready for the war against Damascus.

The total number gathered in Nukhayla was twelve thousand. They had to go there following their chiefs and under the pressure of propaganda. Though this figure is stipulated in many historical sources, some believe that it

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.181

[2]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, pp.70-71

[3]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.44

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.158; Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, p.196

[5]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VIII, p.14

[6]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.64

was forty thousand. It is said that the troops with Imim going to 'Abd al-Ra¦min Convent had been forty thousand form among whom a thousand were sent as the vanguard led by Qays Ibn Sa'd.[1] This mentioned figure can by no means be correct because, the historical narrations certify that all at first remained silent when called. How is it possible that the number augmented suddenly and miraculously? If Imim's supporters were that many, there would be no need to go to Ctesiphon and summon forces nor to risk and leave the army all on its own. Many historians such as Ya'q£b¢, Abu l-Fara**dj** l¥fahin¢ and Ibn 'Asikir who have accurately recorded the report have approved the twelve-thousand figure.[2] There is a strong probability that this false narration refers to those who swore allegiance to him after Imim 'Al¢'s martyrdom. The number mentioned in that narration is forty thousand who were supposed to battle with Damascus.[3] According to some[4], this narration had made a group of people assume that this great number had been prepared to aid °asan Ibn 'Al¢ (a) although the allegiance of this number to Imim 'Al¢ (a) is open to doubt by itself. Regarding Imim 'Al¢'s repeated remarks in Nahdj al-Baligha and other sources about reproaching K£fa people for not helping him in the war against Damascus, it beggars belief that such a large crowd help his son. As it will be seen later the main cause for the compromise was people's non-collaboration. Which can be easily inferred from Imim's remarks. It is clear-cut that with the presence of forty thousand soliers such rematks should not have been quoted from him.

'Ubayd Allih Ibn 'Abbis was the commander of Imim's army but Zuhr¢ has mistakenly named 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Abbis.[5] Some others have mentioned Qays Ibn Sa'd,[6] after 'Ubayd Allih fled, who seized his position. There is no doubt that Imim had appointed 'Ubayd Allih.[7] Why Imim chose him was

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.153; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.61

[2]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.71; Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.214; Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn 'Asikir, p.167

[3]. Dhakhi'ir al-'uqbi, pp.138-139

[4]. ¯ul¦ al-°asan, ªl Yis¢n, p.123

[5]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.168

[6]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn 'Asikir, p.176

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.34

that in the present situation full of doubt Imim had no other choice but appointing one form his own lineage. Moreover, ‘Ubayd Allih bore Mu‘iwiya a grudge because Busr Ibn Ar§it, one of Mu‘iwiya’s commanders, in an attack on °idjiz had beheaded his two sons before their mother’s very eyes. Yet, Imim treated it with caution and appointed two deputies for him, Qays Ibn Sa‘d and Sa‘¢d Ibn Qays.

Sending them towards the enemy, Imim headed for Sibi§ in Ctesiphon. But before they go, he gave ‘Ubayd Allih some advice, **ألن جانبك** “Behave softly” **ابسط ووجهك** “Try to look cheerful” **أفرش لهم جناحك** “Cast the umbrella of your affection over them.” **ادنهم من مجلسك** “Try to keep close to them” **وشاور هذين** “Consult these two” **فلا تقاتله حتى يقتلك** “Never start battling before being stated.”

Imim also pointed out that those people were the survivors of the ones whom Imim ‘Al¢ (a) trusted. Then Imim added that they should move to the Euphrates and then to Maskan to defend themselves against Mu‘iwiya and stay there until being ordered.[1]

Imim himself went to Sibi§. As recorded by D¢nwar¢, Mu‘iwiya sent an army with ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir Ibn Kurayz to Anbir and then to Ctesiphon. Comprehending the situation, Imim had to set out to Ctesiphon.[2] The incident occurred there and is reported by all historians, was the Khiridjites attack on Imim. Such historians as D¢nwar¢, Balidhur¢, Abu l-Faradj I¥fahin¢ and even Shiykh Muf¢d quoting I¥fahin¢ have said that form Imim’s remarks the probalility of compromise could be inferred. Due to this reason the Khiridjites attacked him. It can not be acceptable. How could Imim, who had gone to Ctesiphon prevent the enemy’s invasion or recruit people, give such utterances with the implicit aim of compromise before the war be started? Ya‘q£b¢ has recounted clearly what happened. Mu‘iwiya who never ever gave up trickery sent Mughº¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba and ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir to Sibi§ to talk to Imim about compromise. When returning disppointedly in order to provoke the Khiridjites and under their breath in a way to be heard, they said, “Allih indeed prevented blood shedding and suppressed the sedition by the Prophet’s son. At last he

---

[1]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.71; Sharª nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XVI, p.40

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.216

accepted to compromise". Ya'q£b¢ added that it was then that on heating, the army grew furious and never doubted their truthfulness, so they attacked °asan (a) and plundered what he possessed.[1] The Shi'ite Muslims protected Imim in the middle and kept him away. Meanwhile Djarri¦ Ibn Sanin shouting,

"Like your father you have become polytheist" struck Imim on his thigh. Shi'ite Muslims attacked Djarri¦ and killed him. Imim then had to take a rest in the house of Sibi§ governor, Sa'd Ibn Mas'£d Thaqaf¢ who was Mukhtir's paternal uncle, for treatment.[2] Ya'q£b¢'s narration of the riot in Ctesiphon uncovered the fact that event was also plotted by Mu'iwiya and his commonders, specially, Mugh¢ra Ibn Shu'ba, a corrupt man.

After Imim was wounded, he addressed people, **اتقوا الله فينا، فانا أمراؤكم وضيفانكم، أهل البيت الذين قال الله, إنّما يُريدُ الله ليذهبَ عَنكمُ الرّجسَ أهلَ البيتِ ويطهّركُم تطهيراً "**Seek divine behavior towards us for we are the best rulers among you, that is the same Household about whom God said, "Verily God hast the will to purge evils off thee in thy purity."

The narrator says,"The listeners were all weeping".[3]

Imim's separation from the army for mobilizing forces and preparing Ctesiphon to avert the entrance of Damascus plunderers, created particular problems. The two armies stood against each other in °ab£biyya village of Maskan. Mu'iwiya as usual had recourse to trickery to delude the rival army. He sent 'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Samura to falsely inform 'Ubayd Allih and his army of Imim °asan's demand for compromise. People, nevertheless, denied and cursed him.[4]

Later, he secretly sent one to give a message to 'Ubayd Allih Ibn 'Abbis, "°asan has requested us to compromise. If you join us, I will pay you a million dhms. You take the half now and the other half when we entered K£fa." While people waited for 'Ubayd Allih to come for the Dawn Prayer, he had nightly joined Mu'iwiya. Qays Ibn Sa'd led the prayer and

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.215

[2]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.72

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.167,169,170; al-Mu'djam al-Kab¢r, Vol.III, p.96, No.2761; Madjma' al-Zawi'id, vol.VI, p.167

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p. 37

then talked behind ‘Abbis how he had assisted the unbelievers in Badr until he was arrested. Then he talked behind ‘Ubayd Allih how in Yemen he fled and let Busr Ibn Ar§it murder his sons.[1]

Suggesting bribery on the part of Mu‘iwiya and other reports reveal well that Mu‘iwiya had under false pretences propounded the request for compromise on behalf of Imim. If, as a matter of fact, Imim had accepted the compromise, there would have been no need for Mu‘iwiya to pay a million dhms to ‘Ubayd Allih. Most Iraqis were on the qui vive to see Imim’s tendency towards compromising and immediately leave the army. As soon as ‘Ubayd Allih left, about two thirds of the army joined Mu‘iwiya[2]; therefore, four thousand people remained with Qays Ibn Sa‘d.

Mu‘iwiya supposed that after ‘Ubayd Allih and a part of his army sought refuge no one had remained. When he sent Busr Ibn Ar§it to the Iraqi army, they attacked him. He had to return and with an army attack them. Once again Qays and the army resisted and made them withdraw. A number were killed in the clash.[3] Mu‘iwiya tried to deceive Qays as well, but Qyas said about his religion he would never be deceived. Belittling him, Mu‘iwiya called him a Jew the son of a Jew and said, “Look how your tribe left your father alone as he breathed his last on his own in °awrin of Damascus.”

In his answer Qays called him an idol the son of an idol and wrote,

“From the very beginning you unwillingly embraced Islam and you did nothing for it but sowing the seeds of discord and then willingly you deviated from it. You have always been in battle with Allih and His Apostle and a party from the polytheist parties.”[4] I¥fahin¢ after recounting the event has referred to a delegation sent by Mu‘iwiya to Sibi§ for talks with Imim °asan. It indicates that Mu‘iwiya’s aim for taking the former action had been only deceiving ‘Ubayd Allih.

Before the Iraqis were informed of Imim’s injury, the spies had informed Mu‘iwiya. Upon hearing the news, he wrote to

---

[1]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p. 73

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p. 38

[3]. Ibid, vol III, p.38

[4]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p. 74; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. III, pp. 39-40

Qays that his defiance was futile, for °asan's disciples had revolted and wounded him Sibi§. It made Qays to wait for a message from Imim.[1] When the noble in Iraq realized that the victory would probably be Mu'iwiya's, they one after another either joined him or sent him the message of allegiance. According to Balidhur¢ the distinguished figures of Iraq went to Mu'iwiya and swore allegiance the first of whom was Khilid Ibn Ma'mar. He said that his allegiance was equal to those of Rabi'a tribe.

Later on, a poet had composed for Mu'iwiya,"Hold Khilid Ibn Ma'mar in esteem for without him you would never secured the authority".[2]

The policy that Mu'iwiya manipulated was spreading rumors in three areas of K£fa, Sibi§ and the war field. The K£fiyins thought that everything was over. In the war field it was said that your Imim had demanded to compromise. And in Sibi§ Imim was said that 'Ubayd Allih along with a majority had joined the enemy and it was even rumored that Qays Ibn Sa'd also had compromised. The only historian who has taken these multi-lateral rumors into consideration is Ya'q£b¢.

He has said, "On one hand, Mu'iwiya sent a group to Imim's military camp to report that Qays Ibn Sa'd has compromised. On the other hand, he sent another group to rumor among Qays's troops that °asan (a) has requested to compromise".[3] Regretfully, a number of historians have recorded such rumors as historical reports. As an instance, Mu¦ammad Ibn Sa'd has recorded Mughra Ibn Shu'ba's trickery which led to the revolt of some people in Sibi§ of Ctesiphon as a historical report and added that it was where Imim accepted any condition laid down by Mu'iwiya.[4]

Even a group of the Iraqi nobles who had joined Mu'iwiya had told him that they were ready to hand in °asan locked up. As narrated by Ibn A'tham, when Qays in a letter informed Imim of the army's surrender, Imim called on the distinguished among his disciples saying, "O Iraqi people! What should I do with you? This is a letter from Qays who

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.38

[2]. Ibid. vol. III, p. 39

[3]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p. 215

[4]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.169

has written that your chiefs have joined Mu‘iwiya. By Allih it comes as no surprise. In ¯iff¢n you forced my father to accept the arbitration and when he did so you objected. When for the second time he summoned you to war against Mu‘iwiya, you delayed until he was endowed with divine generosity. Quite unwillingly after that you swore allegiance to me. I trusted your allegiance and took a step. Allih Himself is fully aware of my intention. But see what you have done. O people, these all suffice me, deceive not me about my religion.”[1]

Imim’s remarks prove that he had not even the least doubt about the war but people’s unpleasant behavior had harassed him.

MU‘ªWIYA AND REQUEST FOR COMPROMISE

What elucidates Imim’s stance is that he had on no accounts demanded to compromise. It was Mu‘iwiya who desired to besiege Iraq with no trouble and insisted to convince Imim to abdicate. In spite of the fact, some sources based on the rumors and those narrators who called them historical reports have claimed that it was Imim who suggested the compromise willingly.[2] Yet in return we mention some proofs one of which is what Ya‘q£b¢ has recounted. Mu‘iwiya sent a group to Sibi§ for talks with Imim °asan (a) about the compromise. It was exactly the meeting therein Imim declined to compromise.[3] Accordingly, Mu‘iwiya’s first request was declined. Another proof is Imim’s letters in which he had persisted in war and threatened that if he did not surrender, he would face his army.

Imim also told Mu‘iwiya’s envoy,”Tell that sword will judge between you and me.” All demonstrate that Imim’s intention was to battle.

The other one was what Imim told people,” Mu‘iwiya has suggested a compromise there is no honor in. If prepared, I

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.157; compare with Imim’s distorted remarks in Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.39

[2]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol. VIII, p.14; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol. III, p.205

[3]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.215

am with you to battle but if worldly life is vital for you, tell me to compromise."[1]

Sib§ Ibn Djawz¢ narrated,

"When Imim °asan (a) found out people have left him alone and have betrayed him, he had to accept to compromise. Earlier Mu'iwiya had requested but Imim had rejected. And it was Mu'iwiya who wrote to him many times."[2]

"Mu'iwiya wrote to Imim about compromise", Shiykh Muf ¢d has said.[3]

As we discussed earlier, the rumors Mu'iwiya had spread had made some historians believe that Imim had been the one suggesting the compromise. Reportedly, Mu'iwiya sent his spies to rumor among the vanguard that °asan has in a letter demanded Mu'iwiya to compromise and say,"What do you jeopardize your life for?"[4] Also in order to mislead 'Ubayd Allih Ibn 'Abbis, he wrote, **ان الحسن قد راسلني في الصلح**[5] **"**°asan wrote to me about compromising."

These rumors later were recorded as historical narrations and changed the reality diametrically.

Why the Compromise Was Accepted

There were several reasons that hindered Imim to achieve his goal, a mighty and honorable battle against Mu'iwiya. To safeguard the principal Islam and impede fruitless bloodshedding, he had to avoid battling. We point to some reasons below,

A.The most crucial reason for why Imim adopted a new position was people's weakness in supporting him. No one can ever claim that Imim was never determined to fight with Mu'iwiya inasmuch as his remarks and position had already proved the reverse. What took place in Sibi§ obviously showed how incapable were the people in keeping on their

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn 'Asikir, pp.178-179; al-Kimil fi l-tir ¢kh, vol.III, p.406; (A'lim al-D¢n) p.181; Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.21; Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, p.199

[2]. Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, p.197

[3]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.48

[4]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XI, p.42

[5]. Ibid.

struggle. It was then, according to Shiykh Muf¢d, Imim found out that people had disparaged him.[1] A large number from among these people had been killed in wars of Djamal, ¯iff¢n and Nahrawin and now tired of any battle not only they felt no strength to fight but also they considered Ahl al-Bayt as debtors. They believed that Imim was responsible for the murdered.

As soon as Imim learnt that many soldiers have fled, he addressed people as saying,"You disobeyed my father to continue fighting and let the arbitrators judge while my father disagreed. He called upon you to keep on the war but you feared until he was killed. Later you came up to me and swore allegiance. You vowed to battle against any one I battled and compromise with any one I compromised. Today I heard that your nobles have joined Mu'iwiya. It dose suffice me. Deceive me not about my religion."[2]

Concerning the reason for Imim's abdication, Djı¦i¨ has written,"When he found these people's behavior towards his father and had known how capricious they were, he had to relinquish the power."[3]

Imim realized that he could not trust such people. This inconfidence was not only for lack of cooperation on their part but Imim stated, **والله لو قاتلت معاويه لأخذوا بعنقي حتى يدفعوني اليه سلماً**[4] **"**By Almighty Allih, if I clash with Mu'iwiya, they will grasp hold of my neck and hand me over locked up."

Elsewhere he has said, **ورأيت أهل العراق، لايثق بهم أحد أبداً الا غلب "**Iraqi people are those whom anyone trusted, was defeated, for no one agrees with another. They are never serious either about the wrong or the right."[5]

With such people battling with determined and united people of Damascus was impossible. The sad remarks of Imim 'Al¢ (a) made in 39 and 40 A.H. do convince any equitable individual that there was no other alternative but handing Iraq to Damascus. Never ever could Imim °asan (a)

---

[1]. al-Irshid, vol. II, p.13

[2]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.XVI, p. 22

[3]. Risilat Djı¦i³ f¢ Ban£ Umayya printed in 'A¥r Ma'm£n, vol.III, p.7

[4]. 'I'lim al-wari, p. 205; Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.20; 'Awilim al-'ul£m, vol.XVI, p.175

[5]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.405

surrender himself and a number of his Shi'ite Muslims bare-handed to Damascus people whose commander was Busr Ibn Ar§it, bloodthirsty. Now compromising was the only way for protecting Iraq from being plundered. Although it seemed possible that Imim and his small army resist and be martyred, rarely did it bear fruit. Mu'iwiya had poisoned the atmosphere through the slogan of 'Uthmin's blood. In addition to Damascus, Egypt and other areas were now in his hand. At this point, Imim with that precedence and eloquence could do nothing and it had no reason but Iraq's ineptness before Damascus. Hence, Imim's martyrdom could solve no problem. Mu'iwiya was absolutely infamous and there was no need to make him known. At times, Imim was mistakenly introduced as the one loathing bloodshedding. It can never be accepted. He participated in wars of Djamal and ¯iff¢n actively and confirmed his father's tradition. What Imim loathed was futile bloodshedding with no politically clear results.

B. Another reason was that waging a war normally depended upon people's presence and a ruler to a limited extent could force them to battle. Two points merit consideration. One is whether a Muslim ruler could under any circumstances and even with overt disagreement of the majority start the war. If he were entitled to, under what conditions should he do so? The other point is that supposing he did so, would it be for the good of the Muslim nation or not?

The Prophet's tradition was that he basically consulted the Muslims on war affairs. Considering the wars during his lifetime, we discussed it in detail. It occurred while firstly he had already secured allegiance from them and secondly since Djihid was one of the practical laws of Islam, it was Muslims' duty the same as prayer. So why did he consult them regardless of these two points? One reason was because war was a heavy burden which was supposed to be carried by people. Prayer took a little time for a Muslim to do whereas war might cause heavy casualties and damages or make many homeless. When one was martyred, a tribe was bereaved. Naturally, people themselves should have become aware through consultation and shouldered the responsibility a bit. Although Djihid was a practical law of Islam, Allih's Apostle did never call upon An¥ir to participate in wars before Badr because they had committed not. Only

in Badr did they participate after their leaders declared readiness. Later on, he had also consulted them in U¦ud and A¦zib.

Whether to compose people to combat or not is a point that should be considered. Imim ‘Al¢ (a) has always been set to convince them either through advice or perhaps through having a whip in hand. Under no circumstances, did he try to coerce them by sword or torture.[1]

He stated explicitly, “Yesterday I was the one who commanded, but today I am commanded. Yesterday I was the one who prohibited but today I am prohibited. You love to survive and, **ليس لي أن احملكم ما تكرهون** I never ever compel you to do what you dislike. [2]

Imim Mudjtabi (a) was also faithful to this very method. When finding that they were not willing to have such an Imim nor were they prepared to defend themselves against Damascus, it looked quite natural that he left Iraq for Medina after giving essential advice that was mostly given in advance by his father. Imim ‘Al¢ (a) had already foretold them what an intolerable situation they would have in the future,”Be informed that thou will get into three great difficulties after me, an epidemic objectless, fatal sword and despotism. Then thou will desire that thou could have seen me, helped me and sacrificed thyself for me.” [3]

Facing such hard status in Iraq and people’s indifference to his demands for a war, Imim °asan (a) expressed his transparent position under the pressure of Mu‘iwiya’s insistence on his resignation. First of all Imim declared that there was no doubt about the war against Damascus. **والله لا يثنينا عن أهل الشام شك ولا ندم، وإنما نقاتل أهل الشام بالصبر والسلامة** “No doubt or regret will prevent us from battling with Damascus. Forebearingly and calmly we will fight.”

Concerning people’s morale, he added,”You differ greatly from the past. Once you were getting prepared for ¯iff¢n, your religion was prior but today you give priority to this worldly life over your religion. Now between two bloody wars

---

[1]. al-Ghirit, p.173 (Persian version)

[2]. Nahdj al-baligha, sermon 208; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad ¢d, vol.II, p.220; vol.XI, p.29

[3]. al-Ghirit, p. 185

of ¯iff¢n and Nahrawin you weep for those you have lost and want to take revenge... but Mu'iwiya has called upon us to compromise while in the compromise no honor and justice can be ever found, **ألا وانّ معاوية دعانا الى أمر ليس فيه عزّ ولا نصفة "**Beware that Mu'iwiya called us to do something neither of sublimity nor fairness."

Therefore, Imim announced that compromising would on no accounts be for the good of the nation after all. Then he urged people to tell him what course to pursue. **فان أردتم الموت رددناه عليه وحاكمناه الى الله عز وجل بظبى السيوف، وان أردتم الحياة قبلناه وأخذنا لكم الرضى "**If you are prepared to fight, let's decline their request and rely on our swords, allow Allih to pass judgment. But if you like to survive, let's accept their request and provide you with security."

At the same time, people shouted from four corners of the mosque saying, **البقية البقية "**The remainders, the remainders..." and signed the peace pact.[1]

Elsewhere he said, **اني رأيت هوى عظم الناس في الصلح، وكرهوا الحرب فلم احب أن أحملهم على ما يكرهون "**I found people mostly willing to compromise yet unwilling to fight. Never do I like to impose what they dislike."[2] **أرى أكثركم قد نكل عن الحرب وفشل في القتال ولست أرى أحملكم على ما تكرهون "**I realized how weak you have gone and how reluctant you have turned to fight. So I am not the one who compels you to do what you disgust."[3]

Imim referred to people's non-cooperation as the reason for abandoning his caliphate. There was no other solution the normal situation. He stated, **والله اني سلّمت الامر لاني لم أجد انصاراً ولو وجدت نصاراً لقاتلتة ليلي ونهاري حتى يحكم الله بيننا وبينه**[4] **"**By Almighty Allih, I abandoned it for I had no helper. If there were a helper to me, I would fight him day in and day out until Allih judge between him and me."

C. Imim's the other reason for accepting the compromise was protecting the Shi'ite Muslims' lives. Those objecting to

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan (a), Ibn 'Asikir, pp. 178-179; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.406; A'lim al-D¢n, p.181; Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.21; Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, p. 199

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.220

[3]. Akhbir al-§iwil. p.217

[4]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.147; pp. 45-46

Imim were of two groups, the extremists, the Khiridjites, who had the same clash with Imim ‘Al¢ (a) as well and the revolutionary Shi‘ite Muslims who could never stand compromising.

There was a few among those objecting who described Imim as, **مـذلّ المـؤمنين "**the one who humiliates the believers."

Yet, in return Imim considered the acceptance of the compromise as honor and described himself as, **معـز المؤمنين "**The one who holds the believers dear."

He justified it as follows, **اني لمّا رأيت ليس بكم عليهم قوّة، سـلمت الامـر لأبقـى أنـا وأنتـم بيـن أظهركـم "**When I found thee not powerful enough, I preferred to compromise so that thou and I could survive."

Next utterances manifest that by their and his surviving he meant safeguarding Shi‘ism. Somewhere else, Imim has likened his action to piercing the ship by a scholar with Moses whose aim was preserving the ship for her owners.[1]

He also had said, **فصالحت بقياً على شيعتنا خاصّـة مـن القتل فرأيت دفع هذه الحروب الى يوم مّا، فانّ اللّه كـل يـوم هو في شأن "**I did compromise to save the Shi‘ite Muslims' lives. I pondered over delaying these wars for every day Allih deals with an affair."[2]

In an answer to one of the objectors Imim said, **ما أردت بمصالحتي معاوية الا أن أدفع عنكم القتل عندما رأيت تباطيء أصحابي عن الحرب ونكولهم عن القتال "**With the aim of at least protecting your lives I compromised with Mu‘iwiya when I found my disciples weak and unwilling to fight."[3]

Answering another objector, Imim likened his compromise to the Prophet's with a difference that had been a compromise with the disbelievers, **بالتنزيـل "**Ordered directly by Allih with revelation."

But his compromise was with the disbelievers **بالتأويل "**Indirectly through interpretation."

---

[1]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.19; Tu¦af al-‘Uq£l, p. 227; ‘Awilim al-‘ul£m, vol.XVI, p.175; Fari'id al-sim§ayn, vol.II, p.120

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p. 220; Maniqib Ibn Shahr ªsh£b, vol. IV, p. 35

[3]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p. 221

Then he added, **ولولا ما أتيت، لما ترك من شيعتنا على وجه الارض أحد الا قتل "**If I had not done so, no Shi'ite Muslim would have survived."[1]

When °udjr Ibn 'Ad¢ objected, Imim reacted as saying, **يا حجر! ليس كل الناس يحب ما تحب، وما فعلت الا ابقاءً عليك، والله كل يوم هو في الشأن "**O °udjr! all do not like what you like. I did so for nothing but saving your life and others'. Allih also deals with an affair every day."[2] **يا مالك! لاتقل ذلك، اني لما رأيت الناس تركوا ذلك الا أهله، خشيت أن تجتثّوا عن وجه الارض، فأردت أن يكون للدين في الارض ناعي "**O Milik! say not so, Imim addressed Milik Ibn ®amra when objecting, when I saw how people but a few left me on my own, I feared you be wipped off the face of the earth. Hence, I decided to make one survive cry out for the religion on the earth."[3]

He also said, **انما هادنت حقناً للدماء وصيانتاً واشفاقاً على نفسي وأهلي والمخلصين من أصحابي "**I agreed to compromise to both prevent bloodshed and save my life, my family's and my faithful disciples."[4]

The objectors were mostly faithful to Ahl al-Bayt. Such individuals from among them as °udjr Ibn 'Ad¢ who deemed caliphate no one's right but 'Al¢'s family tried to resist anyway due to their hatred of the Umayyads as well as their revolutionary spirit. The above mentioned remarks that were intentionally elaborated demonstrate Imim's great insight and logic. He was well aware that Mu'iwiya, in the guise a rightful man, with his large and foolish army could easily suppress limited Iraqi troops and massacre the distinguished Shi'ite Muslims and 'Alawites under the pretext of revenge for 'Uthmin's murder. Mu'iwiya had changed anything for his benefit. Only a few eminent disciples were survived who were mighty enough to stand against him. Until then he could make Iraq have doubts as well. With any possible way he could keep the Iraqis far away from Imim. When Mu'iwiya intended to conquer Iraq at the end of Imim 'Al¢'s term, Imim could do nothing other than what his son, °asan, did.

---

[1]. 'Ilal al-shari'I', vol.I, p.211; 'Awilim al-'ul£m, vol.XVI, p. 174

[2]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, pp.29, 57; Maniqib Ibn Shahr ªsh£b, vol.IV, p.35; 'Awilim al-'ul£m, vol.XVI, p.170

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn 'Asikir, p.203

[4]. 'Awilim al-'ul£m, vol.XVI, pp. 169-170

The devoted persons with Imim °asan were too few to wage a war. In order to prove that if Imim ‘Al¢ (a) were in such a situation, he would surely have no other alternative, we refer to the issue of arbitration. When a number objected to Imim ‘Al¢ why he accepted arbitration, he said,”You see how disobedient my army has become. In comparing to their population you are very few. If we fight, this vast majority of war opponents will turn more hostile towards you than the Damascus army. If they ally with the Damascus troops, all of you will be massacred. By Almighty Allih, I myself am never pleased with arbitration but I had to approve the majority decision for I was greatly worried about your lives”.[1]

Anyhow, Shi‘ite Muslims’ protection was an incumbent duty that made Imim to approve what for which valor was needed. It is of significance for an Imim or anyone of this type that he carry out his lawful responsibility not care about people’s harsh sarcasm which leads to his and his companies’ annihilation.

Regarding his compromising, Imim Mudjtabi said, **والله، الذي عملت، خير لشيعتي مما طلعت عليه الشمس**[2]**“**By Allih, what I did was far better than what sun shines and sets for my Shi‘ite Muslims.”

In the same respect Imim Biqir (a) has said, **والله، الذي صنع الحسن بن علي (ع) كان خيراً لهذه الامة مما طلعت عليه الشمس**[3] **“**By Allih, what °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ did was far better than what to which sun shines for this nation.”

IMªM °USAYN (A) AND COMPROMISE

We discussed earlier that a group of historians and tradionists have done their utmost to introduce the two brothers different. The false notion concerning their opinions about compromise was propounded in such a way as though Imim °usayn had denied the compromise and objected to his brother. It was justified, however, that Imim °usayn (a) had been faithful to his father’s policy whereas Imim °asan had not approved of the policy of fighting. As already shown,

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.338; Tardjamat l-Imim l-°asan, Ibn ‘Asikir, p.203 (footnote)

[2]. Fari’id al-sim§ayn, vol.II, p.124; Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.19

[3]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.25; Raw¤a al-kif¢, p.330

Imim Mudjtabi had been of the same mind about the war and it was quite explicit in his remarks.

Imim °usayn is quoted as objecting to his brother, **أعيذك بالله ان تكذّب علياً في قبره وتصدّق معاوية "**I take refuge in Allih that you deny 'Al¢ in grave and confirm Mu'iwiya!"[1]

It is also narrated in Madi'in¢ that Imim °usayn (a) balked at compromising until his brother convinced him.[2] Against such claims there are many proofs indicating that Imim °usayn (a) had known no other way more appropriate than compromising and had called upon people to obey his brother.

First, Imim °usayn's practical way of conduct was indifference to the remarks and actions trying to set him against his brother and introduce him as the Shi'ite Muslims' leader in Iraq. To the very last moment of his brother's life, Imim °usayn was beside him living like him in Medina. For eleven years even after his brother's martyrdom, his position was exactly as that of his brother's. It demonstrates that without a shadow of a doubt he agreed to compromise.

Second, Resentful of compromising, the extremist Shi'ite Muslims came up to Imim °usayn urging him to undertake their leadership.

'Al¢ Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Bash¢r Hamdin¢ recounted, "Sufyin Ibn Ab¢ Layli and I went to Medina to meet °asan Ibn 'Al¢ (a). When we stepped in, Musayyib Ibn Nadjba along with a number was there. I greeted him, **السلام عليك يا مذل المــؤمنين "**Peace be upon you who humiliated the believers."

Peace be upon you too, said Imim calmly, sit down. I never humiliated the believers but I held then dear. I compromised for the sake of naught but protecting you.

He added, "We went to visit his brother, °usayn, and inform him of what °asan had said".

Imim °usayn said, **صدق ابو محمد، فليكن كل رجل منكم حلساً من أحلاس بيته مادام هذا الانسان حياً فان يهلـك وانتـم احياء رجونا أن يخيّر الله لنا ويؤتنا رشدنا ولايكلنا الى انفســنا "**My brother is true. All of you should stay at home as long

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn 'Asikir, p. 178

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XVI, p. 23; al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol. VIII, p. 26; Usd al-ghiba, vol. II, p. 20; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II. p.247; Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, p.197

as Mu‘iwiya is alive. If he were dead and you alive, may Allih do what our progress is in and may He leave us not on our own.”[1]

When he was demanded to rise up, Imim °usayn said, **أما أنا، فليس رأيي اليوم ذلك، فالصقوا رحمكم الله بالارض واكمنوا البيوت واحترسوا الظنة مادام معاوية حياً** “Now I do not believe so. Mercy on you, as long as Mu‘iwiya is alive, stay at home and avoid being suspected.”[2]

Imim’s referring to Mu‘iwiya’s existence reveals that he was fully conscious of the prevailing situation which led to compromising. The role Mu‘iwiya played was pivotal. Anyhow, afte the compromise was finalized, the two brothers left K£fa for Medina.

PEACE PACT

Concerning the articles stipulated in the pact and signed by Imim °asan (a) and Mu‘iwiya, there is no perfect consensus in historical sources. Not only the rumors spread then, but also the spitefulness of historians and Tradionists impacted on the articles. Magnifying some articles, censoring some others, counterfeiting some and ignoring the principal conditions are seen in historical narrations as distortion.[3] Heedless of these cases, there are various narrations in this regard each of which has mentioned one part of the authentic text. ªl Yis¢n and some others have compiled these narrations and presented as a whole. Here we present the authentic text and then other narrations sporadically reported.

A number of sources by Ibn A‘tham K£f¢, Balidhur¢ and Ibn Shahr ªsh£b have described the perfect text of the pact as an official treaty. The prefaces confirm the authenticity of the text.

According to Ibn A‘tham, when the clash between Imim and Mu‘iwiya culminated in a compromise, Imim °asan (a) sent ‘Abd Allih Ibn Nawfal to warn Mu‘iwiya that he would

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.150; Akhbir al-§iwil, p. 221; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p. 187

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.222

[3]. As an example, see Zuhr¢’s report in Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn ‘Asikir, p. 168

never swear allegiance to him unless he vowed that people and their belongings were secure. Nonetheless, when 'Abd Allih came up to Mu'iwiya, he told him on his own behalf that there were a number of conditions he should meet if he wanted to compromise. First, caliphate would be his provided that he designated Imim °asan as the caliph after himself. Secondly, he should pay fifty five thousand dhms from the public fund to him annually. Finally, he should not merely pay the taxes collected from Diribdjird to him but also provide people with high security.

Accepting the conditions, Mu'iwiya asked for a white sheet, signed it at the bottom and sent it to °asan Ibn 'Al¢ (a). When 'Abd Allih returned and recounted what happened, Imim told him, "Never do I want the caliphate after Mu'iwiya. And about the financial conditions you suggested I should say that it is in no way Mu'iwiya's right to commit himself to paying me from Muslims' treasury.

Then Imim called his amanuensis to write as follows,

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم، هذا ما اصطلح عليه الحسن بن علي بن أبي طالب، معاوية بن أبي سفيان، صالحه على أن يسلم اليه ولاية أمر المسلمين على أن يعمل فيهم بكتاب الله وسنة نبيه محمد صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم وسيرة الخلفاء الصالحين؛ وليس لمعاوية بن أبي سفيان أن يعهد لأحد من بعده عهداً، بل يكون الأمر من بعده شورى بين المسلمين، وعلى أن الناس آمنون حيث كانوا من أرض الله، شامهم وعراقهم وتهامهم وحجازهم، وعلى أن اصحاب علي وشيعته آمنون على أنفسهم وأموالهم ونسائهم وأولادهم، وعلى معاوية بن أبي سفيان بذلك عهد الله وميثاقه وما أخذ الله على أحد من خلقه بالوفاء بما أعطى الله من نفسه، وعلى أنه لا يبغي للحسن بن علي ولا لأخيه الحسين ولا لأحد من اهل بيت النبي صلى الله عليه واله وسلم، غائلة سراً وعلانية ولا يخيف أحداً منهم في أفق من الافاق.[1]

This is a compromise between °asan Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib and Mu'iwiya Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin. He compromises with him and entrusts caliphate to him provided that he will designate no successor after himself and will allow Muslims' council to designate any one judged competent, for his death is imminent. Another condition is that Muslims must entirely be secure from him. He should behave well towards people. The third condition is that 'Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib's Shi'ite Muslims, family and agents must be safe anywhere they are and no

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, pp.158-160

aggression should be made against them. Hereby Mu‘iwiya Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin swears allegiance to Allih and makes a pledge to be faithful to his allegiance and not to take in. He promises not to do an ill turn to °asan Ibn ‘Al¢, his brother °usayn and neither of their wives, children, relatives and disciples either overtly or covertly. Anywhere they are they should be safe and never threatened. That is it.[1]

As recorded by Balidhur¢, Mu‘iwiya wrote a peace pact himself and sent it to °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ (a) as follows,”I did compromise with you on the conditions that the caliphate after me be yours, I conspire not against you, I pay you a million dhms from the public fund plus taxes of Fasi and Diribdjird.”

This text is confirmed by both Mu¦ammad Ibn Ash‘ath Kind¢ and ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir which was written in Rabi‘ al-ªkhir, 41.H.

As soon as Imim read the foregoing text, he said,”He has stipulated something if I yearned for it, never ever would I relinquish the authority”. Then he sent ‘Abd Allih Ibn °arth Ibn Nawfal (Ibn °arth Ibn ‘Abd al-Mu§§alib) to tell Mu‘iwiya, “If people will be safe, I swear allegiance to him.”

Mu‘iwiya gave him a white sheet and said, “Write whatever you like”.

Imim °asan (a) also wrote what we referred what we referred to previously.[2] The text was cited by Ibn Shahr ªsh£b in Maniqib.[3] Madi’in¢[4] and Ibn ¯abbigh Milik¢[5] also have confirmed the report related to ‘Abd Allih Ibn Nawfal’s dispatch and the conditions laid down.

Many sources have referred to the condition of Imim °asan’s successorship after Mu‘iwiya with presenting no particular text.[6] Some other sources also have confirmed the financial commitments made with regard to the taxes of Diribdjird, Fasi and Ahwiz in addition to the one-million

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦ (translated by Mu¦ammad Mustuwf¢ Hiraw¢ into Persian), pp.765-766

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. III, pp. 41-42

[3]. al-Maniqib, vol. IV, p.33

[4]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XVI, p. 22

[5]. al-Fu¥£l al-muhimma, pp.162-163; ‘Awilim al-‘ul£m, vol.XVI, p.172

[6]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn ‘Asikir, pp.172,178

payment per year.[1] Reportedly, the other condition had been that Mu'iwiya should never curse Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n (a).[2]

Here, two points merit to be taken into account concerning two conditions, the financial condition and caliphate condition. About the financial condition which is mentioned in different sources and for justifying which a group of Shi'ite Muslims have even discussed in any way[3] it should be kept in mind that the only text we confirm is the one shown before; accordingly, imposing any condition in the accord is basically deemed false. The cogent evidence is the reaction Imim had when finding out that 'Abd Allih Ibn Nawfal had on his own behalf laid down such conditions and said, "Mu'iwiya is not entitled to commit himself paying me from the Fund."

As far as we know what Imims' way of conduct had been, such reasoning is clearly conceivable. The question, however, raised here is how the historians have propounded this condition. The answer can easily be inferred form what discussed above. Ibn A'tham had narrated that the condition had been laid down by 'Abd Allih Ibn Nawfal. As reported by Balidhur¢, Mu'iwiya himself had imposed the financial condition among the conditions. Furthermore, seemingly in order to mar Imim's reputation, Mu'iwiya's spies and later courtier historians had spread a number of rumors. It appears that the financial condition had been suggested by the delegation sent by Mu'iwiya to Sibi§ in Ctesiphon for talks on compromising.[4] Another evidence for proving that there had been no financial condition in the pact is when

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi', p.74; Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn 'Asikir, pp.176-177; Akhbir al-§iwil, pp.217-218

[2]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn 'Asikir, p.176; A'lim al-Wari, p.206

[3]. For instance it was said that according to the verse of مَا أَفَاءَ اللَّهُ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْقُرَى فَلِلَّـهِ وَلِلرَّسُـولِ وَلِـذِي الْقُرْبَـى. "What God granted His Messenger (s) belongs to Him, the Prophet and his descendants" Imim had a share in Bayt al-Mil, so he had claimed his proportion. Bi¦ir al-anwir, Vol.IV4, p.10 (footnote); another justification was that Imim had asked the tributes of Diribdjird for the families of Djamal and ¯iff¢n martyrs; Bi¦ir al-anwir, Vol.XXXXVI, p.3; 'Awilim al-'ul£m, Vol.XVI, pp.182, 187, 188

[4]. Tahdh¢b Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.IV. p.224; Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, p.198

after the compromise Sulaymin Ibn ¯urad Khuzi‘¢ objected to Imim why he had not assigned a proportion.[1]

Such reasoning can also be found for the condition of Imim’s successorship after Mu‘iwiya. It is narrated that based on the signed accord Imim °asan had been supposed to replace Mu‘iwiya and if he were dead, his brother should be the successor.[2] This time again Imim was not content to accept what ‘Abd Allih Ibn Nawfal or according to Balidhur¢ and others[3] what Mu‘iwiya had suggested. In return in a text, Imim deprived Mu‘iwiya of appointing any successor to himself. He stressed that Muslims should shoulder this responsibility. Since Imim was aware that Mu‘iwiya had always been set to make caliphate hereditary, he decided to tie his hands in the accord in this respect. If Imim had said something about his successorship, it would have been the confirmation of hereditary system per se. The term of “Muslim council”, however general, could be a way to dispense with the hereditary concept. It might be criticized that it is by no means compatible with the belief in “Na¥¥” (textual nomination) about Shi‘ites Imims. It should be said that firstly the majority of the people among whom Imim lived did not believe in Na¥¥ and but this way, they had no other choice. Secondly, if legitimacy was judged by Na¥¥, it would not be incompatible with the principle any way because people’s approval is evidently essential in a ruler’s legitimacy as a leader in a community. Some points within the peace pact merit consideration,

A. The first vital point was practicing the divine Book, the Prophet’s tradition as well as the pious caliphs’ lifstyles. Imim’s intention was to limit Mu‘iwiya within a framework. He referred to this very point while making a speech on the pulpit when Mu‘iwiya had come to K£fa. He said, **إنما الخليفة من سار بسيرة رسول الله وعمل بطاعته وليس الخليفـة مـن دان بالجور وعطّل السنن واتخذ الدنيا أباً وأمّاً** “The caliph is the one who practices the Prophet’s tradition and obeys him. The caliph is never the one who oppresses, disregards the Prophet’s tradition and adores the worldly life like his parents.”

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.48; Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.29

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol V, p.14; ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.67

[3]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.XVI, p.21

وَإِنْ أَدْرِي لَعَلَّهُ فِتْنَةٌ لَكُمْ وَمَتَاعٌ إِلَى حِينٍ.

Who knows, perhaps it is an acid test for you and little goods for Mu'iwiya

he added. Mu'iwiya turned furious at Imim's remarks.[1]

At the same sermon Imim announced, "On a right Mu'iwiya disputed me that was mine but for the good of the nation and hindering bloodshed I ignored it." [2]

B. Another point was Imim's opposition to a hereditary caliphate that we already discussed in detail.

C. The Shi'ite Muslims' security was one of the crucial principles of the contract. As mentioned before, Imim at the first leg of his talks with Mu'iwiya affirmed that that he would never swear allegiance to him unless Mu'iwiya promised to provide people with security. It is referred to in some narration's that Imim asked clemency of guarantee even for A¦mar and Aswad. It may imply that Imim stressed on Mawil¢'s (freed slaves) security as well who were very respectable in Imim 'Al¢'s sight.

D. Imim's other condition which had a particular significance was that there should be no covert or overt conspiracy against him or his brother, Imim °usayn (a).

With no prerequisite, Mu'iwiya signed the contract owing to the fact that the only thing he wanted was the conquest of Iraq. Mu'iwiya and also Imim himself were certain that he would turn a blind eye to any condition. To none of the conditions was Mu'iwiya faithful. He not only did not follow Qur'in and the tradition, but also went to extremes more than 'Uthmin. He appointed Yaz¢d as his successor, and deprived 'Al¢'s followers (Shi'ites) of security, imposing Ziyid and other tyrants to rule over them. °u¥ayn bin Mun**dh**ir used to say: Mu'iwiya did not observe any of the conditions he had agreed to in his treaty with °asan. He killed °ujr and his companions, appointed Yazid as his successor and did not delegate the matter of succession to a counsel, and poisoned °asan."

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.171, 172

[2]. Dhakhi'ir al-'uqbi, p.140; Na³m Durar al-sim§ayn, pp.200-101; Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.42; al-Ma¦isin wa l-Masiw¢, vol.I, p.53; Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.173; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.43

Mu‘iwiya came to K£fa and said, **ألا إني كنتُ شـرطت شروطاً أردت بها الألفة ووضع الحرب، ألا وإنها تحت قدمي**ا agreed on the conditions to put out the fire of sedition and reconcile the people, yet now I disregard them all.”[1]

It is also quoted form him as saying, “Never did I fight to have you perform prayers, fast, go °adjdj (pilgrimage) or pay poll tax, I fought to rule over you. And Allih bestowed it to me whereas you were all unwilling”.[2]

A group of residents led by °umrin Ibn Abin decided to revolt against Mu‘iwiya in Ba¥ra. As reported he had been summoning people to swear allegiance to Imim °usayn (a). In order to suppress him, Mu‘iwiya sent ‘Amr Ibn Ar§it or his brother, Busr to Ba¥ra.[3] By the same token, he could manage to dominate Iraq. He appointed Mughc¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba to K£fa governorship for nine years as long as he was alive and ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir as Ba¥ra governor.

Imim °asan’s caliphate began in Rama¤in 40 and terminated in Rabi‘ al-ªkhir, 41H. after seven months.[4]

IMªM MUDJTABª’S CHARACTER

Imim °asan was born on Rama¤in 15, 3 A.H. He looked like his forefather, Allih’s Apostle.[5] After his father was martyred, he became the Shi‘ite Muslims’ leader. It is narrated from Abc¢ Razc¢n as saying that Imim, wearing black robe and a turban, delivered sermons.[6] Imim °asan was one of the most morally eminent figures whose conduct was an example to follow. We already discussed how repeatedly the Prophet admired him in his remarks and recommended all to feel affection for him. For instance, **أللهم إني قـد أحببتـه فأحبَّه وأحِبَّ من يحبه**[7] **“**O Allih! I love him, so adore him and the one who loves him.” **من أحبَّني فليحبه وليبلغ الشـاهد**

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, pp.44-46; al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.163; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°adc¢d, vol.XVI, p.46

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°adc¢d, vol.XVI, p.46

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.52; al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.168

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.54

[5]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa‘d, pp.130-131

[6]. Ibid. Ibn Sa‘d, p.163

[7]. Ibid. Ibn Sa‘d, p.139; Sunan al-Tirmidhc¢, vol.V, p.661

منكم الغائب[1] "The one who loves me surely loves him. Tell it to the absentees too," **من أحب الحسن والحسين فقد أحبني، ومن أبغضهما فقد أبغضـني**[2] "Anyone who loves °asan and °usayn, he indeed loves me and anyone who annoys them, he indeed annoys me." **من سرّه أن ينظر الي سـيد شـباب أهل الجنة فلينظر إلي الحسن بن علي**[3] "Anyone who likes to see the master of the youth in Heaven can look at °asan Ibn 'Al¢ and some utterances the Prophet has made about Imim °asan (a)."

Many narrations also are recorded in the light of Imim's ideological features for example his trips as a pilgrim gone on foot. He has said, **إني لأستحي من ربي أن ألقاه ولم أمش إلي بيته، فمشي عشرين مرة من المدينة علـي رجليـه**" I am really ashamed of meeting Allih if I go to His House on horsebac."

He visited there as a pilgrim twenty times.[4] According to another narration, he had gone to Mecca for pilgrimage twenty five times on foot,[5] yet Ibn Sa'd has recorded it as fifteen times.[6]

His generosity for Allih's sake was a proverbial aspect of his ethical character. When Ismi'¢l Ibn Yasir along with 'Abd Allih Ibn Anas went to meet Mu'iwiya in Damascus and take money from him but they did not succeed, Ismi'¢l in a poem addressed his friend Ibn Anas as follows,

لعمرك ما إلى حسن رحلنا و لا زرنا حسيناً يا بن انس[7]

"O Ibn Anas by you we did not go to meet °asan and °usayn."

He implied that if they had gone to those two brothers, never would they have returned empty-handed. It is

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.138; Musnad A¦mad, vol.V, p.366; Mustadrak, vol.III, p.173

[2]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.138,143; Tadhkirat ±ayilis ¢, No.2502; Tadhkirat A¦mad, vol.II, p.440; al-Mustadrak, vo.III, p.166

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.138; al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VIII, p.35

[4]. Akhbir l¥bahin, vol.I, p.44

[5]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi', p.73

[6]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.159

[7]. al-Aghin¢, vol.IV, p.419

narrated that some one went to meet Imim °asan while needy.

Imim told him, “Write down whatsoever you need ant then give it to me”. When the man gave him the list of what he needed, Imim offered him twice as much.[1] It is pointed out elsewhere that during his lifetime Imim granted three times each time half as much as the property he had for Allih’s sake.[2]

A man named Ab£ Hir£n recounted, “On our way to Medina for pilgrimage we decided to drop in on the Prophet’s son. Visiting him, we talked about our Journey. When we returned, he sent us each four hundred D¢nirs. We went back to him and said that our condition was okay. He answered, **لا تــردّوا علــيّ معــروفي**[3] **“**Reject not my generosity.”

Imim °asan was told, **فيك عظمة “**You are great enough.” Imim said, **لا بل عزَّة، قال الله تعالى, فللّه العِـزَّةُ ولرسـوله وللمؤمنين “**It is not greatness but honor. Allih has stated that honor belongs to both Allih and His Apostle as well as the believers.”[4]

After the compromise, the K£fa’s Shi‘ite Muslims who came to °idjiz for pilgrimage constantly were in touch with Imim during his eight or nine-year residence in Medina. It was natural that they had approved him as their Imim and tried to avail themselves of him ideologically.

A man from Damascus recounted,”One day I ran in to a handsome and serene man wearing smartly on horseback. I asked who he was. They said he was °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib (a). I was filled with rage and felt jealous of ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib for having such a unique son. I approached him asking, “Are you ‘Al¢’s son?” As soon as I heard his positive answer, I heaped abusive words onto him as many as I could. When I stopped he asked me if I was a stranger. “Yes”, I replied.

---

[1]. al-Ma¦isin wa l-Masiw¢, p.55

[2]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa‘d, p.159; Tir¢kh al-Khulafi’, p.73; Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, p.196

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa‘d, p.155

[4]. Rabi‘ al-abrir, vol.III, p.177

Then kindly he said, "If you have no place to live, I give it to you, if you need money, I pay you". I parted him while I had no one as dear as him in my heart".[5]

IMªM °ASAN'S MARTYDOM

One of Mu'iwiya's unforgivable crimes is martyring Imim °asan (a) who was the apple of the Apostle's eye about which there is no doubt historically. As usual, Mu'iwiya hatched a plot and prompted Dju'da, Imim's wife and cursed Ash'ath Ibn Qays's daughter, to kill her husband. When Medina was plundered in the course of °arra event in 63 AH. this cursed woman's house was plundered too. Nevertheless, due to her cooperation in her husband's murder, her properties all were back. The report of Imim's martyrdom by Dju'da as well as Mu'iwiya's conspiracy is recorded in numerous sources.[2] As narrated by Haytham Ibn 'Ad¢, Imim had been poisoned by Suhayl Ibn 'Amr's daughter prompted by Mu'iwiya.[3] The poison had Imim stay in bed ill for forty days until he achieved martyrdom.[4]

Miswar's daughter, Umm Bakr said, "Imim had been poisoned many times. Although each time he survived, the last time the poison was so strong that it made the pieces of his liver come out through his throat." [5]

After he was martyred, he was supposed to be buried next to the Prophet's grave according to his last will, but 'ªyisha and Marwin, the ruler of Medina then, did not allow. Imim had advised that if they faced any problem, he should be buried in Baq¢'.[6] 'ªyisha did reveal his sheer spite towards Zahri (a), Her Excellency, and her son once more. No sooner had Imim's corpse been approached to the Prophet's grave

---

[5]. al-Kimil fi l-adab, vol.I, p.235

[2]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.175-176; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, pp.55-88. Professor Ma¦m£d¢ has quoted the report above from many sources in the footnotes of the mentioned pages. Yet, Ibn Khald£n, with his religious Prejudice and unlike all historical proof, has said, وحاشا لمعاوية ذلك **"**Never ever can Mu'iw¢ya do so." Tir¢kh Ibn Khald£n, vol.II, part 2, p.18

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.59

[4]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.176

[5]. al-Muntakhab Min Dhiyl al-mudhayyal, p.514

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, pp.61, 64; footnotes of pp.61-62

than ‘ªyisha warned, **“هـذا الأمـر لايكـون ابـداً** Under no circumstances, such an action is possible.”[1]

Both Ab£ Sa‘¢d Khudr¢ and Ab£ Hurayra addressed Marwin, “Do you prevent °asan from being buried beside his forefather whereas the Apostle (s) had called him the master of the youth in Heaven?”

“If such individuals as you, said Marwin sarcastically, did not narrate the Prophet’s hadiths, they would be dissolved soon.”[2]

Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya has narrated that when Imim was killed, Medina turned thoroughly mournful and all people wept. It was Marwin who let Mu‘iwiya know saying him,”They want to bury °asan by the Prophet, but as long as I am alive, I will never allow them.”

Imim °usayn come up to the Prophet’s grave and ordered to dig the ground. Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘ª¥ who was Medina governor pulled back but Marwin commanded the Umayyads to be armed on alert.

“It is impossible to let you”, said Marwin.

“It is non of your concern”, Imim °usayn (a) told him.

“You are not the governor, are you?” Marwin answered.

“No, but as long as I am alive, I will never let you do this”.

Imim °usayn (a) asked °ilf al-Fu¤£l (the agreement reached during pre-Islamic period for ensuring the safty of the pilgrims) who were always with the Hishimites for help. A number of people belonging to the tribes of Taym, Zuhra, Asad and Djа‘£ba took up arms then. Imim °usayn (a) and Marwin holding a flag in hand each opened fire on each other. Yet a group of people demanded Imim to practice the will Imim °asan had made.”If there were a probability that someone be killed, bury me beside my mother in Baq¢‘.” At last they could convince Imim °usayn.[3] As inferred form another narration, Marwin who was deposed by then was intent to make Mu‘iwiya gratified with him by such an

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa‘d, p.184

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.65; Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa‘d, pp.184-185

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa‘d, pp.177-179

action.[1] When Marwin flourished to change Imim's mind, he reported to Mu'iwiya in a bombastic manner.[2]

He said,"How is it possible to see the son of 'Uthmin's murderer buried next to the prophet but 'Uthmin in Baq¢'?"[3] Beyond any doubt, Marwin had been among the wickedest figures of the Umayyads throughout whose term as Medina governor cursed Imim 'Al¢ as well as the Hishimites.

Some believe that Imim was martyred in Rabi' al-Awwal, 49H. While some others have recorded it Rabi' al-Awwal, 50 H.[4] The former seems to be more reliable. As soon as Imim was martyred, the Hishimites sent some persons to different spots of Medina and the suburbs to inform An¥ir. Reportedly, no one could ever stay at home.[5] The Hishimites women moaned his loss all day long for a month.[6] ±abar¢ has quoted Imim Biqir (a) as saying that Medina people shut their shops mourning for him for seven days.[7] He added that in Imim's burial ceremony the participants were so many that there was no elbow- room.[8] News of Imim's martyrdom in Ba¥ra led the Shi'ite Muslims there to mourn.[9]

After Imim Mudjtabi's demise, K£fiyin Shi'ite Muslims wrote a letter of consolation to Imim °usayn (a), in which Imim's demise was regarded, on one hand, a tragedy for all Umma and particularly for Shi'ite Muslims, on other hand. This shows formation of "Sh¢'a" and even its terminological usage around 50 H. They talked about Imim Mudjtabi (a) with these titles, "'Alam al-Hudi and N£r al-Bilid", someone

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.180, 187

[2]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd,, p.188

[3]. Ibid. p.183. 'Uthmin was not even buried in Baq¢' because people prevented.

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.66; Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, pp.183, 189, 190

[5]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.181; Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn 'Asikir, No.371

[6]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.182; Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn 'Asikir, No.338

[7]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'd, p.182

[8]. al-Muntakhab Al-Muntakhab Dhiyl al-mudhayyal, p.514; al-Mustadrak 'ala l-¥a¦¢¦ayn, vol.III, p.173; Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa'dp.182; Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn 'Asikir, No.372

[9]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.V, p.224

who was hoped to raise up religion and rehabilitation of conduct of the righteous people. They hoped God would return Imim °usayn's right to him. [1] The letter had to be considered as one of the documents forming Imamate and ideological Sh¢'a in K£fa.

'Amr Ba'djja says, "The first humiliation that befell to Arabs was Imim Mudjtabi's demise.[2]

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.228

[2]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan (a), p.183

CHAPTER VI
MU‘ªWIYA’S MONARCHY

MU‘ªWIYA, THE FOUNDER OF THE UMAYYAD MONARCHY

Upon seizure of Iraq, center of government since 36, all Islamic territories came under the yoke of Mu‘iwiya, who took power thirty years after the Prophet’s demise.

Before becoming a caliph, he governed Damascus and the Greater Syria for roughly twenty years. The Umayyads martially leading the Quraysh in Dark Age, stood against Islam as far as possible and they embraced Islam only when they had no way but this. Not only through their behavior but also by knowing about Ab£ Sufyin and Mu‘iwiya, in particular, Imim ‘Al¢’s statement shall be acknowledged as to the fact that they embraced Islam only because of interests.[1] Zubayr also thought of Ab£ Sufyin in the same way.[2] Yaz¢d Ibn Ab£ Sufyin commanded the troops when conquering. Greater Syria and Ab£ Bakr granted Mu‘iwiya sainthood besides his brother.[3]

After Yaz¢d died, Mu‘iwiya was designated as the ruler of Damascus in ‘Umar’s tenure. As mentioned before, ‘Umar’s rigorlessness to Mu‘iwiya had astonished a number of people.[4] According to Ibn ‘Asikir, ‘Umar entrusted Damascus

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XX, pp.298-299; Nahdj al-baligha, letter 454 of ‘Al¢ to Mu‘iw¢ya; concerning Mu‘iw¢ya’s ignoring insult of one Jew towards one Muslim; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.160

[2]. al-Aghin¢, vol.VI, p.355; some time Ab£ Sufyin, at the °amza’s grave, said, “God bless thee.”; You fought us over something that came under control; al-Amti‘ wa l-Mu’inisa, vol.II, p.75

[3]. Rasi’il al-Dji¦i¨, al-Rasi’il al-siyisiya, p.344

[4]. Tathb¢t Dali’il al-nubuwwa, p.593. °asan Ba¥r¢ has said, لقد تصنّع معاويه للخلافة في ولاية عمر بن خطاب Mu‘iw¢ya had been preparing Himself for caliphate since ‘Umar’s tenure Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh

thoroughly to Mu‘iwiya[1] and by the same token, Mu‘iwiya affirmed that by Almighty Allih he could accomplish to dominate over people merely through his high esteem by ‘Umar.[2] Once encountering Mu‘iwiya going and accompanied majestically by his retinue, ‘Umar asked about the ground. Mu‘iwiya responded that the more the enemy spies multiply, the more our grandeur has to heighten; yet, I will abide by what you command.

“By no means do I enjoin him nor prohibit him”, said ‘Umar.[3]

Mu‘iwiya himself deemed his firm standing as consequence of ‘Umar’s way of behaving towards him.[4] Reacting against objections to Mu‘iwiya, ‘Uthmin said that how he was ever able to depose him designated by ‘Umar.

Nevertheless, Imim ‘Al¢’s response to him in this respect was, “Although Mu‘iwiya held ‘Umar in reverence, he now does perform whatever without taking counsel with you”.[5]

What ‘Umar frequently stated was, “You are naming Kasri (title of Sassanian kings) and Caesar whereas Mu‘iwiya is amongst you.”[6]

Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.24

[1]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.17,18,20; Rasi’il al-Dji¦i¨, al-Rasi’il al-siyisiya, p.344

[2]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.161

[3]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.I, p.15, vol.V, p.114; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.18; once Mu‘iw¢ya was complained at the presence of ‘Umar. ‘Umar said, “Leave us away from reproaching Quraysh’s young man and his son of the prophet’s descendant. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.18. This is most likely to be attributed to ‘Umar

[4]. al-Ghad¢r, vol.IX, p.35. From Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, pp.88,90. Dji¦i³ said, “One of the most significant reasons of the Sufyinids for substantiating Mu‘iw¢ya’s caliphate was his own statement. He stated, “This is a position thereto ‘Umar has designated me. Never did he depose me since he designated me whereas he designated no emir unless he deposed him or at least he was incensed by his actions and summoned him. Neither did he depose me nor was incensed. He did consign Damascus thoroughly to me and succeeding him. ‘Uthmin did reinforce me; Rasi’il al-Dji¦i¨, al-Rasi’il al-siyisiya, p.385

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.550

[6]. al-Fakhr¢, p.77, Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, Vol.XXV, p.30

Succeeding ‘Uthmin’s assassination, in his remarks addressing people, Mu‘iwiya announced that he has been the caliph of ‘Umar as well as ‘Uthmin amongst them.[1] In ‘Uthmin’s tenure Damascus was regarded as his security zone. He did banish K£fa reciters along with Ab£dhar there.[2] Mu‘iwiya did expel them from Damascus soley owing to retaining his position and likewise avoiding their influence on nation. Damascus has been trained by Mu‘iwiya and in the course of the Umayya’s governorship the in-depth devotion of its dwellers to them clearly manifested the fact.

It is quoted that the Umayya rulers have attested in the presence of “Saffi¦” that they considered no relative for the Holy Prophet (s) save the Umayya.[3]

Mu‘iwiya has been quoted as stating,[4] **نحن شجرة رسول الله (ص**) “We are from the lineage of Allih’s Apostle.”

Furthermore, under the guises of the revelation amanuensis and Khil al-Mu‘min¢n (the uncle of the faithful) he did strive in order to fortify his religious stance. He compelled a number of hadith (tradition) narrators as well to fabricate tens of hadiths concerning his supremacy and disseminate them among people.[5]

Mu‘iwiya’s rule was the one and the only experience of a ruler who flourished to secure the sovereignty by employing coercion as well as devising political stratagems vis-a-vis all

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n. P.32; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol. XXV, p.30.

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.IV, p.229; al-Ghad¢r, vol.VI, p.304; vol.IX, p.373

[3]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.33; al-Nizi‘ wa l-takhi¥um, p. 28

[4]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XI, p.87; It has been narrated that there were some in Damascus saying; “If Mu‘iw¢ya is not a prophet, he is at least half of a prophet”; See also Bahdjat al-madjilis, vol.I, p.550. And once one of his devotees met him, he, as a salutation, addressed him, “O Allih’s Messenger!” See also al-Awi’íl, Tustar¢, p.163; Regarding the person who cursed ‘Al¢ in front of Mu‘iw¢ya, A¦naf Ibn Qays asserted, “By Allih if he knew your gratification was in cursing all the prophets, he would certainly do so.”; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.IV, p.113

[5]. As an instance, it has been quoted from the Holy prophet as stating, **“**In sight of Allih the trustees are three, Djibri’¢l (Gabriel), Mu‘iw¢ya and me” Such narations have been discussed in detail by Ibn ‘Asikir; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp. 5-16 والأمناء عندالله ثلاثة, جبرئيل وأنا ومعاويه

prevailing political-religious or perhaps tribal and regional disputes. Until then neither a military expedition had been occurred, nor had duress been officially manipulated in order to obtain the political authority. And now how can it be ever justified whereas the rule was thoroughly established by force? It should be borne in mind that this very fact had to be endorsed like other political facts emerging at the beginning of caliphate term that afterwards did turn legitimately into a governmental theory. In order to secure allegiance, when a sovereign could suppress all the dissenters through his political authority, Djami‘a (congregation) has subsequently appeared. What dilemma was now there for those who stressed the concept of community and said that they would be the last ones swearing an oath of allegiance? Under the pretext of the self of Community, they, heedless of how the ruler has secured the authority, swore allegiance to a caliph with whom all were agreed. Mu‘iwiya himself declared that he had secured the caliphate neither through nation’s amity, nor with their gratification but by sword.[1] Mu‘iwiya named that year as “the year of Djami‘a”. Touching upon that Mu‘iwiya not only secured the authority that year, but also he held sway over other members of the Shuwri (council), Muhidjir£ns and An¥irs, Dji¦i¨ has stated, “Mu‘iwiya named that year as **عام الجماعة** **“**The year of Community” whereas that year was, **عام فُرقةٍ وقهر وجبر وغلبة** **“**The year of separation, wrath, constraint and predominance.”

The year therein Imamate turned into monarchism and Kasri system and caliphate became usurped and Caesarean.[2] Afterwards, the principle of “Sovereignty does belong to the one who suppress others” turned an incontrovertible principle in political Fiqh (religious jurisprudence) of Sunnism.

Since the inception of his revolt against Imim ‘Al¢ (a), Mu‘iwiya’s legal mainstay has been his recourse to his kinship with ‘Uthmin in addition to his self-introduction as his next of kin. He alleged that the assassin of ‘Uthmin had been ‘Al¢ (a) and he as his next of kin would retaliate his assassins. And gradually it turned into hereditary transfer of caliphate from ‘Uthmin to Mu‘iwiya in the view of Damascus

---

[1]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.IV, p.81

[2]. Risilat al-Dji¦i¨ fi Ban£ Umayya, p. 124 in al-Nizi‘ wa l-takhi¥um

dwellers, for materializing which Mu‘iwiya himself played a pivotal role. Prior to this, it should be taken into consideration that Mu‘iwiya deemed himself the successor of Quraysh¢ power which had transferred from Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar to ‘Uthmin. We earlier referred to Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr’s letter to Mu‘iwiya therein the former had reproached him for his insistence on inequity about ‘Al¢ (a).

As its response, Mu‘iwiya wrote, “Your father and I during our prophet’s lifetime had held ‘Al¢’s right incontestable and had indeed discerned his supremacy; nevertheless, usurping his right, your father and ‘Umar, after prophet’s departure, were the ever-first ones who summoned him to swear allegiance to them. He did swear allegiance under duress, they two, yet, granted naught as an allotment to him. After those two, ‘Uthmin secured the authority. If it were assumed a blunder, your father had blundered for the first time and we were all his accomplices, yet if it were approved, we emulated your father. If you intend to reproach, you had better reproach your father first.”[1]

From the beginning of his revolt against ‘Uthmin, Mu‘iwiya was doing his utmost to exploit him. Once he requested ‘Uthmin to proceed to him in Damascus in order to be immune from the dissenters, ‘Uthmin rejected however.[2] Later on, when the revolt aggravated, Mu‘iwiya found no alternative except ‘Uthmin’s assassination. He could abuse the people’s confidence in Damascus in this regard. Mu‘iwiya accordingly never aided ‘Uthmin until ‘Uthmin eventually perceived it when deeply in trouble, hence he wrote a reproving letter to him.[3] Immediately in the wake of ‘Uthmin’s assassination as well as his wife’s escaping to Damascus, Mu‘iwiya proposed to her but she declined.[4]

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, Vol.II, pp.393-397; Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.118, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.III, p.188; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.10; Sam§ Nudj£m al-‘awil¢, vol.II, p.465

[2]. al-kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.157. Mu‘iw¢ya definitely intended to prepare the ground for his succession through his coming to Damascus

[3]. Being requested for an aid by ‘Uthmin, Mu‘iw¢ya along with two others came to Medina and went to ‘Uthmin overnight. “Have you brought any helper?”, ‘Uthmin questioned

He, in his letters to Imim ‘Al¢ (a), asserted, “Our caliph ‘Uthmin is assassinated oppressedly and since Allih has said, ‘When one is murdered oppressedly, we have assigned a power for his guardian’, we are more preferable to ‘Uthmin and his descendants.”[1] Mu‘iwiya’s stress on ‘Uthmin’s succession had culminated in an influence on Sunnis’ historical-political line of thinking that for two centuries thereafter K£fa Shi‘ite Muslims, other than the Shi‘ite Muslims and few Sunnis, imagined that Orthodox Caliphs were merely three and following them the only possible and legitimate caliph was Mu‘iwiya. Afterwards, the notion of “Tarb¢‘“ was broached by A¦mad Ibn °anbal wherein ‘Al¢ (a) had been introduced the fourth caliph.

Having composed numerous verses of poems as laudation for the Umayya, Farazdaq has manifested in his poetry the assumption that the Umayya regarded themselves as ‘Uthmin’s heirs apparent. In a poem addressing ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwin, he has composed,

تراث عثمان كانوا الاولياء له سربال ملك عليهم غير مسلوب[2]

“They are the custodians of ‘Uthmin’s inheritance and this royal robe can by no means be divested.”

He in another poem addressing Wal¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, has certified that his caliphate has been transferred from ‘Uthmin[3] and elsewhere he has composed addressing Yaz¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik that the caliphate has been transferred from ‘Uthmin to Mu‘iwiya and then to him among the Umayya[4],

ورثت ابن حرب وابن مروان والذي به نصـر الله النبـي محمـدا [5]

“You are the heir of °arb’s son, Marwin’s son and the heir of the one with whose assistance Allih made Mu¦ammad (s) vanquish (he has probably meant ‘Uthmin by the last one)”

---

[4]. Nathr al-durr, vol.IV, p.62; Balighit al-nisi’, p.139; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.VI, p.90

[1]. al-Ghirit, p.70

[2]. D¢win Farazdaq, Vol.I, p.25

[3]. Ibid, vol.II, p.210

[4]. D¢win farazdaq, vol.II, p.210

[5]. Ibid, vol.I, p.114

And for Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d he has composed,

ورثوا مشورُتها لعثمان التي كانت تراث نبينا المتخيّر[1]

“They are the heirs of Shuwri (the council) which designated ‘Uthmin, the Shuwri which is the inheritance of the Chosen Prophet’s caliphate.”

Djiɬi¨ has also specified that Mu‘iwiya justified his right for caliphate through ‘Uthmin’s blood.[2]

Mu‘iwiya, from the outset of his opposition to ‘Al¢ (a), announced that he did never seek after caliphate but as a matter of fact he had already prepared himself for securing caliphate. At the very starting point of caliphate, Imim ‘Al¢ (a) urged Mu‘iwiya’s envoy to inform him that under no circumstances was he was contented with his emirate over Damascus, nor would the nation be gratified with it.[3] His inward aim was overt for the majority but seemingly he commenced to delude them. Prior to Djamal war, he wrote to Zubayr that he had secured allegiance from Damacsus people for him and if he accomplished to conquer Iraq, he would definitely encounter no trouble in Damascus. Zubayr became very thrilled at the letter.[4] Irrespective of Zubayr, Mu‘iwiya must have elaborated to what way he had acceded for an admissible caliph to be designated. Consequently, he propounded “Muslims’ Council” in this respect. Within the letters written to a number of celebrities of Medina from ¯iff ¢n, he had referred to this issue already discussed in ¯iff¢n event. Mu‘iwiya was determined to absorb one of the political figures of Qurayshmainly from those attending the councilin order to exploit him politically because Imim had censured him for neither of those from Qurayshin Damascus was permitted in the council and their caliphate was unauthorized.[5] In a letter to Imim ‘Al¢ (a) as well, Mu‘iwiya did propound the issue of Council.[6] There matters were on no accounts serious on the part of Mu‘iwiya.

---

[1]. Diwin Farazdaq. vol.I, p.336; al-Umawiyy£n wa l-Khilifa, pp.13-15, other verser are mentioned besides the aforesaid poems.

[2]. Rasi’il al-Djiɬi¨, al-Rasi’il al-siyisiyya, pp.345-346

[3]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.28

[4]. A‘yin al-sh¢‘a, vol.III, Section 2, p.12

[5]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.58

[6]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.121

Reportedly, the dwellers of Damascus at first had sworn allegiance to him as an emir not Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n (the Commander of the Faithful) but in the wake of 'Al¢'s martyrdom he pretended to the caliphate, so the nation did swear allegiance to him as Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n.[1] Since the inception, he decided to secure allegiance as the one seeking retaliation for 'Uthmin's blood and as the emir coveting not caliphate so that this responsibility would be entrusted to the Council.[2] It is hinted in "Al-Imima wa al-S ¢yisa" that prior to ¯iff¢n, Mu'iwiya had secured allegiance as an emir.

Mu'iwiya wrote to °im¥ governor to secure allegiance for him in the same way Damascus people had sworn. Affirming that they would certainly not assemble for retaliating 'Uthmin's blood without a caliph, the nobles of Damascus were not convinced to swear allegiance to Mu'iwiya as an emir. As a result, the dwellers of °im¥ were the ever-first ones swearing allegiance to Mu'iwiya as a "caliph". After the spread of the news in Damascus the people thereof did swear allegiance to him as well.[3] It is stated that °adjdjidj Ibn Wa¥ma had been the first one addressing him as a caliph and being gratified at it.[4]

Procuring caliphate for Mu'iwiya had been confronted with another hindrance and it was that he was by no means among the precedented Muslims. He together with his father as well as most members of the family had battledwith Islam and subsequent to his conversion to Islam he was among ±ulaqi (the captives whom Allih's Apostle set free after a triumph). It was a contemptuous lable.

Although Mu'iwiya had fulfilled to reinforce his position somewhat in Damascus by introducing himself as "Khil al-Mu'min¢n" and "the revelation amanuensis" as well as relying on 'Umar's[5] and 'Uthmin's assistance, °idjiz and Iraq were both well-acquainted with his nature. Once 'Umar had saud that caliphate did only belong to Badr participants but

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.161.; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol. XXV, p.27

[2]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, p.82

[3]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, Vol.I, p.100

[4]. Waq'at ¯iff¢n, pp.78,80

[5]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.161

if neither of them were survived, caliphate would be for U¦ud participants as long as even one were alive, yet, caliphate would neverever be entrusted to ±ulaqi, nor to their descendants.[1] It is probable that this narration had been ascribed to ‘Umar; however, it should have been engraved in Muslims’ minds after him. In his remarks in ¯iff¢n, ‘Ammir had said that they, the Umayya, had had no background in Islam in order to be entitled to be the guardians of the nation or be abided by.[2] Even ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar responding Mu‘iwiya’s letter also wrote, “O Mu‘iwiya, what do you have to do with caliphate? You are from ±ulaqi!”[3]

Enclosing with the letter of ‘Umar’s son, a number of verses belonging to a poet from among An¥ir were dispatched reading that Mu‘iwiya was too minor to converse about the council participants.[4] And once ‘Al¢ (a) reprimanded Mu‘iwiya when he expressed his ideas about allotments among Muhidjir£n and An¥ir and told him that such affairs have no pertinence to ±ulaqi![5]

When Mu‘iwiya set out to Medina to assure the opposers of Yaz¢d’s succession to the throne, ‘ªyisha dissented and accused him of her brother Mu¦ammad’s murder. She reiterated, “You are from among ±ulaqi for whom caliphate is interdicted.”[6]

This defect was not of significance for Mu‘iwiya, however, who had surmounted more formidable hurdles. Not only did he designate himself enforcedly as Muslims’ caliph, but he nominated his son, infamous for being a debauchee, for that very rank as well.

The Umayya’ rule was also a kind of Quraysh¢ one; therefore, it was on no accounts distinct from the former ones. This circumstance was perpetuated in the ‘Abbisids dynasty too. Now what merits consideration is to perceive when the prerequisite of being from Quraysh had become one of the indispensable prerequisites for caliphate. We

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.III, p.342; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.25, p.42

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.39

[3]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.63

[4]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.64

[5]. Nahdj al-baligha, letter 28

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.237

already discussed that the prerequisite of being from Quraysh had never been stipulated among prerequisites of Fiqh for caliphate. Although the Shi'ite Muslims, the Twelvers, had faith in Imamate belonging exclusively and citedly to 'Al¢ (a) and his descendants, those even believing not in citation never considered the element of being from Quraysh a prerequisite for caliphate. °udhayfa had been quoted subsequent to swearing allegiance to 'Al¢(a) as saying that he had would in no way swear allegiance to any Quraysh¢ after him.[1] This utterance by one of the renowned Companions (disciples) does justify that the prerequisite of being from Quraysh had by no means been treated legitimate and incontrovertable. Nontheless, the Umayya who were the principal substructure of Quraysh with securing the authority, propounded the prerequisite of being from Quraysh in earnest and Hadith-fabricaters began fabricating Hadiths in this respect. It has been quoted from Mu'iwiya as alleging that this empire and caliphate has been laid amongst Quraysh except whom no other one has the eligibility of a caliph.[2]

Addressing the dwellers of Medina who hesitated to swear allegiance to Yaz¢d, Raw¦ Ibn Zinbi' belonging to the tribe of Djudhim and from among the devotees of the Umayya in Damascus said, "We are not soliciting you to swear allegiance to the tribes of Lakhm, Djudhim or Kalb, **ولكنا ندعوكم الى قريش ومن جعل الله له هذا الأمـر واختصّـه"** We are summoning you toward Quraysh and the one for whom Allih has uniquely assigned this authority, namely Yaz¢d Ibn Mu'iwiya."[3]

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, Vol.II, p.216

[2] al-Fitna wa waq'at al-djamal, p. 109; from: Min dawlat 'Umar ili dawlat 'Abd al-Malik, p. 109

[3]. al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, Vol.I, p.300; al-Shuwri fi l-'A¥r al-umaw¢, p.34; Later on, when two Umayya ('Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az ¢z with Sulaymin Ibn Hishim) performed their prayers led by one of Khiridjites, an outsider composed,

الم تر انّ الله أظهر دينه وصلّت قريش خلف بكر بن وائل

Not you know Allih's religion won while Quraysh performed its prayer behind the tribe of Bakr Ibn Wi'il

al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.I, p.343, vol.II, p.265; Shi'r al-khiridjites, p.208, from Ansib al-ashrif, vol.VIII, p.365, vol.III, p.137; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.II, p.1913

The counterfeit Hadiths prevailing were plentiful among which were “The one disdaining Quraysh has indeed disdained Allih”.[1] “The formost Imims for the nation are the ones from Quraysh.”[2] It is astonishing that to substantiate their nobleness, they availed themselves of their consanguinity with Allih’s Apostle(s)[3], though they antagonized his close kins.

The Umayya’s Quraysh-oriented policy was manifest in Umayya’s ruthlessness against An¥ir.

Akh§al, an Umayya poet, had composed, “Quraysh is the possessor of the entire virtuousness and greatness whereas contemptability is under the turban of An¥ir.[4] Enumerating the grounds for his triumph over ‘Al¢ (a), Mu‘iwiya referred to his fine relation with Quraysh.[5]

Mu‘tazila has indicted Mu‘iwiya for initiating fatalism in the Islamic world.[6] It can be avowed that faith in fatalism in Arab world has had it’s antecedent in Dark Age as those of a number of Christians and the Jews of °idjiz. Also succeeding the emergence of Islam, much or less, a number of people have inflamed the subject of fatalism; on the contrary, the fact is that this belief predominated in the Umayya’s tenure and gradually turned into a principle in tribal disputes. Employing this principle on caliphate has been revealed in the well-know utterance ascribed to ‘Uthmin. The revolters’ insistence was his dethrone but in return ‘Uthmin acknowledged that he would never ever remove the robe which Allih had made him wear.

It was wholly evident that he attributed his caliphate to Allih whereas it was in reality emanated from ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf’s notion. Mu‘iwiya did take considerable strides in

---

[1]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.III, p.318, vol.VI, p95; al-Ba¥i’ir wa l-dhaki’ir, p.35

[2]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.VI, p.148

[3]. al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.II, p.67

[4]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XVI, pp.35-36; al-Shi‘r wa l-shu‘ari’, p.302; see: al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.I, p.63

[5]. al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.II, p.115

[6]. ±abaqit al-mu‘tazila, p.6; Fa¤l al-I‘tizil wa ±abaqit al-mu‘tazila, p.143, al-Awi’íl, Ab£ Hilil Askar¢, vol.II, p.125

this regard. Mu‘iwiya is quoted as saying, as the entire affairs are under Allih’s control, endeavors are all in vain.[1]

Elsewhere he said, “This caliphate is a decree from among Divine decrees along with a destiny from among Divine destinies.”[2]

Reacting to ‘ªyisha’s dissent from the succession of Yaz ¢d, Mu‘iwiya responded, “This affair is a Divine destiny but which no one has any other alternative.”[3]

In his famous sermon, Ziyid Ibn Ab¢h, Mu‘iwiya’s governor in Ba¥ra and K£fa declaimed, “O people, we are all the politicians and the advocates of yours. We govern you with recourse to the power bestowed by Allih.”[4]

In addition, Yaz¢d in his inaugural sermon, stated that since his father had been a servant from among Allih’s servants, Allih, magnanimous enough, bestowed him the caliphate. Now He has laid it with him.[5]

In an answer to ‘Uthmin’s son who objected to Yaz¢d’s succession and said, “It was our father after whom you secured the authority”.

Mu‘iwiya said, “This sovereignty is what Allih has granted us.”[6]

To induce Mu‘iwiya to introduce his son a caliph, Misk¢n Diram¢ composed,

---

[1]. °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.III, p.529

[2]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.85 **(هذه الخلافة أمر من أمرالله وقضاء من قضاء الله)**

[3]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.205, Aswad Ibn Yaz¢d narrated, he enquired ‘ªyisha “Is not it surprising that a man from ±ulaqi (the released) is disputing with Mu¦ammad’s companions on caliphate?”

“No need to surprise” ‘ªyisha replied, It is سلطان الله **“**a Divine power” that Allih grants to both debauchees and the righteous; as Pharaoh ruled Egypt for four hundred years; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XV, p.42

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.180, al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.II, p.49; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol,V, p.220; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.IV; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.449; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, Vol.XVI, p.202; Djamharat Khu§ab al-‘arab, vol.II, p.273; al-umaw¢yy£n wa l-Khilifa, p.25

[5]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.225; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.226; Ansib al-Ashrif, vol.IV, p.299, No.798

[6]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.214

بني خـلفاء الله مهـلاً فأنّما يُبوئها الرّحمن حيث يزيد

اذا المنبـر الغربي خلّاه ربـّه فـإن اميرالمؤمنين يزيـد

“O descendants of Allih’s caliphs, slow down, Allih will rest the rule anywhere He ordains. When the western pulpit of Damascus voided (when Mu‘iwiya passed away), Yaz¢d would be Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n.”[1]

Eventually we will find out how the caliphate simply denoting the succession of Allih’s Apostle(s) at first, gradually conveyed the sense of Divine caliphate. The cardinal matter in Mu‘iwiya’s caliphate was that he did abolish the tradition of caliphate and declared monarchism officially in stead. By “officially” what we intend is that prior to that in ‘Uthmin’s tenure the ground had been paved for monarchism (discussed earlier in the section concerning ‘Uthmin). Narrated by Ibn ‘Asikir, on hearing the news of ‘Uthmin’s murder, Thumima Ibn ‘Ad¢, one of the prophet’s disciples, wept and stated that he was among those taking the “Prophetic caliphate” from “Mu¦ammad’s household” and turning it into a despotic monarchy.[2]

Although of ‘Uthmin’s was murdered, a great number of people dissented him, later on account of the Umayya dominion they acquitted and cleansed ‘Uthmin of all those flaws. Nevertheless, they still did somewhat cleave to the principle that Mu‘iwiya’s dominion equals a termination to caliphate era and a commencement to monarchism. This conversion by no means did make them doubt its legitimacy. As a matter of fact, they justified that legitimacy is something and the perfectness of the rule something else.

Regarding this very conversion, a Hadith is attributed to the Holy prophet (s) as stating, **خلافة النبوة ثلاثون سنة**.[3] “Prophetic caliphate lasts for thirty years,” and elsewhere

---

[1]. al-umawiyy£n wa l-Khilifa, p.65. From al-Shi‘r wa l-shu‘ari’, vol.I, p.544; al-Aghin¢, vol.20, p.212; Khazinat al-adab, vol.III, p.59; Shi‘r Misk¢n, p.33

[2]. Ibid, vol.V, p.344

[3]. Ibid, vol V, p.344

as, **الخلافة ثلاثون عاماً ثم يكن بعد ذلك الملك** [4] **"**Caliphate is for thirty years after which monarchism appears."

These Hadiths do never seem authentic. What should be taken into account is that Mu'iwiya was pleased with using the term of monarchism about himself. Mu'iwiya constantly repeated, **أنا اول الملوك "**I am the first monarch."

In order to fortify his authority and erase all traces of caliphate, it was possible for him to counterfeit such a Hadith as many other instances have been seen. Ka'b al-A¦bir one of the admirers of 'Uthmin and Mu'iwiya stated that in the Old Testament he had found Allih's Apostle(s) as the one who would be born in Mecca, migrate to ±iba and whose rule is in Damascus.[1] And this might have made Mu'iwiya think of transmitting the Holy Prophet's pulpit as well as his waking-cane from Medina to Damascus.[2] It is also quoted from Ab£ Hurayra as stating, **الملك في قريش والقضاء في الانصار**[3] **"**Monarchism is for Quraysh but governorship for An¥ir" and **الخلافة في قريش والحكم في الانصار**[4] **"**Caliphate is for Quraysh but governorship for An¥ir."

And in another narration, one of those possesing bibles had told to Mu'iwiya that he had noticed his attribute within the Divine Books as the one who would for the first time turn caliphate into monarchism, yet, Allih is merciful and forgiving after all.[5] The Hadith according to which caliphate would last for thirty years had been narrated by Sufayna who was reportedly one of the prophet's Mawil¢ (freed slaves).

He affirmed that he had heard from the prophet (s) saying, **الخلافة ثلاثون عاماً ثم يكون بعد ذلك الملك "**Caliphate lasts for thirty years and after which monarchism appears."

---

[4]. Musnad A¦mad, vol.IV, p.273; vol.V, p.44,50,404; al-Djimi' al-¯a¦¢¦ (Sunan al-Tirmidh¢) أنا اول الملوك وآخر خليفه **"**I am the first monarch and the last caliph;" Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.55; Kitib al-fitan, No.48

[1]. Sunan al-Dirim¢, vol.I, p.6

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.237-238; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.463, 464

[3]. Ibid, vol.IV, p.346

[4]. Musnad A¦mad, vol.IV, p.185

[5]. al-Kimil fi l-lughat wa l-adab, vol.II, p.191

Consequently, he reckoned that two years for Ab£ Bakr, ten years for ‘Umar, twelve years for ‘Uthmin and six years for ‘Al¢ (a).[1]

However, it is known that Imim’s authority did merely lasted for four years and nine months not longer. A further reckoning was narrated by Mas‘£d¢ as follows, two years, three months and eight days for Ab£ Bakr, ten years and six months for ‘Umar, eleven years, eleven months and thirteen days for ‘Uthmin, four years, seven months minus afew days for ‘Al¢ (a) and eight months and ten days for °asan (a) that altogether equals precisely thirty years.[2] Primarily other Hadiths dealing with caliphate are virtually of this category unless, the conclusive evidence vindicate their authenticity otherwise.

The narration of, **ان الخلفاء من قريش الى أن تقوم الساعة**[3] **“**Caliphate does belong to Quraysh until the Day of Judgement” would be of this type as well unless in compliance with our belief it corresponded to Na¥¥ (textual nomination) of Imim ‘Al¢ (a) together with his succeeding Imims.

Heedless of the origin of the Hadith, the historical evidence indicated the start of a thoroughgoing monarchism within the domain of the Islamic caliphate. The term of monarchism as a substitute for caliphate equates to the existence of despotism which is deemed as one of the fundamental features of the rule. As the completion of the narration of this very Hadith “after thirty years” has come,

1. Musnad A¦mad, vol.V, p.220,221; Tirmidh¢ has narrated the aforegoing quotation from Sa‘¢d Ibn Djamhin quoted from "Sufayna";

He quoted from Sa‘¢d telling Sufayna, “The Umayya is of this opinion that caliphate belongs to them.”

“They are lying, they are the kings and from the worst kinds” he answered.

Al-Djimi‘ al-¯a¦¢¦, vol.IV, p.503; al-Nizi‘ wa l-takhi¥um, p.70; Tirmidh¢ has added that the Umayya had claimed that caliphate was lain among them by the Holy Prophet(s)

2. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.429. It merits consideration that those fabricating Hadiths have been trying to be accurate in calculation.

3. al-Djimi‘ al-¯a¦¢¦, Kitib al-fitan, No.49

4. Musnad A¦mad, vol.IV, p.273; Kitib Muslim, Kitib al-zuhd, No.4

The noticeable instances of which were Kasri's rule in Iran and those of Caesar's and Heraclitus's in Rome and Damascus. Mu'iwiya was a great enthusiast for the background of Damascus in particular. Muslims were all well acquainted with these two rulers.

In one of his sermons concerning Qisi§¢n (the oppossers), Imim 'Al¢ (a) said, "Combat Allih's foes, those striving to extingish Allih's light. Battle against the misled wrongdoers, the felons who are neither Qur'in recitors, nor religious jurisprudents, scholars of paraphrase and those having no background in Islam. I do swear by Almighty Allih that if they could secure the authority, they would undoubtedly perform what was done by Kasri and Heraclitus."[1]

'Ammir also regarding Qisi§¢n said that 'Uthmin's assassination was a pretext to them until, **ليكونـوا بـذلك جبابرةً ملوكا**[2] " The oppressors became monarchs."

It was the approach that Mu'iwiya had singled out in order to secure the authority and govern an Islamic land. He himself divulged, "By Almighty Allih I did neverever combat for the sake of performing prayers, observing fast, pilgrimage nor paying Zakit (poor-rate as prescribed by Islam). You yourself were acting them all. I did combat to dominate you and although Allih bestowed it to me, you never contented."[3]

On entering K£fa he announced that the one swearing not allegiance to him would in no way be secure. He set a three-day respite for allegiance.[4] Quoted from Ibn 'Abd al-Barr and Djj¦i¨, he did secure allegiance from the nation as loathing for 'Al¢ (a).[5]

In a letter to 'Abd Allih Ibn Dja'far to swear allegiance to Yaz¢d, he had written, "If you swear allegiance, you will be adored; otherwised, you will be coerced." [6]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.78

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.V, p.39

[3]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.16,46; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.43,45

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.47

[5]. Bahdjat al-madjilis, vol.I, p.99; al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.II, p.105

[6]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.201

Allegedly, he had ordered to slay the one who avoids swearing.[1] About figures like Qays Ibn Sa‘d, having a kind of influence, he secured allegiance by clasping his hand and compelling him to pat his hand whereas Qays was refraining.[2]

Mu‘ıwiya’s aristocratic lifestyle and his procedures adopted in caliphate, pompted Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ as well to address him a “monarch” when meeting.[3] In Damascus he was determined to find the works created about ruler’s biographies in Damascus.[4] Later on, Dji¦i¨ recorded that Mu‘iwiya turned the rule into the rule of Kasri and Caesar.[5] Historians have also introduced him as the ever-first monarch.[6] And Sa‘¢d Ibn Musayyib affirmed that Mu‘iwiya was the first one converting caliphate into monarchism.[7] Mugh¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba described Mu‘iwiya as an emir and specified that there should be a difference between a peasant and an emir.[8] Reportedly, the first one who substituted, **ملك يوم الدين** “Master of the Day of Judgment” for **مالك يوم الدين** “Owner of the Day of Judgment” was Mu‘iwiya.[9]

Ya‘q£b¢ has enumerated what he did as indications of monarchism as follows, being seated on a platform and making others sit in a lower position, singling out the best propertys of the people and allotting them all to himself.[11] He commanded to devote whatsoever Iranian kings had possessed in farmlands or anywhere else to him.[11]

---

[1]. °ayit al-¥a¦iba, vol.II, p.441

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XVI, p.48-49

[3]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.VIII, p.210; Tir¢kh Ya‘q£b¢, vol.II,.217; al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.I, p.291

[4]. Muntakhabit al-tawir¢kh li-Dimashq, p.81 quoted from Min dawlat ‘Umar ili dawlat ‘abd al-malik, p.146

[5]. Rasi’il al-Dji¦i¨, Rasi’il al-kalimiyya, p.241

[6]. Tir¢kh Khulafi’, pp. 196,203

[7]. Tir¢kh Ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.232

[8]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VI, p.20

[9]. Akhbir I¥bahin, vol.II, p.255

[10]. al-Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.VI, p.6; Tir¢kh Ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.232

[11]. Tir¢kh Ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.233

Mu‘ıwiya’s status was so conspicuous that ‘Umar had named him Kasri in his tenure.[12] It should be asserted that Mu‘ıwiya was set to establish a “caliphate of Islamic royalty”. He considered himself as a king but described as a caliph concerning old traditions. Making efforts to transport Prophets’ pulpit from Medina to Damascus, he intended to fortify his Islamic strength although he could never succeed.[13]

Mawd£d¢ has itemized a number of characteristics for clarifying the distinction between Mu‘ıwiya’s monarchism and his predecessors’ caliphate as follows, first, the way of designating a caliph converted. In spite of his predecessors who never rose up for caliphate, Mu‘ıwiya in any way exerted to gain the caliphate. As soon as he secured the authority, no one was able to dissent him. Anyone had to swear on oath of allegiance to him.

It was what Mu‘ıwiya himself had confessed, “I was absolutely aware of nation’s discontent with my caliphate; however, I secured it by sword”.[3]

It gradually culminated in hereditary caliphate by Mu‘ıwiya. Secondly, the lifestyle of the caliphs converted. Following the approaches of monarchism of Iran and Rome did commence from Mu‘ıwiya’s tenure on. The third feature is concerned with Bayt al-Mıl (public fund). At this juncture, public treasury changed in to the king’s and his lineage’s personal wealth. No one had the right to reprimand the government for the accounts thereof. Fourthly, it was the termination of freedom of speech. At this period, not a single one had an ability to enjoin the good nor prohibit the evil. This new process began in Mu‘ıwiya’s term after °ud̲jr Ibn ‘Ad¢’s assassination. Fifthly, it was the end of freedom of judiciary branch. The end of the council-oriented government was the sixth characteristic of a monarchical government. The seventh was the emergence of racial and tribal prejudices. And also elimination of superiority for law has been deemed as the eighth feature.[4]

---

[12]. al-I¥iba, vol.III, p.434

[13]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.230-240

[3]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VIII, p.132

[4]. Khilifat wa mul£kiyyat, pp. 118-207

Mawd£d¢ has represented many historical instances for each characteristic.

SHI‘ITE MUSLIMS IN MU‘ªWIYA’S TIME

In Mu‘iwiya’s term, one of the crucial issues was the Shi‘ites beliefs amongst a number of people specifically Iraqis. We have already discussed the emergence of Shi‘ism. Now we are to evaluate the interactions between Shi‘ite Muslims and the Umayya.

Beyond any doubt, Shi‘ite Muslims have always been Mu‘iwiya’s archenemies as the Khiridjites were considered as other foes for him. Nevertheless, the Khiridjites were not of great significance. The universal pessimism on the part of Muslims about them, their oppression as well as their baseless position-taking had resulted in having no support among people. On the contrary, Shi‘ite Muslims particularly in Iraq were all endowed with a mighty support like Imim ‘Al ¢ (a) and others from Ahl al-Bayt (Prophet’s infallible household).

The culture disseminated by Imim ‘Al¢ (a) in Iraq was indeed thoroughly Islamic and although people had to keep silence under Mu‘iwiya’s compulsion, they were all able to distinguish ‘Al¢’s truthfulness and Mu‘iwiya’s wrongfulness.

Mu‘iwiya and with his agents confronted this process with diverse ways, from reconciliation and gentleness to vast harshness. The latter was wide-ranging especially in Iraq. Creating hatred for ‘Al¢ (a) was one the most critical approach used. Mu‘iwiya and other Umayyads succeeding him have persistently been endeavoring to wipe ‘Al¢ (a) off the face of the earth and introduce him as an element, aggressive, bloodthirsty and the like. In Holy Prophet’s term and later on in caliphs’ terms and his own caliphate especially, Imim ‘Al¢’s life verified his unique glory in both scientific and practical domains. His sermons were narrated chest by chest. The statements regarding his scientific supremacy, the Hadiths quoted from the Holy Prophet (s) concerning his excellence as well as his praiseworthy and extraordinary judgments were all recounted by people to one another in hadith assemblies. These all led to dissemination of that culture among people, the culture which prompted Imim ‘Al¢’s disciples to retain this affection

for him even at the cost of their martyrdom. And above all, this culture could naturally perpetuate among Imim ‘Al¢’s descendants, from Prophet’s household. Inasmuch as the Umayya had perceived this fact, they consequently were determined to stigmatize the Imim, express their disgust for him in every assembly and curse him. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d has written a chapter entitled “the hadiths counterfeited by Mu‘iwiya concerning ‘Al¢ (a) through stimulating a number of disciples and Tibi‘¢n” in his book.[1]

When Marwin Ibn °akam was asked why they were doing so, he responded, **لا يستقيم لنا الامر الا بذلك**[2] **“**Our governorship will on no accounts be abiding but through this way.”

Principally, the Umayya’s sovereignty could never perpetuate except the policy of insulting ‘Al¢ (a). Cursing His Excellency, highlighting other caliphs as well as introducing them as superior to ‘Al¢ (a) were constantly pursued. As stated by some, since Hadith-fabricators aimed to approach the Umayya with recourse to these Hadiths, most Hadiths concerned with disciples’ virtues had been fabricated in the Umayya’s tenure.[3] At this juncture, individuals like ‘ªyisha were introduced as a source for Hadiths[4] and others like Zayd Ibn Thibit, being on ‘Uthmin’s side, were appointed to be the source of advice on legal or religious matters for Mu‘iwiya.[5] Attributing Hadiths by Imim ‘Al¢ (a) to himself or others was among what Mu‘iwiya did so that others could at times attribute them to Mu‘iwiya as well. Djj¦i¨ who had realized the fact denied the attribution of such Hadiths to Mu‘iwiya owing to the fact that he had no relation with the devout.[6]

This Hadith narrated by Imim, **ما رأيت سرفاً الا الي جانبها حق مضيّع**[7] **“**I have seen no lavishment unless

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.IV, p.63

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.184

[3]. Fadjr al-islim, p.213

[4]. al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.II, p.303

[5]. al-Mu¥annaf, ‘Abd al-Razziq, vol.X, p. 267

[6]. al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.II, p.61

[7]. Tir¢kh Khulafi’, p.247

someone’s right was disregarded therein” was ascribed to Mu‘iwiya.

In another case, one of Imim’s Hadiths was attributed to a Bedouin.[1] “We ascribe ‘Al¢’s letter to Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr to Ab£ Bakr”, Mu‘iwiya himself had confessed.[2]

‘Al¢’s malediction to the K£fiyins was attributed to ‘Umar.[3]

Insulting and cursing ‘Al¢ was prolonged as a tradition until it was ceased in ‘Umar ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z’s time.[4] Mu‘iwiya himself stressed that it must be spread to the extent that the offspring mature with this slogan, the youths grow old and no one narrates his excellence.[5] From among the disciples, some contributed to Mu‘iwiya in this regard. There existed a Hadith by Ab£ Hurayra concerning the mischief-making among the nation that says it is about ‘Al¢, yet, the Holy Prophet (s) has cursed such a person.[6] It has also been narrated that Mu‘iwiya rewarded Samura Ibn Djundab with 400,000 dhms to alege that the following verse had been revealed about ‘Al¢ (a),

وَمِنْ النَّاسِ مَنْ يُعْجِبُكَ قَوْلُهُ فِي الْحَيَاةِ الـدُّنْيَا وَيُشْـهِدُ اللَّـهَ عَلَى مَا فِي قَلْبِهِ وَهُوَ أَلَدُّ الْخِصَامِ.

“And among men is the one whose speech about this worldly life causes you to wonder, and he calls on Allih to witness as to what is in his heart, yet he is the most violent of adversaries.”[7]

Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d has written that Mu‘iwiya had stimulated a number of disciples to narrate some Hadiths against Imim

---

[1]. Madjma‘ al-amthil, vol.I, p.651

[2]. al-Ghirit, vol.I, p.251

[3]. al-Bad’ wa l-tir¢kh, vol.VI, pp.27-28

[4]. Tir¢kh Khulafi’, p.243

[5]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.IV, p.57; al-Na¥i’i¦ al-kifiya, p.72

[6]. al-«¤i¦, pp.210-211; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.IV, p.63 It is probable that this Hadith is attributed to Ab£ Hurayra and he Himself has not narrated it.

[7]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d,vol.I, p.361 (the four-volume edition)

‘Al¢(a) among whom were Ab£ Hurayra, ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, Mugh ¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba and ‘Urwa Ibn Zubayr.[1]

In his letters to his agents in cities, Mu‘iwiya wrote, “The Hadiths regarding ‘Uthmin’s virtues are being augmented in cities, as soon as you received my letter, urge people to begin narrating the excellences of companions and caliphs and also narrate a Hadith contradicting any Hadith narrated concerning Ab£ Turib’s (Imim ‘Al¢) virtues.”

Accordng to Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, most of them in order to get closer to the Umayya fabricated Hadiths expressing disciples’ excellences.[2] To replace the Hadith about the brotherhood between ‘Al¢(a) and the Holy Prophet (s), they counterfeited it therein the Prophet(s) stated, “If I intended to designate a successor for myself, he would undoubtedly be Ab£ Bakr.”

They had fabricated the hadith of “Khawkha” opposite to Hadith of “Sadd al-Abwib”.[3]

Mu‘iwiya was extremely bound to curse Imim ‘Al¢ (a) as the conclusion of his sermons.[4] He even compelled Imim’s disciples to go up the pulpit and curse him.[5] Any agent of Mu‘iwiya who did not abide by the tradition of cursing was deposed and replaced right away.[6] He had eaniced people into daring not to name their babies ‘Al¢[7] but call them Mu‘iwiya instead.[8]

He had announced that if anyone narrated the excellences of ‘Al¢, he would never warrant his security. Subsequently all preachers expressed their disgust for Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and cursed him.[9] However, in return he commanded

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d,vol.I, p.63

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XI, p.44

[3]. Ibid, vol.XI, p.49

[4]. Ibid, vol.IV, pp. 56-57

[5]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.II, p.298; Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, pp.66,101-102; Ma‘rifat ¥a¦iba, vol.II, p. 236

[6]. Turithuni, No.10, pp.143-144

[7]. Shadhirit al-dhahab, vol.I, p.148

[8]. Concerning Mu‘iw¢ya Ibn ‘Abd Allih Ibn Dja‘far; Ansib al-ashrif, section 4

[9]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XI, p.44; Bi¦ir, vol.IV, p.125

his agents to support the one narrating ‘Uthmin’s excellences.[1] A great number also lived either in Damascus or Iraq who loathed Imim ‘Al¢ (a) for their kins’ murder. And now the opportunity was provided to them to disclose their rancor by insulting and cursing him. When °ar¢z Ibn ‘Uthmin was asked why he cursed Imim (a) seventy times every morning and night, his response was, “How can I abstain from it whereas he has beheaded my forefathers with suspicion.”[2]

We will discuss later that the pressure exercising on Ahl al-Bayt was wholly for the sake of hindering ‘Al¢’s name to be commemorated. As one of the reasons for murdering °asan Ibn ‘Al¢(a) by poison, Ibn Djawz¢ has pointed to his entry into Damascus[3] which was naturally intolerable. All of these harsh treatments in order to wipe ‘Al¢’s name off the face of the earth occasioned people not to have the courage to narrate ‘Al¢’s virtues. Awzi‘¢, a renowned traditionist, did narrate nothing concerned with Ahl al-Bayt’s virtues save the Hadith to inform the revelation of the verse of “Ta§h¢r” (purification) about them[4], the same as Zuhr¢ who narrated not more than a virtue.[5] It seemed quite natural that all these repeated and universal curses could eventually influence people’s hearts, particularly in °idjiz and Damascus, and gradually change public opinions. It was, in every respect, what Mu‘iwiya sought. Because Islamic leadership lay with Imim ‘Al¢, eliminating him could lead to elimination of the religion from the society. As an emphasis, Mu‘iwiya secured allegiance from people by prerequisite of loathing ‘Al¢ (a)[6] in the same mannar that he had forced them for the first time to swear.[7]

Mu‘iwiya’s another action facing Shi‘ite Muslims was excercising compulsion. The manifestation of his rancor to Imim and Shi‘ite Muslims was in his brutal treatments. Imim °asan Mudjtabi’s martyrdom, a conspiracy by Mu‘iwiya, was

---

1. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.184
2. al-Madjr£¦¢n, vol.I, p.268
3. Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, Ibn Sa‘d, p.212
4. Usd al-ghiba, vol.II, p.20
5. Ibid.
6. Bahdjat al-madjilis, vol.I, p.99; al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.II, p.105
7. Ibid, vol.I, p.550

in line with this very policy. It is what historical sources have reported and accordingly, they have in truth discredited Mu‘iwiya among Muslims. The opposition of Umm al-Mu‘min ¢n (mother of the faithful, ‘ªyisha) in Imim’s burial beside the Prophet (s) exhibited the immense oppressedness of Imim together with his Shi‘ite Muslims.[1] Mu‘iwiya who believed that it was not feasible to delude the people of Iraq in the same way as silly people of Damascus, he had to choose the route of slaying and chastizing. Besides, Iraqi dwellers, including both Shi‘ite Muslims and non-Shi‘ite Muslims, were so sensitive that even a slight irritation could result in chanting bitter slogans against the Umayya although they were all obedient under the sword of Ziyid and °adjdjidj. The common term describing Shi‘ite Muslims was “Turibiyya” in the Umayya’s tenure.[2] It was derived from “Ab£ Turib”, (the father of soil), the title use by the Umayya for scorning Imim ‘Al¢ (a); nevertheless, later on a number of “Ghulit” (the Exaggerators) availed themselves of it for proving the Divinity of Imim ‘Al¢.

Slaying Shi‘ite Muslims had begun since Imim ‘Al¢’s term. After Imim’s forces dispersed and there was no security found but in Iraq, Mu‘iwiya deployed his troops along with some envoys to various areas among whom were Busr Ibn Ar§it, Sufyin Ibn ‘Awf Ghimid¢ and ®ahhik Ibn Qays. Their responsibility in cities was to trace and, **فيقتلوا كلّ من وجده من شيعة علي** “Kill any Shi‘ites they noticed at Mu‘iwiya’s behest.”

