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ABSTRACT

The Umayyad Caliphate during the reign of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik (105-125/724-743) is the theme of this study. It commences with a survey of the major sources and brief comments on some relevant modern works.

Chapter I deals with the early life of Hishām and the situation in the empire prior to his accession to the throne.

The second Chapter is concerned with the Shī‘ī opposition and is divided into two parts: part I deals with the revolt of Zayd b. 'Alī. In it Zayd's relationship with his brother, al-Bāqir, and his son, Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, and also with Wāṣil b. 'Aṭā' are discussed. Zayd's activities before his revolt in addition to the events of the rebellion and its consequences are thoroughly investigated. Part II deals with the ghulāt movement during the period under study.

Chapter III is also divided into two parts: part I deals with the Berber revolt in North-Africa. The motives, events and the results of this rebellion are discussed. The Civil War in Spain is the subject of part II.

The Khārijite opposition in the east and the Coptic revolts in Egypt are presented in the fourth Chapter.

The motives, events and results of the rebellious movement of al-Ŷārith b. Surayj are scrutinised in the fifth Chapter.
The sixth Chapter deals with the Arab conquest in Khurāsān and Transoxania while the seventh Chapter is concerned with the Arab conquest in Armenia, Adharbayjān and Caucasus in addition to the Arab–Khazar war during the period under consideration.
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INTRODUCTION
SURVEY OF SOURCES

As all extant sources except poetry and documentary evidences emanate from the period of 'Abbāsid rule they show a bias against the Umayyads. This is an endeavour, therefore, to scrutinise the sources and to test, as far as possible, the reliability of their information concerning the period under study. The sources fall into two groups, one of which can be classified as literary works and the other as documentary evidence. Literary works include annals, local histories, religious books, biographical works, Ḥadīths, literature and geographies. The most important of these works are:

1. Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ (d. 240/854-5) was a traditionist in addition to being a historian and, as such, he quotes his authorities from which he derived his information. Two of his works have survived: the Ta'rīkh and Kitāb al-Tabaqāt. Khalīfa's Ta'rīkh begins with the first year of Hijra and terminates with the year 230/844-5. In this work he cites a number of earlier writers who are listed by the editor, A.D. al-'Umarī, in the "introduction" to Kitāb al-Ta'rīkh.¹ His sources for the period under discussion are

¹A.D. al-'Umarī, introduction to Khalīfa's Ta'rīkh, I, pp. 26-45.

Khalīfa touches upon many aspects of Hishām’s reign among which is a brief and occasionally inaccurate account of the war in Transoxania. His data concerning the revolt of al-Ḥarīth b. Surayj is brief and often inaccurate. Equally brief is his information concerning wars with the Byzantines and he scarcely makes reference to authorities. Conversely he supplies much material of events in the western provinces and on the Berber revolts in North-Africa – but abstains from reporting those of Spain. He does not usually quote his authorities on the Berber revolts but occasionally cites Abū Khālid. Abū Khālid himself lived in Baṣra, far distant from the scene of the events of North-Africa. He usually cites earlier writers but does not quote any references in his narrative of North-African events and his reports must be carefully considered.

In general Khalīfa’s account of the events in North-Africa during the period of Hishām appear at times to be confused as he sometimes inaccurately records the names of the leaders and the
governors, and occasionally provides unconfirmed reports. These discrepancies and a further discussion of Khalīfa's account are to be found in the relevant chapter of this thesis.¹

Khalīfa ingnores the revolt of Zayd b. 'Ali and merely states that he was killed in 122/740.² This, and his brief incomplete version of the revolt of al-Ḥarīth, appear to show that Khalīfa had pro-Umayyad tendencies.

Khalīfa's value to the period under discussion lies in his narrative of the Arab Conquest in the Caucasus. His material is chiefly given on the authority of Ibn al-Kalbī and Abu Khalīd who at times traces his information (concerning the war in the Caucasus) to participants in the events of which he speaks.³ It is unique in that Khalīfa gives occasional precise data of day, month and year for certain episodes in the Caucasus and Adhar-bayjān which are not to be found in any other extant source.⁴

Khalīfa b. Khayyat concludes the reign of each caliph by providing a list of scribes, judges, governors and other officials.

¹See Chapter, iii, pp. 142, 146, 156, n. 4.
³See for example Khalīfa's Tārīkh, II, p. 356.
⁴Ibid., pp. 353, 359.
2. Abu’l-'Abbas Ahmad b. Yahya al-Baladhuri (d. 279/892) is the author of Kitab Futuh al-Buldan and Ansab al-Ashraf.

His Kitab Futuh al-Buldan is concerned chiefly with administration in conquered provinces. He occasionally gives brief information of expeditions against the Byzantines and the construction of fortifications on their borders. He also provides some information on the military expeditions in Sind and the Caucasus during the reign of Hisham. There is no chronology in his account of these events but dates can be ascertained by comparison with other extant sources. His information in connection with the amount of tribute imposed by the Arabs on the principalities of Armenia, Adharbayjan and the Caucasus is unique. In his Futuh al-Buldan he cites many of his sources, amongst whom are Waqidi, Mada‘ini, Hisham b. al-Kalbi, Abu ‘Ubayda and others of less importance. Also by such phrases as "wa Ḥaddāthani Jamā‘atun min ahl Bardha‘a" he shows that he visited some of the places he mentioned in his book and obtained certain information from some of the inhabitants he met during the course of his work; alternatively he met these people in his place of residence who supplied him with some information about their city or district.

---

1Baladhuri, Futuh, pp. 166-7, 186.
2Ibid., pp. 206 ff.
3Ibid., p. 203.
Baladhuri's other extant work is Ansāb al-Ashraf, which is invaluable for its information concerning the Umayyad dynasty. Those parts which concern Hishām's period remain in manuscript. Here he supplies considerable material concerning some of the internal problems of Iraq and the eastern provinces. History is indebted to him for much information dealing with the revolt of Zayd b. 'Alī which Baladhuri himself derived from several authorities, most prominent among them being Abū Mikhnaf. This was acquired from Hishām al-Kalbī and his son 'Abbas and was sometimes quoted via Mada'īnī. Baladhuri also quotes other authorities while speaking about the revolt of Zayd, amongst them are al-Haytham b. 'Adiyy and 'Awāna b. al-Ḥakam. In most respects he and Tabarī provide similar accounts of Zayd's uprising and the insignificant discrepancies are discussed in the relevant chapter of this thesis.

In Ansāb al-Ashraf Baladhuri's information concerning the Kārijite revolts in the eastern provinces is unique and is not obtainable in any other available source. He cites this on the authority of al-Mada'īnī. In addition he supplies brief but unique information concerning the revolt of al-Ḥārith b. Surayj which is partly quoted on the authority of Ibn al-Kalbī. In

---

1 See Chapter, v, pp. 175ff.
2 Baladhuri, Ansāb, II, p. 898.
this Balādhurī recounts the tribal character of the revolt which throws new light on the nature of the support given to al-Ḥārith.¹ He also provides fresh information about the propaganda used by al-Ḥārith and the retaliation of his opponents.² In addition he records the complete name of al-Ḥārith and his kunya.³

3. Abū Ḥanīfa ʿAbd al-Dāwiḍ al-Dīnawarī (d. 282/895), the author of al-Akhbār al-Tiwal, concentrates on events in Iraq and the eastern provinces of the Empire during the Umayyad period. The 'Abbāsid daʿīs and their activities in the eastern territories during the reign of Hishām receive his special attention.⁴ Many major events, such as the revolt of al-Ḥārith b. Surayj, the Khārijīte opposition, conquests and wars in Transoxania and Caucasus, are not mentioned by him. The revolt of Zayd b. ʿAlī is touched upon but a wrong date is given when he claims that it commenced in Safar of the year 118/736.⁵ Governors and their achievements are portrayed in trivialities, with stress on the treatment each meted out to his predecessor, rather than on events. There are obvious errors, such as the statement that

¹Ibid., pp. 897-8.
²Ibid., p. 898.
³See Chapter, v, p. 194, n. I.
⁴Dīnawarī, al-Akhbār al-Tiwal, pp. 337 ff.
⁵Ibid., p. 345.
Khālid al-Qasrī was appointed by Yazīd II as governor of Iraq and remained in office for ten years, six of which were continuous in the service of Hishām.¹

Al-Dīnawarī scarcely mentions the sources of his authority and never of the events which took place under the rule of Hishām.