Busr set out to Medina were he martyred many of ‘Al¢’s disciples and enthusiasts and demolished their houses as well. He then went to Mecca and Sarit respectively and slayed any Shi‘ite Muslim he discovered. Ultimately, he left there for Nadjrin and martyred ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abd al-Muddin as well as his son. Earlier we presented a profile of his crimes.

Among areas that Busr passed en route and plundered was an area the residents of which were from the tribe of Hamdin, ‘Al¢’s Shi‘ite Muslims.

Ambushing them, Busr killed numerous men and captured a number of women and children. For the ever-first time

---

[1]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p.115

[2]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, p.184

Muslim women and children were captured.[3] These measures were once again adopted later in Karbali. About Busr, Mas‘£d¢ has written that he slayed a number from the tribes of Khuzi‘a and Hamdin together with a group known as al-Abni’ (from Iranian race) in Yemen. **ولم يبلغه عن أحد انه يمـالي عليـاً او يهـواه الا قتله**[2] **“**He killed anyone of whose attachment to ‘Al¢ he heard.”

Setting out to Anbir, ‘Awf Ibn Sufyin martyred Ibn °assin al-Bakr¢ in addition to Shi‘ites men and women.[3]

After °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ (a) had to compromise with Mu‘iwiya, one of the menaces Imim felt was the security of ‘Al¢’s Shi‘ite Muslims. Hence it was stipulated within the contract that ‘Al¢’s disciples should be all endowed with security. Although Mu‘iwiya had conceded it, immediately on the same day he announced that he would disregard the entire commitments.

Since K£fa was the center of Shi‘ite Muslims’ political and religious tendencies, Mu‘iwiya had to appoint one who can curb such people. Following the clashes between ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ and Mughº¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba who could keep up with Mu‘iwiya in deception, Mughº¢ra eventually flourished to be appointed as the governor of K£fa.

Mu‘iwiya’s endeavor was to have politically peaceful treatments towards the opponents as much as he could. The bases of two groups of the Umayya adversaries such as the Khiridjites and Shi‘ite Muslims were in Iraq. The Khiridjites revolted several times but were suppressed with all possible haste. But on the other hand, Shi‘ite Muslims by virtue of the contract signed between °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ and Mu‘iwiya, did not permit themselves to transgress. Mughº¢ra also intended to take no action except against the one revolting. As a result, even the Khiridjites of K£fa also had apparent relations with one another.[4]

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, vol.V, p.11

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.22

“Busr also was determined to slay anyone who might have had a hand ‘Uthmin’s assassination” Tir¢kh al-§abar¢ has written. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.134

[3]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XVI, pp.266, 267

[4]. ±ir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 132

Among the Iraqi tribes, the tribes of Rabi‘a, Hamdin[1], Ban£ ‘Abd al-Qays and Khuzi‘a (few in Iraq) had Shi‘ites inclination.

In his remarks addressing the tribe of Ban£ ‘Abd al-Qays, ¯a‘¥a‘a Ibn ¯£¦in said, “When apostasy was common, you did remain beside the religion and when some followed ‘ayisha, ±al¦a, Zubayr and ‘Abd Allih Ibn Wahb Risib¢, you declared that, **انا لا نريد إلا أهل البيت الذي ابتدأنا الله من قبلهم بالكرامة** [2] **“**You seek naught save Ahl al-Bayt, at first by whom Allih had granted you blessing.”

¯a‘¥a‘a under other circumstances availed himself of the opportunities provided for spreading his beliefs which were mostly censuring ‘Uthmin and eulogizing ‘Al¢ (a).

When Mugh¢ra was notified of such movements, he summoned ¯a‘¥a‘a and told him, “Far more than you we are acquainted with his excellences but **هذه السلطان قد ظهر وأخذنا بإظهار عيبه للناس فندع كثيراً مما أمرنا به ونذكر الشيء الذي لانجد منه بداً نرفع به هؤلاء القوم عن أنفسنا تقيّة** [3] **“**Because as soon as this ruler appeared, we had to denounce ‘Al¢ and relinguish many of what we were ordered to merely in order to extricate ourselves from this race (the Umayya).”

Anyhow Mugh¢ra the same as other agents were compelled to denounce Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and exonerate ‘Uthmin. Owing to this fact **يتعرّض لعليٍّ في مجلسه وخطبه ويدعو لعثمان ويترحّم له**[4] **“**He variably denounced ‘Al¢ (a) in every assembly and sermon in the mosque but commemorated ‘Uthmin and pled mercy for him.”

Subsquent to Mugh¢ra’s death (probably in 49 or 50 A.H.) the status quo converted. Although Ziyid Ibn Ab¢h was the governor of Ba¥ra at that time, Mu‘iwiya added K£fa to this realm as well. At the time of Imim ‘Al¢ (a), Ziyid Ibn Ab¢h was the governor of Firs. Since Mu‘iwiya’s intention was deluding ‘Al¢’s disciples, he decided to delude Ziyid too. His defect was lacking a definite begetter that Mu‘iwiya solved the problem by naming him Ziyid Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin. Despite

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.379

[2]. Tir¢kh al-dhahab, vol.II, p.379

[3]. Tir¢kh al-dhahab, vol.IV, p.144

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.188; Tir¢kh Ibn Khald£n, vol.III, pp.10,11

Imim ‘Al¢’s forewarning to him[1], Ziyid did never resent it and ultimately a while after of compromising he took refuge in Mu‘iwiya’s side.

Ziyid as well as his toughness were quite well known to Mu‘iwiya. He also knew that Ziyid had been in Iraq for some time and knew ‘Al¢’s Shi‘ite Muslims all well. Accordingly, first he despatched him to Ba¥ra and added K£fa to his realm after Mugh¢ra’s death. Mu‘iwiya might realize that the Shi‘ite Muslims in K£fa enjoyed relative freedom and at times could openly object in presence of Mugh¢ra in the mosque. It was considered a real threat which Mu‘iwiya removed by Ziyid’s dispatch.

The first measure taken by Ziyid was cutting off the hands of those (nearly eighty) who were not convinced to swear allegiance to him.[2] Ziyid’s harsh treatment in Ba¥ra, with a group of the Khiridjites in addition to Shi‘ite Muslims, was proverbial. He had declared a kind of martial law in Ba¥ra. At nights, following the night prayer, the opportunity people had for staying outdoors was as long as reciting the S£ra (chapter) of The Cow. During the curfew, Ziyid’s soldiers slayed anyone they traced.[3] Historians have introduced Ziyid as the ever-first one who drew his sword to people, arrested them by accusing them and chastized them with suspicion.[4] Among the Shi‘ite Muslims martyred by Ziyid were Muslim Ibn Zaymur and ‘Abd Allih Ibn Nudji who were both from the tribe of °a¤ram. In a letter to Mu‘iwiya succeeding °udjr’s martyrdom, Imim °usayn (a) had commemorated their martyrdom too.[5]

Ziyid’s main mission was to suppress the Shi‘ite Muslims of K£fa throughout Iraq.

“He was always seeking after Shi‘ite Muslims and anywhere tracing he slayed them”, Ibn A‘tham said.

---

[1]. Rab¢‘ al-abrir, vol.III. p.559

[2]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.462

[3]. Tir¢kh Ibn Khald£n, vol.III, p.8; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.450

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.174; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.167; Ibn Khald£n, vol.III, p.18; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.450

[5]. al-Mu¦abbar, p.479, Mu¦ammad Ibn °ab¢b has written, “Ziyid Ibn Ab ¢h executed MuslimM Ibn Zaymur and ‘Abd Allih Ibn Nudji, both Shi‘ite Muslims, at the doors of their houses at Mu‘iw¢ya’s behest.

He cut off the limbs of people and blinded them. Mu‘iwiya himself murdered a great number as well.[1] Elsewhere it has been written that Mu‘iwiya had issued the verdict of executing a group of Shi‘ite Muslims.[2] Ziyid assembled Shi‘ite Muslims in a mosque in order to make them express loathing for ‘Al¢.[3] He also searched for Shi‘ite Muslims in Ba¥ra to kill.[4] In a letter Imim °asan (a) objected to Mu‘iwiya in this regard.[5] Treating the same way, Samura Ibn Djundab, a substitute for him in Ba¥ra, had allegedly augmented the number of orphans in Ba¥ra and massacred nearly 8000 people until Ziyid objected him.[6] Although the accuracy of the abovementioned figures is not definite, it manifests a profile of their atrocities. Ziyid’s treatment towards ‘Al¢’s friends was unjust, in a real sense[7] exactly the same as that of ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir, Mu‘iwiya’s another governor.[8] Nu‘min Ibn Bash¢r, ex-governor of this area, on account of his acute rancor to dwellers of K£fa did not even want to obey Mu‘iwiya’s order to increase their provisions from Bayt al-Mil (public fund).[9]

Under the guise of a peace-seeking character, Mu‘iwiya had commanded Ziyid to decimate anyone at ‘Al¢’s religion.[10]

“Kill anyone amongst you who is from ‘Al¢’s Shi‘ite Muslims or accused of his amity”, he wrote to his agents, “and for it find evidence even hidden under the rocks even though it was solely an assumption”.[11] “Exclude the name of

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.203; see also Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad ¢d, vol.XI, p.44

[2]. al-Mu¦abbar, p.479

[3]. Mukhta¥arTir¢kh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.88

[4]. Ibid, p.88

[5]. Mukhta¥arTir¢kh Dimashq, vol.IX, p.86

[6]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.176, Ibn Khald£n, vol.III, p.10; see also Tir ¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.217; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.462

[7]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XII, p.312

[8]. Ibid, pp.317,336

[9]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XVI, pp.29,30

[10]. Bahdj al-sabigha, vol.III, pp.179,180; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.IV, p.57; this sentence has authentically come in °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢’s letter which will be discussed later.

[11]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.150; Bahdj al-sabigha, vol.III, p.180

the one for whose amity to ‘Al¢ you found any proof from Bayt al-Mil”, he added, “and discontinue his provision.”

He then wrote in conclusion, **من اتهمتموه بموالاة هولاء القوم فنكّلوا به واهدموا داره**[1] **“**Kill any one from among yourselves who is accused of having devotion to ‘Al¢ and demolish his house as well.”

Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d has also written that as far as Ziyid was well-aquainted with Shi‘ite Muslims, **قتلهم تحت كل حجر ومدر وأخافهم وقطع الأيدي والأرجل وسمل العيون وصلبهم على جذوع النخل وطرَّدهم وشردّهم**[2] **“**He massacred them all anywhere whom he noticed, intimidated them, cut off their limbs, blinded them, hung them from tree branches and banished them.”

The impetus of such treatments was totally obvious. According to A¦naf Ibn Qays, one of the headmen of Ban£ Tam¢m tribe had told about Mu‘iwiya that he had captured Iraq not by force but through commitement and contracts;[3] Anytime it was probable for people to revolt against Mu‘iwiya or “a catastrophe”, as he called it, take place.[4] It was as a result, necessary that any rebellion be suppressed. Dissatisfied with the Umayya’s the people of Iraq had to yield to them reluctantly. Imim °asan (a) also had reminded Mu‘iwiya of this point.[5] By the same token, as mentioned by Dji¦i¨ it was in truth a blunder that Mu‘iwiya had named 41 A.H. as **عام الجماعة “**The year of congregation” on the contrary, it must have been named as, **عام التفرقة “**The year of separation”[6]

These all accounted for the lack of factual collaboration and even the potential enmity of the K£fiyins towards Mu‘iwiya. In spite of the compulsion exercised by individuals like Ziyid and deception practised by Mugh¢ra to impede the growth of adversaries, Shi‘ite Muslims were still wholeheartedly faithful to their allegiance. Imim ‘Al¢ (a) had

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XI, p.45; al-Ghad¢r, vol.XI, p.29

[2]. Ibid, vol.XI, pp.44,46

[3]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, pp.156,158; Bi¦ir, vol.XXXXIV, p.108

[4]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.104

[5]. Maniqib Ibn Shahr ªsh£b, vol.IV, p.22; Bi¦ir, vol.XXXXIV, p.104

[6]. Risilat Dji¦i³ f¢ Umayya published with al-Nizi‘ wa l-takhi¥um, Miqr ¢z¢.

recommended them to curse him if they were under duress, but neverever loathe him.[1] Anyhow, K£fa was like fire under ashes that should have been thwarted with great effort not to catch fire again.

The Suppression of °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢’s Shi‘ite Movement

°udjr al-Khayr or °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢ who had been among the Holy Prophet’s disciples, did later range himself with ‘Al¢’s firm and devoted Shi‘ite Muslims. He belonged to the tribe of Kinda, a southern tribe in °idjiz, who had migrated to Iraq in 17 A.H. This tribe was involved in Iraqi events as participants in ¯iff¢n and later on in Mukhtir’s uprising.[2] A crowd from among them was at odds with °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢ (a) in Karbali. In the course of ¯iff¢n, his activity was utterly broad and he played a role as a commander in ‘Al¢’s army, yet when many a bandoned Imim (a)[3], up to the very last moment he stayed beside him.[4] °udjr could be found amid the most pious disciples of Allih’s Apostle(s). °ukaym Niyshib£r¢ called him the monk of Prophet’s disciples.[5] After ‘Al¢’s martyrdom, he was amongt the ones stimulating the nation to swear allegiance to °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ (a). In the process of compromising, °udjr seemed discontented but Imim elaborated that he had to consent merely due to protecting the lives of individuals like him.[6] Nontheless later Mu‘iwiya by no means remained faithful to his pledge and martyred both °udjr and his followers.[7]

During the governorship of Mughª¢ra over K£fa that lasted until the beginning of 50s, in spite of relative freedom, insults were still hurled at Imim ‘Al¢ (a) in the masque. The leadership of ‘Al¢’s Shi‘ite Muslims was lain with the characters such as °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢ and ‘Amr Ibn °amiq

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighª, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.IV, p.106

[2]. Mu‘djam Qabi’il al-‘arab, vol.IV, p.999; Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.104

[3]. Ibid

[4]. al-Ghirit, vol.II, p.481

[5]. A‘yin al-sh¢‘a, vol.XX, pp.60,67

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.45

[7]. Ibid, p.47

Khuzi‘¢.[1] °udjr was among those who frequently objected to Mugh¢ra accustomed to insult Imim ‘Al¢ (a). When Mugh¢ra was paved the way to send a caravan carrying some properties to Mu‘iwiya who was in need, °udjr intercepted the caravan and declared that as long as he has not granted the rights of the rightful, on no accounts would he allow these properties to be conveyed.[2] At Mu‘iwiya’s behest, Mugh¢ra had commanded them to take part in the congregational prayer at the mosque.[3]

Once °udjr was urged by Mugh¢ra to go up the pulpit and curse Imim ‘Al¢ (a) he went up and said, “Mugh¢ra propels me to curse ‘Al¢ (a), curse him you all.”[4]

Immediately, the congregation perceived that his intention had been Mugh¢ra himself. Mugh¢ra, however, had already declared that he never intended to be the first one murdering the celebrity of K£fa and as a result contribute to Mu‘iwiya’s grandeur in this world and his own abjectness in the Hereafter.[5] This statement was the response to those objecting why he did not arrest or harass °udjr.

Following the demise of Mugh¢ra and Ziyid’s governorship over K£fa, the status quo altered perceptibly.

Ziyid, from the very first night of his governorship, did commence his rigors. His exceptional sermon for threatening K£fa people, has been recorded as a typical Arab sermon in historical sourcesat that juncture.

Well acquainted with °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢, he warned him stating, “You and I have been in the same situation that you know yourself (concerning ‘Al¢’s amity) but today anything has converted. Hold your tongue and stay at your home. My throne can be yours too. I will doubtlessly meet all your demands provided that you get along with me although you are rash”.

Seemingly, °udjr who was convinced went away.[6]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.175

[2]. Tahdh¢b Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.IV, p.84

[3]. al-Kimil

[4]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, pp.69,101,102

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.189

[6]. ±abaqit al-Kubri, vol., p.218; al-Aghin¢, vol.XVII, p.134, 135

Once again the status quo changed. It is said that one time °udjr interrupted Ziyid's remarks protracted and the time of prayer was elasping, yelling out, "Al-¯alit" (prayer).[2] It is also narrated that he along with other Shi'ite Muslims had been convening meetings after Ziyid's departure to Ba¥ra. Ziyid's substitute, 'Amr Ibn °urayth, wrote to Ziyid that if he desired to maintain K£fa, he should return without delay.[3]

In this respect, °udjr was not merely solitary, but also he was under any circumstances accompanied by a number of Shi'ite Muslims. Quotedly, when °udjr protested against Mughc¢ra in the mosque, more than one- third of the audience validated his remarks.[4] As written by Abu l-Faradj, in the absence of Ziyid, being in Ba¥ra, °udjr together with his companions occupied one-third or half of the mosque and began denouncing and vilifying Mu'iwiya.[5] Ziyid himself had denounced the nobles of K£fa that **أنتم معي وإخوانكم وأبنائكم وعشائركم مع حجر**[6] **"**You are on my side whereas your brothers, offspring and tribes are on °udjr's side."

After a while, a multitude of those on °udjr's side dispersed since the chiefs of tribes had menaced the members of the tribes. Therefore, there was no more companion remained with °udjr.

When a group was sent to arrest him, he addressed his friends as saying, "Since you are by no means able to defy them, there is no way for any struggle.[7] Eventually, °udjr conceded to surrender provided that for drawing deduction he should be taken to meet Mu'iwiya.[8]

Having accepted the condition, Ziyid was making an attempt on the other hand to expose him to murder. By the same token, he compelled four characters having been appointed as the chiefs of the tribes in K£fa to make an affidavit against °udjr. It was stipulated in the affidavit that

---

[2]. Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol.IV, p.190

[3]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VI, p.218

[4]. Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol.IV, p.189; Ibn Khald£n, vol.IV, p.11

[5]. al-Aghinc¢, vol.17, p.135

[6]. Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol.IV, p.191; al-Aghinc¢, vol.XVII, p.36

[7]. Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol.IV

[8]. Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol.IV, p.190; Tirc¢kh Ibn Khald£n, vol.IV, p.14

°udjr had formed some assemblies wherein Mu‘iwiya had been cursed. His belief was that no one merited the caliphate save those from ±ilib’s lineage. As stated by them having caused chaos within the town, he had expelled ‘Amr Ibn °urayth, the governor; furthermore, he had not only saluted ‘Al¢, but expressed his disgust for his foes and those having combated him.

Ziyid who had on no accounts approved the aforesaid affidavit ordered Ab£ Burda, son of Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢, to prepare a more pungent one. What he wrote as a result was, **إن حجر خلع الطاعة وفارق الجماعة ولعن الخليفة ودعا إلي الحرب والفتنة وجمع إليه الجموع يدعوهم إلى نكث البيعة وخلع اميرالمؤمنين معاويه وكفر بالله كفرة صلعاء “**°udjr has declined to comply with the caliph and seceded from “Djami‘a”. He has cursed the caliph and summoned all to a battle and sedition. Having congregated the people around himself, he has urged them to breach their pledges. He dethroned Mu‘iwiya, Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n, from the caliphate and blasphemed against Allih in addition.”[1]

This time °udjr was labeled a blasphemer. Ab£ Burda who was one of the eminent Sunnites traditionists bore the witness of it.[2] Ziyid persuaded others to sign it too. Among the signitories were Is¦iq and Moses, sons of ±al¦a, Mundhir, Zubayr’s son, ‘Umar, son of Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ and ‘Umira, son of ‘Uqba Ibn Ab¢ Mu‘ay§.[3]

As narrated by historians, while °udjr was being arrested, he yelled out, “I am still faithful to my allegiance”. He was absolutely right because he neverever intended to revolt againt Mu‘iwiya. What he insisted on was about ‘Al¢ not to be insulted. And it was precisely what had been stipulated in Mu‘iwiya’s commitment and conceded by him Fascinatingly, it was specified in the affidavit that °udjr believed that caliphate was well deserved to no one but those from ±ilib’s lineage. It was the manifestation of °udjr’s purifiedly Shi‘ites

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp.199,200; al-Ghirit, vol.II, p.565; al-Kuni wa l-Alqib, vol.I, p.15; al-Aghin¢, vol.17, p.146; Tir¢kh Ibn Khald£n, vol.IV, pp.12,13. "¯al‘i’" might refer to ‘Al¢ (a) who was well-Known as A¥la‘ or might mean "intensely"

[2]. Concerning Ab£ Barda has come in Tadhkirat al-¦uffi¨, vol.I, p.95 as follows انه النقيه احد الأعه الاثبات **“**He has been one of the eminent Islamic jurisprudent”

[3]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XVII, p.146; Tir¢kh Ibn Khald£n, vol.IV, pp.12,13

belief. “Purified Shi‘ite Muslims” denotes those being religious Shi‘ite Muslims. The belief of such Shi‘ite Muslims is that Imamate does solely belong to prophet’s household (Ahl al-Bayt).

In a poem quoted from °udjr we read, **فإنه كان له وليًّا ثم ارتضاه بعده وصيّاً “‘**Al¢ was a friend of the prophet’s (s) and he was gratified with his executorship.”[1]

°udjr described ‘Al¢ as Prophet’s friend and executor. At that time many were of this belief in Iraq. When Abu l-Aswad Du‘al¢ was sneered due to his in-depth enthusiasm for ‘Al¢, he stated in a poem,

أحب محمداً حبّاً شديداً وعباساً وحمزة والوصيا[2]

“I adore Mu¦ammad (s), ‘Abbis, °amza and the executor (‘Al¢)”

He did introduce ‘Al¢ as the Holy Prophet’s executor manifestubg his successorship. Corresponding to it is Milik’s statement regarding ‘Al¢, **هذا وصـي الأوصـياء ووارث علـم الأنبياء**[3] **“**The executor of the executors and the inheritor of all prophets’ body of knowledge is he.”

This description was also what Imim Biqir’s Shi‘ite Muslims like Djibir Ibn Yaz¢d Dju‘f¢ uttered about ‘Al¢ (a).[4] Further instances have been presented earlier in discussion of Shi‘ism at Imim ‘Al¢’s time.

Ultimately, °udjr along with his fourteen companions, known as the heads of °udjr’s followers[5], was sent to Damascus. A few of them were interceded and forgiven by Mu‘iwiya in Damascus. Although °udjr also was interceded, Mu‘iwiya did in no way accept. Reportedly, Mu‘iwiya was at first ambivalent and on this account he had already written to Ziyid that he believed that °udjr should never be murdered but Ziyid had replied that liberating him would result in corruption of Iraq[6], and he could allow °udjr to return Iraq on the condition that he did not require K£fa.[7]

---

[1]. Waq‘at ¯iff¢n, p.381

[2]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XII, p.321

[3]. Tir¢kh Ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.151

[4]. al-Irshid, p.280

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.199

[6]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, p.204

[7]. Ibid, p.203; al-Aghin¢, vol.XVII, p.149

Mu‘iwiya eventually made a decision to assassinate °udjr; notwithstanding, since he was terrified to meet him face to face, he commanded to detain them in Mardj ‘Adhri’ a few Farsangs far away from Damascus.[1] Later he read out the affidavit of dwellers of K£fa to those of Damascus and appealed to them to voice their opinions! It was utterly evident that what they could ever say when the disciples’ descendants were of that opinion! Mu‘iwiya deployed a number to Mardj ‘Adhri’ to carry out what they were supposed to. They were at first duty-bound to propose them that if they expressed their loathing for ‘Al¢ (a), the verdict would be declared null and void. Under no circumstances did °udjr and his companions agree. And it might have been owing to this fact that Imim ‘Al¢ (a) had asserted that after him if they were impelled to insult him, they should abide by but neverever express loathing for him.[2] Subsequently, digging their own graves, °udjr and his companions spent dusk to dawn in worshiping. Eight out of them were set free but six of them announced their readiness for martyrdom.

Next morning they were again requested to express their idea about ‘Uthmin, **“أول من جار في الحكم** The ever-first one who did injustice was ‘Uthmin”, they retorted. They were asked whether they would pronounce disgust for ‘Al¢. They responded, **“لا، بل نتولاه ونتبرأ ممن تبرأ منه** No, never, we do all love him and hate those who hate him.”

Then they prepared themselves for being martyred. °udjr who was prominent among the devout of Iraq said a very-long-two-Rak‘at prayer (Rak‘at, unit of prayer consisting of three postures) and stated, **“والله ماصليت قطّ أقصر منها ولولا أن تروا أن ما بي جزع من الموت أحببت أن استكثر منها** As yet, I have never performed a prayer shorter than this and I yearned to prolong it if you did not accuse me of being scared of decease.”

Six of them were martyred. Kar¢m Ibn ‘Af¢f Khath‘am¢ and ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn °assin al-‘Anz¢ were both taken to meet Mu‘iwiya. Kar¢m was interceded but when it was ‘Abd al-Ra¦min’s turn, Mu‘iwiya questioned him about ‘Al¢ (a).

---

[1]. It is quoted that in conquering Damascus, °udjr Himself had conquered this area; al-Mu¦abbar, p. 292 ان حجراً اول من وحد الله عزوجل بمرج عذراء حين افتتحت on conquering Mardj ‘Adhra’, the first one who glorified Allih by saying "Allih Akbar" was °udjr.

[2]. al-Irshid, p.169; Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, p.101

"You had better not enquire any question", he responded.

When Mu'iwiya insisted, he declared, **أشـهد أنـه مـن الذاكرين الله كثيراً ومن الآمريـن بـالحق والقـائمين بالقسـط والعافين عن الناس "**I do attest that he was among the ones bearing Allih invariably in mind, enjoining good, establishing justice and being magnanimous." And when he was asked about 'Uthmin, he replied, **هو اوّل من فتح باب الظلم وارتجع ابواب الحق "**He was the first one who opened the door of injustice and closed the doors of justice."

Mu'iwiya sent him to Iraq and instructed Ziyid to kill him brutally. Then, he was buried alive at Ziyid's behest.[1]

Repercussions of °udjr's Martyrdom

°udjr's martyrdom did mar the reputation of Mu'iwiya as well as other Umayyads incredibly. As far as his fame for devoutness and worship among the Prophet's disciples was concerned, rarely could anyone be found unacquainted with his piety. Being among the chiefs of the tribe of Kinda had magnified his eminence too. Therefore, eruption of objections against the Umayya in general and Mu'iwiya in particular seemed quite natural. Although the heavy pressure exerted could impede the occurance of probable riots in Iraq, it could on the contrary intensify the nation's devotion to Shi'ism on the one hand and their rancor to Mu'iwiya on the other hand. Later, a multitude including °udjr's sons such as 'Abd Allih and 'Abd al-Ra¦min took part in Mukhtir's uprising.[2] On hearing the news of °udjr's martyrdom, even a number of Ziyid's agents like the governor of Khurisin, Rabi' Ibn Ziyid °irith¢, deplored greatly. It is said that Rabi' prayed for being died soon and by accident, he did fall down and pass away on the same day.[3] 'ªyisha was also among the protesters. She had dispatched 'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn °irith to Mu'iwiya to recommend him not to murdering °udjr but prior to his arrival °udjr had been martyred.[4]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp.205,206; al-Aghin¢, vol.XVII. pp.151, 152, 153

[2]. al-I¥iba, vol.I, p.315, A'yin al-sh¢'a, vol.20, p.61 (From Mustadrak and ±abaqit al-kubri)

[3]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, pp.400,401

Later, ‘ªyisha reproached Mu‘iwiya for °udjr’s murder[1] as saying, “I would object to you for °udjr’s murder if it were not the case that anything we dissented occurred in a worser form”.[2]

°udjr’s devoutness had prompted ‘ªyisha to object to Mu‘iwiya in this regard though his standing in Djamal War was for Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and against ‘ªyisha.

As usuall, Mu‘iwiya resorted to deception and deniedthat he had murdered him.

“Those who testified against him were his murderer”, he added.[3]

The consequences of such a claim in sight of some like °asan Ba¥r¢[4] were their disbelief in the Umayya and then their discredit among people.

It was quoted from Mu‘iwiya as declaring, “Anyone whom I slayed I knew why I did it except about °udjr.”[5]

Ab¢ Zur‘a has narrated, “Whenever I met Mu‘iwiya, he recalled °udjr.”[6]

While in the agony of death, he had stated, **أي يوم من حجر وأصحاب حجر**[7] **“**Where are those days with °udjr and his followers.”

In his very last breath, °udjr had requested to be buried with the same shirt owing to the fact that he desired to stand before Mu‘iwiya with that state on the Day of Judgment. [8]

Historians have said, **أول ذل دخل الكوفة قتل الحجر وقتل الحسين ودعوة زياد**[9] **“**The first abjectness for K£fa was

---

[4]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VI, p.219; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.208; al-Aghin¢, vol.XVII, p.154

[1]. al-I¥iba, vol.I, p.315

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.208; al-Aghin¢, vol.XVII, p.154

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.208

[4]. Ibid..

[5]. Tahdh¢b Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.IV, p.84

[6]. al-Mustadrak, vol.III, p.469

[7]. A‘yin al-sh¢‘a, vol.XX, p.58

[8]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VI, p.220

[9]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XVII, p.13

the martyrdom of both °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢ and Imim °usayn plus Ziyid’s claim to be Ab£ Sufyin’s son.”

Gragually the relation between Imim °usayn and his Shi‘ite Muslims improved rapidly. Having paniced, in a letter, Mu‘iwiya warned Imim not to creat separation, sedition and corruption among the nation. As a riposte, Imim protested against martyring ‘Al¢’s Shi‘ite Muslims, the foremost of whom °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢, and deplored for he never took up arms against Mu‘iwiya. We will show the letter later concerning Imim °usayn’s stance against Mu‘iwiya.

One of the other followers of °udjr martyred at the same juncture was ‘Amr Ibn °amiq Khuzi‘¢ who was among Prophet and ‘Al¢’s disciples and later deemed as the pivot of the Shi‘ite Muslims in K£fa.[2] When Ziyid had ordered his guards to trace °udjr and his companions, ‘Amr Ibn °amiq along with Rufi‘a Ibn Shaddid escaped to Ctesiphon and then to M£¥il. The governor of the district sent a mission to arrest them who were aliens. Rufi‘a fled but ‘Amr was taken to M£¥il governor, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Uthmin Thaqaf¢. Recognizing ‘Amr, he wrote to Mu‘iwiya what the proper course was to pursue.

Mu‘iwiya wrote, “‘Amr himself had confessed he had given nine lashes to ‘Uthmin, thus whip him nine times.” And since ‘Amr was sick, with the very first lash he achieved martyrdom. Then he was beheaded and sent to Damascus. It was the first head carried from one town to the other.[3] Later it was repeated about the head of Imim °usayn and his disciples. That it has been written that he was found dead in a cave and they beheaded him[4] seems to be for acquitting Mu‘iwiya of the charge of Companions-cide Mu¦ammad Ibn °ab¢b has narrated that his head was showed around in Bizir.[5]

---

[2]. Tir¢kh Ibn Khald£n, vol.III, p.10

[3]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XVII, pp.143-144; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.197; al-Daradjit al-raf¢‘a, p.343; al-Mu¦abbar, p.292

[4]. al-Daradjit al-raf¢‘a, p.432

[5]. al-Munammaq, p.490

Conquests in Mu‘iwiya’s time

With the five-year civil wars in ‘Al¢’s term, conquests in east and west of the Islamic land ceased. Inasmuch as ‘Al¢’s policy was improving the internal status quo and deposing seditious figures, the process of conquests was ceased. Mu‘iwiya who required great might to combat ‘Al¢(a), had to compromise the Romans.[1] Accordingly, war was ceased there as well. After victory of the Umayya, conquests leading to economic benefits for the government were resumed.

The areas ruled by the East Roman Empire were frequently under attack that lasted for almost all years of Mu‘iwiya’s dominion. In 49 or 50 A.H., Mu‘iwiya deployed a massive army consisted of ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis and Ab£ Ayy£b An¥ir¢ together with another group of disciples and their descendants to that area. They could advance as near as the enclosures of Constantinople; Nevertheless, they could not conquer it. Ab£ Ayy£b An¥ir¢ passed away there.[2]

Another war site was Africa thereon Muslims advanced ceaselessly in the course of conquering Egypt from the time of caliphII on. S£din in Africa was conquered in this period. Observing the constant apostasy of the dwellers, the governor, ‘Uqba Ibn Nifi‘, established a town called Q¢rawin in order to guarantee the stability of the region through Muslim residents there.[3] This town did play a crucial role in maintaining Muslims’ conquests in that land.

Islamic East was also subject to conquering. For a while Said, ‘Uthmin’s son, was involved in conquering Bukhiri and the suburbs. He clashed with the Soghdids in Samarqand but later he compromised with them.

He had taken a number of hostages from the queen of Bukhiri to set them free after return from conquering Samarqand. In spite of his pledge he took them to Medina and exploited them. Afterwards Sa‘¢d was assassinated by them.[4] The war had been continuing during the following years.

---

[1]. al-Fi’iq f¢ Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.I, p.46; al-Muwaffaqiyyit, p.301

[2]. Fi l-tir¢kh al-kimil, vol.IV, p.461

[3]. Fi l-tir¢kh al-Kimil, vol.III, p.465

[4]. Fi l-tir¢kh al-Kimil, vol.IV, pp.193-197; Fut£¦ al-buldin, pp.401,402

India and Indus River were exposed to consecutive wars as well. These areas, between Kibul and Multin, were hit in 43 A.H. and onwards which preceded a great deal of loot.[1]

In farther areas like Ghawr, conquering had been also kept on. In 47, when the dwellers of the region violated their compromise, the attacks on them were recommenced.[2]

From this time on, no considerable contest can be found for Muslims and it is in view of the fact that the Romans had prepared themselves to battle more valiantly on the one hand and the remoteness of war sites particularly Islamic East inhibited the Muslims to adopt serious measures for conquering the land, on the other hand. The problems originated from such conquests as well as Arabs' tribal disputes in conquered lands such as Khurisin, gradually impeded more troops to be equipped for pursuing conquests.

The constant apostasy in conquered areas undermined the Muslim Arabs. Civil riots in the Islamic land such as Khiridjites movements, Shi'ites oppositions and so forth can be considered as another facter in debilitating the central authority.

THE KHªRIDJITES IN MU'ªWIYA'S TIME

Succeeding Imim's martyrdom, K£fa was composed of classes with various schools of thought, the mojority indifferent, those on Mu'iwiya's side, those regarded as Khiridjites or Imim 'Al¢'s Shi'ite Muslims. As many people had lost their close kins in "Nahrawin" War, they naturally could not remain faithful to 'Al¢'s descendants. However, due to their enmity towards Mu'iwiya, they got ready to join the army organizied by Imim °asan (a) against Mu'iwiya. After appearing indifference and inclinations on the part of the K£fiyin nobles towards Mu'iwiya specificly in the process of compromising, the Khiridjites decided to assassinate Imim, although their attempt failed.

At the same time, Mu'iwiya predominated all over the Islamic land especially Iraq. The Khiridjites considered both enmity towards 'Al¢ (a) and practical disgust for Mu'iwiya

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.III, p.446

[2]. Ibid, vol.III, p.456

and his agents as their principal responsibilities. On account of their disbelief in Taqiyya (precautionary dissimulation), a few[1] were assembled in a 40 or 70-people small group to clash with an army. Moreover, owing to their deep-rooted beliefs, even if deviated, they were never seeking after a means of escape. They, in light of their distinctive morale, in no way approved leniency.[2] If the Khiridjites hesitated over combating ‘Al¢ (a) formerly but later they even those who were not convinced to combat ‘Al¢ (a) in Nahrawin[3], had no doubts about battling against Mu‘iwiya.

‘Urwa Ibn ¯akhr had stated, “Due to my long and close affinity with ‘Al¢ (a) I did abstain from battling against him and now I shall definitely rise up against Mu‘iwiya.[4]

In the face of such remarkable deviation as the Umayya’s sovereignty, tyranny and oppression that the people of distinct classes sustained, the existence of the Khiridjites appeared evident. Since many of the oppressed regarded them as a group able to stand against the Umayya beside them, the continuity of their movement throughout this sovereignty was incontestable.

No sooner had Mu‘iwiya left Iraq than the Khiridjites revolted. Nearly five hundred of them who had already gone to Shahrz£r with Farwa Ibn Nawfal returned K£fa following the compromise. Mu‘iwiya himself had the people of K£fa combat them.[5] Subsequenly, small groups of the Khiridjites like Mu‘¢n al-Khiridj¢ and Ab£ Maryam from among the Mawil¢ of Ban£ al-°irith Ibn Ka‘b and Sahm Ibn Ghilib revolted against K£fa governor, Mughra, so were all massacred.[6]

The leniency of Mughra toward the Khiridjites culminated in their gathering from various regions in K£fa. Therefore, they could confer with one another.[7] Having fled

---

[1]. But one time some groups of the Khiridjites believed in Taqiyya. See also al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III. pp. 516, 518

[2]. They talked at availing themselves of "Taqiyya"; l-Kimil fi l-lughat wa l-adab, vol.II, p.201; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.181

[3]. Because they had no proof for combating ‘Al¢; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.210

[4]. al-Kimil fi l-adab, vol.III, p.276

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.126 (The events in 41)

[6]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, pp.412,417

[7]. Ibid, vol.III, pp.409,420

with four hundred of the Khiridjites to Riy, Mustawrid Ibn ‘Ullafa after ‘Al¢’s martyrdom returned K£fa and together with °ayyin Ibn ²abyin convened meetings with other the Khiridjites.

°ayyin Ibn ²abyin who was a leader for the Khiridjites in Riy proposed them, “Let’s return our homelands, towards our brothers in order to enjoin them good, forbid them from evil and summon them to battle against the parties. We have no excuse not to rise up while our governor generals are all tyrants, the tradition of guiding is abandoned and all those slaying our brothers are alive. We ought to avenge”.[1]

When gathering in K£fa, the Khiridjites negotiated about designating an emir. Three figures were nominated, Mustawrid Ibn ‘Ullafa, Mu‘idh Ibn Djuwayn and °ayyin Ibn ²abyin. The report of negotiation is presented by Ab£ Mikhnaf. The aforesaid report is consisted of their opinions concerned with the eligibility of an emir.

Mustawrid said, “Elect anyone you like. It does make no difference for me whom from among you be my governor-general.”

“I have no request for it. I shall be gratified with and swear allegiance to any one designated”, said °ayyin. Mu‘idh Ibn Djuwayn also declared, “When you two, Muslims’ Sayyid (chiefs) with renowned lineages, and as the high-qualified and pious ones say so, who shall then undertake Muslims’ responsibility? If all are equal in virtues, the most well-informed in wars, the most intelligent in religion and the most liable of whom ought to be designated for Muslims’ guardianship. Since both of you merit this position, thus one of you two should consent.”

In return they, two, suggested it to him.

“You are my senior”, he added.

The audience of the Khiridjites announced, “We approve you all three. Elect one from among yourselve.”

°ayyin Ibn ²abyin told Mustawrid, “I do agree with Mu‘idh. You are my senior too. Give your hand to swear allegiance to you”.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, pp.173-174

In this way Mustawrid was designated. The Khiridjites swore allegiance to him all.[2] Mughc¢ra who had perceived the probability of revolt arrested °ayyin Ibn ²abyin. Mustawrid and his followers rose in revolt, although Mughc¢ra had warned the chiefs of all tribes earlier to banish them from themselves and not allow them to influence on their tribes.

±abarc¢’s report and that of Mubarrid’s varies concerning the Khiridjites first clashes with Mu‘iwiya. Yet, all are unanimous that the Khiridjites with a few numbers battled against Damascus army but were immediately defeated.[2]

Mubarrid and Balidhurc¢ have recounted many adventures about the Khiridjites in Mu‘iwiya’s tenure that manifest the scope of their infiltration into diverse tribes.[3] At any war whether mini or massive, the Khiridjites had commanders.

After the Khiridjites’ suppression, ‘Alc¢ (a) recommended his followers, **لا تقـاتلوا الخـوارج مـن بعـدي**[4] **“**Under no circumstances should you enter into confilict with the Khiridjites after me.”

This instruction was given by Imim to Shi‘ite Muslims to bear their main enmity towards the Umayya in mind and not to waste their strength on combating the Khiridjites who were among the Umayya foes. Regretfully, this instruction was not heeded on the part of the Shi‘ite Muslims.

Addressing his tribe and reiterating that they were faithful to Shi‘ism and the leadership of the Prophet’s household, ¯a‘¥a‘a Ibn ¯£¦in, an eloquent chief of the Shi‘ite Muslims said, **لا قوم أعدى لله ولأهل بيت نبيّكم ولجماعـة المسـلمين من هذه المارقة الخاطئة الذين فارقوا امامنا واستحلوا دمائنـا وشهدوا علينا بـالكفر**[5] **“**Not a single group like this group shows enmity towards Allih, the Holy Prophet’s household and Muslims; the wrongdoing Miriqc¢n (the deviators) who seceded from our Imim, declared shedding our blood lawful and considered us infidel.”

---

[2]. Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol.V, p.175

[2]. Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol.V, pp.165-166; al-Kimil fi l-lughat wa l-adab, vol.II, pp.195-196

[3]. al-Kimil fi l-lughat wa l-adab, vol.II, pp.198-212; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, pp.163-186

[4]. Nahdj al-balighha, sermon 61

[5]. Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol.IV, p.142; al-Kimil fi l-tirc¢kh, vol.III, p. 427

This statement of Ibn ¯£¦in foreboded that the Shi‘ite Muslims’ hatred of the Khiridjites made them not only remain indifferent in the face of their revolt but conversely become set on suppressing them. And it was exactly beacause almost all Shi‘ite Muslims knew them as the fundamental cause for the failure of the Shi‘ites movement. ‘Ad¢ Ibn °itim, another Shi‘ites leader, had made the same remarks on aversion to the Khiridjites.[1] The command of war against the Khiridjites was undertaken by Ma‘qal Ibn Qays who was a commander in Imim ‘Al¢’s army.

As soon as being informed of the Shi‘ite Muslims’ inclination for a battle with the Khiridjites, Mugh¢ra as well as his advisors became pleased and it was emanated from this fact that, **وهم أشد استحلالاَ لدماء هـذه المارقـة وأجـرأ عليهم وغيرهم وقد قاتلوا قبل هذا بمرة**[2] **“...** since they had battled with them once before, they could have shed their blood more daringly and severely.”

Whatever its outcome might be even the Shi‘ite Muslims’ failure could be for the Umayya benefit because both rivals, the Umayya adversaries, had enfeebled each other.

Not merely had Imim ‘Al¢ (a) realized and warned about such perils[3], but Imim °asan (a) also had considered it wrong via his conduct practically. Subsequent to the compromise, when Imim (a) set out to Medina, a riot had been triggered by the Khiridjites. Mu‘iwiya urged Imim to prepare for a battle against the Khiridjites.

In his reaction he stated, **لو آثرت أن أقاتل أحداَ من أهل القبلة بدأت بقتالك “**If I were supposed to combat anyone, I would start from you first.”

By the same token, in the course of Mustawrid Ibn ‘Ullafa’s revolt, along with three thousand from **نقاوة الشيعة “**The most purified Shi‘ite Muslims.”

Ma‘qal Ibn Qays moved to him. While the Khiridjites were in the vicinity of Ba¥ra, the Umayya governor of Ba¥ra, ‘Abd

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.143; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p. 429

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 144

[3]. From the view point of fiqh (jurisprudence) Imim had stated, ان خرجوا على امام عادل او جماعة فقاتلوهم وان خرجوا على امام جائر فلا تقاتلوهمKill those who rise up against a just Imim and people, but never kill those rising up against an unjust ruler.

Wasi’il al-sh¢‘a, vol.XI, unit 26, Hadith 3

Allih Ibn ‘ªmir, did emulate Mughº¢ra and dispatched three thousand Shi‘ite Muslims led by Sharº¢k Ibn A‘war who was a renowned Shi‘ites of Ba¥ra towards them.[1]

Upon hearing the news of the strike by K£fa army, Mustawrid took “counsel” from people. Some suggested battling and some other “retreating”.

The decision, however, was to keep away from the army and refrain from confronting provided that they were faced unexpectedly which would result in a conflict.[2] The details of this conflict are delineated by ±abarº that Mustawrid was killed on the one hand and Ma‘qal Ibn Qays on the other hand. At this juncture, the Khiridjites, who under no circumslances were eradicated, dispersed.

It is worth reminding that the Khiridjites of this period of time had an extremely harsh treatment towards other Muslims. The only caliphates confirmed in their sight were those of Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar so that they had laid them both beside “Kitib” (Qur’in) and “Sunna” (Tradition). In his narration, one of the Khiridjites has referred to a letter from Mustawrid to the governor of Ctesiphon whereas naming him Amº¢r al-Mu’minº¢n”.[3] It denoted that he must have been regarded as a caliph by the Khiridjites.

It has been cited that the first one who propounded in earnest the subject of blasphemy on the part of the members of the tribe was Sahm Ibn Ghilib Hudjaymº¢ who revolted against ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘ªmir in Ba¥ra in 44 A.H.[4] This very issue could play a cardinal role in making the Khiridjites secede from the Islamic community. Ba¥ra was among the areas accommodating a multitude of the Khiridjites in those days. Rising up in this region, accompanied by some seventy people, Qarº¢b Azdº¢ and Za¦¦if ±iyº¢ were murdered in 50 A.H. following a clash. As recorded by Ibn Athº¢r, Ziyid who was too rigorous and unyielding towards the Khiridjites had prescribed his substitute in Ba¥ra, Samura Ibn Djundab, to treat them relentlessly. They clashed with a mass number of the Khiridjites and flourished to decimate them.[5] Their

---

[1]. al-Kimil fi l-tirº¢kh, vol.III, p.431

[2]. Ibid, vol.V, p. 193

[3]. Ibid, vol.V, p.191

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.172

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, p.463; Tirº¢kh al-§abarº¢, vol.IV, p. 177

considerable number in Ba¥ra did account for such severe actions.

Once more rioting in 58 A.H. a group of the Khiridjites were instantly suppressed near to K£fa. Ibn Ziyid's dealing towards the Khiridjites was also such a tough one that he at times incited them to slay one another. Concurrently a throng of them who were imprisoned by him became slaughtered after a while.[1]

At this stage like the succeeding ones the firm defiance of the Khiridjites against Umayya troops is utterly perceptible as once at the end of Mu'iwiya's caliphate, a forty-member group caused Ibn Ziyid's two-thousand-soldier army to flee and make the commander of which be humiliated for a lengthy time.[2]

MU'ªWIYA'S ENDEAVOR FOR HEREDITARY CALIPHATE

Earlier it was quoted from Mu¦ammad Rashd¢d Ri¤i that Ab£ Bakr's action in delegating a successor paved the ground of making caliphate hereditary.[3] As Marwin Ibn °akam too reasoned Ab£ Bakr's measure in designating 'Umar while recommending succession to the throne.[4] A hereditary authority bore two features one of which was designation of a successor by the former monarch and another was designation of a son or a member from monarch's lineage as a successor. The latter was submitted from Mu'iwiya's time on. Under the pretext of his kinship with 'Uthmin, he not only addressed his heritance in order to justify his caliphate but also he proposed the subject of making caliphate hereditary by appointing his son, endowed with no religious, political or military trait. Although this matter has always been unusual among Muslims, hereditary caliphate later became the most fundamental principle in a

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.III, pp.515,517

[2]. Ibid, vol.III, p.519

[3]. And¢shih siyis¢ dar Islim mu'i¥ir, p.150

[4]. Tir¢kh al-Khulafi', pp.196,203

caliph’s designation. Merely when the Umayya’s administration was converting into that of the ‘Abbisids and the ‘Abbisids’ administration into that of ‘Uthminids the theory of hereditary caliphate was declared null and void through transfer of caliphate from a lineage to another, yet replaced by violence and force. Except the cases aforesaid the hereditary succession was treated as a radical principle for appointing a new caliph. Deviation from the traditional system, at least nominally claimed to be established on “consultation” and nation’s vote, was intolerably disagreeable for believing Muslims. However, the status quo was in a way that all endorsed it and but a minority no one defied. The internal coherence of the Umayya reinforced by ‘Uthmin’s charity in addition to conveyance of farmlands impelled the Umayya to adopt a measure for safeguarding their power. If it were let to take its normal course, ‘Uthmin would beyond question designate Mu‘iwiya as his successor. And because it was delayed by his assassination, Mu‘iwiya did afterwards withstand obstinately. It stood to reason that when securing the power, he on no accounts would allow the monarchy to make an exit from his family. Except the Shi‘ite Muslims and the Khiridjites, throughout the Islamic world, in the face of the official caliphate not only no Sunnites laid claim to the caliphate but also he did never credit that through power and wealth one could become a caliph. Such regions as Spain, North Africa and Egypt experienced further caliphs later.

In Mu‘iwiya’s tenure, not simply did Damascus people never stood against approving of Yaz¢d’s succession but they also insisted on it because their entity before claimants emerging from Arabia Petrae or Iraq depended upon aiding the Umayya to remain in power. Persuading the people of Medina however who were, from among disciples’ descendants, seemed thorny. On one hand, Iraq was naturally opposed to Damascus and besides K£fa Shi‘ite Muslims, Iraqi the Khiridjites were thoroughly opposed to the Umayya on the other hand. Realizing the public opinions about governorship at that time shall appear convenient through a review of the reasoning on the part of Mu‘iwiya and his opponents in regard with a hereditary caliphate.

It was already discussed that Mu‘iwiya’s rule had lost its nature of caliphate and transformed into monarchism of

which nature necessitated the subsequent caliphate or designation to be hereditary. ‘Umar himself had by that time likened Mu‘iwiya’s rule in Damascus to those of Kasri and Caesar. When Mu‘iwiya secured the authority freelance, people named him “Heraclitus”.[1]

The matter of making caliphate hereditary as well as Mu‘iwiya’s endeavor regarding it are set forth in detail in “Al-Fut£¦” and “Al-Imima wa al-S¢yisa”. Others also have referred to it concisely. The ground for the notion of Yaz¢d’s succession to throne could be paved following Imim °asan Mudjtabi’s martyrdom.[2] Despite the fact that there existed no unanimity on who had for the first time suggested this notion, many a look was at Mughh¢ra Ibn Shu‘ba. In late 40s A.H. Peeling that he might be deposed by Mu‘iwiya due to his oldness and inability in running K£fa, he set out to Damascus to stimulate Yaz¢d to talk about his did so to his father and he succeeded after all. Mughh¢ra also on his part told Mu‘iwiya that he feared that the recent events, sedition and divergence, in the course of ‘Uthmin’s caliphate might reoccur once again.

“You had better designate a successor and it would be far better if he were Yaz¢d, your son”[3], he added.

Admitting his proposal, Mu‘iwiya delegated Mughh¢ra to gradually prepare the ground in K£fa. He dispatched a number to Damascus for this reason.[4]

Beyond any doubt such a notion had been in Mu‘iwiya’s mind for a long time, but Mughh¢ra’s was a sparkle for making it public. After Ziyid Ibn Ab¢h became the governor of K£fa, Mu‘iwiya propounded the issue of successorship. Totally negligent of Mu‘iwiya’s intention, he did his utmost

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.233; vol.V, p.101; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢khh, vol.III, p.506, such governorship was left as inheritance for Muslims’ future. This approach was exercised not only for the ‘Abbisids and Fi§imids in Egypt but also even from the ¯afawids on in Shi‘ites Iran.

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.209; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.175; what is narrated in al-Fut£¦ is that ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ had been the stimulater. By the some token since ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ had passed away in 43 A.H., it cannot be correct.

[3]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.187

[4]. Tir¢khh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.224; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.165; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢khh, vol.III, p. 503

by a trick to change Mu‘iwiya’s and even Yaz¢d’s mind in this respect.[1]

From 55 on the effort Mu‘iwiya made to stabilize Yaz¢d’s position multiplied. On a trip to Mecca and Medina, religious centers Mu‘iwiya exerted himself to engross the people through substantial open-handedness. It does surprisingly merit consideration that people seemed gratified, however. The poets such as ‘Uqayba al-Asad¢ and ‘Abd Allih Ibn Hammim al-Sal£l¢ who hated Yaz¢d composed some verses of poems for reproaching him although Mu‘iwiya could muzzle them with paying hush-up money.[2]

When he returned to Damascus to keep on his activities, he summoned groups of people from K£fa and Ba¥ra. Mu‘iwiya compelled ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays to address the congregation and advance the issue of successorship. Consequently, indicting Iraqi people for being hypocritical and schismatic, he denounced them.[3] In the same meeting, A¦naf Ibn Qays announced, “As long as °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ is alive, the people of Iraq and °idjiz will neverever swear allegiance.”

Accusing the Iraqi of Hypocrisy, Qays Ibn ®a¦¦ik said, “°asan and ones like him have nothing to do with divine king whom He has appointed; caliphate is not inherited collaterally from a daughter.”

A¦naf Ibn Qays, in his response, reminded Mu‘iwiya’s commitments promised to °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ and referred warningly to Iraqis’ loathing for Mu‘iwiya which might cause the swords to rise up from Iraq. After that, Mu‘iwiya kept silence about allegiance to Yaz¢d until 50 (Imim °asan was martyred in 49 A.H).[4] Mu‘iwiya appointed ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays and ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Uthmin, advocating Yaz¢d strongly in that very meeting, as the governors of K£fa and °idjiz respectively to pave the way.[5]

Mu‘iwiya was of this opinion that from the standpoint of religion the main problem lies in Medina. Were it feasible to

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp. 224,225

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, pp.225,226; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.508

[3]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.28; al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.231; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, pp.166-169

[4]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, pp.187-194

[5]. Ibid, vol.I, p.171; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.I, p.182

persuade Iraq by force, reasoning would definitely be required for Medina to get satisfied.

Already written to Mu‘iwiya by Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘ª¥ was, “... People follow these few individuals therefore as long as the latter have not sworn allegiance, the former would by no means do so.”[1]

Ibn Qutayba had also written that but few, all did hesitate to swear allegiance. Typically they were the Hishimites neither of whom did so.[2] Before he came, Mu‘iwiya had sent various letters mingled with either menace or allure to all those opposing allegiance.[3]

In a session convened on this occasion following Mu‘iwiya’s arrival in Medina, opposers voiced their diverse opinions.

‘Abd Allih Ibn Dja‘far addressed Mu‘iwiya as saying, “If you have recourse to Qur’in, Ul£ al-Ar¦im (relatives) enjoy priority over one another; if you practice the Prophet’s Sunna (tradition), they are the kins of Allih’s Apostle (s); and if you practice the Sunna of Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar, who would ever be more deserved than the Prophet’s household? By Almighty Allih, if Wiliyat (Islamic jurisprudential guardianship) were lain with them after the Prophet, ‘Amr (authority) would have been properly conveyed to the rightful. Caliphate does belong to Quraysh. O Mu‘iwiya, fear from Allih! Here are ‘Abd Allih Ibn Dja‘far, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis, °asan and °usayn, ‘Al¢’s sons, and it is me, Zubayr’s son.[4] You are well aware of our positions!” Warned ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr.

‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar stated that caliphate was not those of Heraclitus or Kasri to be inherited from fathers.

“If it had been the case, I should have as a result secured the authority after my father. This caliphate not only belongs to Quraysh but also to those whom Muslims comply with and are more pious furthermore,” he added.

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.182

[2]. Ibid, vol.I, p.177

[3]. Ibid, vol.I, p.178,179,180,181

[4]. Mentioning the name of Imim °asan does not seem incorrect because this narration referes to the year after his martyrdom.

Irrespective of securing allegiance for Yaz¢d, in his response, Mu‘iwiya uttered, “This belongs to ‘Abd Manif’s descendants since they are from among the Prophet’s kins. People themselves aided Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar to secure the power. Although they were brought up by no monarch or caliph, they had extremely admirable lifestyles and conduct. Monarchism was transferred to ‘Abd Manif after them and it will remain perpetually among them until the Day of Judgment. And you! O sons of Zubayr and ‘Umar! Allih has deprived you from this authority.” Afterwards he returned to Damascus.[1]

According to some sources, at the very same meeting, somewhere else in his intimidating speech, Mu‘iwiya had warned that if they did not swear allegiance, **لأفعلن كذا وكذا** **“**He would do so and so.”[2]

Mu‘iwiya told Imim °usayn (a), “I procrastinated this city’s allegiance owing to the fact that they are from among the kins of mine. If I could feel that there existed anyone else better than my son among Mu¦ammad’s Umma (nation), I would neverever let him be picked out.”

Imim (a) who had been agitated for his remarks, accused Yaz¢d of being debauchee and drinking wine.

Menacingly, Mu‘iwiya warned him as saying, “Be cautious lest someone from Damascus (accompanying Mu‘iwiya)[3] hear your voice.”[4] Later he threatened others concerning the people of Damascus.[5]

‘ªyisha was among the oppossers.

Regarding the lawfulness of Yaz¢d’s successorship Mu‘iwiya told her, “It is a Divine destiny about Yaz¢d. No one has the option. The nation has considered swearing allegiance to him as its duty and has sworn to him. Do you think they must breach their allegiance?”[6]

Another reasoning on the part of Mu‘iwiya vis-a-vis the opponents was the Imamate permit for an inferior over a

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, pp.194-196

[2]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.236

[3]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.183; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.508

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, pp.240,241

[5]. Ibid, vol.IV, pp.243,244; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, Vol.I, p.188

[6]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.205

superior. Addressing Imim °usayn (a) and a number of disciples and contrasting them with Yaz¢d and qualifying him to be well acquainted with Kitib and Sunna, he stated that in the war of Dhit al-Salisil, Allih's Apostle (s) had singled out 'Amr Ibn 'ª¥ as superior over Ab£ Bakr and 'Umar and appointed him as the commander. Accordingly, if the Prophet (a) were a good model, such an action i.e the superiority permit of an inferior over a superior would certainly appear reasonable then. By the same token, they should concur with Yaz¢d's caliphate.[1]

In return, Imim °usayn in his lengthy sermon alluded to the extorted right of his lineage after prophet's demise as well as Yaz¢d's black records and added, "O Mu'iwiya! How can you reason out by what is already abrogated."[2]

Dissenting 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar, Mu'iwiya replied, "You have declared yourself that you can never go to bed while swearing allegiance is on your responsibility. This issue is divine destiny about Yaz¢d and there is an option for noone. People have sworn allegiance to him."

'Abd Allih touching upon the predecessor's manners pointed out, "The caliphs preceding you had surely have offsprings. Although theirs must have been for better than your son, they at no time did what you do about yours."

'Abd al-Ra¦min, Ab£ Bakr's son, recommended this job be assigned to a council.[3] What else Mu'iwiya in his public speeche to dwellers of Medina vocalized was that Allih's Messenger (s) did designate no successor to himself; howevere, Ab£ Bakr did and neither did 'Umar behave like him. He assigned it to a six-member council. Inasmuch as neither Ab£ Bakr did like the Prophet nor 'Umar like Ab£ Bakr, I am, therefore, able to do what they had never done both, I do designate my successor.[4] Another question Ibn Zubayr posed was whether it was credible to swear

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.208; later on ¯ufyiniyya also in order to substantiate the legitimacy of Mu'iw¢ya's caliphate and although there existed some having previous record in Islam, had narrated that 'Umar had preferred Ab£ 'Ubayd Ibn Mas'£d to forty participants of Badr; Rasi'il al-Dji¦i¨, al-Rasi'il al-siyisiyya, pp.391-392

[2]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.209

[3]. Ibid, vol.I, p.210; Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, pp.213-214

[4]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.212

allegiance to him where as his father, Mu‘iwiya, was alive. He voiced to Mu‘iwiya that he would be ready to swear allegiance to his son provided that he abdicates himself. If he swore allegiance to his son while he himself is alive, whom should he abide by?[1] This problem was solved after a while though it was the starting-point of the process at that time. It is quoted from Ibn Zubayr that on the strength of the hadith, **“لا طاعة لمخلوق في معصية الخالق** No one is entitled to be obeyed while the creator was disobeyed” he contradicted the allegiance to Yaz¢d.[2]

In order Mu‘iwiya to allure a group of eminent opponents, he sent gifts, nevertheless, °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢ declined.[3]

Being unable to flourish in Medina, he left it for Mecca. He guessed new schemes now. Mu‘iwiya made those coming from various spots for pilgrimage come together and he proclaimed later that a few swore allegiance to him for Yaz ¢d privately. A number of people from Damascus with their swords sheathed out yelled out that have to do so openly, but Mu‘iwiya made them silent. Climbing down the pulpit, he distributed a many present among them and set out for Damascus. Although those individuals were present at the assembly, they dare not deny. However, later they revealed that it has been naught but a trick and they had never sworn.[4] Since Mu‘iwiya had not sent any present to the Hishimites, the ‘Abbissids intimidated him. That he would go around Damascus and stimulate people against him. Mu‘iwiya had to concede and send [5] but Imim °usayn (a) declined them all once again.[6]

A few years later, not merely he himself re-secured allegiance for Yaz¢d but he also wrote to the governor of Medina to do so from people. “People are all conforming to these few ones such as °usayn (a), ‘Abd Allih Ibn Ab¢ Bakr, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr as well as ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar and not a single one of them can be convinced to swear allegiance to

---

[1]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.214

[2]. Tir¢kh Ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.228

[3]. Ibid, vol.IV, p.240

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, pp.248,249

[5]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.191; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.III, p.511

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.245

me," wrote Sa'¢d Ibn 'ª¥, the governor, to Mu'ıwiya.[1] The dwellers of Damascus propounded the issue of inheritance and admitted it as a principle in caliphate. A poet had composed as follows,

فان تأتوا برملة أو بـــهند نبايعـها أميـرة مؤمنيـنا
أذا ما مات كسـرى قام كسرى نعـد ثـلاثـة متنـاسقينا

"Were Ramla or Hind introduced as the caliph, we would swear allegiance to her as Am¢ra al-Mu'min¢n (the Commanderess of the Believers) and if a Kasri passed away and another Kasri replaced him, they would be all three equal at our sight."[2]

And also 'Abd Allih Ibn Hammim al-Sal£l¢ had composed for Yaz¢d as,

تعزّوا يا بني حَرْب بِصَبْر فمن هذا الذي يرجو الخُلودا
تلقَّاها يزيدُ عن أبيــه فخذها يا معـاوِي عن يزيدا
أديروها بني حرب عَلَيْكم ولاترموا بها الغرض البعيدا[3]

"Soothe yourself with patience. Who does ever expect an eternal life in this world? Yaz¢d inherited the caliphate from his father and you O Mu'ıwiya Ibn Yaz¢d assume it from your own father, Yaz¢d. O °arb's sons, do maintain the caliphate amongst yourselves and never relinguish it."

What has been observed within the poems belonging to Umayya poets was that they have treated Umayya caliphs as the successors of Allih's Messenger (s).

إن الوليد وليُّ عهد محمّد كلَّ المكارم بالمكارم يَشْتَري[4]

"Wal¢d being in the position of Mu¦ammad's successor responds with good), had composed Farazdaq regarding Wal ¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik."

It has been ignored that this approach was perfectly unknown for the disciple's descendants and what 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar had asserted, "This caliphate is dissimilar to those

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.204

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.37; al-Bad' wa l-tir¢kh, vol.VI, p.8

[3]. al-umawiyy£n wa l-Khilifa, p.73; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, part 2, p.5; ±abaqit Fut£¦ al-shuwri, p.626; Nasab Quraysh, p.129

[4]. D¢win Farazdaq, vol.I, p.336

of Heraclitus and Khusraw that anyone who departs a son of his replaces him”.

‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Ab£ Bakr also stated, “We desire to hear not a word about Roman’s tradition according which any Heraclitus passed away, another Heraclitus substituted him.[1] Here, it has been endowed with the narrations from those following the Divine Books as well in order to forebode the indubitability of Mu‘iwiya’s and Yaz¢d’s caliphate though it does not stand to reason whether such narrations have solely been manipulated at that time or the Umayya’s adherents had fabricated them later. A typical narration of Ka‘b al-Akhbir in light of Mu‘iwiya’s caliphate has been subsequent to ‘Uthmin’s assassination.[2]

‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥ famed for dealing with the books written by followers of the divine Books had conducted a survey of books in Christians’ churches in Damascus before he informed Ibn Zubayr, “In conformity with my research on books, you will claim caliphate, yet you are not a caliph but Yaz¢d Ibn Mu‘iwiya is. Also quoted from him is, **“ملك الارض المقدسة معاوية وابنه** Mu‘iwiya and his son are the kings of the holy earth”[3]

In course of such a process, counterfeited hadiths can be traced, as an instance, “The Holy Prophet had prophesied Mu‘iwiya’s future caliphate.”[4]

All endeavors made on the part of Mu‘iwiya to stabilize Yaz¢d’s position fulfilled whilst large numbers of those at odds in Iraq and °idjiz still remained like fire under ashes.

It was mentioned that the dwellers of Damascus persisted on Yaz¢d’s successorship and it was in view of the fact that first, Umayya Islam was predominant and the Umayya was deemed as the manifestation of Islam and secondly their benefits in comparison with those of Iraq necessitated to advocate the Umayya. Ultimately, they pressured Mu‘iwiya, in his last days of life, into introducing his son. Making him wear the caliphate robe, Mu‘iwiya officially appointed him as his successor.[5]

---

[1]. Amil¢, Ab£ ‘Al¢ al-Qil¢, p.175; Tathb¢t Dali’il al-nubuwwa, p.575

[2]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.24-25

[3]. Tir¢kh khal¢fat Ibn khayyi§, p.218

[4]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, pp.16-17

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.255

In an account written to Yaz¢d, appointing him as the next caliph after him, Mu‘iwiya wrote, “Bear in mind, the Umayya along with the family of ‘Abd Shams must be granted priority over the Hishimites and so must the family of ‘Uthmin over the family of Ab¢ Turib as well as the descendants”[1] and in such a way the future policy for the Umayyads was specified by him.

While Mu‘iwiya was expressing his regret and sorrow for shedding the blood of °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢ and ‘Amr Ibn °amiq under his breath, he resigned his shameful life after nineteen years and three months of rule in Radjab, 60 AH.

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p.257

CHAPTER VII
KARBALª MOVEMENT

IMªM °USAYN BEFORE KARBALª'

Although far too many remarks have been constantly made in light of Imim °usayn's features as yet, purely for luck and good omen, Several of which shall be referred too.

This magnanimous Imim was born on Sha'bin 3,4 A.H. And having been intimately beside the Prophet, his forefather, he could never detach himself from him even at the prayer time. Allih's Messenger, who adored him and his brother exceedingly, could demonstrate a profile of their virtues through his statements to his disciples. In hadith books many virtues describing Imim °usayn (a) can be detected. Mostly like the hadith of, **الحسن والحسين سيدا شباب أهل الجنّة** "°asan and °usayn are both the masters of the youth of Paradise dwellers."

They are repeatedly narrated by successive generations and considered authentic. The Prophet's extreme affection for these two sons was entirely overt to all disciples. As hinted at concerning with Imim °asan, the Prophet has been doing his utmost so hard to make the nation conscious of his true attachment to them both that he stated, **من أحبني فليحب هذين**[1] "O Allih, adore the one who adores these two" **من أحب الحسن والحسين فقد أحبني، ومن أبغضهما فقد أبغضني**[2] "The one feeling affectionate for °asan and °usayn, feel so for me; nonetheless, the one making them wrathful, has made me too" **هما ريحاني من الدينا**[3] "These two are my fragrant flowers from universe."

---

[1]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.135

[2]. Ibid. p.136

[3]. Ibid. p.131

Among the virtues exclusively narrated about Imim °usayn the most well-known of all is, **حسين منّي وأنا من حسين**[4] **"**°usayn is from me and I am from °usayn."

It has been narrated by Ya¦yi Ibn Silim Maw¥il¢, Imim °usayn's governor, as saying, "As we were walking accompanying Imim, he stopped to knock on a door and ask for water. A bondswoman came out holding a bowl of water. Prior to drinking, he took out a piece of silver and offered it to her and then said, "Give it to your family". He drank afterwards.[2]

Ab£ Bakr Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn °azm has recounted that when Imim °usayn had been passing by the platform whereon a group of the underpriviliged was having food, he was requested to have a share in.

"Under no circumstances does Allih love the arrogant", stated Imim and dismounted to eat. Later, Imim told them, "You invited me and I replied in the affirmative. Now I invite you and I expect you to comply with". Addressing his wife, Rubib, he demanded her to provide what she had prepared.[3]

It is quoted from Imim Biqir (a) that for pilgrimage, Imim °usayn inclined towards moving on foot whereas his horses were all going behind him.[4]

Attending the wars of Djamal, ¯iff¢n and Nahrawin, Imim °usayn battled against those breaching their promise and exerting oppression with his father side by side. A sermon is narrated from him in ¯iff¢n whereby he persuaded people to struggle.[5] From the very nitrating stages of ¯iff¢n, Imim °usayn had had such a determining role in capturing the route of water from the soldiers of Damascus that after the victorious result Imim 'Al¢ asserted, **هـذا اول فتـح ببركـة الحسين (ع)**[6] "It was the ever-first conquest for the sake of °usayn's blessing."

---

[4]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.137; see Fari'id al-sim§ayn, a precious reference, for more information concerning these two Imims. Among the recently published books in "Fa¤i'il al-khamsa fi ¯i¦i¦ al-Sitta", Ahl Bayt's virtues are compiled from Sunnites' famous books.

[2].Ibid. Ibn Sa'd, p.146

[3]. Ibid. p.149

[4].Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.145

[5]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXII, p.405

[6]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXIV, p.266

After Imim was called and told by ‘Ubayd Ibn ‘Umar that his father had done such and such to Quraysh, Imim accused him of abiding by Qisi§¢n (the apostates) and added that these kinds of individuals have consented to Islam reluctantly but as a matter of fact they are in no way Muslims.[1]

The one who earnestly and thoroughly upholded Imim °asan’s policy during his tenure was Imim °usayn (a). In spite of frequent demand by Iraq for Imim’s travel to K£fa even after his brother’s Matyrdom, His Excellency did never incline and warned that it shall look irrational taking an action as long as Mu‘iwiya is alive. This utterance denoted that for a ten-year interlude Imim endured Mu‘iwiya compulsorily. This point can be regarded as of significance in Imim °usayn’s political standings although rarely is it taken into account. And the reason might be due to the fact that we notice Imim °usayn merely from the standpoint of his revolutionary action in Karbali.

Both the relations between Imim and Mu‘iwiya and the conversation that they have had under various conditions profoundly manifest Imim’s politically unyielding manner in acceding the legitimacy of Mu‘iwiya’s rule. One of the most credible evidence is Imim’s lengthy letter to Mu‘iwiya therein numerous facts about Mu‘iwiya’s atrocity against ‘Al ¢’s Shi‘ite Muslims has been revealed. “Never do I intend to oppose you nor combat you”, Imim wrote.

Then he added,

وأيم الله لقد تركت وأنا أخاف الله في تركه وما أظن الله راضياً مني بترك محاكمتك اليه ولا عاذري دون الاعتذار اليه فيك وفي اوليائك القاسطين الملحدين حزب الظالمين وأولياء الشياطين...أولست قاتل حجر بن عدي وأصحابه المصلين العابدين الذين ينكرون الظلم ويستعظمون البدع ولا يخافون لومة لائم، ظلماً وعدواناً بعد اعطائهم الأمان بالمواثيق والايمان المغلظة، أو لست قاتل عمرو بن الحمق الخزاعي، صاحب رسول الله الذي أبلته العبادة وصفرت لونه وانحلت جسمه،... أو لست المدعي زياد بن سمية المولود علي فراش عبيد عبد ثقيف وزعمت أنه ابن أبيك وقد قال رسول الله صلي الله عليه وآله وسلم, الولد للفراش وللعاهر الحجر، فتركت سنة رسول الله صلي الله عليه وآله وسلم وخالفت أمره متعمداً واتبعت هواك مكذباً بغير هدى من الله، ثم سلطه على العراقين فقطع أيدي المسلمين وسمل

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.III, p.35

أعينهم وصلبهم علي جذوع النخل، أولست صاحب الحضرميين الذي كتب اليك ابن سميه أنهم على دين علي، فكتبت اليه، اقتل من كان على دين علي ورأيه، فقتلتهم ومثل بهم بأمرك؛ ودين علي، دين محمد صلي الله عليه وآله وسلم الذي كان يضرب عليه أباك والذي انتحالك اياه اجلسك مجلسك هذا ولولا هموا[1] كان أفضل شرفك تجشم الرحلتين في طلب الخمور...فلا أعلم لنفسي ودبني أفضل من جهادك، فان أفعله فهو قربة الى ربي وان أتركه فذنب أستغفرالله منه في كثير من تقصيري... فابشر يا معاوية بالقصاص وأيقن بالحساب واعلم أنّ لله كتاب لايغادر صغيرة ولا كبيرة الا أحصاها وليس الله بناس لك أخذك بالظّنة وقتلك أوليائه علي الشبهة والتهمة للناس بالبيعة لابنك غلام سفه يشرب الشراب ويلعب بالكلاب ولا أعلمك الا قد خسرت نفسك وأوبقت دينك وأكلت أمانتك وغششت رعيتك وتبوأت مقعدك النار فبعداً لقوم الظالمين

“By Almighty Allih, I relinquished combating against you meanwhile I have fear of Him. I surmise not that Allih would be gratified with me unless I allow Him to adjudicate about you the atheist and ruthless party as well as the devils’ supporters. Were you not the one who slayed °udjr Ibn ‘Ad¢ and his followers brutally, those who struggled in a bid to abolish oppression and oppose the heresy while dreading no jeopardy? But then with recourse to swearing oaths, you gave them a quarter. Were you not the assassin of ‘Amr Ibn °amiq Khuzi‘¢, he who was among the Prophet’s disciples and whose too much worshpping had emanciated and enfeebled his physique and transformed his expression...? Were you not the one who claimed brotherhood with Ziyid Ibn Sumayya, a newborn whose begetter was ‘Ubayd ‘Abd Thaq¢f where as you declared that he was your father’s son? It was while the Holy Prophet had affirmed that the newborn belongs to the one who does beget it and it is requisite that the adulterer be stoned to death. Deliberately, you ignored the Prophet’s Sunna and disobeyed him and with no divine guidance you still sought after your carnal desire. Heedless of the fact that Ziyid cut out Muslims’ hands, blinded them and hung them from the palm trees, you gave him predominance in K£fa and Ba¥ra. Did you not slay those two from °a¤ram, attributed to °a¤r Mawt, those about whom Ziyid wrote to you that the, two, believed in ‘Al¢’s religion and you responded that anyone being of the same religion

[1]. It is refereed within this very text that it must be "هم".

and belief as ‘Al¢ ought to be slaughtered? As a result, he did slay and mutilate them at your behest. It’s the fact other than this that ‘Al¢’s religion is in every respect Mu¦ammad’s, the one against whom our father battled? And this religion was what thereby you won this position and if it were not of existence, your only virtue would be merely the tolerance of difficulties during the summer and winter trips seeking for intoxicating drink... I deem naught more momentous than Djihid against you for myself and my religion. I shall draw nearer to my Lord if I do accomplish it but I should ask Him for forgiveness for my neglect and error unless I did accomplish it ... O Mu‘iwiya! I give you glad tidings of retaliation for °udjr’s murder! Never doubt and be informed that there exists a book for Allih wherein any sin whether minor or major is accurately recorded. Yes, never ever will Allih fail to remember you for all those whom you have cynically arrested and skeptically slayed; for all those whom you compelled to swear allegiance to your insane, wine drinker and dog-fancying son. What I can say is that you let yourself sustain losses, rendered your religion futile, abused what has been left in your custody, deceived your peasant and consequently you fill you grave with fire to overflowing. May Allih keep the oppressors away from us!”[1]

Elsewhere, Balidhur¢ has brought the letter in brief having an additional sentence, **وما أعلم فتنة أعظم من ولايتك هذه الامة** “I know of no sedition being more dreadful than your rule over this nation.”[2]

Later, no sooner had Mu‘iwiya faced Imim °usayn than he inquired, “Have you heard what we did for °udjr, his followers and your father’s Shi‘ite Muslims?

“What?” asked Imim.

We murdered them, Mu‘iwiya replied, wrapped them in shroud, performed prayers for them and interred them.

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, pp.154-155, footnote; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.224; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.180-181; al-I¦tidjidj, vol.II, p.20; pp.48,49; al-Daradjit l-raf¢‘a, p.434; Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, vol.II, p.121; a part of the letter in al-Mu¦abbar, p.479. therein the names of the two from °a¤ram whose martyrdom was mentioned by Imim are referred to as Muslim Ibn Zaymur and ‘Abd Allih Ibn Nudji.

[2]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, Ibn ‘Asikir, p.198

Imim stated in return, “Neither would we wrap them in shroud, perform prayers for them, nor bury them, if we killed your followers.”[3]

By the same token, Mu‘iwiya resorted to any means to suppress the opponents. He even put the holiest figures to the test through alluring. In this way, once he had strivde to silence Ab£dhar in Damascus. Here, we demonstrate an amazing example about Mu‘iwiya’s policy toward Imim °usayn (a), the policy that Mu‘iwiya had adopted to relieve Imim’s wrath about the Umayya by sending presents.

Narrated by A¥ma‘¢ is that a gorgeous bondswoman was brought for Mu‘iwiya. When he questioned her price, he was told “100,000 dhms”. Mu‘iwiya purchased her. Taking a look at ‘Amr Ibn ‘ª¥, he asked who deserved that woman.

‘Amr and all those present said, “ Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n does”.

“No”, Mu‘iwiya contradicted, “She is solely appropriate for °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢.” “For his family dignity, he deserves her the most”, he added. “It can remove the indignation stemmed from the contention between his father and I.” He commanded that they dispatch her to Imim as a gift. Making her ready for a journey after forty days, they sent her along with a great deal of goods, clothes and so forth. In a letter, Mu‘iwiya wrote to Imim that Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n purchashed a bondswoman and although he loved her, he granted her to him generously. After the bondswoman was brought in, upon seeing her, Imim who was astonished at her charm, inquired what her name was.

“Hawi (passion)”, she responded.

Imim stated, “How becoming is the name to you! Can you read anything?”

Yes, I can, she replied, both Qur’in and poem.

Imim demanded that she recite Qur’in. She prefaced,

وَعِنْدَهُ مَفَاتِحُ الْغَيْبِ لَا يَعْلَمُهَا إِلَّا هُوَ...

“All means for discovering the hidden things are with Allih and no one else knows them but He…”

Being requested by Imim to read poems if she knew, the bondwoman asked “Am I immune enough?”

“Certainly”, Imim answered.

---

[3]. al-Daradjit al-raf¢‘a, p.429; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, pp.231-232

The woman read,

أنت نعم المتاع لو كنت تبقي غير أن لا بقاء للانسان

“What a precious property you would be if you survived, what a pity no one will survive.”

In regard with the content of the poem, Imim burst into tears and said, “Not only are you liberated, but also all sent goods are yours.”

“Have you composed anything concerning Mu‘iwiya?” he asked.

“Sure, I have,” She responded,

رأيت الفتي يمضي ويجمع جهده رجاء الغني والوارثون قعود

و ما للفتي الا نصيب من التقي اذا فارق الدنيا عليه يعود

“I saw a youth passing by and dreaming about riches while his heirs were waiting in an ambush. There is no one higher for a youth but piety, for when passing away it would give him a hand.”

Imim, ordering to offer her 1000 dhms as well, stated that his father had also composed regarding it,

و من يطلب الدنيا لحال تسـرّه فسوف لعمري عن قليل يلومها

اذا أدبرت كانت علي المرء فتنة وان اقبلت كانت قليلا دوامها

“Anyone, who seeks after this world to make him cheerful for a moment, by myself, he will regret presently; when he turns back on it, he faces problem and when he turns toward it, it will be transient.”

Afterwards, Imim wept and stood up to pray.[1]

Earlier when discussing the issue of making caliphate hereditary, we elucidated Imim’s stance against Mu‘iwiya’s measures. Imim was one of the most notable opponents at that juncture who spared no effort for expressing his opposition in this respect.

Throughout the years when Imim °usayn and his brother were in Medina, Marwin was the governor of the city whose abomination and abusiveness was proverbial and searched for an occasion to slander and insult Imim ‘Al¢ (a).

---

[1]. Tir¢kh Mad¢nat Dimashq, Taridjim al-nisi’, pp.469-470

Ab£ Ya¦yi has recounted, “I was present while Marwin and Imim °usayn were wrangling. Imim °asan (a) could cease his brother but Marwin kept on so courteously that he said “You, Ahl al-Bayt, are all cursed.” This utterance was the manifestation of Marwin’s innate and deep-rooted malice. Upon hearing, Imim °asan reacted that, **والله لقد لعن الله أباك علي لسان نبيه وأنت في صلبه “**Allih had cursed your father with the tongue of His Messenger where as you were still in his loins.”[1] Accordingly, in this way came Marwin’s vengeance towards the prophet (s).

Once Mu‘iwiya did his best to persuade the daughter of ‘Abd Allih Ibn Djа‘far Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib to marry his son, Yaz¢d. When ‘Abd Allih consulted Imim °usayn (a), Imim advised, **أتزوجه وسيوفهم تقطر من دمائنا؟ “**Do you intend to offer your daughter to the one down whose swords our blood drips?”

“Convince her to marry your nephew, Qisim Ibn Mu¦ammad”.[2]

In compliance with another narration, Mu‘iwiya’s intention for this action was creating reconciliation between the Umayya and the Hishimites in other words, making the Hishimites surrender to the Umayya.[3]

Imim °usayn’s Opposition to Yaz¢d’s Caliphate

As preplanned, Yaz¢d became the caliph subsequent to Mu‘iwiya’s death in Radjab, 60 A.H. No sooner had this news spread through Medina than Yaz¢d exerted himself to secure allegiance from all those opponents whose opposition might wage a revolt against him.[4] Writing a letter to Wal¢d Ibn ‘Utba Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin, governor of Medina, Yaz¢d urged him to secure allegiance from ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr and °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢ (a). Marwin also commanded that Wal¢d dispatch the soldiers to them at that very night and if they defied, they should decapitate them all on the spot in view of the

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, Ibn Sa‘d, pp.145-146.

[2]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, Ibn Sa‘d, p.149.

[3]. Ibid. p.150.

[4]. Akhbir al-§iwil,p.227.

fact that that night seemed an opportunity to suffice to revolt and summon people.[1]

Imim °usayn who was informed of Mu‘iwiya’s death through the message-bearer of the governor of Medina, proceeded to the palace accompanied by a number of followers armed to guard Imim against any probable menace. Being asked by Wal¢d to swear allegiance to Yaz¢d, Imim stated that such a figure like him ought not to swear privately but openly in a mosque. Wal¢d concurred, but Marwin made an attempt threateningly to provoke him into arresting Imim. Imim, furious with Marwin, addressed Wal¢d as saying, **أيها الامير! انا اهـل بيـت النبـوة ومعـدن الرسـالة ومختلف الملائكة ومحطّ الرحمة وبنا فتح الله وبنا ختـم ويزيـد رجل فاسق شارب خمر، قاتل النفس المحرمة معلن بالفسـق ومثلي لا يبايع مثله** “O emir! We, Holy Prophet’s household, are the mine of Prophetic mission, angels’ companions and the fountain of mercy. Allih has commenced with us and so will He terminate with us. By no means will I swear allegiance to Yaz¢d who is libertine, wine-drinker, murderer of the venerated and the one debauching in public.”

It was at the same session where Imim affirmed in reaction to Marwin’s insistence in securing allegiance, “The knell of Islam will be rung if Yaz¢d is supposed to secure the power, **وعلى الاسلام السلام.**

Vindicating through the verse of Ta§h¢r (purification), he commented on Ahl al-Bayt’s meritedness in obtaining the caliphate.[2] This vindication was what had been narrated by Imim ‘Al¢(a) and Imim °asan (a) as well.

At the same night, Ibn Zubayr departed from Medina and was pursued by the governmental guards next day. Next night Imim °usayn did so[3] in a trip along with all Ahl al-Bayt and the only one remained in Medina was Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya.[4] It is told that the date of departure was Sha‘bin 3, 60 A.H. concurrent with his birthday.

When Imim stepped into Mecca, the residents became quite delighted and even Ibn Zubayr who was a leader himself took part in Imim’s congregational prayers and

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.11.

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.17.

[3]. D¢nwar¢, p.228.

[4]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.16; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.15.

hadith sessions.[1] Since Mecca was assumed a religious base for Islam, it was naturally the center of attentions where Imim was in touch with various distinguished and ordinary individuals and interpreted the reasons of not swearing allegiance to Yaz¢d.

Looking forward to experiencing such a day for quite a long, the Shi‘ite Muslims of K£fa became elated by hearing Imim’s resistance against Yaz¢d and his arrival in Mecca. They had already condoled Imim °usayn on Imim °asan’s martyrdom in a letter and invited him; nevertheless, Imim had refused. In the held meeting, such Shi‘ites leaders as Sulaymin Ibn ¯urad, and the others made speeches and propounded Imim’s invitation to Iraq. Despite the agreement all announced, Sulaymin stressed all to undertake and not to violate; they renounced their commitment.[2] And then a joint letter was written by a few regarded as Shi‘ites leaders such as Sulaymin, Musayyib Ibn Nadjba, °ab¢b Ibn Ma¨ihir, Rufi‘a Ibn Shaddid as well as ‘Abd Allih Ibn Wil inviting Imim to come to K£fa.[3]

Their letter remained unanswered on Imim’s part. After a while, other letters were consecutively sent and above all Qays Ibn Musahhar ¯aydiw¢, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Wil and several others personally travelled to Mecca. On account of the additional letters received by Imim one after another the status quo modified in such a way that it was something beyond the bounds of possibility for Imim to pay no heed to the inviters.[4] When Hin¢ Ibn Hin¢ went to Mecca, he reported people’s presence in general and the distinguished’s readiness in particular and it managed to be a confirmation and emphasis on letter’s contents.

Dispatching Muslim to K£fa

The first action Imim took was dispatching Muslim to K£fa. Imim addressed him as saying, **وان رأيت الناس مجتمعين على بيعتي فالعجل لي بالخبر حتى أعمل علي**

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.37

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.260-261; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.46. This emphasis was because they were infamous for not supporting ‘Al¢ and his son, °asan.

[3]. The letter is fullyread in al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.20

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp.49,50

حسب ذلك[1] "Notify me swiftly to adopt a measure in case you perceived that the people are totally willing to swear allegiance to me."

Muslim, around 40, was singled out from among Ahl al-Bayt for this vital mission. As stated by historians, en route to Medina and then to Iraq from Mecca, Muslim lost his way and one of or both couriers conducting him breathed their last. He, in a letter, asked permission to return but Imim's response was to accomplish his mission.[2]

Muslim entered K£fa and resided in Mukhtir's house, being renowned among Shi'ite Muslims. He commenced to secure allegiance. Summoning to Divine Book, Prophet's Sunna, Djihid against the oppressors, defending the oppressed, aiding the needy, fair distribution of Bayt al-Mil (public treasury) among Muslims, backing prophet's household, compromising the one whom they compromise, battling the one against whom they battle, abiding by Ahl al-Bayt's word and action and not practicing the contrary, were all among the stipulated conditions of allegiance.[3]

In an interval of thirty five days after Muslim's arrival, Shawwil 5, 60, nearly 18.000 people swore allegiance to him. In addition to Shi'ite Muslims, ordinary people were among them too, as an example Mu¦ammad Ibn Bash¢r said, "I'd like Allih to assist my friends although I do never like to be killed, nor do I like to lie". The gap formed succeeding Mu'iwiya's death among the Umayya opponents in Iraq was filled by Muslim's arrival. All surrounded Muslim. While the might of government had mitigated, Muslim could openly visit people more easily than before.

The Umayya's spies who were discontented with the status of Nu'min Ibn Bash¢r, in a letter wrote to Yaz¢d that the more he required K£fa, the sooner he should adopt a measure.[4] Muslim also was engaged in recruiting forces and

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.V, p.53.

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.263-264. Some researchers deny such events. Mab'£th al-°usayn, p 90.

[3]. al-Shah¢d Muslim, p.104; these sentences are not in historical books but Muqarram by availing Himself of narrations related to allegiance of 'Aqaba and Yawm al-fat¦ has referred approximately to them.

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp.59,60.

preparing military weapons. About Ab£ Thumima Sa‘¢d¢ it is narrated, **يشتري لهم السلاح وكان به بصيرا** "As far as his full acquaintance with weapons was concerned, he was delegated to purchase them."[1]

Later on, Ibn Ziyid had accused Hin¢, "Your house has been a refuge for Muslim's followers and a cache for the weapons".[2]

Yaz¢d appointed Ibn Ziyid as the governor of K£fa while he was the governor in Ba¥ra as well. According to historians, in a will given to his servant to transfer to Yaz¢d later, Mu‘iwiya had appointed Ibn Ziyid to confront any probable riot in Iraq.[3]

Having executed °usayn Ibn 'Al¢'s message-carrier in Ba¥ra, Ibn Ziyid set out for K£fa to suppress the insurgents through harshness he had inherited from his father.

The most practical and efficient tool resorted by Ibn Ziyid for suppression of the Iraqi was nothing save threat. Since the inception, he summoned the distinguished of the city and ordered that they are duty-bound to introduce the aliens and those whose arrest is pleasant for Yaz¢d, Khiridjites and all those willing to create disunion and conflict and also register their names. And if one did not carry out his own responsibility, any mischief done by aforgoing persons would be upon his conscience and the ruler would on no accounts protect him. In that sense, shedding his blood and confiscating his possessions would be presumed lawful.[4]

The pressures from the side of Ibn Ziyid propelled Muslim to change his residence and act in secrecy. The new place was Hin¢ Ibn 'Urwa's house, one of the chiefs of the tribe of Madh¦idj and it seemed to be more secure. Ibn Ziyid was searching for him confusedly. Appointing a spy to claim amity with Ahl al-Bayt, he could locate his whereabouts. Ibn Ziyid apprehended Hin¢ first and urged him to hand over Muslim. At the same time, those belonging to the tribe of Madh¦idj rose up. But Shuray¦ Qi¤¢ treacherously assured

---

[1] Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 271

[2]. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 273; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.28.

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.265; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.21.

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.267; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, pp.24, 25.

them that Hin¢ was alive and Ibn Ziyid's guest; therefore, he could dispel them.[1]

Muslim took an action and demanded a few numbers that they summon their friends by chanting the slogan of "O the helper of nation" which was one of the slogans of the Prophet at the time of wars. While making a sermon in the mosque, Ibn Ziyid heard the voices. He who crawled into the palace, concealed himself behind all the locked portals. Muslim's army besieged the edifice but by reason of something indefinite the back portal remained unbesieged through which the distinguished of K£fa were regularly in touch with Ibn Ziyid. That door was known as "Bib al-R£m ¢yy¢n". The throng accompanying Muslim was such a countless number at first that it could terrify Ibn Ziyid and his people and confine them in the palace.[2]

Incited by Ibn Ziyid, the distinguished of K£fa began menacing. "Tomorrow, an army will arrive from Damascus and will do such and such," they warned people.[3] Another group made the members of their own tribes secede from among Muslim's followers, Going after their husbands and children, the women said preventively, **والناس يكفونك** [4] "Others are present."

"They will fill the gap of your absence."

After a couple of hours many dispersed,[5] **وصلي المغرب وما معه الا ثلاثون رجلاً** "Only did thirty people participate in his congregational evening prayer."

Afterwards they also dispelled!

Ibn Ziyid, daring not to exit from terror, commanded to check inside the mosque which was joined to the edifice from the roof to see whether someone was there or not. With throwing down a torch, they made sure that no one was there; therefore, they commenced searching for Muslim in

---

[1]. Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, p.242. Later on Shuray¦ had said, "As Ibn Ziyid had appointed an agent to watch me, I scared to give Han¢'s message to the members of the tribe that he was under duress."

[2]. al-Kmail fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.31

[3]. al-Irshid, p.210, Around 4000 people is reported.

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.277; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.87; al-Kimil fi l-tir ¢kh, vol.IV, p.31.

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.227.

the city. Ibn Ziyid had commanded to inspect all the houses in K£fa door to door and arrest Muslim.[1]

Ultimately he was traced and after a short clash he was taken to Ibn Ziyid. **يا شاق! خرجت علي امامك وشققت عصا المسلمين "**Have you come from your Imim's side," inquired Ibn Ziyid, to remove Muslims' union?

Muslim replied that he in no way recognized not only Mu'iwiya's caliphate but also beyond any question his son's as legitimate because he oppressively usurped the caliphate from Prophet's successor.[2]

"The inhabitants of this city are all of this belief that your father has shed the blood of their kins and misbehaved like Caesar and Kasri", he added, "we have come to establish justice and summon people to Allih's and the Prophet's decrees."[3]

In order to mar Muslim's reputation among people and to put his deception in practice, Ibn Ziyid said, "In Medina, you have been drinking!"

Sedately, Muslim asserted, "Someone like you for whom slaying innocent people is insignificant will be superior to me if I drink".[4]

Muslim whose whole perturbation was for the sake of Imim °usayn (a), called 'Umar Ibn Sa'd being from Quraysh and claiming to be Muslim's relative to make his will. What he recommended him was, first, to dispatch one to °usayn and hinder him from coming to K£fa; secondly, to wrap his corpse in a shroud and bury him and thirdly, by selling his sword and other belongings, to pay for his debts. Then Muslim was martyred.

Although beyond any doubt Muslim was a chaste and pious man, Imim °usayn's confidence in him, on one hand, and his debt in K£fa, on the other hand, proves the point. He did never ask someone for a loan[5] and all this time with 700 dhms he had already loaned could make ends meet. At the

---

[1]. al-Irshid, p.212.

[2]. Al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.98.

[3]. Ibid. vol.IV, p.35.

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp.98,99; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.283.

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.57; Maqtal al-°usayn, vol.I, p.197; Mab'£th al-°usayn, p.123.

threshold of his martyrdom he was determined to sell his belongings for clearing his debt.

Another point in his characteristic was that once the ground was prepared for Muslim to kill Ibn Ziyid but he did not. After Ibn Ziyid had gone to K£fa with Shar¢k Ibn A'war, a Shi'ites in Ba¥ra, Shar¢k became sick and had to rest in Hin¢ Ibn 'Urwa's house who was one of the Shi'ite Muslims as well. Ibn Ziyid was set to visit Shar¢k while Muslim was concealed there. Prior to his arrival, Shar¢k proposed Muslim to take this golden opportunity and attack Ibn Ziyid after a special cue, which was reading verses of poem. Never did Muslim do so however. Being reproved by Shar¢k after Ibn Ziyid left, Muslim stated that Hin¢ did not feel like Ibn Ziyid to be murdered in his house. Also, he referred to a hadith from the Prophet that, **الايمان قيد الفتك** "Such a murder is not confirmed in Islam at all."[1]

The firstly abovementioned point can not be that acceptable about Hin¢ unless presumably he might have been dreading that with arrival of the dwellers of Damascus later his life might be wholly lost. And about the second one, even though Muslim had reasoned through that hadith, now it merits consideration due to the fact that killing Ibn Ziyid who was a corrupt and criminal man at that moment could change the future of Iraq and Karbali effectively. The Holy Prophet(s) himself in Medina had delegated a group to go to Mecca and kill Ka'b Ibn Ashraf and Ab£ 'Afak were both killed in the same manner. Killing not Ibn Ziyid had a political motivation, some pointed out. And people would have gone from Damascus to K£fa, afterwards, for taking vengeance and plundering it.[2] It should not remain untold that they would go there whether Imim °usayn was victorious or not and it had no relevance to Ibn Ziyid's assassination. And later in the process of besieging his palace, why people left Muslim alone simply was never disclosed. Should this accident be blamed on the people of K£fa only or was it because the leader of the movement could not persuade the people to remain?

How Muslim's whereabouts was located is very interesting. In order to locate Muslim's hiding place, Ibn Ziyid had paid one of his servants. The servant who went to

---

[1]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.27.

[2]. Mab'£th al-°usayn, pp. 152, 153

the mosque was looking for him according to the criteria he had heard about the Shi‘ite Muslims. A person, performing prayers continuously, drew his attention. **ان هولاء الشيعة يكثرون الصلاة وأحسب هذا منهم "**Since the Shi‘ite Muslims pray innumerably I guess that man is a Shi‘ites"[1] he said to himself.

The man was Muslim Ibn ‘Awsadja. After several testings, he could not detect his dastardly plot and while deceived took him to Muslim. The utterance evidently manifests that Shi‘ite Muslims have been famed for asceticism and worship.

Imim’s Movement Towards Iraq

As Imim’s official representative had verified the readiness of K£fa, there was no longer enough time for a moment’s hesitation. With regard to the letters received as well as Muslim’s letter the scene was beyond question set for rising against the Umayya; therefore, Imim hastened in such a way that on 8th Dhi l-°adjdja and exactly in thick of °adjdj (pilgrimage) he changed "‘Umra Tamattu‘" (a kind of °adjdj) into "‘Umra Mufrada" (another kind of °adjdj) and then set out to Iraq. Wasting a moment could influence the status quo in Iraq. Furthermore, in view of the fact that Imim’s assassination was probable in Mecca, his stay looked by no means proper. Reportedly, Imim’s fellow-travelers were 80 people; nonetheless, they are to be more suggested by some other narrations. The number might denote only those accompanying Imim as far as Karbali.

En route, Imim’s first encounter was with a caravan moving from Yemen to Damascus. What it was transporting were presents for Yaz¢d’s court. Intercepting the caravan, Imim appealed to them for joining him if willing; otherwise, they ought to return.[2] Imim from Na‘¢m, the area where he encountered the caravan, proceeded to al-¯afi¦ and it was where he met Farazdaq, a young poet at that time. After Imim asked him about the conditions in K£fa, he responded, **قلوب الناس معك وسيوفهم عليك "**The people’s hearts are with you whereas their swords are drawn at you too."

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.249.

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.164; Akhbir al-§iwil,.245; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp. 289-290.

When he arrived at Ba§n al-Ramma in a letter while touching upon Muslim's letter informed the people of K£fa to prepare for his entry.[1] Qays Ibn Musahhar who had become responsible for taking the letter on his way to K£fa encountered °usayn Ibn Numayr's army and was arrested. Eating the letter on the spot, Qay was then martyred by Ibn Ziayd.

In another area, called Zad£d, Imim saw Zuhayr Ibn Qayn. As soon as he heard of Imim's invitation and with his wife's persuasion he became one of Imim's close followers though he was an 'Uthminid. He later asked his friends if they had enthusiasm for martyrdom they could join him; otherwise, they could take their way to Mecca.[2]

It was Dhit 'Irq where Imim °usayn (a) informed of both Hin¢'s and Muslim's martyrdom in a message given by a man from Ban£ Asad.[3] As quoted, Imim came to a decision to return but Muslim's brothers impeded. Never does it seem that Muslim's brothers either intended or were capable of compelling Imim to go on to K£fa if he were reluctant. Owing to the fact that in order to stimulate Imim to go, some had said, **والله ما أنت مثل مسلم بـن عقيـل ولـو قـدمت الكوفـة لكان الناس اليك أسرع "**You are not Muslim, upon stepping into K£fa all will unite behind you at speed."[4]

Imim was still decisive. The message Muslim had left to 'Umar Ibn Sa'd prior to his martyrdom and had pleaded to him for transferring it to Imim was received in Zabila.[5] No sooner had the time elapsed than the martyrdom news of Qays Ibn Musahhar[6] and 'Abd Allih Ibn Yaq§ur, Imim's foster-brother spread. What these reports could indicate was that everything has changed in K£fa and the present status was utterly distinct from that of the past reported by Muslim. At this very moment, Imim brought together all accompanying him and addressed them, **أيها الناس قد خذلتنا شيعتنا فمن**

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.245

[2] Akhbir al-§iwil, p.247

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 120

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.300

[5]. The message was that Imim °usayn should return to °idjiz as soon as possible.

[6]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p. 247, 248

أراد منكم الانصراف فلينصرف "O people, our Shi'ite Muslims left us alone. Anyone willing to return can return."[1]

A number of people who had joined Imim halfway went back and the only ones remained were Imim's special friends.[2] They were those who not only were with Imim from Mecca,[3] but also before that from Medina.[4] Nevertheless, those detaching from him were Arabs who had imagined that they would enter a town with Imim therein all were his followers.[5] When the reality was revealed, they returned without hesitation.

After this stage, Imim kept on moving again. Here, it had become fully explicit for Imim that going to K£fa was under no circumstaces rational according to political evaluations; however, there existed an issue that, beyond politics, should differently be taken into account. Imim proceeded to Sharit where he made an overnight stay. He was moving next day that Ibn Ziyid's army led by °urr Ibn Yaz¢d Riyi¦¢ appeared from the distance and blocked Imim's way.

The People of K£fa and Karbali Event

Here, it would seem convenient if we analyze the position taken by the people of K£fa towards the event of Karbali.

Among the historical sources as well as common people, the dwellers of K£fa have been introduced infamous and treacherous. What has been described concerning them was that being faithful to promises was invisible amongst them. While enumerating a few features of the people of K£fa, we referred to their rashness and it could invariably be to the detriment of them and their rulers at the time of decision-making. To be easily resented and easily persuaded, from one hand, and simply surrendering and disobeying, from the other hand, were all a profile of their split personalities.[6] Here, let's consider their standing.

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.169

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.248

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.169

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp. 300, 301

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.300

[6]. See, Acquaintance with the people of K£fa at the beginning of discussion about Imim °asan's Caliphate.

The population in K£fa included those from various tribes each of which enjoyed different arrangements during the different rulers' terms. The expediency the rulers regarded accounted for the variety in the classifications of tribes. Yet, the rulers mostly made allowances for the chiefs or the distinguished of the tribes bearing the fact in mind that in some situations their might was far more than that of governors'.

Merely a part of the population was formed by Shi'ite Muslims. Although a number of tribes were famous for Shi'ism, hardly ever could they be deemed to be first class Shi'ites tribes. They who were dispersed among the tribes had no unity. Since in addition to tribal morale they had a certain kind of K£fiyin morale; as a result, no discrepancy was conspicuous between them and others.

The count of Shi'ite Muslims was not considerable at all then. Reportedly, when in the mosque, °udjr Ibn 'Ad¢ dissented Ziyid's remarks only a half or a third was concordant. With reference to Shi'istic morale of the town and assuring that the beliefs of a number of people were based on a kind of political Shi'ism according to which they only assented to join 'Al¢'s descendants relatively in political issues, the Shi'ites process of the town consisted of at least a fourth of the total population.

No one doubts that K£fa had invited Imim °usayn but did not assist him and later conducted his murder. Notwithstanding, it ought to be perceived who they have been, who had written the letters and how many from K£fa participated in the battle against Imim. It is also worth mentioning that, later on, K£fa turned into a hub for 'Al¢'s Shi'ite Muslims and even reacted against Ban£ 'Abbis who usurped the sovereignty of 'Al¢'s descendants. Aside from the historians and hadith-narrators affiliated to the Umayya who loathed the people of K£fa, those of Ban£ 'Abbis had the same feeling. The oppressedness of the Shi'ite Muslims was not only political but also cultural. With the cultural sovereignty of Ban£ 'Abbis such a thing appeared thoroughly natural. Accordingly, much attention should be paid to the fact that the trend of narrating the events is observed through a pair of spectacles the color of which is as dark as disgusting K£fa for the sake of its Shi'ism.

Taking the aforesaid point into consideration, it should also be noted that such historians are all doing their utmost to prove that Shi‘ite Muslims are unfaithful to the promises; in other words, Shi‘ism foes are determined to attribute the advocating not of K£fa to Shi‘ite Muslims. On the contrary, the elaboration below will somewhat indicate that, at that time, only a minority of people remained Shi‘ites and they were in a position that they could not defend Imim °usayn (a) although they would if they sacrificed devotedly. This utterance is what we present proofs for, in brief.

Visualizing the status quo of K£fa, it could be as to say that Yaz¢d was a man who seemed, although tolerable for Damascus, he was extremely intolerable for Iraq. As soon as he secured the power, Shi‘ite Muslims in K£fa began protesting. Since many in K£fa found no appropriate substitute for Yaz¢d and while affected by the public atmosphere, they elected °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢ (a). Besides, Iraq was normally unwilling to concede the domination of Damascus. When the invitation was made on the part of Shi‘ite Muslims, not simply did the common people, having special morale, expressed their advocacy, but also those who either assumed their positions in peril or were influenced by others, announced their support behind °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢ (a).[1] It resulted in an artificial but public atmosphere of support for him. The Umayya was also incapable of filling the political gap created subsequent to Mu‘iwiya’s demise for a while. This atmosphere was continuously expanding and particularly, as a result of Nu‘min Ibn Bash¢r’s governorship, who was no strict at all, prevailed as long as Ibn Ziayd entered K£fa.

By taking a glance at a hadith by Imim °usayn, a further likelihood about the invitation on the part of the distinguished may be regarded that they intentionally added fuel to the flames to take Imim to Iraq and martyr him. The hadith was as follows, **وما كانت كتب الي الا مكيدة لي وتقرباً الى ابن معاوية** “They wrote nothing but for trickery and keeping closer to Ibn Mu‘iwiya.”[2]

---

[1]. Men such as ‘Amr Ibn °adjdjidj and Shabath Ibn Rib‘¢ who were commanders of Ibn Ziyid’s army in Karbali were among those writing letters to Imim °usayn. See al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp. 50-51.

[2] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p. 185; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 169.

Anyhow, the atmosphere was prepared so positively that upon realizing it, Muslim felt that Imim should set out to K£fa as soon as possible.

K£fa Under the Pressure of Ibn Ziyid

Scarcely ever can a person be at variance or rebel while the ruling system is of domineering and audacious dictatorship. When Nu'min Ibn Bash¢r, compassionate somehow, was the governor of K£fa, people dared reveal their Shi'ism without constraint and when Muslim entered the town, they warmly welcomed him with the Ibn Ziyid's substitution for Ibn Bash¢r, the tide turned against all at once. Ibn Ziyid's great savagery had terrorized many a person. Those who were oversensitive and made decision impetuously no only were they menaced by Ibn Ziyid, but also they were terrified by the present propaganda about pending arrival of an army from Damascus.

No sooner had few days passed than the withdrawal on the part of Muslim's supporters expedited. The nobles of the town who were now certain about the dominion in K£fa and had no doubt about the Umayyads's stability, stood up for them overtly. They have kept all silence as yet. Many others also looked not it expedient to be at odds with the chiefs of their tribes. These nobles were the ones who minimized Muslim's allies through alluring and threatening when Muslim attacked Ibn Ziyid's palace and they intended to manifest their power in controlling the people.[1]

The status in K£fa had taken such a new shape that before Ibn Ziyid's despotism even if a chief had defied, the members of the tribe would have never dared to be on his side. As recounted by historians, when Hin¢ Ibn 'Urwa, chief of Ban£ Murid, was arrested "four thousand cavalrymen and eight thousand infantrymen" were his supporters. If the allies of Ban£ Murid joined them from Kinda, the total would be thirty thousand people. Despite the fact when he was dragged along in Bizir with his hands tied and while he was imploring one to help, no single helper appeared.[2] After a

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 277, Ibn A'tham, writing the letter was a trick against me and for becoming nearer to Yaz¢d.

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.59

short time, he was martyred whereas no one dissented at all.

During Imim °usayn's sojourning in Karbali, in his remarks Ibn Ziyid ordered the people to left K£fa for Karbali. He threateningly warned that, **فأيّما رجل وجدناه بعد يومنا هذا متخلّفا عن العسكر برئت منه الذمّة** [1] "From today on whoever disobeys the army, he shall no longer be protected by us."

It denoted that his punishment would be murder. In order to search in the town for anyone not complying with the army, Ibn Ziyid delegated Qa'qi' Ibn Suwayd. Qa'qi' while inspecting traced a man from the tribe of Hamdin who had come there to secure his father's inheritance. After he had been taken to Ibn Ziyid, he issued the verdict of his assassination. Later, **فلم يبق محتلم بكوفه إلا خرج الى العسكر بالنخيلة** [2] "Not a matured one could be seen in K£fa unless he had joined the army, Nukhayla."

It was now when all swords were pulled against Imim °usayn (a). Assuredly, if people were free in their actions, by no means would they do so, since a great number were in the same condition.[3] And now what Farazdaq had composed can be perceived concerning K£fa, **قلوبهم معك وسيوفهم عليك**[4] "Their hearts are with you while their swords are drawn against you" or **أنت أحب الناس إلي الناس والقضاء في السماء والسيوف مع بني أمية**[5] "You are the dearest of all, amongst people, but divine decree is in the sky and swords are beside the Umayya."

For delineating the sense of this utterance, we can reason to Mudjamma' Ibn 'Abd Allih al-'ª'idh¢ quotation, that joined

---

[1].Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.178; Akhbir al-§iwil, pp. 245, 255

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.179

[3]. It was noticed, in Iraqi war against Iran, how it compelled Iraqi people to combat Iranian Muslims. By the same token, such people are culprit and we do never intend to acquit the people of K£fa this way, But there is a vast difference between the one who goes freely and the one going under duress. However, many chiefs and nobles and those affiliated with the Umayya whom later Zaynab and Umm Kuth£m blamed went to Karbali willingly.

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.290; al-Fut£¦ vol.V, pp.120,124; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.245; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.165

[5]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn of Ibn Sa'd, p.171; Tardjamat al-°usayn, Ibn 'Asikir, p.206

Imim from K£fa as saying “The nobles are all in opposition to you and though the hearts of the rest are with you, tomorrow they will pull the swords against you”.[1] Under those existing circumstances, people could not help going to Karbali owing to the fact that their stay coincided with their slay. The Shi‘ite Muslims or those being reluctant to do so had two alternatives, one, to ally themselves with Imim, two, to flee from K£fa and Karbali.

It can be well detected from varying reports that the group of people, who were coercively sent to Karbali for a battle against Imim °usayn, either fled halfway, or did not appear in Karbali at all. The total number of soldiers recruited for Ibn Ziyid’s army and announced in Karbali was the census, which was taken while dispatching them to Karbali; nonetheless, a throng of them had fled halfway. There must have been some ten thousand people or less in Karbali whereas compared with the population of K£fa it was considerably few. It is said that K£fa mosque had been accommodating forty thousand people.[2] What this fact does disclose is that many had either concealed themselves in K£fa or fled halfway.

Balidhur¢ has written, **وكان الرجل يُبعث في ألف فلا يصل إلاّ في ثلاثماة أو أربعمأة وأقل من ذلك كراهة منهم لهذا الوجه**[3] **“**A commander was sent with a thousand troops but when entering Karbali the troops were reduced to as few as three hundred, four hundred or even less. And it stood for the disgust people bore for moving there.”

“When a commander along with a great many was sent to Karbali by Ibn Ziyid”, wrote D¢nwar¢, **يصلون إلي كربلاء ولم يبق منهم إلا القليل كانوا يكرهون قتال الحسين فيرتدعون فيتخلّفون**[4] **“**A great few arrived in Karbali and it was due to the aversion they had to battle against °usayn, hence they preferred to return and secede from the army.”

In addition to fleeing, a number’s endeavor was to join Imim °usayn for his support. When Imim entered Karbali, it could be eight days before his martyrdom. No one could ever dream about occurrence of a war and Imim’s martyrdom. It

---

[1]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.48

[2]. Tashayyu‘ dar mas¢r tir¢kh, p.160

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.179

[4]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.254

was ‘ªsh£ri morning when °urr Ibn Yaz¢d perceived how serious the situation was and allied himself with Imim. Many people might have had the same idea as °urr. He told Imim, **بابي أنت وأمي! ما ظننت الأمر فينتهي بهؤلاء القوم إلـى مـا أرى وظننت أنهم سيقبلون منك إحدى الخصال الـتي عرضـتها عليهم فقلتُ في نفسي لا أبـالي أن أطيـع القـوم فـي بعـض أمورهم** [1] “May my parents be sacrificed for you! I could never imagine that people’s conditions might be culminated in such a phase I observe. I presumed that they might consent to one of the several alternatives you proposed. I said to myself that I would not mind if I abide by them in a few affairs, but now…”

It was merely °urr who joined Imim together with a few numbers. Although some might have it in mind, they could not make their decision. Even if Shi‘ite Muslims intended to defend, they did not hasten and only did special ones draw decisively a conclusion and could join Imim at the very beginning. Among those who joined Imim were Nafi‘ Ibn Hilil Murid¢, ‘Umar Ibn Khilid ¯aydiw¢, Sa‘d, one of ‘Umar Ibn Khilid’s governors and Mudjamma‘ Ibn ‘Abd Allih al-‘ª’idh¢ from the tribe of Madh¦idj.[2] By the day of ‘ªsh£ri, Muslim Ibn ‘Awsadja and °ab¢b Ibn Ma¨ihir could reach there. As written by Ibn Sa‘d, in ‘ªsh£ri morning, some twenty men joined Imim.[3] Ibn Qutayba has reported the number as many as thirty.[4] Further names are referred to by historians.[5]

Noticing such escaping and joining, Ibn Ziyid had to prevent them; consequently, he took an action. Ibn Sa‘d who was one of the first narrators has written, **وجعل الرجـل والرجلان والثلاثة يتسللون إلى حسين من الكوفـة** “When Ibn Ziyid was notified that people were joining °usayn individually or in two people or three-people groups.”

Commanding to prepare the barracks, he appointed ‘Amr Ibn °urayth to drive the people into Nukhayla. His order was also keeping watch on the bridge not to allow one to flee.[6] °usayn Ibn Numayr was duty-bound to patrol the area

---

[1]. Tadjirib al-umam, vol.II, p.70

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.172

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn of Ibn Sa‘d, p.178

[4]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p.7

[5]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.73

[6]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn of Ibn Sa‘d, pp.178-179

between Qidisiyya and Qu§qu§ina to identify anyone proceeding to °idjiz inasmuch as under this pretext they might join Imim.[1] Ibn Ziyid wrote to his governor in Ba¥ra to send a signal man to control the routes and if anyone traversed, he should arrest him.[2] It is absolutely obvious that whom they meant were those who might come to aid Imim. Similarly, Ibn Ziyid had commanded that the routes between Wiqi¥a and Damascus up to the route of Ba¥ra be tightly restricted, **"ولا يدعون أحد يلج ولا يخرج** and not to allow anyone to move and exit through it."[3]

Once °ab¢b Ibn Ma¨ihir prompted the tribe of Ban£ Asad, being in the vicininty, to help but 'Ubayd Allih's army alienated seventy of them from Imim's army and did not permit them to join Imim.[4] At this juncture, many were in prison. Among the prisoners was Mukhtir Ibn Ab¢ 'Ubayda who was apprehended and whipped by Ibn Ziyid. Whipping caused Mukhtir's one eye be blinded for ever.[5] This tight control could play an influential role in hindering the people of K£fa to support Imim.

Alluring was also applied by Ibn Ziyid in addition to threatening. Prior to people's departure, Ibn Ziyid told them, "in order to persuade you to prepare for battling against his foe, Yaz¢d has sent four thousand D¢nirs and two hundred thousand dhms to give you".[6]

People's reliance on financial generosity provoked a group of them to stand against Imim in Karbali. When Imim conceived that people were in true intent on assassinating him, he affirmed, **"يا هؤلاء! إسمعوا يرحمكم الله، مالنا ولكم، ما هذا بكم يا أهل الكوفة؟ قالوا خفنا العطاء** Lo! What has occurred between you and us? O people of K£fa! What has happened to you? They responded, "We fear the generosity." Imim added, **ما عند الله من العطاء خير لكم**[7] "Whatsoever is from Allih is the best for you."

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.243

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.263; Imim had already asked some of the Shi'ites distinguished in Ba¥ra for help in a letter, vol.IV, p.23.

[3] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, pp.173,179; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.295

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.180; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp.159,160

[5]. al-Mu¦abbar, p.303

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.157

[7]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn of Ibn Sa'd, p.178

But no one heeded what Imim said.

The evidence so far is wholly to confirm this fact that a group of people including the distinguished and their adherents were all criminals who merited the abusiveness and harshness on the part of those reproaching them. Yet, concerning the specific despotism that predominated, there existed a large number who intended to join Imim but were not able to.

What Balidhur¢ has written appears appealing that Sa‘d Ibn ‘Ubayda was quoted as saying, “Standing on the hills, many a clergyman in K£fa were praying, **أللهم أنزل عليه نصرك** “O Allih reveals your aid to °usayn.”

Sa‘d added that he told them, **يا أعداء اللـه ألا تنــزلون فتنصرونه** “O Allih’s foes! Why don’t you climb down to aid him?”[1]

Anyway, there is no doubt that Imim was martyred by the people of K£fa while there was only one from Damascus among them.[2] Notwithstanding, the people of K£fa should not be deemed as a single group.

Assessing the Travel to Iraq

Now, we ought to consider whether Imim’s travel to Iraq was expedient or not in that situation. Regardless of the aspect of indivisibility of Karbali event, here we are to assess Imim °usayn’s travel to Iraq politically in a few words. The first question raised is whether there was any other measure to be adopted for Imim other than travelling to Iraq and whether it could be anticipated that conducting such a revolution against Yaz¢d was feasible.

A deep glance at the existing historical sources will indicate the frequent objections voiced denoting that by no means had a travel to Iraq been expedient. The objections were from the very beginning. When people of K£fa, subsequent to Imim °asan’s martyrdom, invited Imim °usayn to that town, Imim replied that he would never consent to any revolution as long as Mu‘iwiya was alive.[3] His justification might have been Iraq’s inability to resist

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.226

[2]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.28; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.61. (Even this one is not mentioned either).

Mu‘iwiya’s tricks because they have already been tested in ‘Al¢’s and °asan’s terms. Following Imim’s opposition to the issue of allegiance and when Imim set out for Mecca, a travel to Iraq was probable. Quotedly, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu§¢‘ forewarned Imim against his travel to K£fa on the way from Medina to Mecca.[1]

When Imim entered Mecca, the objectors were innumerable. ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis suggested Imim to waive proceeding to Iraq and go to Yemen’s mountains for preference due to various reasons as it is a mountainous area and more secure therein and that his fathers Shi‘ite Muslims are abundant.[2] It was quoted by Ibn A‘tham from Ibn °anafiyya.[3]

“People are partial to D¢nir and Dirham which are both in the ruler’s hands. Lest you might go to Iraq”, said ‘Amr Ibn ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Hishim.[4] The objection raised by ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar was on account of his extreme fear of bloodshedding.[5] Touching upon his martyrdom in Iraq, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Dja‘far had written, **إني أخاف أن يطفيء نور الارض روح الهدى وأمير المؤمنين، فلا تعجل الى العراق فاني آخذ لك الامان من يزيد”** I have a foreboding that the light of the earth will be extinguished as a result of your murder. The spirit of guidance and Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n is no one but you. Hasten not toward Iraq, I can seek quarter for you from Yaz ¢d.”[6]

---

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, Ibn ‘Asikir, p.197; Akhbir al-§iwil pp.222-224

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp.36,37; Akhbir al-§iwil, pp.228,246; al-Kimil fi l-tir ¢kh, vol.IV, p.19. on p.41 Imim’s meeting with Ibn Mu§¢‘ eroute from Mecca to K£fa is referred.

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.224; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.113; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.287; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.161; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.39

[3]. Ibn A‘tham, vol.V, p.32

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.161; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.110; Tir¢kh al-§abar ¢, vol.IV, p.287

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.163; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.39; Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn of Ibn Sa‘d, p.166

[6] Ibn A‘tham, vol.V, p.116; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.291; Ibn Ath¢r, vol.IV, p.40

Ab£ Sa‘¢d Khudr¢ is also quoted as saying, **لا تخرج على امامك**[7] **“**Never revolt against your Imim.”

Miswar Ibn Makhrama who was among the protesters as well wrote to Imim, “Be not deluded by Iraqi people”.[2] What Ab£ Wiqid Layth¢ had stated was like that of above.[3] Moving from Iraq to °idjiz, Farazdaq opposed the travel.[4]

All of these objections plus some more are recorded in historical sources and many spiteful narrators might have been endeavoring to multiply them to substantiate that Imim had been truly deceived and traveled to Iraq with not a least rational reason. Prior to reflecting Imim’s justification of why going to Iraq was requisite, it is worth presenting an introduction.

Political history shows that it rarely happened when a revolutionary man rose up politically he, in all probability, could foresee a definite triumph or an achievement of the goal with no peril. Those who struggle to assume a power either benevolently or malevolently always deal with a probability. In politics, even the most tiumphant and popular ones are invariably subjected to various probabilities of hardness and defeat. In no way should it be assumed that a movement be conducted with a high certainty. Such a notion is not only inconsistent with the historical realities, but also it is emanated from the simple-mindedness regarding the nature of political activities.

And now we ought not to presuppose that Imim should have inevitably had a high certainty to win in the travel. On the one hand, those who deemed Imim’s travel inexpedient never must they notice the proof which demonstrate the probable defeat; as an instance, the people of K£fa had already been tested once. On the other hand, those who deemed it expedient neither should they suppose that there had been no probability of defeat. Taking them all into consideration, Imim °usayn’s position should be gauged in that situation first and then the travel to Iraq be evaluated considering both historical evidence and Imim’s remarks.[5]

---

[7]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn of Ibn Sa‘d, p. 167

[2]. Ibid. p. 167

[3]. Ibid. p.166

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.165

Imim by no means assented to Yaz¢d and his sovereignty no matter if it might have preceded his martyrdom. Nevertheless, he was seeking for an opportunity to rise up against Yaz¢d and secure the sovereignty. From the framework being made in Imim's mind one probability should have been preferably singled out and he should have naturally reacted to any suggestion or objection voiced. Since the plan was not flexible at all, any suggestion that could spoil it in any way was condemned on the part of Imim.

In such a situation, there existed particular specifications for the Islamic world politically. Imim had to adopt measures in such a way that he could under those circumstances achieve his goal successfully in a bid to defend the religion and establish a just government. In diverse levels were Imim's objectives. Procuring the rule could have been treated as a considerable victory for him having been thought of it. As the one enjoying the good and prohibiting the evil, he could have accomplished his mission even though his goal had become unattainable. Given that if he were not able to reach such an achievement he had no doubt that with his blood streamed he was able to irrigate the lofty tree of Islam and enlighten the nation as to the tough environment they live in.

The reality was that Yaz¢d never allowed anyone like Imim °usayn who abstained from swearing allegiance to him to live at ease. Owing to the fact that Imim was not a man who lives calmly, Yaz¢d's only resort was to take his life in case he was not convinced to swear. Moreover, Damascus, Medina and Mecca in particular and °idjiz in general were not the ones which could resist Yaz¢d having such an intention. Imim must have turned his attention to elsewhere. Although proceeding to Mecca seemed rational for the time being thanks to its sacred nature wherein his safeti was warranted for a short while, it could certainly not be a permanent refuge for him. Above all, Mecca was not on Imim's side and even in the course of allegiance to Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n, it swore with hesitation. At this juncture, the only place as a focal point of attention could be Iraq that was a

---

[5]. As mentioned earlier, this matter is beyond the scholastic aspect of Imamate.

center for Imim's Shi'ites Muslims. In different respects, it was a foe to Damascus as well. The demand made by K£fa for Imim's travel reinforced the probability of victory. The more the invitation was stressed, the more the percentage of the probable victory was augmented.

Never does it mean that there was no jeopardy in Iraq. However, the question posed is that if Imim was set to settle in somewhere, where could he select? Was Imim °usayn ever a man to swear allegiance? Or was Yaz¢d a man who permits him to survive without allegiance? If Imim had not gone to Iraq, would not the historians have written that if he had gone, he would have gained a victory? Would not they have inquired why he had not given a positive answer to the letters? How could he allow Yaz¢d's agents to martyr him in °idjiz whereas he could take an action? These questions together with some more are the ones that would be raised by any wise individual were a travel to K£fa not taken place.

What merits consideration is that the consequence of objector's demands for Imim's not going was approving Yaz ¢d's sovereignty even if temporarily and never ever could it be practical for Imim. Accordingly, since seeking quarter from Yaz¢d that had been recommended by 'Abd Allih Ibn Djafar was on the condition that Imim swears allegiance to him it was on no accounts tolerable for Imim. Now let's take a glance at Imim's own response and how history has reflected it.

Among the points Imim (a) had been regularly hinting at was that Yaz¢d with his agents would in no way allow him to remain alive in Mecca and definitely they would murder him. In an answer to Ibn 'Abbis's objection, Imim stated, **ان أقتل خارجاً منها بشبرين أحب الي من أقتل خارجاً منه بشبر**" I would rather be killed two inches farther from Mecca than one inch farther."[1]

It highlights not only the reverence of Mecca had to be observed but also Imim's life was at risk and he should have taken an action. In reacting to Ibn 'Umar, Imim had asserted, **انّ القوم لايتركوني ... فلا يزالون حتي أبايع واني كاره**

[1] Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.164; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.289; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.113; Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, the first Ibn 'Asikir, p.190; al-Ma'rifat wa l-tir¢kh, vol.I, p.541; Madjma' al-Zawi'id, vol.I, p.192; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.55; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.38

فيقتلونني[1] **"**This group will never stop insisting on swearing allegiance on my part. As I will never do so, they will kill me."

The situation wherein Imim was, is well-described in above utterance. Elsewhere Imim had made it clear, **ولو كنت في جُحر هامة من هوام الأرض اسـتخرجوني ويقتلـونني**[2] **"**Even though I hide in the hole of a desert animal, they will trace and murder me."

When Imim was questioned why he hastened, he answered, **لو لم أعجل لاخذت**[3] "I will be arrested, unless I hasten."

Somewhere else he stated, **إنّ بنـى أميّـة أخـذوا مـالي فصبرت، وشتموا عرضي فصبرت وطلبوا دمـي فهـربت**[4] **"**The Umayya confiscated my properties. I had to tolerate, marred my reputation but I tolerated, when they decided to shed my blood, I had to flee."

All these narrations confirm that they were determined to take Imim's life and there was no hope of survival left provided that he contented to swear allegiance. The other side of the coin was traveling to Iraq. What spot should have been chosen by Imim?

In an interval between Sha'bin and Dhi l-°adjdja when Imim lived in Mecca, he received many letters from Iraq. These letters were the ones which later turned into Imim's main reason for a travel to Iraq. Any time any objection to going was raised, Imim referred to the letters.[5] When Imim faced °urr and when he was asked by 'Umar Ibn Sa'd why he came to Iraq, he reasoned those very letters.

Once Budjayr Ibn Shaddid asked Imim for the reason of going, he replied, **هذه كتب وجوه أهل المصر**[6] "These letters are all from the distinguished of this city."

---

[1]. loc.cit.

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.116; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.38

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.290

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.124

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, pp.163-165

[6]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.173

‘ªsh£ri morning, he again referred to the letters.[1] He showed the letters to ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar too.[2] His response to any objection was, **خلفي مملوءة بالكتب**[3] **“**The sack on my horse is overflown with their letters.”

This wide-ranging invitation was seemingly serious particularly because in addition to the mass ordinary people, the distinguished of K£fa had written the greater number of letters, those whom people follow. This crowd included many other distinguished figures as well as the Shi‘ite Muslims. Were it only formed by the Shi‘ite Muslims, it would take little notice in light of the fact that the number of them was truly inconsiderable. It was solely its broadness that gave a serious shape to invitation.

Beyond the invitation were the results of two tests K£fa had taken in the times of Imim ‘Al¢ and Imim °asan, in both of which they had failed. Which one should have been attended by Imim, their black record or their present state? Regarding our previous remarks, if we assume that the probability of Imim’s victory was less than fifty percent, there was no other altentive for him? It does appear that in normally political conditions there was no other way the probability of victory of which to be as equal as that in K£fa, neither was there in Yemen if proceeding there. It was thanks to the fact that not only the Shi‘ite Muslims in Yemen were never as many as those in K£fa, but it was within the realm of Mu‘iwiya as well. Even when Imim ‘Al¢’s governor was there, an army invaded Yemen from Damascus and massacred the Shi‘ite Muslims.

The fundamental reason of probable victory was the letters showing that not only a great number would guard him but also they would battle against his foe. Furthermore, nowhereelse did invite him. Those who wrote letters first were such Shi‘ite Muslims as Sulaymin Ibn ¯urad, Musayyib Ibn Nadjba, °ab¢b Ibn Ma¨ihir, Rufi‘a Ibn Shaddid and others. With a short opportunity available to Imim, he selected a way reasonably. At this stage, he let the letters unanswered inasmuch as Mecca was flooded with frequent letters. Besides, the representatives of the writers went to

---

[1]. Ibid. p.181

[2]. Ibn ‘Asikir,Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p. 192

[3]. Ibid. pp. 209, 210

Mecca and offered their invitations personally. Any letter received in Mecca had many a name and signature at the bottom. According to a few narrations, the number of the letters had been one hundred and fifty. Notwithstanding, Imim gave no answer to them up to the end[1] but he only contented himself with dispatching Muslim.

To assess public support better, Imim dispatched an envoy, Muslim Ibn ‘Aq¢l who was trustworthy to K£fa. In a letter he wrote to K£fa, **اني بعثت أخي وابن عمي وثقتي من أهل بيتي مسلم بن عقيل وقد أمرته أن يكتب الي بحالكم ورأيكم فقدموا مع ابن عمّي وبايعوه وانصروه**[2] **“**I have sent my brother, my cousin and the most truthful in my family, Muslim Ibn ‘Aq¢l to you. I have demanded that he write about the conditions there to me. Help him and, swear allegiance to him.”

After Muslim had entered the town, people swore allegiance to him group by group. Recording their names, he had them make a pledge to back Imim and not be treacherous. The recorded number was twenty thousand and more.[3] Muslim who found the situation well wrote to Imim °usayn, **فاني أخبرك أنه قد بايعك من الكوفة نيف وعشرون ألفا فاذا بلغك كتابي هذا فالعجل**[4] **“**As soon as you have received my letter, hurry for more than twenty thousand people who swore allegiance to you.”

When Imim departed, he had received a letter informing that eighteen thousands in K£fa have sworn allegiance to Muslim.[5]

What was Imim able to do upon receiving such a letter? In advance of dispatching Muslim, by no means was he certain. But now it was the letter his envoy had written and could be the evidence of people’s to him. At the last stage reacting to

---

[1]. See, al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp. 46, 49, 50, 51; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.262

[2]. See, al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.52; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.262

[3]. See, al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.68, see also Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 259; Ibn ‘Asikir, Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, 207; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p54, (The number recorded was 12000); see also, al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p.5 (The recorded number was 30000)

[4]. Ibn Sa‘d, Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.174; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.281; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.77

[5]. Ibid. p. 174

Ibn ‘Abbis’s objection, Imim said, I know that your intention is naught except advising but, **ولكن مسلم بن عقيل كتب الي باجتماع أهـل المصـر علـى بيعـتي ونصـرتي وقـد أجمعـت على المسير اليه**[1] **“**Since Muslim has written to me that all have congregated to aid me and swear allegiance to me, I am decisive to travel.”

In another narration, Muslim had written to Imim, **والناس كلهم معك ليس لهم في آل معاوية رأي ولا هـوى**[2] **“**Everyone is with you and no one is attentive to Mu‘iwiya’s family.”

It was exactly what Muslim had witnessed and reported. Although he had assuredly noticed public ignorance towards Mu‘iwiya and their inclination to ‘Al¢’s family, with Ibn Ziyid’s arrival and black shade of his despotism the tables were turned. Threatening K£fa was a serious affair for the Umayya. In a letter to Yaz¢d, spies wrote, **قد بايع مسلم الترابية**[3] **“**Turibiyya- a label given to Shi‘ite Muslims after naming ‘Al¢ as Ab£ Turib- have all sworn allegiance to Muslim and entreated him to come to their rescue in K£fa.”

Dispatching ‘Ubayd Allih accounted for it. It had become totally overt that they would be deprived of K£fa unless they make haste. Notably, when according to a narration Nu‘min Ibn Bash¢r, in addition to his indifference, had stated, **لابن بنت رسول الله أحب الينا من ابن بجدل**[4] “Allih’s Messenger’s descendant is more popular with us than Ibn Badjdal’s[5] son.”

As quoted by Ibn A‘tham, in the course of Muslim’s coming to K£fa, Nu‘min was on his own in the palace. No one attended Friday prayers andP no one paid tax to him. Anyone whom he summoned did never care and anyone whom he commanded did not comply with.

Imim Versus Iraqi Army

The ever-first army Imim encountered was a one-thousand- soldier army the head of which was °urr Ibn Yaz¢d Riyi¦¢; Then, °urr was a subordinate commander at Ibn Ziyid’s service and did not interfere in political affairs. By the

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, pp. 54, 55

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.281

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.281

[4]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p.5.

[5]. Ibn Badjdal refers to Yaz¢d.

same token on account the belief he enjoyed he along with his army performed his prayer led by Imim °usayn. °urr's accountability was to escort Imim to K£fa and never allow him to return.

In a sermon delivered Imim addressed the worshippers as saying, "I had in no way intended to come here until your letters and message-carriers came to me. I will step into your town if you guarantee that no breach of promise will be made; otherwise, I return to where I came from".[1]

As already mentioned, as soon as Imim received Muslim's Letter, he left Mecca with all possible haste for K£fa. Moving ahead was kept on until the news of Muslim's martyrdom spread. No sooner had the caravan learned it[2] than it slackened its pace and consequently exchange of views began among Imim, his household and the followers. It is alleged that Imim changed his mind about going onwards. Nonetheless, Muslim's brothers were not convinced but decisive to retaliate.[3] If presumably they had had such an intention, they must have been definitely hopeful about the victory. And it might have influenced Imim to become apparently persuaded to proceed. It is hardly rational to assume that they sought revenge for their brother's murder while being certain of their defeat. There existed another matter apart from political victory and it was the fact that Imim °usayn should have taken a stance on Mu'iwiya after all even though it cost his martyrdom and to his eye this kind of martyrdom was equated with condemning Yaz¢d. To confirm the probability of victory, many might have made some remarks.

Quotedly a number said, "You and Muslim Ibn 'Aq¢l are not alike. Upon seeing you, the people of K£fa will warmly welcome you".[4]

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, see also Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.170; Al Fut£¦, vol.V, p.135

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.247 it is narrated that two people belonging to Ban£ Asad who were coming from K£fa informed them. That the one giving the news of Muslim's martyrdom was either Farazdaq or °urr is not true. See Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.61; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.125.

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.168; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.292;Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.176; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p.6

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.300; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.42

They meant that perhaps Muslim could not accomplish to prompt people for whatever reason but his personality will unequivocally captivate them. In view of all letters and ten-year requests on the part of K£fa, never did it seem unlikely. Accordingly Imim consented to keep on.

In consistent with a narration in al-Fut£¦, the letter sent by Imim through Qays Ibn Musahhar for urging K£fa to observe their commitment[1] had been possibly after being informed of Muslim's martyrdom though doubt about K£fa had been remarkably prevailed in Imim's army its impact on returning was uncovered only when it encountered °urr's army. The coming of °urr together with his army, hearing that enemy's four-thousand- soldier army being enroute to Qidisiyya as well as the previous news from K£fa given by Ibn Sa'd's envoy about Muslim's recommendation all propelled Imim to disregard going to K£fa. Being arrested and noticing how people left him alone, Muslim tried to dissuade him from coming at all costs with a message as he had already tried to persuade him. He had appealed to 'Umar Ibn Sa'd for leaving his message to Imim.

A while after receiving the message in early Mu¦arram, Imim's caravan encountered °urr's army in Iraq. Although Imim was set to return, °urr impeded him, for his duty was to escort Imim to K£fa. Imim who had become aware of the real status in K£fa, rejected his request. In order to refrain from any clash for which he had no mandate, he decided to lead the army towards Karbali, an arid land, in lieu of °idjiz or K£fa.[2] Heedless of what was adopted practically, Imim propounded the matter of returning when meeting °urr and demanded him to allow them to return.[3] Once more he repeated the same proposal to Ibn Sa'd later,[4] and frequently he stated, **يا أيها الناس إذا كرهتموني فدعوني أنصرف عنكم إلى مأمني الأرض** "O people! If you are reluctant to support me, at least let me return to the secure land, Mecca."[5]

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.304

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.170; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.139; al-Kimil fi l-tir ¢kh, vol.IV, pp.47, 48

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.170; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.135; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.250

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.311; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.155

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.323

As narrated by a number of historians, Imim's suggestions were three, Returning to °idjiz, Damascus or to oriental land of Islam, on the outskirts of the Islamic land. The tradition just mentioned in addition to others all manifest that Imim requested to only return to °idjiz, either Mecca or Medina, not to Damascus. Balidhur¢ has stipulated that his insistence was only on returning to Medina when seeing 'Umar Ibn Sa'd.[1] It has been also quoted from 'Uqba Ibn Sam'in supportedly as saying, "Contrary to popular belief under no circumstances did Imim ask permission to visit Yaz¢d and swear allegiance to him though I was beside him at all times. What he urged was, **دعوني أرجع إلي مكان الذي أقبلت منه، أو دعوني أذهب في هذه الأرض العريضة حتى تنظر الى ما يصير اليه أمر الناس**[2] **"** Let me either return where I came from or live in this extensive land to find out what the destiny of such people would be."

According to Balidhur¢ Imim appealed to °urr for permitting him to go to Damascus and swear allegiance to Yaz¢d. [3] It is as plain as day that Imim endured such sufferings as the homelessness for the sake of not swearing allegiance to Yaz¢d, and were this narration genuine supposedly, it could never be interpreted as corroborating Yaz¢d's caliphate, but in all probability as keeping away from Ibn Ziyid's realm who was a libertine and bold man. Imim was certain that his not swearing allegiance would prompt Yaz¢d to assassinate him; therefore, it seemed irrational to go to Damascus intentionally.

Yaz¢d personally had written to Wal¢d, **وليكن جوابك إليّ رأس الحسين**[4] "Your response to me has to be °usayn Ibn 'Al ¢'s head."

Wal¢d detested to murder him in person and later on he expressed regret on Imim's martyrdom.[5] It is by no means admissible that even if Imim had made such a remark, his aim could have been swearing allegiance or proceeding to Damascus at all.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.II, p.182

[2]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.54

[3]. Ibid. p.173; in footnote, this tradition is declared untrue by Editor.

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.26

[5]. Ibn Sa'd,Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.192

When Imim for the purpose of enlightening °urr refereed to the pile of letters from K£fa as the motivation of his travel, °urr was totally unaware of the letters. After the letters were all displayed, he again pointed out that he was duty-bound to take them to K£fa. Imim who was never ever convinced to go to K£fa took the route of °idjiz.[1] °urr's army blocked his way then. They compromised to take a midway neither to °idjiz nor to K£fa but to the area of al-'Udhayb.[2]

It was this point where ±irimmi¦ Ibn 'Ad¢ proposed Imim to go towards ±ayy mountains but on account of the presence of °urr's army and the agreement they had reached, Imim refused it[3].On his way Imim made an attempt to switch to way to the desert and keep as far away from K£fa as possible. °urr was regularly the one who prevented him until they arrived at Ban£ Muqitil's palace and then Naynawi.[4] Exactly it was here where the command of ceasing was received by °urr from Ibn Ziyid, **و لا تحلّه إلا بالعراء على غير خضر ولا ماء**[5] **"**Keep him awaiting solely in an arid desert."

Here a number of the Shi'ite Muslims of K£fa could join Imim and despite °urr's opposition remained beside him.[6]

While °urr was with Imim, Zubayr Ibn Qayn suggested Imim to attack them who were few then. Declining Imim affirmed, **إني اكره أن أبدئهم بالقتال**[7] **"**I loathe to be the one who wages war."

Arriving in Karbali coincided with the second of Mu¦arram, Wednesday or Thursday. According to D¢nwar¢, Mu¦arram 1st was the day of arriving in Karbali.[8]

---

[1]. Ibid. p.250

[2]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.250; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp.130, 141; vol.II, p.170

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.307; Balidhur¢, vol.II, p.173 the tribe of Ban£ ±ayy was the tribe of °itam ±iy¢ whose son, Adi, was from among the Prophet's and later 'Al¢'s companions and now his son, ±irimmi¦, made such a suggestion for his Sh¢'ism.

[4]. Akhbir al-§iwil, pp.250, 251

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.176;Akhbir al-§iwil, p.251

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.172

[7]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.252

[8]. Ibid. p.253

As written by Mas‘£d¢, when Imim arrived in Karbali, five hundred cavalrymen and one hundred infantrymen were accompanying him.[1] During the eight-day period and above all on the eve of ‘ªsh£ri, the day after which war would undoubtedly break out, these men turned their back on Imim. Although the number of whom at that night might have been fewer than that reported by Mas‘£d¢, beyond any question a number left Imim an his own at this interval.

The day after Imim’s arrival in Karbali, Ibn Ziyid’s troops were gradually deployed to this land. All tribes were group by group dispatched to the spot due to the fact that Ibn Ziyid insisted that each one of K£fa participate in the process. Such a policy was to hinder a few tribes to be accused later and to try to make all have a hand in Imim’s murder and it could be a hindrance to the people of K£fa to engage in any movement in ‘Alawites’ favor. Those having been dispatched were some twenty two thousand according to Ibn A‘tham[2] although Balidhur¢,[3] D¢nwar¢[4] as well as Ibn Sa‘d have described that some had fled halfway.

In view of the fact that Ibn Ziyid had announced, **أيّما رجل وجدناه بعد يومنا هذا متخلفاً عن العسكر برئت منه الذّمة**[5] **“**Anyone who abstains from joining the army, from today onwards, will in no way be protected by me.”

And this menace was what made the crowd set out to Karbali.

‘Umar Ibn Sa‘d Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥ was due to proceed to Riy and do battle with Daylamin, a polytheist; however, it was resolved to move to Riy after finalizing the plan in Karbali. As the commander of K£fiyin troops in spite of his and Ban£ Zuhra’s[6] reluctance, he eventually opted the governorship of Riy in return for streaming Imim’s blood and then went to Karbali.[7]

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.61

[2]. °urr with one thousand, °u¥ayn Ibn Numayr with tour thousand, Shabath Ibn Rib‘¢ with one thousand, Shimr Ibn Dhi l-Djawshan with four thousand, ….; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.159

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.179

[4]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.254

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.178

[6]. Sharaf al-imim al-°usayn, p.178

At first Ibn Sa‘d sent an envoy to Imim to ask for the ground of his coming. Imim who refereed to the letters received from K£fa stated that if they had retracted, he would return where he had come from. Seeking refuge, ‘Umar Ibn Sa‘d reported the suggestion to Ibn Ziyid, “°usayn has made a pledge to either return or go to one of the extremities of Islamic land and live a quiet life and it is satisfactory for you and is for the good of the nation, [1] **هذا لك رضا وللأمة صلاح** “Nevertheless, Shimr tried to dissuade Ibn Ziyid willing to accept the suggestion and told him that if he let °usayn go, under no conditions could he be found any more.”

Ibn Ziyid in a letter to Ibn Sa‘d wrote, “I have not sent you to condescend but to secure allegiance for Yaz¢d presently. If he refrained, take his life”.[2]

As soon as receiving the message, Imim stressed, **لا أُجيب ابن زياد، لا ذلك ابداً، فهل هـو إلا المـوت فمرحبـاً به** [3] “Never ever will I reply Ibn Ziyid’s proposal in affirmative. Will there be any other consequence save demise? Demise is very welcomed, however.”

A couple of days to ‘ªsh£ri, Ibn Ziyid commanded emphatically to keep water beyond Imim °usayn’s reach, **حل بين الحسين والماء فلا يـذوقوا منـه قطـرة كمـا منـع بـالتّقي الزّكي عثمان** [4] “Keep him far away from water so that he cannot take a drop as they did so to ‘Uthmin.”

He also had written to Ibn Sa‘d, “I have learned that °usayn with his companions have sunk wells and water is within reach. Upon receiving the letter, stop their digging as

---

[7]. Imim sent an envoy to dissuade Ibn Sa‘d but the response given to him was رفي ابن سعد أن يقتلك بملك اسري Ibn Sa‘d to battle against you in return Riy. Al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.173

[1]. al-Irshid, p.229

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.166; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III,, p.183 فانظر فإن نزل الحسين وأصحابه على الحكم فابعث بهم اليّ سلماً وإن أبوا فازحف إليهم حتى تقتلهم وتمثل بهم فانهم مستحقون لذنك

[3]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.254

[4]. This order was given three days after Imim’s arrival. See also, Akhbir al-§iwil, p.255; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.180, what Ibn Ziyid has stated about ‘Uthmin was on no accounts true because when ‘Uthmin was under opponents’ pressure, it was Imim ‘Al¢ (a) who provide water for him. Earlier, we have discussed this in this regard.

far as possible and by no means allow them to consume the water of the Euphrates."[1]

During the last days Imim had some clandestine meetings with Ibn Sa'd attempting to dissuade him. Yet as demonstrated by historical narration's he could in no way disregard the governorship of Riy.

Shimr due to consanguinity he had with 'Abbis Ibn 'Al¢'s mother, made Ibn Ziyid to write guarantee of clemency to him as well as his brothers. Under no circumstances were they able to be prevailed upon to leave Imim °usayn alone.[2]In another case a guarantee of clemency is reported for 'Al¢ Akbar and it was also for the sake of his mother. 'Al¢ Akbar had asserted, **أما والله لقرابة رسول الله (ص) أولـى أن ترعى من قرابة أبي سفيان**[3] **"**Deferring to consanguinity with the Prophet (s) is more superior than that with Ab£ Sufyin."

Ibn Ziyid who was determined to attack in the evening of Tis£'i (the ninth day of the month of Mu¦arram) admitted to procrastinate it till tomorrow at the request of Imim. At night Imim made some remarks to his companions. He declared that he ignored their allegiance, they are free to leave and they can take a few members of his family with them as well. However, companions did announce their steadfastness.[4]

On the eve of 'ªsh£ri, Imim commanded to dig out trenches all around the tents but one side to avert the enemy's attacks from all sides. From early morning of 'ªsh£ri, both armies arrayed against one another. No imperfection could be noticed in Imim's army. Without consideration of facts, divine predestination or the political

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.162; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.311. Reaction to some objections as saying because with digging two or three metersof water could be found in Karbali and there was no need for the water of the Euphrates; there fore, no one suffered from thirst. It is absolutely evident that Ibn Ziyid's army was so ruthless that it did not allow them to sink wells. Nevertheless, Imim's army could take water from the Euphrates several times until a couple of days prior to ªsh£ri.

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.184; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.168

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.182

[4]. Ibn Sa'd,Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn,, p.178; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, pp.58,59

privileges of which subsequent to Imim °usayn's martyrdom, taking the household with him exposes to view the intention Imim had had for procuring Yaz¢d the sovereignty. Even their transferring from Mecca to K£fa had seemingly originated from political certainty and it was the submission of K£fa to Imim. Accordingly their staying in °idjiz was never politically expedient in view of the fact that it could be envisioned how the Umayya would behave towards them following securing Arabia Pertae if the victory were supposedly gained in Iraq.

On the eve of 'ªsh£ri Imim addressed his companions as saying, "Tomorrow there shall be naught but martyrdom, **فأنتم في حل مني وهذا الليل قد غشيكم، فمن كانت له منـم قوة فليضم رجلاً من أهل بيـتي اليـه وتفرقـوا فـي سـوادكم، فعسى الله أن يأتي بالفتح أو أمر من عنده فيصبحوا علـى مـا اسرّوا في انفسهم نادمين**[1] "You are all at liberty and it is the night at which you feel secure. Any of you who is more courageous can take one from my household with him and abandon so that Allih can either grant us the triumph or adopt another measure to deter them from materializing their plan."

It is alluded here that it was probable for them to gain victory or for the foes to change their minds although such a probability did never appear politically strong. Under such circumstances, there existed no other alternative other than martyrdom. °urr's as well as thirty individuals' joining to Imim[2] in addition to political broad-mindedness on the part of Imim in 'ªsh£ri morning both implied that such a development was not beyond the bounds of possibility. Not withstanding 'Umar Ibn Sa'd's villainous nature whose father was among the Qi'id¢n[3], the malice fo such Khiridjites-featured individuals as Shimr Ibn Dhi l-Djawshan[4] along with the pressure exerted by Ibn Ziyid altogether engendered one of the most gruesome felony in the Islamic world.

---

[1]. Ibn Sa'd,Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, pp. 179, 180

[2]. Ibid. pp. 178, 181; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p.7

[3]. Those who had been described well by Imim 'Al¢ (a) as

خذلوا الحق ولم ينصروا الباطل

They have not only forgotten the gospel truth but also they never back the credal error

[4]. Notorious of being Khiridjites

Imim's army as narrated by Ibn Sa'd, included fifty men but later twenty others joined him.[1] Prior to the clashes, Imim delivered a speech to the opposite army, "Thanks to the request of you and others I came here. You had written that the Prophet's Sunna (tradition) was being neglected and discord was being sown. My coming here was at your demand to guide my forefather's Umma (nation). If now you feel disinclined, allow me return at least. Think twice! Do you ever consider shedding the blood of the Holy Prophet's son legitimate? The son of Prophet's cousin who was the ever first believer? The one whose uncles were °amza, 'Abbis and Djaʻfar? Have you ever not heard how the Prophet (s) had characterized my brother and me as, **سيدا شباب أهل الجنّة** **"**They both are the masters of the youth in Heaven."

Question Djibir An¥ir¢, Ab£ Sa'¢d Khudr¢ and Zayd Ibn Arqam if you do not believe me".[2]

The reasoning Ibn °u¤ayr had refereed to are like those mentioned.[3] Zuhayr Ibn Qayn, a renowned figure, pronounced an ultimatum as well.[4]

So for presuming that it might never be culminated in blood letting not least streaming the blood of Allih's Messenger's son, °urr Ibn Yaz¢d perceived the reality all at once.

He went to Ibn Sa'd asking, "Was none of his remarks convincing for you?"

"I would never murder him if I could," 'Umar Ibn Sa'd responded, "now there is no other alternative."

Upon hearing such comments, °urr without delay went to Imim, begged for forgiveness, stood to defend him and ultimately after killing two people achieved martyrdom.[5] Among the ones who allied themselves with Imim and became martyred was Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Ziyid, too.[6]

---

[1]. Ibn Sa'd,Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn,, p.178

[2]. Ibn Sa'd,Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.181. see also al-Kimil fi l-tir ¢kh, vol.IV, pp. 60, 61

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.182

[4]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p. 63

[5]. Ibid. vol.IV, pp. 64-65

[6]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p. 73

Since it was by no means Imim ‘Al¢’s approach to be the beginner of the war, Imim also was not the one who commenced it in Karbali. It was ‘Umar Ibn Sa‘d who put on arrow in his bow and shot at Imim’s army first. And afterwards he announced that they should wear witness to Ibn Ziyid that he was the first shooter.[1]

When the battle started, the members of Imim’s army went to the battlefield one by one. After a while the enemy’s death toll had risen to more than the martyrs. Therefore, touching upon the fact that they were combating Arab heroes, ‘Amr Ibn °adjdjidj forewarned, “You will all be slaughtered unless you put them under a rain of arrows”.[2] Under a heavy barrage of arrows and in the course of several clashes, Imim’s adherents and the members of his household were martyred respectively. The details of the conflict have been inscribed by a number as inscribed by Ibn Sa‘d in ±abaqit. Eventually the event of Karbali, resulting in martyring Imim and more than seventy of his followers and killing some eighty eight people of the opposite army, came to an end.[3]

THE ELEMENT OF INVISIBILITY IN KARBALª

Among the factors that have played pivotal roles in the historical dimension of ideological epic in Karbali is the element of “invisibility”. This very element is what not merely has created friction in analyzing this historical event but has contrasted a subject in scholastic theology with a historical one. There are many narrations in this regard in most of which Allih’s Messenger has foretold Imim °usayn’s martyrdom. ‘Allama Am¢n¢ has compiled a number of such narrations in S¢ratani wa Sunnatani. Moreover, they can be found innumerably in Sunnites books.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.326; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.183

[2]. Tarkih ±ir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 331; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.67

[3]. Ibn Sa‘d, Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.184; see also Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.63. It has been the true historical narration and consistent with the status quo at that time and the mutual manners.

In addition to[1] these narrations which are historical by themselves, there are other ones having explicitly or implicitly predicted the incident in Karbali. Below we present some adapted from the historical books.

As recounted, a night before emigrating from Medina to Mecca, when Imim went to pay a visit to the Prophet's tomb, he fell asleep. He dreamed about the Holy Prophet together with a group of angels. Hugging him, the Prophet stated, **يا حسين! كأنك عن قريب أراك مقتولاً مذبوحاً بأرض كرب وبلا من عصابة من أمتي وأنت في ذلك عطشان لا تسقى... يا حسين إن أباك وأمك قد قدموا عليَّ وهم اليك مشتاقون وأن لك في الجنة درجات لن تنالها الا بالشهادة "**O °usayn! I foresee that in a near future you will be killed by a group from my Umma in Karbali while thirsty.... O °usayn! Your parents who are both with me are looking forward to meeting you. A rank is determined for you in Paradise to which you can reach merely through martyrdom."

According to another narration, Imim °usayn (a) had stated in Mecca, **انّي رأيت جدي (ص) في منامي وقد أمروني بأمر وأنا ماض لأمره**[2] **"**I had a dream about my forefather. He commanded something for implementing which I am going."

On the strength of this very dream Imim wrote a letter to Sa'¢d Ibn '¥ saying, **وأعلمك أنّي رأيت جدي في منامي مخبرني بأمر وأنا ماض له**[3] **"**I inform you that I had a dream about my forefather. Since he notified me of something I am seeking for."

In Khuzaymiyya, Zaynab (s) came to Imim and said, "At midnight I heard a yell, What was it?" Imim inquired. She replied "An invisible speaker was yelling out,

ألا يا عين فاحتفلي بجهد ومن يبكي علي الشهداء بعدي

على قوم تسوقهم المنايا بمقدار الي انجاز وعدي

---

[1]. See Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, pp.154-161 and the footnotes of the pages.

[2]. Ibid. vol.V, p.51

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, p.116; see also Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.291, he had written the same to 'Abd Allih Ibn Dja'far as well. See also Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p. 202

“O eye! Rejoice as much as you can. Who shall shed tears for the martyrs after me? Death is approaching this tribe in order to make my vow unconditional.”

“Whatsoever Allih has foreordained will assuredly materialize”, Imim stressed.[1]

Others are when Imim arrived in Karbali. After he asked what the area was called, he stated, **لقد مرّ أبي بهذا المكان عند مسيره الى صفين وأنا معه فوقف فسأل عنه فأخبر باسمه؛ فقال ها هنا محطّ ركابهم وها هنا مهراق دمائهم، فسئل عن ذلك، فقال: ثقل لآل بيت محمد ينزلون هاهنا**[2] **“**Once my father on his way to ¯iff¢n asked the name of this area. When he was answered and while I was with him, he expressed that here would be where they would dismount and their blood would be shed. Being asked, he replied that a group from the Prophet’s Ahl al-Bayt would dismount here.”

It was in the afternoon when Imim in Tha‘labiyya lay down and fell asleep. As soon as he woke up he began sobbing. After ‘Al¢ Akbar asked the reason, he said, **انّي رأيت فارساً على فرس حتى وقف عليّ فقال: يا حسين! انّكم تسرعون المسير والمنايا لكم تسرع الي الجنّة. فعلمت أن أنفسنا قد نعيت الينا**[3] **“**There was a man on horseback who came nearer and stopped before us saying, “O °usayn! The fast you are proceeding on this way, the fast your death is moving towards Paradise,” I realized that our souls are bidding farewell to us.”

In ‘ªsh£ri morning, Imim told his sister, **يا أختاهّ اني رأيت جدي في المنام وأبي علياً وفاطمة أمي وأخي الحسن عليهم السلام فقالوا: انّك رائح الينا عن قريب وقد والله يا أختاه دنا الامر في ذلك لا شك**[4] **“**O sister! Last night my forefather, my father ‘Al¢, my mother Fi§ima and my brother, °asan, were all in my dream saying that I will join them soon. O sister! By Almighty Allih and beyond any doubt the time is ripe.”

Concerning the eve of ‘ªsh£ri, it is quoted from Imim as stating that he had a dream about the Holy Prophet along with a number of his companions who had said, **يا بني! أنت شهيد آل محمد وقد استبشرت بك السماوات وأهل الصفح**

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.122

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.253

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.177; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.123

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp. 175-176

الاعلى فليكن افطارك عندي الليلة تعجل ولا تؤخر[1] "O my son! A martyr of Mu¦ammad's family is you. The heavens and the dwellers of the lofty heavens have given you glad tidings. Tonight you are supposed to break your fast beside me, so hasten."

Elsewhere Mudjihid has narrated from Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n delivering a sermon in K£fa, **كيف أنتم اذا أتاكم أهل بيت نبيكم يحمل قويهم ضعيفهم** "What will you do if you see your Prophet's household while the stronger one carries the weaker one."

"We will do so and so", the audience responded.

Shaking his head, Imim added, **توردن ثم تعرّدون ثم تطيعون البراءة ولابراءة لكم**[2] "You accept and then change your mind. You prefer to disgust whereas you are not disgusted."

These examples all imply Imim's knowledge about the event in Karbali previous to his martyrdom. Notwithstanding, it is by all means natural that neither Imim °usayn, nor the Prophet manipulated the factor of invisibility in their political lives. Except the time of substantiating the fact of Prophethood and Imimat, the Prophet's and the twelve Imims' conduct was compatible with the existing political evaluation. This kind of Divine knowledge was what they have been informed by Allih through distinct ways either by Gabriel, in a dream or alike owing to the fact that the principle of invisibility is beyond all's power but Allih's. Deeming the Prophet (s) as well as Imims' role models and vanguards is founded on the existing state and ostensible evaluation not the unseen. It has been the policy of all the prophets and Imims in their natural lives. In this respect many historical and scholastic analyses are done but they are beyond the capacity of this concise book and require an independent study.

THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS DEVIATIONS IN KARBALª EVENT

The Islamic community in the year the event of Karbali took place, had greatly differed from that in the last

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p.181

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. IV, p.82

year of Prophet's life. The trend of deviation has been however gradual, according to many of researchers, the basis thereof was established from the first years after the Prophet's departure. The foregoing deviations were in such a way that the politicians could avail themselves of them to not only delude the people but also justify their despotism. The ones who played a crucial role in the origination and the development of such deviations were the Umayyads. The power notably secured by Yaz¢d revealed the fact that neverever had the Umayya believed in a genuine Islam and their belief was merely a covering people had spread in order to justify and concede their sovereignty.

Having accused the Umayya of oppression and enmity,[1] Imim °usayn (a) had described them as those who "obey Satan, disobey Allih, propagate misdeeds, disregard Allih's specified rules and also encrouch upon Bayt al-Mil (public treasury)".[2] In addition to creating corruption and ignoring divine limits, they had distorted a large number of religious concepts and misused them. Here let's discuss a few of them which had impacts in the course of Karbali according to historical evidence.

"Obedience to Imims, the necessity of Community and unlawfulness of breach of allegiance was three common political terms used by caliphs. It may be claimed that the above-mentioned terms could have guaranteed the base and the persistence of the caliphate. Anyhow, these three terms were right principles among the religious, political and Islamic concepts of which observing for the sake of the community was reasonably incumbent. Obeying an Imim denotes obeying the ruling system. The question raised is that to what extent the ruler should be complied with. Is it imperative that a just Imim be followed or an unjust

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 137

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p. 171; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp. 144-15; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.304; elsewhere, Imim had stated, الا ترون أن الحق لا يعمل به وأن الباطل لا يتناهي عنه Not you see how the gospel is not practiced but the credal error is endlessly practiced?

Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.305; Ibn 'Asikir, Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn,p. 214. Also Imim had said, فان السنة قد أميتت وان البدعة قد أحييت The Prophet's Sunnah is dissolved while heresies are revived

Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 266

monarch ought to be obeyed too? Earlier we discussed it in detail while considering ‘Uthmin’s caliphate.

Upholding Community implies avoiding disturbance or taking no action to undermine the unity or pave the ground for the emergence of a shaky Islamic community. The considerable question is whether silence should be kept before despotic monarchism or a libertine ruler under any circumstances in other words, should any objection be suppressed relying on the fact that it spoils “Community” and causes “disunion”?

Unlawfulness of breach of allegiance, namely fulfilling a pledge is heavily underlined in Islam. Since breaking a pledge or an allegiance is prohibited seriously, it stands to reason how much the role of which in political affairs can be positive. But if the allegiance were not sworn to caliphs like Yaz¢d or it were breached and consequently Community was spoiled, would it again follow the principle of unlawfulness of breach of allegiance or would it basically be an exception to the rule? As already alluded to the Umayya caliphs and later those of Ban£ ‘Abbis by manipulating such concepts, however distorted and unconditional, compelled the people to acquiesce their sovereignty.

After Mu‘iwiya had secured allegiance for his son, Yaz¢d, he went to Medina to coerce the opponents to swear. ‘ªyisha was among in view of the fact that his brother, Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab£ Bakr, had been martyred by Mu‘iwiya.

When the issue of allegiance was propounded, Mu‘iwiya told her, “I have secured allegiance for Yaz¢d from all Muslims, if you will, **انـي لا أري ذلـك ولكـن عليـك بـالرفق والتأني** “Never do I pronounce it lawful but act moderately toward people instead.”[1]

This case in point demonstrates how ‘ªyisha was ever convinced. Let’s consider one other instance. As stated by Ibn Is¦iq, they were doing prayers (perhaps in al-°arim mosque) they noticed that Shimr Ibn Dhi l-Djawshan, being with them, had raised his hands saying “O Allih! You are well-aware of my nobleness, so forgive me.”

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.IV, p. 237; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p. 183

“I told him, added Ibn Is¦iq, how could you ever be forgiven whereas you have aided and abetted in murdering the Prophet’s son?”

“What have we preformed?” Shimr reacted.

“It was the mandates of our commanders and we could in no way defy them”. If disobeyed, **كنا شراً من هذه الحمر السقا**[1] **“**We would be far more inferior to water carrier beasts.”

Apprehending him, Ibn Ziyid told Muslim Ibn ‘Aq¢l, **يا شاق! خرجت علي امامك وشققت عصا المسلمين**[2] **“**O outlaw! You have seceded from your Imim and have sowed the seeds of discord among Muslims.”

Muslim who never yielded to such a digression, riposted that Mu‘iwiya not only did not procure the caliphate through the consensus of opinions of the nation at all, but he overcame the Holy Prophet’s successor through deception and usurped his caliphate.

When Imim °usayn was about to leave Mecca, the deputies of ‘Amr Ibn Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘ª¥, the governor, said, **الا تتقي الله تخرج عن الجماعة بين هذه الامّه**[3] **“**Do you not fear from Allih for seceding from the Muslim congregation and for causing disunion among the nation?”

“We have neverever ignored disobeying Imim, nor have we seceded from Community” affirmed ‘Amr Ibn °adjdjidj, a commander of Ibn Ziyid’s.[4]

Advising Ibn Ziyid’s army, he added, **ألزموا طاعتكم وجماعتكم ولاترتابوا في قتل من مرق عن الدين وخالف الامام**[5] **“**Not ever fail to remember obedience and union and at no time do you doubt about killing the one seceding from the religion and being at variance with Imim (ruler).”

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p.197; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, Lisin al-m ¢zin, vol.III, p.151 (Al-°umayr al-saqqi’it)

[2]. al-Fut£¦, bol.5, p.98

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 289; such adverse publicity had made, the majority of people specially those from Damascus to consider Imim °usayn as an outsider (the one seceding) and to accuse him of heresy.

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, p. 275

[5]. Ibid. p. 331

Figures like ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar who was among the Sunnites religious jurisprudents and hadith-narrators, had imagined that if entire people acquiesced to swear the oath of allegiance to Yaz¢d, they would consent too.

He had given his assurance to Mu‘iwiya, **فاذا اجتمع النّاس على ابنك يزيد لم أخالف**[1] **“**I shall oppose you unless people all swear allegiance to your son, Yaz¢d. He also had addressed Imim as saying, “Do cause not disunion among Muslims!”[2]

Such individuals as ‘Umar and ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Awf’s daughter had written to Imim to regard obedience with reverence and treat Community and its upholding as urgent.[3]

Another religious deviation in the Islamic community was “belief in fatalism”. Previous to the event of Karbali this belief has been misused. In Early Islamic Era, however, Mu‘iwiya had been the reviver of which or according to Ab£ Hilil ‘Askar¢ he was the initiator of which.[4] Referring to the fact that Mu‘iwiya is the founder of “fatalism”, Qi¤¢ ‘Abd al-Djabbir has quoted Mu‘iwiya making as remarkable remarks[5] as follows, **ان أمر يزيد قضاء من القضاء وليس للقضاء الخيرة من أمرهم**[6] **“**This matter concerning Yaz¢d is a destiny from among Divine destinies and no one has any volition in this regard.”

‘Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid asked Imim Sadjdjid (a), **أو لم يقتل اللـه عليـاً؟ “**Was Allih not the One who killed ‘Al¢ Akbar?”

Imim’s response was, **كان لي أخ يقال له علي، اكبر مني قتله الناس “**I had an elder brother whom people killed.”[7]

---

[1]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p. 167, as described by Mu‘iwiya, Ibn ‘Umar was a coward (Ibn A‘tham, vol.IV, p. 260). He advised Imim °usayn saying “Do not rise up, be patient, compromise as others did. See also al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 39; Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p. 166.

[2]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p. 17

[3]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p. 167

[4]. al-Awi’íl, Askar¢, vol.II, p. 125

[5]. Fa¤l al-l‘tizil wa §abaqit al-mu‘tazila, p. 143

[6]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, pp. 183, 187

[7]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p. 188

Once ‘Umar Ibn Sa‘d was objected why he killed Imim °usayn solely for the sake of Riy governorship, he replied that such an affair had been predestined.[1]

When alive, Ka‘b al-A¦bir had been foretelling that under no conditions would authority be secured by the Hishimites, (although later both the ‘Abbisids and ‘Alawites could secure it as an instance in ±abaristin). It has been quoted from ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar as well, as saying, **فاذا رأيت الهاشمي قد ملك الزمان فقد هلك الزمان**[2] **“**Any time you realized that one from the Hishimites has secured the authority, conclude that it is that end of the world.”

The consequences of these kinds of deviations for the future generations were that Imim °usayn’s movement has never been considered as an uprising against immorality in Sunnism but an illegal insurgency.[3]

POLITICAL IMPACTS OF THE EVENT OF KARBALª ON SHI‘ISM

The event of Karbali is among the determining incidents in the process of Shi‘ites genesis in history. It was ealier mentioned that Shi‘ism theories in general and its most elementary principle namely Imimat in particular can thoroughly be traced in the Holy Qur’in and Sunna both. Notwithstanding, the historical separation of Shi‘ite Muslims from the other existing parties occurred quite gradually. Both lifestyle and the ideas left as memorials from Imim ‘Al ¢’s caliphate could to much extent cohere Shi‘ism intellectually. The Umayya advocating their self-fabricated Islam the nature and the discrepancy of which from the authentic Islam never revealed by Mu‘iwiya’s policies could evidently be unveiled in the course of Yaz¢d’s caliphate. Throughout the vent of Karbali, the historical separation of Shi‘ite Muslims from others affected by the Islam backed by the Umayya finalized. From then onwards, distinguishing Shi‘ite Muslims as the followers of Sunna, ‘Al¢ and his successors seemed truly a simple task.

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p. 148

[2]. Ibn ‘Asikir,Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, p. 193

[3]. Tir¢kh Islim, Cambridge University, vol.I, p. 81 (Englisht text); See also al-Ikhtilif f¢ l-laf¨, pp. 47-49

Amongst the Shi‘ite Muslims there, existed a number who were from all standpoint followers of Imim and regarded them as the Prophet’s successors elected by him. The limit of Shi‘ism, on the other hand, on the part of other groups from Iraq, etc was only the superiority they believed for ‘Alawites over Umayyads.[1] Those who achieved martyrdom beside Imim °usayn in Karbali were among the Shi‘ite Muslims describing Imamate as the only prerogative of ‘Al¢ and his descendants. Imim himself on various occasions had frequently recommended people to leave the right to the rightful and contribute to him as well. The Umayyads were in truth the usurpers this very right.[2] Somewhere he had stated, **أيها الناس أنا ابن بنت رسول الله ونحن أولـى بولايـة هذه الامور عليكم من هولاء المدعين ما ليس لهم**[3] **“**O people! It is I, a son of Prophet’s daughter’s. We are superior in your guardianship to the false claimants.”

Elsewhere, **أنا أحقّ من غير لقرابتي من رسول اللّه**[4] **“**And I deserve it more than any one else for my kinship with Allih’s Messenger.”

Furthermore, Imim’s disciples had appreciated different opportunities by presenting such a belief either in verses of poem or prose. Said by Muslim Ibn Ziyid was that by Almighty Allih on no accounts was it Mu‘iwiya’s right to be a caliph. He overcame the Prophet’s successor by deception and usurped his caliphate.[5] ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Abd Allih Yazan¢, one of Imim’s companions in Karbali, had composed,

أنا بن عبدالله من آل يزن ديني على دين حسين وحسن[6]

“I am ‘Abd Allih’s son from Yazan family. My religion is the same as those of °usayn and °asan.” Addressing Imim °usayn (a), °adjdjidj Ibn Masr£q had composed,

ثم أباك ذا الندى عليّا ذاك الذي نعرفه الوصيّآ[7]

---

[1]. In "Tir¢kh tashayyu‘ dar Irin" we have discussed in detail.

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p. 170; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 135

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 137

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp. 144-145

[5]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 98

[6]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 194

[7]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 199

“You father, ‘Al¢, is sportsmanlike. He is the one whom we consider as the Prophet’s successor.”

It was composed by Hilil Ibn Nifi‘ Badjal¢,

أنا الغلام التممي البجلي ديني على دين حسين وعلي[1]

“This is from Ban£ Tam¢m and Badjal¢ and I believe in the religion °usayn and his father, ‘Al¢ believe.

In some verses ‘Uthmin Ibn ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib had composed,

اني أنا عثمان ذو المناخر شيخي علي ذو الفعال الطاهر

و ابن عـم النبي الطاهر أخو حسيـن خيـرة الاخائـر

و سيد الكبار والاصاغر بعد الرسول والوصي الناصر[2]

“The possessor of honor is no one but me. My master, ‘Al ¢, is the actor of all purely good deeds. The causin of the immaculate Prophet is me. I am the brother of °usayn, the most chosen of the chosen and the master of the youngest and the eldest after the Prophet and his successor.”

After Nafi‘ Ibn Hilil had said, **أنا الجملي أنا على دين علي** **“**My religion is the religion of ‘Al¢.”

A person from the rival army said, **أنا على دين عثمان**[3] **“**My religion is that of ‘Uthmin.”

What can be easily discerned from these verses and others quoted from ‘Abbis Ibn ‘Al¢ and others is the Shi‘ites belief of Imim’s followers not only in political arena but also in ideological one.

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 201

[2]. Ibid. vol.V. P. 206

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp. 331, 336

CHAPTER VIII
TRANSFER OF CALIPHATE TO THE MARWªNIDS

DISPUTE BETWEEN °IDJªZ AND DAMASCUS

Seemingly subsequent to Imim °usayn's martyrdom, there existed no hurdle facing the Umayya. It was Yaz¢d's impudence that had one of the Muhidjir£n's descendant, 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr, muster up courage and cause turbulence in °idjiz. Although one of the instigators of the war of Djamal was he, during Imim °usayn's several-month presence in Mecca, despite his own mind and due to his political harmony with Imim, he established a good rapport with him. (Stipulated by all historians, however, is that he wished Imim had gone to K£fa and °idjiz had been prepared for him. Every thing went on favorably). Imim °usayn was martyred. There remained no competitor for 'Abd Allih in °idjiz. Nevertheless, not only he did by no means intend to battle against Yaz¢d overtly, but also had claimed that he wanted the caliphate not for himself and he proposed that the sequence and designation of the caliphs be in accordance with the "council".[1] He, however, began securing allegiance from the people of °idjiz covertly.

Being extremely concerned about the probable aftermath of Karbali movement, Yaz¢d exerted himself to invoke trickery like his father. Accordingly, he sent presents to Ibn Zubayr. In no way did he accept. As soon as he aggravated his conflict, a group from Mecca and Medina joined him.[2]

Once more Yaz¢d dispatched a number of the distinguished of Damascus to silence him through alluring and menacing. As well as indicting Yaz¢d for corruption, he announced that revolting was not his intention and he had chosen the shrine to be secure from Yaz¢d and others. He

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol IV. pp. 16, 17

[2]. Ibid. p.17

described himself as a pigeon among the pigeons of the shrine.[1]

Yaz¢d was set to suppress Ibn Ziyid's movement as soon as possible. He commanded Medina governor, 'Amr Ibn Sa'¢d Ibn 'ª¥, as a result, to delegate a group to kill Ibn Zubayr in Mecca.[2] 'Amr Ibn Sa'¢d also sent 'Amr Ibn Zubayr, who was 'Abd Allih's brother and Umayya on his mother's side, to accompany the army going for a battle. A clash between he and his brother in the vicinity of Mecca ended to 'Amr's defeat and capture. All the excruciating tortures he sustained under the name of Islamic punishment limits for his atrocities caused him so enervated that he lost his life in 'Abd Allih's prison with no doctor.[3]

This incident had prompted the followers of Zubayr to feel more powerful and absorb people in both Medina and ±i'if. Since Ibn Zubayr considered Wal¢d Ibn 'Uqba who had replaced 'Amr Ibn Sa'¢d perilous in Medina, he urged Yaz¢d in a letter to substitute a sedate one for him if he wanted the state to improve. No sooner was 'Uthmin Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin appointed[4] than their pressure exerted on the Umayyads being in Mecca and ±i'if multiplied.[5] There, two towns at a regular pace were seized by 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr. Now Damascus was assured that in order to pacify °idjiz, its forces never suffice and it was obliged to seek help from the dwellers of Damascus.

THE BATTLE OF °ARRA WªQIM

Among the most detestable atrocities committed by the Umayya following Imim °usayn's martyrdom was one notorious for the event of °arra in Islamic history. This event is connected to the revolt of Medina in 26th or 27th Dhi l-

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 285; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, pp. 19, 20, 21

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p. 23

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp. 285, 286; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV. P.28

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.30

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 277

°adjdja, 63 A.H.[1], not 62[2] nor 64[3] A.H. which culminated in bloodletting by Damascus army. Three versions as alluded to by historians elucidating the motivations behind the revolt,

First: According to Balidhur¢ when ‘Abd Allih murdered his brother, ‘Amr, he summoned people to balk at obeying Yaz¢d and to combat against him. Later than Medina which was called upon. °idjiz bowed to be dutiful to him. ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu§¢‘ secured allegiance from Medina on behalf of Ibn Zubayr. Upon hearing the news, Yaz¢d appealed to the governor for dispatching the distinguished of Medina to him for affability....[4] As indicated through this version, Medina stood against Yaz¢d as a result of swearing allegiance to Ibn Zubayr, due to the fact that subsequent to the event of °arra, Ibn Zubayr had proclaimed to his adherents, “Your friends were all massacred in the event”.[5]Abu l-Faradj has also presented interpretation concerning how Medina deposed Yaz¢d from caliphate and swore allegiance to Ibn Zubayr in the process of its revolt.[6]

Second: Written by Ya‘q£b¢ is that once ‘Uthmin Ibn Mu¦ammad was appointed as the governor of Medina, in order Ibn M¢ni as usual to take ¯awif¢ -the picked-out objects from Bayt al-Mil exclusively for the caliph- he went to Medina. Deeming them their own properties, a number of people inhibited him from taking. The insurrection and dismissal of the Umayya from the town stemmed from the verbal dispute occurred between people and the governor.[7] Like this narration Ibn Qutayba has also narrated.[8]

Third: ±abar¢’s version is that after ‘Uthmin Ibn Mu¦ammad’s appointment, he sent a group from among the distinguished of Medina to Yaz¢d to be endowed with his affability and generosity. While returning from Damascus, they commenced slandering Yaz¢d, **ليس لـه ديـن، يشـرب**

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p. 220; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp. 374, 380; Ashrif, vol.IV, p.41

[2]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p. 251; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p. 42

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 374 mentioned as untrue.

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p. 31

[5]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.III, p.156

[6]. al-Aghin¢, vol.I, pp. 21-24

[7]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p. 250

[8]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.206

الخمر، يغرف بالطنابير ويضرب عنـده القيـان ويلعـب بـالكلاب
"Being irreligious, he drinks, he plays lute, plays with the dogs and his slaves play music for him."

In lieu of admiring him, they, consequently, declared that they would neither comply with him nor approve his sovereignty.[1]

It seems that all the three points were taken into account. Immediately after proposing the first matter, Bali<u>dh</u>ur¢ propounded the third one. Zubayr-orientedness has certainly been considered as a fundamental element in °i<u>dj</u>iz. The second matter was then what could pave the ground for nation's disgust from the Umayya.

In historical sources °i<u>dj</u>iz is famed for being Ab£ Bakr- and 'Umar-oriented whereas Damascus famed for being Umayyads-oriented and such places as Iraq for <u>Sh</u>i'ism and alike. Such a feature attributed to the people of °i<u>dj</u>iz particularly people of Medina who had been accomplices in 'U<u>th</u>min's assassination, impeded them to be approved by the Umayya and vice versa. Moreover, Medina which had observed 'Umar's open-handedness including both Muhi<u>dj</u>ir£n and An¥ir, now could in no way tolerate the Umayya when noticing how Mu'iwiya and his son treated for taking the properties.

Ibn Zubayr's emergence in political scene as well as the Umayya's fragility in °i<u>dj</u>iz laid the foundations for the riot of Medina. Yaz¢d's attempt for pacifying them through 'Abd Allih Ibn <u>Dj</u>a'far remained abortive.[2] Nu'min Ibn Ba<u>sh</u>¢r, a pro-Umayyads An¥ir, (converting to a pro-Zubayr one and killed later) went to Medina to summon the people to "obedience to Imim" and "observing community" on behalf of Yaz¢d,[3] people declined, nevertheless. ±abar¢ has quoted 'Amr Ibn Sa'¢d as saying, "Both Mecca and Medina incline towards Ibn Zubayr."[4] The insurgents besieged the Umayya together with their followers and governors being as many as one thousand assembled in Marwin Ibn °akam's house and then expelled them disdainfully while children were

---

[1]. Tir¢<u>kh</u> al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 368; Ansib al-a<u>sh</u>rif, vol.IV, p.31

[2]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, pp. 206, 207

[3]. Tir¢<u>kh</u> al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 367

[4]. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 369; Ansib al-a<u>sh</u>rif, vol.IV, p. 32

hurling stones.[1] They bet that if the expelled swore not to return along with the Damascus army, they would be allowed to leave the city. They assented although atrocious individuals like Marwin[2] breached their promise. As this expulsion is introduced by Wiqid¢ to be done by Ibn Zubayr, he has added that the total number of those expelled from Mecca, Medina and other areas had been some four thousand people.[3] In accordance with Ibn A'tham the insurgents were led by 'Abd Allih Ibn °an¨ala Ghas¢l al-Mali'ika at Ibn Zubayr's behest, the governor of Medina.[4]

Wearied of his political strategies for silencing Ibn Zubayr as well as Medina, Yaz¢d sent an army to Medina. The commander of the army was Muslim Ibn 'Uqba who slaughtered so many people that he was named "Musraf" (prodigal killer). Apparently, his five-thousand-soldier[5] army was sufficient for suppressing Mecca and Medina through the number might have been higher. The people of Damascus were allowed to loot the town and take the possession of other's properties after gaining victory.[6] When being dispatched, they received their proportion from Bayt al-Mil thoroughly in addition to surplus a hundred D¢nirs.[7]

The residents of Medina dug trenches at the entrance to the town (exactly where the Prophet had dug on the course connecting the western °arra to the eastern in Northern Medina) for the purpose of protecting the town. They were led 'Abd Allih Ibn Mu§¢', Ma'qal Ibn Sanin together with 'Abd Allih Ibn °an¨ala at the top who was killed with his son during the clash.

Instantly after the Damascus armies arrived in Medina, they settled in the district of °arra in consultation with 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwin expelled along with other members of the Umayya. They could also flourish to take in a number of Ban£ °iritha with the help of Marwin by financial promises[8]

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p. 208

[2]. Ibid. vol.I, p. 210

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, pp. 37, 38

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp. 292-293

[5]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.250

[6]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p.209; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.III, p. 372

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.23; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 371

[8]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p. 211

and penetrate into the town. Their invasion and clashes lasted less than twenty four hours, they could besiege the town, however.[1] As already pledged by Yaz¢d entire possessions of the town belonged to the armies for a three-day period, hence they spared no crime in this respect. At this juncture, not only many were slayed but also a large number of women were raped.[2] Muslim Ibn ‘Uqba murdered a multitude of the captives including a few from Quraysh.[3] Among the victims were a group from the Prophet’s companions who were beheaded later.[4]

Reported by Ibn Qutayba the death toll included one thousand and seven hundred An¥ir, Muhidjir and their offspring plus ten thousand ordinary people.[5] He has added that as many as eighty people form companions were also killed.[6] Haytham Ibn ‘Ad¢ has recorded six thousand and five hundred casualties.[7] Reported by Mas‘£d¢ is ninety and so from Quraysh, the mentioned number from An¥ir and four thousand others identified.[8] What has been narrated by Ibn A‘tham is that Muhidjir£n’s offspring had been one thousand and three hundred while those of An¥ir had been one thousand and seven hundred.[9] This figure is except the common victims. These pieces of data depict how many citizens were decimated and how many houses were looted in the course of the incident. ‘Awina Ibn °akam has stated that when they invaded the town from the side of Ban£ °iritha, the only house which remained immune was Usima Ibn Zayd’s and the only woman was one from °imyar. They combated the people of Medina while calling them Jews.[10] Within the event of °arra it was not simply An¥ir who were

---

[1]. Some had already predicted the inefficiency of the people of Medina (Al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p. 210) and some others and amazed at their submission (Al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, pp. 216, 217).

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.37; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p. 250; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 295

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.378

[4]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p. 213

[5]. Ibid. vol.I, p. 215

[6]. Ibid. vol.I, pp. 216, 220

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p. 42

[8]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p. 70

[9]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 295

borne a grudge by the Umayya but there also existed many a family from Muhidjir£n among the victims. Here we should make allowance for two points,

1. It can be claimed politically that although the scene was set for the invasion in early 60s, amongst the most crucial points meriting consideration is the participation of Medina in 'Uthmin's assassination in 36 AH. Having counted hopefully on 'Uthmin and specifically considering Medina as a principal accomplice of the assassination, the Umayya called the event of °arra as a retaliatory reaction. It was the notion of Yaz¢d.[1] Another evidence is that this man namely, Muslim Ibn 'Uqba was captured in the Holy Prophet's term in Ghaafin. A woman from An¥ir purchased and then liberated him. When he was appealed in the course of the event for having regard to them for the sake of his past, he responded, **لكنكـــم قتلتـــم عثمـــان**[2] **"**You are 'Uthmin's assassins."

As soon as the news of the event spread, Yaz¢d recited the poem Ibn Zib'ari had composed in U¦ud i.e, **ليت أشياخي ببدر شهدوا**[3] **"**I wish my forefathers had been present in Badr observing."

Alluding to taking revenge of An¥ir for slaying Quraysh in Badr. While the Damascus army was invading Medina, it

---

[10].Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.37. As it can be perceived, Muslim Ibn 'Uqba's atrocities have been to the extent that ±abar¢, Ibn Qutayba, Balidhur¢, etc. have explicitly enumerated them. But can it be justified why Wellhausen defended him and starved to acquit him, (Tir ¢kh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p.156). Afterwards, he tried to introduce the discord between Damascus and Medina as purely political; nonetheless, it is clear that such an outlook was solely for exonerating both Damascus and the Umayya. We do never intend to totally define the people of Medina but it ought to be borne in mind that religious motivations could have by no means be ineffective, (Ibid. p.161). Under other circumstances, also his defen of Damascus is noticeable, (p.162). Supporting °adjdjidj as well as denying the charges laid on him are among the cases (pp. 247, 248). He had also described sensual Sulaymin as a pious man (p.256).

[1]. Abu l-Faradj al-Aghin¢, vol.I, p.14

[2]. Abu l-Faradj, al-Aghin¢, vol.I, p.14

[3]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p. 267; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.42

yelled out, **يـا لثـارات عثمـان**[4] **"**O revengers for 'Uthmin's blood."

Subsequent to the event of °arra, Muslim announced, "Now I am extremely thrilled to kill 'Uthmin's assassins".[1]

Later on 'Abd al-Malik addressed Medina as saying, **انكم لا تحبوننا وأنتم تذكرون يوم الحرة ونحن لانحبكـم أبـداً ونحـن نذكر مقتل عثمان**[2] **"**You do dislike us due to the event of °arra and we do so due to 'Uthmin's murder."

2. Another matter was the staunch belief in "obedience to the caliph" and "observing community" prevailing among the people in Damascus and it was the Umayya who had made them firmly cleave to these principles. Such a belief was the main means for provoking and deploying them to Medina.[3] Deep-rootedly faithful to the principles, Muslim Ibn 'Uqba consented to attacking Medina and trespassing its sacred limits. After the massacre he said, "O my God, Thou art all aware that under no conditions have I disobeyed a caliph neither publicly nor privately. I consider the annihilation of the residents of °arra my worthiest deed after the avowal of, **لااله الا الله "**There is no God but Allih."[4]

"Nothing has so far been more adorable for me than turning cleansed. Now after wiping off these corrupt people I feel entirely cleansed", added he.[5]

°usayn Ibn Numayr, Muslim's successor, quoted him while breathing his last enroute to Mecca subsequent to the event as saying, **أللّهم انك تعلم أني لم أشـاق خليفـة ولـم أفـارق جماعة قط فاغفرلي**[6] **"**O Allih! You are well conscious that I have never ever stood against a caliph nor have I dared to secede from Community, so forgive me."

The impacts of such religious deviations were discussed in the chapter concerning Karbali uprising. The principles of observing Community and obedience to Imim yet

---

4. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p. 208

1. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p. 41

2. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 122

3. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp. 373, 375

4. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p. 40; Ibn A'tham, vol.V, p. 301

5. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.41

6. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 42; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.382; previously, we discussed it entitled "Religious Deviation in Karbali".

admissible, the main condition of obeying an Imim is venerating the religious limits and stipulations on his part.

The Damascus army after accomplishing their operations in Medina set out to Mecca to repeat the same crimes against Ibn Zubayr and his followers. Muslim passed away on the way and then °usayn Ibn Numayr replaced him at Yaz ¢d's behest. He proceeded and for a several-month period settled on the outskirts of Mecca and threw stones and balls of fire to the divine shrine from the pinnacles of the mountains through catapults.[1] Becoming informed of Yaz¢d's death in Rabi' al-Awwal 64 A.H., he ultimately called a truce. °usayn, who had entered Mecca for the pupose of pilgrimage following a concord, proposed Ibn Zubayr to accompany him to Damascus and lay the groundwork for his caliphate. He declined, however.[2] In order to take part in the activities prevalent in Damascus regarding the caliphate, he returned. The way was wholly paved for Ibn Zubayr in Iraq since 'Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid had rushed to Damascus upon hearing Yaz¢d's demise.

At this stage, there was no obstacle facing Ibn Zubayr in °idjiz. The vital troubles were in Iraq in view of the fact that his plans for domination were thwarted by the Shi'ite Muslims who were extricated from the Umayya's domination and had gained a profound influence on the city.

THE PENITENTS' MOVEMENT IN 65 A.H

Tawwib¢n's Movement occurred in 65 against the Umayya's sovereignty and for the purpose of eradicating °usayn Ibn 'Al¢'s assassins although the start of which had sparkled emotionally with in the hearts of a huge number of the Shi'ite Muslims after the even of Karbali. The K£fiyin Shi'ite Muslims, who had become conscience- stricken at leaving Imim °usayn helpless in Karbali, were determined to make amends at all costs. Not supporting Imim °usayn had become an unforgivable sin in their sight the compensation thereof would be feasible provided that they be killed or kill his assassins.

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 301; Akhbir al-§iwil, p.268

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, p. 306

The Umayya and their agents had K£fa under their thumbs for a while following the event in Karbali. Despite the suppression of the Shi‘ite Muslims and the existing restlessness created by Ibn Zubayr in the easternmost part of the Islamic land, the Shi‘ite Muslims were still deemed perilous. Here recounting an example of the Shi‘ite Muslims’ valour against ‘Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid looks appropriate.

Some day after the event of Karbali ‘Ubayd Allih on the pulpit in a mosque proclaimed. “Exaltation does solely belong to Allih who made the truth prevail and aided Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n Yaz¢d Ibn Mu‘iwiya and his party”.

As soon as he heard, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Af¢f Azd¢ who had lost the use of one of his eyes in Djamal and the other in ¯iff ¢n stood up and dissented, “O liar! O liar’s son! By Almighty Allih you, your father with the one designating you and his father murder the Prophet’s descendants, and now talk like the truthful!”

“O Allih’s foe! What are you saying about ‘Uthmin?” ‘Ubayd Allih asked.

“He was a man who did both good and bad, both reformed and corrupted. It is Allih’s Providence to treat justly. Why do you not inquire about yourself, your father, Yaz¢d and his father?” ‘Abd Allih retorted.

‘Ubayd Allih said furiously, “Never shall I inquire so that I can take your life. I have constantly beseeched Him to bestow martyrdom on me. Before you were born I lost the use of my eye hence I relinquished my hope.” “But now I offer my gratitude to Him who is accepting my prayer,” calmly uttered ‘Abd Allih.[1]

When the turmoil caused by Ibn Zubayr flared up in Mecca and the appearance of a revolt in K£fa was probable, Ibn Ziyid summoned ‘Amr Ibn °urayth, K£fa’s governor, to delineate to what extent the news is reliable.

He stated, “Ibn Zubayr is never threatening for Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n Yaz¢d.” **إني أخاف عليه من الترابية شيعة أبي تراب علي بن ابي طالب (ع)** “What perturbs me is ‘Al¢’s Shi‘ite Muslims. Is there anyone in K£fa nowadays ho feels affection for him?”

“Definitely no one adores him but abhores him,” answered ‘Amr Ibn °urayth.

---

[1]. al-Mu¦abbar, pp.480-481

Ibn Ziyid named Mukhtir as an instance. Later, Ibn °urayth apprehended Mukhtir[1] until ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar went to his assistance.

Next adventures proved that ‘Al¢’s and his descendant’s faithful followers were myriad in K£fa who were secretly in contact with one another those days. The dilemma facing the Shi‘ite Muslims was double-sided. One was from the Umayya’s side and the other from the side of the nobles and a large number of K£fiyins who had been in the opposite front against Imim °usayn in Karbali; There fore, the stance taken was anti-Shi‘ism. A group of the Shi‘ite Muslims set to take a revenge for Imim °usayn’s martyrdom were necessarily hostile to K£fiyins as well who had martyred Imim.[2]

Succeeding Yaz¢d’s death in 64, Shi‘ite Muslims were called upon by Sulaymin Ibn ¯urad Khuzi‘¢. Many replied him in affirmative.[3] But since the Umayya’s sovereignty had not become unstable yet, there was no strong probability for their emergence. First of all they began dissemination and assembling the propagandists, they trained and spread them around.[4] Little by little, the Umayya’s state deteriorated. The second Mu‘iwiya, Yaz¢d’s son, either abdicated or was curbed by others. The status quo in Damascus was the scene of unrest. The clashes were arisen among ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr’s adherents on the one hand and among Marwin Ibn °akam’s on the other hand. The consequence of such riots was nothing except the stabilization of The Umayya’s sovereignty in Iraq and the abolition of which gradually notwithstanding, ‘Abd al-Malik could take Iraq under the Umayya’s rule once again in early 70 A.H.

The Shi‘ite Muslims appreciated the convenient opportunity and maintaining their endeavors commenced from 61 onwards to instruct forces and store weapons[5] they began recruiting troops. Four eminent Shi‘ite Muslims who

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp.268, 269

[2]. Ibid. vol.VI, p.47

[3]. Tadjirib al-umam, vol.II, pp.97, 98

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.432; see also Tadjirib al-umam, vol.II, p.97

were chosen as responsible for organizing with Sulaymin were Musayyib Ibn Nadjba, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d Ibn Nawfal, Rufi‘a Ibn Shaddid as well as ‘Abd Allih Ibn Wil. A great number of the renowned Shi‘ite Muslims in K£fa took part in the session convened.[1]

Delivering lectures in this convention, the Shi‘ites leaders laid stress upon making amends for their oppressive behavior towards the right of the prophet’s infallible household and leaving him all alone. They were intent on repenting and being killed to make up for their misdeed.[2] By relying on the Qur’inic verse of,

يا قوم إنكُم ظَلمتمْ أنفُسَكمْ باتّخاذِكُمْ العِجْـل فَتُوبُـوا إلـي بارِئِكُمْ فَاقْتُلُوا أنفسكُمْ[3]

“O my people! Thou have surely been unjust to thyselves by taking the calf (for a god), therefore turn to thy Creator (penitently), so kill thy people.”

In the meeting all reached an agreement to cooperate. Those who appealed for fiscal help to the movement were supposed to refer to ‘Abd Allih Ibn Wil.[4]

The elderly man elected as the leader of the movement was Sulaymin, from among Prophet’s companions and Imim ‘Al¢’s adherents. In his first action, he wrote to Sa‘d Ibn °udhayfa Ibn al-Yamin who was one of the special Shi‘ite Muslims residing in Ctesiphon, a Shi‘ites Muslim-populated area, to join them together with other Shi‘ite Muslims if willing. He declared the predetermined date and place of departure. It was Rabi‘ al-Awwal, 1st. 65 in Nukhayla, well-known barracks in K£fa.[5]

---

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.432; See also Tadjirib al-umam, vol.II, p.97

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.428

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.206; Tadjirib al-umam, vol.II, p.96; al-Fut£¦, vol.VI, p.50

[3]. Baghara, 54

[4]. Tadjirib al-umam, vol.II, p.96

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp.430, 431; See also Ansib al-ashrif. vol.V, p.206; Tadjirib al-umam, vol.II, p.97; al-Fut£¦, vol.VI, p.52, a similar letter was also written to Ba¥rian Shi‘ite Muslims led by Muthanni Ibn Makhraba.

The words attributed to the penitents (Tawwib¢n) to have uttered in a sermon clearly manifest the content of the movement. Enumerating the greatness of the Prophet's descendants, 'Ubayd Allih Ibn 'Abd Allih hinted at how they were affronted in Karbali and while addressing the audience being Tawwib¢n, he affirmed how to repent, **أما أدعوكم إلى كتاب اللـه وسـنة نـبيّه والطلـب بـدماء أهـل بيتـه وإلـى جهـاد المحلين والمارقين فإن قتِلنا فمـا عنـد اللـه خيـر للأبـرار وإن ظهرنا، رددنا هذا الأمـر إلـى أهـل بيـت نبيّنـا**[1] **"** I do call you towards the divine Book, the Prophet's Sunna, a revenge for Ahl al-Bayt's blood and Djihid against the deniers of the religion as well as Miriq¢n. Were we killed, whatsoever exclusively assigned to the benevolent would be the best. But if we could succeed, the authority would be belonged to Ahl al-Bayt."

Concurrent with launching the movement of Tawwib¢n, both K£fa and Ba¥ra were ruled by 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr's agents. As no one had replaced 'Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid in Iraq who had already fled to Damascus, 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr, the ruler of Mecca from 61 on, dispatched his agents to Iraq and accordingly the pro-Zubayr elements took the thorough power of oriental Islamic land. A man called 'Abd Allih Yaz¢d An¥ir¢ was appointed as governor and Ibrih¢m Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn ±al¦a as treasurer.

K£fiyin noblemen who were every time in favor of the Umayya inwardly and outwardly, straightly invoked 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr on learning that a Shi'ites movement was expected. On the other hand, Shi'ite Muslims and those having a tendency went towards Sulaymin or Mukhtir as it will be noticed later.

Vital for the Shi'ite Muslims was a reaction against both the nobles and the ruling system in K£fa. They were by no means two separate issues inasmuch as the governor of the town was a Zubayr-designated one and the nobles were also for the governorship. Hardly ever could Shi'ite Muslims clash them.

'Abd Allih Ibn Yaz¢d, the governor, adopted initially a misleading stance to turn Shi'ite Muslims' attention to Damascus and goad them into confronting 'Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid's army departing from Damascus. He believed that

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.433

they would be naturally supported if they searched for °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢’s assassins. Since it was not vague that his assassin was no one but Ibn Ziyid, never would Tawwib¢n trigger off a wave of carnage inside the town[1]. This taken stance not merely could contribute to the intratown security to be well safeguarded but could propel Zubayr’s opponents to come into conflict with one another. And consequently pro-Zubayr men would simply get rid of their threats. Although the position was propounded a reconcilable one by such persons as Ibrih¢m Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn ±al¦a, and even if ‘Abd Allih Ibn Yaz¢d’s real intention were not deceitful, it compelled Tawwib¢n to leave K£fa and encounter the major army of Damascus with their minor one.

At all events it forced the Shi‘ite Muslims to act openly and get fully equipped to proceed to Damascus.[2]

Sulaymin who was also gratified with military expedition to Damascus in a response to those advising that Imim’s assassins live in K£fa said that the foremost cause of the event was Ibn Ziyid.[3] By the same token no one defied. Sulaymin had added that a battle inside K£fa would culminate in fratricide and automatically multiply the adversaries and figures like ‘Umar Ibn Sa‘d were not as powerful as Ibn Ziyid.[4] Sulaymin might have implied that he would meet his doom later.

In the throes of the activities, Mukhtir, a prominent Shi‘ites Muslim, arrived in K£fa. As elicited from the reports, he had preplanned to mobilize the Shi‘ite Muslims for an uprising but he was faced with Tawwib¢n’s movement in K£fa. As far as he was concerned such a movement was on no accounts a fundamental stride for achieving the goal and the only aftermath thereof would be Shi‘ites’s genocide. The propaganda made a number of Shi‘ite Muslims to incline

---

[1]. See Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. IV, p. 438; Tadjirib al-umam, vol.II, p. 99; vol.IV, p. 207

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 208; Tadjirib al-umam, vol. II, p. 99

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. IV, pp. 353-354

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol. VI, pp. 65-66

towards him.[1] Approximately a quarter of those swearing allegiance to Sulaymin began advocating Mukhtir.[2]

Some four thousand people out of sixteen or twelve thousand men who had sworn allegiance to Sulaymin prepared themselves for setting out to Damascus and with Sulaymin's persuasion one thousand more joined them.[3] After Sulaymin and the rest of Tawwib¢n left K£fa, °usayn's assassins (such as Shabath Ibn Rib'¢ and others) breathed a sigh of relief. The only serious misgiving they had was about the presence of Mukhtir. In a collusion they pressurized the governor of K£fa to incarcerate him.[4] It was after the event of Tawwib¢n that once more he was set free while mediated by his sister's husband, 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar.

The atmosphere predominant on penintents's army was purely mingled with determination of repentance. **فتنادي الناس من كل جانب: انا لا نطلب الدنيا وليس لها خرجنا**[5] **"**The voice heard from the four corners of the army was, neither do we seek for this worldly life, nor do we revolt for its sake."

At this time, Marwin who had overcome ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays in Damascus dispatched troops to Iraq. Quite evident that Tawwib¢n could in no way resist against them. Changing his former position, the governor of K£fa sent a message to Sulaymin to wait for his army to battle together against 'Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid.[6] His later position was on account of the critical menace Damascus had for °idjiz and with Tawwib ¢n's defeat, the invasion to Iraq was incontrovertible. It was not admitted by Sulaymin. After leaving K£fa in the middle of the way they received a letter from the governor repeating the same proposal. Sulaymin declined again. He had said that if acquiescing to collaboration, troops would disperse. According to him it would additionally result in Zubayr's sovereignty and subsequent to the victory, they would be obliged to battle for 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr and it

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. IV, p. 499. See also Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 207; Tadjirib al-Uman, vol. II, p.98

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, p.208

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, pp. 452-453; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, p. 208

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. IV, p. 450

[5]. Ibid. vol. IV, p. 453

[6]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.III, p.455

was a deviation in a real sense of word. Not once did defeat obsess Sulaymin and his followers. They would embrace martyrdom. They had pledged if they won they would transfer the rule to those entitled.[1] With this way of reasoning, allying with Ibn Zubayr was not rational at all.

Tawwib¢n first set out to K£fa but en route a number of fellow-travellers seceded from the group.[2]They paid tribute to Imim °usayn's tomb and while sedding tears they entreated Allih to forgive them. Later, they farewelled the martyred Imim one by one[3] and went to Dja¥i¥a and then to Anbir and the district of of ¯ud£r. Since their destination was Damascus, they went to H¢t and then to Qirq¢siyi''. It was where Zufar Ibn °irith, among Marwin's opponents succeeding the internal disputes in Damascus, welcomed Tawwib¢n with open arms. Equipping them, he provided them with adequate information about the combat Zone. Then they moved to Damascus. Re-highlighting repentence, Sulaymin Ibn ¯urad made speeches once more and reiterated that their behavior towards the wounded and captives in Damascus should be like that of Imim 'Al¢ (a).

While it was not too distant to the enemy's position, Musayyib Ibn Nudjba along with a few Tawwib¢ns as the vanguards launched an ambush which put the opposite vanguard to flight and supplied them with loot. Afterwards, the two armies were pit against each other. The Umayya rival recommended that they bow to 'Abd al-Malik, Marwin's son, at the present time that he was dead. In return, Tawwib ¢n's recommendation as Shi'ite Muslims was that they hand over 'Abd al-Malik due to the slaughter he had made. And later they could both take an action against 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr, oust him and then, **نُرد الأمر ألي أهل بيت نبيَنا الذين أتانـا اللـه مـن قبلهـم بالنعمَـة والكرامـة**[4] **"**They leave the

---

[1]. Ibid. Vol.III, p.459; See Tadjirib al-umam, Vol.II, p.103

[2]. Some one thousand went back; See Ansib al-ashrif, Vol.V, p.209, as narrated by Ibn A'tham, they were 3300 when encountering, Vol.VI, p.8

[3]. al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p.89

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.464; Ansib al-ashrif, Vol.V, p.210; Tadjirib al-umam, Vol.II, p.109 and Ibn A'tham has said, هلم الي طاعة اهل بيت النبوة **"**Hasten to obey the Prophet's Household" Al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p.82

authority in the custody of prophet's Household, the ones through whom Allih bestows His mercy and blessings."

Naturally neither of them acceded to, however.

The clashes were triggered off. First day was a mischance for the foe, but since fresh troops were regularly being dispatched next days, the pressure exerted on Tawwib¢n was gradually being intensified. On the second day eight thousand soldiers commanded by Shura¦b¢l Ibn Dhi l-Kili' joined °usayn Ibn Numayr's twelve- thousand-soldier army.[1] The third day battle led to Sulaymin's and then Musayyib's martyrdom. After a short time 'Abd Allih Ibn Wil who was supposed to command succeeding them achieved martyrdom as well. Later on describing whom he had killed, his murderer stated that he was said to be one of the Iraqi religious jurisprudents who, **كانوا يكثرون الصوم والصلاة ويفتون الناس "**performed so many prayers, observed so many fasts and issued Islamic verdicts among people."

The other commander of Tawwib¢n, 'Abd Allih Ibn Sa'd, was also martyred. Only when it was Rufi'a Ibn Shaddid's turn, did he retreat overnight to Iraq.

Though the Shi'ite Muslims of Ctesiphon and Ba¥ra were assumed to join them, they could not reach in time. While nearly a hundred and seventy Shi'ite Muslims from Ctesiphon and three hundred from Ba¥ra led by Makhraba Ibn Muthanni had been moving towards Tawwib¢n, they encountered the few-survived of them withdrawing and then returned with them.[2] Corresponding to what Balidhur¢ has reported, the Shi'ite Muslims of Ba¥ra had joined Tawwib¢n nearby Imim °usayn's tomb[3] It appears not to be true. As a consequence, their movement bore no tangibly fruitful results.

Here Some Points Merit Attention as Regards to the penitents

A. In the light of the foregoing proofs, Tawwib¢n's religious ideology can be easily measured. Their beliefs were based on a ideological Shi'ism the most central pillar of

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.460

[2]. Tadjirib al-umam, vol.II, pp.111, 112; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.470

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol. V, p. 211

which was belief in Imamate. Devolving the leadership of the community upon Ahl al-Bayt was what had been time after time flashing among their remarks. Conforming to Imim ‘Al ¢’s lifestyle additionally confirms such ideology-based Shi‘ism.

B. Another point was the psychological manner Tawwib ¢n had found. They were amongst the ones who did not participate in Karbali event for whatever reason but when they came to their senses it was too late, for the Prophet’s descendant had been tragically martyred and his captive family had been forced to traverse in K£fa. The K£fiyins were severely reproached by Zaynab. Umm Kulth£m and Imim Sadjdjid(a). The outcome of the event as well as Ahl al-Bayt’s such reactions generated feeling of sin for the K£fiyins and then it was their guilty conscience which distressed them the most and it was in view of the fact that they were those who had invited Imim to K£fa.

The one and the only dose being able to soothe their agony was obliterating the psychological side-effects of sin. One of the ways for cleansing themselves was wiping off Imim’s assassins; however, it was never as sweet as martyrdom. They felt that in order to tranquilize themselves even with killing his assassins, their misstep of default could not be compensated. Totally conscious of the greatest number of the army leaving Damascus accompanied by Ibn Ziyid, scarcely ever did they hesitate about the struggle. Tawwib¢n’s assessment of the current status quoin K£fa was by no means politically precise. Less determining was planning on conquering K£fa, murdering °usayn’s murderers and equipping Iraq against Damascus in their opinion. These are all what were pursued by Mukhtir later.

The only precious thing was repentance for them. A kind of repentance which could solely be accomplished through nothing but martyrdom. At the last moments of war when Rufi‘a said, **انـي لا أريـد، أريـد لقـاء ربـي واللحـاق بـاخواني والخروج من الدنيا الـى الاخـرة** “What we yearn for is not what you seek. Meeting our Lord, reunifying our brethren and farewelling this world are our wishes.”

In an attack, he was murdered later. ’Abd Allih Ibn ‘Az¢z Kind¢ who had left his child in the custody of those from Kind in Damascus launched an attack from the other side and

then achieved martyrdom.[1] Kurayb Ibn Zayd °imyar¢ together with a hundred people heedless of Rufi‘a’s order did not retreat.

He had said, “I have learned that a group is set to return, but **“لا أولي هذا العدّو ظهري حتى أرد موارد اخواني** I neverever turn my back to the foe so that I can reunify my brothers.”

Dhi l-Kili‘, a Damascus commander, gave him guarantee of clemency since they were both from °imyar originally.

Nevertheless Kurayb responded, **انا قد كنّا آمنين من الدنيا، انّما خرجنا نطلب أمان الاخرة “**We have been in peace and quiet in this world, we have come for we search for a peacefuand quiet life in the world hereafter.”[2]

The utterances and verses of poems narrated from Tawwib¢n in the course of attacks against Damascus army entirely denote the concept of repentance and the manifestation thereof in departing this world and attaining martyrdom. From the incipient stage of the battle, Sulaymin Ibn ¯urad yelled out, **يا شيعة آل محمد! فوالله ما بينكم وبين الشهادة ودخول الجّنة والراحة من هذا الدنيا الا فراق الانفس والتوبة والوفاء بالعهد “**O Shi‘ite Muslims of Mu¦ammad’s family! Not a short distance is there between you and martyrdom, your entrance to the Heaven and being released from this worldly life except sublimating your souls, repenting and fulfilling your pledge.”

In a poem he had said,

اليك ربي تبت عن ذنوبي وقد علاني في الوري شيبي

فارحم عبيداً غير ما تكذيب واغفرذنوبي سيدي وحوبي

“O My Lord, I beg for forgiveness for my sins whereas where as my old age has made me conspicuous. While not denying me, pardon your servant and have mercy on him, the sinner.”

‘Abd Allih Ibn Sa‘d has composed,

ارحم الهي عبدك التوابا ولا تواخذه فقد أنابا

---

[1]. Ibid. vol. IV, p.469

[2]. Ibid. vol. IV, p.469

لا كوفة يبقي ولا عـراقا لا بل يريـد الموت والعتاقـا[3]

"O my God! Have mercy on your penitent servant. Take not him to task for he has repented. No longer is he after K£fa or Iraq. He is merely after death and freedom."

Rufi'a Ibn Shaddid also has composed,

يارب اني تائب اليكا قد اتكلت شدتي عليكا[2]

"My Lord! Not only have I repent but also I have trusted in you."

While ¯akhr Ibn °udhayfa was in battle with thirty of his cousins, he said,

الى الله من الذنب أفرّ أنوي ثواب الله فيما قد اسر[3]

"I run away from sins to Allih my only intention is nothing but Allih's reward."

MUKHTªR'S UPRISING (66, 67 A.H.)

Mukhtir has been Ab£ 'Ubayd Thaqaf¢ whose fame thanks to his valor in Muslim Arab's first attacks against the Iranians as Muslim's commander. He was martyred in the event of Djisr while at the helm.

The ever-first Mukhtir's bad record inscribed in Islamic history had been his non-Shi'ites behavior towards Imim °asan (a). When Imim was wounded in Sibi§ of Ctesiphon, he resided in the governor's house, Mukhtir's uncle, Mukhtir suggested that he be handed over to Mu'iwiya in order to prove his good will to Mu'iwiya. As soon as his uncle became incensed, Mukhtir became mute.[4]

It is said that for this reason Mukhtir had been deemed as 'Uthminids (pro-'Uthmin) in Shi'ites Muslim's view[5] until he allied himself to the Shi'ite Muslims later. Since there were abundant motivations among the Umayya narrators to introduce Mukhtir a hypocrite, a liar and a man with

---

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VI, p. 83

[2]. Ibid. vol.VI, P. 84

[3]. Ibid. vol.5I6, p. 85

[4]. Ibn Sa'd,'Asikir Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, p.154; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.441

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p.214

capricious personality, such a conduct ascribed to Mukhtir must be forged. Undeniable is the fact that prior to the event of Karbali he was among the renowned Shi'ite Muslims of K£fa and when Muslim Ibn 'Aq¢l came K£fa, he sojourned in his house.[1] As no definite time had been determined for the start of uprising, Mukhtir could not manage to assist Muslim when invading Ibn Ziyid's palace and after clashes was arrested and martyred. Out of K£fa was Mukhtir[2] and when returned, he found that Ibn Ziyid had dominated, declared martial law and had put a great number under lock and key in the mosque.