4. ʿAbd b. Abī Yaʿqūb al-Yaʿqūbī (d. 284/897) was a historian and geographer. He gives a concise narrative dealing with the period of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik and briefly narrates events in Khurāsān, particularly those concerning changes in the governors of that province. He also accounts for the wars in Adharbayjān and Caucasus but his reports concerning these events are brief, with occasional inaccuracies.²

Yaʿqūbī's account of events in North-Africa is also brief and, as he makes no mention of the dates of these episodes, his narrative is not helpful.³ Inaccuracy of dates in his very brief report of the revolt of the Khārijite, Bahlūl b. Bishr, renders it of little value.⁴ Inaccuracies are also to be found in his brief information concerning Khārijite activities in Sīstān.⁵ His

¹Ibid., pp. 336, 344.
²Yaʿqūbī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 381–2; see also Chapter, vii, pp. 263, 274 ff.
³Ibid., p. 382.
⁴Ibid., p. 387.
⁵Ibid., pp. 383–4; see also Chapter, v, p. 184 n. 1.
account of the revolt of Zayd b. 'Alī is neither unique nor detailed and citing the date of Zayd's death as 121/738-9 is an error.¹

Yaʿqūbī provides a list of governors and theologians incorporated at the end of the account of each caliph.

At the commencement of the second volume of his Ṭarīkh he refers to his sources² but does not mention them in the course of his work. Some of these authorities were actually pro-ʿAbbāsid.³ This is confirmed by the considerable amount of information on prominent personalities among them when they receive mention.⁴

5. Abu Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Jarir al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923) is the author of Ṭarīkh al-Rusul waʾl-Mulūk. No other extant source is more comprehensive or gives more details concerning the history of the Islamic caliphate than Ṭabarī's work. However, Ṭabarī concentrates on the events in Ṣaʿd and the eastern pro-

¹Yaʿqūbī, Ṭarīkh, II, pp. 390-1.
²Ibid., pp. 3-4.
⁴See for example Yaʿqūbī, Ṭarīkh, II, pp. 384-6.
vinces. Being a traditionist himself he depicts events in true traditionist character, quoting his chain of authorities but seldom criticising them. For the period under consideration Ṭabarī's authorities are: al-Madāʾinī, al-Haytham b. 'Adiyy, Abu 'Ubayda Maʿmar b. al-Muthanna, Abū Mikhnaf, 'Ubayd b. Jannād, Waqīdī, Abū Maʾshar and 'Umar b. Shabba. He quotes al-Madāʾinī the more profusely on his record of events and wars in Khurāsān and Transoxania and on the administration of these provinces. Indeed, so valuable is his information that it has become an integral part of any writings concerning Arab Conquests and campaigns fought in these areas. The reports on the revolt of al-Ḥārith b. Suryaj belong exclusively to al-Madāʾinī. The latter's narrative is sometimes handed down by 'Umar b. Shabba. Madāʾinī himself quotes earlier sources such as Abū Muḥammad al-Qurashi, Abū Muḥammad al-Ziyādī, al-Minhāl b. 'Abd al-Malik, Suḥaym b. Ḥafṣ al-ʿUjayfī, Abū al-Dhawīyāl al-ʿAdawī and Muḥammad b. Ḥamza.¹ Sometimes, Ṭabarī omits to mention Madāʾinī's sources except by reference found in such phrases as "dhakara 'Alī 'an Shūkhīhi"² or "'an ʿašḥābihi".³ Madāʾinī's reliability as a historian is enhanced by his neutral and unbiased accounts.

¹Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1462, 1504, 1527.
²Ibid., pp. 1477, 1489, 1539, 1564, 1566, 1589, 1659, 1688, 1717, 1718.
³Ibid., pp. 1462, 1485.
The wars in the northern provinces of Armenia, Adharbayjan and Caucasus are briefly dealt with by Tabari. The fact that he gives chronology of these events makes his information valuable.

Tabari gives little and often unreliable information concerning the western provinces. Syria, the hub of the Arab Empire, and the provinces of Egypt and Ifriqiya receive sparse attention.

The narrative of the revolt of Zayd b. 'Alî which is recorded by Tabari on the authority of Abu Mikhnaf is second to none. Abu Mikhnaf's account is the most detailed, and he occasionally cites participants such as Salama b. Thâbit al-Laythî. Abu Mikhnaf is a pro-'Alid historian and his narrative is preserved by Hishâm b. al-Kalbî, himself an 'Alid sympathiser. In spite of this the account appears to be well-balanced. Other historians such as 'Ubayd b. Jannâd, Abu 'Ubayda, Madâ'inî and 'Umar b. Shabba are also quoted by Tabari concerning the 'Alid uprising. Their information is, however, brief and deals with inter-'Alid relations and those between Zayd and the Caliph Hishâm.

---

1 See Chapter, III, p. 139.
2 Tabari, Tārikh, II, p. 1709.
4 A.A. Duri, op. cit., p. 52.
None of them present an account of the fighting between Zayd and government forces.

Tabari quotes Abu 'Ubayda Ma'mar b. al-Muthanna on the Kharijite uprisings but as Abu 'Ubayda was himself a Kharijite, and gives some reports not confirmed elsewhere, his account is specially scrutinised in the relevant passages of this thesis.¹

Among other information Tabari refers to the extremist religious agitators - Bayan b. Sam'an and al-Mughira b. Sa'id. There is much interesting information concerning appointments and depositions of governors. The names of the current rulers of the eastern provinces and Hijaz are recorded at the end of each year.

To sum up, Tabari's annals are an essential source of any study of this period and without them there would be little reliable knowledge of many topics.

6. Abu Muhammad Ahmad b. A'tham al-Kufi al-Kindi (d. 314/926), is the author of Kitab al-Futuh,² which was written in two volumes. The first volume commences with the Caliphate of 'Uthman b. 'Affan and concludes with the revolt of al-Mukhttar al-Thanafi

¹See Chapter W, pp. 175ff.
²Broekelmann, Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur, I, p.150; Supp. I, p.220. However, Dr. M.A. Shaban suggests that Ibn A'tham belongs to the 2nd-3rd/8th-9th centuries. See The 'Abbāsid Revolution, p.XVIII.
66/685. In the introductory paragraph to this volume he quotes the names of Mādā'īnī, Wāqīdī, Zuhrī, Abū Mikhnaf, Hishām b. al-Kalbī, Sāliḥ b. Ibrāhīm, Zayd al-Waqifī and ‘Alī b. Ḥanẓala al-Shāmī as his authorities, although he does not again refer to them in connection with events he describes. In the second volume Ibn Aʿtham continues his narrative and ends with the revolt of Babak which occurred during the reign of the ‘Abbāsid Caliph, al-Muʿtāṣim (218/833–227/842).

Much valuable information is given by Ibn Aʿtham concerning Iraq, Khurāsān and the northern provinces of Armenia, Adharbayjān and Caucasus. Of great value also is his information concerning the revolt of Zayd b. ‘Alī. It is in some aspects similar to, but briefer than, the account given by Abū Mikhnaf in Tabarī’s Tarikh. His bias is strongly in favour of the Alīids while his contrary sentiment against the Umayyads is shown by his obviously exaggerated and prejudiced account of the torture and killing meted out to Zayd’s supporters by Yūsuf b. ‘Umar when the revolt failed. In addition, his account at times becomes confused and is often unconfirmed.

---

1 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, I, p.1a.
2 Ibid., II, pp. 205a–211a.
3 Ibid., pp. 210a–211a.
4 Ibid., p.207b. See also Chapter, II, p.102.
The accounts of wars in Transoxania during the reign of Hishām is briefly given by Ibn A‘tham and is mainly concerned with the period during which al-Junayd b. 'Abd al-Rahmān was governor.\textsuperscript{1} He provides little information on the revolt of al-Ḥārith b. Surayj but it is, nevertheless, important in that it indicates the nature of support al-Ḥārith received.\textsuperscript{2}

Although Ibn A‘tham's work lacks chronology, it is valuable concerning wars in Armenia, Adharbayjān and Caucasus and administrative matters in these provinces during the period under study. In some instances accounts appear to be exaggerated but by comparison with other sources, which give the data of these events, discrepancies can be detected. His information is to be carefully scrutinised and used in the relevant chapter of this thesis.