Mukhtir who was unaware of the happenings was apprehended by 'Amr Ibn °urayth. Regarding his old amicable relationship with 'Amr Ibn °urayth, he did his utmost to persuade him to intercede for him with Ibn Ziyid and say that he had surrendered. Nonetheless, Mukhtir was imprisoned and throughout the event of Karbali he was in jail but later 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar acted as an intermediary and released him. Ibn Ziyid offered him a three-day respite to leave K£fa as soon as possible.[3] Normally Mukhtir's activities at odds with the Umayya accounted for Ibn Ziyid's extreme fright. According to narrated accounts, whipping at Ibn Ziyid's behest had led to loss of the use of Mukhtir's one eye.[4]

Travelling to Mecca, Mukhtir had to live in ±i'if for one year where his tribe, Ban£ Thaq¢f, lived. After going back to Mecca, Mukhtir was asked by Ibn Zubayr, the present governor of Mecca, for cooperation. He bet to swear allegiance to him rovided that he took counsel from him in all affairs. At that time, Mecca was under siege by Damascus. Mukhtir also defended the Divine Shrine with the other Muslims side by side so that the rival army could no

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.440; Mab'£th al-°usayn, p.98; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, Vol.IV, p. 22; Ansib al-ashrif, Vol.V, p.215

[2]. Ibn Sa'd, Tardjamat al-imim al-°asan, p.154; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.441

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp.441-442. Ya'q£b¢ has written, وكان مختار أقبل في جماعة يريدون نصر حسين بن علي (ع) فاخذه عبيد الله بن زياد فحسبه "Since Mukhtir was the vanguard of those desiring to help °usayn Ibn 'Al¢; 'Ubayd Allih imprisoned him" Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.58

[4]. al-Mu¦abbar, p.303

more resist and returned. Even a group of Khiridjites were among the participants.[1] Their actions were as a counter to profanity of Damascus army about Ka'ba.

After the siege was raised and the Zubayr-supported ones seized the control of K£fa, Mukhtir went back to K£fa. Ibn Zubayr who had suspected him, ignored him and never allowed him to take up a post. The majority of historians have reported that what had been frequently stressed by Mukhtir succeeding the event of Karbali was taking revenge on °usayn Ibn 'Al¢'s assassins and his likely uprising.[2]

His arrival in K£fa was concurrent with Tawwib¢n's preparation for leaving the town. As far as Sulaymin's long record of service was concerned, Mukhtir could never absorb naturally as much Shi'ite Muslims as he could. However he discredited Sulaymin's action in a way that he explicitly had announced that, **لا علم له بالحروب والسياسة**[3] **"**By no mean is Sulaymin acquainted with war and politics."

Mukhtir's propagation retarded Tawwib¢n's activity. The majority was with Sulaymin whereas only a minority had joined Mukhtir. No alternative existed for Mukhtir except awaiting patiently until Tawwib¢n decide.[4] Upon Sulaymin's departure from the town, Imim °usayn's assassins, fearful of Mukhtir, compelled the governor, pro-Zubayr, to put him in prison. This measure was adopted irrespective of all pressures the Shi'ite Muslims exerted on the governor to consider his past being with Mukhtir and liberate him. Later on, 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar interceded for Mukhtir with Ibn Zubayr and after Shi'ite Muslims' undertaking Mukhtir was set free,[5] Mukhtir was in prison when the news of Tawwib ¢n's defeat and return to K£fa spread through. In a message he offered his condolences to Rufi'a Ibn Shaddid and in addition to wishing blessing for Sulaymin's soul and complementing his character, he urged the survived to prepare for an uprising. He invited them towards the divine Book, the Prophet's Sunna, revenge for Ahl al-Bayt's blood, defense of the oppressed and Djihid against Mu¦ill¢n, those

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢,vol.IV, p.446

[2]. Ibid. vol.IV, p.443

[3]. Ibid. vol.IV, pp.434 -449

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VI, p.56

[5]. al-Fut£¦, Vol.V, p.74; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.488

going beyond the sacred limits of Islam and converting °arim (unlawful) into °alil (lawful).[1]

In 66, K£fa governor was ousted by ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr and ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu§¢‘ was appointed in place. Since the inception, the new governor announced that he would follow the policies of the second and the third caliphs in economic arena but Si’ib Ibn Milik Ash‘ar¢ Stimulated by Mukhtir objected to him as insisting “Except ‘Al¢’s policy nothing ought to be followed”.[2]

Mukhtir secretly had been keeping on his activities. Holding clandestine meetings, he gathered the Shi‘ite Muslims together to absorb while introducing himself as Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya’s representative. Although it had drawn the Shi‘ite Muslims’ attention to him, it had also evoked their doubt whether Mukhtir was truthful calling himself Mu¦ammad’s representative! In order to make certain, they reached a decision to go to Medina and meet him. Leaving the town for Medina, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Shuray¦ accompanying a group met Ibn °anafiyya privately and asked him about his position concerning Mukhtir. Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya supported Mukhtir implicitly and ambiguously and said, **أما ما ذكرتم من دعاء من دعاكم الي الطلب بدمائنا فوالله لوددت أنّ الله انتصر لنا من عدوّنا بمن شاء من خلقه**[3] **“**About what you mentioned that someone has summoned you to rise up in revenge for Ahl al-Bayt’s blood, by Almighty Allih I desire that Allih get our revenge by anyone of His servants He wills.”

Nothing more did Ibn °anafiyya add; therefore, they returned. Other Shi‘ite Muslims came up to them questioning about his content or discontent. Ibn Shuray¦ replied that they asked his opinion and he, **فأمرنا بمظاهرته**[4] **“**commanded us to back him” and **وأذن لنا في نصرتك**[5] **“**allowed us to back him.”

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp. 471, 478; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 212

[2]. al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p. 88; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, pp. 220-221

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 399; al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp. 91, 92, 93

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 221

[5]. See al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p. 95; describing his father, he had said, **وهو سيد الناس في محبة اهل البيت (ع)** “His affection for the Household was the strongest among people”

Such approval impelled those skeptical about banding together with Mukhtir by then to join him.

Mukhtir determined to consolidate his social bases via the advocacy of a number of chiefs of tribes endeavored to trace authoritative figures. Among them was Ibrih¢m Ibn Ashtar, Milik Ashtar's son, who was esteemed both for his father's reputation in Shi'ism and his intrepidity and influence on the Nakha'¢tes of K£fa. Following the negotiations he had with Ibrih¢m, Mukhtir succeeded in attracting his attention and fortifying his position in K£fa through him though Ibrih¢m detached himself from him later.

Wednesday night on Rabi' al-Awwal, 14th, 66, it was prearranged, was the promised day for triggering off the attack and rescuing the town from the yoke of Zubayr followers. 'Abd Allih Ibn Mu§¢' who had learned Mukhtir's possible insurrectoin had previously commanded to keep the town under tight security and impose a curfew. Keeping such news unrevealed was something beyond any possibility. From the very beginning he had been told that a large number of Turibiyya have sworn allegiance to Mukhtir.[1]

It could be two days to duedate when a group headed by Ibrih¢m encountered and then came into clashes with troops sent by K£fa governor. Decapitating Iyis Ibn Mu¤irib, police chief, Ibrih¢m flourished to disperse them. They had to, it was evident, take the action prematurely. By chanting the slogans of, **يا منصور أمت** "O Man¥£r, kill the enemy!" (rehearsed by Muslims during the wars in Early Islamic Era) and **يا لثارات حسين** "O revengers for °usayn's blood!" In line with which had ever been Mukhtir's movement, Shi'ite Muslims joined him. As narrated by Ibn A'tham, **وجعل يخرج الناس من كل ناحية علي صعب وذلول**[2] "Despite all complications, Muslims were joining him from everywhere."

Ibrih¢m's parties marched through the town to prompt the Shi'ite Muslims to join them. Mukhtir who considered commencing the war not allowable abiding by Imim 'Al¢'s conduct had forewarned Ibrih¢m not to be the beginner.[3]

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p. 99. the Umayya and later pro-Zubayr people's intention of calling the Shi'ite Muslims "Turibiya" was usually disparaging them.

[2]. al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p.105

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.498

Conquering the town by Mukhtir's forces led to various clashes.[1] In the face of 'Abd Allih Ibn Mu§¢'s' crowded army (some twenty thousand soldiers)[2], Mukhtir could assume control of K£fa as a governor with his small army, a fifth as many as the rival's.

Throughout the battle the leaders in Mukhtir's army ceaselessly inspirited the Shi'ite Muslims to combat as mightily as possible. What Yaz¢d Ibn Anas or Milik Ibn Si'ib Ash'ar¢ had been saying was, "O Shi'ite Muslims! Prior to this you were massacred, your limbs were cut up, you were blinded and hung from the branches of palms. All of these tortures were due to your affinity for the prophet's infallible household. They were occurring while you had stayed at homes and complied with your foes. What do you say now? If they overpower you, in the twinkling of an eye no one of you will remain alive at least."[3]

With Rash¢d Ibn Iyis Ibn Mu¤irib's murder and the dispersion of the troops commanded by Shabath Ibn Rib'¢, the palace was eventually besieged by Mukhtir's adherents. 'Abd Allih Ibn Mu§¢' after spending three days left the palace in secret and others also raised the white flag seeking a guarantee of clemency.

The noblemen, the most influential class in K£fa, had compromised with the Umayya prior to Zubayr-appointed person's coming but later afraid of Shi'ite Muslims as well as their rule, joined forces with Ibn Zubayr's followers.[4] Such a class was also followed by many in its turn. Unlike Tawwib ¢n, whose troops were wholly Arabs, Mukhtir's were often Iranian and non-Iranian masters. A throng of Arabs later joined him, furthermore. The aforesaid masters were those who on the one hand had memorably and pleasantly experienced Imim 'Al¢'s Islamic and human conduct and on the other hand had endured the Umayya and the affiliated noblemen's pressure from 40A.H. It was why they were after a golden opportunity to modify their unbearable situation in the society and extricate themselves from the abjectness. Mukhtir's emergence was reciprocally beneficial to both the

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p.103

[2]. al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p.106; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.VI, pp.108, 109

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.503; al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, pp.108,109

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.507

masters to attain influence through him and Mukhtir to remove the enemy through their aid.

In the morning of the day thereon the battle was due to start, Shabath Ibn Rib‘¢ recited the short S£ra (Qur’inic chapters).

Being objected, he responded, “You see how Daylamites are standing before you and now you expect me to recite “the cow” and “‘Imrin’s family” S£ra (the longest of all)”.[1]

When all were fleeing, Shabath addressed them as saying, **أأنتم من عبيدكم تهربـون**[2] **“**Are you escaping from your own slaves?” “So acutely did the noble detested the masters that they murdered anyone captured but set the Arab ones free.”[3] It is recorded by D¢nwar¢ that almost all members of Mukhtir’s army in the battle with Damascus were Iranian masters.[4]

Describing Mukhtir’s soldiers, the commander of the Damascus army stated, “O dwellers of Damascus! You do battle with slaves, those who had abandoned Islam and seceded from it, have no piety and speak not Arabic”.[5]

Mu¦ammad Ibn Ash‘ath, a nobleman, who had fled to Ba¥ra told Mu¥‘ab, “Turks and Daylamites are all behind me”.[6] A year later when the noble and Ibn Zubayr’s supporters came into power in the town, Mu¥‘ab issued the decree to wipe out the masters, for their blasphemousness was made public, their conceit had heightened and their humility before the Arabs had reduced.[7] Earlier it was quoted from Mugh¢ra that if non-Arabs had been summoned towards Mu¦ammad’s family and to a revenge for their blood, all would have congregated.[8] The victor was Mukhtir.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.501; al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p.107; "Daylamites" was a title for Iranian non-Muslims though the masters were Muslims mostly. This term was used by Muslim Arabs describing them as disbelievers in order to disdain them.

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.502; al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p.108

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.502

[4]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.293, see also p.306

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.516

[6]. al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p.138

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, Vol.V, p.294; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.577

[8] . Ansib al-ashrif, Vol.V, p.223

A number of noblemen ran away to Ba¥ra and some others secluded themselves at homes awaiting for divine predestination which came forth after a while.

The people of K£fa swore allegiance to Mukhtir as an emir. Based on his Shi'ites belief he said, "Subsequent to swearing allegiance to 'Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib (a) and his family worthier than this one, I have sworn allegiance to no one else."[1] He enumerated what based on which their allegiance should be as, the divine Book, the Prophet's Sunna, revenge for Ahl al-Bayt's assassinations, Djihid against those transgressing the sacred limits, defense of the oppressed, a battle against the one battling them and a compromise with the one compromising with them.[2]

Mukhtir who had taken the power first of all made an attempt to establish national security. Then he eliminated all the elements playing negative roles in Karbali. To absorb the nobles, he initially was so merciful to them that was suspected by the masters.[3] Nevertheless, referring to the point that his position-taking is in line with that of theirs, Mukhtir enlightened the masters declaring that such a behavior is transient.[4] K£fa was deemed as a center for all cities in oriental Islamic lands and Northern Iraq. Such areas as M£¥il, °ulwin (adjacent to Sar Pul Dhahib), Ctesiphon as well as Armenian lands, ªdharbiydjin, Arrin, °awrin, Mihiyin, Riy and I¥fahin were ruled by Iraq.

Mukhtir's endeavor for keeping K£fa secure did not last long as he learned that an army led by 'Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid had left Damascus to K£fa. The army succeeding to defeating Tawwib¢n and after a short break for clashing with Qays Ibn 'Aylin's tribe set out to M£¥il.[5]

During the armed conflict between the three-thousand-soldier army dispatched by Mukhtir and 'Ubayd Allih's six-thousand-soldier army, Rabi'a Ibn Mukhiriq, a commander, was killed and three hundred people were captured by

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.508

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.508; Ibn A'tham, Vol.VI, p.115

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.508

[4]. Ibid. Vol.IV, p.509

[5]. Narrated by Ibn A'tham, Vol.VI, p.139; following its clash with Mukhtir, the army of Damascus returned and again in order to conquer Iraq, it set out to Djaz¢ra and then to M£¥il.

Mukhtir's army. It was obvious however that these few numbers could never resist against the rival army. Accordingly Mukhtir sent another group with seven thousand people headed by Ibrih¢m Ibn Ashtar as a relief group.

Under no circumstances were the noble gratified with Mukhtir's governorship. It was firstly owing to Mukhtir's intention had been avenging °usayn Ibn 'Al¢'s assassins among whom were the noble as central elements. Secondly, regarding his limited Shi'ites forces in K£fa, Mukhtir had begun inviting the masters for cooperation and it as a matter of fact was equal to belittling the noblemen. When determined to reprove Mukhtir, there was nothing to be more intolerable than the booties he had devoted to Mawil¢ (freed slaves).[1]

Such objections were all made in Shabath Ibn Rib'¢'s house.The deduction drawn was Shabath's visit with Mukhtir.

Meeting Mukhtir, he said, ... **وأعظم الأشياء عليك أنـكّ عمدت إلى عبيدنا وهم فيئنا الذين أفاء الله بهم فأخذتهم إليك ثم لم ترض بأخذهم حتى جعلتهم شركاء في فيئنا ولايحل لـك فـي هـذا دينـك ولا يحمـل بـك فـي شـرفك**[2] "Your biggest shortcoming is that you rely upon our slaves, those whose looties belong to us. And you deprived us of what Allih had bestowed us. It did not suffice you however, you also let them share in Bayt al-Mil. What you did was thoroughly contrary to both your religion and dignity."

The nobles' ultimatum was that they would never stop protesting unless Mukhtir committed to return Mawil¢ to them.

In return for their request, Mukhtir requested something about declining of which by the noblemen he was certain, it was whether they would declare their readiness to battle beside him against the Umayya and Ibn Zubayr or not.[3] Shabath who went to bring their answer never came back and it denoted that the noble were set to revolt.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.518

[2]. Ibid. Vol.VI, p.146

[3]. Ibid. Vol.VI, p.146

The other reproof was about Mukhtir's and his followers' Shi'ism, that they all loathe **"اسـلافنا الصـالحين** Our competent forefathers."[4]

What they implied might had been that the Shi'ite Muslims reproached many of the Prophet's companions (for the deviations caused by them).

For consultation, the nobles went to 'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Mikhnaf, warning them not to combat Mukhtir, he added, "All the valorous of the tribes are with him and moreover Mawil¢ who are as lion-hearted as Arabs and as revengeful as non-Arabs are with him". He urged them to await pending the arrival of troops from Ba¥ra (Ibn Zubayr) or Damascus. They balked at his proposal in view of the fact that at that time the majority of Mukhtir's adherents in particular Ibrih ¢m Ibn Ashtar had left the town for M£¥il. They imagined that it was a favorable occasion to win a victory over Mukhtir.

No sooner had the army commanded by Ibrih¢m arrived in Ctesiphon than a wave of rioting was triggered off. As soon as Mukhtir noticed that the situation was critical, he sent for Ibrih¢m to return K£fa. In order to keep them occupied, he himself began futile negotiations with the insurgents.[2] One day to Ibrih¢m's entry, the clasnes flared up. Both Ibrih¢m's haste to return and Mukhtir's withstanding led to Mukhtir's triumph and the nobles' debacle. In this war, Mukhtir's army sustained 135 casualties whereas it was 640 for the foe.

The nobles' insurrection made Mukhtir, who had taken no action in revenge for Ahl al-Bayt's blood hopeful about absorbing the nobles, adopt a measure. His first action was the killing of 284 captives seized in the war with the nobles. Reported by eye-witnesses, they had been among the participants in Karbali.

Mukhtir announced then, **إنه من أغلق با به فهو آمـن الا رجلا شـرك فـي دم آل محمـد (ص)** "Anyone staying at his home is secure unless he has aided and abetted the ones streaming the prophet's descendants' blood."

The noblemen, who were confident that Mukhtir would beyond the shadow of a doubt apprehend and slaughter

---

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.518

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.VI, p.149

them this time, fled to Ba¥ra and another group concealed themselves in K£fa. Mukhtir had promulgated, **ما من ديننا ترك قوم قتلوا الحسين يعيشون أحياء في الارض "**Permitting °usayn's assassins to go on living freely on the earth is never ever passable in our religion."

Its implication was their murder. Recollecting those collaborating in Karbali, Mukhtir's supporters brought them to him one after another. He also cut the arms of some and the legs of some others in order to kill them.[1] It is estimated that the men charged with participating in the event of Karbali were approximately three thousand.[2] Among the figures targeted was Shimr Ibn Dhi l-Djawshan who was murdered by Mukhtir's envoys while escaping to Ba¥ra. As a rule of thumb, 'Umar Ibn Sa'd Ibn Ab¢ Waqqi¥, the commander, pleaded guilty as the main culprit. From the outset of his responsibility- when busy with absorbing the nobles-Mukhtir had given a guarantee of clemency to him stipulating that he were secure provided that he should under no conditions attend an incident against him, **الا أذا أحد ث حاد ث**. In the throes of recent adventures when he was arrested too, he showed his guarantee of clemency. He was said,nevertheless, that the stipulated condition could include any incident even flight of a pigeon or entry and exit from house!

Not only 'Umar Ibn Sa'd's doom was death but also his son was killed as well. The heads of both were sent to Medina. The former one was in revenge for Imim °usayn's blood and the latter for 'Al¢ Akbar's, the eldest son.[3] Narratedly, it was the one and the only day Imim Sadjdjid (a) was seen smiling,[4] since he had always been with a sorrowful expression weeping up to that very time. Both ±abar¢ and Ibn A'tham have recounted the murders of various individuals in detail.

The latest phenomena drew certain boundaries. Shi'ite Muslims seceded from other parties completely. For the time

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, p.343 ('Izz al-d¢n publication) أمّا أمان المختار لعمر بن سعد الا أن بحدث حدثاً فأنّه كان يريد به أذا دخل الخلاء واحدث ...

[2]. Ibid. Vol.VI, p.139

[3]. al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p.123

[4]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, Vol.II, p.259

being, Mukhtir's support was merely the Shi'ite Muslims although he had been striving to absorb from al parties. In the opposite front were the Umayya adherents in addition to Ibn Zubayr's devotees. Their number was not low. Many traveled to Ba¥ra and many others stayed looking forward to a golden opportunity. At the same time, Mukhtir intended to intensify his efforts to engross the attention.

Giving a description of Mukhtir's conduct, the historians stated, ... **وكان مختار أوّل من ظَهَر أحسن شيءٍ سيرة تالفاً للناس**[1] **"**He was the first one behaving in the best way. He invariably prompted people to befriend one another."

According to Ibn A'tham, **وأحبّه الناس حُباً شديداً**[2] **"**People were attached to him."

Balidhur¢ narrated, **وأحسن المختار مجاورة أهل الكوفـة والسيرة فيهم** [3] **"**Mukhtir was the best for the K£fiyins with his best conducts."

It definitively was concerned with the Shi'ite Muslims not those with whom Mukhtir was wrathful. In regard to this reason it is said, **كان عبد الله بن جعدة أكرم خلق الله علي المختار لقرابته من عليٍّ (ع)**[4] "'Abd Allih Ibn Dju'da was held dear by Mukhtir on account of his kinship with 'Al¢ (a)."

Having resolved the internal points at issue through suppression of the noble and the ones affiliated to the Umayya and Ibn Zubayr, Mukhtir anticipated how to broaden the realm of his governorship.

Ba¥ra known as a haven for the fugitives from K£fa and a stronghold for the pro-Ibn Zubayr persons in Iraq had drawn Mukhtir's attention but it could naturally be a focal point of potential peril. His action might have been in a bid to absorb the Shi'ite Muslims there although few. The leader of such Shi'ite Muslims was Makhraba Ibn Muthanni who had assisted the penitents but could not arrive at the battle in time. Swearing allegiance to Mukhtir, he was commissioned to proceed and incite the people in Ba¥ra to a riot against Ibn Zubayr. In Ba¥ra, Muthanni gathered a group from his

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.53

[2]. al-Fut£¦, Vol.VI, p.120

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, Vol.V, pp.228-229; Maqidas¢ narrated that Mukhtir had done his best to absorb as many people as possible. See also, al-Bad' wa l-tir¢kh, Vol.VI, p.22.

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.531

tribe along with other residents. In a clash, nearly forty soldiers from Muthanni's army were dead. Later on, with A¦naf Ibn Qays's intercession, Muthanni could return K£fa with his a few-remained people.[1]

Another spot which had become center of Mukhtir's attention was °idjiz, namely Ibn Zubayr's main base. At that time an attack by Damascus from Wasidi al-Quri was imminent. Mukhtir plotted to send an army to exercise control over Medina under the pretext of obviating the threat of Damascus. Ibn Zubayr consented. A three-thousand-member army of which seven hundred were only Arabs[2] set out to °idjiz. Ibn Zubayr, by no means over confident about Mukhtir, dispatched an army to Medina recommending that they should get along with them on the condition that they were convinced to be supervised; otherwise, it was imperative that they be suppressed immediately. On the other hand, Mukhtir, reluctant to unvail his real scheme, recommended the commander that a message dash carrier take his mandates to them when convenient.

Prior to the communication of Mukhtir's mandates, Ibn Zubayr's army clashed with Mukhtir's. By virtue of the fact that they did not yield to Ibn Zubayr's army as the commander they were assaulted. Many were killed and many had to flee. Mukhtir's genuine intention which wPas revealed, later in his letter to Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya was, **"فإني بعثت إليك جنداً ليذلّوا لك الأعداء وليحـوزوا لـك البلاد** I sent my army for the purpose of overthrowing your opponents and conquer the land."

The letter did manifest that his aim had been eliminating Ahl al-Bayt's foes and liberating °idjiz for the Shi'ite Muslims'sovereignty. Responding the letter for asking his permission to deploy a large army to Medina, in addition to lauding him and his intent, Ibn °anafiyya wrote, "If I were bent on combating, there would be many a person ready to join me but I have secluded myself."[3]

Afterwards when Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya and a group from the Hishimites were in Mecca, Ibn Zubayr aimed to

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, pp.536, 537

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.542

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, Vol.III, p.282

secure allegiance from them menacingly. Demurring, they were threatened to be imprisoned and burned to death. How dauntless! Ibn Zubayr had realized that without their allegiance consolidation of his sovereignty over other lands would be beyond the realm of possibility. The other side of the coin was that their allegiance might unstablize Mukhtir's position as Mu¦ammad °anafiyya's representative in K£fa.

Once 'Urwa Ibn Zubayr, the pretender to religious jurisprudence, was objected in this regard, he reacted as stating, "My brother's intention is to establish unity and to avert discord among Muslims". It was exactly as 'Umar Ibn Kha§§ib secured allegiance from the Hishimites for Ab£ Bakr by laying logs on their doorsteps.[1] Ibn °anafiyya who felt the status insecure wrote to Mukhtir to help them out.[2] Mukhtir dispatched nearly one hundred and fifty people group by group, in order not to be identified, to Mecca to emancipate the Hishimites with no clash with the slogan of, **يا لثارات حسين**[3]

They moved to Zamzam wherein the prison was located and released them after all. Both Ibn Zubayr and the sent group by Mukhtir refrained from any conflict which would certainly culminate in bloodshedding in Divine Shrine. Since this group had entered Mecca with sticks (not swords) had been named "Khashabiyya".[4]

Mukhtir's the most remarkable action was his confrontation with the army of Damascus. It occurred between Mukhtir's dispatched army led by Ibrih¢m Ibn Ashtar and an army commanded by 'Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid. A great number of prominent leaders of Damascus taken part in various battles against Iraq so far were killed during the fight among whom were 'Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid, °usayn Ibn Numayr Suk£n¢ and Shura¦b¢l Ibn Dhi l-Kili'. The remaining of the army while limping and running away wandered through M£¥il.

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, Vol.III, p. 282

[2]. Ibid. Vol.II, p. 283; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.250

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.282

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.IV, p.455; Mur£dj al-dhahab, Vol.III, p.99; Ansib al-ashrif, Vol.III, p.285; Vol.V, p.231, it has been said that they had taken the logs being repaired for burning Ibn °anafiyya and others from the Hishimites by Ibn Zubayr.

The K£fiyin fugitives were the main elements causing Mu¥‘ab Ibn Zubayr’s invasion to K£fa. Through incitement, they could flourish to impel Mu¥‘ab Ibn Zubayr to suppress Mukhtir and the K£fa into control too. Such individuals as Mu¦ammad Ibn Ash‘ath Ibn Qays, one of Imim °usayn’s assassins, were among the commanders of Ibn Zubayr’s troops while attacking K£fa. Excluding them there were a number delegated to propagate against Mukhtir amongst people.[1] Ibrih¢m Ibn Ashtar, governing M£¥il, did never declare his readiness to return to K£fa and back Mukhtir, furthermore. Reassuring how the fugitive noblemen had prompted other sinners to uproot the right and let the wrong replace it, Mukhtir attempted to mobilize the K£fiyin.[2] When both rivals met one another face to face, those on Ibn Zubayr’s side proposed that Mukhtir’s forces relinguish fighting by swearing allegiance to ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr as “Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n”. Those on Mukhtir’s side also urged them to swear allegiance to Mukhtir and entrust “the Messenger’s family” with the caliphate.[3]

At this juncture, the commander of pro-Ibn Zubayr soldiers was Muhallab Ibn Ab¢ ¯ufra and Mukhtir’s was A¦mar Ibn Shumay§. Mu¦ammad Ibn Ash‘ath was the commander of the fugitives from K£fa to Ba¥ra. The clashes terminated in Ibn Zubayr’s favor which preceded Mukhtir’s and his follower’s martyrdom.

Earlier we provided you with plentiful evidence averring Mukhtir’s and his adherents’ belief in Shi‘ism as well as their indescribable devotion to Ahl al-Bayt in a way that it is by all means beyond any doubt historically. Moreover there are available proofs indicating Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya’s support which thoroughly substantiates Mukhtir’s uprising, relative, however. Mukhtir’s personal standing taken in revenge for the Umayya and the noble elucidates how he jeopardized his position with apprehension and murder of Imim °usayn’s assassins.

Inasmuch as he struck the Umayya hard for several times and also called the legitimacy of Ibn Zubayr’s governorship into question, they exerted themselves to make him the

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 559

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢. vol.IV, p. 559

[3]. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 560

target of any kind of charges at all costs. The accusations were his claim of "Prophethood" for himself, "Mahdavitism" for Ibn °anafiyya, founding the sect of the K¢ssanids and the most common one was the label of "liar" (Kadhdhib) which has been referred to in all sources.[1] Almost all of these accusations, in accordance with a researcher, were ascribed to Mukhtir after his martyrdom[*].

Assuming that Mukhtir had committed some errors but it ought to be borne in mind that the pivotal factor in his indictment had been thanks to the strokes the Umayya and Ibn Zubayr had experienced on the part of him.

As soon as the news of Mukhtir's martyrdom was heard, Ibn Zubayr informed Ibn 'Abbis, **ألم يبلغك قتل الكذاب "**Have you heard not the news of the liar's death?"

"The liar?" asked Ibn 'Abbis.

"Mukhtir, I mean", Ibn Zubayr replied. "It seems that you do not feel like calling him the liar".

Ibn 'Abbis said, **ذلك رجل قتل قتلتنا وطلب بدمائنا وشفى صدورنا وليس جزاءه منا الشتم والشماتة**[2] **"**He is the one who had killed our assassins, has taken revenge for our blood and has soothed our pains. The reward of such a person in our sight is not insulation."

Elsewhere when once more the name of Mukhtir was mentioned before Ibn 'Abbis, he said, **صلى عليه كرام الكاتبون**[3] **"**The two illustrious writers send their regards to him."

It is reported that Ibn 'Abbis, Ibn °anafiyya and even Ibn 'Umar never returned Mukhtir's sent presents.[4]

Once 'Ubayd Allih's head was carried to 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn (a) in Medina, he stated, **لم يبق من بني هاشم أحد إلا قام بخطبة في الثناء علي المختار والدعاء له وجميل القول فيه "**There was no one from the Hishimites who did not make a sermon complimenting Mukhtir and praying for him."

Kashsh¢ has quoted Imim Biqir (a) as saying, **لا تسبّوا المختار فانّه قتل قتلتنا وطلب ثارنا وزوّج ارامنا وقسّم فينا**

---

[1]. See 'Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.V, p. 300

[*]. Hadgson, How did the early shia become sectarian?, p. 3.

[2].Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.287; Vol.V, p.265

[3]. Ibid. Vol.V, p.267

[4]. Ibid. Vol.V, p.270

المال علي العسرة[1] **"**Insult not Mukhtir owing to the fact that he has killed our assassins, has taken revenge on them, has had our orphans marry and contributed us financially when in trouble."

As commented by himself, Ibn Zubayr who had borne Ahl al-Bayt's grudge for forty years[2] could on no accounts stand Mukhtir's presence whose endeavor was in line with Ahl al-Bayt's governorship. And the Umayya enmity was truly overt how he agitated the leaders of Damascus to battle with Mukhtir.

Sufficient would be if we quote ±abar¢ and others regarding Mukhtir's devotedness. Succeeding his martyrdom, his two wives, one of whom Nu'min Ibn Bash¢r An¥ir¢'s daughter and the other was Samura Ibn Djundab's daughter, were interrogated. They latter confessed that her ideas about him were like those of theirs! However, the former said, **انّه كان عبداً من عباد الله الصالحين "**He was a servant from Allih's pious servants."

Confining her, Mu¥'ab wrote to Ibn Zubayr, "This woman is of the opinion that her husband, Mukhtir, has been a prophet!"

In the answer, 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr commanded him to slay her.[3]

The worst accusation Mukhtir was leveled was his claim to be a prophet. Such a charge is totally baseless. Its roots can be located in an utterance the historians have quoted from Mukhtir mostly in rhymed prose (most of which have been narrated by ±abar¢ and others).[4] Another accusation was that he had introduced himself a diviner and had carried out what the prophets had done.[5] We believe that these remarks do him an injustice although it never implies that he had been infallible.

---

[1]. Ikhtiyir Ma'rifat al-ridjil, p. 125; for other hadiths in this regard, refer to Bahjat al-imil, vol.VII, p.

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p. 291

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 574; Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p. 264; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 99

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, pp. 233, 235, 236

[5]. An example was a narration about "throne". Mukhtir has been quoted as telling his followers a lie, "Bring 'Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib's throne". Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, pp.241,242

Socially, the novelty of Mukhtir's uprising was due to Mawil¢'s presence and except one case which was limited compared with Khiridjites, it was an absolutely new phenomenon. Previous to his uprising, hardly ever did Mawil ¢ have roles in the Arabic society of Iraq though they had been promoted scientifically in the late first century A.H. It was Mukhtir's uprising which cleared the way for the appearance of Mawil¢ as an applicable and considerable force in Iraq. By reason of their participation in Mukhtir's movement, they were severely suppressed, however, they could play an effective role within the community. What many had suggested Mu¥'ab Ibn Zubayr was, **أقتل هولاء الموالي فانهم قد بدء كفرهم وعظم كبرهم وقلّ شكرهم**[1] **"**Massacre all Mawil¢ for they have revealed their disbelief, have heightened their conceit and lessened their gratitude."

Reportedly, six thousands of them were slaughtered by Mu¥'ab!

The Next events pending the extinction of the Umayya dynasty proved that the Iranian Mawil¢s' development had been originated from the time of Mukhtir onwards and their role in the Islamic community reached the pinnacle by coming into power by Ban£ 'Abbis. Deeming them minacious, 'Abd al-Malik planned to avert their likely insurrection through paying much more heed to them. By the same token be enlarged their proportion of Bayt al-Mil more than what allotted by Mu'iwiya.[2]

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV. P.577

[2]. al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.IV, p.148

CHAPTER IX
IMªM SADJDJªD (A)

IMªM SADJDJªD(A)

'Al¢ Ibn °usayn Ibn 'Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib, known as Sadjdjid, the fourth Shi'ites Imim, was as maintained in one narration born in 38A.H. and poisoned by Wal¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik in 94 A.H.[1] If the narrated date of birth be true, Imim should have evidently perceived both Imim 'Al¢ and Imim Mudjtabi as well as Imim °usayn (a) and realized how Mu'iwiya had been exercising pressure on the Shi'ite Muslims living in Iraq and other lands. In the light of the reports narrated from the event of ±aff (Karbali) a number of writers concluded that Imim's age must have been less than what reported ands his year of birth had been 48. Such reports forebode that following Imim °usayn's martyrdom some were determined to assassinate Imim Sadjdjid (a) also, but they were impeded due to his immaturity.

°umayd Ibn Muslim, present in Karbali, said, "When Shimr came to kill Imim Sadjdjid, I dissuaded him saying he was a little boy".[2]

Found in another version when 'Ubayd Allih decided to murder Imim Sadjdjid (a), he commanded to examine the signs of his maturity. After they attested to it, he issued the verdict of his murder. Notwithstanding, Imim managed to change his mind by saying him "If you claim that you are from among the Prophte's kins (as Ab£ Sufyin's grandson), you are obliged to let a man accompany these women to Medina".[3]

---

[1]. al-It¦if bi ¦ubb al-ashrif, p. 143; the date of martyrdom reported by Mas'£d¢ is 95; see also Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 160

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 229 ('Izz al-d¢n publication)

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, p.231

It is also quoted that Zaynab (a) averted Imim Sadjdjid's murder saying "kill me first if you want to kill him".[1] Enumerating the Umayya atrocities, Djiˆi¨ has alluded to their irreverence about Imim Sadjdjid (a) by checking the signs of his maturity after the event of Karbali.[2] Supposing the narration true[3], Imim should have been younger since the maximum age of maturity was fifteen necessitated by the current situation.

Although such kinds of reports are recorded in various sources, there exists many a proof of hand which denies them. First, the renowned historians have recorded Imim's birth in 38, based on which Imim had been twenty-three years of age in the course of Karbali event. Secondly, it had by not means been ignored by the expert historians, from the very beginning they contradicted the common narration the genuineness of which had been confirmed and come into question however.

Mu¦ammad Ibn 'Umar Wiqid¢, a distinguished narrator of the Sunnis, subsequent to a quotation from Imim ¯idiq (a) as saying "'Al¢ Ibn °usayn (a) departed in 58" added that this utterance vindicated that while 23 or 24, Imim Sadjdjid (a) had been with his father in Karbali and those describing him under age are wrong. Imim was seriously ill in Karbali; therefore, he was not able to participate in the war. How could he ever be immature whereas his son, Ab£ Dja'far Mu¦ammad Ibn 'Al¢ Biqir, had met Djibir Ibn 'Abd Allih An¥ir ¢ and quoted hadiths from him. Djibir had passed away in 78 A.H.[4]

Thirdly, the way of Imim Sadjdjid's behaving towards 'Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid and even Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Sufyin corroborates that he had been old enough and to discuss his maturity or immaturity in Karbali looked in vain. The scene set for his delivering sermons on the pulpit, in its turn,

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.V. P.231

[2]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d,Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.XV, p.236

[3]. 'Al¢ Ibn al-°usayn, Sayyid Dja'far Shah¢d¢, pp. 32, 33

[4]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p.222; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XVII, p.256; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p.191. Not only can Djibir's demise be a cogent reason for Imim Biqir's birth before the event of Karbali, although it weakens the probability of his birth after Karbali. Waqid¢'s reasoning has been the report of Imim Biqir's birth not his visit with Djibir.

stemmed from his age as well. Such a ground could have never been prepared by Yaz¢d for an individual whose maturity was open to question.

Fourthly, with a glance at numerous narrations about Imim Biqir's birth in historical books, it can be observed that he had been present in Karbali as a four-year old boy. No one has declared it untrue. If assenting these reports, there is no alternative but admitting the common narration with a two-year-or-so discrepancy.

Three versions that certain figures like Biyhaq¢ have recorded telling Imim's date of birth (33, 36 and 38) are not unconnected to that mentioned above. The former was reported by Ibn 'Asikir.[1] Zuhr¢ also has confirmed that 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn was beside his father in Karbali at the age of twenty-three.[2]

Another controversial issue the analysis where of would bear fruitful results is the accurate name and pedigree of Imim Sadjdjid's mother. Regretfully, after all extensive studies that a number of writers have done in this respect, it is not still definite. The notion that his mother had been one of Sassanids princesses was recently denied lest the anti-Shi'ite Muslims as a consequence judge that the spread of Shi'ism in Iran had been due to the association of Imim's lineage with the Sassanids through Yazdgard III's daughter who has been alleged to be Imim Sadjdjid's mother. Professor Shah¢d¢, in his foregoing book, has cited and criticized most of these narrations. Further, there are few quotations suggesting that she be "Umm Walad" (a bondswoman whose husband was not a bondsman). In spite of all controversies about the reports or their incompatibility with the reports of the contests and so forth, the genuine narration is definitively worthy and is mentioned in the Shi'ites books belonging to the ancient times such as Waq'a ¯iff¢n, Tir¢kh Ya'q£b¢ and Ba¥i'ir al-Daradjit, all written in the third century. A hadith also has been quoted from Imim ¯idiq(a) in Kif¢[3]as reported by Qi¤¢ Nu'min in the fourth century as well.[4] Acknowledging that there does exist

---

[1]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XVII, p.230

[2]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq. p.231

[3]. al-Kif¢, vol.II, p.369

[4]. Shar¦ al-akhbir, vol.III, p.266

skepticism, we shall examine the illusory link between this issue and the spread of Shi'ism properly later.[1]

Consistent with what the Shi'ites hadith-narrators have narrated, Imim Sadjdjid (a) is the successor of his father, °usayn Ibn 'Al¢ (a). These are narrated by Shiykh Kulayn¢ in Kif¢ and Shiykh °urr 'ªmil¢ in Ithbit al-Hudit, etc. It can also be detected from the Prophet's hadiths naming the Shi'ites Imims. Heedless of it, approving Imim Sadjdjid (a) in Shi'ites community as well as his Imima throughout history is an original proof itself. The one and the only mistrust at that critical point prevailing a small number of Ahl al-Bayt's supporters was Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya's Imamate which will be discussed in berries later. As specified by Shi'ites hadiths, the Prophet's sword, armor and so on should be with Imims and their being with Imim Sadjdjid was validated even in Sunnites books.[2] The time at which Imim Sadjdjid lived was a special period that all religious values were exposed to the Umayya distortin and Medina residents, one of the religious centers, were all compelled to swear allegiance to Yaz¢d like his slaves. Islamic commandments had turned into a plaything for people such as Ibn Ziyid, °adjdjidj and 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwin. In °adjdjidj's view, 'Abd al-Malik was superior to Allih's Messenger (s)! Unlike Islamic narrations, he extorted "Djizya" (poll-tax) from Muslims and with a slight calumny he handed over them to the executioners.

In the shadow of such rule it was inevitable that the less people's religious training was elevated, the more disvalues were revived. Under those circumstances, Imim Sadjdjid (a) was only a worshipper and his most socially penetrating impact on establishing a link between people and Allih was solely through Du'i (prayer). So influential a characteristic had he that people were enamored of him. A large number of knowledge-seekers were the narrators of his hadiths and availed themselves of his overflowing spring emanated from the Prophet and 'Al¢'s boundless body of knowledge. Describing Imim's personality, Mu¦ammad Ibn Sa'd, Sunnites historian and scholar, had said, **كان علي بن الحسين ثقـة**

---

[1]. See a concise paper about the relation between Sh¢'ism and Iran, I¥fahin, 1365.

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.I, pp.486, 488

مأمونـا كـثير الحـديث عاليـاً رفيعـاً ورعـاً[1] **"'**Al¢ Ibn °usayn, trustworthy, said many hadiths. He was magnanimous, superior and pious."

In his thesis about the reliability of this unique narration, Shifi'¢ had written, **وجدت علي بن الحسين – وهو أفقه أهل المدينة[2] – يعوّل علي خبر الواحد "'**Al¢ Ibn °usayn who was the only outstanding religious jurisprudent in Medina relied upon this unique narration."

Although Ibn Shahib Zuhr¢ was from the Umayya kins and regardless of the dispute existing between the Umayya and Shi'ite Muslims, he was among the scholars at Imim Sadjdjid's time. Getting zealously the most out of Imim's presence, he had praised him in many sentences. In a letter written by Imim, Zuhr¢ was advised to reconsider his position as an instrument for the Umayya sovereignty.[3] Once he was reproached by Imim Sadjdjid for his insultation to 'Al ¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib (s)[4]; however, he was his narrator and his narrations have been recorded in various books.[5] Additionally he was enamored with Imim Sadjdjid's worshipping and purity. As reported, **كان الزهري إذا ذكـر علي بن الحسين يبكـي ويقـول: زيـن العابـدين**[6] **"**As soon as Zuhr¢ heard the name of 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn, he wept and said, Zayn al-'ªbid¢n the worshippers' beauty."

He was quoted as saying, **علي بن الحسين أعظم الناس منّة عليّ**[7] **"'**Al¢ Ibn °usayn was the most generous of all people." **ما رأيت أحداً أفقه مـن علـي بـن الحسـين**[8] **"**I have seen no one being more erudite than 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn."

His commendation for Imim Sadjdjid (a) was to the extent that some of the Marwinids told him, **يا زهري! مافعل نبيّك يعني علي بن الحسين**[9] **"**O Zuhr¢! What has your Prophet ('Al ¢ Ibn °usayn) done for you?"

---

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d,Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.XV, p. 274

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p.222

[3]. Tu¦af al-'Uq£l, p. 200

[4]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.IV, p. 102

[5]. For instance see ±abaqit al-kubri, vol. VIII, p. 172; °ilyat al-awliyi', Vol.III, p. 86; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p. 103

[6]. °ilyat al-awliyi', vol.III, p. 135

[7]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p. 214

[8]. Zayn al-ªbid¢n, Sayyid al-Ahl, p. 43

[9]. Shar¦ al-akhbir, vol. III, p. 258

Ab£ °izim, another hadith-narrator, had said, **ما رأيت هاشمياً أفضل من علي بن الحسين ولا أفقه منه**[1] **"**I have seen no one from the Hishimites whose Knowledge and jurisprudence be higher than those of 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn."

It is quoted from Djiɬi¨ as stating, "Concerning 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn's characteristic, the Shi'ite Muslims, schismatics, the Khiridjites were all unanimous and not a single one of those was sceptical about his superiority over others".[2]

As it will be discerned later, the most decisive reason for Imim's popularity with the people was his eloquent sentences within the framework of supplication engrossing people.

Sa'¢d Ibn Musayyib, an eminent hadith-narrator, described Imim Sadjdjid (a), **ما رأيت أورع من علي بن الحسين**[3] **"**I have never seen one more pious than 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn so far."

During his lifetime, Imim was called "'Al¢ al-Khayr" (example of goodness), "'Al¢ al-Aqharr (outstanding 'Al¢) and "'Al¢ al-'ªbid" (Worshipper).[4] At that time Milik Ibn Anas was of this belief that there existed no one like Imim Sadjdjid in the Prophet's Ahl al-Bayt.[5]

Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d had said, **كان علي بن الحسين غاية في العبادة**[6] **"'**Al¢ Ibn °usayn was the highest in worshipping."

On account of Imim's too many prostrations as well as of which mark on his forehead he was called "Dhi l-Thafanit" (the Owner of Calluses).[7] Also, Ibn °ibbin had described Imim as follows, **وكان من أفاضل بني هاشم من فقهاء المدينة وعبادهم ... يقال علي بن الحسين سيد العابدين في ذلك الزمان**[8] **"**He was one of the most learned of the Hishimites,

---

[1]. Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, p. 186; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p. 80

[2]. 'Umdat al-§ilib, p. 193

[3]. °ilyat al-awliyi', vol.III, p. 141; Kashf al-ghumma, Vol.II, p. 80; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol. XVII, p. 236; Tahdh¢b al-tahdh¢b, vol.VII, p. 305; Siyar a'lim al-nubali', vol.IV, p. 391

[4]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.XV, p. 273

[5]. Tahdh¢b al-tahdh¢b, vol.VII, p. 305

[6]. Ibid. Vol.I, p. 27

[7]. Mu'djam al-udabi',, vol.XI, p. 103

[8]. al-thiqit, vol.V, p. 160

one of the jurisprudents and worshippers of Medina ... it is said that he was the master of worshippers at that time."

Ab£ Zuhra also said, **فعليّ زين العابدين كان إمام المدينة نبلاً وعلمًا**[1] **"'**Al¢ Zayn al-'ªbid¢n was Imim of Medina from the viewpoint of rank and knowledge."

Reportedly, when Imim made ablution before prayer, he was noticed with a pale complexion. After being inquired for the reason, he replied, **أتدرون بين يدي من أريداً أن أقـوم**[2] **"**Do you know before whom I am going to stand?"

It is recounted that at prayer time Imim began shivering while turning pale. In his answer to the question for its ground, he stated, **اني أريد الوقوف بين يدي ملك عظيم** [3] **"**I want to stand in front of the Great King."

Heeded to nothing while he was engaged in performing prayers. Once his child broke his arm. He was crying severely. An orthopedist was called to set the bone. Later, after finding the child with his arm hung from his neck, Imim realized the happening after all.[4]

Zamakhshar¢ has narrated that when 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn immersed his arm to make ablution, **ثـم رفـع رأسـه الـى السماء والقمر والكواكب، ثم جعل يفكّر في خلقها حتي أصبح وأذن المؤذن ويده في الماء "**He raised his head staring at the sky, the moon and stars and pondering over as long as morning appeared and the Mu'adhdhin started calling to prayer while his arm was still in water."[5]

When his servant was questioned about him, she said, "Never ever did I take him food during the day nor did I prepare bed for him at nights."[6] It is narrated that while he was busy with his prayers, a snake approached him. The snake crept along through Imim's two feet but not a slight move or change of complexion was noticed.[7]

---

[1]. al-imim al-¯idiq, p. 22

[2]. ¯ifat al-¥afwa, vol.II, p. 55; N£r al-ab¥ir, p. 127; ±abaqit al-kubri, Vol.V, p. 216; al-It¦if, p. 136; al-Fu¥£l al-muhimma, p. 201, al-'Iqd al-far¢d, Vol.III, p. 114

[3]. Shar¦ al-akhbir, vol.III, p. 258

[4]. Ibid. vol.III, p. 263

[5]. Rabi' al-abrir, vol.III, pp. 160, 163

[6]. A'immatuni, vol.I, p. 263, Maniqib Ibn Shahr ªsh£b, vol.II, p. 255

[7]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.X, p. 159

In giving alms and aiding the underprivileged he was proverbial. It was after his martyrdom when it revealed that a hundred families had been living on his alms and charity.[1] Imim Biqir (a) has been quoted as saying that his father, Imim Sadjdjid (a), had been carrying food on his back at dead of night for the destitute stressing that charity at night-time mitigates Allih's wrath.[2] People's affection for him beggared description. Narratedly, the Qur'in reciters under on conditions set out to Mecca unless Imim Sadjdjid came and one thousand people on horseback followed him.[3]

Sumptuously dressed, he left home but promptly returned and asked to bring his previous robe pointing out, "As though I am not 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn."[4] While he was passing the streets in Medina on horseback, not once did he ever warn "let me through" in view of the fact that he believed that the route was communal and he was never entitled to outrun.[5] His son, Imim Biqir, was cited as saying, "My father sacrificed his properties entirely for Allih's sake twice".[6]

At the moment of breathing his last, Mu¦ammad Ibn Usima Ibn Zayd was beside him. Mu¦ammad was shedding tears when Imim asked the why.

"I am 15000 dhms in debt", responded Mu¦ammad.

"Do not agitate yourself, I pay it", Imim stated.[7]

All of these mentioned points look a drop from the ocean of Imim Sadjdjid's virtues.

---

[1]. °ilyat al-awliyi', Vol.III, p. 136; Kashf al-ghumma, Vol.II, pp. 78; Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, Vol.XVII, p. 238.

[2]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol. XVII, p. 238

[3]. Ikhtiyir Ma'rifat al-ridjil, p. 117

[4]. Makirim al-Akhliq, p. 58; Wasi'il al-sh¢'a, vol.II, p. 364; It is also narrated that he occasionally wore impressive dress lest people might assume that he acted contrary to what Allih had ordered, قُلْ مَنْ حَرَّمَ زِينَةَ اللَّهِ الَّتِي أَخْرَجَ لِعِبَادِهِ وَالطَّيِّبَاتِ مِنْ الرِّزْقِ. "Say, who has prohibited the embellishment of Allih which he has brought forth for these servants?" See Tafs¢r al-ayyish¢, vol.II, p. 15, the second hadith; Mustadrak al-wasi'il, vol.III, p.203

[5]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol. XVII, p. 246

[6]. Ibid. vol.XVII, p. 238

[7]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XVII, p. 239; Shar¦ al-akhbir, vol.III, pp. 261-262 (His name is mentioned Zayd Ibn Usima Ibn Zayd in the second one)

IMªM SADJDJªD AND SHI‘ITE MUSLIMS

On the last day of the event of Karbali the Shi‘ites’s political and ideological position was in a tragic situation both qualitatively and quantitatively. K£fa which had always been considered the center of Shi‘ites tendencies had turned into a base for suppressing them. All the vertical Shi‘ite Muslims of Imim °usayn having been either in Medina, or in Mecca or those from K£fa who could flourish to join Imim were martyred in Karbali. Although there were some living in K£fa, they could in no way express themselves under the appalling circumstances exercised by Ibn Ziyid. Karbali was as a matter of fact a debacle for the Shi‘ite Muslims psychologically. What was seemingly publicized was that the Shi‘ite Muslims could no longer raise their heads aloft. A group of Ahl al-Bayt headed by Imim °usayn had achieved martyrdom and the only remainng son from Imim °usayn and Fi§ima’s issue was no one but Imim Sadjdjid who was not famed at that time. Imim °usayn’s eldest son, ‘Al¢ Akbar, haf also been martyred in particular. Imim Sadjdjid’s life in Medina and being distant from Iraq did never allow opportunities to be provided for him to lead the Shi‘ite Muslims in K£fa.

In such a status which Shi‘ites basis was determinedly targeted. Imim Sadjdjid had to resume from Zero and absorb people towards Ahl al-Bayt, Imim could successfully reach many achievements, however.[1]

The achievements have been verified in history. Imim Sadjdjid could not only breath new life into the Shi‘ite Muslims but also lay the foundations for both Imim Biqir’s and Imim ¯idiq’s future activities. It has been evidenced by history that he, during his thirty-four-year activity, extricated the Shi‘ite Muslims from the thorniest periods of their lives, the period which had nothing save Shi‘ite Muslims’ suppression by the Umayya and Ibn Zubayr. °adjdjidj’s twenty-year sovereignty in Iraq together with ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwin’s dominance of the thorough Islamic realm had concentrated on suppressing the Shi‘ite Muslims and somewhere else suppressing other Umayyads opponents including Khiridjites and such insurgents as ‘Abd al-Ra¦min

---

[1]. Dirisit wa Bu¦£th fi l-tir¢kh wa l-islim, Vol.I, p.61 (Ist edition) the paper of al-imim Sadjdjid Bi‘ith al-islim min djad¢d

Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Ash‘ath. Hearing the term of Shi‘ites was far more irritating than the term of disbeliever for °adjdji dj.[1]

During these years, two Shi‘ites movements were waged in Iraq either of which-despite the temporary victory of one-was defeated. Subsequently the Shi‘ite Muslims were with all might put under the threat of murder, torture and imprisonment by the Umayya. The penitents one of the movements was that of Tawwib¢n led by Sulaymin Ibn ¯urad Khuzi‘¢ with a small number of the renowned Shi‘ite Muslims of K£fa that we already discussed. It is alleged that Tawwib ¢n had yielded to ‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn’s Imima.[2] We could find no proof for the allegation in primary sources. What is worth consideration is that as a rule Tawwib¢n had been set to entrust Imima to Ahl al-Bayt if succeeded and naturally there existed no one from Fi§ima’s issue but ‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn (a). Not a report has been traced in history whether they were precisely of this opinion or not. It appears that no specific political relation between Imim Sadjdjid and Tawwib ¢n had been established. Nevertheless, whatever had given Shi‘ites spirit to the movement was the active participation of the notable Shi‘ite Muslims of K£fa as well as its sentimental nature, that is, repenting for not defending °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢ and getting martyred as the only way for the acceptance of their repentance. Nowhere of the movement was the name of Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya mentioned.

Their poletical blunder was assessing not the status quo, abandoning K£fa and leaving himself to the accidents. Believing that the leader of the movement was incapable of estimating military and political issues, not only Mukhtir did by no means collaborate but he also hindered a number of Shi‘ite Muslims to back the movement.

Imim Sadjdjid’s association with the second movement, namely Mukhtir’s movement was as vague as the former one. Such a connection bore numerous troubles both form the viewpoints of politics and ideology. It was said that after attaining support from the Shi‘ite Muslims in K£fa, Mukhtir pleaded to ‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn (a) for cooperation but Imim showed no delight.[3] By taking Imim’s abiding policy into

---

[1]. See Imim Biqir’s remarks in Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha of Ibn Abi l-°ad ¢d, Vol.XI, p.44; al-imim al-¯idiq of Ab£ Zuhra, pp.111-112

[2]. Tashayyu‘ dar mas¢r tir¢kh, p.286

[3]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, p.126

account, the standing adopted looked reasonable. Later than the event in Karbali, Imim had well perceived that reviving such a dead community through securing the leadership was beyond the bounds of practicability, Besides, implicating in another political movement with the presence of external powers might have preceded many a peril which was not worth risking at all. By this reason, the entity of Imim's movement throughout his Imamate elucidated that his was never merely a political one though in many cases secession from politics exactly denoted a certain political activity.

And the ideological aspect of the adventure commenced when Mukhtir asked for Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya's assistance and advocacy. He consented but not officially. From then on, it was rumored that Ibn °anafiyya's Imamate was accepted amongst the Iraqi Shi'ite Muslims. Although this notion was not corroborated, later when a sect named the K¢ssanids was founded, the story began from the time of Mukhtir.

With the infiltration of the Exaggerators' theories into the Shi'ites nation in K£fa, Mukhtir also was subject to accusation later. It was rumored that Mukhtir had played an influential role in emerging the Exaggerators. Based on noncount justifications, referring to which does not seem convenient here and have been discussed elsewhere, all of these issues even that a sect named the K¢ssanids believed in Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya's Imamate and Mahdavitism are open to doubt. Notwithstanding, regarding Imim Sadjdjid's position-taking against the Exaggerators there is evidence available. It was the predominant deviation among Iraqi Shi'ite Muslims which compelled Imim to refrain from taking a transparent stance and setting up a direct link with them.

Imim Sadjdjid (a) addressed a group of Iraqis saying, **أحبونا حبّ الاسلام ولا ترفعونا فوق حدِّنا**[1] **"**Adore us for the sake of Islam but never promote us higher than we deserve."

Somewhere else, **أحبونـا حـبَّ الإسـلام ولا تحبُّونـا حـبَّ الأصنام**[2] **"**Adore us for the sake of Islam but never idolatize us."

Ab£ Khilid Kibul¢ had recounted that he had heard Imim Sadjdjid (a) saying, **إن قوماً من شيعتنا سيُحبّونا حتى يقولوا**

---

[1]. °ilyat al-awliyi', Vol.III, p.136

[2]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, Vol.XVII, p.242

فينا ما قالت اليهود في عزير وما قالتِ النصاري فـي عيسـى بن مريـم، فلا هـم منّـا ولا نحـن منهم[1] **"**Some of our Shi'ite Muslims go to extremes in adoring us to the extent that they repeat what the Jews and the Christians had declared about Ezra and Jesus Christ saying, "Neither are we from them nor are they from us"

In accordance with Shi'ites sources, Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya was on no accounts a misled one and had assented Imim Sadjdjid's Imima. In order as a consequence to verify that Ibn °anafiyya had indeed introduced himself as an Imim a few questions would be posed and solutions would be presumed that he had taken this action with the aid of Imim to keep Imim away although no historical proof supports such an assumption.

What merits to be borne in mind is that it beggars belief that Imim Sadjdjid (a) had uttered such words about Mukhtir, **يكذب على الله وعلى رسوله**[2] **"**He attributes false things to Allih and the Prophet."

Especially, when Mukhtir had sent 'Ubayd Allih's head to him, he had averred, **جزى اللـه المختـار خيـراً**[3] **"**May Allih award Mukhtir the best!" Narratedly at that time, **لم يبق من بني هاشم أحد الا قام بخطبة فيالثناء علـى المختـار وجميـل القول فيه**[4] **"**There was no one from the Hishimites who did not rise and admire Mukhtir." Quoted from Imim Biqir was, **لا تسبّوا المختار فـأنه قتـل قتلتنـا وطلـب ثأرنـا وزوج أراملنـا وقسم فينا المال على العسرة**[5]

"Insult not Mukhtir for he has killed our assassins, has had our orphans marry and has allotted properties to us when in trouble."

And in an answer to the question of Mukhtir's son, he described his position about Mukhtir as positive.[6]

As discussed before, Mukhtir's movement did not politically last long and was suppressed by Ibn Zubayr followers in 67 AH. However, it had an impact on stimulating

---

[1]. Ikhtiyir Ma'rifat al-ridjil, p.102; ±abaqit al-kubri, Vol.V, p.214; Nasab Quraysh, Mu¥'ab Zubayr¢, p.58

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, Vol.V, p.213

[3]. Ikhtiyir Ma'rifat al-ridjil, p.127

[4]. ±abaqit al-kubri, Vol.V, p.285

[5]. Ikhtiyir Ma'rifat al-ridjil, Ibid. p.128

[6]. Ibid. p. 126

and perpetuating Shi‘ites emotions in K£fa and on motivating Mawil¢ to take part in political activities.

Due to the aforesaid deviation and even unlike Ibn °anafiyya’s possible wish, some were ambivalent whom to choose as an Imim. Qisim Ibn ‘Awf, one of Imim Sadjdjid’s disciples, who had initially been hesitant whether to choose ‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn or Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya ultimately joined Imim Sadjdjid as confessed by himeslf.[2] According to Kashsh¢, Ab£ °amza Thumil¢ and Farit Ibn A¦naf had been among his disciples.[3] Although Sa‘¢d Ibn Musayyib was controversial to be among them, he had apparently been ruling in accordance with the Sunnism. In Ridjil, Kashsh¢ has treated Sa‘¢d’s position as disentanglement from °adjdjidj.[4] His veneration for Imim, at all events, is without a shadow of a doubt and availing himself of Imim’s presence scientifically and ethically is confirmed. But he did not attend Imim’s funeral ceremony and as a result was objected to.[5]

Aside from these individuals, there had been a number deemed steadfast Shi‘ite Muslims on the report of Shi‘ites sources. At the starting-point there had been only few with Imim such as Sa‘¢d Ibn Djubayr, Sa‘¢d Ibn Musayyib, Mu¦ammad Ibn Djubayr Ibn Mu§‘im, Ya¦yi Ibn Umm al-±aw¢l and Ab£ Khilid al-Kibul¢.[6] The number of Imim Sadjdjid’s disciples was said 173 by Shiykh al-±i’ifa.[7]

Anyhow Imim could vastly contribute to Shi‘ism eternity and its dissemination. His style in Islamic jurisprudence domain was narrating the Holy Prophet’s hadiths through ‘Al¢ (a). Only were these hadiths authentic in Shi‘ite Muslims’ sight. By the same token, Shi‘ites managed to take his first strides in Islamic jurisprudence averse to the existing

---

[2]. Ibid. p. 124

[3]. Ibid. p. 124

[4]. Ibid. p. 124

[5]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil. p. 116

[6]. Ibid. p. 115; In another narration, they are ntroduced three, **ارتد الناس بعد قتل الحسين ثلاثة, يحيى بن ام الطويل، ابو خالد الكابلي، جبير بن مطعم، ثم ان الناس لحقوا وكثروا**... “After °usayn’s murder all people apostatized but three, Ya¦yi Ibn Umm al-±aw¢l, Ab£ Khilid al-Kibul¢ and Djubayr Ibn Mu§‘im. People joined them then...” see also Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, p. 123

[7]. Ridjil al-±£s¢, pp. 81-102

deviations; nontheless, the main phase thereof procrastinated.

While calling for prayer (Adhin), Imim Sadjdjid inserted the sentence of, **حيّ علـي خيرالعمـل** "Hasten to practice good deeds."

When objections raised, he stated that Adhin had been that form since the inception.[1] Seceding from Iraqi deviations culminated in maintaining the doctrinal bases of Shi'ism against deviations. In spite of Imim's serious endeavor, which, of course, led to the perpetual Shi'ism, Medina could never ever be disposed to Shi'ites growth in the light of its deviations created from the Early Islamic Era as well as its incitement against Shites. Imim Sadjdjid himself had asserted that their vertical devotees both in Mecca and Medina had not exceeded twenty people.[2] Many lived in Iraq who were their enthusiasts, however.

IMªM'S ENCOUNTER WITH THE UMAYYADS

Imim's ever-first encounter with the Umayya rulers after Karbali event was with 'Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid. Ibn Ziyid asked his name.

Imim replied, "This is 'Al¢".

"Did Allih kill not 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn?" Ibn Ziyid asked surprisingly.

"I had a brother whom people killed", responded Imim.

"But Allih did kill him", Ibn Ziyid added.

Imim Sadjdjid stated, **اللَّهُ يَتَوَفَّى الْأَنْفُسَ حِينَ مَوْتِهَا**.

Concluding to murder Imim, Ibn Ziyid was heroicly stopped by Zaynab (a).[3]

Yaz¢d also met him in Damascus[4] and reproached him. In an excellent sermon, Imim introduced himself and his family addressing the audience in the mosque. People who had for a long time been ignorantly influenced by the Umayya

---

[1]. al-Mu¥annaf, Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, vol.I, p. 215 (published in India).

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha of Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.IV, p. 104; Bi¦ir, vol. XXXXVI, p. 143; al-Ghirit, p. 573

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 231 (published by 'Izz al-d¢n); Nasab Quraysh of Mu¥'ab Zubayr¢, p. 58

[4]. al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p. 131

propagation and were not in the slightest acquainted with the Prophet's household became awakened somewhat by his sermon. Yaz¢d had to interrupt Imim, demagogically imputed the wickedness to Ibn Ziyid and respectfully saw off 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn along with other captives of Karbali to Medina. Among the noteworthy points in Imim's sermon was that he introduced his father, his family and himself as the Prophet's descendants whereas both Mu'iwiya and the Umayya have been constantly striving to inroduce them 'Al ¢'s descendants not the Holy Prophet's.

A while after the event in Karbali, revolting against the Umayya, the people of Medina organized the riot of °arra, moreover. The leadership of the riot lay with 'Abd Allih Ibn °an¨ala, Aliyas Ghas¢l al-Mali'ika whose character was anti-Umayyads and anti-Yaz¢d and whose life style was non-Islamic. Imim Sadjdjid's as well as others' position from the Hishimites was not positive; consequently, they abandoned the town with a number of their families. In Imim's view, the aforementioned movement had not merely a Shi'ites nature but was absolutely in line with Ibn Zubayr's intent, someone who had been among those occasioning the war of Djamal. Since Imim's any standing as a Shi'ites leader could precede the riskiest consequence for the Shi'ite Muslims, he did not involve himself.

Besides, when people had expelled the Umayyads, Imim's manliness entailed to give asylum to Marwin Ibn °akam's wife at his request. ±abar¢ has written that Imim's old friendship with Marwin accounted for Imim's action.[1] It is in actual fact a barefaced lie. At that age and under those circumstances that his father and forefather had been in conflict with this reign, Imim's intimacy with Marwin as the most wretched element among the Umayyads was out of the question in a real sense of word. Marwin was the one who from the outset of securing allegiance in Medina had coerced the governor to either force Imim °usayn to swear allegiance or take his life. Imim's reaction was a sportsmanlike answer to the Umayyads' foulness so that history could compare the conducts.

After Muslim Ibn 'Uqba, Aliyas Musraf suppressed the movement of Medina people and committed the greatest atrocities during the Umayya age, he acted moderately

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, Vol.V, p. 245; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.I, p. 208

towards ‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn due to his absence in the movement. Muslim secured allegiance from people in a way that they know themselves Yaz¢d’s slaves; not withstanding, securing allegiance from ‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn was quite normal.[1] Prior to Imim’s entry, Muslim was cursing Imim and his forebear. But on Imim’s arrival, he behaved calmly.

When Muslim was asked for his change subsequent to Imim’s departure, he responded, **ما كان ذلك لرأي منّي لقد ملىء قلبي منه رعباً**[2] **“**My second conduct was not my wish. Fear had fully permeated into my heart.”

Heedless of the fact that Imim’s position-taking ought to be interpreted by considering the political state, military oppositions and the establishment of organizations, it had been the current situation which necessitated any Imim’s responsibility[3] at any juncture. Every politically rational man is cognizant that the approaches adopted vary in various situations. As examined history evidences how Imim Sadjdjid(a) reserved and proliferated Shi‘ism for the future activites.

As far as the relations between the ‘Alawites and the Umayya were concerned, Imim was vehemently suspected by them and as Imim’s slight movement could bare negative outcomes, he naturally believed that action-taking was not worth. One of the most significant religious-political principles by using which Imim spent his political life was Taqiyya (precautionary dissimulation). It shielded the Shi‘ite Muslims’ lives throughout history as pointed out by Imim over and over. Yet, in order to undermine the Shi‘ite Muslims, a group, not in need of manipulating it, denied it strongly although it had been straightforwardly stipulated in Holy Qur’in. The Sunnis on account of being in power required not Taqiyya and only for accusing the Shi‘ite Muslims did they delete it from among the incontrovertible Islamic and Fiqh¢ commandments.

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha of Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.III, p. 259; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p. 215; Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p. 107; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b ¢, Vol.II, p. 25

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, pp. 70, 71

[3]. The unseen knowledge is consistent with the duty mentioned not separated from it.

In a hadith, Imim Sadjdjid has stated that anyone not enjoining good and forbidding evil is like one who has set the divine Book aside and turned his back on it unless he follows Taqiyya. He was asked what Taqiyya was. He answered, **يخاف جباراً عنيداً يخاف أن يفرط عليه أو أن يطغى**[1] **"**To fear from a cruel ruler to kill him or oppress him."

Believing in Taqiyya as a Qur'inic principle was in terms of Islamic jurisprudence accentuated more by Imims who had to practice it. Imim Sadjdjid who lived an exceedingly difficult life had no other alternative but Taqiyya. It was fundamentally Taqiyya which safeguarded Shi'ism at that time, what of which Khiridjites, the extremists, did not avail themselves and as a result were struck hard. Narratedly, meeting Imim, someone asked him how he spent his life.

Imim responded, "We pass the time among our people as Israelites were among the Pharaoh's people. They kill our children and take our women as bondwomen. People get nearer to our foes by insulting our lord. If Quraysh prides itself on having Mu¦ammad before other Arabs and if Arabs consider themselves superior to non-Arabs for having Mu¦ammad (s) and they have approved such a virtue for Arabs and Quraysh, we, Ahl al-Bayt, should be proud of ourselves before Quraysh because Mu¦ammad has been from among us. Yet, they usurped our rights and this is the way our time goes by".

The narrator added that Imim was speaking in a way that only those nearby be able to hear him.

Overall, Imim's lenience with the Umayya provided a free life in Medina for Imim and less was he center of attention on the part of the opponents. Furthermore it manifested Imim's scientific dimention in reserving the religion. The great admiration made by a Sunnites scholar about him is a proof. Were Imim involved in politics, no one could describe this aspect of Imim's character.

IMªM SADJDJªD'S PROFITING FROM DU'ª (PRAYER)

When the community was deviated, the spirit of comfort-loving and worldliness prevailed, it was confined by political,

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p. 214; °ilyat al-awliyi', vol.III, p. 140

ethical and social corruption and when there was no opening to breathe politically, Imim Sadjdjid could partially express his beliefs throgh prayer and reactivate the nation to pay heed to insight and worship. Although, seemingly, the main aim within the prayers had been insight and worship, in regard with the phrases it can be claimed that people could have perceived the political concepts between the lines.

Al-¯a¦¢fa al-Sadjdjidiyya including more than fifty prayers is only a part of Imim Sadjdjid's compiled prayers. The number of the collections inclusive of his prayers is six with the above mentioned one. The prayers inside some of them exceed 180.[1] These prayers had been used by the Sunnis in addition to the Shi'ite Muslims,[2] so it can be inferred how influential they had been at that time. Among all Shi'ites Imims, Imim Sadjdjid (a) is more famous for his prayers.

Within the prayers there is a phrase repeatedly used and rarely can a prayer be found excluding it. It is, **صلوات بر محمد وآل محمد "**Peace be to Mu¦ammad and his progeny."

Basically it is an indication of genuine prayers. Once naming a baby 'Al¢ was decried and the Umayya could execute nothing without insulting 'Al¢ (a),[3] observing such a phrase appeared virtuous.

Such phrases as, **محمد وآله الطيبين الطاهرين الاخيار الانجبين**[4] **"**Mu¦ammad and his decent, clean, chosen and honored descendants."

Imim's insistence on uniting Mu¦ammad and his descendants was what Allih had emphasized and it is of utmost importance for expressing Shi'ites beliefs. Previous to narrating contents of some of his prayers it looks proper to refer to a hadith on consolidating the link between Mu¦ammad and his Household.

Imim Sadjdjid has stated, "It is incumbent upon a learned to say ¯alawit to Allih's Prophet. Allih has joined us to him as well. If anyone say ¯alawit for the Prophet but excludes us, not only does he make it imperfect but also he disobeys

---

[1]. al-Dhar¢'a, vol.XV, pp. 18-21

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha of Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XI, p. 192; vol.VI, pp. 178-186; vol.V, p. 113

[3]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha of Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XIII, p. 220; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p. 184

[4]. al-¥a¦¢fat al-Sadjdjidiyya, prayer 6, item 24

Allih.[1]“ The union of Mu¦ammad and his Household can substantially affect people’s stance on the Holy Prophet’s household.

The issue of Imamate is one of the central religious-political contents of al-¯a¦¢fa. The concept of Imima as a Shi‘ites concept depicts the divine aspects of infallibility along with profiting from the prophets’ body of knowledge in general and that of the holy Prophet in particular in addition to its superiority over caliphate and leadership.

We show some examples, **ربّ صلّ على أطائب اهل بيته الـذين اخـترتهم لأمـرك وجعلتـم خزنـة علمـك وحفظـة دينـك وخلفـائك فـي أرضـك وحججـك علـى عبـادك وطهرّتّهـم مـن الرجـس والـدّنس تطهيـراً بارادتـك وجعلتهـم الوسـيلة اليـك والمسـلك الـى جنّتك**[2] “O Lord! Bless those pure from Mu¦ammad’s progeny, those whom Thou have chosen for ruling and those whom Thou have designated as Thy depositaries of science and guards of Thy religion. Thou created tem as Thy caliphs and proof for Thy servants on the earth. Thou not only cleansed them from any impurity of Thy own volition, but also determined them as a vehicle for reaching Thee and the abiding Heaven.”

اللّهم انّ هذا المقـام لخلفـائك وأصـفيائك وموضـع أمنـائك فـي الدّرجـة الّـتي اختصصـتهم بهـا قـد ابتزوهـا... حـتى عـاد صفوتك وخلفائك مغلوبين، مقهـورين مبـتزّين ... أللهـم العـن أعدائهم من الاوّلين والآخرين ومن رضي بفعـالهم وأشـياعهم وأتباعهم[3]

“O Allih! Caliphate does solely belong to Thy caliphs, the chosen from creatures. The position Thou had assigned for Thy Trustee in sublime ranks was usurped by others... until Thy caliphs and chosen ones were vanquished by the oppressors and their rights were disregarded. O my Lord! Thy malediction be upon their enemies from the beginning to the end, upon those gratified with this oppression and upon their followers.”

وصلّ على خيرتك اللّهم من خلقك محمّـد وعـترته الصّـفوةّ من بريّتك الطّاهرين واجعلنا لهم سامعين ومطيعين كما أمرت

---

[1]. Tir¢kh Djurdjin, p. 188

[2]. Tir¢kh Djurdjin, prayer 47, item 56

[3]. Ibid. prayer 48, items 9-10

اللهّـم اجعلنـى مـن أهـل التّوحيـد والايمـان بـك والتّصـديق برسولک والائمة الّذين حتمت طاعتهم.[1]

"O Lord! Bless the best creature of all, Mu¦ammad, and his chosen kinfolks. Make us obedient to them as Thou have commanded. O Lord! Make me one of the believers of the Prophet and Imims, those whose obedience Thou have ordered."

اللّهم انّك ايّدت دينك في كلّ أوان بامام أقمته علماً لعبادك ومناراً في بلادك بعد ان وصلت حبلـه بحبلـك وجعلتـه الذّريعـة الي رضوانك وافترضت طاعته وحذرت معصيته وأمرت بامتثال أوامره والانتهاء الي نهيه وأن لا يتقدّمه متقدّم ولا يتأخّر عنـه متأخّر فهو عصمة للائذين وكهف المؤمنين وعروة المتمسكين وبهاء العالمين ....[2] **وأقم به كتابك وحـدودك وشـرائعك وسـنن رسولك صلواتك اللّه عليه واله وأحي به ما أماته الظّالمون من معالم دينك وأجل به صداء الجور عن طريقتك وابن به الصّـراء مـن سـبيلك وأزل بـه النّـاكبين عـن صـراطك وامحـق بـه بغـاة قصدك عوجاً ... واجعلنا له سامعين مطيعين.**[3]

"O Lord! At any time Thou have appointed an Imim as a flag and a guidance lamp for Thy servants on the earth. Through establishing a direct link between Thyself and him, choosing him a way far drawing Thy gratification, enjoining all to obey his commands and prohibiting all from disobeying him, Thou did approve Thy religion. He is an Imim over whom no one has priority and from whom no one has the right to separate. An Imim for whom Thou have arranged a secure place for approaching Thee is he. Thou have bestowed firm faith on him who resorts Thy leading and favor and bestowed a highest honor in the world as he is a refuge for the believers... O Lord! Safeguard Thy book, Islamic limits, religious laws and Thy Prophet's Sunna by him, revive any of Thy religious tenets which the oppressor dissolved by him and obliterate any corruption or deviation in Thy straight path by him. Obviate the dangers in Thy way by him, make us obedient to him and successful in satisfying him."

It can be evidently inferred from the sentences above that Imim's determination had been disseminating Shi'ites beliefs through the concept of Imima as the most crucial in

---

[1]. Tirċkh Djurdjin. prayer 34

[2]. Ibid. prayer 47

[3]. loc.cit.

Shi‘ism. Similar contents admiring Ahl al-Bayt from Nahdj al-Baligha had been presented in the discussion about Imim ‘Al ¢’s caliphate.

As referred to the domain of the prayers is incredredibly vast and contains other aims such as devotional, intellectual and political. Brining an intellectual example would be appropriate here. Irbil¢ recounted that while Imim Sadjdjid was in the Prophet’s mosque in Medina he noticed that a group having a doctrinal discussion likened Allih to his creature. Imim who was incensed, stood up, went to the Prophet’s grave and began praying from which the content of negating comparison could be deduced. Shedding tears he was praying,

الهي قد بدت قدرتك ولم تبد هيئتك فجهلوك وقدّروك بالتقدير على غير ما انت به فشبّهوك وأنا بريء يا الهي من الذّين بالتّشبيه طلبوك ...[1]

“O my Allih! Thy might is revealed. They do not appreciate Thee. They ordain despite what Thou have foreordained. They compare Thee with mankind while I loathe it. O my Allih! Who are those who seek Thee with comparison?”

One of the Imim’s actions at different times was to make people acquainted with the Prophet’s Household about whom all the rights and virtues were specified in Qur’in and Sunna. In Damascus the Umayya introduced themselves the Holy Prophet’s Household as in °idjiz some of the Prophet’s wives did so. Since his wives died one after another and left no child, the existence of Ahl al-Bayt was rendered null and void. And now no one but Fi§ima’s offspring was remained. Making them known was requisite especially in as much as the incidents after the Prophet’s departure had had them keep silent in political scenes. Imim Sadjdjid introduced the household when he was taken to Damascus and it was in his famous sermon as confirmed by a number of historical records.

In this regard, we present a narration.

و أتي بحرم رسول اللّه صلى الله عليه وآله حتي دخلوا مدينة دمشق من باب يقال له «توماء»، ثم أتي بهم حتى وقفوا علي درج باب المسجد حيث يقام السبي واذا الشيخ قد أقبل حتى دنا منهم وقال, الحمد لله الذي قتلكم وأهلككم

[1]. Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p. 89

وأراح الرجال من سطوتكم وأمكن أميرالمؤمنين منكم. فقال له علي بن الحسين, يا شيخ! هل قرأت القرآن؟ قال: نعم قد قرأته، قال: فعرفت هذه الاية: قل لاأسئلكم اجراً الا المودّة في القربى؟ قال الشيخ: نعم. فقال علي بن الحسين: فنحن القربى يا شيخ، قال: هل قرأت في سورة بني اسرائيل: وآت ذا القربي حقه؟ قال الشيخ: قد قرأت ذلك، فقال علي: نحن القربى يا شيخ. وهل قرأت هذه الاية «واعلموا أنما غنمتم من شيء فان لله خمسه وللرسول ولذي القربى، قال الشيخ: قد قرأت ذلك، فقال علي: فنحن ذو القربى يا شيخ. ولكن هل قرأت هذه الايه: انما يريد الله ليذهب عنكم الرجس أهل البيت ويطهركم تطهيراً، قال الشيخ: قد قرأت ذلك. قال علي: فنحن أهل البيت الذي خصنا بآية الطهارة. فبقي الشيخ ساعة ساكتاً نادماً علي ما تكلّمه؛ ثم رفع رأسه الي السماء وقال: اللهم اني تائب اليك في ما تكلمته ومن بعض هولاء القوم، اللهم اني أبرء اليك من عدّو محمد وآل محمد.[1]

The Prophet’s Household were brought. They were entered Damascus through a door called “T£mi’’” They stood by the mosque door with other captives.

An old man approached them and said, “I offer my appreciation to Allih who killed you and let people relieve and Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n Yaz¢d overcame you”.

‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn asked him, “Man, have you ever recited Qur’in?” “Sure, I have” the old man answered.

“Have you ever seen the verse of Say, I do not ask of you any reward for it (my mission) but love for my near relatives”, Imim asked.

“Yes, I have”, said he.

‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn added, “Those near relatives are we, man”. Imim asked again. “How about the verse in Ban¢-Isri’¢l S£ra “Give the rights of the relatives?”

“Yes”, he answered.

“We are those relatives”, stated Imim. “Have you ever read the verse of ‘And know that whatever thing you gain, a fifth of it is for Allih and for the Apostle and for the near of the kin’ “, asked ‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn.

The man answered, “Yes”.

“How about this verse, man? Allih only desires to keep away the uncleanness from you, O people of the House! And to purify you a (thorough) purifying”, asked Imim.

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.V, pp. 242-243

“Yes, I have read it”, he said.

“These people of the house are we”. ‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn added.

The man ashamed of whatever he had produced kept silent for a while. Then he rose his head up to the sky and said, “O My Allih! I repent of what I have said and of the grudge I have born them. I loathe the enemies of Mu¦ammad and his progeny”.

Imim Sadjdjid’s lamentation as well as his real worship within the frame of these prayers was an instructive lesson for the present corrupted community wherein Islam was disdained by the Umayya. His lamentation was also for the harrowing event of Karbali.

Imim had stated, “Although doubtful about his death, Jacob wept for Joseph so hard that his eyes turned blind. How can I not help weeping while sixteen people from the Prophet’s Household were martyred in front of my very eyes.”[1] His lamentation did automatically make people conscious of the event in Karbali though he himself recounted the details of the event, moreover.[2]

IMªM SADJDJªD AND SLAVES

One of Imim’s activities, both religious and political, was his heed to a class who had been under socially vehement pressure from the caliph II’s tenure onward particularly during the Umayyads’ term and had been the most underprivileged group in the Islamic community in early centuries. The bondsmen and bondswomen whether Iranian, Roman, Egyptian or Sudanese suffering the most laborious tasks were humiliated by their masters.

Like Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n (a), Imim Sadjdjid (a) absorbed a number of Iraqi Mawil¢ (freed slaves) through his Islamic conduct and attempted to upgrade the social reputation of this class. Once Imim freed a bondswoman and married her, in order to censure her, ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwin reproached him for this marriage, Imim refereed to the verse of,

لَقَدْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فِي رَسُولِ اللَّهِ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ.

---

[1]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XVII, p. 239

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, pp. 196, 212, (published by ‘Izz al-d¢n)

"Allih's Messenger is a good model for you."

Concerning the Prophet's approach about ¯afiyya. He also pointed out the marriage of the Prophet's cousin with Zayd Ibn °iritha.[1] Accordingly, he breathed new life into Prophet's dead tradition afresh.

Sayyid al-Ahl has written that although Imim never needed slaves, he purchased them regularly only for the purpose of their releasing. Reportedly, some one hundred thousand slaves were freed by Imim. Discerning Imim's intention, the slaves exposed themselves to him to be purchased. Since Imim Sadjdjid had been purchasing them day in and day out, a large group was formed in Medina like an army including male and female slaves being all Imim's Mawil¢.[2]

Narrated by 'Allama Am¢n¢, at the end of each fasting month of Rama¤in, Imim Sadjdjid freed twenty slaves. He has added that never did he keep a slave more than a year and even after setting free he granted some properties to them.[3] During that period they personally got well acquainted with Imim Sadjdjid's extensive knowledge, ethics and piety and their affection for him was as a consequence natural. Some time a bondwoman with a bowl of water was pouring water on Imim's hands. All of a sudden it dropped down, knocked Imim on the face and injured him. As soon as Imim took a look at her, she said, **"والكاظمين الغيظ** Those restraining their anger." Imim said, "I restrained my anger". **"والعافين عن الناس** Those forgiving people." ,added she. "I forgave you", Imim stated. **"والله يحب المحسنين**[4] Allih loves the benevolent," she recited. Imim said, "For Allih's sake, I released you".[5]

On stepping out of the mosque, Imim Sadjdjid (a) was insulted by someone. When Imim's Mawil¢ invaded him, Imim hindered them and stated, "What has remained unrevealed about us is more than what he expresses". The

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p. 24; al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p. 140

[2]. Zayn al-ªbid¢n, Sayyid al-Ahl, pp. 7, 47

[3]. A'yin al-sh¢'a, vol.IV, p. 468 (First Edition)

[4]. ªl Imrin, 134

[5]. Shar¦ al-akhbir, vol.III, p. 260

man became ashamed after all and was pardoned by Imim generously.[1]

Now once again Imim's magnanimity is mentioned. It is worth recounting a story.

'Abd Allih Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn 'Umar had narrated, "Hishim Ibn Ismi'¢l, an Umayya governor in Medina had ignored the neighbors' rights and had begun annoying us specifically 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn. When he was deposed, Wal¢d commanded to expose him to the public so that any one willing could take revenge on him. Hishim confessed that he scared no one that much but 'Al¢ Ibn °usayn. While being hung from the Marwin bulwark, he requested his friends not to utter an insulting word when Imim Sadjdjid passed by. As soon as noticing Imim going, Hishim yelled out, **الله اعلم حيث يجعل رسالته**[2] **"**Allih truly knows with whom to lay His mission."

THE HªSHIMITES AFTER THE EVENT OF KARBALª'

Aside from Imim Sadjdjid there existed two 'Abbisids and 'Alawites figures who cooperated in political and collective activities. One was Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya, 'Al¢'s son, and the other was 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Abd al-Mu§§alib whose fame was thanks to the narrations quoted from the Prophet notably dealing with interpretation.[3] Not Fi§ima's son however, he was deemed high-ranking by the Shi'ite Muslims due to his elderliness among the other 'Alawites as the leader of political Shi'ite Muslims, propounding Ahl al-Bayt's leadership politically. Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya had been eminent and focus of Imim 'Al¢'s attention in the course of wars at that Imim's term. The flag of Imim's army in the war of Djamal was held aloft by Ibn °anafiyya.[4] His own analysis was that both Imim °asan and Imim °usayn

---

[1]. Kashf al-ghumma, vol.II, p. 101; al-It¦if, pp. 137, 138; Mukhta¥ar Tir ¢kh Dimashq, vol. XVII, p. 243

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, p. 526; Shar¦ al-akhbir, vol.III, p. 260

[3]. °udjdjat¢, Mu¦ammad Biqir, Si Maqilih dar tir¢kh tafs¢r wa na¦w. (three papers n history of Interpretation and Syntax), from p. 27 on (Tehran, 1360)

[4]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.I, p. 243

were Imim ‘Al¢’s eyes and he was his hand and it was hand which ought to protect the eyes.[1]

Indicating the positions of these three brothers, Imim ‘Al¢ had state, **أين النجم من الشمس والقمر**[2] **“**Where is the star of the sun and the moon.”

Imim enlightened them why the flag was given to Ibn °anafiyya. It had been for the protection of the Prophet’s descendants.[3] That he had not been from the Fi§imids was an excuse for Ibn Zubayr to humiliate him later[4] although never did it affect the Shi‘ite Muslims.

No one doubts that he had been one of the most steadfast Shi‘ite Muslims as his actions had verified the fact; nevertheless, no evidence could ever be located from the historical sources about his claim for leadership, though others might take advantage of him, even found a sect and believe his Mahdavitism. Many individuals including a few Shi‘ites Imims had had the same affliction too. Ibn °anafiyya was the narrator of the hadiths which could lead people more towards the Holy Prophet’s Household.

He has been quoted as saying, **من أحبنا لله نفعه اللـه بحبنا ولو كان اسيراً بالدّيلم**[5] **“**Any one who loves us, he will be benefited by Allih even if he is imprisoned in Diylam.”

The devotees of the Household were many whereas the loyal to the verse of, **قُلْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُحِبُّونَ اللَّهَ فَاتَّبِعُونِي**. “Say, If you love Allih, then follow me” were few.

Owing to this fact Imim Sadjdjid had stated, **ما بمكة والمدينة عشرون رجلا يحبنا**[6] **“**Our Faithful Shi‘ite Muslims do not exceed twenty both in Mecca and Medina.”

The number of the political enthusiasts was great, however.

When addressing him, Ibn °anafiyya’s followers usually said, **يـابن خيرالاخيـار وابـن ابـرّ الابـرار مـا خلا النـبيين**

---

1. Shar¦ nahdj al-bal¡gha, vol.XI, p. 28. He had been one of the bravest in the Hishimites; Shar¦ nahdj al-bal¡gha of Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XV, p. 285

2. Shar¦ nahdj al-bal¡gha, p. 245

3. Shar¦ nahdj al-bal¡gha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.IX, p. 111

4. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 63

5. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 105

6. Ibid. vol.IV, p. 105

والمرسلين[1] **"**O son of the best of the best, son of the benevolent of the benevolent after the prophets and the Apostles."

More threatening of Ibn Zubayr's two adversaries namely, Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya and Mukhtir was Ibn °anafiyya. The whys and the wherefores were one, Mukhtir had risen up in K£fa under his banner and the other was that the leadership of some part f Shi'ites movement apparently had been undertaken by him. Ibn Zubayr who had determinedly bent his efforts to smear their reputation banned reciting blessing to the Holy Prophet (s) for 40 weeks.

Being asked for its reason, he said, **ان له أهيل سوء فان ذكر مدّوا أعناقهم لذكره**[2] **"**His family is small. Whenever he is commemorated, all members of this family will say we are in this family."

He had made more offensive remarks in this respect as well[3] like, **بيت سوء لا أول لهم ولا أخر "**The sinister house for which there is neither beginning nor end."

It aroused Ibn 'Abbis's anger acutely banished by Ibn Zubayr to ±i'if.[4] Ibn Zubayr himself had made a confession that it had been 40 years he bore this family a grudge.[5] He was the one who incited his father to betray Ahl al-Bayt and stand against Imim 'Al¢ (a) in Djamal.

Concerning him Imim 'Al¢ had stated, **ما زال الزبير منا اهل البيت حتي نشأ ابنه المشؤوم عبـد الله**[6] **"**Zubayr always belonged to us, Ahl al-Bayt until his inauspicious son, 'Abd Allih, emerged."

As narrated by Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, the only stimulater of 'ªyisha had also been 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr according to Ibn 'Umar.[7] It was not unreasonable why she felt affection for him after his father and the Prophet.[8]

---

1. al-Fut£¦, vol.VI, pp. 239, 240.

2. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p. 29.

3. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.IV, p. 62; pp. 127, 129; al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p. 161.

4. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.XX, p. 128.

5. Ibid, vol.IV, p. 62; vol. XX, p. 148.

6. Ibid, vol.XX, p. 102

7. Ibid, vol. XX, p. 107

8. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol. XX, p. 110

These was a testimony that how great was the grudge Ibn Zubayr bore the ‘Alawites, Although his archenemy was the Umayyads, neverever did he leave the Hishimites relieved. Since the Hishimites naturally swore no allegiance to him, he emancipated Ibn °anafiyya, Ibn ‘Abbis together with 24 people from among the Hishimites in the entrance to the well of Zamzam. Mukhtir’s envoys succeeded to release them in an ambush attack with their bare hands.[1] Ibn Zubayr’s determination had been to burn them to death. When ‘Urwa Ibn Zubayr, famous for narrating the Prophet’s hadiths, was objected in this regard, he reacted as saying that it had been done for the purpose of maintaining Muslim solidarity and it had been what the caliph II had adopted against those who opposed to swearing allegiance to Ab£ Bakr. Even he had accumulated logs to set fire to their houses.[2] Nevertheless, Ibn Zubayr had not the audacity to do so in view of the fact that a majority of his followers had turned to him merely due to the Umayyads oppression and as a matter of fact they would rather be with a corrupt man than be with a more corrupt one and on no accounts would they allow him.[3]

Time after time in his sermons, Ibn Zubayr cavilled Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and made Ibn °anafiyya raise an objection. Consequently, verbal dispute flared up between them.[4] It resulted in Ibn °anafiyya’s expulsion which was followed by Ibn ‘Abbis’s protest.[5] Seeking advantage by exploiting this dispute, ‘Abd al-Malik wrote to Ibn °anafiyya inviting him to Damascus. Ibn ‘Abbis admiring Ibn °anafiyya’s character requested ‘Abd al-Malik to make allowances for him. He accepted his demand, hence Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya betook himself to Damascus. Anyone who passed by him on the way talked about his uprising. His features had become

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p. 261; They were 17 in another narration; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XX, pp. 123, 124

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha of Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol. XX, p. 147; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 86

[3]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.XX, p. 128

[4]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p. 262

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VI, p. 252

proverbial. ‘Abd al-Malik who predicted his menace informed Ibn °anafiyya while en route that he should swear allegiance to him if coming to Damascus. Declining his proposal, he switched his way to Mecca again and resided in Ab£ ±ilib mountain-pass with a group of his K£fiyin friends. The conflicts between him and Ibn Zubayr reignited and sparked off his expulsion to ±i’if. Meanwhile Ibn ‘Abbis was expelled from Mecca to ±i’if too; therefore, both began propagating against Ibn Zubayr together. It was where Ibn ‘Abbis passed away in 68 and Ibn °anafiyya said prayer for him.[1]

The final phases of Ibn °anafiyya’s life remained vague. Some people known as followers of the Kissin¢ds claimed that he had been alive and living on Ra¤wi mount. In accordance with Ibn A‘tham, he left ±i’if with 40 Shi‘ite Muslims to Ra¤wi mount and disappeared without trace.[2] His going to Ra¤wi mount was mentioned by Ya‘q£b¢ as well.[3] From Sayyid °imyar¢’s poems, once a believer of the K¢ssanids, a belief in Ibn °anafiyya’s Mahdavitism and his disappearance from sight can be inferred.

Alluding to the Prophet’s hadith on Mahdavitism, “His name is like that of mine and his nickname also resembles that of mine”, he had composed,

يفوز بكنيتي واسمي لاني نحلتمـاه والمهدي من بعدي

يغيّب عنهم حتى يقولوا تضمنه بطيبة بطـن لحــد

سنين وأشهر برضوى بشعب بيـن أنمـار وأسد[4]

“He will be in a grace that I have bestowed him with my name and nickname. He will be the leader after me. He will

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VI, pp. 240-253

[2]. Ibid, vol.VI, p. 253

[3]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p. 262

[4]. al-Aghin¢, vol.VII, p. 234, It is reported that later Sayyid °imyar¢ changed his beliefs and became Imim ¯idiq’s disciple and composed,

تجعفرت باسم الله والله اكبر وأيقنت بالله يعفو ويغفر

“In the name of Allih, the Great, I became Dja‘far’s follower while certain of Allih’s forgiveness” Although some expressed doubt about his conversion from the K¢ssinids, al-Aghin¢, vol.VII, pp. 231, 235, 241-242

disappear while people say he has gone to his last resting-place. For years and months he will be invisible in the valley among the lions and leopards and on Ra¤wi mount."

The lines below belong to Kuthayyir 'Azza about Kissin¢ds tenets,

ألا ان الائمة مـن قريش ولاة الحق أربعـة سـواء
علي والثلاثه مـن بنيـه هم الاسباط ليس بهم خفاء
فسبط، سبط ايمـان وبر وسبط غيّبتـه كربـلاء
وسبط لا يذوق الموت حتى يقود الخيل يقدمه اللـواء
تغيب لا يري فيهم زمانـا برضوي عنده عسل وماء[1]

"Be informed that Imims from Quraysh and the owners of rights are four, 'Al¢ and his three sons. These are his sons not anyone else. A son of his was the example of faith and goodness while his another son was removed in Karbali. The other one who has not yet tasted death in order to lead cavalrymen having a standard at the front is disappeared from view on Ra¤wi mount with honey and water."

Some considered Mukhtir as the founder of the K¢ssanids which might have been named after one of Imim 'Al¢'s slaves called Kissin¢ds.[2] Other reasons have been presented for its denomination in various books related to different sects and religions. No scientific research has ever been done yet, but some are of this belief that the K¢ssanids have been wholly fabricated by narrators.[3]

As a number believed that Ibn °anafiyya had shared in foundation of such a sect, the 'Abbisids tried from the outset to secure power through 'Al¢'s succession, thus they declared a proportion for Ibn °anafiyya. In order to justify their caliphate, they announced that the Prophet's authority transferred to 'Al¢ then to Imim °asan and °usayn and entrusted to Ibn °anafiyya by Imim °usayn (a). After being transferred to Ibn °anafiyya's son, Ab£ Hishim, it was

---

[1]. al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.I, pp. 133, 134; Shar¦ al-akhbir, vol.III. P. 297

[2]. al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.I, p. 131.

[3]. Madhihib Ibtada'athi al-siyisia fi l-tir¢kh, 'Abd al-wi¦id al-An¥ir¢, published in Beirut 1973; Qim£s al-ridjil, p. 452

devolved to Mu¦ammad Ibn ‘Al¢ Ibn ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis subsequent to Ab£ Hishim’s death.[1]

Connecting these two issues reveals that the K¢ssanids sect had been beneficial to the ‘Abbisids so that it could transfer the caliphate this way to their lineage. Later on, that way went disadvantageous to the ‘Abbisids. Accordingly, they decided to legitimize their caliphate with recourse to ‘Abbis and proving his inheritance from the Prophet.[2]

‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis, another distinguished member of the Hishimites, was among Ibn Zubayr’s unyielding opponents in Mecca. Yaz¢d, when alive, had held him in high esteem for his opposition against Ibn Zubayr owing to the fact that he had imagined he could use this opportunity in favor of himself.

In response to his letter, touching upon Imim °usayn’s and ‘Abd al-Mu§§alib’s offspring’s murders, Ibn ‘Abbis reproved him as saying, **لا أبالك ! أنسيت قتلك الحسين وفتيان عبدالمطلب، مصابيح الدجي الذين غادرهم جنودك مصرعين في صعيد واحد مرملين بالدماء مسلوبين بالعراء غيرمكفنين ...** “O fatherless! Have I forgotten Husyan’s murder and ‘Abd al-Mu§§alib’s youths who were lights in darkness, those whom your troops left while shrouded in their blood and stripped off they had been fallen on the ground?”

And about his father he added, **وقد أمات ابوك السنّة جهلاً وأحيا البدع والاحداث المضلّة عمداً**[3] “Your father did ignorantly dissolve the Prophet’s Sunna and did expressly revive the misleading heresies.”

Yaz¢d in his answer accused Ibn ‘Abbis of being an accomplice of ‘Uthmin’s assassins. In return, Ibn ‘Abbis said that the main culprit had been his father, Mu‘iwiya, because he had delayed his assistance until ‘Uthmin was dead.[4]

Like Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya[5], in Ibn ‘Abbis’s opinion caliphate had been changed terribly from Prophethood and caliphate into monarchism. He advised people to keep as far

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha of Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.VII, pp. 149, 150

[2]. al-°ayit al-siyisiyya li l-Imim al-Ri¤i, from p. 37 on

[3]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, pp. 248, 250; the letter is fully in al-Ma‘rifat wa l-tir¢kh, by Fasaw¢, vol.I, pp. 531-533

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p. 18

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VI, p. 238

away from both Ibn Zubayr and the Umayyads as possible, for they both drive them toward Hell.[6]

Quite compatible was the position adopted by Ibn ‘Abbis about the events in Mecca during Ibn Zubayr’s time with that of Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya. Ibn ‘Abbis mainly backed Ibn °anafiyya and every now and then they both got into argument with Ibn Zubayr over diverse issues.[3] One of their most considerable arguments was when Ibn Zubayr set Ibn ‘Abbis against the people abiding by caliph II in the issue of “temporary marriage ban” by accusing him on the pulpit of believing in “temporary marriage”. Ibn ‘Abbis stood up all at once and declared that his belief in temporary marriage was based on what the Holy Prophet had prescribed and if he (Ibn Zubayr) had doubted, he could have asked his mother.[4]

Ibn ‘Abbis’s oposition culminated in his expulsion from Mecca. Banished to ±i’if, under no circumstances did he relinquish his struggle.

About Ibn Zubayr he told people, **بقي أقوام يطلبون الدنيا بعمل الاخـرة ويلبسـون جلـود الضـأن تحتهـا قلـوب الـذئاب ... ليظن الناس أنهم مـن الزاهـدين “**Those who are remained are seeking worldly life and are wolves in sheep’s clothing to pretend they are ascetic people.”

It caused Ibn Zubayr to write to him taking him to task. Notwithstanding, Ibn ‘Abbis, an eminent figure, never abstained from answering him reproachfully.[5]

Ibn °anafiyya said prayer for ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis who passed away in 68 in ±i’if and announced, **اليوم مات رباني هذه الامـة رحمـه اللـه تعـالي “**Today a divine person from among this nation died. May Allih bless him.”

Up to that time and even after a long while, there was no strife amongst the Hishimites. As observed afterwards, conflict between the ‘Abbisids and the ±ilibites triggered off and developed so gradually that the ±ilibites were deemed the ‘Abbisids’ archenemies at Man¥£r’s time and were under their heaviest pressure.

---

[6].Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 196

[3]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha of Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol. XX, pp. 134, 148

[4]. See al-Ziwidj al-muwaqqat fi l-islim "Al-Mut‘a", pp. 99, 103 by Kitib Muslim, vol.IV, p. 133; Na¥b al-riya, vol.III, p. 180; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol. XX, p. 130

[5]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XX, pp. 125, 126

Whatsoever had been narrated regarding the Hishimites after ‘Abd al-Malik’s sovereignty shows that he had adopted the policy of condescension and had written to °adjdjidj to avoid streaming the blood of ‘Abd al-Mu§§alib’s descendants. Since Ab£ Sufyin’s family had lost their power this way.[1] In the meantime, until Zayd Ibn ‘Al¢’s uprising in 122 there had been no openly political activity on the part of the Hishimites except what had been said vaguely about the ‘Abbissid’s.

[1]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p. 149

CHAPTER X
THE MARWªNIDS' GOVERNMENT

ªL MARWªN'S RULE

Yaz¢d's demise (in ¯afar 64) was the origin of instability in the Sufyinids's sovereignty. Such instability could be felt not only in the lands distant from the capital but also inside Damascus, the center of the Umayyads's caliphate. The instability was expanded when Mu'iwiya II after forty days or four months abdicated. He announced, **الا وان جدّي معاوية بن ابي سفيان نازع الامر من كان أولى بـه منـه فـي القرابـة برسـول اللـه وأحـق فـي الاسـلام، سـابق المسـلمين، اول المـؤمنين وابـن عـم رسـول رب العـالمين وأبـا بقيّـة خـاتم المرسلين "**My forefather, Mu'iwiya did battle with the one who was the closest to the Prophet in kinship and had long record in Islam. The ever-first Muslim, the ever-first believer, the Prophet's cousin and the father of the Seal of the Prophet's Household was no one save he."

Enumerating some of his father's and forefather's negative conducts, he added, "They martyred the Prophet's kinfolks, profaned the sacred sanctuary and set fire on Ka'ba. Neverever will I undertake your responsibility."[1]

Marwin Ibn °akam suggested that he organize a council like 'Umar. He recoiled from the responsibility, however.[2]

It was astonishing that he was Yaz¢d's son especially when he described his brother,'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Yaz¢d as, **كان ناسكاً متألّها**[3] **"**He is a divine man and a worshipper."

The principal threat to the Umayyads was in the oriental Islamic lands. It was due to the emergence of a rather powerful substitute from 61 A.H. in Mecca who bid his time to take advantage of the existing instability and dethrone the Umayyads in that area. After Yaz¢d's death, 'Ubayd Allih

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p. 254

[2]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p. 254

[3].Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p. 72

Ibn Ziyid, the governor, tried to keep still Ba¥ra and K£fa under his power but the riot of Ba¥ra people had him escape to Damascus.[1] From then on after Mukhtir until 72 A.H., Iraq was ruled by Ibn Zubayr and the Umayyads contented themselves with only Damascus and Egypt.