7. Abu 'Abdallāh Muhammad b. 'Abdūs al-Jahshiyārī (d. 331/942), author of Kitāb al-Muzara‘ wa‘l Kuttāb, provides valuable information on administrative matters and on the current rulers of the different provinces during Hishām's period. Information on Hishām's own officials and scribes are also obtainable in Jahshiyārī's work. He is the earliest extant source to provide

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. 202a-204b.
\item \textsuperscript{2}See Chapter, \textit{v}, p. 222.
\end{itemize}
information on the arabization of the dīwāns in Khurāsān and records the man responsible for achieving this task as Ishaq b. Tulayq al-Kātib of Banū Nahshal. He throws some light on Hishām's character by referring to the love he had for horses, and speaks of his possessions and private properties.

Al-Jahshiyārī rarely quotes his authorities and for the period under consideration he has, in one instance only, cited al-Mada'inī.2

8. Al-Mas'ūdī, Abu’l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn (d. 345/956), a famous scholar and prolific writer, is said to have compiled thirty five works. Only two are now extant and published — Murūj al-Dhahab and al-Tanbih wa’l-Ishrāf.3

Mas'ūdī’s anti-Umayyad tendency can be observed in his accounts of the battle of al-Ḥarra and the deaths of both al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalib and the Umayyad Caliph Mu‘āwiya II.4

2. Ibid., pp. 59-67.
3. There are two other extant and published works attributed to al-Mas‘ūdī — Akhbar al-Zaman (Cairo 1938) and Ithbāt al-Wasīyya (Najaf 1955). The contents of these two books and their style throw doubt on their ascription to al-Mas‘ūdī. A manuscript in Istanbul is also ascribed to al-Mas‘ūdī but unfortunately I was unable to get access to this work.
In addition he states that no harder period than that of Hishām had ever been witnessed, while he describes Hishām as tough and relentless.\textsuperscript{1} He also states that the ‘Alid rebel, Zayd, was joined by the Arab Ashrāf; this is contradicted by all other extant sources, including those of the Zaydīs.\textsuperscript{2} Al-Mas‘ūdī devotes most of his narrative on Hishām’s period to the revolt of Zayd b. ‘Alī but without any further significant information concerning this episode. He gives no record of the wars and events in Khurāsān and Caucasus during the reign of Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik. Nor is he informative concerning the revolt of al-Ḥarīth b. Suryaj nor yet of the Khārijite uprisings, and ignores events in the western provinces.

In the period under discussion he makes little mention of his sources; those quoted being Abu Bakr b. ‘Abbās, al-Haytham b. ‘Adiy and al-Madā‘īnī.

In \textit{Tanbīh} there is a brief account covering the period of Hishām. Some names of Hishām’s scribes and judges appear also there which do not occur in \textit{Murūj}. The inscriptions written on Hishām’s Khātam (seal) are supplied in this work.\textsuperscript{3}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1}Murūj, V, p.467.
\textsuperscript{2}See Chapter II, p.105.
\textsuperscript{3}Mas‘ūdī, \textit{Tanbīh}, p.323.
\end{flushright}

In al-Aghāni he provides a unique and valuable picture of social life during the Umayyad period. The character and private life of Hishām are portrayed together with his attitude towards poetry, music, concubines and wine. For the purpose of authenticity this should be treated with caution. The relationship between the Caliph and his nephew al-Walīd II is also described at length.

Abu’l-Faraj frequently cites authorities, many of whom are considered to be reliable, among them Mādā’inī, Ibn al-Kalbī, al-Haytham b. ‘Adiyy, al-Zubayr b. Bakkār, ‘Umar b. Shabba, Abu’l-Yaqūn, al-Zuhrī and many others. Some of the most reliable of these authorities are quoted in connection with Hishām’s activities and conduct. Although Abu’l-Faraj was an Umayyad he was a Shī‘ī. Nevertheless, his accounts concerning Hishām are, in the main, unbiased. He is the earliest source to assert that Hishām neither drank nor gave his guests wine to drink; that indeed Hishām’s disapproval extended to the punishment of those who disgressed.

---

1 Abu’l-Faraj, Aghānī, II, p.121; V, pp. 67, 116–7; VI, pp. 102–4; XV, pp. 50–1, 122.
2 Ibid., II, pp. 78–9, 102–9.
3 Abu’l-Faraj, Aghānī, Cairo edition, VI, p.77.
On the other hand it was Abu’l-Faraj’s Shi‘i inclinations which were responsible for the compilation of his other extant work, Maqātil-al-Tālibiyyīn. In it are found many biographies of ‘Alids who were killed, not only by the Umayyads but also by ‘Abbāsids. In his chapter on Zayd b. ‘Ālī he quotes many authorities, among them Shi‘i and ‘Alid sympathisers. Although some of his information is obviously legendary,1 nevertheless, he provides considerable material on Zayd’s revolt and his activities in Kūfa, which can be sifted and utilized in the research. By naming the prominent theologians2 who favoured the cause of the ‘Alid rebel and the type of assistance they rendered, Abu’l-Faraj provides fresh information on the nature of the support given to Zayd.

10. Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233) is the author of Kitāb al-Kāmil fi’l-Tarikh. He copies Tabarī’s accounts of events in the eastern provinces of Iraq and Khurāsān. He also appears to have drawn upon other sources to fill the gaps in Tabarī’s work which concern events in the western provinces of the empire and the northern provinces of Adharbayjān, Armenia and Caucasus. The sources from whence his information is derived are not mentioned but his narrative concerning the war with the Khazars is one of

1Abu’l-Faraj, Maqātil, pp. 88-9.
2Ibid., pp. 98-100.
the most detailed to be found on this subject. Although his narrative was written later than the events concerned, he provides data which renders his work extremely valuable. Some parts of it give less detail than those of Ibn A'fham and Bālamī and lacks some of the legendary accounts supplied by these authors.

After the dismissal of Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik in 114/732-3 the dates given by Ibn al-Athīr appear to become confused but this is fully discussed in the relevant chapter.

His accounts of events in North-Africa are almost in complete agreement with those of al-Raqīq al-Qayrawānī and al-Nuwayrī but are less detailed. He gives only a brief résumé of the civil war in Spain and barely mentions the Berber uprisings in that province. He relies on Tabarī's account of the alleged Berber deputation to Damascus and this has come under discussion in the relevant passages of this thesis.

11. Nuwayrī (d. 732/1331-2) is the author of Nihāyat al-'Arab fī Funūn al-'Arab. This is a very large and comprehensive work much of which is still in manuscript. Three volumes are of special interest to the study of the period under consideration. The first of these concerns the history of the Umayyad dynasty

---

2 See Chapter III, p. 139.
and is still in manuscript. The information given by Nuwayrī appears to have been derived from the work of Tabarī. Comparison between their writings shows a great similarity and Tabarī's narrative has sometimes been repeated verbatim. Unlike Tabarī, Nuwayrī concentrates more on accounts of war with the Khazars and in this, although less detailed, he follows the work of Ibn al-Athīr or perhaps utilises the same source.

In the volume which is named Akhbar al-Talibiyyīn he gives some information about the revolt of Zayd b. ‘Alī but adds nothing to the narrative of Abu Mikhnaf preserved by Tabarī.

In volume XXII, Nuwayrī deals with the history of North-Africa and Spain from the time of early conquests. The present edition of the volume divides it into two parts, the first of which deals with events in Spain. It commences with the arrival of ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mu‘awiya b. Hishām, known as al-Dākhil, and extends to the conquest of Almoravids during the last quarter of the 5th century A.H. It does not, however, contain any information relevant to the period under discussion.

Part II narrates the history of North-Africa, Sicily and Crete dating from the early conquest to the latter years of the 7th century A.H. No reference is quoted for the authority of Nuwayrī's reports, although a comparison of his work with that
of al-Raqīq al-Qayrawānī shows great similarity between them, and suggests that Nuwayrī utilised al-Raqīq's work or that both of them may have relied on an identical source.

Nuwayrī provides considerable information concerning the Berber revolts in North-Africa. Although in less detail than that of al-Raqīq's account it includes all the major events of the period.

12. Ibn Khaldūn (d. 804/1406), author of Kitāb al-‘Ibar, provides information on almost all the topics discussed in this thesis. Descriptions of events in the eastern provinces are similar to those of Mashriqī sources. Ibn Khaldūn also provides some material on the provinces of Ifrīqiya and Spain during the period under consideration, and supplies brief and often unreliable accounts of the Berber revolts in North-Africa. He rarely gives precise dates of events while throughout his work names of persons and places are frequently confused. By comparison with that of extant writers, such as al-Raqīq al-Qayrawānī, the standard of Kitāb al-‘Ibar is deficient. He, however, supplies certain points concerning the Berbers, their customs and their conversion to Islam which shed light on the nature of their

---

1 Compare Nuwayrī, XXII, II, pp. 34-8, with al-Qayrawānī, pp. 107-122.

revolt. One example of this is the statement that Berbers had remained nomads and resented firm government. He states that their conception of Islam in early times was not clear and was not complete until decades later.¹

On the civil war in Spain during the reign of Hishām he is brief and supplies no significant material.

13. Balʿamī (d. 363/974) is the compiler of Takmila va Tarjama-i-Tārīkh-i-Tabarī.² Although considered to be a translation from the Arabic text of Tabarī’s annals, there is no parallel between them concerning the events under discussion. The similarity of its information lies rather with Kitāb al-Futūḥ of Ibn Aʿtham al-Kūfī. Their accounts of the war with the Khazars are in agreement. A slight divergence appears when assessing the numerical strength of the combatant armies or when reporting the amount of booty seized.³

The agreement between their works extends to their brief accounts of the war in Transoxania. In their report of the revolt of Zayd b. ʿAlī the parallel is the same, even to the repetition

²I have used the French translation by Zotenburg, see Bibliography.
³For further information about Balʿamī’s work, see: Dunlop, EI², Art. "Balʿamī".
14. **Regional Sources.** There are many sources which supply information concerning certain provinces and places. They also render some relevant information about other provinces and the history of the Caliphate in general. Among these works are those by:

i) **Al-Raqiq al-Qayrawani** (d. 417/1026), who was the head of the *Dīwān al-Rasā'il* in the Sanhājī court for more than twenty years and wrote many books on different subjects. One of them was a history of *Ifrīqiya wa'l-Maghrib* from the Arab Conquest to the beginning of the fifth century A.H. Although al-Munjī al-Ka'bī, editor of the part extant, terms it *Tarīkh Ifrīqiya wa'l-Maghrib* it is doubtful whether it was the original title of the work. The part which is extant deals with events which took place in the province of Ifrīqiya and al-Maghrib from the assumption of the government by 'Uqba b. Nafī' Al-Fihrī to the accession of the Aghlabid prince Abu'l-Abbās 'Abdallāh b. Ibrāhīm b. al-

---

1 See below, p. 102. n. 5.


3 Ibid., p. 22.

4 It should be noted that the manuscript does not bear the name of the author but its discoverer, editor (see al-Munjī al-Ka'bī, op. cit., pp. 31ff) and reviewer (see al-Shadhili Bu Yahya, *HUJT*, 1968, pp. 127-131) ascribe it to al-Raqīq al-Qayrawānī.
Aqlab (d. 201/817). Al-Raqīq provides information about appointments of governors and their depositions. He also supplies considerable material on the reign of Hishām and the major revolts of the Berbers in North-Africa. His narrative concerning these events is the most detailed, consistent and probably most accurate of all sources. Unlike some of the Maghrībi sources, al-Raqīq gives dates of many events. He also provides information on the grievances which led to revolts in al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā which spread over the North-African territories.

Unfortunately his narrative concerning the battle of Sebu between Kulṭūm b. ‘Īyāḍ and the Berbers in 123/741 is missing.¹ On the other hand his information on the events following the murder of Kulṭūm is meticulous in detail. Al-Raqīq is the earliest extant source which provides information on the battle of Bāja between the Berber rebels and Ḥanẓala’s army which preceded the battle of al-Asnām.² Good descriptions of the battles of al-Qarn and al-Asnām are also given by al-Raqīq which are consistent in detail and clarity.

Sometimes al-Raqīq quotes his sources of information and for the period concerned with this study ‘Abdallāh b. Abī Ḥassān

¹Qayrawānī, Tarikh Ifriqiya wa’l-Maghrib, p.113.
²Ibid., p.118.
al-Yaḥṣubī and ʿUmar b. Ghānim are quoted. ʿAbdallāh, who cites his father, a contemporary with the events, was al-Raqīq's source for the battle of al-Asnām. ʿUmar b. Ghānim was himself a contemporary of the events he described and resided in Qayrawān, the capital of the province. He also held official appointments under the governor, Ḥaṣṣa b. Saʿfān, and his successor, and possibly had access to official documents, and is thus able to render first hand information.

ii) Akhbar Majmuʿa which commences with a brief account of the early Arab conquest of North-Africa bears no indication of its author or date of its compilation. The detailed narratives of events in the province of Ifrīqiya and Spain begin during the governorship of Mūsā b. Nuṣayr and terminate with the end of the caliphate of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Naṣir in 350/961. Although there is no information given of sources and despite the fact that its narrative is sometimes inconsistent or disconnected, it provides valuable material on the period under study. It supplies considerable information on the Berber revolts in North-Africa.

1Ibid., p. 107.
2Ibid., pp. 121–2.
3Ibid., pp. 124–5.
and Spain. However, the narrative concerning the Berber revolt in al-Maghrib al-Aqsa during the governorship of 'Ubaydallāh b. al-Ḥabīb is surprisingly brief and inaccurate and gives a wrong date for the revolt and an incorrect name for the governor of Ifriqiya. Conversely, the detailed account of the formation of Kulthum b. 'Iyād's forces is, in some instances, unique. The description of Kulthum's battle with Berber rebels at Baqḍurra on Wādī Sebu is vivid and some of the material does not appear in any other extant source. In one error, however, the name of the rebel leader is cited as Maysara, who had previously died, and this name is used in all accounts of the revolt to the exclusion of any other.

Its account of events in Ifriqiya after the appointment of the governor Ḥangala b. Ṣafwan, although less detailed, supplies fresh information. The author of Akhbār Majmū'a not only gives a full account of the Berber revolts in Spain but also of the dispute between the Syrian army led by Balj and the older settlers.

---

1 Akhbār Majmū'a, pp. 28-9.
2 Ibid., pp. 30ff.
3 Ibid., pp. 32-5.
4 See Chapter, III, pp. 154, 158.
5 Akhbār Majmū'a, pp. 36-7.
6 Ibid., pp. 37-46.
In general the narrative of *Akhbār Majmū‘a* lacks chronology. Its pro-Umayyad tendency is clearly indicated by its denial that the tyrannical measures adopted by the governors of Ifrīqiya were responsible for the revolts, and attributes them, mainly, to Khārijite propaganda.¹ This is further reflected in that it does not report the dispute between the Syrians and the North African Arabs after the arrival of Kulthūm b. ‘Iyāḍ and Balj in Ifrīqiya. On the whole, however, the narrative of *Akhbār Majmū‘a* on the events under consideration is well balanced.

iii) *Tarikh Iftitah al-Andalus* by Ibn al-Qūṭiyya (d. 367/977) begins with the Arab Conquest of Spain and ends with the reign of ’Abdallāh b. Muḥammad (d. 299/912). The plan and sequence of this book is inconsistent and, although it occasionally cites its sources, none are relevant to the period which concerns this thesis. Although by no means the best, it is one of the earliest available sources concerning it.

Unfortunately it has many inaccuracies and the narrative on events under study must be treated with caution. Moreover, mention of the Berber revolts in Spain is omitted and a most inaccurate account of the conflict between the Syrians of Balj and

¹Ibid., pp. 31-2.
the older settlers of that province is given. The narratives have been criticized in the relevant passage of this thesis.\(^1\)

iv) Ibn ʿIdhari (d. 8th/14th century) wrote *Al-Bayān al-Mughrib fi Akhbar al-Andalus waʾl-Maghrib*. Although not a contemporary of the period under consideration he gives detailed information concerning events in the province of Ifrīqiya and Spain. Ibn ʿIdhari's records are taken from the works of earlier historians, the names or titles of whose works appear at the commencement of his work and are interspersed through it. These sources are mostly Maghribī but some Mashriqī sources were also utilised.\(^2\)

Concerning Ifrīqiya during the reign of Hishām he quotes al-Raqīq al-Qayrawānī, ʿAbdallāh b. Abī Ḥassān al-Yaḥṣubī, Abū ʿAmr al-Sālimī and Ibn al-Qaṭṭān.\(^3\) Appointments and depositions are given of governors together with relevant dates. Ibn ʿIdhari appears to paraphrase and sometimes to copy, word for word, al-Raqīq al-Qayrawānī's account of the Berber revolts under the rule of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik.\(^4\) While he omits some events, such as the battle of Bāja between Ḥanṣala b. Ṣafwān's forces and

\(^1\)See Chapter, **III**, p. 167, n. 2, 170, n. 5.