With the prevailing instability in Damascus, some allied themselves with Ibn Zubayr to eradicate the Umayyads. Nu'min Ibn Bashc¢r An¥irc¢ governing °im¥ turned to Ibn Zubayr. ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays, one of the most influential Umayyads commanders, took control of Damascus. In Palestine, Nitil Ibn Qays Djudhimc¢ joined Ibn Zubayr. 'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Dja¦dam Fihrc¢ as Ibn Zubayr's agent began his activities in Egypt. The one and the only land remained for the Umayyads was Jordan ruled by °assin Ibn Bu¦dal Kalbc¢.[2] And about the tribes, the Qaysids were on Ibn Zubayr's side and the Kalbids on 'Amr Ibn Sa'c¢d's and Marwin Ibn °akam Ibn Abi l-'ªs's side.[3] The Qaysids included the tribes of Sulaym, Hawizin and Ghas§fin whereas the tribes backing Marwin were Kalb, Ghassan, Sak£n, Saksak, Tan£kh, ±ayy (from Damascus) and Qayn.[4] The conflict between these two wings occurred in 64. Marwin Ibn °akam as a leader from Qurayshand the Umayyads secured allegiance from his followers as a caliph and together with the followers of 'Amr Ibn Sa'c¢d went to a war with ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays. The violent battle done in Mardj Rihi§ led to the Qaysids' defeat and ®a¦¦ik's murder, on one hand, and to Marwin's penetration into Damascus and new sovereignty of the Umayyads under the name of the Marwinids, on the other hand. It has been said that 'Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid had been the main element who incited Marwin.[5]

Anyhow, Marwin became the founder of the Marwinc¢ds dynasty. From different standpoints, his rule as well as the way of his assuming power gained a novelty. Although

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 85; Tirc¢kh al-§abarc¢, vol. IV, p. 387

[2]. Tirc¢kh al-ya'q£bc¢, vol.II, p. 255

[3]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p.16; the seed of discord between these two groups was sown when Mu'iwiya married a woman from Kalb. The tribe of Qays not least ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays felt that their social reputation was blackened. The Kalbids turned to the Umayyads and the Qaysids took position against them; Tirc¢kh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p. 177

[4]. Tirc¢kh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p. 177

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, pp. 138, 141

Mu'iwiya had come into power by compulsion and dissimulation, Marwin could secure it thoroughly by sword. According to Mas'£d¢, he was the first one who procured the power by sword with satisfying no group of people at least.[1]

Marwin was in dilemma. One was from the side of 'Amr Ibn Sa'¢d who had played a leading role in the course of this development and was of course nominated as a successor after his son.[2] Nonetheless, he was later slayed by 'Abd al-Malik mercilessly. Another problem was Khilid Ibn Yaz¢d Ibn Mu'iwiya who had secured allegiance from a number of Jordanians in the turmoil of clashes. For the purpose of disparaging him, Marwin married his mother. His affront was followed by Khilid's objection to his mother and Marwin's assassination by his new wife in 65.[3]

Probably Marwin had staged a coup to conquer °idjiz although some sources have ascribed it to 'Abd al-Malik. Overpowering Ibn Zubayr's army in Medina, °ubaysh Ibn Duladja entered the town and began eating dates on the Prophet's pulpit. Afterwards, he set out to Raba¤a, where he battled with the army dispatched by 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr. The majority of Damascus came to be killed and captured.[4] It is alleged that °adjdjidj had been in °ubaysh's army as well.

Marwin's background bears no luminous point. His first political emergence was that as 'Uthmin's son-in-law in the throes of 'Uthmin's conflict with people, he wrote a letter to the ruler of Egypt on behalf of 'Uthmin and without his awareness to decimate Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Bakr and his friends. Later on, he was the governor of Medina for years during which he constantly insulted Imim 'Al¢ (a).[5] When Yaz ¢d after his father's death urged Medinans governor to

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 86

[2]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi', p. 218

[3].Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, pp. 144, 145; Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p. 257; al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p. 146

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 153; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p. 181; al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p. 151

[5]. Tardjamat al-imim al-°usayn, Ibn Sa'd, p. 143 **عن عمير بن اسحاق، كان مروان اميراً علينا ستّ سنين فكان يسبّ عليا في كل جمعة علي المنبر... ثم اعيد مروان فكان يسب عليا "**'Umayr Ibn Is¦iq narrated, "Marwin who was our ruler for six years insulted 'Al¢ every Friday on the pulpit... »

secure allegiance from °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢ (a), Marwin suggested that he be killed if balking at.

Morally, he was described, **كـان مـروان فاحشـاً سـباباً**[1] **“**Marwin was extremely foul mouthed.”

Marwin’s rule lasted for nine months. After his assassination in 65 A.H his son, ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwin, assumed the caliphate. Before that ‘Abd al-Malik was well known for his worship and Qur’in recitation in Medina.[2] No sooner had he heard about his caliphate than he shut Qur’in and bid farewell to it forever.[3]

His main internal problem was the existence of ‘Amr Ibn Sa‘¢d who was supposed to succeed him at his father’s behest. When ‘Abd al-Malik went to conquer Iraq in 68, ‘Amr Ibn Sa‘¢d revolted in Damascus and besieged it. Returning halfway, ‘Abd al-Malik introduced him as his successor deceitfully and after a while killed him.[4] This action did divulge ‘Abd al-Malik’s profound deceitfulness in history and such person as Ibn ‘Abbis applied it to their propagation against him.[5]

Before Mukhtir rose up, ‘Abd al-Malik had endeavored to conquer Iraq by making use of ‘Uthmin-oriented individuals in Ba¥ra. He sent Khilid Ibn ‘Abd Allih to Ba¥ra carrying a message for the nobles. Later, an army headed by Milik Ibn Misma‘ was dispatched too, but both unable to conquer Ba¥ra fled to Damascus. This event was recorded in history as, **يوم الجفرة بالبصرة**[6] **“**Yawm al-Djafra Bi l-ba¥ra”

This very event had likely been recorded by Ibn A‘tham as being led by Za¦r Ibn Qays. He had written that ‘Abd al-Malik had pleaded with the Marwinids to adopt a measure and uproot Ibn Zubayr’s dominion. He had sent Za¦r Ibn Qays accompanied by a one-thousand-soldier army to Ba¥ra; however, the battle resulted in the Marwin¢ds’s serious defeat.

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p. 17

[2].’Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 372; Tir¢kh al-khulafi’ of Ibn Sa‘d, p. 216

[3]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi’, p. 217

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 599; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, pp. 137, 138; vol.V, p. 150

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.144

[6]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp. 155, 157

Mu¥'ab, Iraqi governor, compelled Ba¥ran Marwinids to divorce their wives, he confiscated their properties and demolished their houses.[1] Yet, it indicated that he could not materialize his aim easily. To solve his problems and reinforce his forces, he compromised the Romans[2] -as Mu'iwiya had done so when at war with Imim 'Al¢ (a)- and could suppress troubled areas of Greater Syria like Palestine ruled by Nitil Ibn Qays Djudhim¢. After years in 72,he reached a decision to conquer Iraq. Noticing how Nitil Ibn Qays was vanquished, Mu¥'ab Zubay¢ with an intent to conquer Damascus had to dispense with it.[3]

While the Khiridjites had been making so many obstacles for the Zubayrids from the late 60s and early 70s, 'Abd al-Malik, determined to conquer Iraq, was busy mobilizing troops. The Zubayrids's dominion in oriental Islamic lands and °idjiz lasted nine years (eight years in Iraq). Although 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr himself was far more popular than the Umayyads, some of his specifications made all those able to be helpful for him disperse.[4] His miserliness[5] and accusing others of being worldly were what had all leave him on his own. It is said about his jealousy,

عدمت قريشا رضوا بك سيدا و أنت بخيل الكف غيرجواد

"You killed the Quraysh who approved you. The miser is you."

In spite of the pressure exerted by Mu¥'ab Ibn Zubayr, the Zubayrids had not a firm foundation in Ba¥ra in the light of the fact that Ba¥ra belonged to both Djamal participants and the Marwinids as well as the 'Uthminids. In K£fa, on the other hand, due to its relative Shi'ism, they had no stronghold. The suppression of Mukhtir's uprising had bitterly agitated the Shi'ite Muslims. 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr's enmity with the Hishimites not least with Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya had doubled the Shi'ite Muslims' disgust. It is said

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VI, p. 256

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 98; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 300

[3]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p. 269; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 98

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p. 29

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 197

about Mu¥‘ab Ibn Zubayr that he had been invariably seeking after the Shi‘ite Muslims’ murder.[1]

Consecutive wars with the Khiridjites caused many other people to rebel. A grudge which ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr bore his enemies ended in his disreputation among people. Bearing the Hishimites a grudge (according to himself from 40 years ago)[2], he even was reluctant to recite Mu¦ammad (s) blessing in his sermons and said if so, his household would show off that they were the prophet’s progeny![3] These factors accounted for Ibn Zubayr’s weakness in both Iraq and °idjiz; nevertheless, his influence on °idjiz was more than Iraq. Although his debacle might be blamed on Iraq’s not support, ‘Abd al-Malik’s might, his dependence on Damascus army, proverbial for their obedience to the caliphs,[4] and especially °adjdjidj’s coercion on Damascus people to move to Iraq[5] were considered as the reasons for Ibn Zubayr’s defeat and ‘Abd al-Malik’s victory.

Inasmuch as Ibn Zubayr’s base was shakier in Iraq, ‘Abd al-Malik moved to Ba¥ra in 72. **لـم يبـق شـريف الا كـاتبه** **“**There was no nobleman who had not written to him.”

As all of the distinguished people had written to him but Muhallab Ibn Ab¢ ¯ufra,[6]upon waging the war, a great number left Mu¥‘ab’s army joining to that of Damascus.[7] He resisted to the bitter end and while breathing his last, he asked ‘Urwa Ibn Mugh¢ra what °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢ did when martyred. He responded that neverever was °usayn Ibn ‘Al¢ convinced to do Ibn Ziyid’s bidding.

Mu¥‘ab then said,

إنّ الألي بالطف من آل هاشم تأسّوا فسنّوا للكرام التواسيا[8]

“Those pearls in Karbali were from the Hishimites who chose the best as their model.”

---

[1]. ’Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 197

[2]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha of Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XX, p. 147

[3]. Ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p. 261; al-Aghin¢, vol.II, p. 277

[4]. Wafayit al-a‘yin, vol.I, p. 252

[5]. al-‘Iqd al-Far¢d, vol.V, p. 158

[6]. ’Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 333

[7]. Loc.cit

[8]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 6; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.V, p. 344

One ground for Mu¥'ab's fragility was Ibrih¢m Ibn Milik Ashtar's murder.[1] He defied however, until he was removed. As long as the Zubayrids held sway in Iraq, he was the most important Zubayrids element ruling there except a short while. He had Arabic racial prejudice particularly he was more pessimistic about the Iranians who had accompanied Mukhtir.[2]

Following the clashes, Iraqi residents swore allegiance to 'Abd al-Malik; therefore, the Marwinids became dominant entirely in oriental Islamic lands. The only remaining land was °idjiz ruling by 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr, 'Abd al-Malik, who had already perceived the sensitivity of °idjiz due to the rite of °adjdj (pilgrimage) and even had banned it, contemplated how to seize that land, especially with Ibn Zubayr's involvement in political scenes punctuation there existed some people who had not yet deemed his caliphate legitimate.[3] Among them was 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar who neither had likely sworn allegiance to 'Al¢ nor had he participated in his wars but immediately after Ibn Zubayr's assassination, he nightly went to °adjdjidj and swore allegiance to him.[4]

'Abd al-Malik sent °adjdjidj Ibn Y£suf Thaqaf¢ to °idjiz for conquering Mecca. He stopped in ±i'if, center of Thaq¢f tribe, temporarily and then betook himself to Mecca. It was the second military expedition that the Umayyads made against Mecca for the purpose of overwhelming Ibn Zubayr. The first time in 64 °usayn Ibn Numayr, the commander of Damascus army, returned upon learning Yaz¢d's death, but this time °adjdjidj was engaged in besieging Mecca with his

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VI, p. 266

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 5; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, pp. 161, 162-163

[3]. Suy£§¢ had said that since he secured allegiance as his father's successor during Ibn Zubayr's caliphate, his caliphate was not rightful. Once in power in Damascus and Egypt, later he seized power in Iraq until Ibn Zubayr was killed in 73. From then on his caliphate was right; Tir¢kh al-khulafi', p. 215.

[4]. al-«¤i¦, p. 34; al-mustarshid fi l-Imima, p. 16; concerning his political votes we have discussed in detail in. "the History of Caliphate from Islam's Emergence to the Sufyinids' fall". (Tir¢kh ta¦awwul dawla wa khilifat)

troops as many as 12000 for eight months.[1] During this period, catapults were installed around the town on the heights targetting Ibn Zubayr and al-°arim Mosque under a rain of fire and stones.[2] It was carried on until Ka'ba caught fire. So insolent was he that he even did not avoid throwing garbage on al-°arim Mosque.[3] On Djamid¢ al-Thin¢ 10th, 73 A.H Mecca was eventually blockaded by the Umayyads. Subseqently, °adjdjidj moved to Medina and narratedly he affronted the remaining from the Prophet's disciples such as Djibir Ibn 'Abd Allih, Milik Ibn Anas, Sahl Ibn Sa'd, etc.[4]

From then onwards, the Marwinids governed in all Muslim- populated areas. A barbaric man, 'Abd al-Malik together with some other brutal rulers including °adjdjidj, Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab as well as Hishim Ibn Ismi'¢l[5] made people feel sword. He believed that sword was the only panacea for people.[6]

He abominated "enjoining the lawful acts" and said, **والله لا يأمرني أحد بتقوى الله بعد مقامي هذا الا ضربت عنقه** "If anyone enjoins me fearing Allih, I will break his neck."[7]

Like any other person on the very last days of his lifetime, he wished he had been born porter.[8]

°ADJDJªDJ IN IRAQ

The main element that laid the foundation of caliphate was no one but °adjdjidj. Regarding him, 'Abd al-Malik told his sons later, "It was °adjdjidj who aided us to come to the throne".[9] Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Muslim, °adjdjidj's scribe had said

---

[1]. Wafayit al-a'yin, vol.III, p. 73

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VI, p. 276

[3]. Ibid, vol.II, p. 486; 'Uqali' al-madjin¢n, p. 178 cited form al-¯a¦¢¦ Min S¢rat al-nab¢ (s), vol.I, p. 23

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 35; Tir¢kh al-khulafi', p. 215

[5]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 90 **وكان له اقدام علي الدماء وكان عمّاله على مثل مذهبه** "He was bloodthirsty and so were his agents.

[6]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi', p. 218

[7]. Ibid, pp. 218, 219

[8]. Ibid, p. 220

[9]. Ibid, p. 220; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p. 58

that he had bent his thoughts and efforts to serve the Umayyads.[1]

To reason the superiority of a caliph over the Holy Prophet (s), he himself had affirmed, **أخليفة أحدكم في أهله أكرم أم رسوله في حاجته**[2] **"**In your sight, is the one as your substitute in the family dearer or the one sent to do something?"

According to Djị¦i¨, he had been annoyed when people paid homage to the Prophet's tomb and said as a consequence, **هلا طافوا بقصر أمير المؤمنين عبد الملـك، الا يعلمون أن خليفة المرء خير مـن رسـوله**[3] **"**Why did you not pay homage to the palace of Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n 'Abd al-Malik? Do you not know the caliph is the best one after the Apostle."

°adjdjịdj's this reasoning was repeated by many others too for ingratiating.[4]

°adjdjịdj had been so devoted to 'Abd al-Malik that he had said, "If I learn that demolishing Ka'ba did never draw 'Abd al-Malik's gratification, I shall break it into stones".[5]

Realizing his devotion, when 'Abd al-Malik designated °adjdjịdj as the governor of Iraq, he told his scribe, **اكتب عهـده علـي العراقيـن واطلـق يـده علـي الرجـال والسـلاح والاموال "**Write the permission of his governorship in both Ba¥ra and K£fa and make him fully authorized about people, properties and weapons"[6]

With °adjdjịdj's arrival in Iraq that had never had a taste of the 60s-peace could be returned for twenty years with °adjdjịdj's sword. Since his roughness was extraordinary no one dared oppose him. However, it would be seen how such

---

[1]. Wafayit al-a'yin, vol.II, p. 425

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 147. The same narration has been asscribed to Khilid Ibn 'Abd Allih Qasr¢, Mecca governor in 89. Comparing Wal¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik with Prophet Ibrih¢m (a) on the pulpit, he introduced Wal¢d as the superior one. He said that when Ibrih¢m asked for water, Allih offered him salty water while He offered fresh water to Wal¢d. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 225.

[3]. al-Na¥iyi¦ al-kifiya li-man Yatawalli Mu'iwiya, p. 81; al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol..IX, p. 136

[4]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p. 228

[5]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p. 52

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VII, p. 3

a pressure sparked off riots at last. On arrival in K£fa, he announced, “The caliph had given me two swords of mercy and requital. On my way here, I lost the sword of mercy and the only sword remained is of requital!”[1] In the same sermon, he indicted Iraqi people of schism, hypocrisy and moral corruption[2]; accordingly, he belittled the K£fiyins who were, **ذو هيئة وعزة** “The respectful people.”

As stated by Ibn A‘tham and took them under his yoke.[3] His emergence in Iraq had previously foretold by Imim ‘Al¢ (a) when pronouncing the malediction of **أللهم عجل عليهم بالغلام الثقفي**[4] “O Allih! Hasten the appearance of the man from the tribe of Thaq¢f.”

Yet, it had been later attributed to ‘Umar.[5]

°adjdjidj’s delight in homicide created a myth that when a baby, he was notbreastfed but fed with blood and it had been Satan’s suggestion under the guise of a human.[6] Ibn Khallakin has written, **و كان للحجاج في القتل وسفك الدماء والعقوبات غرائب لم يسمع مثلها**[7] “Many a story has been recounted about massacre and torture done by °adjdjidj that were unparalleled at all.”[8]

The aftermath of his great savagery in Iraq was the slaughter of more than 120000 people.[9] Nearly 50000 men and 30000 women, half of whom unmarried, were confined in his mixed jails.[10]

Characterizing him, Suy£§¢ has written, **و قد قتل من الصحابة والتابعين ما لا يحصي، فضلاً عن غيرهم وختم في عنق انس وغيره من الصحابة ختماً** “He massacred countless

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p.32

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VII, p.8; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.43; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.132; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.273

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VII, p.4

[4]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.142

[5]. Shadhirit al-dhahab f¢ Akhbir Min dhahab, vol.I, p.107

[6]. Wafayit al-a‘yin, vol.II, p.30; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.132

[7]. Wafayit al-a‘yin, vol.II, p.31

[8]. Ibid, p.30

[9]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.183; Mu‘djam al-buldin, vol.V, p.349

[10]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.166

Prophet's disciples and followers let alone others. He made some gashes on Anas Ibn Milik's neck and other's."[1]

From 75 to 95, °adjdjidj was the absolute ruler in Iraq and oriental Islamic lands including Khurisin, S¢stin and all other Iranian areas. Despite the existing hindrances, he had been so preoccupied with suppressing the Khiridjites, Shi'ite Muslims and any rebel Sunnites that no conquest, except during the last years, was made. What ought to be borne in mind is that °adjdjidj had numerous rivals in Iraq but he removed them all barbarically.

His first enemy was the Khiridjites. Only Qa§ar¢ Ibn Fudji'a, a Khiridjites leader, engaged him for years. After their defeat in Kirmin and the Khiridjites' split, it was Shab¢b who occupied K£fa twice for hours. Ultimately after a long clash, °adjdjidj could accomplish to suppress them with recourse to Damascus.[2] The Khiridjites were scattered in various districts of Iraq as well. More than half of °adjdjidj's prisoners were either Khiridjites or being accused of it.

Another group was the Shi'ite Muslims opposing °adjdjidj in Iraq. As a consequence of the penitents and Mukhtir's defeat in 65 and 67 respectively, Shi'ite Muslims were scattered losing their solidarity. 'Abd al-Malik who had no apparent fight with 'Abd al-Mu§§alib's progeny, had advised °adjdjidj in a letter to adopt the same strategy. As written by Ibn 'Abd Rabbih not a single objection did °adjdjidj raised to the ±ilibites.[3] It never implied that he was not at odds with the Shi'ite Muslims but it was on account of the fact that no ±ilibites lived in Iraq. Nontheless, the Shi'ite Muslims residing in K£fa and other spots of the country were under the worst pressure. As stated by Imim Biqir (a) hearing the word "'Al¢'s Shi'ites Muslim" was far less tolerable for °adjdjidj than the word dualism or "atheist".[4]

Whatever made him pleased was to hear a person from a tribe saying, "No one in our tribe has ever cursed 'Uthmin; in ¯iff¢n, seventy people from our tribe had been with Mu'iwiya while only one with Ab£ Turib; no woman from women has ever felt in affection for Ab£ Turib; there has been found no

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi', p.221

[2]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, pp.274, 275

[3]. al-'Iqd al-Far¢d, vol.V, p.149

[4]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.II, p.44

one in our tribe whom we urged to curse Ab£ Turib in addition to °asan, °usayn and Fi§ima and he disobeyed.[1]

In order to pressurize them to curse ‘Al¢ (a), °adjdjidj whipped such individuals as ‘A§iyya Ibn Sa‘d ‘Awf¢ four hundred lashes for their amity with ‘Al¢ (a), ‘A§iyya defied, however.[2] Those intending to wheedle °adjdjidj, manipulated such values.

‘Al¢ Ibn Asma‘ came up to °adjdjidj and said, **انّ أبويّ عقّاني فسمَّياني عليّاً فسمِّنِي أنت** “My parents have not only disowned me but also named me ‘Al¢. Change my name. Changing his name, °adjdjidj offered him presents.”[3]

Even the simplest Shi‘ites idea was followed by °adjdjidj perturbation. He, for instance, summoned Ya¦yi Ibn Ya‘mur from Khurisin to Iraq due to announcing that both °asan (a) and °usayn(a) were the Prophet’s descendants. He merely contented himself with his banishment once Ya¦yi could validate his notion through authenticating that Jesus Christ had been Ibrih¢m’s descendant too on the strength of Qur’in.[4] As °adjdjidj laid stress on affection for ‘Uthmin, he, in his turn, murdered any one suspected of participating in riots against ‘Uthmin before.[5]

‘Abd al-Malik and his agents had been persistently attempting to boost the fights between the ‘Alawites and the Zubayrids for the purpose of keeping them engaged. It was in one of these certain meetings that Imim Sadjdjid did not attend feigning illness.[6] ‘Al¢’s lineage was coerced by ‘Abd al-Malik to curse ‘Al¢ while the Zubayrids were so to curse ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr.[7] His son, Sulaymin Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, perpetuated this policy pressurizing people to curse Imim ‘Al ¢ (a) under threat of murder.[8]

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.144; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad ¢d, vol.IV, p.61.

[2]. Shadhirit al-dhahab, vol.I, p.144

[3]. Wafayit al-a‘yin, vol.III, p.175

[4]. Ibid, vol.VI, p.147

[5]. al-Muwaffaqiyyit, p.99

[6]. Nasab Quraysh, Mu¥‘ab Zubayr, pp.47, 48

[7]. Nasab Quraysh, Zubayr Ibn Bakkir, p.83

[8]. Wafayit al-a‘yin, vol.II, p.426

In such a financially tough situation did the Prophet's Household live under the Umayyads pressure that later the Iraqi ruler had said concerning them, **أن أهل هذا البيت من بني هاشم [بني علي] قد كانوا هلكوا جوعاً حتى كانت همة أحدهم قوت يومه "**This family from the Hishimites was under threat of starvation to the extent that they only bent their efforts to earn their daily bread."[1]

Besides the Shi'ite Muslims and the Khiridjites, °adjdjidj encountered other adversaries who had risen up against the Umayyads's oppression or for whatever reason. The first year °adjdjidj came in power in Iraq, he cut out the surplus proportion from Bayt al-Mil (public treasury) to Ba¥ra people. This action culminated in Ba¥ra revolt in 75 led by 'Abd Allih Ibn Djir£d although it was immediately stifled.[2] Another movement was led by Mu§arraf Ibn Mugh¢ra who himself and whose father had been from the kins of the Umayyads and the governors of K£fa and Ctesiphon but was affected by the Khiridjites. When the representatives of Khiridjites Shab¢b met with Mu§arraf, he proposed that after gaining victory the caliph be determined by a council and be from the Quraysh. Neither of his conditions was approved by the Khiridjites, however.[3]

The motivations he himself had enumerated for his insurrection against °adjdjidj were, **الاستئثار بالفيء وتعطيل الحدود والتسلط بالجبريّة "**Misappropriation of public treasury, transgression of divine limits and despotism."[4]

He along with his followers left Ctesiphon to Qa¥r Sh¢r¢n and after a stop-over on the outskirts of I¥fahin to Simin district and then to Qum and Kishin.[5] Gradually some people from Riy and I¥fahin, naturally many Arabs and likely a few Iranians, joined him. In a letter, I¥fahin governor wrote to °adjdjidj if he wanted the city, he should hasten. The Arab governor of Hamadin for his part asked for °adjdjidj's permission to suppress Mu§arraf, since the scattering of Arabs in the lands paying tax had appalled him, he declined

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.VII, p.106

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.46

[3]. Ibid, vol.V, pp.108, 109

[4] Ibid, vol.V, p.108

[5]. Ibid, vol.V, p.113

his proposal.[1] By the same token, an army composed of Damascus and Riy people could finally manage to chuckle down Mu§arraf's movement in 77 AH.

Afterwards, 'Abd al-Malik entrusted all eastern lands up to Khurisin and S¢stin borders to °adjdjidj. °adjdjidj who had conquered nowhere as yet - even halted from Yaz¢d's time before him-decided to take an action in this respect and bring further booties for the Umayyads. His determination to dispatch an army for the conquests faced a hurdle for surmounting which behooved him to devote one or two years.[2]

'ABD AL-RA°MªN IBN ASH'ATH'S RIOT

'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Ash'ath Ibn Qays was selected as the commander of a massive Iraqi army to launch his conquests while neither he nor his household was good enough towards Ahl al-Bayt. As it was mentioned by Imim ¯idiq (a), Ash'ath was an accomplice in 'Al¢'s martyrdom his daughter, Dju'da, was the murderer of Imim °asan and his son, Mu¦ammad, was an agent in Imim °usayn's martyrdom.[3] 'Abd al-Ra¦min was once appointed by the Zubayrids to amass alms in Medina.[4] Heading for S¢stin in 80 A.H. along with his army, he made up his mind to bring the fight to a standstill until the next year after being somehow victorious. Proposing this to °adjdjidj, he refused it; consequently, neither 'Abd al-Ra¦min nor his army accepted to approve °adjdjidj's demand while knowing the laborious task encumbered upon them. Later, this came to be an excuse for them the to be at odds both with °adjdjidj and the Umayyads.

Iraqi rebellious army, instead of conquering new lands, returned to Iraq while being fully equipped to rebel against that country but since the Arabs were not in S¢stin, it would

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.V, p.115

[2]. In recent years, (1405 A.H) a book entitled "al-°adjdjidj Radjul al-dawlat al-Muftari 'Alayh" was published in Iraq for defending °adjdjidj.

[3]. Raw¤a al-kif¢, p.245

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p.60

have been much easier for them to gain victory if this riot had happened in Khurisin.[1]

'Abd al-Ra¦min called upon people to adhere both to Qur'in and the Prophet's Sunna, depose misleading leaders and combat the unbelievers.[2] His army entered Ba¥ra in 81 A.H.. The residents of Ba¥ra, both those who knew Qur'in by heart and the readers thereof as well as the doyen altogether gave a helping hand in overthrowing 'Abd al-Malik. People in K£fa also joined him utterly.[3] From among the rioters, the followers of Ibn Ash'ath, there were huge numbers of Qur'in readers and scores of Iraqi jurisprudents[4] such as Ibn Ab¢ Layli, someone who was battered and pushed by °adjdjidj to insult 'Al¢ (a).[5] The majority of those adoring 'Al¢ played a significant role in this uprising. Kumayl Ibn Ziyid was a commander of a group of Qur'in readers.[6] Being embarrassed, 'Abd al-Malik, put forward the idea of unsenting °adjdjidj in order to maintain peace; however, owing to the fact that both 'Abd al-Ra¦min and his supporters who on one hand, had a taste of being triumphant and, on the other hand, did not feel confident enough whether he would carry out his undertaking or not, failed to accept his suggestion.[7] Moreover, they were not in opposition to °adjdjidj but basically to the Umayyads and it was reasonably evident from their remarks in deposing 'Abd al-Malik.

To prompt people to revolt against the Umayyads, some vocalized 'Al¢'s remarks. This was an indication of the presence of those tending to Shi'ism.[8]

Such a trend of this riot, in comparison to that of Tawwib ¢n's and Mukhtir's was not so noticeable. Above all, someone was leading the riot who behaved not well towards Ahl al-Bayt. The only reason for various parties to join hands

---

1. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.149
2. Ibid. vol.v, p.149
3. Ibid. vol.v, p.155
4. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.6, p.293
5. Tadhkirat al-¦uffi¨, vol.1, p.58
6. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.158
7. Ibid. vol.v, p.157
8. Ibid. vol.v, p.163; It has been told in a quotation in 'Umdat al-§ilib, he had paid allegiance to one of the 'Alawites.

was not more than enmity to the Umayyads and to overthrow °adjdjidj. From among the notions they repeatedly were taking advantage in their campaign against the Umayyads, one can name their brutality, disregarding the weak and attempting to leave no trace of prayers. **قـاتلوهم علـى جـورهم فـي الحكـم وتجـبرهم فـي الـدين واستذلالهم الضعفاء وإماتتهم الصلاة** [1] **"**Fight them to get rid of their cruelty in ruling their bullyism in religion, their violation of the rights of the weak and their attempt of disregarding prayers."

One of the prime reasons that brought about this riot was °adjdjidj's compulsion on the villagers who recently had embraced Islam and moved into cities. Tax deduction, consequence of that migration, impelled °adjdjidj to drive them out of those cities and re-settle them where they had been. Being under hard pressure, they cried out, "O, Mu¦ammad!"[2] This caused them to tilt towards 'Abd al-Ra¦min to kill °adjdjidj. Besides, sending the Iraqis to the most remote areas to fight simply for the booties which were handed to °adjdjidj ultimately was another reason for their rebellion.[3] The impact of taking capitation from newlly converted Mawil¢ should also be taken into account. It was told that the majority of the rioters were jurisprudent, Ba¥ra's soldiers as well as Mawil¢.[4]

'Abd al-Ra¦min's riot continued until 83 A.H. when Dayr al-Djamidjim event, one of the foremost strike, took place. Due to his defeat and the captivity of extensive numbers of his supporters, 'Abd al-Ra¦min was not able to withstand in the subsequent clashes. Eventually, he returned to S¢stin and on his way to Khurisin. Most of his supporters separated from him. Then he took refuge by one of the kings in Harit. Ratb¢l, the king of that land, concluded a treaty with °adjdjidj in 85 A.H. in which he had promised to send 'Abd al-Ra¦min's head to °adjdjidj.

Massacring a large number of Dayr al-Djamidjim's captives, °adjdjidj set free only those confessing that they were infidel. There, among them, were a handful of Iraqi

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.v, p.163

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢. vol.v, p.182

[3]. Tir¢kh al-Dawlat al-'arabiyya, p.225

[4]. al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.3, p.364

jurisprudents.[1] Sha'b¢ was one of the jurisprudents, who surrendered himself to °adjdjidj after being defeated. Another one was Sa'¢d Ibn Djubayr who was apprehended by the governor of Medina, Khilid Ibn'Abd Allih Qasr¢. Inquiring about his viewpoint with respect to the previous caliphs, which was an indication of being skeptical of trusting them, °adjdjidj put an end to his life. From then on, °adjdjidj was suffering from a severe psychical disorder because of Sa'¢d's murder.[2] They kept on killing the captives to such an extent that 'Abd al-Ra¦min himself complained about it to °adjdjidj.[3]

Ibn Ash'ath's clash with °adjdjidj was the fourth one out of the strings of clashes between Iraq and Damascus. The three previous ones were once with 'Al¢ (a) and with the penitents and Mukhtir, another time with Mu¥'ab and finally with Ibn Ash'ath. This time again the dispersed Iraqi people failed to succeed and the people of Damascus, due to their solidarity as well as unsparing contribution to the Umayyads Caliphs, came to be triumphant.

'Abd al-Malik died in 86 A.H. while he had managed, with assistance of °adjdjidj, to eliminate monstrous problems facing the Umayyads and pave the ground for the Marwinids. It is said that he was the initiator of some event in the Islamic history. Being the first one ever to carve name of Allih and His prophet on coins, the first and foremost jealous, cunning and treacherous caliph, the first to proscribe speaking in the presence of caliphs, to enjoin the good and to change the records of public treasury tribunal account from Arabic to Persian. He was also the first to include prayer call prior to performing the prayers of two Festivals namely the Fast breaking and Sacrifice. [4] After him, his son, Wal¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik came to power. Regarding Wal¢d and his agents 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z stated, "Wal¢d in Damascus, °adjdjidj in Iraq, 'Uthmin Ibn °ayyin in °idjiz and Qurra Ibn Shar¢k in Egypt are all individuals prevailing

---

[1]. al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.v, p.169; al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.2, p.47

[2]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.2, p.54; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.156

[3]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.133; Tahdh¢b Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.4, p.67; Wafayit al-a'yin vol.2, p.35

[4]. Tir¢kh al-Khulafi', p.218, It is uncertain whether he had mint coins or not.

oppression throughout the Earth. **امتلاء الارض والله جوراً** [1] **"**While there is much cruelty on the Earth."

It has been told about Wal¢d that, **اول من تجبّـر مـن الخلفاء** [2] **"**He was the first ever cruel caliph."

The Umaw¢ mosque in Damascus is one of the most significant monuments built in his term. The apparent tranquility of the period from Shawwil, 86 A.H. to Djamid¢ al-Thin¢, 96 A.H. all over the Islamic lands once again led to conquering new lands to such an extent that, according to Dhahab¢, "The conquests of his term regained the same splendor as that of 'Umar Ibn Kha§§ib's term".[3] The most important assault was, on one hand, against Constantinople and, on the other hand, against Andalusia.

Wal¢d, just the same as his father, was indebted to °adjdjidj, one of his best counselors. Once a crowd of Iraqi people went to Medina to meet 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z, the governor, and he wrote a letter of complaint to Wal¢d. Thereafter, Wal¢d in consultation with °adjdjidj deposed him from Medina's governorship. Then he singled out 'Uthmin Ibn °ayyin Marr¢ instead of him. He sent Iraqi refugees kept in fetters to °adjdjidj.[4]

The subsequent governor of the Islamic lands from Djamid¢ al-Thin¢, 96 to ¯afar, 99 A.H., Sulaymin Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, selected 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z his successor. As it was touched upon formerly, this period should be labelled as a peaceful one following constant attacks of 'Abd al-Malik in stabilizing his position in the shadow of which the Umayyads caliphs could not only expand their conquests but strengthen their economy as well. In addition, the internal political disputes, a severe strike on the economy of the society, were eliminated too. That was why Wal¢d was widely known as the best caliph for Damascus.[5] Annoying and chasing the companions of °adjdjidj were some of the actions of

---

[1]. Ibid. p.223

[2]. Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p.216; Ansib al-ashrif, p.243

[3]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi', p.225

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.2, pp.1285,1261; quoted from Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya p.247

[5]. al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.v, p.173

Sulaymin, the main reason of which was a dispute between °adjdjidj and him when he was their apparent.[1]

°adjdjidj was killed in 95 A.H.. To speak about him what Shuray¦ had said will suffice. According to him, he was an unbeliever.[2] Upon hearing the news of his death, °asan Ba¥r ¢ prostrated to show his gratitude to Allih.[3]

'UMAR IBN 'ABD AL-'AZ«Z'S ADMINISTRATION

For the historians dealing with the Umayyads caliphs, 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z, ruling from 99 to 101 A.H. is an eminent figure. For in comparison with them not others, he was a man of outstanding features. In his studies about the approaches of kings, Ibn Ath¢r stated that he could not find anyone better than him in conduct succeeding to Orthodox Caliphs.[4] He is usually regarded as the fifth member of them.[5] This statement of Imim Biqir (a) is probably right that he was the Umayyads's nobleman.[6] Being Medina's governor, as it was said, he was in touch with traditionalists as well as jurisprudents, so he was also an specialist in this regard.[7] However, he himself said that he could remember what he had learnt just during the period he was in Medina and he forgot it no later than he entered Damascus (assuming caliphate).[8] Radji' Ibn °aywa, one of the linked learned to the Umayyads' caliphs, did make great endeavor bringing him to power.[9] We had already spoken about him.

To know both him and his policy in ruling the Islamic society, no matter Whether he had a political or religious aim in has term, a point of great importance should be taken into account. He had made great endeavor to bring justice to that society and not to be a cruel rule. He also had directed his attention towards the accepted merits of a typical Islamic

---

1. Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, vol.v, p.250
2. Wafayit al-a'yin, vol.2, p.463
3. Ibid. vol.2, (the footnote), al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.v, p.49
4. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.1, p.403
5. Ibid. vol.v, p.65
6. Ibid. vol.v, p.62; Siyar a'lim al-nubali', No.7, p.589, vol.v, p.117
7. al-Aghin¢, vol.9, p.273
8. Siyar a'lim al-nubali', vol.v, p.121
9. Ibid. vol.v, p.123

society, Observing religious tenets and respecting at least some of the popular individuals. He had tried to show a religious image of his caliphate too. Most likely, he had understood that the situation of the society would lead soon to overthrowing of the Umayyads. What was required then was a radical change for the stabilization of them. It is worthwhile to review his reactions towards different groups from various aspects.

ENCOUNTERING THE SHI‘ITE MUSLIMS

Speaking about the Shi‘ite Muslims, at first, does not imply that ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z wanted to be good towards them. Some of the sources inclined to the Shi‘ite Muslims had tried to show that he was adherent of Imim ‘Al¢ (a). They may have done so to say that no one from among the Umayyads’s caliphs had paid attention to Ahl al-Bayt as him. Reviling ‘Al¢ (a) in sermons formally and publicly prevailed at that time.[1] He said that from then on, noone was permitted to do so. He himself, as it was said, was doing so before, but later on, he came to know about his bad habit and always recalled ‘Al¢ as a good man.[2] Upon coming to power not only did he himself abandon this habit but also he had his agents give it up.[3] There is no doubt, based on historical sources, that he had done so.[4] Kuthayyir ‘Azza, a Shi‘ites poet, composed some verses in praising ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z before him,

وليت فلم تشتم عليّاً ولم تخِف بريئاً ولم تتبعْ مقالة مجرم

تكلمت بالحق المبين وإنما تبين آيات الهدي بالتكلم [5]

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.4, p.56

[2]. Siyar a‘lim al-nubali’, vol. 5, p. 117

[3]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.v, p.42; It was written in one of the footnotes of the book entitled "Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-‘arabiyya that Wellhausen who was a researcher was doubtful about it but he had no reason for being so, see, p. 299

[4]. See, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.4, p.56; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.2, p.305; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, p. 184

[5]. Dhahab¢, Siyar a‘lim al-nubali’, vol.4, p.147; al-Aghin¢, vol.9, pp.258,259; Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.2, p.305; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.v, p.42; Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.4, p.59

"Thou came to power and did not revile 'Al¢ (a), thou did listen to no culpable instead thou told the true word. Others came to know about Allih's signs by listening to thy word."

It was said that he gradually enlarged his understanding of Imim 'Al¢ (a) specifically when he found 'Al¢'s letter in the Damascus public treasury. Then he informed all about it.[1]

He had been quoted as saying, **أزهد الناس في الـدنيا علي**[2] **"'**Al¢ is the most pious person in the world."

However, it is doubtful whether he was courageous enough to be so on that occasion or not even if one disregards all of those quotations what was said about him is most likely true.

Wal¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, on the other hand, while on the pulpit quoted Allih's Prophet, regarding 'Al¢ (a) and rank tradition, as saying, "Your status in comparison with me is like that of Qur'in in comparison with Moses."[3]

It was also said that he was respecting Imim Biqir(a).[4]

Another issue was returning Fadak to Fi§ima (a). It was a booty that was given to Fi§ima (a), with no war, by his father Mu¦ammad (s). This land was taken from Fi§ima, thereafter, without any apparent reason. Returning it to the 'Alawites was an indication of nullifying the order of both caliphs I and II. On the other hand, 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z, the upholder of a jurisdiction that was mostly based on the conduct of the second caliph. Such action by him, as it was said by some of the researchers, shows that he was not following the second caliph but was somehow independent.[5] Ibn Ath¢r by giving false account of the ownership of Fadak during the time of Orthodox Caliphs had tried to show that such deviation goes back to the time of Mu'iwiya in which he donated it to Marwin Ibn °akam. It was also said that 'Uthmin had done this not Marwin. Since from the very beginning of the first caliph's term, it was not under the ownership of Ahl al-Bayt.

---

[1]. Shra¦ Nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d vol.6, p. 72

[2]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.3, p. 401

[3]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.VI, p.278

[4]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XIII, pp.77-78

[5]. Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p. 287 **(**و معني هذا انه لم يكن يتبعهما اتباعاً تاما**)**

Ibn Ath¢r said, “When ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z came to power, he returned it to Fi§ima’s descendants. Later on, it was taken from them once again. Ma’m£n, this time, gave it back to them.[1]

There are other narrations regarding his attention to Fi§ima’s children. For instance, once he asked his governor in Medina to distribute 10000 diners among ‘Al¢’s children. He wrote back saying that ‘Al¢ has children among various tribes. The caliph told him to share it out among the children of Fi§ima.[2]

Abu l-Faradj l¥fahin¢ had mentioned some instances of his attention to ‘Abd Allih Ibn °asan Ibn °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ (a).[3]

When the caliph was criticized for his action, he said, “I heard Allih’s Prophet said, **إنما فاطمة بضعة مني يسرّني من يسرها** “Fi§ima is part of my body. Whoever makes her happy, he shall make me happy.”

The he added, **ليس أحد من بني هاشم الا ولـه شـفاعة** [4] “There is no one from among the Hishimites who can intercede him before Allih except her.”

When a Mawil¢ of Imim ‘Al¢ came to him, the caliph sat down on the ground and said, **انا والله مولى علـي** “Both Allih and I are ‘Al¢’s friends.”

Then he quoted this tradition from Allih’s Prophet, **من كنت مولاه فهذا علي مولاه** [5] Taking the position of the caliph into account, one doubts about the validity of those narrations. Some poets admired him for what he had done. Sayyid Raz¢, for example composed,

يا بن عبدالعزيز لو بكت العيـن فتـيً مـن أميّة لَبَكيتـُك
غيـر أني أقول أنـك قد طبـ ت وإن لم يطب ولم يذك بيتك
أنت نزهتنا عن السب والقذ ف فلو أمكن الجزاء جزيُتِك [6]

“O, son of ‘Abd al-Az¢z, if eyes are to weep for one of the Umayyads’s youths, they will surely do this for thee. Thou have been purified but not thy household. Thou had

---

[1]. al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.2, pp.224, 225; See, also vol.3, p. 63

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, p. 184

[3]. al-Aghin¢, vol.9, pp. 262-264

[4]. Ibid. vol.9, p. 263

[5]. Ibid. vol.9, p.264

[6]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol. 4, p.60

prevented us from hurling abuse at Ahl al-Bayt. I would reward thee if I could."

Since the 'Alawites were the Umayyads's successors, heading them and subsiding their long-lived rage and hatred could be constructive in the process of 'Umar II's reform movement targetting at the Umayyads's stabilization. At the same time, the Hishimites's call, the way paved by the 'Abbisids, started. 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z tried hard to suppress them and by justifying what they were doing guaranteed the survival of the Umayyads.

ENCOUNTERING THE KHªRIDJITES

Another group threatening Umayyads was the Khiridjites. With their constant revolts, they were almost always irritating Umayyads's rulers and they could not stop them rising up against Iraqi governor and the Khiridjites could defeat them. After a while, another army was sent to the battle. This time, 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z, following his usual policy, wrote a letter to their leader, Bas§im from Ban£ Yashkur tribe, saying, "I was informed that you had revolted just for the sake of Allih and His Prophet. Bear in mind that I am superior to you in this regard but let's debate. If we were right, you should follow us like others and if you were right, we would take your advice."

Bas§im accepted what he said and sent a person to talk to him.

In this regard, ±abar¢ stopped short of saying anything but touching upon the fact that the Khiridjites deemed it improper to pay allegiance to Yaz¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik. Pretending not to know anything about this, 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z said that he should think about it more. He also went on to say that he was poisoned to death by the Marwinids for what he had said.[1]

In contrast, Mas'£d¢ gave an extended account thereof stating, "Admitting the caliph's approach as a fair and square one, the Khiridjites declared (at least as a debate) that if he were so, he would be at adds with his tribe and as a result a cruel one. So he should not only curse them but also turn away from them in disgust. Attempting to reprove

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, pp.310, 311

them, by setting an example, ‘Umar asked them whether they trusted Ab£ Bakr and him or not. They said that they did.

Then he said, “Ab£ Bakr had fought against the infidels and held captives, but once ‘Umar came to power, he set them all free.”

As a result, he nullified what Ab£ Bakr had done.

Then he said, “Did he abhor him then?”

“No he did not”, the Khiridjites replied.

Taking into account the Khiridjites’ reaction in just the same situation, he asked them if they despised one another or not. He said that for the very same reason he should not curse his dynasty. Out of those who were sent to debate, one did join the Khiridjites but the second one did not.

Mas‘£d¢ further says that there are other narrations about the relationships between ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z and the Khiridjites. Besides, he has mentioned the debates and exchange of letters in his book titled Akhbir al-Zamin and in other books.[1]

Obviously, these actions have been taken during two years or so of government according to a certain policy. This made the Khiridjites lose their agitation and not bother the community.

STANDING AGAINST CRUELTY AND PUBLIC EXTORTION

Diminishing the pressure of the governors on individuals was another performance of ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z. People were pessimist about the governors. Since most of the time they were taking the biggest part of the booties themselves, they also were the owners of vast lands. These could give rise to an outburst of violence and provoke both the Khiridjites and Shi‘ite Muslims to support such uprising as that of ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Ash‘ath’s. The caliph so gave back whatsoever the Umayyads had taken from people to their

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, pp.193-191; Ibn Ath¢r also quoted the same statement in addition to some other remarks, see al-Kimil fi l-tir ¢kh, vol.v, pp.46-48

real owners.[1] However, he was cautious not to take the possession of their lands. He even ordered the residents of Damascus to pay more gifts to the Umayyads but he refrained from doing the same to the residents of Iraq.[2] What is obvious is that he neither intended nor could do this since it would disperse the Umayyads, on one hand, and remove pressure from some individuals, on the other hand. Iraqis were from among those bearing the brunt. Not only were the Mawil¢ residing in Iran, oppressed all the time leaving out 'Al ¢'s term, but Arabs residing in Iraq as well were pressurized by the Umayyads rulers, in particular, °adjdjidj.

±abar¢ quoted a letter in which 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z had described the situation of the residents of Damascus to their governor.

He said, "They were subject to ruthlessness, compulsion and malicious conducts of inept governors while religion was in need of justice. Then he ordered the governor of K£fa not to collect tax from those converted to Islam and the destitute beyond their means. He also ordered them not to take anything from the affluent but tax and not to ask people to pay the salaries of tax-collectors and finally not to accept new year and Mihrgin's gifts as well as the money that was taken under the name of Darihum al-Niki¦ or fee for writing the books or wages for the family. Also those who are converted Muslims shall not be received tributes.[3]

The above-mentioned letter shows that the Umayyads governors were ransacking public properties. They were also taking unfair advantages of Zoroastrian's customs namely, The New Year and Ancient Autumnal Festivals by demanding presents from them on those occasions. This was just what Man¥£r 'Abbis¢ was doing with the same intention. According to Imim Ki¨im (a) what they were doing was reviving Zoroastrian's customs.[4]

One further point of prime significance was collecting tax and tribute even form those who had embraced Islam. This action was prevailed by °adjdjidj to compensate for the

---

[1]. Akhbir al-§iwil, p.331; Siyar a'lim al-nubali', vo.5, p.129; al-Aghin¢, vol.9, p.255

[2]. Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.2, p.306

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.102

[4]. Musnad al-imim al-Ki¨im (a), vol.I, pp.51-52

public treasury's losses. The conversion of many people to Islam and its consequence, tax reduction, he had faced many financial problems. 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z, on the other hand, by exempting those converted to Islam from paying tax, a chief reason for most of Mawil¢ to join 'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Ash'ath, could prevent the re-occurrence of such riots. Seemingly, it was feasible and resulted in expansion of Islam. In 77, when Bukayr Ibn Wishi¦ revolted against the governor of Khurisin, Umayya Ibn 'Abd Allih who had gone to Bukhiri for another war, he was terrified that perhaps the number of his soldiers would not be sufficient to withstand them. However, he was told that it would suffice for him to have his town herald announce among people that whosoever embraces Islam, he shall be discharged from paying tax. In that case, he will see fifty thousand people who are the best in obedience joining him.[1]

How Islam's growth was brought to a standstill due to the severity of this kind in °adjdjidj's term is quite apparent. 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z has followed the same policy.

Once an Arab and one of Mawil¢ came to him.

The second one told him, "O caliph, twenty thousand of Mawil¢s are fighting side by side with Arabs against unbelievers while they are not given anything of the spoils. An identical number of protected people (Proteges in accordance with an agreement) have embraced Islam but they are still paying tax."

'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z commanded Khurisin's governor, Djarri¦ Ibn 'Abd Allih to exempt whosoever accepts Islam from paying tax and soon many people embraced Islam.[2] The west barbars had confronted just the same treatment as it quoted by Balidhur¢.[3]

From among sermons as well letters quoted by him, many cases can be seen which depict the great importance attached to religion and piety. Even if they were exaggerated to a great extent to justify the Umayyads at least, on the whole, one can not deny them all.[4] It had been observed that he has been promoted to such an extent as

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.129

[2]. Ibid. vol.v, p.314

[3]. See Wellhausen, Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p.285; Fut£¦ al-buldin, p.233

Allih's favorites but, as a matter of fact, it was only in comparison with the other Umayyads governors that he could attract attention. Anyhow, he was ruling while being among an Umayyads family, so his attempt was directed towards consolidating such system.

Khilid Ibn Rib'¢ was quoted as saying, "I have read in Torah that both the heaven and the earth will be weeping for forty days in 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z's mourning.[1] It is quite obvious that following this way, they were attempting to increase his virtues.

One of the scientific activities of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z was the issue of inscribing traditions proposed by him for the first time in spite of the fact that others did not heed it later. He ordered his commanders to commit the knowledge of their scholars on the paper for him.[2] Zuhr¢, a scholar linked to Umayyads and contemporary with him was the first ever one embarking on it.[3] He himself had said that he was asked not only to write down traditions but also dispatch some copies thereof to other cities.[4] As it was stated in another quotation, he wrote a letter to Ab£ Bakr Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn °azm An¥ir¢, a hadith-narrator and Medina's ruller on behalf of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z saying to collect every single tradition he had heard from prophet (s) as well as whatsoever being quoted by 'Umar and send them all to him for fear that they may be forgotten.[5] He has written the same letter to the residents of Medina.[6]

In spite of the fact that it was a positive movement, even up to the midst of the third century A.H. most of the traditionalists were not still interested in writing traditions and it was considered as a great blow on prophet's biography among to the Sunnites.[7]

---

[4]. See, Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, pp.315, 316, 320, 322; al-Aghin¢, vol.9, pp.266, 269

[1]. Siyar a'lim al-nubali', vol.v, p.142

[2]. 'Abd al-Razziq, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.9, p.337

[3]. Djimi' Bayin al-'ilm, vol.1, pp,88, 91

[4]. Djimi' Bayin al-'ilm, vol,1. P,92

[5]. Sunan al-dirim¢, vol.1, p.126; Taqy¢d al-'ilm, pp.105,106

[6]. Sunan al-dirim¢, vol.1, p.126; Akhbir I¥fahin, vol.I, p.312; Tadr¢b al-riw¢, vol.I, p.312

In 101 A.H., ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z passed away. Then Yaz¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik who was adherent to the consistent policy of cruelty, extortion and pressure came to power. There is a quotation indicating that he was poisoned by the Umayyads, despite the probability of its occurrence, it is nothing but a quotation which is based on assumptions.

YAZ«D IBN ‘ABD AL-MALIK’S SUCCESSION

Even if we accept that ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z had carried out some reforms and improved people’s attitude towards Umayyads. Thereafter, Arab caliphate of the Umayyads was rehabilitated again and extortion, cruelty towards people and inattentiveness to religion all re-appeared. As it was stated by ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Yaz¢d Ibn Aslam¢ once, in 101 A.H., Yaz¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik took the place of ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z. He ordered all to follow the same direction of ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z.

On the other hand, **فأتي اربعين شيخاً فشهدوا له ما علي الخلفـــاء حســـاب ولاعـــذاب**[1] **“**Forty of the elderly men approached him and bore witness before him that there would be neither chastisement nor accounts for caliphs.”

Mas‘£d¢ has described him as,”Being a selfish man, he was after libidinous pleasure and did not permit people to visit him. He was neither conversant with the right work to do nor was he cognizant of wrongdoing to refrain from.”[2]

Before Yaz¢d, ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z had undertaken some fiscal reforms inspite of the damages incurred on the public treasury. He not only did not ask for tribute from Muslims, something which both after and before him was prevailing, but also exempted those from paying tax to some extent. Once he was asked why prices were higher in his term while they were not so before.

In a reply he said, “Those before me were demanding the protected people to pay tax beyond their men means; consequently they were compelled to pant with whatever

---

7. Muqadami’¢ bar tir¢kh tadw¢n ¦ad¢th (An introduction to History of Hadith Compilation), Qum

1. Tir¢kh al-Khulafi’, p.246

2. al-Tanb¢h wa l-ishrif, p. 277

they had and therefore became destitute. But I do not do this, so they can sell at whatever price they want to."[1]

He was also called upon to collect tribute from Jews and Christians newly converted to Islam but he did not consent to it.[2] He also ordered that the tax payers residing by the coast of the Euphrates be authorized to wear golden rings as well as ±aylusin (mantle) [3] and also be allowed to ride on horses while they were asked to pay the surplus thereof.[4] It is visible that these undertakings were appeared to be rectifying ones in comparison with prior severity which had driven the protected people to their own native lands, then the names of those regions were sealed either on their hands or their foreheads to prevent them from going out of there. Yaz¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, on the contrary, put an end to such reforms. He in 105 A.H., commanded 'Umar Ibn Hubayra, Iraq's governor, to survey once again all of the farming lands thereof something which was ignored from the second caliph's term on, so previous statistics was utilized in this regard. His agents were levying tax even on palm trees and this incurred lots of damages on the people who were paying tax while looking down on them. He also was taking both their offerings and whatever they gave him on such occasions as "New year as well as Mihrgin festivals and land tax was paid based on the latest area being measured by Ibn Hubayra.[5] In Yemen, despite 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z's command to eliminate former severety being exerted by °adjdjidj's brother, once 'Umar came to power, everything went back to its former states and he declared that they would not be forgiven as long as they were alive.[6]

The outcomes of such severety in Yaz¢d's term were worse in Khurisin in the eastern parts of which there were many governors as well as kings who each had embraced Islam on their domains and agreed to pay tax. Among them, Sughdiyin who were numerous were held to be a great supporter for Muslim Arabs who were residing there and

---

[1]. al-Kharidj, p.132

[2]. al-Kharidj, p.131

[3]. An Iranian woolen garment that was used by the learned and nobles

[4]. 'Uy£n al-akhbir, vol,1, p.53

[5]. Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.2, p. 313

[6]. al-Nudj£m al-zihira, vol.1, p.239

fighting with Turks settling in Transoxania. Re-imposing prior fiscal pressure in Yaz¢d's term was the major cause of their inclination to Turks with assistance of whom they managed to stand against Muslims in 102 A.H.. In clashes between "Sa'¢d Khuzayna", Khurisin governor, and Turks, on one hand, and a group of Sughdiyin, on the other hand, taking place concurrently, both Turks and Sughdiyin were defeated.

At Sa'¢d's behest, Muslim forces stopped chasing them inasmuch as **"فان السغد بستان امير المومنين** Sughd is flower garden of Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n."

Then he added, "We do not intend to force them to leave this area." Even subsequent to a minor skirmish Sa'¢d's herald once again put emphasis on what he had said.[1] Following Sa'¢d's displacement, "Sa'¢d Ibn 'Amr al-°arath¢" became Khurisin's governor. Feeling insecure due to Arab's presence there, Sughdiyin migrated to "Farghina" and were settled there by the king of that land. Sughdiyin were so important to Arabs that Iraq's governor, Ibn Hubayra, called upon them to go back to their former residence. Then he would single out whosoever they want as their ruler but they avoided doing so. From then on, clashes between Arabs and Turks, on one hand, and Sughdiyin, on the other hand, escalated [2]; as a result, the east of Khurisin was no longer secure for Arabs. Later on, once Na¥r Ibn Sayyir was designated as Khurisin's governor, he received hard conditions on the part of Sughdiyin and reconciled with them.[3]

It can be inferred from what Mas'£d¢ had mentioned that Yaz¢d, considering his personality, was a man after libidinous pleasures and womanizing. Being in love with a woman, he kept her corpse several days after her death.[4] Suppressing Yaz¢d's revolt, Maslama Ibn 'Abd al-Malik came to power but after a while he was dismissed owing to the fact that he had avoided paying tax. Subsequently, 'Umar Ibn Hubayra, one of the rigid governors of Umayyads in Iraq took his place.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. 5, p. 355

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol. 5, pp. 362-366

[3]. Ibid. vol.v, p.508

[4]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, pp.198-199; Tir¢kh Gudh¢dih, p.283; Tir ¢kh Mukhta¥ar al-duwal, pp.115-116

YAZ«D IBN MUHALLAB'S UPRISING

During the last thirty years of Umayyads caliphate several uprisings came about each of which had originated from various regions with various objectives. From among those individuals and groups taking advantage of the outcomes of such riots were opportunists such as Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab, justice-seekers such as °irith Ibn Surayдj, Khiridjites, the 'Abbisids as well as Zayd Ibn 'Al¢ and his son, Ya¦yi, from among 'Alawites.

In 102, Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab, the son of Muhallab Ibn Ab¢ ¯afra and a member of Azd tribe whose fame was thanks to his battles against Khiridjites during 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr and 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwin's term, was nominated as Khurisin's governor. He had some conquests not only there but also in Gurgin. Owing to the fact that he had refused to hand over war spoils in his possession, once 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z took office, he was imprisoned.[1] He was still there when Yaz¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik came to power and was apprehensive of being killed accordingly, so he escaped to Iraq. The governor of Ba¥ra, 'Ad¢ Ibn Ar§it at Yaz¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik's behest, put his family under lock and key. Resorting to a proper policy, Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab managed to attract not only some tribes to himself but three thousand people as well by displaying his generosity to them.[2] In a clash between 'Ad¢ Ibn Ar§it and some of the people of Ba¥ra and Damascus residing there, on one hand, and Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab on the other hand, the Umayyads's army was defeated and Ba¥ra went under Yaz¢d's domination.[3] Subsequently, the same happened to some other eastern cities such as Ahwiz, Kirmin, Makrin, Sind and Hind as well. He designated a governor for each; nevertheless, in the west the army of Damascus termed as "Allih's soldiers"[4] by the Umayyads was threatening Iraqi rebels and prior experiences also endorsed it since they had been defeated by them and this time, the same happened.

The residents of Ba¥ra being free form Umayyads's mischief paid allegiance to Yaz¢d, who had promised to

---

[1]. Al-Tanb¢h wa l-ishrif, p.277

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p. 3

[3]. Ibid. vol.8, p. 5

[4]. Ibid. vol.8, pp.7, 21

follow Qur'in and the prophets Sunna, and stipulated that he should not bring back conduct of °adjdjidj, the wrong-doer.[1] Yaz¢d told the people that fighting against the Umayyads was worthier than waging war against unbelievers and a courageous army.[2]

It was obvious to some of the residents of Ba¥ra that Yaz ¢d Ibn Muhallab was still attached to the Umayyads. Being ruthless toward people just the same as them, he pretended that he was adherent to Qur'in as well as the prophet's Sunna once he recognized his interests were at risk. From among those individuals °asan Ba¥r¢ was the one stimulating others to leave off bolstering him saying that it was Yaz¢d who was joining hands with the Umayyads in public oppression.[3]

In response people said, "He is calling us for following 'Umarayn tradition."

They asked °asan Ba¥r¢ why he was supporting the wrongdoers of Damascus who had destroyed sacred House of God and his prophet in addition to liquidating the residents of Medina during three days.[4] Keeping silent as long as Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab was in Ba¥ra, °asan Ba¥r¢ launched his propagation once again upon Yaz¢d's departure from Ba¥ra to confront a dispatched army from Damascus. His position in Ba¥ra forced some of his supporters to give up backing Yaz¢d. Marwin Ibn Muhallab, Yaz¢d's brother and his successor said of him that he could only attract some of ignoble residents of Uballa and 'Alwadj in Ba¥ra who were most likely referred to non-Arabs. Upon hearing this, people made up their minds to war with the alm of supporting °asan Ba¥r¢ but he prevented them form doing so.[5]

Considering this threat a serious one, Yaz¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik sent Maslama Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, who was leading the commander of confrontations between Muslim Arabs and Romans, along with a corps to Iraq. Being undecided how to fight with him, Ibn Muhallab sought advice from his backers.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.335; See, al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.8

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.335

[3]. Ibid. vol,5, p.336

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.9

[5]. Ibid. vol.8, p.14; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.341

Some were of the opinion that they advance eastward and settle on the course connecting Firs with Khurisin's mountains. Doing so, they would be secured and some will join them too. Another suggestion was that they go to M£¥il[1], but Yaz¢d did not accept it. The army of Damascus nearly consisted of fifty thousand soldiers but for Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab it was insignificant.

Describing them, he told, "Most of them were from Djaridjima, Saqiliba, Anbi§, Djarimiqa and other tribes being all either farmers or ruffians.[2] Considering the point being quoted from his brother about 'Alwadj in Ba¥ra, this shows that Yaz¢d's measure was of Arabic aspect and even aristocratic and he took no effort to use Mawil¢.

At the early stages of the war, compromise was proposed to Yaz¢d but he preferred to fight. This war terminated while it left three thousand killed. From among them were Yaz¢d and four brothers of him as well.[3] The majority of captives of Ba¥ra, who themselves uncovered that by being remiss in that war they had paved the ground for the victory of the army of Damascus, were also slaughtered.[4] This came about in ¯afar, 102 A.H. in 'Aqr nearby K£fa which later came to be known as Yawm al-'Aqr, "Day of 'Aqr". The remainder of Ibn Muhallab's family ran away from Ba¥ra. Going eastward, they confronted with the army of Damascus, then they were massacred all in Qandib¢l in India. In that clash Iraqis such as Nu'min Ibn Ibrih¢m Ibn Ashtar as well as Mu¦ammad Ibn Is¦iq Ibn Ash'ath were also killed.[5]

One further point which should be taken into consideration is that almost all of the Umayyads's rulers were doomed either to be at the head of the government or in jail, the latter of whom were slaughtered most of the time. Once Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab was asked why he did not build a house for himself.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.337; al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.13

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.14

[3]. Ibid. vol.8, p.19

[4]. Ibid. vol.8, pp.20-22

[5]. Ibid. vol.8, p.24

What he said in reply was that, “My domicile is either a royal palace or prison.”[1] In all likelihood, he could not imagine that the grave was his third choice.

From among the poets supporting him indirectly was “Thibit Qu§na”, celebrated poet who was among the Murdji‘ites. He also had a hand in some conquests in the east where he incited people to back up Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab. Abu l-Faradj l¥fahin¢ considered him a Murdji‘ites in his brief biography. In a poem, he has praised and has induced him to war with the Umayyads.[2] Later on, when Yaz¢d was defeated, in a poem he reproached those leaving him alone.[3]

On the whole what can be said about Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab and his riot is that he was an opportunist going on the rampage after years of oppressing people merely because he was disfavored by the Umayyads. People who were tired of the Umayyads’s cruelties and contemptuous attitude of the residents of Damascus toward Iraqis in particular were supporting him for a while despite the fact that they were not serious enough in that. That was why they could not be victorious.

In describing Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab’s riot, it is importuned to refer to another uprising in Africa. ±abar¢ was quoted as saying that Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Muslim wanted to adopt the style of °adjdjidj Ibn Y£suf Thaqaf¢ in Iraq in collecting tribute form the newly converted ones who were paying it prior to embracing Islam. Preventing him from following such policy, people put him to death. At the same time, they did not overlook the Umayyads domination and singled out Mu¦ammad Ibn Yaz¢d al-An¥ir¢, their former governor, as their ruler and wrote a letter to Yaz¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik saying that they did not disobey him. In response, he mentioned that he was not gratified with what Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Muslim had done but he was pleased with Mu¦ammad Ibn Yaz¢d.[4] It is worth saying that Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Muslim was °adjdjidj’s scribe formerly. Emulating him, he desired to put his policy into practice.[5]

---

[1]. ‘Uy£n al-akhbir, vol.1, pp.233, 312

[2]. al-Aghin¢, vol.14, pp.277-278

[3]. al-Aghin¢, vol.14, p.279

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.359; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.v, p.101

[5]. See, Nudj£m al-zihira, vol.1, p.245

HIShªM IBN 'ABD AL-MALIK'S SUCCESSION

In Shawwil, 105 A.H., Hishim took the place of his brother and until the year 125, he was in the some position for about nineteen years and seven months. It was he who presided over one of the splendid and durable administrations of the Umayyads's dynasty. Mas'£d¢ described some specifications of him in particular his interest in horses.[1] As Ya'q£b¢ mentioned, he was renowned by such attributes as prudence, intelligence, stinginess, jealousy, harshness and so forth.[2]

Dhahab¢ also described him by stating, **فيه ظلم مع عدل**[3] **"**He was both cruel and just."

He also had quoted some others as saying that he strongly disliked bloodshed.[4] It is probable that for the very same reason he had ordered to suppress "Zayd Ibn 'Al¢'s" riot.

'Abd Allih Ibn 'Al¢, someone who had chased the remainder of the Umayyads's corps and killed Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad, was quoted as saying, "I collected the chanceries of the Marwinids but none was as systematic as that of Hishim's."[5]

He was preventing the Marwinids from taking bounty out of public treasury excluding the time when they could either participate in war themselves or send someone else on their behalf.[6] There is a quotation from ±abar¢ stating that how Hishim was rebuking his son for his non-attendance in Friday prayers.[7] Just in the same way Sa'¢d dismissed his son, the governor of °im¥ because of adultery.[8] On the other hand, l¥fahin¢ had touched on the ways Hishim treated Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d, his lewd successor, and vice versa – the account of

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.205, See, Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, pp 515-520; al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.v, p.192, about his interest in wearing clothes.

[2]. Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.2, p.328

[3]. Siyar a'lim al-nubali', vol.v, p.352

[4]. Ibid.

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.516

[6]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.515

[7]. Ibid. vol.v, p.516

[8]. al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.v, p.195

ewhich will be given at a later time. These are all definite indications that Hishim was a wine drinker too as well as being trapped by lewd companions[1] promoting people to bolster Yaz¢d. Some other quotations indicate that Hishim was following the same route as Zuhr¢, an eminent traditionalist and linked to the Umayyads, or possibly others were lending a helping hand in assassinating those who were after bullyism. As a case in point, Djahm Ibn ¯afwin's murder can be mentioned. In a letter found later in Hishim's records, it is read that he had called upon Na¥r Ibn Sayyir, Khurisin's governor, to search for someone coming from Dahr¢s to that area and kill him.[2] Somewhere else we will comment on Djahm as well as "Ghaylin Dimashq¢" both being murdered by 'Abd al-Malik in 119 A.H.[3]

Apart from Zuhr¢ who was much adored by Hishim, other traditionists such as Man¥£r Ibn Mu'tamir were attracted by him.[4] Abu l-Zanid was also an scribe of the Umayyads.[5] Zayd Ibn 'Al¢'s riot was a momentous incident in Hishim's term which will be discussed in more detail later.

Khilid Ibn 'Abd Allih Qasr¢, an outstanding governor of Hishim in Iraq, reigned there from the very early stages of his caliphate for almost twenty years. To some, he was similar to a bunch of governors as Ziyid Ibn Ab¢h and °adjdjidj.[6] This was not an extremist view. Just as °adjdjidj, Khilid was trustworthy and utterly loyal to the Umayyads. Being furious at him, Hishim refrained from endorsing what his predecessor had stated so that to accuse him of assisting the prophet's Household as well as being an stimulating element in Yaz¢d's movement.

In response, Hishim said to Y£suf Ibn 'Umar, "You are not more than a lier and by no means do we accuse him of disobedience."[7] His resemblance to °adjdjidj will be quite

---

[1]. al-Aghin¢, vol.7, pp.5-6

[2]. Tir¢kh al-Djahmiyya wa l-mu'tazila, p.17

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.516

[4]. al-I¤i¦, p.91

[5]. Siyar a'lim al-nubali', vol.v, p.449

[6]. Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya, p.116

[7]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.558

apparent once the same utterance of him was said by Khilid. That statement was, "The caliph is superior to prophet."[1]

However later on Khilid bitterly said that some of the supporters of Hishim had said this sentence.

Khilid was quoted as saying, "If, the commander of the believers – Hishim – instructs me to knock down Ka'ba and dispatch every stone thereof to Damascus, I will assuredly do the same".[2]

This was another feature bearing comparison with that of °adjdjidj Khilid presided over Iraq, just about the eastern part of the Islamic lands, for almost fifty years at peace. It was Khilid who prevented Yaz¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik from ousting his brother and substituting his son, Wal¢d. That was why Hishim had trusted[3], adored and abided by him for fifty years. In as much as his mother was a Christian, he had built a synagogue for her, accordingly he was charged with propagating "Christianity" and in consequence he was despised severely by some poets. He was held to be responsible for "demolishing mosques, establishing synagogues, having Muslims under Magian's domination and having daughters of Muslims marrying the protected people".[4]

I¥fahin¢ declared, "He was a heretic and his mother a Christian one. He had Muslims under Magians and Christians thumb and let them bother Muslims. The protected people were paying for slave girls and had sexual intercourse with them and yet Khilid did not show any objection.[5]

Being imprisoned by him, Farazdaq wrote these verses in his reproach,

أبلغ أميرالمؤمنين رسالة فعجّل هداك الله نزعك خالد

بني بيعة فيها الصليب لأمّه وهدم من بغض الإله مساجد[6]

---

[1]. al-Aghin¢, vol.22, p. 18

[2]. Ibid. vol.22, pp 16-17

[3]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.2, p.314

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.458

[5]. al-Aghin¢, vol.22, p.16

[6]. Ibid. vol.22, p.21

“Hishim! Hasten to transfer this message to the commander of the believers, May God guide you in Khilid’s removal, he who dismantled mosques out of his grudge against Allih and established a synagogue instead. He put a cross therein too.”

Referring to the way of his ruling, he vocalized,

وكيف يؤم المسلمين وأمّه تدين بأنّ الله ليس بواحد[1]

How he leads Muslims while on no account is his mother a believer.

I¥fahin¢ accused him of having association with heretics.[2] Thinking about his mother as well as his accusations, one should not be surprised upon hearing that he was handling non-Muslims fittingly and in all likelihood he was inclined towards them.

Dealing with the Shi‘ite Muslims as well as the Commander of the Believers in a harsh way, Khilid affronted Imim ‘Al¢ (a) so openly and bitterly that it is deplorable to be reiterated. He said that Imim was in the midst of the hell. He was also paying money to people to curse him. I¥fahin¢ has a number of quotations in this regard[3] and after mentioning each, he had damned Khilid by stating, **لعن الله خالدا ومن والاه قبحهم صلوات الله علي اميرالمؤمنين** “May God curse Khilid and his puppet rulers woe betide them.”

Khilid was ousted in 120 A.H., the reason of which is hardly relevant to our discussion but as mentioned primarily it was owing to the fact that Hishim was emulating Khilid in cereal production whose increase was a threat to his profits.[4] Being dismissed, he headed for Damascus while he was tortured by Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar for a while just in the same way he had treated ‘Umar Ibn Hubayra once he came to power. In Damascus too, he was subject to Hishim’s persecution. When Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d took office, he handed him over to Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar By taking considerable amount of money,

---

[1]. al-Aghin¢, vol.22, p.21

[2]. Ibid. vol.22, p.24

[3]. Ibid. vol.22, pp.15-18

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.468

then, he killed Khilid. Later on, one of his offsprings took the life of his father's murderer in Yaz¢d Ibn Wal¢d's jail.[1]

The prime reason that enabled Khilid to be the governor of Iraq as well as the eastern parts of Islamic lands for over fifty tears was a special privilege devoted to him in return for his total adherence to the Umayyads's demands. From among them, one was absolute savagery, an one of his outstanding attributes, accordingly he was labeled as "anti-truth tyrant".[2] Another one was hostility towards "'Al¢'s lineage" which was notable in him as well. He was so strongly loyal to the Umayyads that individuals such as Yaz ¢d Ibn Muhallab were not comparable to him because once they became powerful, they thought that they were independent.

KHªRIDJITES' REBELLION IN TIME OF THE MARWªNIDS

An interval between 60s and up to late 70s, known as "Al-Shurit" by the narrators thereof, was considered to be a crucial period of Khiridjites' activities, although they did remain in power and fought against the 'Alawites and the Umayyads thereafter. The leading centers for their activities were Ba¥ra and K£fa's suburbs. Being driven out from there, they settled down in Firs, Kirmin, Kh£zistin and S¢stin. What is more is that their settlement in each region was a transient one so they were almost always relocating. They managed to fortify themselves remarkably in a period between Yaz¢d's death in 64 A.H. and subsequent ineffectuality of the Umayyads in Iraq up to the time it was conquered by 'Abd al-Malik. Khiridjites's advancement was mainly due to the Zubayrids's leniency for some years to such an extent that in 68 A.H. they could freely pay for pilgrimage in Mecca.[3]

Subsequent to Mu'iwiya's death and Karbali's event while 'Ubayd Allih was reigning over Iraq, Mirdis Ibn Udayya from Khiridjites ran wild and was at a later time murdered by

---

[1]. See, Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, pp.541,543, 559-561

[2]. See, Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, pp. 463-464

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.4, p.515; Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.2, p.263

‘Ubayd Allih.[1] Confronting a great number of Khiridjites in Iraq, ‘Ubayd Allih started demonstrating harsh treatment. He himself divulged that the worthiest action of him after believing in Allih’s Unity was assassinating the Khiridjites.[2] Prior to deciding on a caliph for Damascus, he was shouldering this task subsequent to Yaz¢d’s death during which he was capturing those under suspicion. He termed that action, later on, as one of his significant undertakings.[3] The relatives of those who were seized implored him to set them free and he, due to his unsatisfactory situation, admitted it; as a result, Khiridjites were given more freedom. When he escaped to Damascus, there was no longer any obstacle before them. During Ibn Ziyid’s ruling over Iraq, as it was quoted by Ibn Qutayba, he was searching for Khiridjites under suspicion and after their apprehension he took their lives.[4]

What has been disclosed considering Ziyid and his son, ‘Ubayd Allih, is that they shed the blood of at least 13000 of them.[5] Exerting such pressure obliged some of the Khiridjites to run away to Mecca that was under ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr’s control who not only had cordial relationship with them but struggled diligently to take advantage of them in the Umayyads’s confrontation as well. Thus, Khiridjites who felt secure enough, then joined Ibn Zubayr. To justify what they had done, they proposed the idea of “defending the Sacred Territory of Allih”.[6] Being adherent to ‘Uthmin, Ibn Zubayr provoked his father strongly in Djamal war that started in revenge for ‘Uthmin’s murder who was severely despised by Khiridjites. The sole reason for Khiridjites to join Ibn Zubayr was their common interests.

Ibn Zubayr was quated as saying, **لو أعانني الشيطان علي أهل الشام لقبلته** [7] **“**Even if Satan protects me against the residents of Damascus, I would accept his help.”

---

[1]. al-‘Ariq fi l-’A¥r al-umaw¢, p.230

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.4, p.109

[3]. Ibid. vol.4, p.116

[4]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.4, p.403

[6]. Ibid. vol.4, p.436; Ansib al-ashrif, vol. 4, p.58

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.4, p.94; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.v, p. 131

Once Yaz¢d's corps left Mecca upon hearing the news of his death, Khiridjites went to Ibn Zubayr to inquire about his opinion regarding 'Uthmin. Recognizing that he was loyal to 'Uthmin left him alone.

Apart from those Khiridjites being conducted by Nifi' Ibn Azraq, the founder of Aziriqa, another group also shaped up in Yamima, Ba¦rayn, 'Ummin and °adjar under the leadership of Nadjda Ibn 'ªm¢r °anaf¢ subsequent to Imim °usayn's martyrdom. In 68 A.H., it was Nadjda who supervised the pilgrimage service for Khiridjites but for one reason or another, he did not cooperate with Nifi' so he was dismissed by them. Then, Ab£ Fudayk substituted him and was killed after a while.[1]

The Zubayrids's leniency in Iraq was a justification for Khiridjites under the leadership of Nifi' Ibn Azraq (killed in 65 A.H.) to put the residents of Ba¥ra in a great inconvenience so as to block the way to commercial caravans in the east and northeast thereof. Going out of patience, Ba¥ra's occupants considered Khiridjites's threat a serious one and prepared to fight them. After a slight clash which was not a victorious one for them eventually, they, along with Muhallab Ibn Ab¢ ¯afra, whose reputation was due to his continual assaults on Khiridjites for extensive periods, launched an attack on them. Fiscal support of Ba¥ra's merchants[2] for Muhallab who was singled out as governor by 'Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr could suppress them for a while. In spite of the fact that they were not abundant in number in contrast with Iraqis, Khiridjites managed to resist them.

Muhallab in this regard said, **سبحان الله العظيم ما رأيت ولاسمعت بمثل هولاء القوم ساعة قط كلما ينقص منهم أن يزيد فيهم**[3] "On no account had I seen or heard of such a tribe; the more they decrease in number, it seems the more they increase."

In clashes of this kind, they repeatedly retreated while they left too many forces dead each time. Once they were chased up to I¥fahin then they entered Firs and camped in

---

[1]. See, Tir¢kh al-Ya'qub¢, vol.2, p.273; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.4, p. 267

[2]. al-Kimil fi l-adab, vol.3, p. 312; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad ¢d, vol.4, pp.146,181

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.7, p.44

Arradjin while they were over thirty two thousand.[1] Apparently, the majority of those joining them were Iranians opposing the Umayyads. These clashed extended to Ahwiz and Nubanddjin of Firs as well. After a while, Ibn Ma‘mar substituted commander of Iraqis army but his continual defeats[2] verified that no one can make this war a victorious one but Muhallab. Accordingly, once again he was designated as commander by Ibn Zubayr. The Zubayrids were over thrown while the Umayyads still needed Muhallab and he had been fighting the Khiridjites for nearly three years or so subsequent to Iraq’s conquest. Then, they were divided into branches not because of military failure but due to serious discrepancies among themselves. As a result, they were defeated.

Qa§ar¢ Ibn Fudji’a became their commander once Nifi‘ Ibn Azraq was killed in a clash in Ahwiz. Opposing some of the Khiridjites in Kirmin, he departed to ±abaristin and was murdered there.[3] Two other groups, one under the leadership of Ibn ‘Abd Rabbih, the senior and the other Ibn ‘Abd Rabbih, the junior fought separately and both were beaten. Prior to this, Muhallab had informed °adjdjidj that one and the only way to overcome the Khiridjites was creating tension among them.[4]

The Aziriqa were still there, that Shab¢b Khiridj¢, a valorous one from the Khiridjites, started combating °adjdjidj. From 76 A.H. on, he defeated the army of Iraq several times and conquered K£fa twice while in both cases, °adjdjidj concealed himself in his palace. He made some linked individuals to the Umayyads such as Ab£ Burda, the son of Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢ pay allegiance to him.[5] At that time, only the army of Damascus contributed to him.

°adjdjidj himself made it known to ‘Abd al-Malik, **وقد عجز أهل الكوفه عن قتال شبيب في مواطن كثيرة في كـلٍّ يقتـل أمراءهم** [6] **“**K£fiyins were incapable of fighting Shab¢b in verious instances, in each of which their leaders were killed.”

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.6, p.19

[2]. Ibid. vol.6, p.31-46

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, pp.125-126

[4]. Ibid. vol.v, pp.121-122; Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.2, p.276

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.77

[6]. Ibid. vol.v, p.85

This was in contrast with what °adjdjidj had done to Iraqis, that is pressurizing and mobilizing them against the Khiridjites by force.[1] Once he gave them three days to attack the Khiridjites led by Muhallab. To prevent others from disobeying him, he killed an aged man regardless of his acceptable reasons for not going to war.[2]

Despite frequent vanquishments as well as losses that were imposed on them during several years, the Khiridjites managed to save themselves from annihilation; nevertheless, considering their achievements of their aims, one should say they were not triumphant since they were fighting to overpower the Umayyads and by no means could they accomplish it. Whenever they were united, soon they dispersed due to their enemy's assault. Therefore, it can be inferred that they were both victorious in that they protected themselves and defeated in achieving their objectives. The reasons of both cases should be determined. From among factors contributing to their survival, possible repelling of their enemy's invasion as well as suppressing their opponents which enabled them to exercise influence on people [3] was their partisan wars in which they were routing their enemies swiftly before they could prepare themselves. They not only shocked their enemy but destroyed them as well.[4] They uprooted their adversaries by taking advantage of internal elements and those selected as the Khiridjites's executioners by governors were not secure from their revenge. To give an example, once they could not kill the murderer, they killed his camel instead.[5] Sometimes, they succeeded in taking their lives.[6]

Ibn Ziyid disclosed that, **ما أدري كيف اصنع ما أقتل رجلا من هذه المارقة الا قتل قاتله** [7] **"**I know not what to do, I kill none of the Khiridjites save they also killed the spies giving information about the Khiridjites to governors."[8]

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.130

[2]. al-Kimil fi l-adab, vol.2, p.212l; al-Aghin¢, vol.l4, p.244

[3]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.v, p.83

[4]. al-¦ayawin, vol.l, from page 41on

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.4, p.19

[6]. Ibid. pp.91-92

[7]. Ibid. p.91

[8]. Ibid. p.94

Fighting against °adjdjidj who was infamous, the Khiridjites could somehow achieve fame. Being a dictator who was distinguished for his corruption, °adjdjidj did not refrain from oppressing people and it was a typical feature of all Umayyads that the Khiridjites were taking advantage of in provoking people both against them and themselves[1] and even obliging some pious people to follow them. From among them, one can name ¯ili¦ Ibn Masra¦ who, due to existing oppression, told his followers, **متي انتم مقيمون هذا الجور قد فشا وهذا العدل قد عفي ولاتزداد هـذه الـولاة علـي الناس الا علواً وعتواً وتباعداً عن الحق وجرأةً علي الرب "**As long as you stay in power, cruelty runs, the justice disappears and the rulers foment bullying and domination as well as they are abstentious against the truth" and that was why the Khiridjites did ask him to join them. He ran wild in 76 A.H. and was killed later. Then Shab¢b who was from Khiridjites replaced him.[2]

Another one leading man of Khiridjites was 'Abd Allih Ibn Ya¦yi who was told as saying, **فرآى باليمن جـوراً ظـاهراً وعسفاً شديداً وسيرة في الناس قبيحة "**There, I did observe apparent injustice an unpleasant behavior towards people."

Accordingly, for the very same reason he assembled his supporters and by saying, **لا يحل لنا المقام علي مانري ولا الصبر عليه "**Beholding these things, hesitation shall fly away he went on a rampage."[3]

Ab£ °amza Khiridj¢ in his speech in 12 A.H. also touched upon governor's cruelty as a stimulus factor [4] and it is quite obvious that the idea of combating cruelty could attract attention considerably.

Inasmuch as Iran was the major center for their operations, a great number of Mawil¢ joined them in spite of the fact that it was not the case for all Khiridjites' parties. This was a crucial advantage for them since Iranians were valorous enough to battle.

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.4, p.19

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.56

[3]. al-Aghin¢, vol.20, p.97, vol.6, p.149; Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.v, p.106

[4]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.v, p.114, See, also pp.117,118,119

As it was told, **الموالي أشجع الخوارج وأشدهم جسارة** [1] **"**Khiridjites, as Muhallab was informed, were mainly blacksmiths, dyers, butchers, etc."[2] These people from the middle social strata, were naturally acceding to style of the Khiridjites since they were under hard pressure. Additionally, Khiridjites' fame for their piety[3] was an outstanding factor for them to absorb people. Some of them even were considered ascetics.[4]

People's apprehension of them was another element assisting them in particular as regards to those tribes as well as the residents of some cities who were doing so to protect their children and themselves since they were not secure from their attack. Here, one should point out that the very element was also one of the major hurdles in the way of their progress. Although people were contributing to the Khiridjites fearing their lives, they gradually turned to the Umayyads and assisted them to get rid of the Khiridjites who were hard-hearted in their views. The merchants of Ba¥ra and probably other areas who deemed the Khiridjites as a great threat to their interests backed them openly.

The Khiridjites frankness always made them lose their heads. Banning precaution dissimulation by the Aziriqa forced Khiridj¢ Azraq¢ to disobey them in any form and under any circumstances. Then, he, along with fifty or a hundred soldiers, set off untimely and irregular riots which led to their defeat. In contrast, the Shi'ite Muslims

---

[1]. Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.2, p.262; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.3, p.373

[2]. al-Kimil fi l-adab, vol.3, p.314; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad ¢d, vol.4, p.147

[3]. The credibility of this statement is subject to debate since, for instance, there is a quotation about Shab¢b regarding his intention of joing the Khiridjites indicating that he was a financial motive. 'Allima Dja'far Murta¤i also remained dubious about their asceticism. In his book which has not published yet, there is a chapter under the title of "al-Khiridjites ±imi'£n am Zuhhid" in which he touched upon this despite the fact that some of which are not quite valid. In addition, there have been several quotations indicating their piety in their personal lives which were not written in that book. Undoubtedly, regarding those things what the writer has said seemed quite true.

[4]. al-Kimil fi l-adab, vol.II, p.149; al-'ariq fi l-'a¥r al-umaw¢, pp.227,230; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.4, p.89; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.v, p.106

succeeded in setting themselves free from the Umayyads' mischief by observing the very precautionary dissimulation.

Prevailing Islam in Iraq especially in K£fa was an obstacle to Khiridjites's domination. It has been said that the Shi'ite Muslims whose Imim was martyred by Khiridjites had strong spite towards them and the Umayyads did take advantage of such feeling greatly and that was why the Khiridjites residing in K£fa were not as many as those in Ba¥ra.[1]

THE FOUNDATION OF THE KHªRIDJITES' PRINCIPLES

In formation of various sects most of the time the main controversial issue would later on become the central belief of that sect. At times, even the name of that sect would be derived thereof in spite of the fact that occasionally the names of the leaders of sects would go back to them. In Khiridjites' case, the name of their sect originated from their effort to revolt against the Commander of the Believers and their endeavor in excommunicating both 'Al¢ (a) and 'Uthmin was the leading belief of their sect. In fact, discussion about faith versus disbelief was an important point over which different parties debated and became somehow problematic for early sects. With reference to this, 'Uthmin and the companions of Djamal were measured, then, it was turn of the residents of Damascus. Once Iraqis fought against Damascus people, knowing that they were infidels but confronting Arbitration, they hesitated about continuing the war. To eliminate this, they would rather believe in what the opponents had accepted to such an extent that they described Imim 'Al¢ (a) as infidel since he had endorsed Arbitration. One further point was that if someone were disbeliever due to advocating Arbitration which was considered as a cardinal sin, then what would happen to others committing cardinal sins? Based on the same extremist view which was the main reason of their defeat, they labeled them as unbelievers. It is known that Mu'tazila had termed those committing cardinal sins neither as a Muslim wrongdoer nor pious or infidel but purely as a wrongdoer. In contrast, in Imimiyya whoever testifies that there is no God besides Allih and Mu¦ammad is the Allih's

[1]. al-'ariq fi l-'a¥r al-umaw¢, p.242

Prophet is Muslim and is entitled to enjoy the same rights as Muslims accordingly. Considering the doer of cardinal sin one should apply the term Muslim wrongdoer (not wrong-doer alone).

In this regard, Shahristin¢ stated that, "All of them are of the opinion that despising 'Al¢ (a) as well as 'Uthmin is a must. Considering this issue of prime importance they did hold their marriages to be true merely when they were based on this belief."[1]

The dispute over belief versus disbelief regarding Imim 'Al¢ (a) and 'Uthmin from then on turned out to be the main principle for Khiridjites and the other one was showing resistance to rulers whenever they disregard Sunna.[2]

The Aziriqa who was active during that time was one the most extremist groups of Khiridjites who considered those men, women and even children not being a member of the group as infidel and doomed to death.[3]

They referred to this verses,

وَقَالَ نُوحٌ رَبِّ لَا تَذَرْ عَلَى الْأَرْضِ مِنْ الْكَافِرِينَ دَيَّارًا. إِنَّكَ إِنْ تَذَرْهُمْ يُضِلُّوا عِبَادَكَ وَلَا يَلِدُوا إِلَّا فَاجِرًا كَفَّارًا.[4]

"And Noah said, "My Lord! Leave me not one of the disbelievers in the land. If you leave them, they will mislead the slaves and will beget none save lewd ingrates"

Moderate followers of the Aziriqa such as ¯ufriyya sect were obtaining from killing children. Banning "Taqiyya" was one of the fundamental principles of the Aziriqa over which they had discrepancy with the Khiridjites form Yamima and ultimately, it led them to be separated form Nadjda °ar£r¢.[5]

Moreover, books concerning sects as well as scholastic theology and jurisprudence compiled by their opponents were attributed to them. The Khiridjites who were dispersed due to continual wars and were secluded from Muslims' scientific centers, as a result, less commented on this. Other than the Abi¤iyya that still has some followers in 'Ummin and North of Africa, all other sects have swept out and it is

---

[1]. al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.1, p.106; Tab¥irat al-'awim, p.46

[2]. al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.1, p.106

[3]. Ibid. vol.1, pp.109,140; al-Aghin¢, vol.6, p.142

[4]. N£¦, 26,27

[5]. al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.1, p.112

very difficult to confirm the credibility of the principles attributed to them. In addition, another feature of them was altering their principles. It seems as if the Abi¤iyya were dubious whether to renounce ‘Al¢ (a) or not and in the latest scripts of some of them they expressed their devotion to ‘Al¢ (a).

Since some books of various sects were at odds with principles of Khiridjites, there has been exaggeration about basic principles of them. Inasmuch as Khiridjites were mainly composed of Mawil¢, they made up a new theory overlooking a condition for Imamate e namely being a member of Quraysh, a principle which the Sunnites strongly upheld over six hundred years later.[1] Some Arab tribes bolstering Khiridjites probably had endorsed this principle either because they did not value caliphate, which was independent from tribal power or they did this to compete with Quraysh.

Yaz¢diyya, one of the Khiridjites sects that, according to a few fragmented Jarudites, had extremist Khiridjites beliefs about non-Arabism thought, **سيبعث الله رسولاً من العجم وينزل عليه كتاباً قد كتبت في السماء ويترك شريعة محمداً المصطفي** [2] It should be mentioned that Qur’in was revealed in the second century A.H. as a result, the Khiridjites must have been following other sects in this regard. Anyway, some ideas of Mu‘tazilites can be traced back in the Khiridjites’ ideologies.

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.1, p.107

[2]. Tab¥irat al-‘awim, p.41; al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.I, p.122

CHAPTER XI
SHI‘ITE MUSLIMS IN THE LAST DECADES OF THE UMAYYAD STATE

THE SHI‘ITE MUSLIMS UNDER THE PRESSURE OF THE UMAYYADS

As previously mentioned, Umayyads had three obstinate foes, namely Khiridjites who were of great trouble to them during various periods. Shi‘ite Muslims who were in opposition to Mu‘iwiya from ‘Al¢’s term on and thereafter Imim °usayn (a), the penitents, Mukhtir, Zayd Ibn ‘Al¢ and Ya¦yi Ibn Yaz¢d ran wild against them. Moreover, Shi‘ites’s ideology especially its political aspect based on which the ‘Alawites authority was a lawful one operated as an effective trend in the society producing a great threat to the Umayyads. In reality, subsequent to their eradication, Shi‘ite Muslims were the Umayyads’s successor and ultimately the third group was Iraqi people who regardless of their religion, went on the rampage against them since the treatment of Damascus towards them which probably stemmed from tribal or regional prejudice was a contemptuous one. In spite of the fact that such movements someTimes had leaders or some supporters who had good will, most of the time they covering their objectives as well as reviving the Prophet’s Sunna as well as social justice.

Although all of those groups were threatening the Umayyads, the two first groups were more threatening. It is known that the Khiridjites at last could subjugate them in Iraq, then some of those so-called Shi‘ite Muslims opportunistically overthrew the and came to power themselves. The Umayyads was striving hard to confine Shi‘ite Muslims by any means to prevent them from increasing their influence.

Formerly, we touched upon how the Umayyads bothered the ‘Alawites. Now, by bringing some examples, matter is elucidated. During the Umayyads’ rule excluding a short

time during ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z,[1] they insulted Imim ‘Al¢ (a). From among them one can name Khilid Ibn ‘Abd Allih Qasr¢ who did the same while being on the pulpit[2] as well as describing him in the most biting way.[3] And as one would expect to justify what he had done, he urged some traditionalists to vilify him. For the very same reason, Hishim Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik wrote a letter to A‘mash, a so-colled Shi‘ites in K£fa and called upon him to compile a book about ‘Uthmin’s virtues and Imim ‘Al¢’s wrongdoings but he refrained from doing so[4] while such individuals as Zuhr¢ did never hesitated to do this.

Since he had heard ‘Al¢ (a) was using henna for dying his beard, he quoted from Torah, “Whosoever dyes his beard black is cursed”. [5]

The Umayyads’ agents used abusive words towards ‘Al¢’s family throughout the Islamic land [6] to taint their reputation and eliminate them from political as well as intellectual scene by rendering the worst accusations against them. That was why harsh treatment in damning ‘Al¢ was quite justified for them. Once °adjdjidj asked his governor in Firs to make ‘A§iyya Ibn Sa‘d damn ‘Al¢ (a) and if avoided doing so, he should be whipped four hundred times and be shaved as punishment. They did this as °adjdjidj had ordered.[7] Some individuals as Ibn Ab¢ Layli, an Iraqi jurisprudent, was made to curse ‘Al¢ (a) in public.[8]

It was quite common for Mu‘iwiya, Ab£ Bakr as well as ‘Umar to fabricate Hadith to crush Shi‘ite Muslims who were referred Rifi¤¢ extremist and now most of those forged traditions compiled by the Sunnites are at hand.[9]

When Hishim in 106 A.H., the second year of his caliphate, entered °idjiz for °adjdj, Medina’s governor, one of

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.v, p.393-394

[2]. ±ir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.487

[3]. al-Aghin¢, vol.22, from p.15 on.

[4]. Shadjarit al-dhahab, vol.1, p.221

[5]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.I, p.441

[6]. al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.3, p.221

[7]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.6, p.306

[8]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.2, p.181

[9]. al-Maw¤£‘it, vol.2, p.15, vol.1, p.304

‘Uthmin’s grand children, by alluding to ‘Uthmin’s virtues told caliph, “In this region, it is quite common to curse Ab£ Turib, now you can follow this custom too”.

Hishim in reply said, “Now I am here for °adjdj and do not intend to curse anyone.”[1]

This does not mean that Hishim was not a man of cursing others. In contrast all of his deeds revealed his hostility towards the Prophet’s Household and their followers. He himself was the murderer of Zayd Ibn ‘Al¢ and any Shi‘ite Muslims and under those circumstances, he probably gave such reply to Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘Abd Allih for a specific reason.

When Zayd Ibn ‘Al¢ (a) was in Damascus, Hishim shamelessly inquired him about his brother, Imim ¯idiq (a) and said, **مافعل اخوك البقرة** In this way, he demonstrated his malice towards him in his insulting question. In response, Zayd said, **سماه رسول الله باقراً وتسميّة البقرة! لقد اختلفتما اذاً** [2] **“**The Messenger of Allih had called him Biqir and now you are addressing him in this way.”

Then he went on to say Djibir’s quotation in which Allih’s Messenger had told him, “Give Imim Biqir my best regards.”

Shi‘ite Muslims such as Kumayt Ibn Zayd Asad¢, an outstanding Arab poet, were pressurized in various forms. He was imprisoned for his beliefs and, in particular, having Khilid Ibn ‘Abd Allih Qasr¢ satirizing the Umayyads. Hishim Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik demanded Khilid to pull his tongue out of his mouth and hang him from the door of his house.[3]

Filled with terror, Kumayt wore his wife’s clothes who had gone to see him in prison, then he tried to escape. Having no way to do so, he took refuge in Maslama Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik and finally he could satisfy Hishim and save his life.[4] It was quite obvious that he was a Shi‘ites since he was with Imim Biqir (a) and other Mu¦ammad’s descendants.[5] Also, his Hishimites followers are the best proof in this regard.

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, pp.484- 485

[2]. ‘Uy£n al-akhbir, vol.1, p.212

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, pp.82-83

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.84

[5]. Ibid. vol.8, p.95

Apart from suppressing Yaz¢d Ibn ‘Al¢’s uprising, Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar, Iraq’s governor from 120-126 A.H. martyred many of Shi‘ite Muslims.

According to Ibn A‘tham, **فقتل يوسف بن عمر من شيعة آل محمـد خلقـاً كـثيراً رحمـة اللـه عليهم**[1] **“**Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar murdered large numbers of Shi‘ite Muslims of Mu¦ammad (s)’s progeny.”

In a letter addressing Hishim, Y£suf divulged the misery of this household arising from ruler’s pressure.[2]

Umayyads negative propagation against Shi‘ite Muslims, their politico-ideological opponent, forced Sunnis to adopt a bitter stance on them and despite the fact that the Umayyads themselves were affected by Jewish culture, they made Shi‘ite Muslims be known like the Jews.[3] Such accusations were in fact reflections of the Umayyads’s propagation. His mention of a detailed quotation, Imim Biqir (a) displays Shi‘ite Muslims stance plainly.

“Noone knows what sufferings we, Ahl al-Bayt, experienced from Quraysh’s oppression and stance-taking, so did the Shi‘ite Muslims. When Allih’s prophet was about to depart this life told us that we were superior to people while the Quraysh who were collaborating with each other divorced this issue and did take advantage of our superiority to come to power. Then, the post of ruling rotated among them up to the time that once again Ahl al-Bayt restored it, but people who had paid allegiance to us disregarded it and launched an attack against us and ‘Al¢ (a) experienced great hardness prior to his martyrdom. Then it was his son’s turn and just the same happened to him. Thereafter, we were constantly irritated, deprived of our rights, threatened, murdered and driven out of our homelands to such an extent that neither us nor were our followers secure any longer. Then the liars and deniers of the truth paved the ground for themselves and approached the originators of injustice as well as their agents throughout the Islamic land. After that, they started forging and spreading traditions. They did quote us as saying things which were neither mentioned nor performed by us. They merely intended to sow the seed of

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.8, p.124

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.588

[3]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.2, p.410

hatred in the hearts of individuals. This was a policy being followed subsequent to Imim °asan’s martyrdom during Mu‘iwiya’s term. Limbs were cut off and those eminent were plundered and their houses were destroyed. This situation worsened during ‘Ubayd Allih Ibn Ziyid’s term. °adjdjidj Ibn Y£suf came to power in K£fa after him and he did the same to the Shi‘ite Muslims. They were so hard pressed that they would rather be called Zind¢q or infidels instead of Shi‘ite Muslims. In consequence, the so-called pious people fabricated some traditions touching upon the superiority of the previous rulers something which was by no means true in practice. The succeeding traditionalists verified what had been forged by them inasmuch as they were not quoted by a bunch of unfaithful and lying people.”[1]

This was what Imim ¯idiq (a) had stated regarding injustice imposed on Shi‘ite Muslims.[2]

INTERNAL EVENTS OF SHI‘ITE MUSLIMS

Possibly, there would be no other issue as important as pondering upon the socio-ideological attitude of the Shi‘ite Muslims during that time, something which should make clear the stance of some groups surviving under the shadow of “Sh¢‘a”. Earlier, discussing about ‘Al¢’s Imamate, it had been stated that Imamate was considered as a “Divine Decree” among the companions and the Commander of the Faithful himself had made great attempt to clarify it. Looking into Imim Sadjdjid’s viewpoint regarding Imamate, evidence suggested that he considered Imamate as a divine decree and Imim as a person whose obedience is obligatory on behalf of God. Here, it is worth stating internal problems the Shi‘ite Muslims were tackling with.

It was quite obvious that Shi‘ite Muslims were misled mainly due to their detachment from their Imims and it was an apparent consequence since neither Imims nor the Shi‘ite Muslims could contact each other directly. In spite of great endeavors being exerted by Imims, they did not have

---

[1]. Sharı nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.11, p.44; al-imim al-¯idiq, Ab£ Zuhra, pp.111-112

[2]. Somewhere else, cruelties imposed on Ahl Bayt as well as the Shi‘ite Muslims have been mentioned. See, Tir¢kh tashayyu‘ dar Irin, pp.38-44

enough influence on the Shi‘ite Muslims in particular those residing in Iraq far from them, let alone those in Khurisin, to guide them ideologically.

It is requisite to refer to the book entitled “the History of Shi‘ism in Iran” overtured by “various forms of Shi‘ism” to discern completely what had been mentioned formerly. Here, some points would be referred to either dropped thoroughly or not discussed in detail.

Exaggeration and the Exaggerators

An incident later came to be known as “Exaggeration” in Islamic history, a rooted deviation in Shi‘ites internal affairs, did play a major role in distorting their image. This has been discussed in more detail in “History of Shi‘ism” but we will touch upon it here too.

This occurrence goes back to ‘Al¢’s time during which there had been two opposite views regarding him, namely the extremist one based on which he was dealt with as if he were an infidel and the opposite one according to which he was exaggerated to such an extent that he was characterized with divine features. In spite of the fact that there are serious discrepancies concerning peculiarities of views which are too complex to be clarified; however, taking historical events in toaccount, one can make certain that these incidents did take place during Imim ‘Al¢’s time. According to some researchers and as said before, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Saba’, the initiator of “Exaggeration”, was an imaginary person singled out to stain the Shi‘ite Muslims’ reputation. Denying him, however one should not equate it with disregarding such exaggerations among the Shi‘ite Muslims at that time.

What does Exaggeration imply? Its origin goes back to what had been attributed to Imim ‘Al¢ (a) as well as his descendants that is blasphemy according to the Shi‘ites doctrine and abundant traditions from Imims.

To elaborate the meaning, it deems appropriate to suggest a piece of poem from Sayyid °imyar¢, a Shi‘ite Muslims poet,

قـوم غلوا في علّيٍ لا أباَّ لهم وأجشــموا أنفساً في حبّه تعبا

قالوا هو الله جل الله خالقَنـا من أن يكون له ابن او يكون أبا [1]

“Exaggerating about ‘Al¢ (a), some people whose parents may be damned put great pressure on people to adore him saying that he was God and Almighty God was either his father or his son.”

A group of those people were expelled to Madi’in by Imim. Being informed about ‘Al¢’s martyrdom, they nullified it.[2] There are diverse quotations concerning Imim’s severity on them in history books manipulated based on various inclinations. From among them, we can have the false account of burning as well as regarding them as dualists.[3]

Such ideas were also approved by some so-called Shi‘ite Muslims during Imim °asan’s time. **قيل للحسن بن علي أنَّ أُناساً من الشيعة يزعمون أنَّ علياً دابة الارض... فقال, كـذبوا، أولئك ليس بشيعة، اولئك اعداؤه** [4] **“** °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ was told, “A few Shi‘ite Muslims hold the view that ‘Al¢ is a creature on the earth…” He said, “They tell a lie, these people are not Shi‘ite Muslims, they are ‘Al¢’s adversaries.”

Forgers of tradition probably had quoted wrong traditions from Imims repeatedly to subjugate and defame them.

Subsequent to Karbali event when “the penitents” as well as Mukhtir’s uprising took place, the viewpoints of the Exaggerators were still prevailing in Iraq. One point needs consideration, as mentioned before Mukhtir was accused of several wrongdoings one of which was Exaggeration. In the same books, various sects in particular “K¢siniyya”, one of the Exaggerators from among Shi‘ite Muslims, was given emphasis while being characterized by having so many divisions and principles. Most of them are still widespread among upcoming Exaggerators and attributed to others to defame Shi‘ite Muslims as well as their Imims.

---

[1]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.2, p.245

[2]. See, Maqtal ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib (a) (Turithuni Magazine, No.12), p.121

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.2, pp.166,181

[4]. Ibid. vol.2, p.142; Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXXVIII, p.112 (In footnote of "Ansib" for the meaning of "Dibbat al-ar¤", See, Lisin al-‘arab, vol.1, p.370, There this term was said to be a sign of the arrival of the Day of Judgement.

Regardless of veracity of K¢sinnids's exaggerated principles, what can be inferred from Imim Sadjdjid's statements is that some statements identical to those of Jews and Christians about 'Az¢z and Jesus Christ were expressed about Ahl al-Bayt.

Imim Sadjdjid (a) stated, **احبّونا حب الاسلام ولاترفعونا فوق حدنا** [1] **"**Love us as well as you do Islam and keep us as high as we are."

Somewhere else he told, **إنَّ قوماً من شيعتنا سيحبونا حتى يقولوا فينا ما قالت اليهود في عزير وما قالت النصارى في عيسى بن مريم فلا هم منا ولا نحن منهم** [2] **"**Some of our Shi'ite Muslims are so kind- hearted toward us that ascribe what Jews told about 'Az¢z and Christians about Christ to us. By no means are we from among them nor do they."