\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 55, 56; II, pp. 30, 32, 33.

the Berber rebels, he gives information which is missing from al-
Qayrawānī's extant volume such as the fighting between Kulthūm
b. 'Iyāq's army and the Berber rebels on Wādī Sebu, information
on which is derived from Ibn al-Qaṭṭān and al-Raqīq al-Qayrawānī
himself.¹

Although Ibn 'Idhārī's account of the battles of al-Qarn
and al-Asnām is less detailed than that of al-Qayrawānī, they are
in general agreement.²

On the province of Spain Ibn 'Idhārī not only records the
major internal events which concerned the reigns of the various
governors, their appointments, depositions and dates when they
occurred but also mentions the wars with the Christians of the
adjacent territories. The civil war and the struggle for power
in Spain are also portrayed with citations from Ibn al-Qaṭṭān and
the works of Abu 'Amr al-Sālimī: Durar al-Qalā'id wa Ghurar al-
Fawā'id and Bahjat al-Nafa.³

v) Fath al-Andalus. This work is anonymous in both author
and date of compilation. It begins with the Arab Conquest of
Spain, giving a brief account of governors, emirs and caliphs

²Compare Ibn 'Idhārī, I, pp. 54-6, with al-Qayrawānī, pp. 112-4.
extending to the end of the reign of Abu’l-Ḥakam al-Mundhir (d. 273/886). It continues with brief information concerning minor events in the several districts of Spain following the year 400/1009. The final date given by the author is 495/1101 which perhaps suggests that the work was compiled either during the last few years of the 5th or the early years of the 6th centuries of the Muslim era.

It supplies considerable information on the civil war in Spain during the reign of the Caliph Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik, but barely mentions from whence it comes. During the period which concerns this thesis, sources are twice revealed, one of them being al-Rāzī and the other Ibn Ḥazm.¹

It is almost identical in length and in almost complete agreement with Akhbar Majmūʿa concerning the events in Spain during the period under study.² However there is little difference between the two authorities in the spelling of names and dates with which all extant Maghribī sources are not in full agreement.

vi) Al-Maqquir (d. 1041/1632) is the author of Nafḥ al-Tīb. This is a literary work which also provides a useful account of

¹Fath al-Andalus, p. 32.
²Compare Fath al-Andalus, pp. 30-5, with Akhbar Majmūʿa, pp. 37-46.
events in Spain after the arrival of Balj and his Syrian colleagues. It is based on the authority of Ibn Ḥayyān (d. 469/1076) and, by comparison with the narrative of Akhbar Majmūʿa, shows very little difference. Unlike the author of Akhbar Majmūʿa, Ibn Ḥayyān is obviously anti-Syrian and contemptuously terms Balj's followers Ṣaʿālīk (parasites). He further demonstrates this attitude when attributing the dispute between Balj and 'Abd al-Malik b. Qatan exclusively to Balj's refusal to leave Spain after the Berber uprisings had been crushed.

vii) Al-Asdī (d. 334/945) is the author of Kitāb Tarikh al-Mawṣil. This work gives much detail about the city of Mawṣil and the region of the Jazīra, including many facets of the history of the empire. Al-Asdī writes in the chronological order followed by his contemporary, al-Tabarī, and the part which is extant commences in the year 101/719-720 and terminates in 224/838. The author quotes several earlier authorities, including well-known historians such as Maḏāʾinī, Abū ‘Ubayda, al-Haytham b. ‘Adiyy, Abū Mikhnaf, Abū Maʿshar, Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, and others. There is some brief information on the wars with the

---

1 Maqqarī, Naḥal al-Tīb, III, pp. 20ff.
2 Compare Maqqarī, III, pp. 20-23, with Akhbar Majmūʿa, pp. 37ff.
3 Maqqarī, Naḥal al-Tīb, III, p.20 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān).
4 Maqqarī, Naḥal al-Tīb, III, p.21 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān).
Byzantines and in Transoxania during the reign of the Caliph Hishām. In addition he supplies information concerning the activities of the ‘Abbāsid dā‘īs in Iraq and the east and on the affairs of the pilgrimage and its Umera’. But most useful to the period under study is that given on the wars with the Khazars. Although not minute in detail its narrative is superior to that of Tabarī in quality and quantity and the fact that he gives chronology to military operations enhances its value. Al-Azīdī also provides a little material on the early and private life of Hishām.

viii) Al-Kindī (d. 350/961) is the author of Kitāb al-Wulāt wa’l Qudāt which deals mainly with the affairs of the province of Egypt. Details of appointments and depositions of governors and judges, their activities and achievements, are recorded by al-Kindī. He also provides valuable information on some internal political problems such as the Coptic revolts which took place during the reign of Hishām. The details of a minor Khārijite rising which broke out under Hishām is exclusively reported by him.¹ His occasional information on naval operations against, or by, the Byzantines is also worthy of note.

¹See Chapter IV, p.188.
ix) Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam (d. 259/870) is the author of *Kitāb Futuh Mīr* which gives considerable material about the period under discussion. It is the oldest extant source on the Arab Conquest of Egypt. It also provides much information concerning the Berber revolts and the civil war in Spain. Unfortunately it is somewhat inconsistent and with obvious errors. Names of persons concerned in some events are confused and dates often inaccurate. It supplies some fresh but unconfirmed information and this has been carefully scrutinised in the relevant chapter.¹

x) Ibn 'Asākir, ‘Alī b. ʿHasan (d. 571/1176). Although he is a later historian, his importance lies in his preservation of Syrian and Umayyad tradition, as he was himself a Syrian. He was a prolific writer but only one of his works, *Tārīkh Madīnat Dimashq*, most of which is still in manuscript, is extant. He depicts prominent personalities from all part of Syria and portrays the intellectual, commercial and administrative history of Damascus and the other regions of *Bilād al-Shām*.

Less detailed than that of Ibn 'Asākir, but an extremely useful work, is *al-Aʿlāq al-Khatīrā* of Ibn Shaddād (d. 648/1288).

xi) *Tārīkhī-Derbend-Nīmeh* (ascribed to Muḥammad Awabi, who was

alive at the close of the 16th century).  

The work supplies some information on the Arab Conquest in the Caucasus. The account of the expedition of al-Jarrāh b. ʿAbdallāh al-Ḥakamī is, however, confined to this general's military operations during the reign of Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik and does not give any further information about his campaigns during the reign of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik, in one of which al-Jarrāh was killed. There is new information concerning the expeditions undertaken by Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik and there is also some material on the administrative measures adopted by him. Some of the information given is confirmed by earlier authors including Ibn Aʿtham, Balʿamī and the author of Turkish Tabarī. This work does, however, ignore the governorship of Saʿīd al-Ḥarashī and all the military expeditions undertaken by him.

Very brief information appears about the governorship of Marwān b. Muḥammad and the narrative contains obvious errata such as the assertion that he was appointed to his post in the year 120/737-8.

Kazem-Beg in his translation and edition of the book makes many useful comments and adds appendices from the Turkish Tabarī which was compiled after 780/1378-9. It (the Turkish Tabarī) reveals great similarity with works of Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī.

---

1 See Kazem-Beg, Derbend-Nameh, pp. v-ix.
15. **Religious literature:** These are chiefly late works dealing with Islamic sects, their origins, doctrines and developments. They were compiled by Sunnī and Shi‘ī authors, with bias against each other. Those of Shi‘ī authors show prejudice amongst themselves and every sect endeavours to refute the ideas and doctrines of the other. Accordingly, their information must be carefully scrutinised before utilising it in research.