It is worthwhile mentioning that the Exaggerators vocalized Imim °usayn is still alive just the same as Jesus Christ, and As'ad Ibn °an¨ala Shim¢ was killed instead of him.[3]

±abar¢ quoted Ab¢ Mikhnaf as saying that there had been some Exaggerators in K£fa. According to what °a¥¢ra Ibn 'Abd Allih had told Ab£ Mikhnaf in this quotation, from among Shi'ites Exaggerators were "Hind Bint al-Mutakallifa al-Ni'i§iyya whose house was center of all Shi'ites Exaggerators. The other one was "Layli Bint Qumima al-Muzayna who was not loved by his brother Rufi'a, a moderate Shi'ites. Once Ibn °an¢fa was informed about their presence in K£fa, he wrote a letter to Shi'ite Muslims in there urging them to go to mosques and praise Allih and not to choose their friends from among those who are not pious. If they actually are worried about themselves, they should be pious, cautious of liars, perform prayers while keeping in mind that it is at Allih's behest for all living beings to be either loser or winner. **و كل نفس بما كسبت رهينة، ولاتزر وازرة وزر أخرى والله قائم علي كلّ نفس بما كسبت فاعملوا صالحاً وقدّموا لأنفسكم حسناً ولا تكونوا من الغافلين** [4] **"**Everyone falls responsible for his practice and no one bears sin of others, God beholds one's deeds, so practice

---

[1]. °ilyat al-awliyi', vol.III, p.136

[2]. Ikhtiyir Ma'rifat al-ridjil, p.102

[3]. 'Ilal al-shariyi', pp.225-227; Bi¦ir al-anwir, v.XXXXIV, pp.269-271

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.4, p.566, 567; I'lim al-nisi', vol.V, p.252

righteously, proceed onto virtues and avoid being among the negligent.”

As it was touched on before, some historians made every endeavor to define Exaggeration as having some principles much the same as that of the Twelfth Imim Shi‘ism to attribute those principles to them but paying just a little attention, one can easily understand that they are forged. In Shi‘ites sources as well, some people’s stance such as Ibn °anafiyya and Imim’s speeches expressed without caution removes any doubt completely.

CONFRONTATION OF IMªMS WITH THE EXAGGERATORS

Shi‘ites Imims openly took a stand against movements of exaggerators, instances of which could be seen during Imim ¯idiq and Biqir’s time, presenting true beliefs and religious principles. During Imim Biqir, such distortion manifested itself clearly and some corrupted individuals from among them came to be leaders of their movement.

Mughº¢ra Ibn Sa‘¢d was one of them whose lifetime was mostly spent during Imim Biqir’s time and was burned to death in 119 A.H. by Khilid Ibn ‘Abd Allih Qasr¢, Iraqi governor, calling him a magician, ±abar¢ quoted that he along with seven others ran wild against the administration outside K£fa. Being on mosque pulpit, Khilid was told about this and requested water! It is good to mention that Mughº¢ra was one of Khilid Ibn ‘Abd Allih’s Mawil¢.[1] Later on, Khilid burned both his companions and him to death for they had not relinquished their beliefs. There are several quotations from Kashsh¢ revealing Imim Biqir’s abhorence towards him.[2] Some actions of him were manipulating Imim Biqir’s traditions and teaching magic as well as juggling.[3]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, pp.566,567; al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.I, p.157; he has mentioned his ideas as to analogy

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p.321

[3]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, p.223 on.

Regarding the Exaggerators' conduct towards Imim Biqir (a), Ab£ Hurayra 'Idjl¢ wrote these verses,

ابـا جعفر أنت الولي أحبّـه وأرضـى بمـا ترضي به وأتابع
أتتنا رجال يحمــلون عليكم أحاديث قد ضافت بهن الاضالع
أحاديث افشاها المغيرة فيهـم وشر الامور المحدثات البدائع[1]

"O, Ab£ Dja'far, you are master and beloved one to me. I am satisfied with whatsoever you are satisfied with and I do follow you. There are some individuals attributing some traditions to you. This is something which downhearts us. Mugh¢ra had forged some traditions which is the worst heresy."

Bayin Ibn Sam'in[2] was another one supporting Mugh¢ra. He was also burned to death along with Mugh¢ra by Khilid Ibn 'Abd Allih.[3]

In Shi'ite Muslims sources, Bayin Ibn Sam'in was bitterly reproached since he was said to have quoted false traditions.[4] °amza Ibn 'Amira al-Barbar¢ just the same as Abu l-Kha§§ib Ghil¢, Baz¢' and Mugh¢ra Ibn Sa'¢d were all cursed by Imims.[5]

There are detailed descriptions of the Exaggerators and their beliefs in Sa'd Ibn 'Abd Allih and Nuwbakht¢ books. Despite the fact that both the Exaggerators and their leaders were corrupted, one should be heedful enough while dealing with what had been written concerning them in sectarian and religious books in particular those which had been compiled by Sunnis with great pessimism.

It deems appropriate to take Imim ¯idiq's reactions towards the Exaggerators during his life throughout the Umayyads's time when both in this time and during the 'Abbisids they were very active.

It should be noted that the Exaggerator's deviation was to such an extent that the religious principles were at risk. What they had in minds was not to leave a single principle of

---

[1]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p.151

[2]. In some books it is mentioned "Banin" while in some others such as ±abar¢, it is "Bayin" which the latter one is apparently true.

[3]. al-Maqilit wa l-firaq, p.33

[4]. Ikhtiyir Ma'rifat al-ridjil, p. 302

[5]. Ibid. p. 305

religion, either fundamental or practical one untainted. Anyhow, it appears that they had mystical inclinations according to which some people were deceived after being fascinated by their attractions. The Exaggerators were more active in °idjiz than anywhere else since Iraq was a place where various cultures such as Iranian, Russian, Syriac and Jewish and so forth met and it had the capacity to put an impression on Muslims’ attitudes. These interactions confused most religious beliefs.

The notion of Exaggeration threatened Shi‘ism since it not only had falsified their principles from within and secluded them but also distorted public images towards them in such a way that it seemed they were indifferent to the practical laws of Islam.[1]

Taking a glance at sectarian books, it can be perceived in spite of the fact that, considering sectarian divisions, Exaggeration is said to be a distinct one, not only the leaders of various sects but Sunnites scholars as well do not differentiate between various divisions of Shi‘ism and prevent from endorsing their traditions. One of the reasons of such pessimism is influence of the ideas of Exaggerators on Shi‘ite Muslims. Despite all efforts being made firstly by Imims and secondly their scholars, the effects are still more and less obvious. To bring an example, one can refer to some quotations from the Exaggerators regarding Qur’in’s distortion in some of the Shi‘ites hadith books.[2]

Imim ¯idiq (a) and subsequent Imims opposed strongly that falsification. Previously, endeavors being made in an interval from ‘Al¢ (a) to Imim Biqir had brought about Ahl al-Bayt’s popularity as well as expansion of Shi‘ism. Accordingly, the Exaggerators were trying hard to penetrate deep into Shi‘ite Muslims with the intention of damaging it both internally and externally. From among crucial undertakings of Imim ¯idiq (a) to preserve noble Islamic culture bestowed to Shi‘ite Muslims were purification of Shi‘ism, struggle to negate the Exaggerators as well as

---

[1]. Once he said, one of the Khiridjites had blamed the Shi‘ite Muslims for thinking that they were needless of taking righteous actions and that they were spared from pain because of their evil deeds, See, al-Aghin¢, vol.XX, p.107, quoted from al-‘Aq¢dat wa l-shar¢‘a fi l-islim, p.203

[2]. See, Ukdh£bat Ta¦r¢f al-qur’in Bayn al-sh¢‘a wa l-Sunna, p.66

remove them from approaching Shi‘ite Muslims’ instances of which are to be divulged here.

One of the central activities of Imim was preventing Shi‘ite Muslims from having relationship with the Exaggerators since it could magnetize some of the Shi‘ite Muslims to them with all their possible attractions. Besides, they claimed that they were tied to Imims and upon denying them, they expressed what they had done was simply out of dissimulation.

Mufa¤¤al quoted Imim ¯idiq (a) as referred to Abu l-Kha§§ib as well as other Exaggerators, as saying, **يا مفضّل! لا تقاعدوهم ولا تؤاكلوهم ولاتشاربوهم ولا تصـافحوهم** [1] **“**O, Mufa¤¤al, do avoid the Exaggerators, neither eat or drink with them and do not shake hands with them.”

In another quotation once again Imim (a) accentuated the statement, **و أما ابوالخطاب محمد ابي زينـب الأجـدع ملعـون وأصحابه ملعونون، فلا تجالس اهل مقالتهم فاني منهـم بـرئ وآبائي عليهم السلام منهم براء** [2] **“**Both Abu l-Kha§§ib and his followers are cursed. Do not have association with their supporters. My forefathers had abhored him, so do I.”

Imim (a) was in particular heedful to the Shi‘ites youth stating, **احذروا على شـبابكم الغلاة لا يفسـدوهم، الغلاة شـرّ خلق الله، يصغّرون عظمة اللـه ويـدّعون الربوبيّـة لعبـاد اللـه** [3] **“**Remain watchful not to let the Exaggerators deviate your young men. They are the Allih’s archfoes. Reducing His Majesty, they profess to His servants that they are God.”

Imim ¯idiq (a) had warned individuals against having association with not only the Exaggerators, but all the innovators as well stating, **واحْذر مجالسة اهل البدع فأنهـا تنبت في القلب كفراً وضلالاً مبيناً** [4] **“**Do not keep company with innovators inasmuch as it sows the seeds of blasphemy in your heart as well as misleading you overtly.”

To exclude them from membership of a Shi‘ites society, Imim ¯idiq (a) found fault with their beliefs and urged people not to accept them by referring to Allih’s Book for his evaluation.

---

[1]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, hadith,525; Mustadrak al-wasi’il, vol.12, p.315

[2]. al-Ghayba, p.177; Mustadrak al-wasi’il, vol.12, p.315

[3]. al-Amil¢, Shiykh ±£s¢, vol.2, p.246

[4]. Mustadrak al-wasi’il, vol.12, p..315; Mi¥bi¦ al-shar¢‘a, p.389

Shahristin¢ quoted that Sudayr ¯ayraf¢ had gone to Imim and said, “May I be your sacrifice! Your followers have diverse opinions; some are of the beliefe that some one whispers in your ears; some say that Allih reveals secret to you; some think that you are inspired; some others assume that you see in your dreams or give decree based on your forefathers’ command. Which one is true?

In response, Imim said, **لا تأخذ بشيء مما يقولون نحن حجة الله وأمناءه على خلقه، حلالنا من كتاب الله وحرامنا منه**[1] **“**DO not accept whatsoever they tell you. We are Allih’s witness and faithful ones for His servants and we do consider something either lawful or unlawful while having reference to His Book.”

Quotations of this kind indicate that due to the wrong beliefs of the Exaggerators some were doubtful whether Imims introduced new religions or there would be new revelations. Underlining the fact that whatsoever they say comes from Allih’s Book, Imim ¯idiq (a) demanded people not to endorse those wrong beliefs.

In another quotation, Shahristin¢ stated that Fay¤ Ibn Mukhtir went to Imim ¯idiq (a) and said, “May I be your sacrifice! What is this divergence among our Shi‘ite Muslims? At times, I attend their meeting and I feel apprehensive about what they say. Then I refer to Mufa¤¤al and find out what makes me calm there.”

In response Imim (a) said, **اجل! انّ الناس اغروا بالكذب علينا حتى كأنَّ الله فرضه عليهم لايريد منهم غيره، واني لأحدِّث أحدهم الحديث، فلا يخرج مني حتى تتأوله على غير تأويله**[2] **“**See individuals are fond of laying the blame on us as if Allih made them do so and not anything else. When I say something to someone, he alters it soon before leaving me.”

Sahm¢ quoted ‘«si al-°udjrin¢ as saying, “I went to Dja‘far Ibn Mu¦ammad al-¯idiq and said,”Shall I retell what I heard from this tribe?”

Imim replied, “Say it.”

I said, **فانَّ طائفة منهم عبدوك واتّخذوك الهاً من دون الله وطائفة أخري والوا لك النبوة و**... “Some of these people do

---

[1]. Turithuni Magazine. No.12, pp.17-18, article, "Ahl Bayt f¢ ra’y ¥i¦ib al-Milal wa l-ni¦al" quoted from Ma¥ib¢¦ al-asrir.

[2]. Ma¥ib¢¦ al-asrir, Ibid. p.26, Turithuni Magazine, No.12, p.18

worship you and consider you a God quite different from Allih and another group do regard you as a prophet."

Imim wepet bitter tears, then said, **ان أمكنني الله من هولاء فلم اسفك دمائهم سفك الله دم ولدي علي يدي**[1] **"**If I dominate them at Allih's behest, I will surely shed their blood; otherwise, Allih will do the same to my son."

Occasionally, the narrators of quotations manipulate what Imims had said according to their tests with the intention of nullifying basic principles of Shi'ite Muslims. Thereafter, some of them will be mentioned.

Mahdavitism was the central belief of the Exaggerators which was rejected by Imim ¯idiq (a).[2] They also believe in prophecy of some Imims.

Imim ¯idiq (a) told them, **من قال انّا انبياء فعليه لعنة الله ومن شك في ذلك فعليه لعنة الله** [3] **"**God may curse whosoever regards us as His Prophet and whosoever remains skeptical of it."

From among the Exaggerators, some had equated God with Imim saying, **هو الذي في السماء اله وفي الارض اله قالوا هو الامام** He is the one who exists in the heavens and earth, they said, "He is Imim."

That was why Imim ¯idiq (a) told that they were even worse than Magians, Jews, Christians and the unbelievers.[4]

Imim was at odds with the Exaggerators in particular with those beliefs based on which they attributed Godliness to Imims.

The he went on to say, **لعن الله من قال فينا ما لا نقوله في انفسنا ولعن الله من أزالنا عن العبودية لله والذي خلقنا واليه ما بنا ومعادنا وبيده نواصينا** [5] **"**May Allih curse those who quote us as saying what not told by us. May Allih curse those refraining us from worshiping Him, He who has created us and we all will to Him while He determines our fate."

As maintained by Islamic jurisprudence, it deems right to excommunicate individuals denying basic principles of Islam. This is done to prevent violations provided that it do develop

---

[1]. Tirɖkh Djurdjin, pp.322, 323

[2]. Ikhtiyir Ma'rifat al-ridjil, p.300

[3]. Ibid. p.301

[4]. Ibid. p. 300

[5]. Ibid. p.302

through its normal course. Imim ¯idiq (a) endeavored to excommunicate the Exaggerators from Islamic society to frostrate them from distorting the Shi‘ites fundamental principles.

One of the undertakings of the Exaggerators was symbolizing religious notions in such a way that they lose their basic significations. Imim ¯idiq (a) in a letter addressing Abu l-Kha§§ib, one of the Exaggerator’s leaders, stated, **بلغني انك تزعم انّ الزنا رجل وأنّ الخمر رجل وأنّ الصلاة رجل وأنّ الصيام رجل وأن الفواحش رجل وليس هو كما تقول، انا اصل الحق، وفروع الحق طاعة الله، وعدونا أصل الشر وفروعهم الفواحش**[1] **“**You are said to be of the opinion that adultery, intoxication, prayer, fasting and mischief are all men with these names. What you said is not true. I am the supreme truth and in comparison worshiping Allih is subordinate one. Our enemies are the major evil while their mischief is a minor thing in comparison.”

In another quotation, Imim stated, **لعنة على أبي الخطاب والناس اجمعين فاشهد أنّه كافر فاسق مشرك الله والملائكة**[2] **“**May Allih, His angels as well as His servants put a curse on Abu l-Kha§§ib. I do confess that he is infidel, lewd and polytheist.”

Somewhere else, by referring to the Exaggerators, Imim (a) stated, **توبوا الى الله فانكم فساق كفار مشركون**[3] **“**Do repent your sins. You are undoubtedly lewd, infidel and polytheist.”

Imim ¯idiq excommunicated them so openly that, on one hand, they themselves perceived there was no longer any dissimulation and, on the other hand, Shi‘ite Muslims stopped having communication with the Exaggerators completely.

The Exaggerators could publicize their beliefs primarily due to the fact that they called on their followers not to observe either jurisprudic legals or inhibitions.

They quoted Imim ¯idiq (a) as saying, “Whomsoever knows Imim, he shall be permitted to do whatsoever he wants to.”

---

[1]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil. p. 219

[2]. Ibid. p. 297

[3]. Ibid. p. 297

To remove all doubts Imim said, **انَّما قلتُ: ان عرفت، فاعمل ماشئت من قليل الخير وكثيره، فإنه يقبل منك**[1] **"** I said if you knew your Imim, you would surely do good either less or more. Such cognition is the key to the acceptance of your practices."

Imim alluded to the fact that ordinances are subordinate to sainthood (Wiliyat) or without which observing such rules is worthless. The Exaggerators did not take the primary meaning of that statement into account based on their non-observance of the jurisprudic rules. They were quite distinguishable from those who were adherent to them.[2]

One influential factor in the emergence of the Exaggerators was public stupidity.[3] At the same time, ambition as well as yearning to attract individuals, especially with regard to those who claimed succession of Imims and upgraded them to Godliness with the intention of introducing themselves as prophets were other leading factors.

Imim ¯idiq (a) asserted, **إنَّ الناس اولعوا الكذب علينا... وإنّي أحدِّث أحدهم بحديث فلا يخرج من عندي حتى يتأوَّله على غير تأويله وذلك أنّهم لا يطلبون بحديثنا وبحبنا ما عند الله وإنما يطلبون الدنيا**[4] **"**Individuals are eager to falsify our accounts. Even before we end our speech, they reiterate it to others regardless of its exact meaning. Neither in learning traditions nor seeking our friendship do they desire what Allih wants rather they are after mammonism."

To discriminate the forged traditions of the Exaggerators from the authentic ones motioned by Ahl al-Bayt, Imim ¯idiq (a) referred to Qur'in as a criterion.

Regarding this he stated, **لا تقبلوا علينا حديثاً الا ما وافق القرآن والسنة او تجدون معه شاهداً من احاديثنا المتقدمه فان المغيرة بن سعيد لعنه الله دسّ في كتب ابي احاديث لم يحدث بها ابي، فاتقوا الله ولا تقبلوا علينا ما خالف قول ربنا تعالي وسنة نبيّنا صلى الله علي واله، فإنا إذا حدثنا قلنا قال الله عز وجل وقال رسول الله**[5] **"**Do not accept whatsoever they quote from us on condition that they are in accordance with either Qur'in or Sunna or our previous traditions. May

---

[1]. al-Kif¢, vol.4, p.464

[2]. Ikhtiyir Ma'rifat al-ridjil, p. 530

[3]. Ibid. p.295

[4]. Ibid. p.136

[5]. Ibid. p.224

Allih curse Mugh¢ra Ibn Sa‘¢d, the one who quoted traditions from my father not told by him. Be pious and do not endorse whatsoever is at odds with Qur’in and Sunna since whatsoever we quote is based on these two sources.”

There are some other quotations indicating the same action of the Exaggerators.

For instance, Imim ¯idiq (a) said, “Mugh¢ra took home the books being written by Imim Biqir’s companions then, **ويدسُّ فيها الكفر والزندقة ويسندها الى ابي ثم يـدفعها الـى اصحابه “**He quoted hadiths from the dualists and attributed them to my father after that, he returned those to their owners.”

Imim also stated, **فكلما كان في كتـب اصـحاب ابـي مـن الغلّو، فذاك ما دسّه مغيرة بن سعيد في كتبهم**[1] **“**Whatsoever can be found in the books of my father’s companions regarding the Exaggerators are nothing but what Mugh¢ra registered there.”

Such action of Imim ¯idiq (a), on one hand, could differentiate the Shi‘ite Muslims from the Exaggerators but, on the other hand, it had a negative effect on Shi‘ite Muslims’ expansion. Just because of the Exaggerators, Ab£ °an¢fa told his followers not to reiterate Ghad¢r hadith.[2] Not withstanding the fact that it was quite unacceptable, it could divulge the impact of the Exaggerators’ action on quoting the most accurate accounts of ‘Al¢’s virtues.

This was discussed in detail since it was supposed to reveal not only the Exaggerators’ deviation in the History of Shi‘ism but also the reaction of Imims in protecting Shi‘ism from threat of the Exaggerators inasmuch as they roused public hatred towards Ahl al-Bayt.[3] And they had to defend themselves.

SHI‘ISM WHEN GIVING SUPERIORITY TO ‘AL« (A)

Speaking about the internal affairs of Shi‘ism, there still is another form of Shi‘ism which merely appreciates the ‘Alawites and considers them as the true ones for caliphate while according to its principle neither Imamate is a divine

---

[1]. Ibid. p.225

[2]. Shiykh Muf¢d, al-Amil¢, p.27

[3]. al-‘Aq¢dat wa l-shar¢‘a fi l-islim, p.207

leadership nor Imim is someone whose obedience is mandatory. In the realm of policy and leadership, taking the distinct features of them in comparison with other influential tribes into account, one can observe that ‘Al¢ (a) was superior that ‘Uthmin as well as other caliphs.[1] In view of such definition of Shi‘ism, not only majority of the Sunnis traditionalists but Iraqi ones as well are Shi‘ites. Reviewing M ¢zin al-I‘tidil from Dhahab¢, one can see that a great number of religious scholars later come to be known as Sunnites were believed to be Shi‘ites at that time. From among them, there were some people as Mu¦ammad Ibn Djar¢r ±abar¢[2] and °ukaym Niyshib£r¢, the greatest Sunnites scholars in the 3rd and 4th centuries, who severely criticized Mu‘iwiya. These people were not few in Iraq in 1A.H. most of whom were irritated by °adjdjidj and other Umayyads’s rulers just due to their devotion to Imim ‘Al¢ (a) as well as to the Prophet’s progeny.

What should not be left out of consideration regarding this group is that they were by no means Shi‘ites based on its principles. The expansion of Shi‘ism in K£fa due to the presence of both Imim ‘Al¢ (a) and his son there for over five years was the basic cause of the formation of that group there. Embracing Shi‘ism, some individuals at that time spread it in that region. On the other hand, there were also some traditionalists of K£fa affected by this morale. They refrained from quoting Imim ‘Al¢’s virtues just the same as others since they were influenced by ‘Uthmin. He as well as his supporters criticized K£fiyin hadith-narrators since they did not observe the limitations being imposed by them on not only quoting Ahl al-Bayt’s virtues but the evils of companions for the very reason, such individuals as A‘mash the so-called Shi‘ites Muslim, was accused of forging hadiths narrated by the residents of K£fa.[3]

Once Iraqis were said to be Shi‘ites but by taking all limitations into account, one can understand what kind of Shi‘ism it is, despite the fact that there were many Shi‘ite

---

[1]. This was scrutinized under the title of "Political Sh¢‘ism" in Tir¢kh tashayyu‘.

[2]. Regarding his religion, we have an article in the book entitled "Djughrifiyiy Insin¢ sh¢‘a".

[3]. Shadjarit al-dhahb, vol. 1, p. 221

Muslims who considered Ahl al-Bayt merely as their Imims and leaders.

A real Shi‘ites follower is someone who only believes in the Imamate of ‘Al¢’s descendants and regards them as the successor of the successors[1] whose obedience is obligatory regardless of his political power. Belief in this principle was a criterian to distinguish ideological Shi‘ism from others and those who were skeptical in this regard were not from Shi‘ite Muslims. Abin Ibn Taghlib in this regard mentioned, **الشيعة، الذين اذا اختلف الناس عن رسول الله صلي الله وعليه واله، اخذوا بقول علي عليه السلام، واذا اختلف الناس عن علي اخذوا بقول جعفر بن محمد عليه السلام "**A Shi‘ite Muslim is someone who endorses whatsoever Imim ‘Al¢ (a) said, once people were at variance concerning what Allih’s Messenger has said and when soever the same happened concerning ‘Al¢’s utterances, he should accept whatever Dja‘far Ibn Mu¦ammad mentioned."[2]

This meaning of Imamate was based on "Ghad¢r hadith" and those who did not believe in this were called the Disavowers. Imims probably turned their back on them merely to keep face.[3] Ahl al-Bayt’s quotations, on the other hand, presented a clear definition of sainthood which was the cornerstone of Shi‘ites beliefs. There are numerous quotations which equate sainthood with prayer, fasting, °adjdj and tax alms and at times, it is even more emphasized.[4] In practice, the Imims who were Shi‘ites leadership asked people for paying their financial dues to them. They not only considered the rulers as oppressors and manifestation of tyranny but also said they are legitimate

---

[1]. This title "The successor of the successors (Wa¥¢ al-aw¥iyi’) was referred to Imims by ideological Sh¢‘ism when Djibir Ibn Yaz¢d Dju‘f¢ quoted from Imim Biqir (a) he said, حدثني وصي الاوصياء O, the successor of the successors tell traditions for us

This was what dispersed the Sunnites narrators of hadith from him. As Sufyin al-Thawr¢ said he had disparaged them by his work. See, al-Ma‘rifat wa l-tir¢kh, vol.2, p.716; M¢zin al-i‘tidil, vol.1, p.383; Tahdh ¢b al-tahdh¢b, vol.2, p.49

[2]. Ridjil al-nadjish¢, p.12, under the biography of Abin Ibn Taghlib.

[3]. Regarding Imim’s behavior towards Zurira Ibn A‘yin, one of the Sunnites, see, al-Ma‘rifat wa l-tir¢kh, vol.2, p.672; M¢zin al-i‘tidil, vol.2, p.69.

[4]. See, Wasi’il al-sh¢‘a, vol.1, pp.7,10,11,12,17,18

and divine Imims. Accordingly, they did carry out financial as well as political responsibilities upon them.

Once Imim Biqir (a) was asked about his father's inheritance, he said, **ما ما كان لأبي بسبب الإمامة فهو لـي وما كان غير ذلك فهو ميراث على كتاب الله وسنّة نبيه**[1] **"** I am heir to my father's position and other things, except this, which are my father's personal features are to be divided in accordance with Qur'in as well as Prophet's Sunna."

There are some quotations regarding booties, in which the Imims made it quite clear that they have been the right owners of them.[2] Unfortunately, some of the ignorant writers of Sunnis as well as the orientalists, regardless of so many quotations in various aspects of our Islamic jurisprudence, presented our Imims in such a way as if they did claim they were Imims and were attributed by others; however, there are numerous quotations from Shi'ite Muslims, as said before, which remove all historical doubts.

There were a great number of people in Iraq who were of the opinion that the Ahl al-Bayt were selected by Allih's Prophet and obeying from them was mandatory. However, they might be misled regarding some facts. Hishim Ibn 'Abd al-Malik who was apprehensive of the 'Alawites' rebellion wrote a letter to Y£suf Ibn 'Umar expressing the opinion of K£fiyins, **اما بعد, فقد عرفت حال اهل الكوفة في حبّهم اهل البيت ووضعهم ايّاهم في غير مواضعهم لافتراضهم علي انفسهم طاعتهم (و وظّفوا عليهم شرائع دينهم) ونحلتهم ايّاهم عظيم ما هو كائن مما استأثر الله بعلمه دونهم**[3] **"** You know quite well how K£fiyins adore Ahl al-Bayt. They exaggerate about them. They believe that they should obey them in their religious activities because they believe they have some kind of wisdom granted to no one but them."

The content of this letter indicates that there has been a kind of ideological Shi'ism whose milestone was Imim, someone who defined the Islamic law for them and his obedience was incumbent. As referred before, this issue was subject to debate. Since Iraqi Shi'ite Muslims, on one hand, were for from Medina, the main residence of Imims as well

---

[1]. Wasi'il al-sh¢'a, vol.6, p.374

[2]. See, al-°uk£mat al-islim¢yya f¢ A¦id¢th al-sh¢'at al-imimiyya, pp.84-88

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.238; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.489

as other ‘Alawites, and, on the other hand, they were pressurized by the Umayyads and later on, by the ‘Abbisids rulers they, could not understand who the veritable Imim was; nevertheless, from the very beginning, it was believed that only ‘Al¢’s descendants were given the right to rule. To verify this, refer to what had been mentioned regarding political views of the Penitents. A matter of prime importance was Shi‘ism in Qum originated from K£fa. The strong belief of the people of this city in Shi‘ism indicated that the Ash‘ar¢tes in this city had learnt the basic principles of Shi‘ism in K£fa.

As it was previously mentioned, since Shi‘ites Imims were far away from Medina, deviations in Shi‘ism came about, one of which was the Imamate of Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya who was supposed to be veritable Imim subsequent to ‘Al¢ (a), Imim °asan and Imim °usayn (a). Despite the fact that this belief was not widespread, it did undoubtedly exist.

“Kuthayyir ‘Azza” died in 105 A.H. was among poets who had Shi‘ites beliefs.[1] He was actually from the Kissin¢ds who believed that Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya was an Imim.

He wrote these verses,

ألا إن الائـمـة من قريش ولاة الحـق
اربـعة سـواء
علـي والثلاثـة مـن بنـيه هم الاسـباط
ليس بهم خفاء
فسبط سبط ايمـان وبـرّ وسـبط غـيـبته
كـربـلاء
وسبط لاتـراه العـين حتي يقـود الخيـل
يقـدمها اللـواء
تغيّب لايري عنـهم زمانا برضوي عنده
عسـل وماء [2]

“Take it into account that our Imims are four people from the Quraysh tribe. ‘Al¢ and three children of him, one of them, °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ is the epitome of piety and kindness. The other one is the one being embraced by Karbali and the third is the one who can not be seen by eyes until an army

---

[1]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p.292; al-Aghin¢, vol.IX, p.3

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.202; al-Aghin¢, vol.IX, p.14; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.78; Sayyid °imyar¢ has composed similar piece of poem; al-Aghin¢, vol.VII, p.245

appears with a flag in its forefront. For a while he would be on Ra¤aw¢ mountain, out of sight with honey and water at hand."

Ra¤aw¢ is one of the sacred mountains around Medina.

Other poems from the very same author hint at his belief in Mahdavitism of Ibn °anafiyya,

فهديت يا مهدينا ابن المتهدي انت الذي نرقّي به ونرتجي

انت ابن خيرالناس من بعد النبي انت إمام الحق لنسا نمتري

يابن علي سر ومن مثل علي[1]

"O our leader! May He raise thy blessings, thou art the one whose light of guidance we seek to our sublimity and we stay fully hopeful of him. Thou art descendant of the best man after the Prophet (s), no doubt our truthful Imim. O son of 'Al¢! Thou art like 'Al¢ among us."

Regardless of his misinterpretation of the true Shi'ism, Kuthayyir 'Azza basically believed in the cornerstone of Shi'ism, that is divine sainthood. Accordingly, he did not accept caliphate subsequent to prophet.

In a poem, he wrote,

برئت إلي الإله من ابن اروى ومن دين الخوارج اجمعينا

و من عمر برئت ومن عتيق غداة دعي امير المؤمنينا [2]

"I invoke by God to resent 'Uthmin and the Khiridjites as well as 'Umar and Ab£ Bakr, once called Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n."

One of the principles of ideological Shi'ism in rejecting the legitimacy of the first caliphs since based on it Imamate is at Allih's behest. Khandaq al-Asad¢ was a friend of Kuthayyir who once was in °adjdj along with him. Suddenly he shouted, "You had relinquished both the truth and your Prophet's Household consisting of four people and they are right".

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.289

[2]. al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.II, p.246; al-Shi'r wa l-shu'ari'´, p.316; Tir¢kh al-adab al-'arab¢, al-'a¥r al-islim¢, p.323; This poem is quoted from Sayyid °imyar¢ in Aghin¢, vol.VII, p.276,277

Revolting against him, people beat him to death.[1] I¥fahin ¢ has a quotation in Aghin¢ revealing that Imim Biqir (a) had taken part in Kuthayyir’s funeral ceremony and asked others to let him go under his coffin.[2] It was probable that Kuthayyir just the same as Sayyid °imyar¢ in the course of time either had given up he K¢ssanids or due to his friendship with Ahl al-Bayt supported them.

Sayyid °imyar¢, one of the Shi‘ites poets, was a member of the K¢ssanids too. Addressing Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya who was believed to be alive on Ra¤aw¢ mount, he wrote these verses,

ألا قل للوصي فدتك نفسي اطلت بذلك الجبل المقاما[3]

“Tell the successor, May my life be sacrificed to you, you overstayed in that mountain.”

There are many poems about his religion. At the same time, there are some quotations indicating his change of religion, which are all declared untrue by I¥fahin¢ based on his reference to some narrators. Based on some poems attributed to him, it was said that he believed in Imamate of Dja‘far Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn ¯idiq (a). It is not obvious why much effort was made to declare these verses untrue. Anyhow, it can have several reasons. For example, it had been proposed to say that he obeyed the Exaggerators not Imim ¯idiq. In a poem regarding his conversion, he was quoted as saying, **تجعفرت باسم اللـه واللـه اكـبر**[4] **“**In the name of Lord, the Exalted, I am turned to Dja‘far¢ religion.”

This verse is called in question, lthough not so strongly, since Sayyid because of his enough eloquence in speech could not have said, **تجعفرت باسم الله** In another poem, he went on to say,

أيا راكباً نحو المدينة جسرة عذا فرة تهوي بها كلّ سبسب

---

[1]. al-Aghin¢, vol. 12, p.174

[2]. Ibid. vol.9, p. 37

[3]. Ibid. vol.9, p.14; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.202; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.79

[4]. al-Aghin¢, vol.7, p.213; see, Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.79

إذا ما هداك الله لاقيت جعفراً فقل, يا امين الله وابن المهذّب [1]

“O thou who art on sturdy camelback trotting through deserts

O noble! Once thou meet Dja‘far, tell him he is trustee of God and the pure one.”

Kashsh¢ also has a quotation[2] indicating his conversion to Twelve-Imim Shi‘ism. He had done so probably due to his argument with Mu‘min al-±iq, one of the companions of Imim ¯idiq (a) and a man of debate, in which he was defeated.[3] Since he died in Man¥£r’s time, it was impossible for him to be still a K¢ssanids. On the other hand, the number of followers of this sect is not obvious or it is better to say that apart from some quotations mentioned previously, there is no other proof affirming the existence of other followers of this sect. Additionally, a number of followers were decreased since they came to obey either ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya or the ‘Abbisids.

There also are some verses from Sayyid °imyar¢ indicating his hatred towards the early caliphs.[4] When Mahd¢ ‘Abbisi was heir apparent, he asked him to cut off gifts been given to Ban£ Taym and Ban£ ‘Ad¢ inasmuch as they had deprived Ahl al-Bayt of their rights after Prophet’s departure.[5] Aghin¢ quoted that Imim ¯idiq invoked God’s blessing for him.[6]

The role of poets such as Kuthayyir ‘Azza Sayyid °imyar¢, Kumayt Ibn Zayd Asad¢ was of a prime significance in depicting the characteristics of Ahl al-Bayt particularly ‘Al¢ (a). They used the most delicate expressions in this regard. It was said that he never wrote a poem without mentioning this very verse,

أجد بآل فاطمة البكور فدمع العين منهمر غزير[7]

---

[1]. al-Aghin¢, vol.7, p.213; see, Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.79

[2]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, p.288

[3]. Ibid. p.245

[4]. al-Aghin¢, vol.7, pp.273-274

[5]. Ibid. vol.VII, pp.243-244

[6]. Ibid. vol.7, pp. 242,277

[7]. Ibid. p.245

Family of Fi§ima hath a hard time,that is why tears roll down stormily

or in another poem he said,

أقسم بالله وآلائه والمرء عما قال مسئول
أن عليّ بن ابي طالب على التُّقى والبّر مجبول

“I do swear by Allih and hisblessings, individuals shall be asked about what they say, Surely ‘Al¢ is created a pure one.”

He vocalized, **من أتاني بفضيلة لعلي بـن ابـي طـالب مـا قلت فيها شعراً فله ألـف دينـار**[1] **“**Whosoever tells me even one of the ‘Al¢’s virtues about which I had not written a poem, I will give him one thousand D¢nirs.”

Demonstrating the role of the Shi‘ites poet is a matter of great significance but can not be discussed here.[2]

True belief in Shi‘ism, something which prevailed among all the Shi‘ite Muslims had emanated from instructions being disseminated by Imims. During the above-mentioned time, Imim Biqir and ¯idiq (a) played the same role. There were a great number of hadith narrators among the followers of Imim Biqir (a) with their names mentioned in the Shi‘ites scholastic books such as Ridjil by ±£s¢.[3] Verifying merely those traditions being narrated by the Imims regarding either the Islamic Jurisprudence or Shar¢‘a was one of the basic requirements in accepting the divine leadership of Imims. In other words, Imims made every effort to introduce Ahl al-Bayt as the politico-religious pillar. Here, the issue of full-scale obedience is a central principle which requires all to refer to Ahl al-Bayt on different things, something reiterated in the speeches of the Infallible Imims from ‘Al¢’s time onwards. Previously, we touched upon ‘Al¢’s remarks concerning Ahl al-Bayt and their stances. During the late 1st and 2nd centuries when Imim Biqir and Imim ¯idiq (a), led the Shi‘ite Muslims, various sects appeared each of which claimed the leadership of Muslims. Accepting the political

---

[1]. Ibid. p.257

[2]. Our knowledgable friend, Mr.¯idiq ª’¢niwand talks in detail about biography of the Shi‘ites poets and the men of letters and the role in preserving values revolutionary Sh¢‘ism, in his book titled Adabiyit Inqilib dar sh¢‘a (Literature of Revolution in Sh¢‘ism)

[3]. Ridjil al-§us¢, p.102-142

leadership of caliphs, the majority of them struggled to have the religious leadership in their own hands. On the other hand, the Shi‘ites Imims, as it was mentioned in “Thaqalayn hadith”, underlined that the sole reliable sources are Qur’in and Ahl al-Bayt.

Imim Biqir (a) in his speeches most of the time called on people to take advantage of the knowledge of Ahl al-Bayt and just accept what they say as true traditions. In his speed, Imim Said to Salama Ibn Kuhayl and °akam Ibn ‘Uyayna, **شرّقاً او غرّباً فلا تجدان علماً صحيحاً الا شيئاً خرج من عندنا** [1] **“**Traverse both the East and the West of the world, then you will know no science is the accurate one save that of us.”

In another quotation referring to °asan Ba¥r¢, one of the renowned scholars of that time, he said, **– فليذهب الحسن يعني البصري – يميناً وشمالاً فوالله ما يوجد العلم الا هيهنا** [2] **“**°asan Ba¥r¢ can go wherever he wants, but I swear by Allih he can acquire knowledge nowhere but from us.”

In another quotation, Imim said, **فليذهب الناس حيث شاء واء، فوالله ليس الأمر الا من هيهنا- وأشار إلى بيته** [3] **“**Individuals can go wherever they want, but I swear by Allih they can find it nowhere but here, then he referred to his house.”

Such utterances invite people to refer to Ahl al-Bayt to receive Islamic instructions. The acceptance was equal to embracing Shi‘ism.

Somewhere else, Imim Biqir (a) said, **آل محمد ابواب الله والدعاة إلي الجنة والقادة اليها** [4] **“**Mu¦ammad’s descendants are the gates of divine knowledge through which people can attract Allih’s satisfaction. They call people to the Heaven and drive them towards it.”

Imim also said, **كلّ شي لم يخرج من هذا البيت فهو وبال** [5] **“**Whatsoever comes out of any house other than this would be harmful.”

---

[1]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, pp.209-210; al-Kif¢, vol.1, p.399; Ba¥i’ir al-daradjit, p.9

[2]. al-Kif¢, vol.I, p.51; Wasi’il al-sh¢‘a, vol.18, p.42

[3]. al-Kif¢, vol.1, p.399; Ba¥i’ir al-daradjit, p.12

[4]. Tafs¢r al-ayyish¢, vol.1, p.86; Wasi’il al-sh¢‘a, vol.18, p.9

[5]. al-m¢zin, vol.3, p.176 from Kif¢

Our insistence in mentioning these statements be due to their notable effect on the formatain of Shi‘ism.

Imim Biqir (a) also said, **ايها الناس! أين تذهبون واين يراد بكم؟ بنا هدي الله اوَّلكم وبنا ختم آخركم** [1] **“**O people! Where are you going? And where have you been gone? From the very beginning, you have been guided by Ahl al-Bayt and at last, all of you will return to them.”

When Hishim came to Medina, Imim said, **الحمد لله الذي بعث محمد بالحق نبياً وأكرمنا به، فنحن صفوة الله على خلقه وخيرته على عباده وخلفاءه، فالسعيد من اتّبعنا والشَّقي من عادانا وخالفنا** [2] **“**Praise be to Allih, He who selected Mu¦ammad as our prophet. We were respected just because of him. Accordingly, we are selected caliphs from among his creatures. Only those who follow us are fortunate not those who consider us as their enemy and disobey us.”

Because of such utterances, Imim Biqir(a) was summoned to Damascus by Hishim. In Imim ¯idiq’s statements, it has been stressed that all other ways lead to their deviation. Imim (a) said, **ايتها العصابة! عليكم بآثار رسول الله (ص) وسنّته وآثار الائمة الهداة من اهل بيت رسول الله** [3] **“**O Shi‘ite Muslims! It is upon you to take Prophet’s Sunna as well as the traditions of Imim from Ahl al-Bayt.”

Somewhere else, he told Y£nus Ibn ®ubyin, **يا يونس! إن أردت العلم الصحيح فعندنا اهل البيت فانا ورثنا واوتينا شرع الحكمة وفصل الخطاب** [4] **“**O Y£nus! We have the true knowledge inasmuch as we have inherited the paths of wisdom and ways of distinguishing the credal error from the gospel truth from Allih’s Prophet.”

Imim ¯idiq (a) said, **ان عندنا مالانحتاج معه إلي الناس، وإنّ الناس ليحتاجون إلينا وإنّ عندنا كتاباً باملاء رسول الله وخطّ علي، صحيفة فيها كل حلال وحرام** [5] **“**We have something with which we are not in need of anyone while all are in need of us. We have a book which was dictated to ‘Al¢ (a) by Allih’s Prophet. This book contains all ordinances of the lawful or unlawful.”

---

[1]. al-Kif¢, vol.1, p.478

[2]. Dali’il al-imima, p.104; Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.46, p.306

[3]. Wasi’il al-sh¢‘a, vol.18, pp.23,61; Raw¤at al-kif¢, p.5

[4]. Wasi’il al-sh¢‘a, vol.18, p.48

[5]. al-Kif¢, vol.1, p. 241

This atterance was actually the repetition of what Imim ‘Al¢ (a) had said to the residents of K£fa several times, **أهل الكوفة! سلونا عما قال الله ورسوله، فانا أهل البيت أعلم بما قال الله ورسوله** [1] **“**O the residents of K£fa! Ask us of what Allih and his prophet has said. Ask us since Ahl al-Bayt are the most informed source of what they have said.”

The evidence indicates that there has been a unanimous cultural movement on the part of Ahl al-Bayt and the Shi‘ites Imims to introduce Ahl al-Bayt as the center of religion of the Muslims.

One point should be taken into account is that the Shi‘ite Muslims confronted some problems ideologically, as said before in discussing about the Exaggerators, due to dissimulation during the life of Imim Biqir and ¯idiq (a) regarding both the corrupt administrations and public uproar. In addition, Imims themselves also faced some political problems not dealt with here. Regarding Ahl al-Bayt, as the authority was a justification for some linked to them as well as the Hishimites to be claimant and raise some difficulties for them. The ‘Alawites internal diisions had paved the ground for such deviations, and on one hand, led to the formation of fragmentation in Shi‘ism and deprived Imims of their rights of divine Imamate, on the other hand. Some of these divitions are to be discussed here.

ZAYD IBN ‘AL«’S UPRISING AND THE ZAYD«DS IN SHI‘ISM

Zaydism is one of the sects of Shi‘ism and an internal inclination. The practical and principle laws are similar to those of Sunnis. It is also somehow based on the Mu‘tazilites and °anafites principles. But regarding political factors, it is mostly based on Shi‘ism and all nations believe that this sect is actually a branch of Shi‘ism.

It is generally believed that this has emanated from Zayd Ibn ‘Al¢’s approach and its basic principles have been effected by his rebellion and all other movements are subordinate to it. Now this is discussed historically.

Zayd, the son of ‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn (a), was born from an Umm Walad (a slave who had been freed) mother. It is

---

[1]. al-Ma‘rifat wa l-tir¢kh, vol.2, p.759

supposed that Mukhtir had bestowed him to Imim Sadjdjid.[1] He is one of the ‘Alawites who organized the first uprising of them subsequent to Karbali’s event. His action acctually was the beginning of other rebellions of this kind initiated by the Zaydids thereafter throughout the Islamic land. They, most of the time, withstood the Umayyads and ‘Abbisids’ army while they were few.

According to D¢nwar¢, the date of his rebellion goes back to 118 A.H. which is unreal.[2] On the other hand, Mu¦ammad Ibn Is¦iq said it was in the year 120 A.H..[3] While, based on other sources, it was most likely to be in 121 or 122 A.H. and it was surely in ¯afar. While Ibn Kathr mentioned that it was in 122 A.H.[4] other people such as Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d[5], Zubayr Ibn Bakkir[6], Mas‘£d¢ [7], as well as some others were of the opinion that it was in 121 A.H.[8]

A researcher referring to some evidence tried to say it occurred in 122 A.H..[9] Based on the evidence, in all probability, it happened in ¯afar, 122 A.H.. It is said that since ¯afar was the second month of the year and some of the preparatory steps of the rebellion have been taken in the previous year so it happened in 122 A.H.. Based on another evidence, Khilid was deposed in Djamid¢ al-Awwal, 120 and by referring to the events taking place thereafter during the specific period mentioned by the historians in which Zayd was in K£fa, it is improbable to say that it took place at the beginning of the year 121 A.H..

The first happening of this rebellion is about the time when Khilid Ibn ‘Abd Allih Qasr¢ or, as mentioned in some

---

[1]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.86

[2]. Akhbir al-§iwil p.328

[3]. ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.258

[4]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.9, p.328

[5]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.7, p.165

[6]. ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.258

[7]. al-Tanb¢h wa l-ishrif, p.279

[8]. ‘Umdat al-§ilib (quoted by Wiqid¢) p.121; Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.2, p. 326; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p. 482; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.206, (he has mentioned narration 122)

[9]. See, S¢rih wa qiyim Zayd Ibn ‘Al¢, p.24

quotations, ±iriq, Khilid's male slave[1] or his son Yaz¢d confessed under torture when Y£suf Ibn 'Umar came to Iraq, individuals such as Zayd Ibn 'Al¢, Diw£d Ibn 'Al¢ and some others all owed them. Y£suf Ibn 'Umar informed Hishim about it. Then, he called upon Yaz¢d and others to go to Damascus. They all said that such confession was not true. Accordingly, Hishim Ibn 'Abd al-Malik sent them to K£fa to solve that problem before Khilid and Y£suf Ibn 'Umar. Zayd and others who were afraid of Y£suf Ibn 'Umar wrote a guarantee of clemency and even took someone to K£fa along with themselves to judge Hishim's treatment towards them. Later on, it came to be known that Khilid or his son or ±iriq had done it since he was under torture and wanted to be released for a while.[2] This happening might have occured either after 120 A.H. or when Khilid was deposed. Again, at that time, Zayd was either in Medina, then was sent to Damascus at Hishim's behest once he was informed about what Khilid had done.[3] Or he himself was in Damascus or in its outskirts, based on some evidence, to solve his problems with the °asanites concerning 'Al¢'s charity in there.

What some other quotations reveal is that Zayd had already travelled to Damascus. Based on them, Zayd who was at odd with 'Abd Allih Ibn °asan Ibn °asan(a) over 'Al¢'s charity headed for Damascus so that Hishim personally might find the solution to this problem since it could not be settled in Medina but he refrained from visiting him and whenever Zayd wrote a letter to caliph, he wanted him to return to his home. Eventually, at Zayd's insistence, Hishim accepted to call upon him but he said that he could not admit what he has said and, after a shout while, made him to leave Damascus. Setting out for Medina at first, Zayd then shifted his way to Iraq.[4]

Apparently what this narration is to convey is different from why Zayd disapproved the Umayyads. It seems that Zayd went there before the time Khilid said. He was also

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.231

[2]. See, Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, pp.482,483,487; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, pp.90-91; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.231; al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.110; Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.2, p.325

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.472

[4]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.3, p.286-287; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.486; Riyi¤ al-'ulami', vol.2, pp. 319-323

troublesome to Zayd. Regarding Zayd’s meeting with Hishim, the historians hinted at what made Zayd be angry with the Umayyads. Later on, Zayd himself told Djibir Dju‘f¢ that he could not keep silent before Hishim while he was a tyrant and he was against Qur’in.

Zayd said, “I saw myself how a Christian insulted the Holy Prophet in his presence. I said to him, “If I could, I would kill you”.

But Hishim said, “Leave alone our friend.”[1]

In another encounter, Hishim addressed Zayd and told him, “You are told to be entitled for caliphate while you are no one but the son of a slave woman not being competent for this task”.

In response Zayd said, “Ismi‘¢l was also the same as me, on the other hand, Is¦iq like you was not born from a slave woman but before Allih he was superior to Is¦iq and his descendants were the best among people”.[2] Such an encounter implies that Zayd already thought of caliphate. It is said that he set forth his rebellion with his brother Imim Biqir (a), but it is known that Imim Biqir (a) had departed his life at least six years prior to that.

Somewhere else, Hishim to insult Imim Biqir(a) asked Zayd, **ما فعل أخوك البقرة “**What is your brother, Baqara (the cow) doing?”

In response Zayd said, **سماه رسول الله بـاقراً وتسـميه البقرة لقد اختلفتما اذاً “**Our holy prophet called him Biqir, why are you calling him Baqara? You are at variance with him in this regard.”[3]

Anyhow, Hishim sent Zayd to Iraq to call on Y£suf, but since he was apprehensive of him, he wrote a letter to Khilid saying that to let him not stay there even for an hour owing to the fact that he had a great power to attract the residents thereof to himself.[4]

---

[1]. Tays¢r al-ma§ilib, p.109

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.286; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.v, p.225, vol.7, p.139, vol.4, p.117; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.3, p.287; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.206; ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.255; al-°£r al-‘ayn, p.189; Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.2, p.325

[3]. ‘Uy£n al-akhbir, vol.1, p.212; Shar¦ nahdj al-balighа, Ibn Abi l-°ad ¢d, vol.7, p.132. vol.3, p. 286; ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.194

[4]. Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.2, p.325

It is worth saying that once Zayd departed Damascus, Hishim said, “I swear by Allih that he will run wild”.[1] Resolving the problems arousing from Khilid’s confession, Zayd remained in K£fa and others who were wrongfully arrested went back to Medina.

ZAYD IBN ‘AL« IN K¬FA

K£fa, the city center of Iraq, was once also the center of caliphate in which many tribes resided. Among the Islamic cities, it was K£fa that was of great threat to the Umayyads accordingly. It was under tightened security and military measures.

When Zayd left Hishim, he said to him, **يا زيد اخرج حيث شئت ولاتدخل الكوفه** [2] **“**O Zayd! go anywhere you want but do not enter K£fa.”

He also had said the same to Y£suf.[3] As said before, Zayd stayed in K£fa for a while after he put an end to his dispute with Khilid Ibn ‘Abd Allih. Every day Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar encouraged him to leave K£fa as soon as possible but each time he refrained from doing so under various pretexts. Once he said he was about to leave or he wanted to buy something but finally he was forced to leave there.[4] According to Ya‘q£b¢, Zayd who was expelled from K£fa came there once again for he was not under strict control.[5] In a quotation from Ibn A‘tham, it is read that the soldiers of Ibn ‘Umar accompanied him up to “Man§iqa al-Ghudayb” and went back to K£fa.[6] Following them, Zayd stayed there for four months.[7]

Another quotation indicates that the Shi‘ite Muslims were in touch with him. His friends who were irritated by the K£fiyins’ unfaithfulness[8] wanted to leave Medina so the

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.XV, p.275

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.236

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.488

[4]. Ibid. vol.v, p.487; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.91

[5]. Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.2, p.326

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.111

[7]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.488

[8]. Ibid. vol.v, pp.488,489; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.2, p.233

rebellion has not been taken seriously. According to Zayd who was, on one hand, pressurized by Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar and, on the other hand, not so deeply concerned about the rebellion set out for Medina. Feeling that they lost golden opportunities, the Shi‘ite Muslims of K£fa chased him and intercepted him in Qidisiyya. They asked him to return to K£fa to overthrow the Umayyads with their collaboration.

They said, “O Zayd, the son of Allih’s Prophet, why are you leaving K£fa while you will have hundreds of thousand of swordsmen prepared to fight with the Umayyads?”[1]

They went on to say, “The number of the soldiers of Damascus in K£fa would not suffice and it was only Hamdin or Midhhadj tribe that could conquer them.”[2] Then Zayd accepted to return to K£fa once the Shi‘ite Muslims gave an undertaking to support him.[3]

Zayd entered K£fa secretly in such a way that Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar was not informed about it for a long period. Thereafter, he came to know about it since Hishim who was told about his arrival told him about it too.[4]

Zayd stayed in K£fa for over ten months and spent two months out in Ba¥ra.[5] During this period, Zayd who hid in different houses[6] asked many to join him and he could not be found by the Umayyads for either they were not able to find his hiding place or they were totally unaware of his arrival there. It is said that Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar could not believe at first that he had returned to K£fa in spite of all warnings on the part of Hishim about Zayd’s riot. He said, “Zayd is a man of wisdom who will never get himself into hot water”.[7] Being informed both about K£fiyins’ readiness for uprising and the support of Iraqi Ahl Sawid, the farmers of the cultivated lands surrounding K£fa and Iraq, Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar commanded to check the way saying that all individuals

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.11; al-Fakhr¢, p.132; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.91

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.287

[3]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.91

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.504

[5]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.92; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.273; ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.256

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.237; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.492

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.231

should be frisked lest any letter of Zayd might be sent somewhere else.[1]

Na¥r Ibn Khuzayma was one of the pre-eminent supporters of Zayd. He lived in his house for a while during which the Shi'ite Muslims from different places came there to visit him.[2] Another hiding place of him was the house of a woman from Azd tribe who, later on, married him.[3] Other happenings subsequent to his death divulge the fact that he had another wife as well as three children in that city.

Those points over which people had paid allegiance to Zayd, later on, turned to be the basis of the subsequent riots of this kind such as that of the penitents and Mukhtir's.

إنا ندعوكم إلى كتاب الله وسنة نبيّه (ص) وجهاد الظالمين والدفع عن المستضعفين وإعطاء المحرومين وقسم هذا الفيء بين اهله بالسواء وردّ الظالمين وإقفال المجمر ونصرنا اهل البيت علي من نصب لنا وجهل حقنا [4]

"We enjoin you to follow both Qur'in and the Sunna of the Prophet, fight against the oppressor, defend the oppressed, divide booties among its real owners equally, and finally support Ahl al-Bayt against their foes."

The same statements were quoted by Ibn A'tham.[5] He also referred to one of the letters found in a way by the soldiers of Y£suf Ibn 'Umar in which he had addressed individuals saying, "You are not aware of what had happened to you. There surely is a sedition in your religion and volatility in your livelihood. Bloodshed and plunder your share from the state treasury. I enjoin you to follow Qur'in and Sunna, defend the oppressed, fight against the oppressed who had usurped the rights of Ahl al-Bayt."[6]

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.114

[2]. Ibid. vol.8, p.112

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.492; al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.113

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.292; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, pp.237,238; Balidhur¢ instead of saying "Iqfil al-mudjammar" had said "If¤il al-mu¦ammara". Ma¦m£d¢, a researcher, in a footnote wrote, "If this word is right, it signifies the restortion of the Non-Arabs' rights, since "Mu¦mara refers to °amri'" whose rights had been violated. See, Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.238

[5]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.113

[6]. Ibid. vol.8, p.116

In his bidding, Zayd underlined points some of which were religious and financial ones. He also accentuated cruelties that Ahl al-Bayt had endured. Since the residents of K£fa were still dubious about what they had undertaken, Zayd paid allegiance to them not so easily.[1]

During this period of his life, Zayd wrote letters to those fascinated to Ahl al-Bayt expressing the cruelties they endured to stimulate them to fight. In one of those letters he wrote, “Do not say we rebelled **غضباً لكم** “rather say you ran wild.”[2] **غضباً لله ولرسوله**

To secure allegiance from individuals, Zayd dispatched his agents to other cities. For instance, he sent Yaz¢d Ibn Ab ¢ Ziyid to Raqqa [3], Madi’in as well as Wisi§. Some of the residents of those cities joined him and that was why Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar had the gates as well as the roads thereof checked strictly.[4] Zayd also sent Ubdat Ibn Kuthayyir and °asan Ibn Sa‘d to Khurisin.[5]

From among scholars and jurisprudents taking part in Zayd’s riot either directly or indirectly, one can name Ab£ °an¢fa, one of the eminent jurisprudents and experts in religion in Iraq. Politically speaking, during ‘Abbisids and Umayyads’s, he opposed them. During the former time, he assisted Nafs Zakiyya and in the latter time, he aided Zayd. He was from among the Murdji‘ites and could not stop supporting riots of this kind. Although this sect was somehow against Shi‘ism, it basically was a revolutionary movement. It has been proven in many sources that he was from among the Murdji‘ites.[6] Due to the same participation,in anti-government clashes, he has also been charged with Djahmites.[7] Murdji‘ites are said to have been unwilling to equal anybody to Zayd.[8] As previously mentioned, the

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.238

[2]. Ibid. vol.II, p.238

[3]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.99

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.240

[5]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.100

[6]. Djimi‘ Bayin al-‘ilm, vol.2, p.182; Tir¢kh Djurdjin, p.111; al-Madjr£¦ ¢n, vol.3, p.63; al-Ma‘irif, p.268. There is a detailed discussion in this regard in the book entitled "Murdji’a, Tir¢kh wa And¢shih".

[7]. Tir¢kh Baghdid, vol.II, p.179; Tir¢kh Djurdjin, p.225

[8]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.87

Djahmites originated from Djahm Ibn ¯afwin who himself is one of the major companions of °irith Ibn Suraydj, a revolutionary figure of Khurisin. Of couse, Ab£ °an¢fa was once forced by Man¥£r to take care of some business.[1] Mu¦ammad Ibn Dja'far Ibn Mu¦ammad (a) indirectly acknowledged the report about his role in Zayd's uprising.[2]

Zamakhshar¢ is quoted as saying that Ab£ °an¢fa incited people to take part in Zayd's uprising.[3]

Balidhur¢ has witten, "When Zayd sent for Ab£ °an¢fa, he was shocked and said that who among jurisprudents had accepted his call. He was told, Salama Ibn Kuhayl, Yaz¢d Ibn Ab¢ Ziyid, Hishim Bar¢d, Ab£ Hishim Ramin¢ and a number of others." Ab£ °an¢fa said, "I have no authority of rebellion."; however, he sent some money for Zayd to be spent for strengthening his troops.[4]

I¥fahin¢ also quoted in the same way from Ab£ °an¢fa saying that, "I have some money, you can use it for yourself and your companions for buying armour and weapons." He then gave some money to one of Zayd's slaves to be taken to him.[5]

Man¥£r Ibn al-Mu'tamir is among the jurisprudents who provoked the people to help Zayd.[6]

It is said about him, **فيه تشيع قليل** [7] **"**He holds in himself a bit of Shi'ism."

Some have introduced him among the Khashabids, a title given to Mukhtir's companions.[8] Interestingly, Zayd was even attached to Zuhr¢ who was a learned man affiliated with the Umayyads and asked him to rebel with Zayd.

Zuhr¢ said that he would not do so as long as Hishim was alive, but adding that once Wal¢d was in power, he would be ready to do so.[9]

---

1. N£r al-qabas, p.308
2. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.99
3. al-Kashshif, p.232
4. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.239
5. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, pp.99-100
6. Loc.Cit.
7. Tadhkirat al-¦uffi¨, vol.I, p.143
8. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VI, p.337
9. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.239

Zuhr¢ was one of the closest people to Hishim, still somewhere it is narrated that when Zayd’ head was sent to Hishim, Zuhr¢ said, “This family had been engulfed due to their haste.”

Then the narrator says, “I questioned him whether they could come to power or not.”

Zuhr¢ replied, “Yes, I heard ‘Al¢ Ibn °usayn(a) quoting Fi§ima from the Prophet who said, **المهدي من ولدك** [1] **“**Mahd ¢ is from my descendants.”

Another one paying allgiance to Zayd was Hilil Ibn °abib, Madi’in’s judge.[2] It is uncertain whether Salama Ibn Kuhayl participated in Zayd’s riot or not.[3]

A‘mash was one of the Iraqi jurisprudents who had Shi‘istic inclinations.

‘Uthmin Ibn ‘Umayr said, “Zayd sent me to A‘mash to ask him for help.”

In response, he said, “I am cognizant of Zayd’s virtues better than you. Give him my best regards and say that I am not sure whether people will help you or not, but I would join you if I had three hundred people accompanying me.”[4]

Apart from those paying allegiance to Zayd in Madi’in, Ba¥ra, Wisi§, Riy, M£¥il, Khurisin, Djurdjin and Djaz¢ra,[5] fifteen thousand others have been mentioned too.

There were many prominent figures among those paying allegiance to Zayd.

Mas‘£d¢ said, “Zayd ran riot in K£fa while the noblemen and Qur’in readers allied with him[6] although it is not obvious how many joined him once the war was launched.

There were also some of the Khiridjites from among those paying allegiance. Accordingly, it is necessary to explain that Zayd in essence intended to absorb different groups by acting openly. Afterwards, this will be discussed in detail.

---

[1]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, pp.97-98

[2]. Ibid. p.99

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.239

[4]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.100; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.239

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.491; al-Fakhr¢, pp.132-133; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n p.92

[6]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.207

Evidence of some kind indicates that the Khiridjites, too, like other groups wanted to take advantage of Zayd's position and of course how many groups there were is not clear.

Balidhur¢ says, "When Zayd came to K£fa, the Shi'ite Muslims surrounded him and the Khiridjites came up to him as well insofar as the whole people from Madi'in, Ba¥ra and ... who paid allegiance to him numbered 15000.[1] Ibn 'Inba, originally a Zaydids, quoted the same thing.[2]

°imyar¢, one of the Zaydids historians, in his book "Al-Di'ima", quoted Sayyid Ab£ ±ilib as saying that different groups of people joined together in paying allegiance to Zayd in spite of their ideological differences in such a way that all, no matter whether they were from among the Zaydids, the Mu'tazilites or the Murdji'ites, were equally interested in doing so.[3] The very same author had touched upon the presence of various sects in that riot. This implies that the residents of K£fa left him while if the Khiridjites were there they would surely support him.

أأبا حسين لو شراة عصابة علقتك كان لوردهم اصدار

"O 'Al¢! The Khiridjites who challenge you are not those who can survive when facing you."[4]

So it implicitly indicates that the Khiridjites did not participate in that rebellion; nevertheless, they emotionally supported it.

ZAYD IBN 'AL«'S CLASH WITH THE UMAYYADS' FORCES

In an extensive search to locate the hiding place of Zayd, Y£suf paid one of his servants some money to go within the Shi'ite Muslims and introduce himself as one of the Ahl al-Bayt's devotees coming from Khurisin. He had decided to find Zayd's whereabouts in this way.[5] He also at Hishim's command gathered all people together in the mosque and

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.237

[2]. 'Umdat al-§ilib, p.256

[3]. al-°£r al-'ayn, pp.185,186

[4]. Ibid. p.187

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.244; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.505

made them one by one to take an oath to disclose Zayd’s hiding place if they knew it.[1]

Measures of this kind made Zayd revolt at least one week sooner than the expected time. At a Tuesday evening, once the riot was started at Y£suf’s command all those suspected of backing Zayd as well as the nobles and renowned figures of the city were summoned to a mosque then his agents said that they would kill whosoever stayed out of mosque no matter whether they were Arabs or not. Accordingly, all were forced to go there.[2] Such an action prevented people from joining Zayd.[3] Then at Wednesday night that was very cold, Zayd along with seventeen others left the house of Mu‘iwiya Ibn Is¦iq Ibn Zayd Ibn °iritha and lit a huge fire. The door of the mosque was still locked and the government agents let no one out, they were all crying”, “Allih Akbar (God is Great) and those able to join Zayd did so.[4]

The number of those who joined him that night and the day after is not distinct. Based on some sources, they were 400 [5] or 220 [6] people and based on some others, they were 300.[7] According to ‘Awina, they were 250 people.[8] What another quotation reveals is that there were 400 accompanying Zayd but the number of them reduced to 300 or less.[9] Sa‘¢d Ibn Khaytham who was on the side of Zayd said that they had been 500.[10]

Since Abu l-Faradj I¥fahin¢ et al had a lengthy discussion regarding events of a two-day clash, it is not necessary to mention them once again, so just those of prime importance are to be touched upon.

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.232

[2]. Ibid. vol.2, p.243; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.92; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.499

[3]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.100

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.117; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.243; see, Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.499

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.243

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.118; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.500; they are numbered 218 in this source, Ansib al-ashrif, vol.2, p.244

[7]. ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.257

[8]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.249

[9]. loc.cit.

[10]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.95

“Yi Man¥£r, Amit, Amit” was a slogan being chosen by Zayd in his riot which was the same slogan in the war of Badr being chosen by the Holy Prophet. It was Zayd himself who said this was the very same slogan being chanted by the Holy Prophet there.[1] By the very same reason, he selected the same in his riot [2] and it, later on, came to be used in other riots. Observing that the K£fiyins again repeated what they had done to °usayn (a); seizing to support him, Zayd said, **فعلوها حسينيه** [3] **“**They treated me just in the same way they had treated °usayn (a)”

As referred before, the K£fiyins were hasty; on one hand, they made a decision very soon and, on the other hand, they regretted what they had done even sooner. This time in contrast it was not the matter of treachery since they were all besieged in mosque not being able to join him. Being severely in need of help in that predicament, Zayd could not justify their absence and said, **لا والله ، ما هذا لمن بايعنا بعذر** [4] **“**This is not a justification for those paying allegiance to us.”

From the very beginning steps of their riot, Zayd had repeatedly reminded Na¥r Ibn Khuzayma, one of his devotees, of what had happened to °usayn in Karbali by stating, **فعلوها حسينيه “**But Na¥r said, “People are surrounded in the mosque and are not able to leave there.”

Then, they resolved to launch an attack on the mosque to set the people free.[5] The Umayyads troops on the roof of the mosque did not let them open the door of the mosque by throwing stones on both the people inside and Zayd’s forces outside.[6] Striving to reach the door of the mosque, Zayd’s forces shouted, **يا أهل المسجد اخرجوا من الذل إلي العز**

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.14, p.133

[2]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.92; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.246; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.499; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.2, p.106

[3]. Tir¢kh Mukhta¥ar al-duwal, p.161

[4]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.93

[5]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.94; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.247; al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.119; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, pp.500 –501

[6]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.120; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.94

ومن الضـلالة إلـي الهـدي [1] **“**O people of mosque! Turn to exaltation guidance from humiliation and deviation.”

At that time, it was probable that even individuals being able to help, refrained to doing so. As said before, those who were surrounded in the mosque at least could have an excuse but the rest who had concealed themselves in their housees due to a fear of the government’s agents were to blame for such treachery. In Kunisa where Zayd was extremely in need of help other than two or so no one else helped him.[2]

Accepting the majority of the people being surrounded in the mosque, Zayd said, **أيــن البـاقون لا يخرجـون إلينـا** [3] **“**Where art survivors to rush to us.”

Ibn A‘tham referred in his speeche to those staying in their houses while they heard his cry of help.[4]

In contrast to Karbali’s event, the main opponents of Zayd in this riot were the forces of Damascus sent to K£fa in such critical situations. Zayd managed to kill most of them in his two-day clash but it did not suffice him since the Damascus army was composed of 12000 soldiers.[5] It was such a great army that the soldiers standing in lines could not move easily.[6] Being informed about what Zayd had done, Hishim dispatched 8000 soldiers to Iraq to fight along with Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar.[7]

It is said that the women in K£fa asked Zayd to let them go to war. In reply, he said that he was disappointed of the men much less the women.[8] Once someone, who was from Damascus, said abusive words to Fi§ima (a). Weeping bitter tears, Zayd said, **أما أحد يغضب لفاطمة بنت رسول الله** [9] **“**Is

---

1. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.247
2. Ibid. vol.2, p.246
3. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.119
4. Ibid. vol.8, p.119
5. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.95
6. ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.257
7. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.248
8. Ibid. vol.2, p.247
9. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.96

there not anyone who may share wrath of Fi§ima's, daughter of the Messenger (s)!"

Zayd's problems were doubled when Y£suf Ibn 'Umar 1300 of his skilled archers, known as "Al-Q¢qiniyya" who were apparently from Sind. They killed the remainders of Zayd's army.[1]

Y£suf Ibn 'Umar had paid someone 1000 D¢nirs to behead Zayd Ibn 'Al¢.[2]

Ibn A'tham said, "Zayd fought bravely just the same as his grandfather, °usayn (a) when all of a sudden an arrow pierced his forehead.[3] Then he was sent to the house of someone from Hamdin tribe, one of the Shi'ites tribes in Iraq. Pulling the arrow out of his forehead, he passed away.[4] When Zayd was martyred, he was 42 years old [5] and it was only after his martyrdom when the doors of the mosque were opened to public.[6]

After Zayd's martyrdom, Y£suf Ibn 'Umar searched for his body to send his head for Hisham. Based on some different evidence, Zayd's servant who was from Sind or another servant or °adjdjim was brought to him and he was someone who pulled the arrow out of his head, making known Zayd's burial place, to Y£suf.[7] When they found his body, they sent his head for Hisham, then hung him in Kunisa. Na¥r Ibn Khuzayma, Mu'iwiya Ibn Is¦iq Ibn Zayd Ibn °iritha and Ziyid Ibn 'Abd Allih Fihr¢, Zayd's devotee, were all hanged too.[8]

Being furious at the K£fiyins, Y£suf Ibn 'Umar threatened them when they were in the mosque and hurled abusive words at Ahl al-Bayt. He also ordered all the houses to be

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.246; I¥fahin¢ in his book "Maqitil" called them "Nadjdjiriyya".

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p. 248

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.121

[4]. Ibid. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.250

[5]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.88

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.251

[7]. 'Umdat al-§ilib, p.257; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.207; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.503; al-Fut£¦, vol.VIII, p.122; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.97; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, pp.250-252

[8]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.122

searched. After that, they either killed or burnt to death all the captives and the injured.[1]

They also apprehended Zayd’s wife, and after making her naked, they whipped her to death.[2] ‘Abd Allih Ibn Ya‘q£b whose daughter had married Ya¦yi Ibn Zayd was also killed.[3] Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar also whipped a woman 500 lashes that had told her mother to harbor Zayd’s daughter. He also ruined many houses.[4] He ordered to cut the limbs of another woman who had helped Zayd and her husband was also killed.[5] Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar had ordered four hundreds of his soldiers to watch Zayd’s dead body and at night 100 soldiers did so.[6] Upon hearing about Zayd’s martyrdom after four years, Wal¢d Ibn Zayd ordered to burn his body then either to spatter its ashes around or throw to the Euphrates.[7] He had a handmaid and three children of hers in K£fa. They were all given to Fa¤l Ibn ‘Abd al-Ra¦min who was one of the sons of ‘Abd al-Mu§§alib.[8]

Although Hishim was angry because of Zayd’s riot, he ordered not to cut K£fiyins’ grants[9] while regarding the Medinans and Meecans he forbidenned it for one year.[10] He also ordered his governor in Ba¥ra, Qisim Ibn Mu¦ammad Thaqaf¢ to send those who were from among the Hishimites in Iraq back to Medina. He ordered the governor of Medina not to let some specific individuals go out of the city. These individuals who were released on bail were asked to report once a week they were inside the city.

In this regard Fa¤l Ibn ‘Abd al-Ra¦min wrote these verses,

كلّما حدثـوا بأرض نعيقا ضمنوناً السجون أو سيرونا

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.8, p.123; see, Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.504

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.123; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.255

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.255

[4]. Ibid. vol.II, p.255

[5]. Loc.Cit.

[6]. Ibid. vol.II, p.256

[7]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.207; ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.258; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.257; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.538

[8]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.258

[9]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VIII, p.124; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.259

[10]. al-Aghin¢, vol.VII, p.22

اشخصونا إلى المدينة أسرى لا كفاهم ربي
الذين يحذرونا [1]

"Whensoever a cry is heard on Earth, we are either in prison or about to move. We were captured and sent to Medina. May Allih not satisfy the demands of those scare us."

Ibn Abi l-Zanid, someone affiliated with the Umayyads, who was known as "Faq¢h al-Mad¢na" stated that in comparison to the Umayyads' caliphs no one hated bloodshed like Hishim, but Zayd's uprising caused him heay losses, so he could not keep calm until Zayd was decapitated.[2]

Under no circumstances, as it was said, were people completely at ease but during Hishim's time in which only Zayd's uprising in some parts of K£fa had turned there in a state of chaos until he was killed.[3] Quite obvious, it was untrue since during that period, the Khiridjites revolted several times. At the same time, the people of Khurisin who were furious at the Umayyads ran wild under the leadership of °irith Ibn Suraydj, so how is it possible to say that it was a peaceful age?

Zayd's action, as it was told by Ya'q£b¢, made the Shi'ite Muslims in Khurisin openly disagree the Umayyads by stating their hideous cruelties and revile to all what they had done to Ahl al-Bayt. Accordingly, they could attract lots of supporters.[4]

ZAYDISM, SHI'ISM AND ZAYD IBN 'AL« (A)

Previously, it was said that Zaydism, a deviation in Shi'ism, initiated a gap between the Twelve-Imim Shi'ite Muslims and the Zaydids to such an extent that during the last years of Imim ¯idiq's time, they both accused each other of hideous things.

Accepting not that Zayd was the real founder of Zaydism, one can say that he played a significant role in its formation and this is the most important thing to be discussed. One of

[1]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, vol.VII, p.165

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.v, p.326

[3]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p.125

[4]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.2. p.326

the basic principles Zaydism depending on and was expressed in various ways, was that despite the superiority of Ahl al-Bayt over others and only ‘Al¢ (a) and °asanayn, Imim °asan and Imim °usayn (a) have been selected by Allih for Imamate, they were of the opinion that whosoever from among Ahl al-Bayt rises up against the cruel, he shall deserve to be Imim. Such attitude indicates that Zaydism did not consider Imamate the same as the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims an important matter and even they were lenient with Shiykhs that is Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar. They were of the opinion that it was true that they never let ‘Al¢ (a) become a caliph and this was just a problem.

Such leniency that had its own theological and juridical impacts led to the expansion of ties between the Zaydids and the Sunnites scholars having Shi‘ism inclinations. For instance, the Zaydids were completely affected by Mu‘tazilites theologically. They also came to endorse Ab£ °an¢fa’s school of thought which was influential in Iraq. Since they were indifferent towards Imamate, they could have a good relationship with the Sunnis. As a result, there remained not more than a handful of juridical decrees intact. It would be a simplistic attitude to assume that the Zaydids followed the Sunnis completely, they instead struggled hard for centuries to maintain their Shi‘ites identities.

Whether such attitude regarding Imamate has emanated from Zayd’s ideas as well as his conducts or not, discussion goes far in detail. The latest books concerning Zayd’s life, the main of which are “Zayd al-Shah¢d” from ‘Allima Muqarram and “S¢rah wa Qiyim Zayd Ibn ‘Al¢” from Mr. Kar ¢min, all are written in such a way to show that Zayd did believe in the Imamate of ‘Al¢ (a) and his sons. In the above-mentioned books, there is no trace of criticizm regarding Zayd, instead there are abundant quotations all praising him and reflecting his strong belief in twelve Imims. Although this was true based on some evidence, more attention should be paid if it were supposed to say that it was quite true since some other evidence, on the other hand, contradict the previous ones and this should not be overlooked so simply, rather it is intended to overlook them

as a precaution or, **اذكرو موتاكم بالخير**[1] **"**Recollect a good memory of thy dead ones."

Something written in many sources was an argument between Zayd and the Twelve-Imim Shi'ite Muslims during the very beginning steps of his riot about his attitude towards the Shiykhs. The Sunnites sources had tried hard to quote it in line with their religious tendencies, but this should not make us disregard it completely.

When a group of eminent figures from among those paying allegiance to him asked of his opinion towards the Shiykhs, he said, "May Allih bless them, never have I heard Ahl al-Bayt disgust them. Accordingly, I would not do this either".

"So why do you want to take Ahl al-Bayt's revenge of them who had violated your rights?", they asked.

Zayd said, "The only thing I can say is that they did violate our right, but this could not make me be an unbeliever. Although they usurped the throne and did not follow either Qur'in or Sunna, they were fair to people".

They asked, "Why they are not cruel to you like the previous rulers. Why do you intend to wage a war against them?"

In reply he said, "Those rulers were not the same as them. They were cruel not only to me and you but to themselves as well. I enjoin you to adhere to Qur'in and the prophet's Sunna as well as eliminate the heresies. If you accept me, you would be prosperous. If not, you should await the consequence".

This reply made them not pay allegiance to Zayd. Taking into account the fact that at that time Imim Mu¦ammad Ibn 'Al¢ al-Biqir (a) was not alive, the narrator quoted them as saying, "Now Dja'far (a) should take the place of his father and we do not follow Zayd".

It is said that Zayd called them "Rifi¤a" (the Disavowers) but they themselves are of the opinion that it was Mugh¢ra Ibn Sa'¢d who had done this rather than Zayd.[2]

---

[1]. According to Ash'ar¢, وجميع فرق الزيدية مذاهبهم في الاحكام ووالفرائض والمواريث مذاهب العامة **"**Religions of all Zaydyids sects in rules are obligations and inherited religion of all people" al-Maqilit wa l-firaq, p.19

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.498

The same event was quoted by °imyar¢ as well but because of his extremist Zaydids’s stance he stated that the Prophet himself had called them the Disavowers. This would be discussed later.

°imyar¢ went on to say that the Disavowers adrressed Zayd saying, “The Umayyads, in restoring your rights, were just the same as the Shiykhs.[1] In al-Fut£¦, also there is the same statement from them adding that the Disavowers thereafter went to Dja‘far Ibn Mu¦ammad and told him what had happened to them but he asked them to go back to Zayd.[2]

Balidhur¢ stated the same point of what the opponents had said, “Subsequent to Mu¦ammad Ibn ‘Al¢ (a) our Imim is Biqir, his son.”

Zayd send someone to Imim Biqir (a) to ask him whether he wanted to run a riot or not.

They said, “He might practice dissimulation[3] and as a result, they would not join him.”

It is worth stating that it was a false quotation since Imim Biqir (a) at that time was not alive. It is probable that in the very same utterance, the word Dja‘far had been used instead of Ab£ Dja‘far.

One may not doubt about such an argument, on the other hand, it is quite obvious that the historians attempted to demonstrate Zayd as having non-Shi‘ites inclinations to overcome the Disavowers who were from among the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims.

They altered the very same happening to such an extend that another writer went on to say, “The Disavowers shot his forehead, then they hung him and compelled him to cut the hands of his wife. They did the same to ‘Al¢, to °asan, to °usayn and his children.[4]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.v, p.498; al-°£r al-‘ayn p.185

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, pp.116-117

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.240

[4]. ‘Abd al-Djal¢l Riz¢ Qazw¢n¢ (al-Naq¤, p.375) this quotation is from "Ba‘¤ Fa¤i’i¦ al-rawifi¤". The very same statements being uttered out of prejudice is also in "Minhidj al-Sunna", vol.II, p.126

Some others quoted Zayd as saying, **البراءة من خلفاء الثلاثة البراءة من علي وعكسه ايضاً**[1] **"**Dissociation from three caliphs equals that from 'Al¢ and vice versa."

Despite the fact that Zayd did not accept caliph III, anyhow, there are some quotations in other sources that all indicate that Zayd called the opponents the Disavowers.[2]

Two further points in this regard should be taken into account. At first, it should be known whether Zayd did make that statement only for attracting others and because of dissimulation or it was really his own attitude. The second point is that whether the Shi'ite Muslims were called the Disavowers merely because of the above-mentioned reasons or there might be some other reasons as well.

At first, Zayd's dissimulation should be discussed. Even if we suppose that Zayd did not believe in the Imamate of other Imims after °usayn (a), it seems impossible that Zayd had been praising the first or second caliph in spite of the efforts on the part of the Sunnites narrators, in this respect, made to show Zayd did praise them. There are many statements that indicate the Shi'ite Muslims disapproved of them. Another point is that, as it was mentioned by Zayd's opponents too, the illegality of those two caliphs was the basis of Shi'ism. They were of the opinion that their caliphate was a pure injustice. This opinion, later on, became the source of other political mistakes such as the formation of the Umayyads. As mentioned before, by Zayd's opponents, Zayd could not have said so. If he did not really accept their legitimacy, so there might be a specific reason for him to approve them. Just for a while, Zayd who had ran wild in K£fa thought whether it was true or not about mobilizing all to oppose the Umayyads. In that situation, he attempted not to disperse a large number of people who are able to help him by taking position against 'Umar and 'Uthmin. He even expected the Khiridjites's support and it was quite obvious that if he had really divulged his stance, he would have dispersed all the opponents of the Umayyads who were not the Shi'ite Muslims. On the other hand, he

---

[1]. Tir¢kh Baghdid, vol.2, p.89

[2]. 'Umdat al-§ilib, p.257; Nasab Quraysh, p.61; Tir¢kh Mukhta¥ar al-duwal, p.116; al-Mu¦abbar, p. 483; Lisin al-'arab, vol.7, p.158; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.246

might have mistaken counting on those forces for coming to power, but he surely could not rise up without their help.

In spite of what had been mentioned above, it can not be said for sure that Zayd did not believe in what he had said but it is probable that the Shi‘ite Muslims who left him could not perceive that dissimulation. On the other hand, there are some evidence in this regard one of which is the cautious measures taken by the ‘Abbisids who just the same as the ‘Alawites were Shi‘ite Muslims. After coming to power, they still had the same position towards the caliphs and it was reflected in the utterances of Saffi¦ from the very beginning of their caliphates.[1] Attempting to hold the Ban£ ‘Ad¢ and Ban£ Taym (the Shiykhs’ tribes) in high esteem in spite of what the ‘Alawites had desired[2], Man¥£r sowed the seed of hatred between the ‘Alawites and the ‘Abbisids. But once Sayyid °imyar¢ asked him to cut the grants of those tribes, when Mahd¢ ‘Abbis¢ was heir apparent, he did so. This alone is an indication of heresy among the ‘Abbisids let alone Zayd and the ‘Alawites.

Another evidence regarding Zayd’s dissimulation is an utterance of someone syaing, “Being injured, Zayd siad, **أين سائلي عن ابي بكر وعمر، هما أقاماني هذا المقام** [3] **“**Thou ask me of Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar, beware that they let me hold this position.”

If this statement is true, it will verify Zayd’s dissimulation political outcome of which was quite obvious for him. For the very same reason, the Khiridjites, the Murdji‘ites and the Zaydids all participated in his uprising.[4] Taking the above mentioned points into account, it can be said that Zayd’s dissimulation, later on, turned to be the corner-stone of the Zaydids.

One further point worthy of stating is that Zayd was said to call the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims, the Disavowers since they left him as soon as they became aware of what he had said about the Shiykhs.

---

[1]. Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, vol.7, pp.161,162

[2]. al-’Uy£n wa l-¦adi’iq, p.197

[3]. Tab¥irat al-’awim, pp.34,35 from the book "al-Alfi¨" by ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Hamadin¢

[4]. al-°£r al-‘ayn, p.185

It should also be mentioned that Raf¤ means “relinquishing the limitations”. It also refers to an army that has left their leader. Each division of this army is then called “Rafi¤a”, the Disavowers. It also refers to someone who has set his cattle free to go whereever they want to. “Ibl al-Rifi¤a” is also referred to the camels that go to pasture without shepherd.[1]

This term is referred to the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims who did not accept the first and second caliphs, but were approved by those who had accepted their caliphate.

Ash‘ar¢, in this regard, had said, “The Shi‘ite Muslims are called the Disavowers since they rejected the caliphate of both ‘Umar and Ab£ Bakr.”[2]

Relinquishing themselves from all restrictions, in contrast to them, the literalists, followed different rulers. In history, the distinctive feature of the Disavowers is that they did not accept the caliphate of the Shiykhs and criticized them repeatedly since they had violated the rights of Imims.[3]

The writer of Tab¥ara al-‘Awim in this regard had stated, “Once the enemy was asked about Raf¤ and Rifi¤¢, he should answer, “It means giving up, throwing and in common usage, the Disavower is someone who believes in the Imamate of ‘Al¢ not Ab£ Bakr. Since this word means giving up, so they can be called the Disavowers. They relinquished the credal error and followed what was gospel truth. And if you want “Raf¤” as an expression, it implies that they never tilted towards Imamate of Ab£ Bakr and this is just praise rather than reproach.[4]

Sayyid °imyar¢ in front of Qi¤¢ Bawir who had rejected his witness and called him a Disavower said, **و نحن على رغمك رافض لاهل الضلالة والمنكر**[5] **“**In spite of what you want, I am a Disavower, someone who rejects aberation as well as unlawful.”

---

[1]. Lisin al-‘arab, vol.VII, p.157

[2]. Maqilit al-islimiyy¢n, vol.1, p.89; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.2, p.245; al-Khi§a§ al-miqr¢ziyya, vol.4, p.73

[3]. M¢zin al-i‘tidil, vol.3, pp. 249,268,324,325; al-Shi‘r wa l-shu‘ari’, p.316

[4]. Tab¥irat al-‘awim, p.32

[5]. al-Fu¥£l al-mukhtira, pp.61-63

Some points should be taken into account regarding why Zayd called the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims Disavowers.

The first point is that in contrast to what was mentioned before, in al-Maqilit wa al-Firaq from Ash‘ar¢, one of the first scripts about various sects in Shi‘ism, this term denotes something else. This is the story, Once Mugh¢ra Ibn Sa‘¢d who was from exaggerators said that he opposed Nafs Zakiyya in front of the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims and they excommunicated him. **فزعم أنهم رافضة وأنه هوالذي سماهم بهذا الاسم "**He thought that they were the Disavowers and it was him who called them the Disavowers."[1]

In a quotation from ±abar¢ mentioned previously, the Shi‘ite Muslims themselves had accepted this.

The second point is that in an argument between Farazdaq and Hishim Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik about Imma Sadjdjid (a), Farazdaq wrote his popular poem regarding Imim, the caliph asked him, **أورافضي أنت "**Are you a Disavower?"

He replied, **إن كان حب أهل البيت رفضاً فنعم** [2] **"**If loving Ahl al-Bayt is equal to being a Disavower, so yes, I am a Disavower too."

Thereafter, he was sent to prison. Since this had taken place during the life of Imim Sadjdjid (a) who passed away in 95 A.H., it can he understood that this meaning of Disavower had nothing to do with what was mentioned earlier in Zayd's time. It is probable that this term was used about the Shi‘ite Muslims because of its literal usage at first and then to reject the legitimacy of the two caliphs.

The third point is that this term had been used in various manners being quoted by Sha‘b¢ regarding the Shi‘ite Muslims. Since he had died years before Zayd's uprising, it can be inferred that at that time, too, the Shi‘ite Muslims were called the Disavowers.

There are several quotations in this regard [3] one of which is what Sha‘b¢ had said, **أحبب آل محمد ولا تكن رافضياً "**Adore Ahl al-Bayt, but do not be a Disavower."[4]

---

[1]. al-Maqilit al-firaq, pp.76,77; al-Firaq al-sh¢‘a, p.63

[2]. al-Ma¦isin wa l-masiw¢, p.213. In this quotation, ‘Abd al-malik was used instead of Hishim.

[3]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.2, p.250; see, ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.7, p.186

The fourth point is that as it was stated by the same scholars, individuals such as I¥fahin¢ in Maqitil al-±ilib¢n and Ibn Sa‘d in ±abaqit had not this quotation. So it is an indication that shows they, especially I¥fahin¢ failed to accept it.

The fifth point is that Fa¤l Ibn Shidhin quoted the Sunnites narrators as saying, “°asan Ibn °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ (a) had said, **مرقت علينا الرافضة كما مرقت الخوراج على علي** [1] Ibn °asan Ibn °asan had died before Zayd.

It is probable that °asan Ibn °asan Ibn °asan Ibn ‘Al¢ was the brothre of Nafs Zakiyya who had died after him. Anyhow he, as a Zaydids, had told this. An important point is that Fa¤l in his reply had considered the literal meaning of this term, in the least referring not to Zayd.

He also said, “Raf¤ **هم الذين لا يرون قتال احد الا مع امام عـدل عـالم بمـا يـأتي ويـذر** [2] **“**They art those who deem permissible fighting anyone joining no one but ‘Al¢ who is well informed about all affairs.”

It is anyhow certain that probably from the late 1st century onwards, this term based on its literal meaning was used to refer to the Shi‘ite Muslims.

There also is a forged tradition in which the Holy Prophet had said, “At the end of time, there will appear a tribe that is called the Disavowers. They are disbelievers and you have to kill them.”[3]

This statement was surely an insult. Later on, when the Zaydids cut their relationship with the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims, they used this statement when they spoke ironically about the Shi‘ite Muslims. Zayd himself most likely, due to the terrible condition of that time, had used this term. For any reason this term was used and basically its literal meaning had been taken into account. The above-mentioned tradition was prevalent during Imim ¯idiq’s time as a justification for the rulers to sacrifice the Shi‘ite Muslims.

---

[4]. Rabi‘ al-abrir, vol.1, p. 60

[1]. See, S¢rih wa qiyim Zayd Ibn ‘Al¢, p.216; al-«¤i¦, p.473 (printed in Tehran University) and see, ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.v, p.320

[2]. al-«¤i¦, p.475

[3]. M¢zin al-i‘tidil, vol.3, p.237. It is said that its validity because of °adjdjidj Ibn Tam¢m is subject to debate; see al-Ilmim, vol.1, p.33; al-¯awi‘iq al-mu¦riqa, the first preface

Accordingly, this might show that the emergence of this word dates back to the time before Zayd’s uprising. It was also said that some of the Shi‘ite Muslims asked Imim ¯idiq why their enemies called them the Disavowers.

In reply, Imim said, “They did not name you so but based on what was in the Torah and Gospel, you are called the Disavowers since seventy people of Pharaoh’s servants left him and embraced the religion of Moses and they were called the Disavowers by Allih ... just the same as them, you had joined Ahl al-Bayt and obeyed Allih’s command too.”[1]

By referring to the previous quotations, it can be undearstood that Imim had stressed the literal meaning of this word while calling those who had not accepted the ruling of the criminals. ‘Ammir Duhn¢ quoted one of the companions of Imim ¯idiq as saying the same statements before the judge of K£fa that had called him a Disavower.[2]

Criticizing the aforesaid tradition, Fa¤l Ibn Shidhin proved that it was a forged one. Since it is nonesensical to say that someone who believes in both Allih and His Prophet to be called an unbeliever and deserves to be killed.

He went on to say that in our view the Shi‘ite Muslims- whom you call the Disavowers - disapprove Ab£ Bakr and ‘Umar about ‘Al¢’s excellences but they never said that both were vice-incarnated. They said ‘Al¢ was superior to them in different ways.[3]

THE TWELVE-IMªM SHI‘ITE MUSLIMS AND ZAYD

The Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims, being of the opinion that Imims have been selected by Allih and their obedience is requisite and had various stances regarding Zayd and his uprising. As the title implies, two points are to be discussed. Namely, the outlook of both Imims and their companions are to be mentioned.

---

[1]. Tafs¢r Furit K£f¢, p.139 (Nadjaf); Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXXXVIII, p.97-98

[2]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.XXXXXXVIII, pp.156,157

[3]. al-«¤i¦, p.303 (Tehran University), for looking into this matter, refer to, Ta‘l¢qit (suspensions) of the late Urmaw¢ in al-I¤i¦ and also in the book of Naq¤

There are many narrations about Zayd which are difficult to be enumerated. Zayd has been approved in some. Some others had a skeptical view about him, but if we look positively at them, it can be seen that the Shi‘ites Imims were optimist towards him. Justifying his uprising, the Shi‘ite Imims were of the opinion that he could restore the rights of the oppressed if he would have been obeyed. It could not be understood from these quotations that either Zayd was triumphant in his uprising or he did so at Imim ¯idiq’s behest at all. Knowing that the uprisings of that kind were not likely to be victorious and even they were so at first, it was not clear what would happen at the end the Shi‘ites Imims did not approve those uprisings. On the other hand, martyrdom of he who adores it in an attempt to fight with the oppressor is desirable.

Shiykh ¯ad£q in this regard by narrating about Imim Ri¤ i (a) to praise Zayd had stated, “I will bring more traditions from other Imims about Zayd to make the ideas of the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims regarding Zayd perceptible to all.[1] It is worth saying that none of his quotations implies that Zayd rose up at Imim’s behest to bring them to power. One of those quotations which brightens Zayd’s intention is to be mentioned here.

Imim Ri¤i (a) quoted his father and he had quoted Imim ¯idiq (a) as saying, **رحم الله عمي زيداً ، انه دعا الي الرضا من آل محمد ولو ظفر لوفي بما دعا اليه**[2] **“**May Allih forgive my uncle, he who called on others to obey “Al-Ri¤i Men ªl Mu¦ammad”. If he had been victorious, he would surely have not broken his promise.”

This phrase “Al-Ri¤i Men ªl Mu¦ammad” implies that he did not ask people to obey him. There are other quotations some of which are about Zayd’s martyrdom in Kunisa and about Imim ¯idiq’s sorrow accordingly and some others are

---

[1]. ‘Uy£n Akhbir al-Ri¤i, vol.1, p.195

[2]. Ibid. See, Kifiyat al-athar, p.327; Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, p.285; as it was mentioned by Ibn Zuhra in Ghiyat al-ikhti¥ir, فهذا الخبر هو الذي سلم زيداً منهم وجعلهم يترحّمون عليه **“**It was the same report that kept Zayd immune from all harnms and caused him to be pitied by them” This news had made the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims praise him; as a result, Zayd was secured from their harm. See, Ghiyat al-ikhti¥ir, p.128

on his approval.[1] An important point mentioned previously was Zayd’s martyrdom or his defeat. Zayd’s mother was said to have accused Imim of feeling envious upon hearing the news of Zayd’s martyrdom from Imim some time before it.[2]

Most likely the term (**لوفي به**) implies that Zayd had not been determined first to transfer the power to the Imims, on the other hand, to trust Zayd very much, Imim ¯idiq (a) was of the opinion that he would surely let Imim Ri¤i come to power if only he could be victorious.

Some of Imim Biqir’s hadiths regarding Zayd’s virtues in available sources have been compiled by Abu l-Djir£d Mundhir, one of the leaders of the Zaydids. Accordingly, they could not be trusted completely. For example, he had quoted Imim Biqir as saying, **أما زيد فلساني الذي انطلق به** [3] **“**But Zayd is as my tongue by which I speak.”[4]

‘Amr Ibn Khilid who was also one of the leaders of the Zaydids said that Imim Biqir (a) by pointing to Zayd had said, **هـذا سـيد اهـل بيـتي والطـالب بأوتـارهم** [5] **“**He is the master of Ahl al-Bayt and someone who will take their revenge.”

Since the narrators of such quotations were people from the Zaydids, obviously, they might not be relied.

Kashsh¢ also had quoted Ab£ Ya‘q£b Muqr¢ as saying, **وكان من كبار الزيدية** He also had quoted ‘Amr Ibn Khilid as saying, **وكـان مـن كبـار الزيديـة** Thereafter, Imim Biqir’s utterance previously mentioned was once again reiterated.[6]

What these narrations are to depict is that Zayd was the most important figure of Ahl al-Bayt. For instance, Imim Biqir as said regarded Zayd’s superiority to others among Ahl al-Bayt.

°imyar¢, one of the Zaydids scholars also in his book had quoted Imim as saying, “There is no one among us

---

[1]. ‘Uy£n Akhbir al-Ri¤i, vol.1, pp.194-197; Kifiyat al-athar, p.328

[2]. ¯ad£q, al-Amil¢, section,10, p. 40

[3]. Qim£s al-ridjil, vol.4, p. 261

[4]. About the non-credibility of Abu l-Djir£d; see, Qim£s al-ridjil, vol.4, pp.228,230

[5]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, pp.231,232

[6]. Ibid. p.231; Qim£s al-ridjil, vol.4, p.266; Tanq¢¦ al-maqil, vol.1, p.468

comparable to Zayd."[1] And **هذا سيد بني هاشم، اذا دعـاكم فاجيبوه واذا استنصروكم فانصروه** [2] **"**He is the master of the Hishimites, you are to obey him once he calls on you and help him when he asks for help."

In spite of the fact that these statements are not inconsistent with Imim ¯idiq's view about Zayd, since Imim did not consider him as an opportunist but a purified man just the same as his honorable forefathers, so he was sorrowful about his martyrdom, they could barely be valid. Ibn A'tham said that upon hearing the news of his martyrdom, Imim had recited this verse of Qur'in, **مـن المـومنين رجـال صـدقوا مـا عاهـدوا اللـه عليـه "**Among the faithful, there are men who abide by their pledge to God" and equated him with individuals such as 'Al¢ (a) and Imim °usayn (a) and ended his speech by saying, **ويل لقاتلهم من جبّـار الارض والسـماء** [3] **"**Woe unto their murderers from revenge of Almighty God."

Abu l-Djir£d also in the Sunnites books had said that he was a confederate of Qur'in.[4] In the scholastic books, he was said to be not reliable.[5] Fu¤ayl al-Rassin had a narration on Zayd's virtues. He was also one of the followers of Abu l-Djir£d[6] and Ibn Nad¢m considered him among the Jarudites.[7]

There also is another narration in the Sunnites references indicating that some of the Disavowers had asked Imim ¯idiq (a) about paying allegiance to Zayd. Imim said, **بايعوه والله افضلنا وسيدنا وخيرنا**

It was also said that the Disavowers did not let others know what Imim had said.[8] What was said in the narration shows clearly that it was not more than a fabricated one said only to beat the Shi'ite Muslims. It is a question whether the

---

[1]. al-°£r al-'ayn, pp.188-189

[2]. Ibid. p.189

[3]. al-Fut£¦, vol.8, p.125

[4]. Tanq¢¦ al-maqil, vol.1, p.467

[5]. Ibid. vol.1, pp.460-461, Ibn Nad¢m quoted Imim ¯idiq as saying, لعنه الله، فانه أعمى القلب، أعمى البصر Mu¦ammad Ibn Sanin said about him, ابو الجارود لم يمت حتى شرب المسكر وتولى الكافرين al-Fihrist, pp.226-227

[6]. al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.I, p.149; al-Maqilit wa l-firaq, p.74, No.144

[7]. al-Fihrist, p.227

[8]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.5, p.499; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.3, p.240

narrator was informed about it while the Disavowers had concealed it.

Similar to this, ‘Amr Ibn Qisim had said, “I went to Dja‘far Ibn Mu¦ammad and saw a group of the Disavowers.”

Then I said, “They hate your uncle.”

Imim said, “My uncle, Zayd?”

I said, “yes.”

He said, “Their action is disliking Allih.” **والله اقرؤنا لكتاب الله وأفقهنا في دين الله و**... [1] What was said above was much the same as the narration being mentioned previously. Knowing that Zayd was a pious man seeking Allih’s satisfaction, Imim ¯idiq by no means abhored him. Mas‘£d¢, on the other hand, said that Imim Biqir (a) had asked his brother, Zayd, not to trust the K£fiyins since they were well known for being treacherous, so how it is possible that Imim had asked the Shi‘ite Muslims to pay allegiance to him. Imim also added out there, “Your grandfather, ‘Al¢ (a), your uncle, °asan Ibn ‘Al¢, and your father, °usayn, have been martyred and the K£fiyins hurled abusive words at Ahl al-Bayt.”

Then Imim informed him about what he knew regarding the Marwinids as well as the news of the ‘Abbisids ruling. But Zayd still insisted on what he wanted to do, Imim said to him, **إني أخاف عليك يا أخ أن تكون غداالمصلوب بكناسة الكوفة، وودعه ابوجعفر**[2] **“**I am afraid of finding you hung in Kunisa of K£fa, so Imim said farewell to him.”

As it was mentioned in the aforesaid statement, Imim did not order him not to go there but advised him. Even if we do not doubt about its validity, we can understand that Imim was not optimistic about it. In quotations about Imim Biqir’s view regarding Zayd, something which should be taken into account is that Zayd had wanted to rise up before. The number of these narrations on the other hand, may reveal that the narrator had wrongly written the name of Imim ¯idiq instead of Biqir or Dja‘far instead of Ab£ Dja‘far.

It was also said, just the same as what Mas‘£d¢ had said, “Upon showing the letters that the K£fiyins had sent to Zayd asking him to rise up, Imim said, “Lest they might humiliate you, so do not hasten.”

---

[1]. Tahdh¢b Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.6, p.18; Fawit al-wafayit, vol.1, p.210; al-Khi§a§ al-miqr¢ziyya, vol.4, p.307

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.3, p.206

Zayd who got angry said, “Imim is not someone who stays at home, but he is someone who defends his territory and ....” [1]

These narrations that accuse Zayd of bringing people around himself are not compatible with what was repeatedly said by Imim ¯idiq about, **لوظفر لوفي به “**In case he wins, he keeps his word” and all other approvals, an example of which is quotation from °usayn Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhib, who lived in time of Shiykh ±£s¢, in “‘Uy£n al-Mu‘djizit” which Afand¢ stated in his book too.

Imim Biqir by referring to Zayd said, **ترون أخي هذا والله يدعي ما ليس له ويدعو الناس الي نفسه فيجتمع عليه خلق فيؤخذ ويقتل ويُصْلب في كناسة الكوفة**[2] **“**You will see my brother claiming something which does not belong to him. He will call on people to gather around him. Some will do so, but after a while, he would be killed and hung in Kanasa of K£fa.”

As a conclusion, what should be noted is that Imims had praised Zayd while they had also informed him about the consequences of his action. So it can be understood that in this regard he was not after them or at least he had not asked them for a permission to rise up. Accordingly, Imims had praised him because he was a prominent figure who wanted to overthrow the Umayyads and called on others to obey, **الرضا من آل محمد ‘**Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Sayyiba was quoted as saying, “Dja‘far Ibn Mu¦ammad gave me 1000 D ¢nirs to give to the families of those being killed in his uprising. Each of them was given 4 D¢nirs. (it was also said that the family of ‘Abd Allih Ibn Zubayr Rassin was given 4 D ¢nirs).[3]

Regarding Zayd, Imim Ri¤i was quoted as saying, **فإنه كان من علماء آل محمد وغضِّبَ لله عز وجل فجاهد أعداءه حتى قتل في سبيله** [4] **“**He was one of the scholars of Ahl al-Bayt. Getting angry for Allih’s sake, he was martyred in his fight against His enemies.”

---

[1]. al-Kif¢, vol.1, p.357

[2]. Riyi¤ al-‘ulami’, vol.2, p.337

[3]. ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.258; Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, p.338

[4]. ‘Uy£n Akhbir al-Ri¤i, vol.1, pp.194-195

Somewhere else, Imim ¯idiq was said to be angry upon heating that his companions backbited Zayd.[1] He also had considered those reproaching him as being equal to those having hand in his martyrdom.[2]

The conversation between Zayd and the companions of both Imim Biqir and ¯idiq (a) shows another dimension of the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ites view regarding him. In this regard, there are many narrations pursuit of which are documented. Prior to mentioning them, it should be noted that some of the companions of Imim ¯idiq in K£fa when Zayd rose up gave up supporting him once they talked to him about his uprising. This action unfolds the stance of the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims, if it could not show that of Imims.

An interesting point is that the only one participating in Zayd’s uprising from among the companions of Imim Biqir was Sulaymin Ibn Khilid. Nadjish¢ had said about him, **كان قارئا فقيها وجهاً روي عن أبي عبد الله وأبي جعفر عليهما السلام، خرج مع زيد ولم يخرج معه في اصحاب ابي جعفر عليه السلام غيره، فقطعت يده وكان الذي قطعها يوسف بن عمر بنفسه**[3] **“**Being a Qur’in reader, jurisprudent and an eminent figure among Imim Biqir and ¯idiq’s companions, he narrated what they had been saying. He joined Zayd while there was no one from Imim Biqir’s companions to do so but him. His hands were cut by Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar.”

Shiykh ±£s¢ also had stressed that no one from the companions of Imim Biqir (a) had participated in Zayd’s uprising but him.[4] By referring to Imim Biqir’s companions, he had meant those prominent figures, not all of them. The emphasis of Nadjish¢ and ±£s¢, the most important scholars of the Shi‘ite Muslims, is a strong evidence indicating that Imim Biqir’s companions were not present in Zayd’s uprising. They did not do this since they had no reason for doing so. Otherwise, it should be said that either they were

---

[1]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, p.152

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.1, p.353

[3]. Ridjil al-nadjish¢, p.130; see, Tanq¢¦ al-maqil, vol.II, p.57

[4]. Ridjil al-±£s¢, p.207; Ridjil al-‘Allima °ill¢, p.77, ‘Allima °ill¢ brought a quotation form Sa‘d’s book saying, “He had joined Zayd, but was saved” فمن الله عليه وتاب ورجع عن ذلك **“**When God faored him, he repented and avoided doing that” so in the view of some of the Shi‘ites scholars, his participation in that uprising was not right because of the word "repentance" in this quotation.

afraid of doing so or they did it independently without consulting Imim. Anyhow, none of these reasons are acceptable.

Another narration regarding absence of Imim Biqir's companions in Zayd's uprising is worth mentioning. At that time, °usayn Ibn Ziyid entered Medina and went to Imim ¯idiq (a) to speak about his beliefs. Imim said that his beliefs were the true ones. He spoke about his anxiety. Imim asked him the reason.He replied, **إن ظفر زيد وأصحابه فليس أحد أسوأ حالاً عندهم منا وإن ظفر بني امية، فنحن عندهم بتلك المنزلة، قال: فقال لي: ليس عليك بأس من أولي ومن أولي** [1] **"**Our condition would be worst of all no matter whether Zayd oercomes the Umayyads or otherwise. Imim said, "Do not worry, neither of them can harm you." This conversation reveals the fact that the Twelve-Imim Shi'ite Muslims, on one hand, were appeasing the Zaydids and, on the other hand, the Umayyads.

There had been considerable discussion between Zayd and some of the companions of Imim ¯idiq narrated by Kashsh¢. Some of the main points are to be discussed. A matter of great importance was that whether there was Imim whose obedience had been necessary or not and if so who was him?

Zurira Ibn A'yun is substantially quoted as saying, "Zayd, being before Imim ¯idiq (a), said to me, **ما تقول يا فتى في رجل من آل محمد استنصرك "**What do you say to someone from Ahl al-Bayt who asks your help."

Zurira said, **إن كان مفروض الطاعة نصرته وإن كان غير مفروض الطاعة فلي أن لا أفعل "**If he were supposed to be obeyed, I would help him. If not, I can avoid helping him."

"When Zayd went out, Imim was satisfied with my answer since he was not able to say anything else", Zurira said.[2]

The very last part of this narration indicates that Imim disliked Zayd's uprising. The answer of Zurira also shows his respect toward Zayd not anything else.

The late Kulayn¢ had also quoted a discussion between Mu'min al-±iq and Zayd from some of the companions of

---

[1]. al-Amil¢, Shiykh Muf¢d, p.33

[2]. Ikhtiyir Ma'rifat al-ridjil, p.153 فلما خرج، قال ابو عبدالله (ع), اخذته من بين يديه ومن خلفه وما تركت له مخرجاً

Imim, A¦mad Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn ‘«si, ‘Al¢ Ibn °akam, Abin Ibn Taghlib and Mu‘min al-±iq himself.

He said, “Hiding himself from the public, Zayd asked me whether I could see him. When I went to see him, he said, “O Ab£ Djaʻfar it seems that your way is different from ours. Don’t you like to join us?”

“If your brother or your father were instead of you, I would do so”, I replied.

Zayd said, “I want to rise up and fight with these people. I also want you to join me”.

“May I be sacrificed to you! I can not do this,” I said.

“Are you withholding your life from me”, Zayd said.

I said, “I will die only once. If there is another proof for Allih on earth other than you, whosoever joins you instead of him, shall be subjugated and if there is no proof for him, it will make no difference to him whether he joins you or not.”

Zayd said, “O, Ab£ Djaʻfar, When my father and I were eating food with each other, my father made it cool for me to eat. While I was treated so kindly, you tell me now that the hellfire will not have mercy on me. How is it possible for my father to tell you about (the proof) while I am not aware of it at all?”

I said to him, “He did not tell you anything about it since he was afraid that you might not approve of it and meet the hell fire. But your father told me that if I accepted him, I would behave him well. May I be sacrificed to you, are you superior to the prophets?”

“The prophets”, he said.

I said, “Jacob told Josef,

قَالَ يَا بُنَيَّ لَا تَقْصُصْ رُؤْيَاكَ عَلَى إِخْوَتِكَ فَيَكِيدُوا لَكَ كَيْدًا إِنَّ الشَّيْطَانَ لِلْإِنسَانِ عَدُوٌّ مُبِينٌ.

“Alas! O son, he said, reveal not your dream to brothers for they fall in envy of you.”

Your father also hid the truth from you since he was afraid of you”.

Zayd said, “Your master, he referred to Imim ¯idiq (a), had told me that I would be killed in Medina and hung in Kunisa. He has a book in which there is the news of my martyrdom”.

Mu‘min al-±iq said, “Thereafter, I went to Medina and informed Imim about what had happened between us, praising me for what I had done, Imim said that I had closed all ways of reasoning to him.[1]

This narration is evidentially true and quite logical. These points mentioned by Mu‘min al-±iq were also taken into account by the Twelve-Imim Shi‘ite Muslims. It is not intended, based on this narration, to conclude that Zayd claimed Imim rather it is stated to show that Zayd did not believe that Imim ¯idiq (a) was to be obeyed obligatorily. The very same story was also said somewhere else. Based on this, Mu‘min al-±iq had reiterated his conversation with Zayd to Imim ¯idiq (a).[2]

Quoting Zayd, Sawra Ibn Kulayb of ¯idiqayn said, “How did you figure out that your master of the thing you say (i.e. his obedience is obligatory from God).

Sawra said, “I told him, you asked a learned person.”

He said, “Tell me.”

And I said, “We came to Mu¦ammad Ibn ‘Al¢, your brother, and questioned him and he gave us the answer through, **قال رسول الله وقال الله عز وجل فـي كتـابه “**The prophet and God in His Book said”

When he passed away, we came to you of the Mu¦ammad’s progeny. Some of our questioned were answered while some others remained unanswered, until we came to Dja‘far, your brother’s offspring, and he told us the same thing as your father, **قال رسول الله وقال الله تعالى**

Zayd smiled and said, “Its reason is availability of ‘Al¢’s books to him.”[3]

The same discussion happened between Ab£ Bakr °a¤ram ¢, ‘Alqama of Imim Biqir’s companions and Zayd.

They heard Zayd as saying, **ليس الامام منا مـن ارخـى ستره انما من شهر سيفه “**Imim among us isn’t the one who covers himself, but he is the one who pulls his sword.”

Ab£ Bakr °a¤ram¢, a not-tempted person, said to Zayd, “O father of °usayn! Tell me weather ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib was Imim in the time of his isolation or his pulling sword?”

---

[1]. al-Kif¢, vol.I, p.174

[2]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, p.186

[3]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, p.376. Qim£s al-ridjil, vol.IV, p.267

Being reticent, Zayd didn’t give any answers.

Ab£ Bakr went on, “In the case of him to be Imim; therefore, for everyone after him it’s permissible to be Imim not having any sword in his hand. If not, **فانت ماجاء بك ما هيهنا** [1] **“**What caused thee to come here.”

Fa¤l Ibn Shidhin of Imim’s companions and Shi‘ites scholars exists in the way of the afore said quotation. This narration has additionally been narrated in two different ways. As quoted in other narrations, Zayd confirmed that just three Imims exist and the forth is Qi’im [2], the one who pulls sword. This content, in essence, confirmed the idea about Imamate narrated by Zayd. Apparently there shouldn’t be any rooms for doubt three Imims whose obedience is obligatory from God and the forth on condition of being Qi’im were considered by Zayd and this Qi’im can only be of Fi§ima’s dynasty.

Zayd, in Furit K£f¢’s interpretation, was asked about an Imim who necessarily should be obeyed, and he said, “The Messenger was the prophetic Messenger and nobody can challenge him … and after him ‘Al¢ in legal and illegal considered the Muslim’s Imim … and everyone rejecting him is unbeliever … and after him °asan and °usayn are Muslim’s Imims … and then we, the Messenger’s descendants, are of °asan and °usayn. None of us possessed their dignity to the Messenger and claimed the Prophet’s remarks concerning °asanayn for ourselves but our cordiality, friendship and help, as the Prophet’s descendants, is every Muslim’s duty … But among us, the offspring of °asan and °usayn, no one neither my father nor my brother claimed to be Imim whose obedience is mandatory…, O father of Hishim! Among us, Imim whose obedience is the one revolting with sword invites to Qur’in and practice of the prophet … we, among ourselves, don’t know any Imim who necessarily should be obeyed, busy on his own, pinning hopes for his being truthful, his being locked up and waiting for the tyrants’ rules to be executed.”[3]

The mentioned interpretations whose content existed in the aforesaid narrations are very clear. Quoting Zayd in

---

[1]. Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, p.416

[2]. Ibid, p.351

[3]. Tafs¢r Furit, p.182

other narrations of the same book, it's said that the Immaculates among us are five, the Messenger, 'Al¢, °asan, °usayn and Fi§ima and the rest like ordinary people do sins. Then Zayd refers to the high status of the household and their role in keeping Qur'in and tradition.[1] Zayd's interpretation concerning Imamate is available in Kif¢ Kulayn¢'s book.[2] Quoting Zayd, °imyar¢ in al-°£r al-'Ayn mentioned such a remark.[3]

On the contrary to all these narrations, quoting Zayd, Sulaymin Ibn Khilid – Imim Biqir's only companion who took part in Zayd's uprising – said, **جعفـر امامنـا فـي الحلال والحرام "**Dja'far is our Imim in legal and illegal."[4]

Zayd, in this remark, confesses to Imim Biqir's scientific Imamate. From this, it isn't inferred that Zayd considered his brother as Imim whose obedience is obligatory. Zayd, in the content of another quotation, confined that Imim 'Al¢'s books are available to him. Also Zayd in the other narration said, **من اراد الجهاد فالي ومن اراد العلم فجعفر بـن محمـد "**[5]Whosoever wants to Djihid, he shall come to me and one who is after knowledge, he shall meet Dja'far Ibn Mu¦ammad."

This indicates scientific Imamate and doesn't basically accept Imim ¯idiq's political Imamate. The transfer of these narrations, especially what happened between Zurira and Zayd or Mu'min al-±iq and Zayd on precautionary dissimulation isn't right and lacks evidence.[6]

However these narrations indicate Zayd's lack of belief in Imim who should be necessarily obeyed, some quotations in Kifiyat al-Athar conformed Zayd's belief in Twelve Imim's Imamate and through a brief study, it was cleared up that the majority of these narrations were baseless and the authorities mentioned in their predication were mostly unknown. Narration of these hadith, four or five, by Wisi§¢ and Fu¤ayl al-Rassin who were of Abu l-Djir£d's companions of Zaydids's directors is the interesting point. In this case,

---

[1]. Ibid, p.152

[2]. al-Kif¢, vol.I, p.357

[3]. al-°£r al-'ayn, p.188

[4]. Ikhtiyir Ma'rifat al-ridjil, p.361; Qim£s al-ridjil, vol.IV, p.267

[5]. Tanq¢¦ al-maqil, vol.I, p.469

[6]. Tanq¢¦ al-maqil, vol.I, p.468

how is it possible for two of Zaydids’s directors to narrate hadiths in which their Imim i.e. Zayd believed in Twelve Imims? Abu l-Djir£d is of founders of Zaydids ideology, the one who doesn’t basically accept any Imim whose obedience is obligatory after Imim °usayn (a).

With all these, it should be cleared up that Imims praised Zayd’s personality for having good attributes and pure intentions, in these cases, this matter shouldn’t be continued anymore. But different aspects of the issue should be considered.

The owner of Rii¤ al-’Ulami inferring the point that his uprising happened without Imim Biqir’s permission according to the narrations that there existed no banned prohibition of the uprising and Zayd was free to choose either self-sacrifice or worldly life.[1] It is obvious that he not only couldn’t completely reject the slanderous narrations but also made it clear that his uprising was done without permission.

The late Madjlis¢ quoting interfering narrations said, “It’s better both to have a favorable opinion about Zayd and for him not to be reproached and not to object Imim’s descendants like him unless the rule based on the aversion to people like Dja‘far Ibn Kadhdhib shall be proved.[2] It’s clear that such an interpretation was said through precaution not reasoning. Although it should be accepted that of old, Shi‘ites scholars were optimistic about Zayd, the slanderous narrations about him are all written.[3] We formerly observed that Shiykh ¯ad£q made Shi‘ite Muslims’ opinion clear concerning favorable opinion about Zayd, as Ibn Kharriz Qum¢, of forth A.H. concerning scholars, expressing the same opinion wrote that Zayd rebelled to enjoin the good and forbid the evil not to oppose Dja‘far Ibn Mu¦ammad, his brother’s son. Of course the case was raised in a way that duality was basically denied and the emergence of this problem was merely resulted from Imim

---

[1]. Riyi¤ al-‘ulami’, vol.II, pp.352-353

[2]. Mirit al-‘Uq£l, vol.IV, p.120

[3]. Perhaps it’s said that ¯ad£q’s opinion indicates that Shi‘ites scholars rejected all the slanderous narrations. In this regard, it demands mentioning that what ¯ad£q said, can’t be ascribed to all Shi‘ite Muslims while most of his opinions are rejected by Shiykh Muf¢d in Ta¥¦¢¦ al-i‘tiqid.

¯idiq's lack of uprising. Not relying on the discrepancy, we can insist on the lack of allegiance. Ya'q£b¢, as a Shi'ites historian just had a brief reference to Zayd's uprising. Such a stand was considered due to that of the Shi'ite Muslims in being heedless of Zayd's uprising.[1]

Based on what mentioned in "Irshid" and "I'lim al-Wari", the view points of Shiykh Muf¢d and ±abars¢ is that Zayd was very honorable and called to, **الرضا من آل محمد** "Satisfaction of Prophet's family."

People erroneously thought that he called people to himself while he was aware of his brother's merit, Imim Biqir as well as his will for Imim ¯idiq.[2] According to what was said, accepting such an opinion to this extent is difficult. Having a favorable opinion about Zayd, al-'Amr¢, the Shi'ites genealogist of the 5th century, considers the Zaydids as liars in their laying claim to Zayd.[3] This action, at the same time, includes both defense of Zayd and denial of Zaydids. The late Mu¦addith N£r¢ confirming Zayd rejected the slanderous narrations about him.[4] As it has been stated, among the recent thinkers exist some like °usayn Kar¢min and ªyat Allih Munta¨ir¢ who tenaciously support Zayd.[5]

This issue was briefly brought to an end; however, other quotations whose significance is lesser than aforesaid ones exist, they demand a detailed and investigative study to get a more realistic viewpoint and its fulfillment is impossible in this brief general history.

YA°Yª IBN ZAYD'S UPRISING

Ya¦yi, son of Zayd was among those who participated in his father's uprising. He after father's martyrdom and his burial accompanied by father's Shi'ite Muslims, went to Niynawi and Madi'in. He stayed there with a farmer for some time and then went to Riy and Khurisin.[6] Thinking Ya¦yi was

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.326; see, Ba¦th f¢ nash'at 'ilm al-tir¢kh 'ind al-'arab, p.53

[2]. al-Irshid, p.268; A'lim al-wari, p.257

[3]. al-Mudjd¢, pp.156-157; see, Ghiyat al-ikhti¥ir, pp.128-129

[4]. Mustadrak al-wasi'il, vol.III, p.599

[5]. Dirisit f¢ wiliyat al-faq¢h, vol.I, p.208 and the rest

[6]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.104; see, Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.326

in K£fa, Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar on top of pulpit reproached people that Ya¦yi hid himself in the women’s bridal chamber.[1] He left Riy for Q£mis and stayed there with Ziyid Ibn Ab¢-Ziyid Qushayr¢ for fairly a long time,[2] then he went to Niyshib£r.

It was there where he was asked to stay but he rejected and said, “‘Al¢’s flag will not be raised over this city.”[3] Maybe in that time, the situation in Niyshib£r wasn’t ready for a Shi‘ites uprising.

Ya¦yi left Niyshib£r for Sarakhs. He stayed there with a person named Yaz¢d Ibn ‘Umar Tam¢m¢ for six months.[4] “Khiridjites” went to him in Sarakhs and wanted to swear allegiance to him on the base of the war against the Umayyads. Ya¦yi was pleased with their request but Yaz¢d Ibn ‘Umar prohibited him from doing that and said, **كيف تقاتل بقوم يتبرؤن من علي واهل بيته** “How did he want to help those expressed disgust for ‘Al¢ and his household.”

Afterwards, rejecting their request, Ya¦yi through good remarks kept them at the distance.[5] Staying in Sarakhs for six months, Ya¦yi left there for Balkh and lived there with a person called °ar¢sh. He probably stayed there longer than others up to the end of Hishim time and about the time of his death.[6]

Being in pursuance of Ya¦yi, Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar heard of his going to Khurisin so he asked Na¥r Ibn Sayyir to find him, with Ya¦yi’s entrance to Balkh or fairly a long time after that Khurisin government found out about his settlement there and based on Ibn A‘tham’s letter gathered all the people in A‘¨am mosque and investigated their houses one by one. Everyone famous for his affection of the Household was brought and whipped to betray Ya¦yi’s place.[7]

These investigations resulted in °ar¢sh’s detention. Although he under torture didn’t betray Ya¦yi’s place, his son

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.259; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.506

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VIII, p.127

[3]. ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.256

[4]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VIII, p.127; ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.259; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.104

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.260; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.104

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.261

[7]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VIII, p.128

did so.[1] ‘Aq¢l Ibn Ma‘qal, the ruler of Balkh, sent someone to bring Ya¦yi who was considered, according to Ibn A‘tham’s letter, to be in Y£nus Ibn Silim’s house. Then he was chained and sent to Na¥r Ibn Sayyir who inspired him.[2] During this time, Khurisin heard about Hishim’s death and Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d in response to Na¥r’s letter in which he asked about Ya¦yi wrote to set him free and let him go wherever he wished.[3]

When Ya¦yi was set free, a group of people of Khurisin went to the blacksmith who made Ya¦yi get rid of the chains and wanted to buy the chains. Some raised the price to twenty thousands dhms. The blacksmith being afraid of news disclosure said to them to put some money together. Then he cut the chain into piece and gave everyone a piece for making rings or for Tabarruk that is a gift considered as bringing good luck.[4]

Ya¦yi went to Sarakhs, writing a letter to its ruler, Na¥r wanted him to send Ya¦yi to ±£s. He also wrote to the ruler of ±£s to send Ya¦yi to Abarshahr and leave him to ‘Amr Ibn Zurira and Ya¦yi was brought to Biyhaq.[5] In there, Ya¦yi asserted that he was afraid of going to Iraq for Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar was still in power and will probably kill him.[6] It was there where Ya¦yi and his companions clashed with ‘Amr Ibn Zurira. Although it’s said that the number of Ya¦yi’s companions touched one hundred, that of ‘Amr reached ten thousands or even more, the winner was Ya¦yi.[7]

الم تر اهـل نيشابور لمـا لقو الابطال لم يغنوا قليلا

لقوا مئة وهم عشرون ألفاً فما صبروا ولامنعوا قليلا

“Didn’t you see the people of Niyshib£r who confronted the champions when they were a few but when their number

---

[1]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.105; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.356; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.261

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VIII, p.129

[3]. Ibid, vol.VIII, p.131, Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.261; Tir¢kh Gudh¢dih, p.186

[4]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.105

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.537

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.261; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.106

[7]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.537; Tar¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, pp.230-231

and that of Niyshib£r was a hundred and twenty thousands respectively, they lacked resistance and were defeated."[1]

Some more details concerning the time before and about the battle were written in some narrations.[2] Leaving there, Ya¦yi went to Dj£zdjin and there, he was joined by a group of regional people as well as inhabitants of ±iliqin and Firiyib. Number of these people, according to the narrations, differed from one hundred and twenty,[3] one hundred and fifty[4] or five hundred.[5] And there arrived Na¥r Ibn Sayyir's army led by Muslim Ibn A¦waz. Ya¦yi after three days of battle was hit on the forehead with an arrow. He martyred[6] and so did all his companions.[7] This probably happened at the beginning of the year 126 A.H. in a place called "Argh£na or Argh£n¢".[8]

Although being beheaded and buried, he was exhumed and hung up the vault of one of the Dj£zdjin's corridors due to Na¥r Ibn Sayyir's order. Being hung to the Ab£ Muslim's time, his corpse was brought down, prayed on and buried.[9] Ya¦yi's uprising caused Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d to write to the ruler of Iraq. He wanted him to bring Zayd's corpse down, set it on fire and expose his ashes to the wind.

Ya¦yi's uprising, at any rate, made Khurisin more and more ready for a public uprising against the Umayyads. Every child born in that year, according to what Mas'£d¢ said was named Ya¦yi or Zayd.[10]

As some mentioned, Ya¦yi was the first for whom people clad in black and eulogized.[11]

---

[1]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VIII, p.133

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.262; al-Fut£¦, vol.VIII, p.132

[3]. Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, pp.230-231

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.262

[5]. 'Umdat al-§ilib, p.260

[6]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.262; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.107

[7]. Tar¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.231

[8]. 'Umdat al-§ilib, p.266; Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.212; al-°£r al-'ayn, p.189

[9]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VIII, p.136; Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.263

[10]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p.213

[11]. Ansib al-Ashrif, vol.II, p.264

After the victory, anyone of the Ya¦yi's combatants whose names were mentioned in the registry book was found and killed by Ab£ Muslim.[1] The emotion flared up by martyrdom of Zayd and his son, Ya¦yi, along with the public emotions to the benefit of the Household were considered the main reasons for 'Abd Allih's victory who at the price of the Household benefited from these emotions.[2]

'ABD ALLªH IBN MU'ªWIYA'S UPRISING

'Abd Allih Ibn Mu'iwiya Ibn 'Abd Allih Ibn Dja'far's movement from 127 to 131 can be considered as a Shi'ites movement due to the presence of some Hishimites and the 'Alawites. No one but his father named Mu'iwiya at whose insistence, this infant was named Mu'iwiya as well.[3] Searching for poetry and literature, 'Abd Allih, Mu'iwiya's offspring, before his military and political movement had companionship with people whose concern was poetry and literature as well. In the last years of the Umayyads rule, when there existed a battle between Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad who claimed caliphate and Ibrih¢m Ibn Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d, the Umayyads were strongly wanted especially the disputes created by tribal battles between northern and southern Arabs in K£fa made 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z some difficulties. In a narration, ±abar¢ mentioned, observing the incapability of Iraq's ruler, Shi'ite Muslims called 'Abd Allih to swear allegiance whose responsibility was taken by a person called Hilil Ibn Abi l-Ward. 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar's presence in °¢ra gave 'Abd Allih Ibn Mu'iwiya the opportunity to occupy K£fa and even made of Damascus in there swear allegiance to him. Some from Madi'in and Fam al-N¢l swore allegiance to him.

Having an inventive hostility with the Umayyads and considering their successors of the Hishimites, people of K£fa paid allegiance to him at once. Rabi'a tribe having a Shi'ites precedence backed 'Abd Allih Ibn Mu'iwiya up. In the battle between 'Abd Allih Ibn Mu'iwiya and 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z, companions of 'Abd Allih Ibn

---

[1]. al-Mu¦abbar, p.484; Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.102

[2]. See, Shar¦ nahdj al-baligha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d,, vol.VII, p.143

[3]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XII, p.223

Mu‘iwiya didn’t seriously resist and left him alone with the head of Rabi‘a tribe, ‘Umar Ibn Ghan¤bin.

After that Rabi‘a sought quarter for himself, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya as well as his companions and sent him to Medina from K£fa.[1] He, in Medina, reinforced and went to Djibil while accompanied by people of K£fa and its representative[2] and for fairly a long time, ruled over around I¥fahin, Q£mis, °ulwin, I¥§akhr and Riy.[3] The battle against him was postponed due to the Umayyads’ difficulties in their combats against Khiridjites and other rebels. Having started his rebel in 127, now he in 128 weakly ruled over I¥fahin and I¥§akhr. His brothers were sent to Firs, Djibil as well as Ab£ Dja‘far Man¥£r ruled over Ahwiz («dhadj) for some time then facing some difficulties, he could do nothing.[4]

After some time, at least in 129, he combated in I¥§akhr ‘amir Ibn ®abbira who was dispatched to him by the Umayyads in Iraq. Being defeated in the aforesaid battle, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya went to Harit and there he was arrested by Ab£ Muslim’s agent and sent to him. Ab£ Muslim of ‘Abbisids’ agents felt at risk on his side, so imprisoned him and ordered to treat hard on him. Balidhur¢ stated that while in prison, ‘Abd Allih called people of Khurisin fools for their obedience to Ab£ Muslim.[5] Hearing of this news, Ab£ Muslim put more pressure on him. The ‘Alawites and the ± ilibites would be suppressed by Ab£ Muslim, for he was of the ‘Abbisids’ agents. According to a fully explained letter, written by ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya, he was put in chains.[6] Balidh£r¢ through a narration stated that he, being in Ab£ Muslim’s prison, passed away but in another quotation by Hishim Kalb¢, it is mentioned that he was murdered by Ab£ Muslim.[7]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.XII, p.223

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, pp.601-604

[3]. See, Ansib al-ashrif, vol.I, p.63; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, p.38; al-Aghin¢, vol.XII, p.229

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.63; Tir¢kh I¥bahin, Ab£ Nu‘aym,, vol.II, p.42; ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.38

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.66

[6]. Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.428; al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.II, pp.85-86

[7]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.66

An abstraction of all reports about him from different sources is prepared by Abu l-Faradj in just a few pages. Some contradictions exist among them.

According to one quotation, he called people to, **الرضا من آل محمد** "Satisfaction of the Household" but in another one he invited them to his own allegiance.

Also in news, it's mentioned that he dressed like "¯£fis" and the majority of people of K£fa swore allegiance to him some others did not so and said, "No one is left for us and most of us were killed with the people of this house!"

He also mentioned in details that although 'Abd Allih sent his brothers named °asan, Yaz¢d, 'Al¢ and ¯ili¦ to I¥§akhr, Sh¢riz, Kirmin and Qum, he went to Khurisin due to being unable to resist against the Umayyads.

On his way, he was seen and asked, "Are you of the Messenger(s)'s progeny? Are you Ibrih¢m, the Imim?" But these questions were given a negative answer.

The questioner asked, "So I'm free from your help."

Abu l-Faradj also stated, "Being greedy for Ab£ Muslim's help, 'Abd Allih went to him and was imprisoned. There, 'Abd Allih wrote his famous treatise to him but Ab£ Muslim being afraid of corruptions of the people's opinion murdered him."[1]

His murder is narrated by others as well.[2] This happened in 131 A.H.[3] Abu l-Faradj in "Maqitil al-±ilib¢n" mentioned the brief of this news.[4] For 'Abd Allih was killed by the 'Abbisids' agent, there existed some forged news against him. An example of it was raised by 'ªmir Ibn ®abbira who accused 'Abd Allih and his companions of assaulting against women.[5] Here two points are of great significance his personality before the uprising and his stand after that.

The news about him is reported by Abu l-Faradj I¥fahin¢ Darighin¢. In the portrait given by him, 'Abd Allih Ibn

---

[1]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XII, p.230

[2]. Nathr al-durr, vol.I, p.427; al-Maqilit wa l-firaq, p.39; Firaq al-sh¢'a, p.33

[3]. Ibn 'Inaba mentioned it to be happened in 133. quoting in Harit, he said that his tomb was people's shrine ... in the year 976; 'Umdat al-§ilib, p.38

[4]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, pp.144-116

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, pp.40-41

Mu‘iwiya was considered as a poet and a learned person with all the needed possibilities of that time. In addition, he was accompanied by some poets and some accused of dualism – although its purpose isn’t clear but can’t be mere irreligiousity – and I¥fahin¢ named three dualists.[1] In other narrations, he was explicitly accused of dualism.[2] Its correctness isn’t exactly specified; however, on the whole it can’t be judged. Undeniably in the tumult of K£fa, he was accepted by people of there as a meritorious person for the battle against the Umayyads. In the case of his accusation of dualism, how such a thing is conceivable? The writer of al-Mudjd¢, the fifth A.H. century Sh¢‘a genealogist praised him as, **كان سيدا كريما** was a generous master and sad that his father made him as his successor for[3] **لما يعرف فيه من كرم الاخلاق** He found in him nobility of characters and his call to the satisfaction of the Household is doubted.[4]

At first, this motto basically indicates this faith that caliphate belongs to Mu¦ammad’s progeny especially who is “Al-Ri¤i”. Secondly, it, for fairly a long time, was utilized by the ‘Abbisids’ summoners to evade and gradually recognize its applicability in the ‘Abbisids. Thirdly, it was regularly used by Zaydids. In fact, popularity belonged to one who called to the satisfaction of the Household not to himself. It isn’t cleared up whether such an issue was posed in the time of ‘Abd Allih’s uprising or later on. In a narration by ±abar¢, what is worthy of attention is Zaydids’s presence about ‘Abd Allih’s uprising.

In one quotation, he stated, **وحمل اهل القلب من اهل الشام علي الزيـديه** Zaydids were attacked by the middle faction of enemy troops from Damascus.[5]

Sometimes else referring to the clash between Zaydiyya and people of Damascus, he said, “Rabi‘a sought quarter for himself, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya and Zaydids.”[6]

---

[1]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.112; al-Aghin¢, vol.XII, p.251

[2]. al-Aghin¢, vol.XII, p.233; see: Lisin al-m¢zin, vol.III, p.364

[3] al-Mudjd¢, p.297

[4]. Some said that he called to satisfaction of the Household (Nathr al-durr; vol.I, p.427} and the other stated that he invited to Himself, ‘Umdat al-§ilib, p.39

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.603

[6]. Ibid, vol.V, p.604

This aspect of the issue has not been indicated in other sources. It demands reminding that to Zaydids, Imim should be from the ‘Alawites; however, ‘Abd Allih was a ±ilibites and naturally these beliefs were constantly formed later on. Perhaps Zaydids for defeating the Umayyads in that time helped him not for their belief in him. And every ‘Alawites uprising, to historians, was probably considered as Zayd¢ in one way or another. In a narration, ±abar¢ indicates that ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya was surrounded by Khiridjites.[1] And this can be considered as a good device to defame others.

‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya has got a portrait in Firaq books. A party called Djini¦iyya and led by ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya was considered of Shi‘ites extremists.[2] In the above-mentioned portrait, naturally there is no relation between ‘Abd Allih’s issue and that of Zaydids. Sa‘d Ibn ‘Abd Allih Ash‘ar¢ mentioned a party linked to him of the K¢ssinids who believed in Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya’s Imamate and considered his son, Ab£ Hishim, as his successor. In continuation, they believed that he left will for ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya.[3] Shahristin¢ mentioned a party named °irithiyya who believed that ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya as Is¦iq Ibn Zayd incarnated.[4] We learned that Madi’in – where Ibn Is¦iq was from – possessed a lot of Shi‘ites extremists. It is likely to say that all these problems, after the murder of ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya, were probably raised by others while he didn’t have anything to do with them. The same issue is true about Shi‘ites Imims (a) whose spirits were claimed to incarnate in some people.

Anyway, this point is to be reminded that the Umayyads, the ‘Abbisids and the majority of historians couldn’t be pleased by a person like ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya for having rebelled against them as well as being of ‘Alawites’ swords holders. Therefore, he is at all sides surrounded. Naturally, he doesn’t have anything to do with what happened after him and of course, such judgment doesn’t mean the confirmation of all his behaviors and companionship with various people.

---

[1]. Ibid, vol.VI, p.40

[2]. al-Wif¢ Bi l-wafayit, vol.XVII, p.63; Farhang firaq Islim¢, p.142

[3]. al-Maqilit wa l-firaq, p.38

[4]. See, Farhang firag Islim¢, pp.147-149

Most of the Hishimites attended the ‘Abd Allih’s movement and Ab£ Dja‘far Man¥£r is a typical of that. We know that in that time, ‘Abbisids worked independently and why presence of Ab£ Dja‘far alongside ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya is of great importance. Maybe the reason is that victory attainment wasn’t seriously taken into account by the ‘Abbisids. In that time, the concern of their efforts was to come to terms with ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya and ‘Abd Allih Ibn °asan known as Nafs Zakiyya at times to get their share in the future.

THE SHI‘ITE MUSLIMS AND THE ‘ALAWITES’ LAST POSITION IN THE UMAYYADS’S TIME

A great deal of evidence is available showing that to Iraq only ‘Alawites were considered as Umayyads’s successors and when ‘Abbisids through the force of Ab£ Muslim Khurisin¢ and Ab£ Salama Khallil ruled, in that time the imagination of ‘Abbisids’ coming to power was raised. The whole situational climate was naturally to the benefit of ‘Alawites and their political status was thoroughly clear.

The ambiguous but meaningful interpretation of **الرضا من آل محمد** Satisfaction to the Household were applicable to ‘Alawites. The imagination of those familiar with this term was the same but the disagreements among ‘Alawites were problematic. This disagreement was mostly like that of °asanids and °usaynids.

On one side, °usaynids whose outstanding figures were Imim Biqir and Imim ¯idiq distinguished among Shi‘ite Muslims and other religious scholars due to the scientific and ethical position in Iraq community. °usaynids, having a great deal of Shi‘ite Muslims believed in their Imamate and considered them as persons whose obedience is necessary. On the other side, °asanids among whom ‘Abd Allih Ibn °asan Ibn °asan make effort to introduce his son, Mu¦ammad, as the only ‘Alawites candidate for the Umayyads’s rule and succession had their own heritage of ‘Alawites. It cannot exactly be cleared up whose influence was more than the other but ‘Abd Allih Ibn °asan possessing a better status among ‘Alawites and Hishimites could to some extent strengthen his son’s position[1]; however, in Iraq

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.76

a letter based on the acceptance of government was written to Imim ¯idiq by Ab£ Salama, the ‘Abbisids’ great summoner and regardless of its being serious or not, it indicates Imim’s political status. Imim ¯idiq’s Shi‘ite Muslims and the kind of their beliefs were discussed in advance and now here is a brief look at efforts made by Nafs Zakiyya his father for attainment of leadership.

Balidh£r¢, through a narration, indicated that one day, °asan Muthanni, son of Imim Mudjtabi, who were superior to his brothers went to ‘Abd al-Malik who asked him about the reason for a premature aging.

Ya¦yi Ibn °akam being present there said, “Iraqis wished who every year invite him for caliphate has done such a thing to him”.[1]

Such a remark indicates that ‘Alawites were gladly received by Iraqis; however, it lacked a clear direction. Even ‘Abd Allih Ibn Dja‘far’s descendants had the same background. Some issues concerning ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu‘iwiya Ibn ‘Abd Allih Ibn Dja‘far were set forth in advance. Even before that, when °adjdjadj decided to marry ‘Abd Allih Ibn Dja‘far’s daughter, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Marwin who was warned due the fact that this marriage along with the situation in Iraq to the benefit of this family may lead to the Umayyads’ overthrow interfered in it and °adjdjadj divorced her.[2]

In any case, ‘Abd Allih doing a great deal of measures for his son, Mu¦ammad known as Nafs Zakiyya and calling him “Mahd¢”, made him an important status among the Umayyads and others. As indicated in some historical news, some meetings were held in this regard and the Hishimites were called to swear some the ‘Abbisids among them Man¥£r and Saffi¦ swore allegiance to him.

Through a narration by Abu l-Faradj, it is obvious that Hishimites going together in Abwi’ made up their minds to select and pay allegiance to someone among themselves. ‘Abd Allih stating that his son, Mu¦ammad, is Mahd¢ wanted them to swear allegiance to him. Man¥£r being present there confirmed his allegiance to him. ‘Abd Allih Ibn °asan

---

[1]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.II, p.74

[2]. al-Kimil fi l-adab, vol.I, p.349; Nathr al-durr, vol.IV, p.56; Balighit al-nisi’, p.111

stated not to let Dja‘far Ibn Mu¦ammad (s) know since he will spoil everything.

Hearing of this, Imim denied Mahdawism of Mu¦ammad Ibn ‘Abd Allih and said, “I’m willing to give him a hand if his uprising is to enjoin good and forbid evil”, but ‘Abd Allih Ibn °asan accused him of jealousy.[1]

According to Balidh£r¢, after allegiance, Nafs Zakiyya went to Bidiya and stayed there for some time and attended in public at times up to the time of allegiance to Abu l-‘Abbis Saffi¦. When Nafs Zakiyya was in Gha§fin region alongside ªl Ar§it Ibn Shab¢ha, he was sent to Bidiya and called Mahd¢.[2] When the ‘Abbisids came to power, he hid himself until his revolution in 145 in Medina and he was killed. Man¥£r having paid allegiance to him was terribly afraid of him and just after his murder and his brother, Ibrih¢m Ibn ‘Abd Allih found comfort.

What is worthy of attention here is that the Abassids were independently doing some activities and Ibrih¢m, the Imim, sent some representatives to different regions. They took advantage of ‘Al¢’s and his descendants’ names to draw people’s attention[3] and ruled one after the other.

---

[1]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, pp.40-41; al-Irshid, p.277; Kashf al-ghumma, vol II, pp.172,173

[2]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.III, p.79

[3]. Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, p.233; see, Tir¢kh tashayyu‘ dar Irin, p.139-143

CHAPTER XII
DECLINE OF THE MARWªNIDS

°ªRITH IBN SURAYDJ IN KHURªSªN

Khurisin was the major troubled spot for the Umayyads since it was not only far from the capital but also it had its own problems such as tribal wars between the Arab immigrants, cruelties of the Umayyads prevalent there and relative political and economic independence which had made there an important center among the eastern provinces. The formation of the crucial revolutions out there during the final years of the Umayyads ruling was not something which could be easily overlooked by them. And finally from the very same spot appeared a massive army that overthrew the Umayyads. Now the riot of °irith Ibn Suraydj, one of the important riots, from 166 to 127 (A.H.) is to be discussed.

One of the riots against the Umayyads in Khurisin was °irith's that paved the ground for the 'Abbisids to do so and gain victory. °irith was an Arab from Tam¢m tribe who opposied the Umayyads rulers from 116 to 128 (A.H).

Khurisin not only was far from the capital, as a crucial center, but it was suffering from tribal discords as well. In addition the wrong treatment of the Arab caliphate of the Umayyads towards Mawil¢ (freed slaves) was another problem. The cruelties of the Umayyads rulers, which were increasing day by day except the brief period in which 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z ruled, had resulted in some extended riots.

Zayd's riot which happened after the riot of Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab was a more significant one.[1] His main intention was supporting religion and bringing justice to the society. Being at odds with the Umayyads rulers, °irith had repeatedly

[1]. Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab's riot, as it was touched on before, was a political one, emanating from his opportunism.

proposed the idea of counseling for appointing the ruler.[1] The events regarding °irith's riot were described in ±abar¢ and in other sources they were disregarded either completely or partially.

When Djunayd 'Abd al-Ra¦min died in 116, °irith appreciated this opportunity and gave start to his uprising. Within a short period of time he managed to seize some cities such as Balkh, Dj£zdjin, Firiyib, ±iliqin, Marw al-R£dh.[2] Since the people of various cities hated the Umayyads rulers, they surrendered to Ibn Suraydj, as later on 'ª¥im Ibn 'Abd Allih who was Khurisin governor said, easily at their own will.[3] Accordingly, 'ª¥im wanted to ask for help from Damascus army. This was a threat for most of the Iraqi rulers as well as the rulers of other areas. After some clashes between 'ª¥im Ibn 'Abd Allih and °irith, °irith was defeated and escaped towards Iraq. Those farmers who helped him upon hearing about his defeat went back to their own lands.[4] °irith once again equipped his army. When 'ª¥im became aware that he had been deposed, he compromised with °irith. He also suggested that they ask Hishim to follow Qur'in and Prophet's Sunna and if he did not accept them, they would revolt against him. At the end, those supporting 'ª¥im could not compromise after a clash with 'ª¥im, °irith retreated.

Knowing about °irith's riots, Hishim asked Khilid Ibn 'Abd Allih Qasr¢, the governor of Iraq, to send his brother Asad Ibn 'Abd Allih, the former governor of Khurisin, to suppress his riot. He along with the armies of Damascus and Iraq headed for Khurisin. After some clashes between °irith and him and a war between the residents of Tirmidh and again °irith, °irith was defeated and escaped eastwards to take refuge by the Turkish kings who were called Khiqin.[5]

One of the well-known Turkish kings helping him later on came to be known as Ab£ Muzi¦im for he was a trouble-

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, pp. 2-3

[2]. al-Fut£¦, vol.VIII, p.106; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 429

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 429

[4]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 430; The word "farmers" here refers to the owner of big farms who had great power locally.

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 438

maker for Arabs.[1] Asad Ibn ‘Abd Allih by no means could disregard the behavior of the Turkish kings in spite of the fact that in his clashes with them most of the time he could defeat them.

There were still clashes with the Turks when Na¥r Ibn Sayyir was chosen as Khurisin’s governor in 121. He had led some of these clashes in Balkh. In those clashes °irith Ibn Surayd̲j, along with the Turks, fought with Na¥r Ibn Sayyir[2]. After his defeat in Balkh, °irith and his supporters all settled in Takhiristin. Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar, the governor of Iraq, asked then Na¥r Ibn Sayyir to attack the city of Shish, that had harbored °irith, and beat it to the ground.[3] Provoking people to help him, Na¥r reached Shish after a minor clash. Then he ordered the king of that city who had compromised with him to expel °irith from there. He accordingly sent him to Firiyib.

°irith and his supporters stayed there up to the time that Yaz¢d Ibn Wal¢d by killing Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d in 126 came to rule the Umayyads. He wanted to reform the Umayyads affairs. °irith was one of the opponents of the Umayyads whose motto just the same as Yaz¢d was resorting to Qur’in and Prophet’s Sunna. Na¥r who was fighting with Djuday‘ Ibn ‘Al¢ Kirmin¢ thought that °irith was a greater threat to him, so he intended to compromise with him. Accordingly, on behalf of Yaz¢d Ibn Wal¢d, he sent him a guarantee of clemency so he could return to Khurisin. Yaz¢d by stating that he had revolted for Allih’s sake and since Allih’s orders were overlooked and people were under constant oppression, then he could return to Khurisin again. He also ordered the governor of Iraq to release his children and return his properties confiscated[4] up to that. time he had been residing in the Turkish lands for 12 years.

In 127, Yaz¢d Ibn Wal¢d was killed. After him Ibrih¢m Ibn Wal¢d also could not stay in power for a long time. Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad was the last Umayyads caliph who came to power after him. Knowing that Marwin would not continue the same policy as Yaz¢d, °irith clashed with Na¥r along with Kirmin¢. After a while, he had a clash with Djuday‘ Ibn

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 443

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 493

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, pp. 494-495

[4]. Ibid. vol.V, pp. 591-592

‘Al¢ Kirmin¢ and °irith and the Mudrids fought against the residents of Yemen who joined the residents of Kirmin. °irith was killed in that clash in 128. Some points regarding °irith’s riot should be taken into account.

There have been, at least, two major reasons for °irith’s riot, even if he himself was not aware of them, they could attract public attention in addition to some other minor ones which led to his revolt against the Umayyads one of which was obeying both Qur’in and Prophet’s Sunna and the other one was putting an end to the Umayyads’s oppression.

A brief look at °irith’s utterances and behaviors will show clearly that in his riot from the start two things were important namely obeying Qur’in and Sunna and paying allegiance to someone who does so.[1] He did so to divulge that the Umayyads rulers were by no means religious. Since the Umayyads for most of the Muslims were widely known irreligious, at that time referring to Qur’in and Sunna in most of the riots was useful.

Once °irith in 126 went to Na¥r Ibn Sayyir, Na¥r gave him some gifts but he said, “ I am neither after the pleasures of this worldly life nor do I intend to marry an Arab rather”. **انما أسأل كتاب الله والعمل بالسنّه واستعمال أهل الخير والفضل**[2] **“**I want to obey Qur’in and Sunna and the pious and learned people.”

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 428; Van Vloten in "Al-siyidat al-‘arabiyya" (p.62) said that he was inclined towards the Prophet’s Sunna. He also referred to an article in Madjallat al-asiwiyyat al-Firinsiyya (october, 1835, p.327) in which the same matter had been pointed out But in "±abar¢", the main source for °irith’s riot, this matter was told by no means. This was told probably because of the condition of Khurisin at that time. A piece of poem being quoted from Kumayt Ibn Zayd Asad¢ in °irith’s praise in “±abar¢” also can be an evidence in this regard. Although in this poem it was not told that °irith was a Shi‘ite, but the phrase Riyit S£d (The black Flags) was used and based on some narrations "Mali¦im wa Fitan" regarding a riot in Khurisin and using black flags there was used. The use of the phrase “Black Flags” indicates that Kumayt wanted to liken the uprising of °irith to a sh¢’¢ uprising. It is mentioned in a report that °irith considered himself as “the man of the black flags.” (Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p. 3) However, thereis no evidence that °irith was a Sh ¢’¢.

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 606

He also said that he had left Khurisin for thirteen years just for putting an end to cruelties.[1] Many people joined him since he had written the main objectives of his riot and ordered his agents to read them for the public on the way to Marw and in mosques too.[2]

When he joined Kirmin¢, some of his supporters who observed how they were killed and their properties were plundered under the leadership of Bishr Ibn Djurm£z, once one of the closest companions of °irith, separated from him saying. **نحن الفئة العادلة ولا نقاتـل الا مـن يقاتلنـا** "We are just people and we do fight with no one expect him who wages war against us."[3]

What has been said shows that °irith's mottos in his riot were adhering to Qur'in and Prophet's Sunna and putting an end to the Umayyads's cruelties by which he could attract some people to himself.

Other than the Arabs, some of the farmers who were under the pressure of the Umayyads rulers also joined him to get rid of their cruelties.[4] Actually he, as an Arab, accepted to defend non-Arabs who were in difficult condition, against the Umayyads. What he had done was of great significance both to non-Arabs and Mawil¢ especially when the Sughdiyin were pressurized to leave their homeland and take refuge by Turks in spite of the fact that they had embraced Islam. For a long period, °irith was among Turks. The majority of them, as it seems, were the Muslims who had not accepted the ruling of Arabs and wanted to get rid of the Umayyads who were taking tribute even from the Muslims. On the other hand, some others did not give up their previous beliefs. They also fought against the Arabs. Van Vloten by referring to a Muslim judge among the supporters of °irith in the Turkish land, as it had been stated by ±abar¢, concluded that there were some Muslims among them.[5] This is a significant point for removing the doubt of some individuals

---

[1]. loc.cit.

[2]. Ibid. vol.VI. p.IV.

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, p.X

[4]. Ibid. vol.V, pp. 429-430. He especially had taken into account the farmers of Dj£zdjin.

[5]. al-siyidat al-'arabiyya, p.66

as Na¥r Ibn Sayyir who had accused °irith of fighting along with the unbelievers against the Muslims.[1]

THE MURDJI'ITES AND THE DJAHMITES IN °ªRITH'S UPRISING

The second point worthy of stating in °irith's riot is his relationship with Djahm Ibn ¯afwin and his attitude towards the Murdji'ites. He was accused of being linked to both of them. Djahm who was from Mawil¢[2] after studying in K£fa for a while returned to Balkh. For some time, he joined Muqitil Ibn Sulaymin, an expert commentator. Disagreeing him, he was exiled to Tirmidh. There he joined °irith and took part in his riot.

Djahm's participation in °irith's riot is a significant point not because of his beliefs regarding Allih's attributes but because of the fact that by his participation both of them were accused of being Murdji'ites. Politically, there are two opposite attitudes regarding the Murdji'ites one of which is that they were accused of being linked to the cruel rulers since in their views, faith was an inner state and different from good deed, accordingly he who commits a sin is still faithful. This was a belief that the caliphs and other Mammonists after the wordly pleasure took advantage of.

Another point which is opposite to what was said is that the Murdji'ites participated in many uprisings such as that of Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab's. Ab£ Ru'ba, one of the leaders of the Murdji'ites had taken part in Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab's uprising against the Umayyads at the very beginning of the second century.[3] The participation of some of the Murdji'ites in Zayd's uprising and accusation of °irith of being linked to them both reveal that the Murdji'ites were at odds with the Umayyads. So how can these two opposite points be judged?

Despite the Khiridjites who regarded the cardinal sinners as unbelievers and also the Mu'tazilites who regarded them as the unbelievers, the Murdji'ites were of the opinion that they would be still assumed believers if they believe in two principles of Islam namely unity of Allih and Prophethood

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, p. 6

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, p. 2

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 340

when they commit sins. This is a jurisprudic principle which is accepted by all of the Islamic sects. They had no distinct political stance regarding those who were unbelievers in the Khiridjites' view. According to them, they should be left to Allih and be hopeful for His Mercy. This also was a controversial point among Muslims regarding 'Uthmin in Djamal and ¯iff¢n wars. During °adjdjidj's tenure in Iraq (also in Africa) in which most of the local residents of Iran embraced Islam, the Umayyads's agents could no longer take tributes from them and increase their revenues. As a result, °adjdjidj in consultation with the Umayyads's caliphs declared that only saying diploma is not enough for someone to be a believer. Instead, someone is Muslim who is able to read Qur'in. In addition, there might have been some other conditions, for example it must be clear whether he had been circumcised or not. Based on what was said, °adjdjidj went on to collect tributes from those who had newly embraced Islam. There once again the same belief of the Murdji'ites was beneficial. The Murdji'ites in contrast with them were of the opinion that saying diploma was enough for being a Muslim and they declared the conditions that °adjdjidj had set was unvalued in this regard. Accordingly, the Murdji'ites started to support the Iranians who had recently embraced Islam and the revolutionists took advantage of them. Penetration of scholastic and jurisprudic theology of Ab£ °an¢fa in the East and the existence of the Murdji'ites beliefs in Khurisin and even a village which was called Murdj¢ ªbid in suburb of Balkh, all are the evidence regarding this matter. Being one of the leaders of the Murdji'ites, Ab£ °an¢fa not only participated in Zayd's uprising but during the 'Abbisids's term helped the 'Alawites who had joined him as well.[1]

Wellhausen by referring to the above-mentioned point regarding the Murdji'ites added, "They attempted to create a common ground among all tribes and that was opposing tyranny and defining the gospel truth".[2] Van Vloten in his research about the Murdji'ites by referring to their role in solving this difficult problem among various tribes of

---

[1]. To know about the beliefs as well as scholastic theology of the Murdji'ites, refer to a book entitled "The Murdji'ites, Tir¢kh wa And ¢shih" from the writer of the very same lines.

[2]. Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-'arabiyya. pp. 441, 442

Muslims and also their emphasis on observing the rights of all Muslims both Arabs and non-Arabs, said that he refrained from judging the caliphs. He also had spoken about the Murdji'ites taking part in Zayd's uprising who had helped him.[1] Anyway, °irith was among the Murdji'ites according to ±abar¢.

This verse from Na¥r Ibn Sayyir, Khurisin's governor, is an evidence indicating that he was from the Murdji'ites,

وارجاءكم لزّكم والشرك في قرن فأنتم أهل اشراك ومرجونا[2]

"You are Murdji'ites and atheists that are the same."

±abar¢'s narrations regarding °irith and his relationship with the Murdji'ites are mostly about the events taking place during this period. It was said that °irith had asked Djahm to read a book in which °irith way of conduct was described.[3] It was also said that once he came back from Takhiristin he had a clash with Na¥r. Two people have been appointed as judge. One of them was Djahm himself and the other one was Muqitil Ibn °ayyin. They said finally that Na¥r should not interfere so that they might themselves be able to consult with each other.[4] There also is another narration regarding Djahm's participation in that uprising. Based on that he was captured and killed then by Salm Ibn A¦waz.[5]

A positive point in °irith's movement was regarding its mental aspect and this shows that although these movements shaped mostly in Transoxonia, somewhere far from the scientific centers, they were not merely political ones but they had their own mental principles.

At last, it should be said that the term Djahm¢, based on the reaction of its opponents, and in a lesser degree, accusation of being Murdji'ites are two curses that the traditionists had in their minds against their opponents. Some of the Djahm's beliefs were against incarnation and the subject narrations on simile, so the traditionists opposed him. Gradually, this term as a scientific curse was used while

---

[1]. al-siyidat al-'arabiyya, pp. 64, 65

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p.433

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢,. vol.VI, p.2

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, p.3

[5]. Ibid. vol.VI, p.6; al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.I, p.79

referring to most of the people with quite different beliefs. Khilid al-‘Al¢’s book which was previously referred to can make this point clearer.

WAL«D IBN YAZ«D’S CALIPHATE AND EXTREME CORRUPTION OF THE UMAYYADS

Without doubt, one of the main reasons of the overthrowing of Umayyads, being considered mostly by the rioters, was that their rulers were irreligious. In other words, since they were indifferent towards both religious beliefs of the people and those of themselves, those religious people were made rise up against them. Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d was among those rulers. Being the worst of all, he was one of the last caliphs of the Umayyads who came to power after Hishim in Rab¢‘ al-Thin¢, 125 and was killed one year and two months later.

There are some poems descriptive stories and almost all historical sources indicating that he was a corrupted man.

±abar¢, for example said, “There are many narration’s regarding Wal¢d’s insult to religion”.

He had not mentioned most of them to avoid circumlocution.[1] Mas‘£d¢, on the other hand, had quoted some of them. He was very interested in drinking wine and passing nights among different singers and debauchees was his every day action.[2] One of the worst actions, as it was told, was after reciting this verse,

وَاسْتَفْتَحُوا وَخَابَ كُلُّ جَبَّارٍ عَنِيدٍ.

“And (Allih’s Prophets) asked for solutions and at last each obstinate tyrant became disappointed.”

He said that he disliked it. Then he put Qur’in somewhere and shot toward it saying,

اتوعد كلّ جبـار عنيد فها انا ذاك جبـار عنيد
اذا ما جئت ربك يوم حشر فقل يارب حرقني الوليد[3]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 538

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 213; al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p. 197; See, Tir¢kh Mukhta¥ar al-duwal, p. 118; al-Aghin¢, vol.VII, p. 46

[3]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 216; Tir¢kh Gudh¢dih, p. 286; al-°£r al-‘ayn, p.190; Bahdj al-¥abiqa, vol.V, p. 339; al-Aghin¢, vol.V, p. 49;

Are you threatening Djabbir, the fighter. I am Djabbir the challenger. On the Day of Judgement, say to Allih to set fire on me

Somewhere else, Wal¢d himself by denying Prophethood had openly said that he was an infidel.

تلعب بالخلافة هاشمي بلا وحي أتاه ولا كتاب[1]

"A man of the Hishimites played with succession without being revealed a Book."

Mustuwf¢ regarding his wrongdoing, had said, "It was said that on one Friday he had drunk wine with one of his bondmaids then he had sexual intercourse with her. Then she had forced the defiled drunken bondmaid to put turban on her head to cover her ringlet once she heard Iqima, then she preached sermon[2]. Being a remiss, one who could not supervise the affairs of various cities, Wal¢d, according to Ya'q£b¢, did many wrong things. For instance, he had in his mind to build a room upon the roof of Ka'ba for his debauchery so he ordered someone to do so.[3] It seems that his relatives prevented him from doing so for they were afraid of its consequences. Another time, he asked Na¥r Ibn Sayyir to send him musical instruments.[4] His brother, and accomplice in the murder of Yaz¢d Ibn Wal¢d, also endorsed that he was after sin and iniquity.[5] It is worth saying that this sentence, **يا وليد احذر الموت**[6] **"**O Wal¢d, be afraid of death" Had been engraved on his ring.

The Umayyads degraded day by day simply because of what Wal¢d did. **وظهر للناس منه تهاون بالدين واستحفاف به**[7] **"**He was the cause of public negligence in religion."

Nudj£m al-zuhra, vol.I, p. 299

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 216; al-°£r al-'ayn, p. 190; Bahdj al-¥abiqa, vol.V, p. 239

[2]. Tir¢kh Gudh¢dih, p. 286; al-Aghin¢, vol.VII, p. 47

[3]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p.335; Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 521. He wanted to take wine to that room. Bahdj al-¥abiqa, vol.V, p. 340

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 533

[5]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 555

[6]. Ma'ithir al-inifa f¢ Ma'ilim al-khilifa, vol.I, p. 156

[7]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 521; al-'Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p. 206

Abu l-Faradj regarding him had said, “There has been written many poems about his wrongdoing.”[1] In spite of the fact that nearly all of the Umayyads rulers were sinful and people were aware of this matter more or less, no one among them was comparable to Wal¢d in this regard. His remissness in state affairs raised discord among the Umayyads and paved the ground for the opportunists among them to exert themselves more to prevent that dynasty from being fallen. Because of his actions, Wal¢d was disgusted by others and they were ready to kill him.

Abu l-Faradj l¥fahin¢, at the beginning of the seventh volume of Aghin¢ had described him in detail. All of his life was past while he occupied himself with wine, women and music. He was also accused of being heretic. In Aghin¢ there are some verses indicating that he had believed that “Min¢” was the first and the last prophet.[2] According to Madi’in¢, he was disliked by people because of his aspirations, drinking and annoying the children of Hishim Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik.[3] Once his palace was surrounded by troops loyal toYazid Ibn Wal¢d, he asked people while he was there, “Why do you attack me while I was open-handed among you?”

They answered, **انتهاك ما حرّم الله وشرب الخمور ونكاح أمهات اولاد أبيك واستخفافك بامرالله** “Because you have disregarded what Allih has regarded as being unlawful, you also married your father’s bondwomen who had children from him.”

He said, “You are wrong.”

Then he added, **وان فيما احل الله لسعة عما ذكرت**[4] **“**What Allih has declared as being lawful are more than what you are speaking about.”

When he was killed by a group of rioters, Yaz¢d Ibn Wal¢d who was also called Yaz¢d III came to power.

Ayy£b Sukhtiyin¢, who knew Qur’in by heart said, “I wish our caliph were alive”.

---

[1]. al-Aghin¢, vol.VII, p. 2

[2]. al-Aghin¢, vol.VII, p. 72, see, 74

[3]. Ibid. p.73

[4]. al-Aghin¢. vol.VII,. 80

The narrator said, “He said this because he was afraid of being killed”.[5]

Later on, Rashd and his son Mahd ‘Abbis, recalled Wal d a good man and cursed his murderer, Yazd.[2]

Yazd Ibn Wald’s Riot

It was said that Yazd Ibn Wald, Yazd III, was similar to ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azz in behavior. He, along with some of the Umayyads and renowned figures of Damascus managed to resist Wald and finally killed him in Djamid al-Thin, 126 (A.H.). He was the first Umayyads caliph who was killed in such a way that all people knew about it.

What distinguished him from other Umayyads caliphs was that he was among the Qadarites.[3] This term, according to the traditionists, is referred to the Mu‘tazilites. They were of the opinion that human beings have free will. The Mu‘tazilites were at odds with the traditionists since they were rationalists while the traditionists were superficial. Because of their influence on the Umayyads, the traditionists provoked them to suppress the Mu‘tazilites, the Murdji‘ites and the Djahmites. The formation of the Qadarites in Damascus goes back to the time of Hishim Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik. Ghaylin Dimashq, the founder of this sect in Damascus,[4] was killed in 119 by Hishim ‘Abd al-Malik.[5] Ghaylin was linked to the Murdji‘ites too.[6] There were others among the Murdji‘ites in Damascus too. ±abar had quoted ‘Amr Ibn Shari¦l, who was himself among them, as saying, “In 126 some individuals interceded them with Wald but he praised Hishim’s actions in killing or exiling the Qadarites.[7] In contrast with Hishim and Wald, Yazd Ibn Wald was more inclined towards the Qadarites. According to Shifi‘, he had gathered some of them around himself. The companions of Ghaylin Dimashq were also among them.[8] Ab£ Bakr

[5]. Ibid. p. 82

[2]. al-Aghin, p. 83

[3]. Tirkh al-ya‘q£b, vol.II, p. 336; Tirkh al-§abar, vol.V, p. 581; Tir khGudh dih, p. 287

[4]. al-Firaq Bayn al-firaq, p.117; al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.I, p. 51

[5]. Tirkh al-§abar, vol.V, p.516

[6]. al-firaq Bayn al-firaq, p.205

[7]. Tirkh al-§abar, vol.V, p. 539

[8]. Tirkh al-khulafi’, p. 253; Siyar a‘lim al-nubali’, vol.V, p. 376

Khiwrazm¢ in one of his letters had written that he backed the companions of Ghaylin.[1] Mas‘£d¢ also said that he was a Mu‘tazilites and like them believed in the five principles of them.[2] At that time, however, some of the Mu‘tazilites believed in those five principles completely. They, according to Mas‘£d¢, resided in other areas of Damascus namely “Diriyya and al-Mizza”. He also said that they helped Yaz¢d once they saw that Wal¢d was a sinner.[3] Since Yaz¢d Ibn Wal ¢d was inclined toward the Mu‘tazilites, his status in comparison with that of ‘Umar Ibn Abd al-‘Az¢z was very high in their esteem.[4]

It should be noted that the traditionists during the second and third centuries were not rationalists at all. They only took into account the surface meaning of both Qur’in verses and traditions which were mostly fabricated ones. They believed in anthropomorphism. To oppose them, the Mu‘tazilites emphasized the role of intellect. The first trend prevailed among the traditionists such as Zuhr¢, Abu l-Zanid, Radji’ Ibn °aywa who were linked to the Umayyads. The other one as a result opposed the Umayyads. Accordingly, they were attentive to the role of intellect in contrast with those who were attentive to the traditions that were written long ago and were mostly forged ones. These groups were also experts in political affairs so they were opposing the Umayyads both because of their religious and political approaches. As it was touched upon before, Ghaylin Dimashq¢, who was killed in 119 by Hishim, and Dja‘d Ibn Dirham, who was sent to Khilid Ibn ‘Abd Allih Qasr¢ by Hishim, were also among them. The latter was killed by Khilid in the feast of sacrifice.[5] Since Dja‘d Ibn Dirham was one of the scholars of Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad, the last caliph of the Umayyads, he was also called Marwin Dja‘d¢.[6] He was later on killed because he was at odds with the traditionists. He opposed anthropomorphism, which was prevailed among

---

[1]. See, Tir¢kh al-djahmiyya wa l-mu‘tazila, p. 70 from Ab£ Bakr Khirazm¢

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 221

[3]. Ibid. vol.III, p. 226. Because the residents of Mizza had paid allegiance to Wal¢d before his death; al-Aghin¢, vol.VII, p. 75

[4]. Siyar a‘lim al-nubali’, vol.V, p. 376

[5]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 433

[6]. Ma’ithir al-inifa, vol.I, p. 163; Nudj£m al-zihira, vol.I, p. 322

the Muslims by Jews. According to Shahristin¢, this was a belief of a Jewish sect called the Readers. In Torah, also there were some words about anthropomorphism.[1] The same statement was also said by Ibn Khald£n.[2] Dja'd Ibn Dirham could stand individuals such as Wahb Ibn Munabba and others who were Jewish. Wahb said to him, "Allih Himself said that He has hands and eyes, so we believe what he had said".[3] Ibn Kuthayyir said, "His beliefs were identical to those of Lubayd Ibn al-A'tham.[4] This statement according to some researchers was not true. He was said to have such beliefs since he opposed the Jews.[5]

Djahm Ibn ¯afwin who was said to have, the same beliefs as Dja'd Ibn Dirham had also taken the same stance as him. He stood up to Muqitil Ibn Sulaymin, who believed in anthropomorphism.[6] These people were killed not merely because of religious reseasons but because they opposed the Umayyads. To bring an example, we can refer to the companions of Ghaylin Dimashq¢ who cooperated with Yaz ¢d Ibn Wal¢d. As it was said Djahm Ibn ¯afwin had joined °irith Ibn Suraydj and was killed in his uprising. According to Qisim¢, **Dj**ahm was killed not because of his religious beliefs, as it was said by some,[7] but because of political reasons.[8] It is quite obvious that the traditionists were dominant during the Umayyads's time. Based on legal decision, the name of those being killed by the Umayyads should not be divulged.

Yaz¢d Ibn Wal¢d in his revolt against Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d wanted to carry out some reforms. In his first sermon he said, "We did not rise up for this worldly life to assert dominance over others rather for Allih's sake. We ask all to obey both Qur'in and Prophet's Sunna since the religious edicts have become outmoded, piety has been disregarded

---

[1]. al-Milal wa l-ni¦al, vol.I, p. 93; see also, p. 106

[2]. Maqdamat Ibn Khald£n, p. 415; see Bu¦£th ma'a Ahl al-Sunna wa l-sulafiyya, pp. 76-91

[3]. Siyar a'lim al-nubali', vol.V, p. 433

[4]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.X, p. 19

[5]. See, Siyar a'lim al-nubali', vol.V, p. 432 (footnote)

[6]. Ibid. vol.VI, p. 27

[7]. Ibid. vol.VI, p. 27

[8]. Tir¢kh al-djahmiyya wa l-mu'tazila, p.16

and the unlawful turned to be lawful. He also said, “The Sunna has changed and there are obvious innovations”.

Referring to social justice, he said that he wanted to carry out some financial reform to, **حتى تستقيم المعيشة بين المسلمين وتكونوا فيه سواء “**When Muslims live in parity enable all to take advantage of equal rights.” He also added, “You can pay allegiance to me based on what I told you. If I break my promise, you can do whatever you want to and if you could find someone more effective than I am, I myself will be the first one to pay allegiance to him.[1] When he nominated Man¥£r Ibn Djumh£r as the governor of Iraq, he ordered him not to be as Wal¢d since he was killed because of his cruelties towards people.[2]

Yaz¢d’s intention, as he himself said, was not just ruling. He had this sentence written and hung from a post, **انا ندعوكم الى كتاب الله وسنّه نبيه صلي الله عليه وآله وسلم وأن يصير الأمر شورى “**I ask you to obey Qur’in and Prophet’s Sunna. I also want to solve the problem of ruling by counseling [3]

He also asked the residents of °im¥ who wanted to rise up against him in revenge for Wal¢d’s death. **ولكنّه يدعوهم الى شورى**[4] I want you to take advantage of counseling.

It should also be mentioned that even before Wal¢d’s death, the residents of Damascus had paid allegiance to him.[5]

Yaz¢d III was called “Imperfect” since he had cut the share of those who had greater share in public treasury during Wal¢d’s time.[6] For the reason, he ruled just for six months. It seems that he could not put his plan into practice. However, he was somehow successful based on what he was saying and doing in this regard. From among his financial reforms, the issue of taking tribute from those who had recently embraced Islam during ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z’s time can be taken into account. He also had taken into

---

[1]. al-akhbir, vol.II, p. 249; al-bayin wa l-taby¢n, vol.II, p. 70

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 576

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 553

[4]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 565

[5]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 545

[6]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p. 335

account problems of those who were to send to exile merely because they were asked to pay tribute beyond their means. In this regard, he said, **ولا أحمل على جزيتكم ما اجليهم به عن بلادهم واقطع به نسلهم "**I will not ask people to pay tribute beyond their means so that I prevent them from leaving their home and become extinct."[1]

He also ordered °irith Ibn Surayḏj to return from the Turkish land to his home. He had risen up against the Umayyads for the same reasons that Yaz¢d had so he accepted to return home. However, when Yaz¢d was killed, everything returned to its former state. He was killed too.[2] After six months of his ruling, Yaz¢d died in 126. According to ±abar¢, before his death, the Qadarites were repeatedly asking him to select a successor for himself. He asked others to pay allegiance to his brother, Ibrih¢m, and 'Abd al-'Az¢z Ibn °aḏjḏjiḏj Ibn 'Abd al-Malik.[3]

THE IMPACTS OF WAL¢D'S DEATH ON THE UMAYYADS AND THEIR FALL

From 41(A.H.) up to the time when Yaz¢d Ibn Wal¢d came to power, the Umayyads have been weakened twice. The first time was in 64 after the death of Mu'iwiya II when it was intended to transfer power from the Sufyinids branch of the Umayyads to Marwinids having some clashes in Iraq and Damascus, the Umayyads managed to stay in power. Thereafter, the caliphs came to power one by one without any problem. It means that the caliphs who ruled never dismissed their heir apparents who were most of the time their brothers. Even if the caliphs sometimes bothered them. It was believed that they would never dismiss them since they had paid allegiance to them. When, for example, Yaz¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik who had chosen his brother Hishim as his successor, became regretful from doing so, then other people such as Khilid Ibn 'Abd Allih disapproved of what he wanted to do. He said to Yaz¢d, "What you want to do will sow the seed of discord between you. So people will criticize you." Yaz¢d accepted what he said[4].

[1]. 'Uy£n al-akhbir, vol.II, p. 249

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 592, 591

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 593

[4]. Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, vol.II, p. 314

Some of the caliphs such as ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z, however, did not choose either their brothers or their sons as their successors. One of the main reasons for the Umayyads to stay in power was that they respected those principles regarding paying allegiance. As long as they themselves were loyal to those principles, there was no problem and people obeyidg them too. That was why the Umayyads could suppress even the most serious riots. When Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d was killed and Yaz¢d III came to power, most of the Umayyads wanted to take his position without considering the issue of allegiance. Upon hearing that Yaz¢d Ibn Wal¢d wanted to breach allegiance before Wal¢d’s death, Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad wrote a letter to Sa‘¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, who was probably a renowned figure of the Umayyads dynasty, saying, “Do not let them breach allegiance”. He also added, “I have heard that some stupid men among the Umayyads want to breach allegiance. By their actions, there will be opened a gate which would not be closed even by Allih unless much blood be shed.[1]

Marwin knew if he breached allegiance, he would sow the seed of discord. Previously, Yaz¢d Ibn Wal¢d had consulted with ‘Abbis Ibn Wal¢d who, according to I¥fahin¢, was honest just the same as ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z. He then prevented him from doing so too.[2] After securing allegiance, he said, **هلك والله بنو مروان**[3] **“**By God, the Marwinids came to be murdered.”

Once Yaz¢d came to power, according to Ya‘q£b¢, the country was in a state of turbulence. ‘Abbis Ibn Wal¢d in °im¥, Bishr Ibn Wal¢d in Qinnasr¢n, ‘Umar Ibn Wal¢d in Jordan and Yaz¢d Ibn Sulaymin in Palestine revolted against him. Ya‘q£b¢ went on to say, “During a five-month-caliphate of him nearly all countries of the world were in a state of turbulence. The Egyptians killed their ruler, °af¥ Ibn Wal¢d. The residents of Humas killed ‘Abd Allih Ibn Shadjara and the people of Medina removed their governor, ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z Ibn ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z, from office.[4]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 455; see also p.581

[2]. al-Aghin¢, vol.VII, p. 73

[3]. Ibid. vol.VII, p. 79

[4]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p. 35

That was why the issue of succession, allegiance and absolute obedience all lost their significance among Arabs. They revolted against one another, as a result, respecting caliphate, something which was very important before was no longer important. This matter was so significant for them that Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d in his letter, had reminded people to select the successors of his sons °akam 'Uthmin.[1]

In Armenia, Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad rose up against Yaz¢d III to avenge for Wal¢d's murder. He headed for Iraq to remove Yaz¢d from office, but on his way to °arrin he compromised with him on condition that he surrender Armenia, M£¥il, Djaz¢ra and ªdharbiydjin to him.[2]

Ibrih¢m Ibn Wal¢d came to power after Yaz¢d. The Umayyads caliphate was so weakened that he was called "Am¢r"(commander) not caliph.[3] This term was used for the independent governors who were ruling only during the time of transfering power. They wee neither caliphs nor were chosen by a caliph.

Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad who understood that it was the right moment to improve the situation, headed for Damascus. He could defeat their army in ¯afar, 127. He asked others to pay allegiance to °akam and 'Uthmin, Wal ¢d's successors. Knowing that both of them were killed in prison, then people paid allegiance to Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad. To justify their action then, people said that both °akam and 'Uthmin had selected him as their successor and this was alluded in their poems that was composed in prison. So the last caliph of the Umayyads came to power.

MARWªN IBN MU°AMMAD AND THE DECLINE OF THE UMAYYADS

Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad was the last caliph of the Umayyads. He left Armenia and went to Damascus to prevent the Umayyads from overthrowing. He came to power by deposing Ibrih¢m. He had many problems one of which was a riot in °im¥. ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays, one of the leaders

---

[1]. ±ir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 529-532

[2]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 595

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, p.596; Siyar a'lim al-nubali', p. 377; Ma'ithir al-inifa, vol.I, p. 161

of the Khiridjites, was a troublemaker for him. Sulaymin Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Hishim in Iraq and Thibit Ibn Na‘¢m Djudhim¢ in Jordan revolted aginst him. Marwin could suppress those riots then he nominated ‘Amr Ibn Hubayra Fazir¢ as Iraq’s governor. He killed ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays so he had everything under his control. The Khiridjites who were from Yemen were so powerful that they could participate in °adjdj pilgrimage openly. Ab£ °amza Mukhtir Ibn ‘Awf was one of them who managed to have Medina in his control in ¯afar, 130 (A.H.) He was among the Abi¤iyya. ‘Abd Allih Ibn Ya¦yi Kind¢ who had called himself ±ilib al-°aqq (the seeker of the truth). He said that he was the Commander of the Faithful. He was among the Abi¤iyya. In Medina Ab£ °amza preached a sermon in a literary style that is very famous. The residents of Medina, as Ya‘q£b¢ said, said their prayer under the leadership of him. They were so proud of themselves that they decided to attack Damascus. But the Umayyads army defeated them. When they returned to Medina their residents rose up against them. So they escaped to Yemen.

The city of Khurisin was in a state of chaos too. Kirmin¢ advanced but, according to Ya‘q£b¢, Ab£ Muslim was more successful than him.

He quoted Ab£ Muslim as saying, “O, Allih, I help both Na¥r and I Kirmin¢, not to defeat each other”.[1] Ab£ Muslim defeated Na¥r and died when he wanted to escape to Siwi. Ab£ Muslim then entered Niyshib£r in Rama¤in, 130. He selected some governors for various districts of Khurisin. The army of Khurisin under the leadership of Qu¦§aba and his son turned toward west and could defeat those armies that were behind the Umayyads. In Mu¦arram, 132, this army defeated Ibn Hubayra in Iraq. The he escaped to West. Qu¦§aba once again defeated him and he was drowned in the Euphrates. So the Umayyads were doomed to decline. When Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad heard the army of Khurisin had defeated the army of Iraq without having commander, he said, “I swear by Allih that everything is over. Who has ever heard that a dead body be able to defeat someone who is alive?”

Ab£ Salama Khallil in Iraq, asked people to pay allegiance to the ‘Abbisids, once the Umayyads were dethroned, he

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p. 341

sent Abu l-'Abbis to K£fa and after a while, asked people to pay allegiance to him. Later on, he was told to bring the 'Alawites to power so he was killed at Ab£ Muslim's behest. Saffi¦ sent his uncle, 'Abd Allih Ibn 'Al¢ to Damascus to fight against the Umayyads and kill Marwin. In Dh¢ al-°adjdja, 132 Marwin was killed in a battlefront. It caused the downfall the Umayyads all over the east except Andalusia. According to Mas'£d¢, they ruled for nearly ninety years and eleven months and thirteen days that is nearly about a thousand months.[1]

Different aspects of the Umayyads's decline were taken into account previously.[2] To elaborate them in detail philosophical discussions about history are needed. Historians do not discuss about them. In philosophical and ideological discussion, individuals can not overlook their personal attitudes so they might manipulate the historical accounts. It should be mentioned that prior to the overthrowing of the Umayyads, no one had spoken about their decline since it was not obvious whether they could solve their problems or not. But after it, the issue of their decline came to be discussed.

Some points regarding the Umayyads should be taken into account one of which is their party demorality over which the Umayyads laid the foundation of their political power. This was closely related to the superiority of a specific tribe of Quraysh, which was called the Umayyads. They were supported by the residents of Damascus in the northern part of the °idjiz. The skirmish between the tribes of northern and southern was almost always troublesome. During the very last years of their ruling, their hostility peaked such that it was not possible for them to improve the condition of some cities especially Khurisin. There were also some other clashes throughout Arabic land mainly in Iraq and Iran, the residing places of most of the immigrant Arabs. In Iraq, the northern tribe and southern one were at odds with each other. During Khilid Ibn 'Abd Allih Qasr¢'s time, Arabs residing in the north that were called the Mu¤rites were not satisfied with him since he was living in the south.

---

[1]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 234

[2]. Mu¦ammad Ki¨im Khidjawiyin has listed different attitudes of this kind in an article of the magazine of Mashhad's Faculty of Literature year, 19. pp. 503-530.

When Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar came to power, the opposite thing happened. He killed Khilid and the condition was worse. Y£suf Ibn ‘Umar then was sent to prison and killed by Yaz¢d Ibn Khilid Ibn ‘Abd Allih.[1] Tribal clashes, according to Mas‘£d ¢, were the main reason of the Umayyads’s overthrowing, he also said that Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad protected the Nazirites against the residents of Yemen. His action then made the residents of Yemen support his opponents from the Hishimites.[2]

There were more problems in Khurisin. This city was an escape route years before the Umayyads’s overthrowing for Iraqi rebels. °irith Ibn Surayd doubled the problem of that city. Constant clashes between Arabs and the residents of Transoxania had weakened Arabs there. This city also tackled a problem for decades that was °adjdjidj’s cruelties to the newly embraced Muslims and taking tribute from them. In that condition, the skirmish between the northern and southern Arabs threatened the Umayyads. Na¥r Ibn Sayyir backed the Nazirites and Djuday‘ Ibn ‘Al¢ Kirmin¢ supported northern Arabs and the residents of Yemen. Their skirmish was advantageous to the opponents of the Umayyads. Ab£ Muslim Khurisin¢ could take advantage of the positive attitude of the residents of Khurisin towards Shi‘ism while he had asked the ‘Abbisids for their support. He was also a good commander. The above-mentioned points altogether had paved the ground for a radical change in Khurisin. Khurisin was far from the capital so the Umayyads could not easily reach there. It also should be mentioned that the army of Damascus could not help Na¥r Ibn Sayyir since it was, fighting against the Khiridjites in Iraq. The Khiridjites took advantage of the clashes happening from 126 to 127. ®a¦¦ik Ibn Qays was among them who was at odds with Marwin Ibn Mu¦ammad for a long time. He was killed in 127. The Khiridjites who were in Iraq and south of Iran were great threat to the Umayyads too. The victory of the ‘Abbisids in Khurisin was the main reason of the Umayyads’s decline. It was not obvious why the ‘Abbisids not others could take the place of the Umayyads. This has its own reasons related to their approaches not to the decline of the Umayyads, since the Hishimites were far

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p. 338

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 232

better than the Umayyads in ruling, they could easily depose them. If they have not had this power, no one could ever imagine that they would be able to remove Quraysh from the scene. This tribe was so powerful that could survive even after the overthrowing of the ‘Abbisids by Mongols.

The Umayyads’s fall was somehow because of their internal clashes too. The internal clashes, as it said earlier, had paved the ground for both the caliphs and their heirs apparent who were almost more than two persons from the time of ‘Abd al-Malik onward and they were plotting against each other. The riot of Yaz¢d III also a threat to their influence. Killing those who were supposed to come to power from 126 to 127 reminds us of the Sassanids’s kings during the very last years of their rules.

The Umayyads was not held in high esteem by people because of their lack of attention to religion in spite of the efforts being made by ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z and Hishim. Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d, on the other hand, made the condition worse with his corruption and cruelties in ruling. In historical sources, there is more information in this regard. Some of these historical accounts, however, have been manipulated, for the writers of them were either inclined toward the ‘Abbisids or other sects.

Another reason for the residents of Iraq and Khurisin to revolt against the Umayyads was that they were under their domination both politically and economically. The Umayyads were accused of being prejudiced toward the Mawil¢s. Non-Arabs, as it was said, had some influence on the Umayyads but it was not such that to let them progress.

POLITICAL VIEWS OF THE MARWªNIDS

It is certain that some issues such as people’s right to decide on a way a caliph should be chosen, to reject or accept him as well as some other matters were the bases of political system of the Sunnis. In addition, the political stance of both ¯a¦iba (The Companions of the Prophet) and Tibi‘¢n (The followers of ¯a¦iba) during the first century should be taken into account in this regard. However, other events taking place thereafter during other centuries were also important in the formation of their policy. But those principles which were written by Miward¢ (450 AD) and Ab£

Ya‘li (458 AD) under the title of al-A¦kim al-Sultaniyya during the fifth century were mostly emanating from the political developments of the 1st century. To emphasize some of the ordinances, some of political developments of the second century were also mentioned there. For instance, whatsoever both ¯a¦iba and Tibi‘¢n did or what the others were doing in their presence without their objection were regarded as a “Divine Decree” which should be obeyed by others too.

Miward¢ said, “If what Sulaymin had done is not proof endorsing both the scholars from Tibi‘¢n contemporary with him and those who do not fear for Allih’s sake will be proof”.[1]

This attitude had emanated from the above-mentioned principle of the Sunnis regarding “Divine Decree.”

The formation of the political system of the Sunnis and some other sects was discussed in detail formerly. Now what had happened in this regard during the period of the Marwin ¢ds is to be discussed.

There has been a significant change in the concept of caliphate particularly during the Marwinids. The more the caliphs were separated from the religion, the more the concept of caliphate was held in high regard with the intention of deceiving people. At first, the meaning of caliphate in its political sense was equal to the succession of the Holy prophet. Ab£ Bakr was not pleased to call such a person “Allih’s Viceroy”.[2] But later on, gradually this term came to be used both in poems and sermons. Accordingly, caliphs were honored more and some sort of fatalism prevailed regarding caliphate. The ground has been paved much more during the Marwinids than in time of ‘U**th**min and Mu‘iwiya. The poets of that time used some terms in reference to the Marwin¢ds’s caliphs such as, **خليفة الله من الارض، الاميـن المـأمون، امـام المسـلمين، اميـن اللـه، امـام الاسلام، جنه الدين، الخليفه المبارك، راعـي اللـه فـي الارض، الامام المصطفي، ولـيّ الحـق، الامـام العـادل، ولـي عهـدالله ،امام الهدي، الامام المبـارك ، امـام العـدل، الامـام المنصـور،**

[1]. Miward¢, al-a¦kim al-sul§iniyya, p.13 (Sulaymin Ibn ‘Abd al-malik is regarded here).

[2]. Musnad A¦mad, vol.I, pp. 10-11

خيـارالله للنـاس، الحكـم المصـفي، امـام الـوري، ربّ الجنـود، خليفه الحق، الخليفه الافضل، الملك المبارك[1]

Allih's Viceroy, trustee and trusted, Muslims' leader, religion's shield, auspicious caliph, public leader on behalf of God, selected Imim, guardian of the Truth, just Imim, Allih's heir apparent, Imim of guidance, auspicious Imim, leader led by God, selected ruler,supreme chief of council, forerunner of troops, truthful caliph, superior caliph and auspicious ruler, ...

The poets played a significant role in making these terms known to the public. Taking into account the fact that their poets were important to Arabs, one can understand the impact of using such terms by them.[2] One of the Umayyads peoms, Akh§al by referring to 'Abd al-Malik said,

وقـد جعـل الله الخلافـة فيكـم بابيـض لا عاري الخوان ولا جدب

ولكـن رآه الله مـوضع حقـهّا على رغم اعداء وصدّادة كـذب[3]

Thou art Allih's successor, someone who is merciful and has a shining face. Despite what your enemies desired Allih saw thee as the mere truth

By referring to Bishr Ibn Marwin, he said,

اعطاكم الله ما انتم أحق به اذا الملوك على امثاله اقترعوا[4]

Allih has bestowed thee something that Thou deserve while all other kings have something (which they do not deserve)

---

[1]. al-umaw¢yy£n wa l-khilifa, pp. 19-21

[2]. Farazdaq was among those poets. Despite his well-known poem in praising Imim Sadjdjid, he had composed many verses in praising both the Umayyads's rulers and their relatives. By taking a glance at his poems, one can understand his great rule in the Umayyads stabilization. There are many verses in sanctifying the Umayyads caliphs in his D¢win. See, D¢win Farazdaq, vol.I, pp. 261-268. There are some verses in praising Sulaymin Ibn 'Abd al-malik. Some of his poems regarding the stabilization of the Umayyads were mentioned before.

[3]. D¢win Akh§al pp.21-24; al-umaw¢yy£n wa l-khilifa, p. 30

[4]. D¢win Akh§al p.37; al-umaw¢yy£n wa l-khilifa, p. 30

By referring to ‘Abd al-Malik, Djar¢r said,

الله طوّقك الخلافة والهدي والله ليس لما قضي تبديـل

وليّ الخلافة والكرامة أهلها فالملك أفيح والعطاء جزيل[1]

Thou have been appointed as Allih’s vicegerent. What He had decided upon could not be changed. Allih has given caliphate and greatness to someone who deserves it. That is why thy kingdom is so vast and Thou art so generous

Somewhere else to stress the caliphate of ‘Abd al-Ra¦min as a “Divine Decree” he said,

انت الامين امين الله لاسرف فيمـا وليـت ولا هيّابـه ورع

انت المبارك يهدي الله شيعته اذا تفرقـّت الاهـواء والشيّـع

يا آل مروان ان الله فضلكم فضلاً عظيماً على من دينه البدع[2]

Thou art Allih’s trustee, someone who does not waste what has been given, someone who is fearless. Thou art the source of blessings. Whenever different parties go astray, Allih will guide His followers. O the Marwinids! Allih has regarded Thee.

He also composed,

والله قدّر ان تكون خليفة خير البرّية وارتضاك المرتضى[3]

Allih had chosen thee as His viceroy. Thou are the right man for this

Farazdaq said about ‘Abd al-Malik,

فالارض لله ولاها خليفته وصاحب الله فيها غير مغلـوب[4]

---

[1]. D¢win Djar¢r, vol.I, p.95; al-umaw¢yy£n wa l-khilifa

[2]. D¢win Djar¢r, vol.I, p.295

[3]. Ibid. vol.II, p. 620

[4]. D¢win Farazdaq, vol.I, p.24

The owner of this land is Allih and thou art as His vicegerent. The owner of Allih's land would not be defeated there

By referring to Wal¢d Farazdaq said,

امّا وليد فانّ الله اورثه بعلمه فيه ملكاً ثابت الدُّعم[1]

As for Wal¢d, with the knowledge of God, he was granted a firm monarchy

By referring to Sulaymin Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, he said,

به أمّن الله البلاد، فساكن بكلّ طريد ليلها ونهارها

Allih selected thee as a peacemaker so a traveller can go whenever he wants to no matter whether it is day or night

'Ad¢ Ibn Riqi' regarding Wal¢d said,

انّ الوليد اميرالمومنين له ملك عليه اعان الله فارتفعا[2]

Wal¢d, the Commander of the Faithful, is a king. Allih assists him in his ruling, so he has been dignified by Allih

A¦wa¥ composed this verse about Wal¢d,

تخّيره ربّ العباد لخلقه وليّاً وكان الله بالنّاس اعلما[3]

The Lord of the world had nominated him as His guardian. Taking into account that Allih is wiser than people

He said about Sulaymin Ibn 'Abd al-Malik,

سليمان اذ ولاك ربّك حكمنا وسلطاناً فاحكم اذا قلت واعدل[4]

O Sulaymin! Since thou have been chosen by Allih as our king, tell the truth and be just whenever thou want to judge

Farazdaq composed this verse about Sulaymin,

فقال الله اتّك انت اعلي من المتلمسين لك الخبالا

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.II, p. 210

[2]. al-Aghin¢, vol.I, p. 299

[3]. Shi'r al-a¦wa¥, p. 193

[4]. Ibid. p. 173

فأعطاك الخلافه غيرغصب ولم تركب
لتغصبها قبالا[1]

Then Allih said, “Thou art far better than those who want to enervate thee-so thou deserve to be appointed as His viceroy. Thou did not roll thy sleeves to usurp it”

Djar¢r composed these verses about Yaz¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik

اما يزيـد فـانّ الله فهّمه حكماً واعطاه ملكاً
واضح النور

يكفي الخليفه انّ الله فضّله عزم وثيق وعند غير
تقريـر[2]

Allih has given Yaz¢d wisdom. Thou art as the source of light. Allih has given thee priority over others in will and it suffices thee

Djar¢r Ibn Ayy£b, Sulaymin ‘Abd al-Malik’s son said,

الله اعطاكم من علمه بكم حكماً وما بعد حكم الله
تعقيب[3]

Since Allih knew thee, He had appointed thee as the ruler, no one is permitted to disobey Allih’s decree

He also said to ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z,

انّ الذي بعث النّبي محمدا جعل الخلافه في الامام
العادل[4]

The one who selected Mu¦ammad as His prophet will, Farazdaq said to Yaz¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik,

اعطي بن عاتكة الذي ما فوقه غيرالنبوه والجلال
الاجلل

سلطانه وعصا النبي وخاتمـا القي اله بجرانه
والكلكل[5]

---

[1]. D¢win Farazdaq, vol.II, p.100

[2]. D¢win Djar¢r, vol.I, p.145; Regarding the poets of these verses, see al-umaw¢yy£n wa l-khilifa, p. 31-35

[3]. D¢win Djar¢r, vol.I, p.349

[4]. D¢win Djar¢r, vol.II, p. 737

Allih bestowed something to son of ‘ªtika. Nothing is greater than it except the Prophethood and monotheism. Allih had given him both the stick and the ring.

These verses quoted by ‘A§win were composed by Farazdaq and Djar¢r and others. There are many verses in this regard in D¢win[1] Farazdaq.

The residents of Damascus also honored caliphate from the time of Mu‘iwiya onward.[2] During Ayyim al-Muwidi‘a the years that the resid ents of Damascus were going to Mecca for pilgrimage while they were under the domination of Ibn Zubayr, ‘Ubayd Ibn ‘Umayr, the story-teller, backbited their caliph. They said to him,”O the pious man! Retract what you said and do not backbite Allih’s Viceroy since he should be honored even more than Ka‘ba.[3]

°adjdjidj himself followed the same policy in Iraq. He told °asan Muthanni, “O °asan! You have to remind him as a good man. He is Allih’s vicegerent on earth.[4] In his first speech in K£fa he said, **ان اميرالمؤمنين عبدالملك بن مروان استخلفه الله عزوجل في بلاده وارتضاه اماماً علي عباده**[5] **“**Almighty God placed Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n, ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwin, His Viceroy as well as His servants’ leader.”

°adjdjidj in his letter to ‘Abd al-Malik by referring to him said, “You are the Commander of the Faithful and Allih’s Viceroy. You are infallible both in speech and in practice. You

---

[5]. D¢win Farazdaq, vol.II, p.125; al-umaw¢yy£n wa l-khilifa, p. 36. The second line is about camels. They put their bellies and necks on the ground as a sign of obedience.

[1]. Quoted from Dawlat wa ¦uk£mat dar Islim "Government and Ruling in Islam" written by Lambton, p. 110, vol.III. Montigomeri Watt also had quoted some verses regarding the meaning of the time, Allih’s Viceroy during the Umayyads’s time. See Watt, God’s caliph, Qur’inic Interpretations and Umayyads claims in Iran and Islam, Edinburgh, 1971, pp.571-572, see also. Watt. Islamic Political Thought, Edinburgh, pp. 33, 137, No.5, see also, Khal¢fa wa Sul§in, pp. 16-17.

[2]. Prior to this °assin Ibn Thibit had used the term "Allih’s viceroy" in his poem written in 36 about ‘Uthmin. D¢win °assin Ibn Thibit, p.96, quoted from Government and Ruling in Islam, p.110. the third part of the footnote No.7.

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, vol.IV, p. 345

[4]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.VI, p. 222

[5]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, p. 40

have been nominated as his guardian.[1] Fi§ima, the daughter of ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z said, after coming to power my father has not washed his body when sever he was defiled.[2] The residents of Damascus were of the opinion that obeying him was equal to obeying Allih. They did not believe that he should obey Allih.

Then they got angry and said,”You are disobeying the Commander of the Faithful. He could get rid of him very hard.[3] °adjdjidj wanted to treat the residents of Iraq in the same way.

He was told to say, “Do you believe that Allih does not reveal to me. O people of Iraq! I do swear by him that he still does so”.[4]

He was also told to say, “Which one is superior a Messenger or a vicegerent?” Probably he wanted to say that he as Allih’s viceroy was superior to Allih’s Prophet.[5] It should be mentioned that it is not certain whether these narrations are true or not. Mas‘£d¢ attributed the very same statement to Khilid Ibn ‘Abd Allih Qasr¢, the governor of Mecca in 89 AH. According to him, he compared Wal¢d with Ibrih¢m (a). He said, “When Ibrih¢m asked Allih for water, he sent him salty water while upon Wal¢d’s request, he sent fresh water to him.[6] ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z was of the opinion that not only Sulaymin was nominated by Allih but he himself was as Allih’s Viceroy too.[7] ‘Amr Ibn Hubayra Fazir¢, Yaz¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik’s agent in Iran and Khurisin, regarding Yaz¢d told °asan Ba¥r¢ and others,”Yaz¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik is Allih’s Viceroy among people.”[8] Accordingly, they tried to say that Allih had helped them to defeat all of their enemies such as the Zaydids and the Shi‘ite Muslims,

---

[1]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p. 25; al-Shuwri fi l-’A¥r al-umaw¢, p. 35

[2]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi’, p. 235

[3]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.VI, p. 76

[4]. Ibid. vol.VI, p. 214

[5]. Ibid. vol.VI, p. 214; See al-Nizi‘ wa l-takhi¥um, p. 69; al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya vol.IX, p. 136; al-Na¥i’i¦ al-kifiya li man Yatawalli Mu‘iwiya, p. 31; Wafayit al-a‘yin, vol.I2, p. 228

[6]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.III, p. 147

[7]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, p. 567; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p. 60; al-Shuwri fi l-’A¥r al-umaw¢, p. 35

[8]. Mur£dj l-Dhahab, vol.III, p. 212; al-Shuwri fi l-’a¥r al-umaw¢, p. 35

the Khiridjites as well as individuals such as ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Ash‘ath and Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab. For these reasons, he wanted to prove that the Umayyads were not only legitimate but also invincible.[1]

The holiness of the Umayyads strengthened by attributing Mahdawism to their caliphs. This term was first likely to be used by Allih’s prophet in his speeches. It was also said that Mukhtir Ibn Ab¢ ‘Ubayd had used this word in his letter to Mu¦ammad Ibn °anafiyya. He had written, **للمهدي محمد بن علي من المختار بن ابي عبيد؛ سلام عليك يا ايها المهدي**[2] **“**From Mukhtir Ibn Ab¢ ‘Ubayd to Mu¦ammad Ibn ‘Al¢ Ibn Mukhtir. Peace be upon you. O Mahd¢!”

Probably, they wanted to emphasize on their role in leading by using this word, but overemphasizing it would decrease its probability. Mudjihid was quoted as saying, (probably these narration’s were attributed to them), “You would call Mu‘iwiya Mahd¢ if you could see him.[3] Farazdaq by referring to Wal¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik used this term for some of the Umayyads’s caliphs.

ومن عبد شمس انت سادس ستة خلائف كانوا
منهم العمُّ والاب
هداة ومهديين عثمان منهم ومروان وابن
الابطحين المطيب[4]

Thou art the sixth caliph among the children of ‘Abd al-Shams. Some of thy forefathers such as ‘Uthmin, Marwin and Mu‘iwiya were guided by Allih and they guided others too

Farazdaq composed this verse about Sulaymin Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik,

---

[1]. Farazdaq in praising Hishim Ibn ‘Abd al-malik said (D¢win, vol.I, pp.89- 88)

ابي الله الا نصركم بجنوده وليس بمغلوب من الله صاحبه
فما قام بعد الدار قواد فتنه ليشعلها الا ومروان ضاربه
ابى الله الا ان ملككم الذى به نيت الدين الشديد نصابه

Somewhere else he composed (D¢win, vol.I, p.215)

غلبتم الناس بالحق اذا ضربوا عليهم وبضرب غير تعذير

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, p.62

[3]. Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, vol.XXV, p.53

[4]. D¢win Farazdaq, vol.I, p.80; al-umaw¢yy£n wa l-khilifa. P.22

فان امامك المهديُّ يهدي به الرحمن من خشي الضَّلالا[1]

Mahd¢ is standing before thee. He is someone who at Allih's behest can guide whosoever does not want to be led astray

He also said,

فاجاب دعوتنا وانقَذَنا بخلافة المهديِّ من ضُرِّ[2]

Allih accepted our prayers and protected us by His viceroy, Mahd¢ when we were in trouble

Djar¢r composed this verse about Sulaymin,

سليمانُ المبارك قد علِمْتُم هُوَ المهديُّ قد وضح السبيل[3]

Thou know that Sulaymin is Mahd¢, someone who guides thee

The word was attributed to 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z in some other sources as well.[4] Djar¢r composed this verse about him,

انت المبارك والمهديُّ سيرته تعصي الهوى وتقوم الليل بالسور[5]

Thou are ominous and thy conduct is just the same as that of Mahd¢. Thou art not after carnal desire. Thou spend nights by saying prayer

He also composed this verse about Hishim Ibn 'Abd al-Malik,

فقلت لها الخليفه غير شك هو المهديُّ والحكَمُ الرشيد[6]

Then I said thou art Mahd¢ without doubt. Thou art a ruler who had been guided

---

[1]. Ibid. vol.II, p.99

[2]. Ibid. vol.I, p.262

[3]. D¢win Djar¢r, vol.II, p.771

[4]. See, ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p.333; al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.IX, pp.196, 192; Shadhirit al-dhahab, vol.I, p.119; al-umaw¢yy£n wa l-khilifa, p.23; Tir¢kh al-khulafi', pp.235, 234, 233

[5]. D¢win Djar¢r, vol.I, p.416

[6]. D¢win Djar¢r. vol.I, p.228

Farazdaq said about him,

هو المالك المهديُّ والسابق الذي له اول المجد
التليد وآخره[1]

He is Mahd¢ and superior to others. Praise does solely belong to thee

Referring to these verses, one can say for sure that in addition to these verses there have been some other forged traditions in this regard which all indicate that this word was deeply rooted in Mahdawism and it did not come to common usage simply.

One of the main features of the Umayyads ruling that was mostly based on the holiness of their caliphs was that their rulers were dictators. During the times of the first caliphs, counseling was apparently important in their ruling. But later on people interfered in their ruling and by exerting influence on them they enervated rulers. Once they managed to come to power by force, they became dictators so they could suppress their opponents under the pretext of religion and policy.

Ibn ±iq§aqi described ‘Abd al-Malik Marwin by saying, “He was someone who for the first time did not let peasants speak in front of caliphs while previously they could do this.”[2]

Suy£§¢ said,”He was the first ever one forebode enjoining the good and prohibiting the evil.”[3]

In his first sermon ‘Abd al-Malik said, “You are asking others to be pious while you forget yourself. I swear by Allih that I will behead him who tells me to be pious”.[4]

By referring to those who wanted him to be the same as Muhidjir£n, he said, “Do not ask me to be the same as them since you are not following them yourself”[5].

---

[1]. D¢win Farazdaq, vol.I, p.281; al-umaw¢yy£n wal al-khilifa, p.24

[2]. al-Fakhr¢, p.122

[3]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi’, p.219

[4]. Ansib al-ashrif(manuscript) vol.I, p.1164 quoted from al-umaw ¢yy£n wa l-Khilifa, pp.120, 122; al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, vol.IV, p.522; Fawit al-wafayit, vol,II. P.404

[5]. Amil¢ Qil¢, vol.I, p.11; See also al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VIII, p.316; al-umaw¢yy£n wa l-khilifa, p.122

‘Abd al-Malik supported °adjdjidj Ibn Y£suf Thaqaf¢ who was a dictator in Iraq. What he was doing could uncover his despotic policy in ruling.Entering K£fa, °adjdjidj told people, “The caliph had given me both a lash and a sword to come to you but on my way here I missed the lash so what remained was a sword.”[1]

‘Abd al-Malik said,”He will not do either what the weak caliph (‘Uthmin) or what the flattering caliph (Mu‘iwiya) did. He will just use his sword when handling people.[2]Before his death, ‘Abd al-Malik told his son, Wal¢d, to kill those who had not paid allegiance to him.[3] Later on, Man¥£r who himself was also a dictator described ‘Abd al-Malik as being a dictator.[4]

When Mu‘iwiya Ibn Farra and °adjdjidj went to see ‘Abd al-Malik, he asked Mu‘iwiya,”What is °adjdjidj doing”?

He replied,”If I tell you the truth, you will kill me. If not, God will punish me”.

Then ‘Abd al-Malik told °adjdjidj, “Do not torture him instead exile him to Sind.”[5]

The Marwinids were well-known for being tyrannical but some of them were somehow better in this regard.

People of the Book including the Jewsh and the Christians have strong cultural influence on the credulous Muslims. This should be discussed in detail somewhere else. What is relevant to our discussion is their roles in the political developments and particularly regarding the issue of caliphate. The credulous Muslims believed that in their Books there are many predictions about them, about their caliphs, even about their names, some events of their lives as well as the sequence of them. What is to be mentioned here is just a brief account of what was happening at that time. The Umayyads caliphs tried, by making use of either what the people of the Book told to the Muslims or words they themselves put into their mouths or any other means, to pretend that their names had been written in the divine

[1]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.273

[2]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi’, p.218

[3]. Tir¢kh al-ya‘q£b¢, vol.II, p.280-281; Tir¢kh al-khulafi’, p.220

[4]. Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Shar¦ nahdj al-balighha, vol.XV, p.243; and see al-umaw¢yy£n wa l-khilifa, p.128

[5]. al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.IX, p.139

Books. This matter was of great importance concerning the legitimacy of their ruling. In addition, they could claim that such and such caliph had been chosen at Allih's behest. It is said that Mu'iwiya had coveted caliphate once 'Uthmin consulted with him and others about how to cope with his opponents. During °adjdj rite someone read this verse,

انّ الامير بعده عليٌّ و في الزبير خلف رضيٌّ

Verily 'Al¢ is Am¢r after him and Zubayr, too, is a good successor

Ka'b al-A¦bir told him,"You are telling lie. Mu'iwiya will succeed 'Uthmin". Then Mu'iwiya was informed about what he had said.

He said to Mu'iwiya,"You will come to power after 'Uthmin".

He was very pleased with what he said to him.[1] Someone whose name was Y£suf and had embraced Judism prophesied that 'Abd al-Malik would be caliph.[2] Wahb Ibn Munabba on the other hand, called 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z the guilder of the nation.[3] He, just the same as Ka'b al-A¦bir, quoted some statements from the Books of the Jews and Christians for the Muslims.

Suy£§¢ quoted 'Abd Allih, the son of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az ¢z who had encountered a monk in Djaz¢ra, as saying, "The monk sat down just next to me while he had never sitten next to anyone else."

He told me, "Do you know why I came to meet you?"

He said, "No".

The monk said, "Because of your father since (based on what was written in our books) he is one of the just Imims."

He is like Radjab among other °arim months are Dhi l-Qa'da, Dhi l-°adjdja and Mu¦arram they stand for Ab£ Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmin. Radjab is the other one that is not after

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.IV, p.343; al-Nizi' wa l-takhi¥um, p.78; Ansib al-ashrif al-djuz' al-ribi', al-Qism al-Awwal, p.495, No, 1278; al-Bad' wa l-tir¢kh, vol.V, p.208 (There, the word "Mar¤¢yy" was used instead of "Ra¤¢yy") al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh vol.III, p.123, Ka'b al-A¦bir was one of the advisors and companions of 'Uthmin; see Ansib ul Ashrif, al-ajuz' al-Ribi', al-Qism al-Awwal, p.542

[2]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi', pp.216-217

[3]. Ibid. p.233

Mu¦arram. It denotes ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z.[1] Accordingly, the name of those four caliphs-not the name of ‘Al¢-had been mentioned in the Jewish books. It was also said that ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z had told a Christian,”Who would be the next caliph, based on your books, after Sulaymin”?

“You”, he said.[2] °adjdjidj asked him about his successor.

He said,”Someone whose name is Yaz¢d will be your successor.”

°adjdjidj thought that he might be Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab so he deposed him.[3]

Khilid Ibn Rib‘¢ said,”We have founded in Torah that both the earth and the heaven will weep on ‘Umar Ibn Abd al-‘Az ¢z’s death for forty days.”[4] Mu¦ammad Ibn Ka‘b Qura¤¢ also by bringing an example from the Israelis wanted to warn all of the consequences of disobeying caliphs.[5] It was said that ‘Abd al-Malik coined dhms and D¢nirs since Khilid had told him,”O caliph! the Jewish and Christian scholars told me that according to their books whosoever among caliphs carves the name of Allih on coins, he shall be long-lived.” Thereafter, he, for the first time, minted Islamic coins.[6]

Observing these cases, the common people among the Muslims who were mostly affected by the predictions of the people of the Book justified the legitimacy of the Umayyads rulers. Referring to Ayy£b, the son of Sulaymin Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, Djar¢r who was an eminent poet of the Umayyads composed these verses,

انت الخليفه للرّحمن يعرفه اهلُ الزَّبور وفي التوراة مكتوب

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi’, p.233

[2]. al-Muwaffaqiyyit, p.352

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VI, pp.393-94

[4]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi’, p.245

[5]. Rabi‘ al-abrir, vol.II, p.843-844, see also About Mu¦ammad Ibn Ka‘b to, Qi¥¥ikhinin dar tir¢kh Islim, (Story-tellers in the History of Islam), pp.69-68

[6]. al-Nuq£d al-islim¢yya, p.11, there is much to say in this regard, see al-‘Iqd al-mun¢r f¢ mi yata‘alluq bi l-dirham wa l-danin¢r.

الله فضَّلـه والله وفَّقـَـهُ توفيق يوسف اذا وصاه
يعقوب[7]

Thou art Allih's Viceroy. The Zoroastrians know thee and thy name had been written in Torah. Allih had favored thee.Thou art just the same as Y£suf who became triumphant after his father's will, would be triumphant too

It was also said that the Umayyads caliphs were of the opinion that their names had been written in Torah. Those who were familiar with the divine Books of both the Jewish and Christians had the same opinion.