The historical information on the period under discussion is sporadic but there is frequent confusion of the names of persons, places and even sects. Some material is given concerning the revolt of Zayd b. ‘Alī especially in Zaydī books and inter-‘Alid relations are also supplied. These works are the chief source of information on extremist religious agitators such as Bayān b. Sam‘ān, al-Mughīra b. Sa‘īd and Abū Maṣūr al-‘Ijlī and, as such, supply useful detail:

a) **The Sunnī Theological Sources:**

The earliest Sunnī source to deal with Islamic sects was *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* of Abu’l-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī (d. 321/933). This work contains valuable information on these sects, their origins and doctrines. The author provides some material on the extremist religious agitators and assists in the clarification of views held by them. Although of Sunnī authorship the account of *Maqālāt* is on the whole reasonable.
Similar information with more or less detail can also be obtained from *al-Faq bain al-Firaq* of al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037), *al-Fisal fi'l-Milal wa'l-Nihal* of Ibn Ḥāzm (d. 459/1064) and *al-Milal wa'l-Nihal* of al-Shahrastānī (d. 548/1153). The latter gives occasional information which is not confirmed by any earlier source and will be discussed in the relevant passages.

b) **The Twelver Shi‘ī Sources:**

The most important work is *Ma‘rifat Akhbār al-Riṭāl* of al-Kashshī which is a biographical dictionary of the great men of the Shi‘ī sect. It is full of information and gives considerable material on inter-‘Alid relations. It contains unique information concerning the relationship between Zayd and his brother al-Bāqir and also his son Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq. Some additional information about the extremist religious agitators who made their appearance during the period under study is also provided.

Another important work is *Kitāb al-Maqlāt wa'l-Firaq* of Sa‘d al-Ash‘ārī al-Qummi (d. 299 or 301/911-13). This work deals with the Shi‘ī sects from the death of ‘Alī to the disappearance of the twelfth imām. The author gives useful material on the extremist religious agitators such as Bayān b. Sam‘ān, al-Mughīra b. Sa‘īd, Abu Maṣṣūr al-‘Ijlī. He sometimes produces

---

1 See Chapter II, p. 82, 84.
original information.

Another work, although less detailed, but similar to Maqalāt of Sa‘d al-Ash‘arī, is Kitāb Firaq al-Shī‘a which is ascribed to Nawbakhtī. This work also gives some information on the religious agitators. The narrative is unbiased and the writer does not appear to have been an over-zealous Shi‘ī. Concerning the period under consideration he adds nothing to the information given by Sa‘d al-Ash‘arī.

c) The Zaydī sources.

Most of extant Zaydī sources are concerned with theological matters and give little emphasis to political questions. The most important work which supplies information on the revolt of Zayd b. ‘Alī is al-Hadā‘iq al-Wardiyya of al-Mahallī. It provides ample material on the revolt, and comparison of this narrative with that of Abu Mikhnaf in Ṭabarī’s work shows great similarity. Sometimes Abu Mikhnaf is even explicitly cited. Al-Mahallī occasionally produces an original account which is referred to in the relevant chapter.

1Abbas Eghbal rejects the authorship of Nawbakhti and claims that the true author is Sa‘d al-Ash‘arī. See A. Eghbal, Khanedâne Nawbakht, Teheran, 1311, pp. 140 ff. However, Muḥammad Jawad Mashkūr, the editor of Kitāb al-Maqalāt wa‘l-Firaq refutes this claim and states that Eghbal’s judgment was due to his non-acquaintance with the book of Sa‘d al-Ash‘arī which was discovered and published after his death. See M.J. Mashkūr, introduction to Kitāb al-Maqalāt wa‘l-Firaq, pp. xix-xxiii.
16. Christian Sources. These are mainly late works which give little significant information concerning major political events of the empire in which they lived as isolated communities. Their writings deal with affairs of their churches and their successive patriarchs.

They chiefly concentrate on the sufferings and grievances of the non-Muslim population, and are useful for their depiction of the social and administrative status of the dhimmīs in the Islamic empire and the taxes levied upon them by their Muslim masters. Their writings are, sometimes, biased and reveal exaggerations. Nevertheless, they occasionally give unique information not obtainable in Muslim sources especially if it has connection with their own affairs. For the period under consideration they provide little material on the wars with the Byzantines and the events taking place in Armenia.

The most prominent and helpful information from these sources is given in Tārīkh al-Batāriqā al-Misrīyyīn by Severus Ibn al-Muqaffa‘ (d. 4th/10th century). It speaks of the Coptic revolts during the reign of the Caliph Hishām. His sometimes exaggerated, or even at times legendary account, shows his Christian bias but, nevertheless, it is worthy of note.

In addition the works of Sa‘īd b. al-Batrīq, Ibn al-‘Ibrī,
Michael the Syrian and that attributed to Dionysius give sporadic historical information on the period under discussion and are referred to in the relevant passages of this thesis.

17. **Geographical Works** are useful guides to the location of places, towns and provinces and assist the definition of specific areas. However, they give sporadic historical information which is an aid to research. An example of this is the statement by al-Bakri that the Kharijite Salama b. Sa'd al-Hadrami had gone to North-Africa prior to the year 104/722-3. In addition, Hisham's embassy to the Khagan of the Turks is exclusively mentioned by geographical sources.3

18. **Literary Works** are additional sources of historical information. The diwans of poets sometimes assume historical importance, and those of al-Kumayt b. Zayd, al-Sayyid al-Himyarî, A'sha Hamadan, Jarîr and al-Farazdaq fall into this category.

---


3See Chapter, VI, p. 250.
Naqa'id Jarîr wa'l Farazdaq of Abu 'Ubayda and Naqa'id Jarîr wa'l-Akhtal of Abu Tammâm are also important. The prose works of (or ascribed to) Ibn al-Muqaffâ', al-Jâhid, Ibn Qutayba and others contain considerable historical material which can be scrutinised and used in research.

Those poems contemporary to the events under study sometimes refer to political episodes and confirm historical records concerning certain events such as the revolts of Zayd b. 'Alî and al-Ḥarîth b. Surayj and the wars with Turks and Byzantines.

Literary works also underline the characters of caliphs and governors, their habits and their relations with their subjects. Of equal interest is the light thrown by them on the social lives of the caliphs and their officials, although the authenticity of these reports should be carefully probed.

19. Hadîth Literature is also a source of information. The hadîths are to be found not only in the well-known books of hadîth but also in other works. These include literature, geography and sectarian works as well as the books of al-Malâhim wa'l-Fitan.¹ It is certain that some hadîths are right but there are some which were fabricated by later generations for certain purposes.² Not long after the death of the Prophet the Muslim

¹See, for example, Mirwazī, Fitan, fols. 49ff., 68ff.
community was divided and each sect or group attempted to prove its ideas or doctrines by creating traditions and attributing them to the Prophet. Those which prophesied the establishment of the 'Abbāsid dynasty and those which refer to the revolt of al-Ḥārith b. Surayj are typical specimens.¹

20. **Documentary Evidences.** These include Arabic and Greek papyri, coins and inscriptions.

The papyri documents provide contemporary and considerable information about the Umayyad history, particularly in Egypt. Administration, Taxation and tribute levied from dhimmīs, social life and local customs are recorded in these documents. They sometimes provide exclusive material on internal political problems.²

Coins are another original and contemporary source of history. They provide information on places and dates of minting, names of caliphs and governors during whose lifetimes they were struck, while their weight and types of metal bear witness to the economic condition of the empire or province. They also verify history in that they supply original information, often not found in literature. The coins issued by 'Ubaydallāh b. al-

¹See, for example, Chapter v, p. 220.
²See Chapter iv, 189.
Hābāšab, the governor of Egypt during the reign of Hishām, show that he alone struck Nisf Fals of 17 and 15 qīrāts' weight.

The inscriptions on buildings and tablets are also important as sources of information and historical confirmation, and often dates of construction appear together with the name of the caliph or governor concerned in its building. The inscription on the palace of Hishām in Khirbat al-Mafjar in Jericho shows the name of the Caliph Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik and the contemporary governor of Damascus, Kulthūm b. ‘Iyād. The appearance of their joint names confirms that the construction of the building took place, or at least was started, during Hishām's reign.

---

\[1\] See D.C. Baramki, Arab Culture and Architecture of the Umayyad period, unpublished thesis, London, 1953, pp. 109, 113, plates XV, I; XIX, I; XXXI. R.W. Hamilton (Khirbat al-Mafjar, Oxford 1959, p. 44) seems to have misunderstood Ṭabarī's text as Kulthūm's name appears in Ṭabarī's records of the year 126 A.H. Confusion appears to have arisen when he doubts whether this was the same Kulthūm who was killed in North-Africa in the year 123/741. In fact, Ṭabarī refers to Kulthūm in 126 A.H. when he spoke of the killing of Khalīd al-Qasrī in that year. On this occasion Ṭabarī gives a general narrative about Khalīd al-Qasrī's career and refers to the conflagration in Damascus during Hishām's lifetime which Kulthūm accused Khalīd's mawāli of causing. See Ṭabarī, Tarikh, II, p. 1814.
NOTES ON SELECTED MODERN WORKS

Several modern scholars wrote upon some aspects of the Umayyad dynasty and they have dealt with some of the topics discussed in this thesis.