At the end, it seems appropriate to go over the treaty signed by Wal¢d Ibn Yaz¢d for the heir apparentship of his sons °akam and 'Uthmin. This treaty is a minute text which can reflect some of the formal beliefs of the government. At the outset, he elucidated prophets' mission up to the time when Allih appointed Mu¦ammad(s) as a prophet. It was after him, when his caliphs pursued his course of action. Allih's caliphs came one after the other on the basis of what Allih bestowed from the prophets' heritage and offered that caliphate. Allih destroyed everyone who took a stand against their right, and exterminated everyone who was separated from their company, and made the caliphs dominate everyone who disparage their sainthood and considered Allih's Judgment concerning them of a different kind, and made them a lesson for others. Allih treated those being out of the obedience ordered by him like this. Up to this point, the conquest of all anti-Umayyads rebellions is deemed to be a reason for the Umayyads' rightfulness.

Thereupon, for the purpose of setting forth the place of caliphate he noted the verse of human being succession and angels' objection and correlated it with caliphate by stating, "Thus, through caliphate Allih preserves whatever is on the earth and via obedience makes humans prosperous. And Allih knows that nothing is stable and strong unless Allih keeps His truth through an obedient servant, resettles His work, and hinders (the people) from disobedience, keep from unlawful matters and defends His limits. And everyone who profits by this obedience, is Allih's friend, and the obedient of His orders, and the one guided by Allih."

---

[7]. D¢win Djar¢r, vol.I, p.349

Afterwards, with further elaboration he points out the significance of obedience stating, “It is through obedience that the prosperous attain their position, and via disobedience, Allih destroy the misled, rebellious and blind ones.”

He intermingled Allih’s obedience together with that of caliphs. Afterwards he spoke of “treaty” by which he meant that very heir apparent ship. A treaty whose consolidation was inspired to caliphs by Allih, so that there would remain a hope and means of unity and intimacy amongst the people and the Satan would give up the hope of demolishing religion. This treaty is indicative of Islam integrity and is amongst Allih’s great grace the bondman has made indispensable for the servants. A matter through which Allih hampered the people from disunity, destroyed hypocrisy and kept them from any disparity. Further, there has been more explanations on the significance of “treaty”. Then he said, Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n, Commander of the Faithful, (Wal¢d) regarded nothing of much more importance than his treaty since Allih has granted caliphate, inasmuch as he knew its position in Muslims’ work and at present asks Allih to make him succeed in this work. Am¢r al-Mu’min¢n is of the belief that he ought to have two treaty in succession. Afterwards, he made reference to his two sons °akam and ‘Uthmin and appointed them to heir apparentship one after the other.[1] The most salient point of this treaty is that attending to heir apparentship has been deemed a momentous matter and a God-given gift maintaining the security and reverence of the believers’ community. This importance is to the extent that he regarded it as a taken of Islam integrity.[2] Belief in predestination and sanctifying caliphate has been repeatedly mentioned in the treaty. As it’s been pointed out, Allih’s obedience has been considered the same as caliph’s obedience, on the grounds that it was Allih who appointed

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.VII, pp.219-224 (a report like translation)

[2]. Compare with the verse, **اليوم اكملت لكم دينكم** “This day have I perfected for you, your religion” According to some traditionists and in the view of Shi‘ites Imims and Imimiyya scholars, refers to Imim ‘Al ¢ (a) Imamate. Perhaps that’s because of a sort of apposition, that they have put aside the stipulated Imamate which is indicative of religion integrity and replaced it with heirapparentship.

caliphs as His Viceroys on the earth and who inspired them with the idea of heir apparentship.

SCHOLARS SERVE ªL MARWªN

At Umayyads's era, science was confined to al-Hadith, tradition, knowledge incorporating juristic, ethical, historical and interpretative narrations. After the death of the Prophet's companions, just a few people showed some interest in science. Inasmuch as the time was not prone for such a matter; besides, Umayyads didn't show an interest in that. After a long time, it comes to the mind of some people that they collect religious narrations and accounts so that it may be safeguarded against deviation and defilement. The order to this action was issued by 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z at the beginning of the second century A.H.[1] And this very fact indicates the strong neglect of the leaders to the religious science. In Mu'iwiya times and after him, various types of heresy and deviation in religion didn't trigger any opposition. The reason behind this was that the people were not that acquainted with the religious science to resist this matter. Mu'iwiya and °adjdjidj[2] went on with their efforts to revive the wrong religious traditions founded by 'Uthmin and the others. In the meantime, on account of lack of attention to science in this era, even the people took no notice of the religious rules of which they were in the utmost need.[3] A number of traditions were in scholars' hands; however, afterwards this number reached to one million.[4] This very fact showed how the forgotten tradition of the Prophet(s) was compensated by hadith making in the next one or two centuries. Umayyads were to be blamed for this, under the auspices of whose government no attention was paid to

---

[1]. al-Mu¥annaf, 'Abd al-Razziq, vol.IX, p.221

[2]. Mur£dj al-dhahab, vol.II, p.146; al-I¤i¦, p.182

[3]. See, al-A¦kim f¢ Us£l al-a¦kim, vol.II, p.131; Na¤rat 'ªmma f¢ tir¢kh al-fiqh al-islim¢, p.10; al-imim al-Biqir (a), vol.I, pp.215-216; Dirisit wa bu¦£th f¢ l-tir¢kh wa l-islim, vol.I, p.56-57

[4]. See, Tadhkirat al-¦uffi¨, whenever confronted by a reciter, Dhahab¢ counted the number of his traditions, and in this way the number increased.

science, and they tried to lead the people to whatever path they wish through the policy of keeping them ignorant.[1]

In the meantime, most if those having acquaintance with the Islamic science get to serve al-Marwin. Although a large number of those having Shi'ites tendencies and being, for the most part, among Iraqi scholars, fought against Umayyads.

Amongst the assenters, Mu¦ammad Ibn Muslim Ibn Shahib Zuhr¢ (124 A.C.) who was taken thoroughly in the service of Umayyads ought to be mentioned.

At the time when he went along with one of Umayyads rulers to Ab£ °izim, one of the last companions of the Prophet, Ab£ °izim told him sarcastically, "At times Ban£ Isri'¢l went along the right path and the rulers were in need of the scholars ... however, as the rascals acquiring knowledge went to the rulers, the rulers got needless of them."

Zuhr¢ standing aside Sulaymin, the son of 'Abd al-Malik said, "It seems that you mean me in my action."

"That's what you've heard!" Replied Ab£ °izim.[2]

For the most part, he dealt with Hishim Ibn 'Abd al-Malik. Hishim paid his heavy loans,[3] and sent his sons to him for education in return for this service of Zuhr¢. Furthermore, before him, his brothers as well as 'Abd al-Malik have given him financial assistance.[4] The sister of this very Zuhr¢ told the people not to believe in Zuhr¢ speech. For, he has exchanged his religion for this worldly life and is working for the Umayyads.[5] Afterwards in the future, those admitting the Umayyads's Islam, lauded Zuhr¢ tremendously. Ibn Taymiyya said that Zuhr¢ safeguarded Islam for 70 years.[6] And it was undoubtedly obvious that this Islam was the one liked y the Umayyads. Before him a lot of people were in the service if the Umayyads, making hadith for them, such as

---

[1]. See, Dirisit wa bu¦£th f¢ l-tir¢kh wa l-islim, vol.I, p.56

[2]. al-Imima wa l-siyisa, vol.II, pp.108-109

[3]. Tadhkirat al-¦uffi¨, vol.I, p.109;al-Madjr£¦¢n, vol.I, p.40; Shadhirit al-dhahab, vol.II, p.162

[4]. loc.cit.

[5]. Ansib al-ashrif(footnote), vol.I, p.26

[6]. Shadhirit al-dhahab, vol.I, p.163

Samura Ibn Djundab and Ab£ Hurayra.[1] At any rate, Zuhr¢ was among those interested in Hishim and other Umayyads,[2] and was trying to propagate deviating beliefs. It has been said that Zuhr¢ and ‘Awina Ibn °akam who was follow of ‘Uthmin as well, relied upon predestination religion specifically.[3]

It’s interesting that Ibn °ibbin said, “I knew no tradition narrated by Zuhr¢ concerning the virtues of Imim ‘Al¢ by heart.”[4]

Among other narrators being in the service of the family of Marwin, one can refer to Ibrih¢m Nakha‘¢.

It’s been narrated from Ibn ‘Awn that, **كان ابراهيم ياتي الأمراء ويسألهم الجوائز “**Ibrih¢m always came to the rulers calling them for awards.”

According to what another one has written about him, Ibrih¢m himself offered some gifts to the rulers![5] Abu l-Zanid, Medina jurist, was among the narrators and Qur’in reciters who had some relationships with Hishim Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik.[6] Mughtra Ibn Muqsam is among other Qur’in-reciters who was the follower of ‘Uthmin and treated Imim ‘Al¢ (a) aggressively as well.[7]

Amongst the renowned Qur’in reciters and narrators in the service of the Umayyads, Sha‘b¢ ought to be pointed. He took part in ‘Abd al-Ra¦min revolt; however, later on was pardoned through surrendering himself to °adjdjidj and spent the rest of his life alongside him and ‘Abd al-Malik,[8] making up untrue stories with regard to marring the face of some of Shi‘ite Muslims, such as Mukhtir, which ±abar¢ has collected in his book. Also ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Umar who lived up to °adjdjidj times was more or less confirmed, particularly as

---

[1]. See, al-I¤i¦, p.210; Ab£ Hurayra; Sayyid Sharaf al-D¢n, pp.42-45

[2]. In this regard and other information concerning Zuhr¢ see, Tir¢kh Ab¢ Zar‘at al-dimashq¢, vol.II, p.538, Turithuni magazine, No.23, pp.9-27

[3]. al-tir¢kh al-‘arabi wa l-mu’arrikh£n, vol.I, p.173

[4]. al-Madjr£¦¢n, vol.I, p.258

[5]. Tadhkirat al-¦uffi¨, vol.I, p.72

[6]. Ibid, vol.I, p.135

[7]. Ibid, vol.I, p.145

[8]. Ibid, vol.I, p.78

‘Abd al-Malik wrote to °adjdjidj that he might obey him.[1] Radj‘i’ Ibn °aywa, another narrator has been referred to as “Shiykh Ahl al-Shim”, Shiykh of Damascus people, and “Kab ¢r al-Dawla al-Umawiyya”[2], the great of the Umayyads government. He was one of ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwin’s relatives and it’s been said that he was in charge of the financial affairs when the rocks of Bayt al-Muqaddas, Jerusalem, were being built.[3] Wellhausen brought forth a description of his impression on ‘Abd al-Malik government and his sons Wal¢d and Sulaymin and has pointed out how he instigated Sulaymin to appoint ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z as his successor.[4]

The only service these people were in a position to give was the forgery of those hadiths, traditions, which could be of benefit for the adherents of this family regarding dispraising the Umayyads’s foes and narrating their own dignity. Hadith-narration with regard to obeying the caliphs under any circumstances,[5] and being much efficient practically were among the rights of which they won’t be put on trial by Allih,[6] on account of their being caliphs. When Yaz ¢d Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik wanted to act in accordance with ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z’s conduct after him, forty old men confirmed that, **“ما على الخلفاء حساب ولا كتاب** Caliphs won’t be questioned of their deeds.”[7]

The son of Ab£ M£si Ash‘ar¢, i.e. Ab£ Burda was among the other scholars dependent upon the Umayyads; who became a judge after the death of K£fa judge, Shuray¦.[8] Among the dominant duties of such hadith-reciters, were to consolidate the position of Quraysh among the Arabs, and to make some hadith aimed at justifying the unjust discrimination considered lawful by the Umayyads, regarding

---

[1]. Djimi‘ bayin al-‘ilm, vol.I, p.146

[2]. Tadhkirat al-¦uffi¨, vol.I, p.118

[3]. Ansib al-ashrif, p.209; qtd in, Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-‘arabiyya, Wellhausen, p.209

[4]. Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-‘arabiyya, pp.256-257

[5]. Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-‘arabiyya, al-Mu¥annaf, vol.I, pp.229-230

[6]. Tir¢kh al-Khulafi’, p.223

[7]. Ibid. p.246

[8]. Tadhkirat al-¦uffi¨, vol.I, p.95

the superiority of Arabs over non-Arabs. A hadith such as, **قدموا قريشاً ولا تقدموها** "Precede the Quraysh and never let it precede you"[1] was the continuation of a policy exerted by Sulaymin Ibn 'Abd al-Malik who ordered those addressing Quraysh abusively to be whipped.[2]

Refuting the traditions narrated by Iraqi scholars and calling them hadith forgers was on the agenda of the Umayyads court.[3] The reason behind this perhaps is that Imim 'Al¢ (a)'s hadiths were usually circulated in Iraq and this was not satisfying for the Umayyads.

In contrast with those scholars serving the Umayyads in °idjiz or Damascus and sometimes even Iraq, a mass of K£fiyin scholars, both those being pure Shi'ite Muslims or Mutashayyi', a newly converted Shi'ite Muslims, on no account did they deal with the Umayyads, and instead they put their efforts into preserving the correct traditions. Amongst these traditions typically is, those with respect to the Prophet's Household's virtues which have been preserved, for the most part, by Iraqi traditionalists. It is noteworthy that the Iraqi were not generically the followers of 'Uthmin¢ religion, and were interested in Imim 'Al¢ (a) and the household of the Prophet; even so they cannot be deemed Shi'ite Muslims, although they were called so traditionally. Anyhow, amongst these scholars so many were not compatible with the Umayyads and took part in the riots at every opportunity. The participation of a large number of Iraq scholars in Ibn Ash'ath as well as Zayd Ibn 'Al¢ revolution demonstrates the power of such a position among Iraqi scholars.

CIRCULATION OF ISRAELITES AND THE PREVALENCE OF STORY-TELLING

Among the momentous difficulties of the Islamic culture during the first century A.H., is the penetration of Israelites which have left deep marks at extensive dimensions in both

---

[1] Tir¢kh Baghdid, vol.II, p.61

[2]. al-Fi'iq f¢ Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, vol.I, p.135

[3]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.VI, p.342

cultural and political areas, to the extent that during 14 centuries its impacts have constantly remained in the thoughts and various interpretive, historical, theological and juristic writings.

The first person being tremendously active in this path was ‘Abd Allih Ibn Sallim, one of the Jewish scribes who embraces Islam at the Prophet’s (s) time. Sources as well as compilers of traditions have got so many of his narrations concerning the circulation of Jew culture among Muslims. Ka‘b al-A¦bir was more prominent than him, and given the influence he had on the second caliph[1], impressed so many companions of the Prophet(s) who narrated traditions, and was able to induce more pernicious damages to the Islamic culture and defile the world of tradition by his baseless narrations from the Jewish books. He was even highly praised by Mu‘iwiya.[2] ‘Akrama, one of the Mawil¢s of ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abbis, a prominent traditionist has called him “Rabbin¢ Hidhi al-Umma”, “The Devine of this nation”.[3] Among the companions of the Prophet(s), Ab£ Hurayra and ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Amr respected him more than the others, to the extent that in some cases Ab£ Hurayra ascribed his narrations to the Prophet(s) aiming to make them common. In our discussion of the caliphate of the second caliph, we will speak of Ka‘b al-A¦bir in detail.

Ka‘b al-A¦bir’s actual inheritor was Wahb Ibn Munabba in the late first century and the beginning if the second century. According to what Zuhr¢ has written about him, he has got tremendous knowledge of the people of the book, and extremely favored in this regard.[4] Wahb traditions have been compiled in ¯a¦¢¦ Muslim and Bukhir¢ through Wahb’s brother, Hammim, who himself was the narrator of traditions of Ab£ Hurayra being himself under the influence of Ka‘b al-A¦bir.[5]

---

[1]. Previously we’ve discussed this in noting the mental life of the second caliph

[2]. ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.II, p.358

[3]. Ibid, vol.II, p.370

[4]. Tadhkirat al-¦uffi¨, vol.I, p.101

[5]. loc. cit

Taking into account the multi-dimensional relationship of Ab£ Hurayra, Ka‘b al-A¦bir, Wahb Ibn Munabba, and Hammim Ibn Munabba demonstrates their contribution to the circulation of He was the Ka‘b al-A¦bir of his time, and Ka‘b al-A¦bir is the most knowledgeable of the people of his time. And now, what sort of a person is Wahb himself, having access to both sciences?!", said Dhahab¢ about Wahb.[1] **كان كثيرا ينقل من كتب الاسرائيات "**He frequently narrated from Israelites books."[2]

Wrote Dhahab¢ elsewhere about him. It's been narrated, by Wahb himself, that he first believed in predestination; however, having read seventy or so heavenly books, he recanted these beliefs.[3] Elsewhere it's been noted that he has studied 92 heavenly books.[4] Ibn ‘Imid °anbal¢ has written about him, **كان شديد الاعتناء بكتب الاولين واخبار الملاحم وقصصهم بحيث كان يشبه بكعب الاحبار في زمانه "**He took great heed of the books of the primacy people and accounts of the bloody fights as well as their stories, to the extent that he resembled Ka‘b al-A¦bir in his time."[5]

After some years, Wahb gained such a high position in Sunnites culture that they narrated from the Prophet(s), **يكون في أمتي رجل يقال له وهب يهب الله له الحكمة "**[6]There will be a man among my nation called Wahb, to whom Allih will grant sagacity."

He was definitely not heedless of the Umayyads, and he regarded ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z as Mahd¢ al-Maw‘£d.[7]

The Umayyads policy not only didn't hinder the publication of Israelian articles and writings, but it did confine it as well. The Umayyads rulers derived many benefits from their knowledge for the popularization and application of their political thoughts in the society. Mu‘iwiya himself had a Christian counselor namely Sirdjawn Ibn Man¥

---

[1]. loc.cit.

[2]. M¢zin al-i‘tidil, vol.IV, p.353, Mu‘djam al-udabi', vol.XIX, p.259

[3]. loc.cit.

[4]. Shadjarit, vol.I, p.150; Mu‘djam al-udabi', vol.XIX, p.259; ±abaqit al-kubri, vol.V, p.543

[5]. Shadjarit, vol. I, p.150

[6]. al-Madjr£¦¢n, vol.I, p.176

[7]. Tir¢kh al-Khulafi', pp.233-235

£r. He was that very person whom Yaz¢d once made his doorkeeper and showed him a treaty – whether true or lie – from Mu‘iwiya, so that if the people in K£fa revolt, he would commission ‘Ubayd Ibn Ziyid to go to K£fa. Afterwards, Sirdjawn Ibn Man¥£r became the counselor of Marwin Ibn °akam as well.[1] It seems likely that, his son was responsible for the crucial duty of writing about the army and the tribute.[2] According to some other records, Mu‘iwiya has reconstructed a ruined church.[3] If need be, the caliphs referred to the narrations amongst whose narrators was Zuhr¢, with regard to the virtue of Bayt al-Muqaddas, Jerusalem.

When Mecca was in ‘Ubayd Ibn Ziyid’s hand, Damascus people were faced with difficulty during their pilgrimage to Mecca. According to Ya‘q£b¢, ‘Abd al-Malik prevented them from going on pilgrimage to Mecca, inasmuch as Ibn Zubayr compelled them to pledge allegiance to him as the Muslims’ caliph. When opposed to, ‘Abd al-Malik told the people that Ibn Shahib Zuhr¢ quoted from your Prophet to you, **لا تشد الرحال الا الي ثلاثه مساجد, المسجد الحرام ومسجدي ومسجد بيت المقدس وهو يقوم لكم مقام الكعبه** “Pack not off but towards the mosque: al-°arim mosque, al-Nab¢ mosque and al-Aq¥i mosque.”

It is the roach thereon the Holy Prophet allegedly stood during his ascension. Take it in lieu of Ka‘ba. Having built a dome for and hung curtains around it, ‘Abd al-Malik compelled the people to go around it as they do around Ka‘ba. Such a rite had been performed during the Umayyads time.[4] According to Ibn Khallakin people had congregated there on the day of ‘Arafa (the 9th day of Dhi l-°adjdja when the pilgrims perform specified actions in ‘Arafit).[5] It might not have been explicitly mentioned in Arabic sources that performing °adjdj in Bayt al-Muqaddas (Jerusalem) had been ‘Abd al-Malik’s initiation but the only pieces of information reported had been circumambulating around the rock as well

---

[1]. al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, vol.V, p.141

[2]. Ibid, vol.V, p.148

[3]. See, Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.I, pp.205-228 (Leiden); al-Tanb¢h wa l-Ishrif, pp.302-307 (Leiden) quoted in Tir¢kh al-Dawlat al-‘arabiyya

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.II, p.261; al-Bidiya wa l-nihiya, vol.VIII, pp.280, 281; °ayit al-¦ayawin, vol.I, p.66

[5]. Wafayit al-a‘yin, vol.III p.72

as its holiness. Nevertheless, in non-Arabic sources, Europeans, it is precisely stressed that it had been ‘Abd al-Malik’s order. Utikhyus, one of the first historians in Europe had written it in his book called Annales.[1] This action manifests how the Israelites had been made use of with the Umayyads’s policies side by side.

To hold Bayt al-Muqaddas in esteem, both ‘Abd al-Malik and °adjdjidj had committed themselves to building two portals for it. The one built by ‘Abd al-Malik was burnt to a crisp by a thunderbolt later. °adjdjidj wrote to him that the following Qur’inic verse was about them

واتْلُ عَلَيْهِم بنا بني آدم بـالحقّ اِذْ قَرّبـا قُرْبانـاً فَتَقَّبَـل مِـنْ أحَدِهما وَلَمْ يتَقَّبلْ من الآخر[2]

“And relate to them the story of the two sons of Adam with truth when they both offered an offering, but it was accepted from one of them and was not accepted from the other.”

Any other cases concerning the impacts on ‘Abd al-Malik through people of the Book are reported.[3] During his long (twenty-year) rule over the oriental Islamic lands, °adjdjidj was not secure from the scientific dignity of people of the Book therefore, he reinforced their influence on the community through being impressed with them. One of them dates back to the year 84 when he founded the town of Wisi§ motivated by a Christian monk’s prophecy as stated by ±abar¢. While he had stopped there, accompanied by his troops, he noticed a monk crossing the Tigris and urinating towards his mule at the same time. Dismounting from his mule, the monk removed the polluted soil and threw it in out the river. °adjdjidj called him and asked about the reason. He responded that he had read in their books that in this very place a mosque would be built and Allih would be worshipped as long as there were monotheists on that earth. Accordingly, °adjdjidj laid the foundations for the town of

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-dawlat al-‘arabiyya, p.206

[2]. Wafayit al-‘ayan, p.206

[3]. Ibid. vol.VII, pp,681-781

Wisi§ there and founded the principal mosque of the town in....[1]

The phrase “we have read in our books that ...” was common while narrating the Israelites statements. Some day when °adjdjidj was on his way to Damascus to meet ‘Abd al-Malik, he asked a monk whether he had read anything regarding the present status in their books.

He answered, “Yes”.

He asked again, “By name or description?”

“Sometimes by name without description and sometimes vice versa,” replied the monk. After a series of questions, °adjdjidj asked about his successor. The answer was that a man called Yaz¢d would succeed him.

“While I am dead or alive”? he asked.

“I do not know”, he answered.

°adjdjidj asked, “Give a description of him!”

“He would be treacherous to you,” said the monk, “I know nothing more”.

Remembering Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab, Khurisin governor, who was also ousted later.[2] There is a strong probability that some merely with the aim of deposing Yaz¢d had conspired to incite the monk to utter such absurd talks.

The Christian’s penetration into the Umayyads’s administration under the name of amanuenses and so on and so forth cleared the way for the Israelites expansion. Mothers of some rulers were Christian bondwomen, in their turns, influential in disseminating Christian culture in Muslim community. Since Khilid Ibn ‘Abd Allih Qasr¢’s mother was a Christian, Khilid was accused of his religion while being an Umayyads governor in Mecca and Iraq for years. He had built a synagogue for his mother to worship. Concerning him, Farazdaq had composed,

وكيف يؤم الناس من كانت أمّه تدين بـان الله ليس بواحــد

بني بيعة فيها الصليب لامّــه ويهدم من بغض منارالمساجد[3]

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, pp.184,185

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢ vol.V, p.191

How can he ever be a leader for a nation while his mother is unbeliever in monotheism? The man who had built a synagogue having a cross for her and has ruined the minarets of the mosques spitefully

According to I¥fahin¢, Khilid had been accused on his father's side as well, one of whose forefathers had been a Jew joining the tribe of Budjayla.[1] Even Hishim had accused him of heeding more to Christians and Zoroastrians and apportioning properties among them.[2]

Khilid Rib'¢, well-acquainted with the Israelites, had said,"We found in Torah that sky and the earth had shed tears for forty days after 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z".[3]

Wal¢d Ibn 'Abd al-Malik also paid much attention to the Qur'in recites of Bayt al-Muqaddas. As stated by Ibn Ab¢ 'Ulba, Wal¢d had given many pieces of jewelry to him to distribute among them.[4] A study of Islamic history can reveal hundreds of impacts that Christian and Jewish culture have had on Sunnites culture.

It has been also said why 'Abd al-Malik had for the first time coined was that he had been told that based on their books, the followers of the divine Books had been of this opinion that the caliphs who sanctified Allih on the coins would outlive.[5]

Imims took a position against such beliefs. Imim 'Al¢ (a) had stated,

"Anyone who has got a book from the early nations should dispose it as soon as he can."[6] It was while these kinds of books had been spread among Muslims. Imim ¯idiq also in his turn reproached those scholars after the Israelites.[7] Earlier, we noticed how Imim Sadjdjid prohibited

---

[3]. Wafayit al-a'yin, vol.II, p. 229; concerning ruining the minarets see Rab¢' al-abrir, vol.I, p. 328

[1]. al-Aghin¢, vol.V, p. 17; Wafayit al-a'yin, vol.II, p. 230

[2]. al-Muwaffaqiyyit, p. 292

[3]. Tir¢kh al-khulafi', p. 245

[4]. Ibid. p. 224

[5]. al-Nuq£d al-islim¢yya, al-Miqr¢z¢, p.11

[6]. Djimi' bayin al-'ilm, vol.I, p. 72

[7]. Bi¦ir al-anwir, vol.II, p. 108

°asan Ba¥r¢ from recounting stories. It was exactly the continuation of the Prophet's policy that had emphasized,

لا تسألوا أهل كتاب عن شيء[1]

Never ever ask the followers of the divine Books any question

These people made efforts to recount the stories respecting the former prophets which had been distorted in Jewish books and usually contained many insults at them as well as false narrations in terms of scholastic theology and jurisprudence. It was already addressed that story-telling became prevalent from caliph II onward. Later, during 'Uthmin's time, telling the Prophet's stories based on Jewish books while interpreting the Qur'inic verses prevailed more than before. Once Mu'iwiya urged a story-teller to stand up after the prayer and curse Imim 'Al¢.[2] The policy of cursing 'Al¢ (a) was carried on during the Umayyads's tenure by the story-tellers too. When the caliphs realized that the story-tellers needed to be under control, they fabricated some hadiths according to which story-tellers should have worked under the caliph's supervision and personally appointed them in order to pursue their own political and cultural aims. It was the story-tellers who spread false hadiths among people and had even more influence on people than hadith-narrators. Surprisingly, regardless of their influence on Sunnites's religious culture, hadith-narrators rejected them saying that it they are told one hadith they will multiply it.[3] The caliphs were mainly proponents of the story-tellers and as mentioned above they themselves appointed and dismissed them. Almost all stories dealt with the narrations made by the followers of the divine Books and were all discussed in detail elsewhere.[4]

CONQUESTS BY THE MARWªNIDS UNTIL LATE FIRST CENTURY

Although conquests had been somewhat resumed during the time of Yaz¢d Ibn Mu'iwiya, in this 60s and until even 73

---

[1]. al-«¤i¦, p. 311 (published by Tehran University).

[2]. Qi¥¥i khinin dar tir¢kh Islim, p. 46

[3]. Ibid. pp. 86-96

[4]. Ibid. pp. 65-72

when Ibn Zubayr was overthrown, they were halted. However, the ground was repaved for them subsequent to establishment of ‘Abd al-Malik’s broad-based government and Ibn Zubayr’s fall.

The conquests were limited to several areas, One was in theast including both transoxania and S¢stin and the other in the western lands of Islam including Northern Africa and Northern Iraq and Syria called Armenia. Bearing this fact in mind that no consensus is reached on the date of conquests and the quality of their report which have been mingled with irrelevant epics, we present a concise report respecting these conquests.

ORIENTAL CONQUESTS

When ‘Umar was caliph, the conquests in oriental lands of Islam peaked following the overthrow of the Sassanids Empire. Arabs who considered the conquests as a mission for expanding Islam and wiping off non-Muslims did not content themselves with the Sassind’s overthrow and advanced towards the vast Khurisin, half of which is now in Iran and the rest in Afghinistin and Middle Asian republics, so fast that they reached Transoxania. After years of clashes with the local dynasties in such lands, Arabs could after all spread the religion deeply as near as China. It is worth saying that aside from the motivation of both caliphs and rulers of the aforesaid areas as well as the people to battle against non-Muslims, a desire for gaining spoils was of central importance in Muslim’s resistance too.

Khurisin was under the Sassanids’s power then. Nevertheless, the more it was advanced towards the east, the less their influence grew and the stronger the local rulers became. The residents of that land were like Turks in Iranians’ view. As soon as the conquests crossed the border of Khurisin, Iranians became motivated to cooperate. By the same token, the Iranian’s all-out presence beside Arabs in the conquests was eye-catching in the last quarter of the first century.

Although the impediments facing Arabs in such lands were by no means few, their strength in defeating the Sassanids as a superpower together with Islamic attraction and Muslims’s treatment could undermine the residents.

Professor Gip commented, “Since Arabs’ dominance often followed neither murder nor plunder and they contented themselves with the paid Djizya after the capture, the town was evacuated immediately with no serious resistance.”[1]

The existing disputes among the local rulers were another reason for the fragility of these lands and consequently facilitative for Muslim Arabs. Muslims’s attack to Transoxania had in essence begun during Mu‘iwiya’s time by Ziyid, Iraqi governor, in the early 50s.

In 51 A.H. he was set to send 50000 Arab families residing in Ba¥ra and K£fa out to Khurisin[2] in order to materialize his aim which was stabilization of conquests. The urgency of these Arabs’ presence for developing and stabilizing the conquered area was crystal clear. Furthermore, such a movement could precede a number of lateral problems for Muslims one of which was the protracted dispute among the Arab tribes in Khurisin, the origin of most clashes.

The strife between the Mudrids and Rabi‘a in Khurisin had ended in many deep-rooted conflicts. While Ibn Zubayr in power, ‘Abd Allih Ibn Khizim, from among the Qaysids, was the governor. Succeeding Ibn Zubayr’s suppression by ‘Abd al-Malik, ‘Abd Allih was asked to stay there at ‘Abd al-Malik’s demand. He declined however. ‘Abd al-Malik as a consequence invoked Bukayr Ibn Wishi¦, an agent of ‘Abd Allih’s in Marw who accepted the request. In a battle between him and ‘Abd Allih Ibn Khizim, Ibn Khizim was killed and ‘Abd al-Malik could succeed in dominating that land as well.[3]

No sooner had ‘Abd Allih Ibn Khizim been appointed by Ibn Zubayr as Khurisin governor than the clashes among Arabs in Khurisin had Turks dare advance as near as Niyshib£r.[4] The clashes among the Arab residents of Khurisin were so prolonged even after Ibn Khizim’s death that both S¢stin and Khurisin were also entrusted to °adjdjidj. Proficient enough during the war with the Khiridjites, Muhallab Ibn Ab¢ ¯ufra was appointed by him in 78 to govern Khurisin. The governorship of Muhallab’s family

---

[1]. Fut£¦it a‘rib dar isiyiy markaz¢, p. 41

[2]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p. 400

[3]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, pp. 21, 22; Fut£¦ al-buldin, p. 405

[4]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, pp. 404, 405

father and two sons, Yaz¢d and Mufa¤¤al) in that land lasted about nine years. Nevertheless, following the grudge °adjdjidj bore this family, he ousted them and substituted Qutayba Ibn Muslim for them. In 80, concurrent with the attack Muhallab had launched on Kashsh, he stayed there for two years and combated non-Muslims. According to ±abar¢, since there had been no probability of conquest for him, his one and the only desire was to return the army safe and sound to Marw.[1]

Muhallab who passed away in 82 on his way back from Kashsh was replaced by his son, Yaz¢d. In 84, an influential Turk in a fort in Bidaghays to whom Yaz¢d had laid siege had to hand over the entire treasure of the fort in a compromise to him and leave with his family.[2]

°adjdjidj affected by an eminent follower of the divine Books suspected Yaz¢d Ibn Muhallab in 85 and designated his brother, Mufa¤¤al, in place.[3] As Yaz¢d himself had perceived, such a measure was merely for impairing this family's influence and eventually wiping them off the political face of Khurisin and even oriental lands. During his nine-month ruler, Mufa¤¤al invaded Bidaghays and besides conquering it, he brought spoils. Such conquests of Muhallab's family appeared petty compared with those of Qutayba Ibn Muslim who stepped in Khurisin in 86. At the same time 'Abd al-Malik died and his son, Wal¢d, succeeded him. He was the one throughout whose age the greatest conquests were made reminiscent of the primary stages of conquests. Qutayba carried on conquering for nearly ten years during which he endeavored to capture the lands in Transoxania whether south or north of Amudarya (Djiy¦£n). Both ±abar¢ and Balidhur¢ have addressed these conquests in their books but the analysis of them is beyond the scope of this chapter.[4] The reports respecting such issues are evaluated by professor Gibbwithin four units, Restitution of Takhiristin (86), Conquest of Bukhiri (87), Growth of influence (91) and Military Expedition to the provinces[5] with Qutayba's death, conquests were halted for a long time

---

[1]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 139

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, pp. 186, 187

[3]. Ibid. vol.V, p. 191

[4]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, the events during 88-95; Fut£¦ al-buldin, pp. 409-411

although Arabs were still dominant. Embracing Islam had gradually become so prevalent that the conversion of a number of monarchs to Islam by ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z’s[1] invitation set the scene for the caliphs’ absolute dominance.

Qutayba’s conquests in the Orient reached China the most noticeable areas of which were Shish and Farghina; however, Arab dominance in that land was exposed to change. They all occurred during the last years of his life, 94 and 95. As soon as he learned °adjdjidj’s death, he relinquished conquering, upset, and returned to Marw[2]. As reported by Narshakh¢ the principal mosque of Balkh was founded in 94[3] indicative of Islam’s widespread in the cities of Islamic land. Southern transoxania from Kibul to the south and from Kirmin province in Iran to the east was called Sidjistin. Two abortive attacks of Arabs one by ‘Abd Allih Ibn Umayya and the other by ‘Ubayd Allih Ibn Ab¢ Bakra have been reported by Balidhur¢. As far as the mountainous position of the area was concerned, the monarch named Ratb¢l or Zanb¢l could each time force Muslim Arabs to withdraw.[4] When °adjdjidj dispatched an army headed by ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Ash‘ath to Sidjistin in 80, Zanb¢l asked for a compromise but ‘Abd al-Ra¦min declined. Arabs could conquer a large part of Sidjistin and gain spoils subsequent to Zanb¢l’s withdrawal.[5] Contenting himself with these numbers, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min informed °adjdjidj of his decision. °adjdjidj urged him, nevertheless, to keep on conquering. ‘Abd al-Ra¦min as well as the Iraqis who had a potential dissatisfaction with °adjdjidj revolted discussed elsewhere in detail. After being defeated, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min sought refuge by Zanb¢l but in an agreement and under °adjdjidj’s threat ‘Abd al-Ra¦min’s head was sent to him under the conditions of a seven-year or nine-year truce and indemnity. As this period passed by Ashhab Ibn Bishr traveled there on °adjdjidj’s behalf but his harsh behavior toward Zanb¢l made him send him back. Dominant in

---

[5]. Fut£¦it a‘rib dar isiyiy markaz¢, from p. 52 on

[1]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p. 415

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 263

[3]. Fut£¦it a‘rib dar isiyiy markaz¢, p. 65

[4]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p. 390, 391

[5]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, pp. 141-142; Fut£¦ al-buldin, p. 391

Khurisin and Sidjistin, Qutayba Ibn Muslim sent his brother, ‘Amr, to Sidjistin. Muslims’ former defeats in that land which had cast a spell over it according to ‘Amr resulted in a compromise. When Zanb¢l felt that Muslims had no longer the ability to attack there, he discontinued paying to the rulers succeeding °adjdjidj.[1] In 94, Muslims could advance toward India by the Sea of ‘Ummin and conquer a part of it in addition to Sidjistin, under Zanb¢l’s rule.[2] Among the Indian key cities conquered first by Muslims in 95 was Multin. Until then modern western Pakistan had entirely been governed by Muslims.[3]

OCCIDENTAL CONQUESTS

The conquering of Egypt was the start of Muslim conquests in Africa and their penetration into Spain. Egypt was conquered late during ‘Umar’s caliphate in 20 and 21 A.H. Two years later Tripoli was conquered but not staying there, Muslims came back to Barqa. After a while, the civil wars waged among Muslims had them miss the chance of more conquests in Africa. Muslim disputes in that land were mostly with the rulers designated by East Roman Emperor for Egypt, Ifr¢qiya (modern Tunasia) and littoral areas of the Mediterranean. Although the local tribes called Barbars were among the greatest obstacles to conquests, they gradually embraced Islam as conquests multiplied. As already discussed, while Mu‘iwiya in power, ‘Uqba Ibn Nifi‘, resumed conquering and established the town of Q¢rawin in 50 as a base for Muslims’ next conquests. Nonetheless, in an ambush among the Barbarians, he was killed in 64. With successive attacks, he could penetrate into modern Morocco as near as Fis but he was killed en route back.

Once ‘Abd al-Malik had suppressed various riots and dominated the whole Islamic lands, conquests in Africa were resumed in 76. At the same time, °asan Ibn Nu‘min launched his conquests by conquering Qar§idjanna and advanced towards Morocco. Meanwhile, Romans occupied Qar§idjanna but °asan who could take it back in 79 razed it to the ground not to allow them to infiltrate into it again.

---

[1]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p. 392

[2]. Tir¢kh al-§abar¢, vol.V, p. 257

[3]. Impiri§£riyyat al-‘arab, p. 260

This time, the Barbarians united behind a woman, named Kihina, later, against Muslim Arabs and could succeed to get them to retreat as far as the primary conquests. The only place where Kihina and the Barbarians were overpowered was ±abardja in 83.

To pursue °asan Ibn Nu‘min’s conquests, M£si Ibn Nu¥ayr resumed them in Africa in 86 and consequently conquered modern Morocco wholly. At the same time, as the Barbarians have been gradually embracing Islam the ground was getting fully prepared for Arabs’ through dominance in northern littoral lands of Africa.[1] ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwin was the caliph until then who was succeeded by his son Wal ¢d whose endeavors in conquests were the most considerable among the former caliphs according to Suy£§¢.

One of the commanders of M£si Ibn Nu¥ayr’s army was ± iriq Ibn Ziyid who has been allegedly a Barbarian although what his father’s name indicated was that he might have converted to Islam long time ago. Due to his excellent competence as a commander, ±iriq overstepped the bounds of North Africa and took Muslims to Spain for the first time in 93. A year later M£si Ibn Nu¥ayr set out to Spain as well and maintained the act of conquering there. Among the conquered lands were ±ulay§ala, Mirida, etc. Most areas with no war surrendered to Muslims and as a result Spain became entirely Muslim Arabs’.

Wal¢d’s death in 97 and his succession by Sulaymin made M£si Ibn Nu¥ayr return to Damascus and be blacklisted by the Umayyads. He wished he had pursued conquests in Italy and France through Spain and then in Greece and constantinople. Wal¢d’s death as well as his deposal, however, caused Arabs to remain in Spain and even entrust the land to the Europeans after a couple of centuries.

Armenia was among the lands the conquests of which had been begun from ‘Umar’s time and had been under heavy clashes in the late first century. A vast land was called Armenia by Muslims. Balidhur¢ has divided it into four parts including such cities as Shimshi§, Qil¢qali, Busfurdjin, Dubayl, Djurzin and Sidjistin.[2]

---

[1]. Imbiri§£riyyat al-‘arab, p. 214

[2]. Fut£¦ al-buldin, p. 197

When ‘Uthmin in power, °ab¢b Ibn Maslama Fihr¢ attacked Qil¢qali and not only he conquered it but also based on a treaty the residents were duty-bound to pay Djizya(tributes).[1] Tifl¢s, Eastern Armenia, was also surrounded by °ab¢b. While ‘Abd al-Malik and Ibn Zubayr were in clashes, the residents of such areas appreciated the opportunity and revolted, but they were suppressed after some time and ruled by the Umayyads.[2] During Wal¢d’s and Sulaymin’s age many attacks were made on the Roman central territory. Although in their attacks they even reached as near as the gates of Constantinople, Muslims could never succeed in conquering it.

In a nutshell, it can be said that Muslims lost their primary magnificence from the late first century but in return Romans resumed their attacks and were still superior in the second century. Nevertheless, they could by no means conquer Eastern Rome entirely. It was done by ‘Uthminids later in the 10th century after °idjra.

---

[1]. Ibid. p. 203

[2]. Ibid. pp. 207-208

REFERENCES

1) ‘A¥r al-nab¢, Mu¦ammad ‘Izza Darwaza, Beirut, 1964
2) ‘Al¢ Ibn al-°usayn, Dja‘far Shah¢d¢, Tehran, Daftar Nashr Farhang Islim¢
3) ‘Aq¢dat al-salaf A¥¦ib al-¦ad¢th, Ab£ Uthmin Ismi’¢l Ibn ‘Abd al-Ra¦min al-¯ib£n¢, Edited by: Badr ‘Abd Allih al-Badr, Medina, 1415 A.H
4) ‘Awilim al-‘ul£m, Vol 16, ‘Abd Allih al-Ba¦rin¢, Qum, Madrisat al-imim al-mahd¢
5) A¦kim al-Qur’in, Ab£ Bakr A¦mad Ibn ‘Al¢ al-Riz¢ al-Dja¥¥i¥, 1335 A.H
6) A¦kim al-Qur’in, Ab£ Bakr Mu¦ammad Ibn ‘Abd Allih Ibn al-‘Arab¢, Edited by: ‘Al¢ Mu¦ammad al-Bidjiw¢, Beirut, 1378 A.H
7) al-A¦kim al-sul§iniyya wa l-wiliyit al-d¢niyya, Abu l-°asan ‘Al¢ Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn °ab¢b al-Miward¢, Qum, 1406 A.H
8) al-A¦kim al-sul§iniyya, Ab£ Ya‘li Mu¦ammad Ibn al-°usayn al-Farri’, Edited by: Mu¦ammad °imid al-Fiq¢, Qum, 1406 A.H
9) A¦san al-taqis¢m, Maqdis¢, Laiden, 1906
10) A‘yin al-sh¢‘a, Mu¦sin al-Am¢n, Beirut, Dir al-ta‘iruf
11) A’imat al-ithni ‘Ashar, ‘ªdil al-ad¢b, Beirut, Dir al-a¤wi’
12) A’immatuni, Mu¦ammad ‘Al¢ Dukhayyil, Beirut, Dir al-murta¤id
13) A¤wi’ ‘ala l-sunnat al-mu¦ammadiyya, Ma¦m£d Ab£rayya, Qum, 1363
14) al-A¥nim, Hishim Kalb¢, Translated to Persian by: Djalil¢ Ni’¢n¢, Tehran, 1348 Sh
15) A§las Tir¢kh al-islim, °usayn M£nis, Cairo, 1407 A.H
16) Ab£ Hurayra, al-Sayyid Sharaf al-d¢n, Beirut, Dir al-ta‘iruf
17) al-Adhkiyi’, Abu l-Faradj Ibn al-Dj£z¢, Najaf, 1389 A.H
18) al-Aghin¢, Abu l-Faradj I¥fahin¢, Cairo, 1963
19) Akhbir al-§iwil, Ab£ °an¢fa al-D¢niwar¢, Edited by: ‘Abd al-Mun‘im ‘ªmir, Cairo, 1960
20) Akhbir al-buldin, Ibn Faq¢h Hamadin¢, Printed by Fuat Sizg¢n

21) Akhbir al-qu¤it, Mu¦ammad Ibn Khalaf Ibn °ayyin Wak¢', Beirut, 'ªlam al-kutub
22) Akhbir l¥bahin, Ab£ Nu'aym l¥bahin¢, Leidan, 1934
23) Akhbir Makka wa mi dji' f¢hi min al-ithir, Abu l-Wal¢d Mu¦ammad Ibn 'Abd Allih Ibn A¦mad al-Azraq¢, Edited by: Rushd¢ ¯ili¦ *Mal¦as, Beirut, 1403 A.H*
24) al-Munammaq f¢ Akhbir Quraysh, Mu¦ammad Ibn °ab¢b al-Baghdid¢, Edited by: Khursh¢d A¦mad Fir£q, °aydaribid 1384 *A.H*
25) al-Amil¢ f¢ ª¥ir al-¥a¦iba, 'Abd al-Razziq Ibn Hammim al-¯an'in¢, Edited by: Madjd¢ al-Sayyid Ibrih¢m, Cairo, Maktabat al-Qur'in
26) al-Amil¢, Mu¦ammad Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Nu'min, al-Shiykh al-Muf¢d, Edited by: °usayn Ustidwal¢, 'Al¢ Akbar Ghaffir¢, Qum, 1403 A.H
27) al-Amili, Ab£ 'Al¢ Ismi'¢l Ibn Qisim al-Ghil¢, Edited by: 'Abd al-Djawid al-A¥ma'¢, Cairo, 1975
28) al-Amwil, Ab£ 'Ubayd Qisim Ibn Sallim Hiraw*¢, Cairo, 1335 A.H*
29) And¢shih Siyis¢ dar Islim Mu'i¥ir, °am¢d 'Iniyat, Translated by: Bahi' al-d¢n khuramshih¢, Tehran, 1362 Sh
30) Ansib al-ashraf, A¦mad Ibn Ya¦yi al-Balidhur¢, Vol 1, Edited by: Mu¦ammad °am¢d Allih, Cairo, Dir al-ma'irif, Vol 2, 3, Edited by:Mu¦ammad Biqir al-Ma¦m£d¢, Beirut, 1397. Vol 4, 5, Baghdad, Maktabat al-muthanni. Vol 4, Edited by: I¦sin 'Abbis, Beirut, 1400 A.H
31) al-Ansib, 'Abd al-Kar¢m Ibn Mu¦ammad al-Sam'in¢, Edited by: 'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn Ya¦ya al-Mu'allim¢, °aydaribid
32) Asbib al-nuz£l, Abu l-°asan 'Al¢ Ibn A¦mad al-Wi¦id¢ al-Niyshib£r¢, Cairo, 1387 A.H
33) ªthir al-¦arb fi l-fiqh al-islim¢, Wahba al-zu¦ayl¢, Damascus, 1401 A.H
34) Athar Ahl al-kitib fi l-fitan wa l-¦ur£b al-ahliyya fi l-qarn al-awwal al-hidjr¢, Djam¢l 'Abd Allih al-Mi¥r¢, Medina, 1410 A.H
35) al-Awi'il, Mu¦ammad Taq¢ al-Tustar¢, Qum, Maktaba Ba¥¢rat¢
36) B¢st Guftir, Mahd¢ Mu¦aqqiq, Tehran, 1355 Sh
37) al-Ba¦r al-ri'iq, Ibn Nadj¢m, 1331 A.H
38) Ba¦th f¢ Nash'at 'Ilm al-tir¢kh 'Ind al-'arab, 'Abd al-'Az¢z al-D£r¢, Beirut, 1983

39) Ba¥i'ir al-daradjit, ¯affir Qumm¢, Edited by: M ¢rzi Mu¦sin K£chih Bigh¢ Tabr¢z¢, Qum, 1404 A.H
40) al-Ba¥i'ir wa l-Dhakhi'ir, Ab£ °ayyin al-Taw¦¢d¢, Edited by: A¦mad Am¢n, A¦mad ¯aqar, Cairo, 1373 A.H
41) al-Bad' wa l-tir¢kh, Mu§ahhar Ibn ±ihir al-Maqdis¢, *Maktabat al-thiqifat al-d¢niyya*
42) Bahdj al-¥abigha f¢ Shar¦ Nahdj al-baligha, Mu¦ammad Taq¢ al-Tustar¢, Tehran, 1390 A.H
43) Bahdjat al-madjilis, Ibn 'Abd al-barr al-Qur§ub¢, Cairo, al-Dir al-mi¥riyya li l-ta'l¢f wa l-tardjama
44) Balighit al-nisi', Abu l-fa¤l A¦mad Ibn Ab¢ ±ayf£r, Qum, 1371 Sh
45) al-Bayin wa l-taby¢n, 'Amr Ibn Ba¦r al-Dji¦i¨, Edited by: 'Abd al-Salim Hir£n, Cairo, 1948
46) Bazmiward, 'Abbis Zaryib Kh£y¢, Tehran, 1368 Sh
47) Bi¦ir al-anwir, 'Allima Mu¦ammad Biqir Madjlis¢, Beirut, Mu'assisat al-wafi', 1403 A.H
48) al-Bidiyaw a l-nihiya, Ibn Kath¢r al-°anbal¢, Beirut, 1409
49) al-Biy'a fi l-ni¨im al-siyis¢ al-islim¢, A¦mad ¯idd¢q 'Abd al-Ra¦min, Cairo, 1408 A.H
50) Bu¦£th f¢ Tir¢kh al-Qur'in wa 'Ul£ma, Abu l-fa¤l M ¢rmu¦ammad¢, Beirut, 1400 A.H
51) Bul£gh al-'irab f¢ Ma'rifat al-'arab, Ma¦m£d Shukr¢ al-ªl£s¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Bahdjat al-athar¢, Cairo, 1342 A.H
52) al-Buldin, A¦mad Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Wi¤i¦ Ya'q£b¢, Laiden
53) Di'irat al-ma'irif al-islimiyya, 1933
54) Di'irat al-ma'irif Buzurg Islim¢, Tehran, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Ki¨im Budjn£rd¢
55) D¢win al-Farazdaq, Hammim Ibn Ghilib, Beirut, 1385 A.H
56) D¢win Shiykh al-Abi§a¦, Edited by: Ab£ Haffin 'Abd Allih Ibn A¦mad al-Muhzam¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Biqir al-Ma¦m£d¢, Qum, 1372 Sh
57) Daliyil al-¥idq min Fa¤i'il Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n wa Imimatu, Mu¦ammad °asan al-Mu¨affar, Qum, 1395 A.H
58) Daliyil al-nubuwwa, Ab£ Bakr A¦mad Ibn °usayn Ibn 'Al¢ al-Biyhaq¢, Edited by: 'Abd al-Mu'§¢ Qal'adj¢, Beirut, 1405 A.H

59) Daliyil al-nubuwwa, Ab£ Nu‘aym al-I¥bahin¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Rawis Qal‘adj¢, ‘Abd al-Barr ‘Abbis, Beirut, 1406 A.H
60) al-Daradjit al-raf¢‘a, ‘Al¢ ¯adr Sh¢riz¢, Tehran
61) Dhakhi’ir al-‘uqbi f¢ Maniqib Dhaw¢ al-qurbi, Mu¦ibb al-D¢n ±abar¢, Beirut, Dir al-ma‘rifa
62) Dhamhara Ansib al-‘arab, Ibn °azm al-Andulus*¢, Cairo, 1391 A.H*
63) Dhamhara Khu§ab al-‘arab f¢ ‘U¥£r al-‘arabiyyat al-zihira, A¦mad Zak¢ ¯afwat, Cairo, 1352 A.H
64) al-Dhar¢‘a Ili Ta¥in¢f al-sh¢‘a, ‘Allama Shiykh ªghi Buzurg ±ihrin¢, Beirut, 1403 A.H
65) Dhawihir al-kalim, Mu¦ammad °asan al-Nadjaf¢, Tehran, 1392 A.H
66) Dhawimi‘ al-s¢rat al-nabawiyya, Ibn °azm al-Andulus¢, Beirut, 1403 A.H
67) Dirisit f¢ Wiliyat al-faq¢h, °usayn ‘Al¢ Munta¨ir¢, Qum, 1408 A.H
68) Dirisit wa Bu¦£th fi al-tir¢kh wa l-islim, Djafar Murta¤i, Qum, 1400 A.H
69) al-Djimi‘ al-¥a¦¢¦, al-Tirmidh¢, Medina, 1964
70) Djimi‘ Bayin al-‘ilm wa Fa¤lih, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr al-Qur§ub¢, Cairo, 1979
71) al-Djamal, Mu¦ammad Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Nu‘min al-Shiykh al-Muf¢d, Edited by: al-Sayyid ‘Al¢ M¢r Sharaf al-D¢n¢, Qum, 1371 Sh
72) Djamhara Nasab Quraysh wa Akhbiruhi, Zubayr Ibn Bakkir, Edited by: Ma¦m£d Mu¦ammad Shikir, Cairo, 1381 A.H
73) Djaz¢rat al-‘arab f¢ Qarn al-‘ishr¢n, °ifi¨ Wahba, Cairo, 1387 A.H
74) al-Durar f¢ Ikhti¥ir al-maghiz¢ wa l-siyar, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr al-Qur§ub¢, Beirut, Dir al-kutub al-‘ilmiyya
75) al-Durr al-manth£r, ‘Abd al-Ra¦min al-Suy£§¢, Qum, al-Maktabat al-mar‘ash¢
76) Duwlat wa °uk£mat dar Islim, A. K. S. Lambton, Translated by:..., Tehran, ‘Ur£dj
77) al-Fi’iq f¢ Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, Djir Allih al-Zamakhshar¢, Cairo, Ma§ba‘at al-°alab¢
78) Fa¤l al-I‘tizil wa ±abaqit al-mu‘tazila, Qi¤¢ ‘Abd al-Djabbir al-Hamadin¢, Edited by: Fu’id Sayyid, T£nis, 1393 A.H

79) Fadjr al-islim, A¦mad Am¢n, Cairo, Maktabat Nah¤at al-mi¥riyya
80) al-Fakhr¢ fi l-idib al-sul§i¥niyya wa l-duwal al-islimiyya, Mu¦ammad Ibn ‘Al¢ Ibn ±abi§abi Ibn al-±aq§aqi, Qum 1414 A.H
81) Fann al-s¢ra, I¦sin ‘Abbis, Beirut, Dir al-thiqifa
82) Fari’id al-sim§ayn, al-°amw¢n¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Biqir al-Ma¦m£d¢, Beirut, 1398 A.H
83) al-Farq Bayn al-firaq, ‘Abd al-Qihir Ibn ±ihir Ibn Mu¦ammad al-Baghdid¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Mu¦yi l-D¢n ‘Abd al-°am¢d, Beirut, Dar al-ma‘rifa
84) Fat¦ al-bir¢ Bi Shar¦ ¯a¦¢¦ al-bukhir¢, Ibn °adjr al-‘Asqalin¢, Beirut, 1402 A.H
85) Fawit al-wafayit, Mu¦ammad Ibn Shikir al-kutb¢, Edited by: I¦sin ‘Abbis, Beirut, Dir ¯adir
86) Fi l-‘ub£r al-¦a¤ir¢ li l-maktabat al-‘arabiyyat al-islimiyya, al-Kitib al-thin¢: Ka‘b al-A¦bir, Mu¦ammad ‘Al ¢ Ab£ °amda, Ummin, Dir al-bashi¢r, 1411 A.H
87) Fi l-adab al-djihil¢, ±ihi °usayn, Cairo, Dir al-ma‘irif
88) al-Fihrist, Mu¦ammad Ibn °asan ±£s¢, Qum, Ra¤¢
89) al-Fihrist, Mu¦ammad Ibn Is¦iq Ibn Nad¢m, Edited by:Tadjaddud, Tehran, 1393
90) Fiqh al-khilifa wa Ta§awuruha li Tu¥b¢¦a ‘U¥bat Umam Sharqiyya, ‘Abd al-Razziq A¦mad al-Sanh£r¢, Cairo, 1989
91) Fiqh al-lughia wa Sir al-‘arabiyya, Ab£ Man¥£r Ismi’¢l al-Tha‘ilib¢, Qum, Ismi‘¢liyin
92) Fiqh al-s¢ra, Mu¦ammad al-Ghazzil¢, Beirut, ‘ªlam al-ma‘rifa
93) Firaq al-sh¢‘a, Ab£ Mu¦ammad °asan Ibn M£si al-Nuwbakht¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad ¯idiq ªl Ba¦r al-‘ul£m, Najaf, 1355 A.H
94) Fitnat al-kubri, ±ihi °usayn, Cairo, Dir al-ma‘irif
95) al-Fu¥£l al-muhimma, Ibn ¯abbigh Milik¢, Tehran, al-A‘lam¢
96) al-Fu¥£l al-mukhtira, Mu¦ammad Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Nu‘min al-Shiykh al-Muf¢d, Qum, Maktabat al-Diwar¢
97) al-Fur£q al-lughawiyya, Ab£ Hilil al-‘Askar¢, Qum, Ba¥¢rat¢
98) Fut£¦ al-buldin, A¦mad Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Ya¦yi al-blidhur¢, Edited by:: Ri¤win Mu¦ammad Ri¤win, Beirut, 1404 A.H

99) Fut£¦ Mi¥r wa Akhbiruhi, Abu l-Qisim ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abd al-°akam, Baghdad,Ma§ba‘at al-muthanni, (Leidan, 1912)

100) al-Fut£¦, Ab£ Mu¦ammad A¦mad Ibn A‘tham al-k£f¢, °aydaribid, 1393 A.H

101) al-Fut£¦, Persian Translation, Translated by: Mu¦ammad Ibn A¦mad Ibn Mustuwf¢ Hiraw¢, Edited: Ghulim Ri¤i ±abi§abiy¢ Madjd, Tehran, 1372 Sh

102) Fut£¦it A‘rib dar ªsiyiy Markaz¢, Gib, Translated by: A¦mad¢p£r, Tabr¢z

103) Gihnimih Ta§b¢q¢ Sih Hizir Silih, A¦mad B¢rashk, Tehran, 1367 Sh

104) al-Ghirit, Ab£ Is¦iq Ibrih¢m Ibn Mu¦ammad al-Thaqaf¢ al-K£fi, Edited by: M¢r Djalil al-D¢n Mu¦addith Urmaw¢, Tehran, 1355 A.H; and Persion version: Translated by: ‘Abd al-Mu¦ammad ªyat¢, Tehran, 1371 Sh

105) Ghiyat al-Ikhti¥ir f¢ al-buy£tit al-‘alawiyya al-ma¦f£¨a Min al-ghubir, Ibn Zuhra, Edited by: al-Sayyid Ba¦r al-‘ul£m, Najaf, 1962

106) al-Ghad¢r, ‘Abd al-°usayn al-Am¢n¢, Beirut, 1397 A.H

107) Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th, Ab£ ‘Ubayd Qisim Ibn Sallim al-Hiraw¢, °aydat ªbid, 1384 A.H

108) al-°£r al-‘ayn, Nishwin al-°imyar¢, Edited by: Kamil Mu¥§afi, Tehran, 1972

109) °ad¢th al-thaqalayn Tawitira wa Fiqhu, ‘Al¢ al-°usayn al-M¢lin¢, Qum, 1413 A.H

110) °arakat al-tir¢kh ‘Ind al-imim ‘Al¢, Mu¦ammad Mahd¢ Shams al-D¢n, Tehran, 1405 A.H

111) °ayit al-¦ayawin, Dimyar¢, Beirut, al-Maktabat al-islimiyya

112) °ayit al-¥a¦iba, al-Kindihlaw¢, °alab, 1391 A.H. (Beirut, Dir al-qalam, 1968)

113) °ayit al-imim al-Biqir, Biqir Shar¢f al-Qurash¢, Najaf

114) al-°ayit al-siyisa li l-Imim al-°asan, Dja‘far Murta¤i, Qum, 1405 A.H

115) al-°ayit al-siyisa li l-Imim al-Ri¤i, Dja‘far Murta¤i, Qum, 1401 A.H

116) °ayit Mu¦ammad, Mu¦ammad °usayn Hiykal, Cairo, 1354

117) al-°ayawin, Ab£ ‘Uthmin ‘Amr Ibn Ba¦r al-Dji¦i¨, Edited by: ‘Abd al-Salim Hir£n, Beirut, Dir I¦yi’ al-turith al-‘arab¢

118) °ilyat al-awliyi’, Ab£ Na‘¢m I¥bahin¢, Beirut, 1387 A.H

119) al-°uk£mat al-islimiyya fi l-a¦id¢th al-shi‘a al-imimiyya, Qum, F¢ ±ar¢q al-¦aqq Institute, 1360 Sh

120) al-Hudi Ili D¢n al-mu¥§afi, Mu¦ammad Djawid al-Baligh¢, Tehran, 1965

121) Huwiyyat al-tashayyu‘, A¦mad al-Wi’il¢, Qum, 1362 Sh

122) al-«¤i¦, Fa¤l Ibn Shidhin al-Niyshib£r¢, Beirut, al-A‘lam¢. Tehran, Edited by: Mu¦addith Urmaw¢, 1363 Sh

123) al-‘Ibar wa D¢win al-mubtadi’ wa l-khabar, (Tir¢kh Ibn Khald£n), Beirut, 1391 A.H

124) al-‘Iqd al-far¢d, Ibn ‘Abdirabbih, Beirut, 1384,

125) al-‘Iriq fi l-‘a¥r al-umaw¢, Thibit Ismi’¢l al-Riw¢, Baghdad, Maktabat al-Andulus

126) al-I¦tidjidj, ±abars¢, Qum, Quds Mu¦ammad¢

127) I‘lim al-wari, Ab£ ‘Al¢ Fa¤l Ibn °asan ±abris¢, Tehran, 1390 A.H

128) al-I‘lin Bi l-tawb¢kh liman Dhamm Ahl al-tir¢kh, al-Sakhiw ¢, translated by: Asad Allih ªzid, Mashhad, 1410 A.H.

129) al-I¥iba f¢ Tam¢z al-¯a¦iba, Ibn °adjar ‘Asqalin¢, Cairo, 1328 A.H

130) al-If¥i¦, Mu¦ammad Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Nu‘min al-Shiykh al-Muf¢d, Qum, 1413 A.H

131) Ikhtiyir Ma‘rifat al-ridjil, (Ridjil Kashsh¢), al-±£s¢, Edited by: °asan Mu¥§afaw¢, Mashhad University press

132) Ikmil al-d¢n wa Itmim al-ni‘ma, al-Shiykh ¯ad£q, Tehran, 11401 A.H.

133) al-Ilmim, al-Nuwayr¢ al-Iskandarin¢, °aydaribid

134) al-Imim al-Mudjtabi, °asan Mu¥§afaw¢, Qum, Maktabat al-mu¥§afaw¢

135) *al-Imama wa l-siyisa, known by “Tir¢kh al-khulafi’”, Ab£ Mu¦ammad ‘Abd Allih* Ibn Muslim Ibn Qutayba al-Dinwar¢, Edited by: ‘Al¢ Sh¢r¢, Qum, 1413 A.H

136) Imbiri§£riyyat al-‘arab, Djul£b, Translated to Arabic by: Khayr¢ °ammid, Beirut, 1996

137) al-Imli’ wa l-istimli’, Sam‘in¢, Laiden, 1952 A.H

138) al-Imti‘ wa l-mu’inasa, Ab£ °ayyin al-Taw¦¢d¢, Edited by: A¦mad Am¢n & A¦mad al-Zayn, Beirut, Dir al-maktabat al-¦ayit

139) Imtidid al-‘arab f¢ ¯adr al-islim, A¦mad ¯ili¦ al-‘Al¢, Beirut, 1403 A.H

140) al-Irshid al-sir¢ Li Shar¦ ¯a¦¢¦ Bukhir¢, Abu l-‘Abbis A¦mad Ibn Mu¦ammad al-Qas§alin¢, Cairo, B£liq, 1302 A.H

141) al-Irshid f¢ Ma‘rifa °udjadj Allih ‘ala l-‘ibid, Mu¦ammad Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn al-Nu‘min al-Shiykh al-Muf¢d, Edited by: Qum, 1413 A.H

142) al-Ishtiqiq, Ibn Durayd, Baghdad, 1399 A.H

143) Islim Barris¢ Tir¢kh¢, Hamilton A.R. Gibb, Translated by: Man£chihr Am¢r¢, Tehran, 1409 A.H

144) Islim dar «rin, Pe§rushifsk¢, Translated to persian by Kar¢m Kishiwarz, Tehran, 1397 A.H

145) Isri’¢liyyit wa Atharuhi f¢ Kutub al-tafs¢r, Ramz¢ *Na‘ni‘a, Damascus, 1390 A.H*

146) al-Ist¢‘ib, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr al-Qur§ub¢, Beirut, *Dir I¦yi’ al-turith al-‘arab¢*

147) al-It¦if Bi °ubb al-ashrif, al-Shabriw¢, Cairo

148) Ithbit al-wa¥iyya, Mas‘£d¢, Qum, al-Ra¤¢

149) al-kif¢, Mu¦ammad Ibn Ya‘q£b al-Kulayn¢, Edited by: ‘Al¢ Akbar Ghaffir¢, Tehran, 1388 A.H

150) al-Kimil f¢ ®u‘afi’ al-Ridjil, Ibn ‘Uday, Beirut, Dar al-fikr

151) al-Kimil fi l-lugha wa l-adab, Abu l-‘Abbis, Mu¦ammad Ibn Yaz¢d al-Mubarrad, Edited by: Bay¤£n - Nu‘aym zar z£r, Beirut, 1407 A.H

152) al-Kimil fi l-tir¢kh, Abu l-°asan ‘Al¢ Ibn Abi l-Kar¢m Ibn al-Ath¢r, Beirut, 1385 A.H

153) Kal¢lih wa Dimnih, Na¥r Allih Munsh¢, Edited by: Mudjtabi Minaw¢, Tehran, Am¢r Kab¢r

154) Kashf al-¨un£n, °idj¢ Khal¢fa, Beirut, 1402 A.H

155) Kashf al-astir ‘An Musnad al-bazzir, al-Hiythami, Beirut, 1399 A.H

156) Kashf al-ghumma, ‘Al¢ Ibn ‘«si al-Irbil*¢, Tabr¢z*

157) Kashf al-irtiyib, Mu¦sin al-Am¢n, Fifth Edition

158) al-Kashshif, Abu l-qisim Djir Allih Ibn Ma¦m£d Zamakhshar¢, Beirut, Dir al-ma‘rifa

159) al-Kha¥i’i¥ al-kubri, Djalil al-d¢n al-Suy£§¢, Cairo

160) al-Kharidj wa ¯ini‘at al-kitiba, Qudima Ibn Dja‘far, Edited by: Mu¦ammad °usayn al-Zubayd¢, Baghdad, 1981

161) al-Khawiridj wa l-sh¢‘a, wellhausen, Translated to persian by: ‘Abd al-Ra¦min al-Badaw¢, Kuwait, Wikilat al-ma§b£‘it

162) al-Khi§a§ al-miqr¢ziyya, Abu l-‘Abbis A¦mad Ibn ‘Al ¢ Miqr¢z¢, Beirut, Dir ¯idir

163) Khilifat wa Mul£kiyyat, Abu l-A‘li Muwd£d¢, Translated by: Khal¢l A¦mad °imid¢, Piwih, 1405 A.H

164) *Kifiyat al-athar fi l-na¥¥ ‘Ali* ’A’imat al-ithni ‘Ashar, ‘Al¢ Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn ‘Al¢ Ibn Kharriz Qumm¢, Edited by: ‘Abd al-La§¢f al-°usayn¢ al-K£hkamar¢, Qum, 1401 A.H

165) Kitib al-‘ul£m (Amil¢ A¦mad Ibn ‘«si Ibn Zayd), Edited by: Mu¦ammad Ibn Man¥£r Ibn Yaz¢d al-Murid¢

166) Kitib al-bukhir¢, Ab£ ‘Abd Allih Mu¦ammad Ibn Ismi’¢l al-Bukhir¢, Beirut, Dir al-ma‘rifa

167) Kitib Muslim, Muslim Ibn °adjdjidj, Beirut, 1407 A.H

168) Kitib Sulaym Ibn Qays, Najaf

169) al-Kuni wa l-alqib, ‘Abbis al-Qumm¢, Qum, B¢dir

170) Lisin al-‘arab, Mu¦ammad Ibn Mukarram Ibn al-Man¨£r, Beirut, 1408 A.H

171) Lisin al-m¢zin, Ibn °adjar al-‘asqalin¢, Beirut, 1390 A.H

172) Lubib al-albib, Ibn Munqidh, Cairo, 1354 A.H

173) Lubib al-nuq£l, Djalil al-D¢n al-Suy£§¢, Beirut, 1978

174) Milikiyyat Khu¥£¥¢ Zam¢n, ‘Al¢ A¦mad¢ Miyindj¢, Qum, 1404 A.H

175) M¢zin al-i‘tidil, Shams al-D¢n Dhahab¢, Beirut, 1382 A.H

176) al-M¢zin f¢ Tafs¢r al-Qur’in, Mu¦ammad °usayn al-±abi§abiy¢, Tehran, 1397 A.H

177) al-Ma¦isin wa al-masiw¢, Mu¦ammad Ibn Ibrih¢m al-Biyhaq¢, Beirut, 1390 A.H

178) Ma‘idin al-¦ikma, Mu¦ammad Ibn Fiy¤ al-Kishin¢, Edited by: ‘Al¢ al-A¦mad¢, Qum, 1407 A.H

179) al-Ma‘ilim al-ath¢ra fi al-sunna wa l-s¢ra, Mu¦ammad °asan Sharib, Beirut, 1411 A.H

180) Ma‘ilim al-khilifa fi l-fikr al-siyis¢ al-islim¢, Ma¦m£d al-Khilid¢, Beirut, 1404 A.H

181) Ma‘ilim al-Madrisatayn, Murta¤i al-‘Askar¢, Tehran, 1412 A.H

182) Ma‘ilim al-taw¦¢d, Dja‘far al-Sub¦in¢, Tehran, 1400 A.H

183) Ma‘in¢ al-akhbir, Ab£ Dja‘far Mu¦ammad Ibn ‘Al¢ Ibn al-°usayn Ibn Babiwayh al-Shiykh al-¯ad£q, Edited by: ‘Al¢ Akbar Ghaffir¢, Qum, 1403 A.H

184) al-Ma‘irif, Ibn Qutayba al-D¢nwar¢, Edited by: Tharwa ‘Ukkisha, Cairo, dir al-ma‘irif, Qum, 1415

185) al-Ma‘rifa wa l-tir¢kh, Ab£ Y£suf Ya‘q£b Ibn Sufyin al-Basaw¢, Edited by: Akram ®iyi’ al-‘Umar¢, Baghdid, 1394 A.H

186) Ma‘rifat al-¥a¦iba, Ab£ Na‘¢m al-l¥fahin¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Ri¤¢ Ibn °idj ‘Uthmin, Medina, 1408 A.H

187) Mab‘£th al-°usayn, Mu¦ammad ‘Al¢ ‘ªbid¢n, Qum, 1404 A.H

188) al-Madjd¢ f¢ Ansib al-§alib¢yy¢n, Nadjm al-D¢n Abi l-°asan ‘Al¢ Ibn Mu¦ammad al-‘Alaw¢, Edited by: A¦mad Mahdaw¢ Dimghin¢, Qum, 1409 A.H

189) Madjm£‘at al-wathi’iq al-siyisiyya fi al-‘ahd al-nabaw¢ wa al-khilifa al-rishida, Mu¦ammad °am¢d Allih al-°aydaribid¢, Cairo, 1941

190) Madjma‘ al-amthil, al-Miydin¢, Beirut, Dir Maktabat al-¦ayit

191) Madjma‘ al-bayin, Ab£ ‘Al¢ Fa¤l Ibn °asan al-±abris¢, Tehran, Maktabat al-‘ilmiyyat al-islimiyya

192) Madjma‘ al-zawi’id wa Manba‘al-fawi’id, N£r al-D ¢n ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ Bakr al-Haythamc, Beirut, 1967

193) al-Madjr£¦¢n, Ibn °ibbin, Edited by: Ibrih¢m Ziyid, Damascus, Dir al-wa‘y

194) Madkhal Tir¢kh Sharq Islim¢, Jan Suvaje, Translated by: N£sh ªfar¢n An¥ir¢, Tehran, 1407 A.H

195) al-Maghiz¢ al-¬li wa Mu’lif£hi, Translated by: °usayn Na¥¥ir, Cairo, Ma§ba‘at al-°alab¢

196) Maghiz¢ Ras£l Allih li ‘Urwa Ibn Zubayr, Edited by: N£r Sayf, Beirut

197) Makit¢b al-ras£l, ‘Al¢ al-A¦mad¢, Qum, 1404 A.H

198) Maniqib ªl Ab¢ ±ilib, Ibn Shahr ªsh£b, Qum, Mu¥§afaw¢

199) al-Maqilit wa l-firaq, Sa‘d Ibn ‘Abd Allih Ash‘ar¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Djawid Mashk£r, Tehran, 1360

200) Maqimit al-‘ulami’ Bayn Yaday al-khulafi’ wa l-umari’, Ab£ °imid Mu¦ammad Ibn Mu¦ammad al-Ghazzil

¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Djisim al-¦ad¢th¢, Baghdad, 1988

201) Maqitil al-§ilibiyy¢n, Abu l-Faradj al-I¥fahin¢, Edited by: Ki¨im al-Mu¨affar, Najaf, al-°aydariyya, 1405 A.H; Other printed Edited by: A¦mad ¯aqr, Qum, 1414 A.H

202) Maqtal al-imim Am¢r al-Mu'min¢n 'Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ± ilib, Ab£ Bakr 'Abd Allih Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Abi l-Dunyi, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Biqir al-Ma¦m£d¢, Tehran, 1411 A.H

203) Mari¥id al-i§§ili', al-Baghdid¢, Cairo, 1373 A.H

204) Masi'il al-imima wa Muqta§afit Min al-kitib al-awsa§ fi al-maqilit, Edited by: Van Ess, Beirut, 1971

205) al-Mi'yir wa l-muwizina f¢ Fa¤i'il Am¢r al-Mu'min ¢n 'Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib, Ab£ Dja'far al-Iskif¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Biqir al-Ma¦m£d¢, Beirut, 1399 A.H

206) al-Milal wa l-nihal, al-Shahristin¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Fat¦ Allih Ibn Badrin, Qum, 1405 A.H

207) Min Dawla 'Umar ili Dawla 'Abd al-Malik, Ibrih¢m Bay¤£n, Beirut, 1411 A.H

208) Min Tir¢kh al-adab al-'arab¢, ±ihi °usayn, Beirut, 1981

209) Mu¦i¤arit al-udabi', Righib al-I¥fahin¢

210) al-Mu¦abbar, Mu¦ammad Ibn °ab¢b al-Baghdid¢, Beirut, Dir al-ifigh al-djad¢da, (India 1361 A.H)

211) Mu'allaqit Sab', Translated to persian by: 'Abd al-Mu¦ammad ªyat¢, Tehran, 1390 A.H

212) Mu'djam al-buldin, Yiq£t °amaw¢, Beirut, 1399 A.H

213) Mu'djam al-ma'ilim al-djughrifiyya, 'ªtiq Ibn Ghayth al-Bilid¢, Mecca, 1402 A.H

214) Mu'djam al-udabi', Yiq£t °amaw¢, Beirut, 1400 A.H

215) Mu'djam Qabiyil al-'arab, 'Umar Ri¤i Ka¦¦ila, Beirut, Mu'assisat al-Risila

216) al-Mu¥annaf fi l-a¦id¢th wa l-ithir, Ab£ Bakr 'Abd Allih Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Ab¢ Shayba, Edited by: Kamil Y£suf al-°£t, Beirut, 1409 A.H

217) al-Mu¥annaf, 'Abd al-Razziq Ibn Hammim al-¯an'in ¢, Edited by: °ab¢b al-Ra¦min al-A'¨am¢, Beirut, 1392 A.H

218) Mudhakkir wa l-tadhk¢r wa l-dhikr, A¦mad Ibn 'Amr al-Shaybin¢, Edited by: Khilid al-Radid¢, Riyi¤, 1413 A.H

219) al-Mufa¥¥al f¢ tir¢kh al-‘arab Qabl al-islim, Djawid ‘Al¢, Beirut, 1980
220) Mufradit Alfi¨ al-Qur’in, al-Righib al-I¥fahin¢, Tehran, Maktabat al-Murta¤awiyya
221) al-Mukhta¥ar f¢ Akhbir al-bashar, ‘Imid al-D¢n Ismi’il (Abu l-fidi’), Beirut, Dir al-ma‘rifa
222) Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh al-‘arab wa l-tamaddun al-islim ¢, al-Sayyid Am¢r ‘Al¢, Translated to Arabic by: Riyi¤ Ra’fat, Cairo, 1938
223) Mukhta¥ar Tir¢kh Dimashq, Mu¦ammad Ibn Mukarram Ibn al-Man¨£r, Damascus, 1988
224) al-Muntakhab Min Dhayl al-mudhayyal, Mu¦ammad Ibn Djar¢r al-§abar¢, Cairo, Dir al-ma‘irif
225) Muqadama f¢ Tir¢kh ¯adr al-islim, ‘Abd al-‘Az¢z al-D£r¢, Beirut, 1960
226) Muqaddamihy¢ Bar Tir¢kh Tadw¢n °ad¢th, Ras£l Dja‘fariyin, Qum, 1411 A.H
227) al-Muqni‘ fi l-imima, ‘Abd Allih Ibn ‘Abd Allih al-Sudd ªbid¢, Edited by: Shikir Shabs‘, Qum, 1413 A.H
228) Murdji’a, Tir¢kh wa And¢shih, Ras£l Dja‘fariyin, Qum, 1414 A.H
229) Murudj al-dhahab wa Ma‘idin al-djuwhar, Abu l-°asan ‘Al¢ Ibn al-°usayn al-Mas‘£d¢, Beirut, 1358 A.H
230) Musnad al-imim al-Ki¨im, ‘Az¢z Allih al-‘U§irud¢, Mashhad, ªstin Quds Ra¤aw¢
231) al-Musnad, A¦mad Ibn °anbal, Beirut, Dir ¯idir
232) al-Musnad, Ibn Dja‘d
233) al-Mustadrak ‘Ala al-vasi’il, M¢rzi °usayn al-N£r¢, Qum, Mu’assesat ªl al-bayt
234) al-Mustadrak ‘Ala l-¥a¦¢¦ayn, Ab£ ‘Abd Allih al-°ikim al-Niyshib£r¢, °aydaribid, 1342 A.H
235) al-Mustarshid fi l-imima, Mu¦ammad Ibn Djar¢r al-±abar¢ al-Sh¢‘¢, Najaf, al-°aydariyya
236) al-Muwa§§i’, Milik Ibn Anas, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Fu’id ‘Abd al-Biq¢, Beirut, Dir I¦yi’ al-turith al-‘arab¢
237) al-Muwaffaqiyyit, Zubayr Ibn Bakkir, Edited by: Sim¢ Makk¢ al-‘ªn¢, Baghdid, 1392
238) al-Muzhir, Djalil l-D¢n al-Suy£§¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad A¦mad Djid al-mawli, Cairo, Dir I¦yi’ al-kutub al-‘arabiyya
239) N£r al-ab¥ir, Mu¦ammad Mu’min al-Shablandj¢, Cairo, Ma§ab‘at al-Y£sifiyya

240) Na¨m durar al-sim§ayn f¢ Fa¤i'il al-mu¥§afi wa l-murta¤i wa l-bat£l wa l-sib§ayn, Djamil al-D¢n Mu¦ammad Ibn Y£suf °anaf¢ Madan¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Hid¢ al-Am¢n¢, Tehran, Maktabat Niynawi

241) al-Na¥i'¦ al-kifiya li man Yatawalli Mu'iwiya, Mu¦ammad Ibn 'Aq¢l, Qum, Dir al-thiqifa

242) Nahdj al-baligha, Translated to persian by: Dja'far Shah¢d¢, Tehran, 1414 A.H

243) Nahdj al-sa'ida f¢ Mustadrak Nahdj al-baligha, Mu¦ammad Biqir al-Ma¦m£d¢, Beirut, 1397 A.H

244) Nasab Qurays¤, Mu¥'ab al-Zubayr¢, Cairo, Dir al-ma'irif

245) Nathr al-durr, Ab£ Sa'¢d al-ªb¢, Cairo, 1981

246) Ni¨im al-¦uk£ma al-nabawiyya al-musammi , (al-tarit¢b al-idiriyya), 'Abd al-¦ayy al-kattin¢, Beirut, Dir al-kitib al-'arab¢

247) Ni¨im al-¦ukm fi l-islim, Mu¦ammad Fir£q al-Nabhin, Beirut, 1408 A.H

248) Ni¨im Wiliyat al-'ahd wa Wirithat al-khilifa f¢ al-'a¥r al-umaw¢, °usayn 'A§win, Beirut, 1411 A.H

249) al-Nihiya f¢ Ghar¢b al-¦ad¢th wa l-athar, Abu l-Sidit Mubirak Ibn Mu¦ammad al-Djazar¢ Ibn al-Ath¢r, Edited by: ±ihir A¦mad al-Ziw¢, Ma¦m£d Mu¦ammad al-±anni¦¢, Qum, 1364

250) Nihiyat al-irab f¢ Fun£n al-adab, Shahib al-D¢n A¦mad Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhib al-Nuwayr¢, Cairo, 1342 A.H

251) al-Nizi' wa l-takhi¥um F¢mi Bayn Ban¢ Umayya wa Ban¢ Hishim, Taq¢ al-D¢n al-Miqr¢z¢, Edited by: °usayn M£nis, Qum, 1412 A.H

252) al-Nuq£d al-islimiyya, Taq¢ al-D¢n A¦mad Ibn 'Ali al-Miqr¢z¢, Najaf, al-°aydariyya, 1387 A.H

253) *Pazh£hish¢ Darbarih Naqsh D¢n¢ wa* Idjtimi'¢ Qi¥¥ih Khinin Dar Tir¢kh Islim, Ras£l Djafariyin, Qum, 1412 A.H

254) Piyimbar Umm¢, Murta¤i Mu§ahhar¢, Qum, ¯adri

255) Piykir ¯iff¢n, Na¥r Ibn Muzi¦im Minqar¢, Translated by: Parw¢z Atibak¢, Tehran, 1408 A.H

256) al-Qidisiyya, A¦mad 'ªdil Kamil, Beirut, 1404 A.H

257) Qim£s al-ridjil, Mu¦ammad Taq¢ al-Tustar¢, Tehran, 1397 A.H

258) Qi¥ih Khini dar Tir¢kh Islim, Ras£l Djafariyin, Qum, 1412 A.H

259) al-Qu¥i¥ wa l-mudhakkir¢n, 'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn al-Dj£z¢, Edited by: Qisim al-Simirri'¢, Riyi¤, 1403 A.H

260) Rab¢‘ al-abrib wa Nu¥£¥ al-akhbir, Abu l-Qisim Ma¦m£d Ibn ‘Umar al-Zamakhshar¢, Qum, 1369 A.H

261) al-Radda, Mu¦ammad Ibn ‘Umar al-Wiqid¢, Edited by: Ya¦yi al-Djubb£r¢, Beirut, 1410 A.H

262) Rasi’il al-dji¦i¨, ‘Abd al-Salim Hir£n, Cairo, 1964

263) Rasi’il al-dji¦i¨, Edited by: ‘Al¢ Ab£ Mal¦am, Beirut, 1987

264) Rasi’il Ibn °azm, Edited by: I¦sin ‘Abbis, Beirut, 1987

265) al-Raw¤ al-unuf, Abu l-Qisim ‘Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn ‘Abd Allih al-Khath‘am¢, Edited by: ±ihi ‘Abd al-Ra’£f Sa‘d, Cairo, Maktabat al-kulliyyit al-Azhariyya

266) Raw¤at al-Wi‘i¨¢n, Fattil Nyshib£r¢, Najaf, 1386

267) Rawish Shinikht Islim, ‘Al¢ Shar¢‘at¢, Madjm£‘a ªthir, N. 27, Tehran

268) Ridjil al-nadjish¢, A¦mad *Ibn ‘Al¢ Ibn A¦mad al-Nadjash¢ al-Asad¢ al-K£f¢, Edited by: M£si Shubayr¢ Zandjin¢, Qum,* 1407 A.H

269) Riyi¤ al-‘ulami’, M¢rzi ‘Abd Allih Afand¢, Edited by: A¦mad °usayn¢, Qum, 1401 A.H

270) Ruw¤it al-djannit, Mu¦ammad Biqir al-I¥fahin¢ al-Khinsir¢, Qum, Ismi’¢liyin

271) al-¯a¦¢¦ Min S¢rat al-nab¢ al-a‘¨am, Dja‘far Murta¤i, Qum 1403 A.H

272) ¯a¦¢fa Sadjdjidiyya, al-imim ‘Al¢ Ibn al-°usayn

273) ¯ifat al-¥afwa, Abu l-Faradj Ibn al-Dh£zin¢, Damascus, 1390 A.H

274) ¯ub¦ al-’A‘shi f¢ ¯ini‘at al-inshi’, Ab£ al-‘Abbis A¦mad Ibn ‘Al¢ al-Qalqashand¢, Cairo, 1383 A.H

275) ¯ul¦ al-°asan, ªl Yis¢n, Baghdad, Dir al-kutub al-‘ariqiyya

276) ¯ul¦ al-imim al-°asan, Mu¦ammad Djawid Fa¤l Allih, Beirut, Dir al-ghad¢r

277) al-S¢ra al-nabawiyya, Ziyn¢ Da¦lin, Printed with al-S¢rat al-¦alabiyya, Beirut

278) S¢ra Ras£l Allih, ‘Abbis Zaryib Kh£’¢, Tehran, 1412 A.H

279) S¢ra wa Qiyim Zayd Ibn ‘Al¢, °usayn Kar¢min, Tehran, 1402 A.H

280) al-S¢rat al-¦alabiyya, (Insin al-‘uy£n f¢ S¢rat al-am ¢n al-ma’m£n), ‘Al¢ Ibn Burhin al-D¢n al-°alab¢, Beirut, al-Maktabat al-Islimiyya

281) al-S¢rat al-nabawiyya, Abu l-Fidi' Ismi'¢l Ibn Kath ¢r, Edited by: Mu¥§afi 'Abd al-Wi¦id, Beirut, 1407 A.H

282) al-S¢rat al-nabawiyya, Ibn Hishim, Edited by: Mu¥§afi al-Saqqi', Beirut, Dir al-ma'rifa

283) Sam§ al-nudj£m al-'awil¢, 'Abd al-Malik Ibn °usayn al-'I¥im¢, Cairo, 1380 A.H

284) al-Saq¢fa wa Fadak, Ab£ Bakr A¦mad Ibn 'Abd al-'Az¢z al-Dhuwhar¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Hid¢ al-Am¢n¢, Tehran, Niynawi

285) al-Shim f¢ ¯adr al-islim, Nadjda Khumish, Damascus, 1987

286) al-Sh£ri fi l-'a¥r al-umaw¢, °usayn 'A§win, Beirut, 1410 A.H

287) Shadharit al-dhahab f¢ Akhbir Man Dhahab, Ibn al-'Imid al-°anbal¢, Beirut, Dir l¦yi' al-turith al-'arab¢

288) al-Shah¢d Muslim Ibn 'Aq¢l, 'Abd al-Razziq al-Muqarram, Najaf

289) Shar¦ Nahdj al-balighha, Ibn Abi l-°ad¢d, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Abu l-Fa¤l Ibrih¢m, Cairo, 1387 A.H

290) Shar¦ U¥£l al-khamsa, Qi¤¢ 'Abd al-Djabbir Hamadin¢, Cairo, 1385 A.H

291) Sharaf A¥¦ib al-¦ad¢th, Ab£ Bakr A¦mad Ibn 'Al¢ Ibn Thibit al-Kha§¢b al-Baghdid¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Sa'¢d Kha§¢b ¬ghl¢, Ankara, 1971

292) Shi'r al-khawaridj, Edited by: I¦sin 'Abbis, Beirut, 1974

293) al-Shi'r wa l-shu'ari', Ab£ Mu¦ammad 'Abd Allih Ibn Muslim Ibn Qutayba al-D¢nwar¢, Beirut, Dir ¯idir

294) Siyar A'lim al-nubali', Shams al-D¢n al-Dhahab¢, Beirut, Mu'assisat al-Risila

295) al-Siyar wa l-maghiz¢, Mu¦ammad Ibn Is¦iq, Edited by: Suhayl Zakkir, Beirut, 1398 A.H

296) Subul al-hudi wa l-rashid f¢ S¢ra Khayr al-'ibid, Mu¦ammad Ibn Y£suf al-¯ili¦¢ al-Shim¢, Edited by: Mu¥§afi 'Abd al-Wi¦id, Cairo, 1392 A.H

297) Sunan al-dirim¢, Ab£ Mu¦ammad 'Abd Allih Ibn Bahrim al-Dirim¢, Beirut, 1398 A.H

298) Sunan al-kubri, Ab£ Bakr A¦mad Ibn °usayn al-Biyhaq¢, °aydaribid, 1344 A.H

299) Sunan al-nasi'¢, Ab£ 'Abd al-Ra¦min A¦mad Ibn Shu'ayb Ibn 'Al¢ al-Nisi'¢, Beirut, Dir al-fikr

300) Sunan Ibn Midja, Ab£ 'Abd Allih Mu¦ammad Ibn Yaz¢d al-Qazw¢n¢ Ibn Midja, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Fu'id 'Abd al-Biq¢, Beirut, Dir l¦yi' al-turith al'arab¢

301) al-Sunna, Ab£ Bakr A¦mad Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Hir£n Ibn Yaz¢d al-Khallil, Edited by: ‘A§iyya al-Zahrin¢, Riyi¤, 1415 A.H

302) ±abaqit al-kubri, Mu¦ammad Ibn Sa‘d, Beirut, 1405 A.H

303) ±abaqit al-mu¦addith¢n Bi l¥bahin, Ab£ Mu¦ammad ‘Abd Allih Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Djaʻfar Abu l-Shiykh al-An¥ir¢, Edited by: ‘Abd al-Ghaf£r ‘Abd al-°aqq, Beirut, 1412 A.H

304) ±abaqit al-shu‘ari’, Mu¦ammad Ibn Sallam al-Djuma¦¢, Beirut, 1968

305) ±abaqit Fu¦£l al-shu‘ari’, Mu¦ammad Ibn Sallim Djuma¦¢ ¸Edited by: Ma¦m£d Mu¦ammad Shikir, Cairo, 1400 A.H

306) al-±ari’if F¢ Ma‘rifa Madhihib al-§awi’if, Ibn ±iw£s, Qum, Maktabat al-Khayyim

307) al-±ar¢q ila l-madi’in, A¦mad ‘ªdil Kamil, Beirut, 1404 A.H

308) Tidj al-‘Ar£s, Mu¦ammad Murta¤i al-°usayn¢ al-Zubayd¢, Beirut, 1385 A.H

309) Tir¢kh ¯adr al-islim wa l-duwlat al-umawiyya, ‘Umar Farr£kh, Beirut, Dir al-‘ilm li l-Maliy¢n

310) Tir¢kh «rin az Islim ti Salidjiqih, Vol 4, Edited by: R.N.Fray, Translated by: °asan An£shih, Tehran, 1401 A.H

311) Tir¢kh «rin dar Qur£n Nukhust¢n Islim¢, Bertold Spuler, Translated by: Djawid Fali§£r¢, Tehran, 1404 A.H

312) Tir¢kh al-‘arab fi l-islim, Djawid ‘Al¢, Qum, 1413 A.H

313) Tir¢kh al-‘arab wa l-islim Mundh Mi Qabl al-mab‘ath wa °atti Suq£t Baghdid, Suhayl Zakkir, Beirut, 1397 A.H

314) al-Tir¢kh al-‘arab¢ wa l-Mu’arrikh£n, Shikir Mu¥§afi, Beirut, 1983

315) Tir¢kh al-adab al-‘arab¢ (al-‘A¥r al-djihil¢), Shuwq ¢ ®ayf, Cairo, 1960

316) Tir¢kh al-adab al-‘arab¢, R. Blacher, Translated by: Ibrih¢m al-K¢lin¢, Damascus, 1973

317) Tir¢kh al-djahmiya wa l-mu‘tazila, Djamil al-D¢n al-Qisim¢, Cairo, 1331

318) Tir¢kh al-duwlat al-‘arabiyya, Wellhausen, Cairo, 1958

319) Tir¢kh al-islim wa Wafayit al-mashih¢r wa l-i'lim, Shams al-D¢n al-Dhahab¢, Edited by: 'Abd al-Sallim Tadmur¢, Beirut, 1407 A.H

320) al-Tir¢kh al-kab¢r, Ab£ 'Abd Allih Ismi'¢l Ibn Ibrih ¢m al- Bukhir¢, Beirut, Dir al-kutub al-'ilmiyya

321) Tir¢kh al-khulafi', Djalil al-D¢n al-Suy£§¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Mu¦y al-D¢n 'Abd al-°am¢d, Cairo, 1371 A.H

322) Tir¢kh al-mad¢nat al-munawwara, Ab£ Zayd 'Umar Ibn Shabba al-Numayr¢, Edited by: Fah¢m Mu¦ammad Shalt£t, Qum, 1410 A.H

323) Tir¢kh al-turith al-'arab¢, Fu'id Sizg¢n, Qum, Maktabat al-mar'ash¢

324) Tir¢kh al-umam wa l-rusul wa l-mul£k, Mu¦ammad Ibn Djar¢r al-±abar¢, Beirut, al-A'lam¢, 1983. Another publication Edited by : Mu¦ammad Abu l-Fa¤l Ibrih¢m, Cairo, Dir al-ma'irif

325) Tir¢kh al-ya'q£b¢, A¦mad Ibn Mu¦ammad Ibn Wi¤i¦ al-ya'q£b¢, Beirut, Dir ¯idir

326) Tir¢kh Baghdid, Ab£ Bakr A¦mad Ibn 'Al¢ Kha§¢b Baghdid¢, Beirut, Dir al-kitib al-'arab¢

327) Tir¢kh Biyhaq, Abu l-°asan 'Al¢ Ibn Zayd Biyhaq¢, (Ibn Fanduq), Edited by: Kal¢m Allih °usayn¢, °aydaribid

328) Tir¢kh Djurdjin, al-Sahm¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad 'Abd al-Mu'¢d Khin, Beirut, 1407 A.H

329) Tir¢kh Falsafih dar Islim, Vol 2, Edited by: Miyin Mu¦ammad Shar¢f, The persian version, Tehran, 1407 A.H

330) Tir¢kh Guz¢dih, °amd Allih Mustuwf¢, Edited by: 'Abd al-°usayn Nawiy¢, Tehran, 1404 A.H

331) Tir¢kh Ib¢ Zur'a al-dimashq¢, 'Abd al-Ra¦min Ibn 'Amr Ibn 'Abd Allih al-Na¥r¢, Dirisa wa Ta¦q¢q, Shukr Allih Ibn Ni'mat Allih al-Q£djin¢

332) Tir¢kh Ibn al-Ward¢, Zayn al-D¢n 'Umar Ibn Mu¨affar Ibn al-Ward¢, Nadjaf, 1389 A.H

333) Tir¢kh Ismi'¢liyin, Bernard Lewis, Translated by: Firiyd£n Badrih¢, Tehran, 1404 A.H

334) Tir¢kh Khal¢fat Ibn Khayyi§, Edited by: Akram ®iyi' al-'Umar¢, Riyi¤, 1405 A.H

335) Tir¢kh Makka, A¦mad Subi'¢, Mecca, 1372 A.H

336) Tir¢kh S£riyya wa Lubnin wa Filis§¢n, Philip K. Hitti, Translated by: Kamil al-Yizidj¢, Beirut, Dir al-thiqifa, *3rd edition*

337) Tir¢kh Tir¢khnigir¢ Islim¢, Franz Rosental, Translated by: Asad Allih ªzid, Mashhad, 1368

338) Tir¢kh Tmaddun, Will Durant, Tehran, Intishirit ªm£zish Inqilib Islim¢, Second Edition

339) Tir¢kh Ya¦yi Ibn Mu‘¢n, Edited by: A¦mad Mu¦ammad N£r Sayf, Riyi¤, 1399 A.H

340) Tir¢khnegir¢ dar Islim, Translated and Edited by: Ya‘q£b ªzhand, Tehran, 1403 A.H

341) al-Ta¦q¢q f¢ Kalimit al-Qur’in, °asan al-Mu¥§afaw ¢, Tehran, 1360

342) Ta’s¢s al-sh¢‘a li ‘Ul£m al-islim, al-Sayyid °assan al-¯adr, Tehran, al-A‘lam¢

343) Ta§awwur al-fikr al-siyis¢ ‘Ind Ahl al-sunna, Khayr al-D¢n al-Saw¢, Ummin, 1992 A.H

344) Tab¥irat al-‘awim f¢ Ma‘rifa Maqilit al-anim, Edited by: ‘Abbis Iqbil, Tehran, Asi§¢r

345) Tadhkirat al-¦uffi¨, Shams al-D¢n al-Dhahab¢, Beirut, 1374 A.H

346) Tadhkirat al-khawi¥, Sib§ Ibn al-Dj£z¢, Tehran, Niynawi

347) Tadjirib al-umam, Ab£ ‘Al¢ Muskuwayh, Edited by: Imim¢, Tehran, Sur£sh

348) Tadr¢b al-riw¢, Djalil al-D¢n al-Suy£§¢, Medina, 1392 A.H

349) Tafs¢r al-furqin, Mu¦ammad al-¯idiq¢, Beirut, 1397 A.H

350) Tafs¢r al-manir, Mu¦ammad Rash¢d Ri¤i, Beirut, Dir al-ma‘rifa

351) Tafs¢r al-mun¢r, Wahba Zu¦ayl¢, Damascus, Dir al-fikr

352) Tafs¢r al-qur§ub¢, (al-Djimi‘ li A¦kim al-Qur’in), Mu¦ammad Ibn A¦mad al-An¥ir¢ al-Qur§ub¢, Edited by: A¦mad Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Al¢m al-Bard£n¢, Beirut, Dir l¦yi’ al-turith al-‘arab¢

353) Tafs¢r Furit al-k£f¢, Furit Ibn Ibrih¢m Ibn Furit K£f ¢, Najaf, al-°aydariyya

354) Tahdh¢b al-kamil, Djamil al-D¢n Ibi l-°adjdjidj Y£suf al-Mizz¢, Edited by: Bashshir ‘Awwid Ma‘r£f, Beirut, 1402 A.H

355) Tahdh¢b Tir¢kh Dimashq, ‘Abd al-Qidir Badrin, Beirut, Dir al-mas¢ra

356) al-Tamh¢d li Tir¢kh al-falsafat al-islimiyya, Mu¥§afi ‘Abd al-Riziq, Cairo, 1966

357) al-Tanb¢h wa l-ishrif, Abu l-°asan ‘Al¢ Ibn al-°usayn al-Mas‘£d¢, Edited by: ‘Abd Allih Ismi‘¢l al-¯iw¢, Cairo, 1406 A.H

358) Tanq¢¦ al-maqil f¢ A¦wil al-ridjil, Asad Allih al-Mimaqin¢, Tehran, al-Murta¤awiyya

359) Taqw¢m Ta§b¢q¢ Hizir wa Pin¥ad Silih Hidjr¢ Qamar¢ wa Milid¢, Ferdinand Wustenfeld, Edited by: °ak¢m al-D¢n Qurayshi¢, Tehran, 1402 A.H

360) Tardhimat al-imim al-°usayn, Ibn Sa‘d, Edited by: ‘Abd al-Az¢z ±abi§abiy¢, Printed In Turithuni Magezine, N.10

361) Tardjimat al-imim ‘Al¢ Ibn Ab¢ ±ilib, Ibn ‘Asikir, Edited by: Mu¦ammad Biqir Ma¦m£d¢

362) Tardjimat al-imim al-°asan Min Tir¢kh Dimashq, Ibn ‘Asikir, Edited by: al-‘Allimat al-Ma¦m£d¢, Beirut

363) Tardjimat al-imim al-°asan, Ibn Sa‘d, Edited by: ‘Abd al-Az¢z ±abi§abiy¢, Printed In Turithuni Magezine, N.11

364) Tardjimat al-imim al-°usayn Min Tir¢kh Dimashq, Ibn ‘Asikir, Edited by: al-‘Allimat al-Ma¦m£d¢, Beirut

365) Tathb¢t Dali’il al-nubuwwa, ‘Abd al-DjabbirIbn A¦mad al-Hama¤in¢, Edited by: ‘Abd al-Kar¢m ‘Uthmin, Beirut, Dir al-‘arabiyya

366) *Tays¢r al-ma§ilib f¢ Amil¢ al-imim Ab¢ ±ilib, Ab£ ±ilib Zayd¢, 1395 A.H

367) al-Thiqif, Ibn °ibbin, °aydar Abid, Beiut, 1403 A.H

368) al-Tibyin f¢ Tafs¢r al-Qur’in, Ab£ Dja‘far Mu¦ammad Ibn °asan al-±£s¢, Edited by: A¦mad Qa¥¢r, Beirut, Dir al-i¦yi al-turith al-islim¢

369) Tu¦af al-‘uq£l, al-°arrin¢, Tehran, Islimiyya

370) ‘Umdat al-§ilib f¢ Ansib ªl Ab¢ ±ilib, Ibn‘Inaba, Najaf, 1380 A.H

371) al-‘Uthminiyya, Ab£ ‘Amr al-Dji¦i¨, 1384 A.H

372) ‘Uy£n al-akhbir al-Ri¤i, Shiykh ¯ad£q, Najaf, 1390 A.H

373) ‘Uy£n al-akhbir, Ab£ Mu¦ammad ‘Abd Allih Ibn Muslim Ibn Qutayba al-D¢nwar¢, Cairo, 1383 A.H

374) ‘Uy£n al-athar f¢ Fun£n al-maghiz¢ wa l-shami’il wa l-siyar, Abu l-Fat¦ Mu¦ammad Ibn Sayyid al-Nis, Edited by: Mu¦ammad al-Kha§riw¢, Mu¦yi l-D¢n Mast£, Medina, 1413 A.H

375) ‘Uy£n al-tawir¢kh, al-Sifr al-awwal, Mu¦ammad Ibn Shikir Ibn A¦mad al-Kutb¢, Edited by:: °isim al-D¢n al-Quds¢, Cairo, 1980

376) U¥£l Asmi' al-mudun wa l-mawiqi' al-'ariwiyya, Djamil Bibin, Baghdad, 1989

377) al-Umawiyy£n wa l-b¢zan§iyy£n, A¦mad al-'Adw¢, Cairo, al-Dir al-q£miyya lil§ibi'a wa al-nashr

378) al-Umawiyy£n wa l-khilifa, °usayn 'A§win, Beirut, 1986

379) al-Uns al-djal¢l Bi tir¢kh al-quds wa l-khal¢l, Mudj¢r al-d¢n °anbal¢, Qum, 1410 A.H

380) Usd al-ghiba, Ibn al-Ath¢r, Beirut, *Dir I¦yi' al-turith al-'arab¢*

381) al-Wi'il, Ab£ Hilil 'Askar¢, Damascus, 1975

382) al-Wifidit Min al-nisi' 'Ali Mu'iwiya, Edited by: Sukayna al-Shahib¢, Damascus

383) Wafi' al-wafi' Bi Akhbir Dir al-mu¥§afi, N£r al-D¢n 'Al¢ Ibn A¦mad al-Samh£d¢, Beirut, 1404 A.H

384) Wafayit al-a'yin, Ibn Khallakin, Edited by; I¦sin 'Abbis, Qum, 1969 Waq'at ¯iff¢n, Na¥r Ibn Muzi¦im al-Minqar¢, Edited by: 'Abd al-Salim Hir£n, Cairo, 1382 A.H

385) Waq'at al-djamal, Mu¦ammad Ibn Zakariyyi Ibn D ¢nar al-Ghallib¢, Edited by: Mu¦ammad °asan ªl Yis¢n, Baghdad, 1390 A.H

386) Wasi'il al-sh¢'a ili Ta¦¥¢l Masi'il al-shar¢'a, Mu¦ammad Ibn °asan al-°urr al-'ªmil¢, Beirut, 1391 A.H

387) Yathrib Qabl al-islim, Mu¦ammad al-Sayyid al-Wak¢l, Djidda, 1409 A.H

388) Zid al-ma'id, Ibn Qayyim al-Dhawziyya, al-Mu'assisa li l-±ibi'a wa l-nashr

389) al-Z¢na, Ab£ °itam A¦mad Ibn °amdin Riz¢, Edited by: 'Abd Allih al-Simirri'¢

390) al-Zawidj al-muwaqqat fi l-islim, Dja'far Murta¤i, Qum

391) ²ahar al-islim, A¦mad Am¢n, Cairo, Maktabat al-Nah¤at al-qihira