At the end of the last century Van Vloten wrote a monograph on the Arab domination devoting a large part of the book to the Umayyad history. He treated the Shi‘I movements under the Umayyads at considerable length but he only casually mentioned the revolt of Zayd b. ‘Alī. He provides a very brief account of the revolt of al-Ḥarīth b. Surayj, thus gaining the distinction of being the first scholar to interpret this movement. His views were repeated by successive scholars, with the exception of Gibb and Shaban, and are discussed in the relevant chapter of this thesis.

In 1902 Wellhausen contributed the first study which covers the whole period of the Umayyad Caliphate. This work (The Arab Kingdom and its Fall) begins with an introductory chapter on the four Orthodox caliphs and the civil war between Mu‘awiya and ‘Alī and concludes with the establishment of the ‘Abbāsid dynasty.

His account of the events which took place under the Umayyad

1Recherches sur la Domination Arabe, Amsterdam, 1894.
caliphs emphasises the period of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān. He does, however, narrate some of the events which occurred under Hishām and bases his account mainly on the information provided by Tabarī. He deals briefly with the revolts of al-Ḥārith b. Surayj and Zayd b. 'Alī in addition to the conquests in Khurāsān and Transoxania. There is no clear picture of the revolts of Zayd and al-Ḥārith and he repeats Van Vloten's interpretation concerning the movement of al-Ḥārith b. Surayj.

His other work, Die Religions-Politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam, gives no significant information concerning the period under consideration and merely touches upon some of the Kharijite uprisings during the reign of Hishām.

In 1923 H.A.R. Gibb wrote his book, The Arab Conquest in Central Asia, in which he surveys the military operations in Khurāsān and Transoxania from the commencement of the Arab conquest to the end of the Umayyad dynasty.

Gibb relies mainly on Mada'īnī's narrative in Tabarī and the meticulous detail with which he represents this information appears to render his account, sometimes, almost as a translation of the original source. Unfortunately, as with Wellhausen, he does not devote a separate chapter to the revolt of al-Ḥārith b. b. Surayj and thus gives little prominence to this movement.
While questioning Van Vloten's interpretation, he, himself, gives no definite conclusion. New sources, however, to which Gibb had no access, supply fresh and important information.

In 1935 a monograph was written by Gabrieli on the caliphate of Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik and dealt with most events during his reign. However, Gabrieli's narrative concerning the revolt of Zayd b. ‘Alī is also rather brief and inadequate. He ignores inter-‘Alid conflict and gives no information on the dispute between Zayd and al-Bāqir and his son Ja'far; neither does he discuss the activities of Zayd before the rebellion, the nature of the support he received nor the consequences of his movement. He restricts his account to Zayd's activities in Kūfa and often takes obviously erroneous reports at face value.¹

He barely touches the movement of the ghulāt, and merely mentions the death of the agitators, Bayān b. Sam‘ān and al-Mughīra b. Sa‘īd, making no comments upon their views or activities; neither is there any information concerning other extremists or the nature of the ghulāt movement.²

Information concerning Berber revolts in North-Africa is also inadequate, and misses many salient points from newly dis-

¹Compare Il Califfato di Hishām, pp. 28-33, and below, pp. 79-116.
²Compare Gabrieli, p.19, and below, pp. 117-130.
covered sources. The Kharijite role in the revolt and how the views of this sect were transferred to North Africa are also not accounted for. Gabrieli is often not critical of his sources, nor cautious in dealing with their reports. His use of the sources is altogether rather eclectic.¹

When speaking of Kharijite opposition he accounts for those uprisings mentioned by Tabari and ignores those in Khurāsān, Yemen and even some others which broke out in Iraq. These are reported in Baladhuri's Ansāb al-Ashraf which remains in manuscript. He gives credence to statements recorded by Tabari and quoted on the authority of Abu 'Ubayda, himself a Kharijite, and accepts them without necessary criticism.² Concerning the conquest in Transoxania he adds nothing to the narratives given by Wellhausen and Gibb and even uses their method. He repeats Van Vloten's interpretation of the movement of al-Ḥarīth b. Surayj.³

A somewhat inadequate narrative on the Arab-Khazar war occupies a complete chapter. Many important points are not included which he could have found in unconsulted sources. Some of these are still available in manuscript.⁴ Gabrieli provides no bibliography and quotes very few references in the footnotes.

¹Compare Gabrieli, pp. 92ff., and below, pp. 132ff.
²Compare Gabrieli, pp. 19-20, and below, pp. 175-188.
³Compare Gabrieli, pp. 36ff, and below, pp. 194 - 256.
⁴Compare Gabrieli, pp. 74-84, and below, pp. 257-308.
A book on the history of the Khazars was written by Dunlop in 1954. In it he dealt with the Arab-Khazar war. He cited very few sources and does not make full use even of the small number quoted. His narrative is inadequate and he is uncritical of his sources.

The same description can be given of the account of Artamonov in his book, The History of the Khazars, which appeared in 1962.

A book on the "'Abbasid Revolution" which surveys events in Khurāsān during the Umayyad period was written in 1970 by Dr. M.A. Shaban. It shows very much influence by the work of Gibb, which is occasionally quoted as a source. Both authors rely a great deal on Ṭabarī. Although Shaban gives prominence to Ibn Aʿatham's work in his survey of the sources he does not make the best use of it. Some new interpretations of the revolt of al-Ḥārith b. Surayj and other minor events have been made by Shaban but they have no substantial confirmation.\(^1\) He also utilised very few sources.

In 1971 Shaban wrote another book, The Islamic History, in which he surveys the major events during the Umayyad period. Concerning the period under consideration, he touches rather briefly upon some events discussed in this thesis.

\(^1\) See below, pp. 214ff, 200-201, 232.
M.J. Kister wrote a brief account of the revolt of al-Hārith b. Surayj which appeared in the new edition of *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. He repeated the conclusion of Van Vloten concerning the motives of this movement. He does, however, add some new information which he derived from the unpublished part of the manuscript of Balādhurī’s *Ansāb al-Ashraf*.

In his pioneer work written at the end of the last century, Dozy produced *The Spanish Islam*. This dealt with the Berber revolts in North-Africa and the troubles in Spain. Many sources containing new and important information have since been discovered, or published after the compilation of Dozy’s work, from which a clearer picture can be derived.

In his book, *Histoire de l’Espagne Musulmane*, Levi-Provencal gives an account of these events in North-Africa and Spain, but his narrative is rather brief.

Other scholars have contributed much research to the history of Islam. Some of their work has a useful bearing upon the subject under study. Notable among these authors are Bernard Lewis, C.E. Bosworth, Barthold, Minorsky, Cl. Cahen, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Dūrī, Şālîh Aḥmad al-‘Alī and W.M. Watt. The relevant passages of their work have been referred to in the compilation of this thesis.
CHAPTER I

AN INTRODUCTION TO HISHAM B. 'ABD AL- MALIK.
Chapter I

AN INTRODUCTION TO HISHĀM B. 'ABD AL-MALIK

A. Hishām's early life.

Most of the sources\(^1\) state that Hishām was born in 72/691-2 but neither the month nor the day is given. This date is confirmed by the fact that Hishām was fourteen years old when his father died in 86/705.\(^2\) His birth-place is mentioned by two sources; according to the earlier it was al-Madīna,\(^3\) and the later gives it as Damascus.\(^4\) Hishām's mother was, at that time, divorced and the sources do not supply information about her place of residence.\(^5\) There is no further information available on this matter.

Most sources give the name of his mother as A'isha.\(^6\)

\(^1\) Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Tārīkh, I, p.265; Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.236; XI, p.265; Tabarî, Tārīkh, II, p.1466 (citing Mada'īnī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.92; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mīrāt al-Zaman, fol. 154; Ibn Kathīr, Bidāya, IX, p.233; however the author of Tārīkh al-Khulafa\(^3\)' (p.197a) gives the year 65/684-5 while al-Suyūṭī (Tārīkh al-Khulafa\(^3\), p.247) put it vaguely after 70/689-90.

\(^2\) Balādhurī, Ansāb, XI, p.265.

\(^3\) Azdī, Tārīkh al-Mawā'il, p.51.


\(^5\) Tabarî, Tārīkh, II, p.1466.

\(^6\) Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.235; XI, p.154; Tabarî, Tārīkh, II, p.1174 (citing Mada'īnī); p.1466 (citing 'Umar b. Shabba); Ibn 'Abd Rabbīh, 'Iqd, IV, p.446; al-'Uyun wa'l-Hadā'īq, p.43;
Other names such as Fatima, Maryam and Dhahab are also reported. 'A'isha seems to be the most likely because it is alluded to even by some of those sources which provide other names. Hisham's mother was the daughter of the Makhzumii Hisham b. Isma'il b. Hisham b. al-Walid b. al-Mughira.  

Hisham's father was the Umayyad Caliph 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwan b. al-Hasam b. Abi'l-'As b. Umayya b. 'Abd Shams b. 'Abd Manaf b. Qusayy. Hisham's Kunya is unanimously given as Abu'l-Walid, one of his sons.

---

1 Baladhuri, Ansab, II, p.235; Ibn Habib, Muhabar, p.29; Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 154; Qalqashandi, Ma'athir al-Inafa, I, p.150.
3 Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 154.
5 A.A. Dixon, The Umayyad Caliphate, p.15.
'Abd al-Malik was informed of his son's birth at the time of his victory over Mus'ab b. al-Zubayr in 72/691. Accordingly he wanted to name him al-Mansur, in celebration of his triumph, but 'A'isha had already named him after her father, Hisham, and 'Abd al-Malik did not object. Some historians claim that Hisham, as well as the Umayyad caliphs, had adopted regnal titles, and that Hisham's appellation was either al-Mansur, the one who is given victory, or al-Mutakhayyar min Al Allāh, the selected from among the people of God. However, doubt must be thrown on this account because the 'Abbāsid caliphs were the first to adopt regnal titles.

Little is known of Hisham's life and activities before his accession to the throne. His youth prevented his participation in political affairs under his father's rule but during the reign of his brother al-Walīd he once led the pilgrimage to Mecca where he met the 'Alid, 'Alī Zayn al-'Abidīn, whom he envied because of the great respect he received from the people around al-Ka'ba.

---

3Masʿūdī, Tanbīḥ, p.335
5Abu l-Faraj, Aghānī, XIV, p.78; Abū Nuʿaym, Ḥilyat al-ʿAuliya', III, p.139.
It is also related that in 87/706 he led an expedition against the Byzantines, was victorious and conquered some enemy strongholds. If verified, this would have been his first major political involvement in state affairs.

The development of events showed Hishām's aspirations to the caliphate. It is related that when his brother Sulaymān was on his death bed, he chose 'Umar b. 'Abd al-‘Azīz as his successor to be followed by Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik. Sulaymān ordered Rājā' b. Ḥaywa, the executor of his will, not to mention the name of the caliph-designate until after his death. Hishām had tried to discover the name and questioned Rājā' who refused to divulge it. On the day of 'Ummar's bay'a Hishām refused to offer allegiance but finally submitted on threat of execution. It is inconceivable that the mawla Rājā' b. Ḥaywa could threaten an Umayyad prince with death unless he was backed by strong elements. These elements were, doubtless, the Syrian forces, especially the Shurṭa, commanded by Ka'āb b. Ḥāmid al-'Absī who had twice gathered the Umayyads in the mosque to pay homage to

---

2. Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1343-4 (citing Waqīdat); Ibn Saʻd, Tabaqat, V, p.248 (citing Waqīdat); Ibn al-Jawzī, Sirāt 'Umar b. 'Abd al-‘Azīz, p.49; al-'Uyun wa’l-Hadā’iq, p.3; Nahrawānī, al-Jalis al-Sālih, fol. 169; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, Mir'at al-Zaman, fols. 112-3. For further information on the succession of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-‘Azīz, see the excellent article of C.E. Bosworth, "Rājā' b. Ḥaywa al-Kindī and the Umayyad caliphs", IQ, XVI, Nos. 1 & 2, pp. 36ff.
the caliph-designate.¹

Hisham's objection was motivated by his ambition for power and his desire to keep the caliphate in the hands of the sons of 'Abd al-Malik. This is confirmed by the report which says that soon after the death of Sulaymān, Raja' met some of the Umayyads and withheld information on this matter. When questioned concerning the condition of the Caliph, he replied that he was well. He then showed them the succession covenant and, when he asked if they agreed to it, Hishām stipulated the condition that the name given belonged to one of 'Abd al-Malik's sons.²

Under 'Umar II's rule Hishām is not reported to have been involved in any major activities. It is, however, related that he, as representative of the Umayyads, complained to the Caliph 'Umar II of the treatment received by members of the Umayyad House.³ If authentic, this indicates his growing influence and prestige.

During the reign of his brother Yazīd he is not recorded as having participated in public affairs. He lived in Ruṣāfa which he adopted as his place of residence even after his accession to the throne.

¹Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1342, 1344 (citing Waṣīqī), Ibn Sa'd, Tabagat, V, pp. 247, 248 (citing Waṣīqī).
²Ibn Sa'd, Tabagat, V, p. 250 (citing Mādadā'īnī).
On the advice of his brother Maslama, Yazīd II had
nominated his brother Hishām as heir apparent.¹ When Yazīd II
died, Hishām assumed power in Shawbān 105/724.² He remained in
office until he died in Rabī‘ II 125/743.³

¹Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, pp. 236–7; Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, VI, p.13;
Abu‘l-Faraj, Aghānī, VI, p.102 (citing Mada‘īnī); Nuwayrī,

Tarikh-i-Sistān, p.125; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamīl, V, p.92; Ibn Kathīr,
Bidyā, IX, p.232; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arāb, XXIX, p.115; Tarīkh
al-Khulāsah’, p.197a; Ṣafādī, Umerā’ Dimashq fi’l-Islām, p.92;
Ibn al-‘Ibri, Tarikh Mukhtasar al-Duwal, p.200. However, Ya‘qūbī
(Tarīkh, II, pp.378–9) gives the month of Ramadān while Mas‘ūdī
(Murūj, V, p.466) gives the month of Shawwal.

365; Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.236; Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1728
(citing Abu Ma‘ṣhar, Waqīdī and Mada‘īnī); Ibn ‘Abd Rabbīh,
‘Iqd, IV, p.452; Aṣūrī, Tarīkh al-Mawṣil, p.50; Mas‘ūdī, Murūj,
V, p.465; idem, Tanbih, p.322; al-Uyun wa’l-Hadā‘iq, p.67; Ibn
Ḥazm, Jawāmi‘ al-Sīra, p.363; Ibn ‘Asākir, Tarīkh Madinat
Dimashq, II, I, pp.149, 152; Ibn ‘Idhārī, al-Bayān al-Muhkām,
I, p.59; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamīl, V, p.195; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, Min‘at
al-Zaman, fol. 206; Ṣafādī, ‘Umarā’ Dimashq fi’l-Islām, p.92; Ibn
Khallīkān, Waṣfīyāt, XII, p.9; Ibn Kathīr, Bidāya, X, p.2; Tarīkh
al-Khulāsah’, p.214a. However, Ibn Ḫabīb (Muḥammad, p.30), Ibn
Aṭṭām (Tutuk, II, p.212b), Ḥanbalī (Shadharat, I, p.163) and
Qalqashandī (Subh, III, p.257) give Rabī‘ I.
B. The legacy of the previous period

The Umayyad dynasty which had been established by Mu'awiyah b. Abi Sufyan was threatened by disintegration after the death of Yazid I. The battle of Marj Rahit, which took place in 64/684, re-established Umayyad authority in a large part of Syria, while Egypt once again came under Umayyad rule. A few months after the Battle of Marj Rahit the Caliph Marwan I died before he had time to re-unite the empire. The task was left to his son and successor 'Abd al-Malik. With the assistance of the Syrians, the revolts which had broken out previous to and during his reign were quelled and the re-union was accomplished. When he died in 86/705 he bequeathed a powerful empire to his son and successor al-Walid I.

Al-Walid's policy followed that of 'Abd al-Malik and he retained the prominent governors who had served under his father, such as al-Hajjaj in Iraq and the east, 'Abdallah b. 'Abd al-Malik in Egypt and Musa b. Nu'man in North Africa. The expansionist policy which had begun under 'Abd al-Malik was continued on an even larger scale by his son. During the latter's reign the Arab Empire reached the peak of its expansion and strength; the borders of the empire extended from Samarqand in the east to Spain in the west.

Although the Arabs had crossed the Oxus and established
colonies in Soghdiana, Jūrjān and Ṭabaristān were not under firm control. Yazīd b. al-Muhallab, who served Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Malik as governor of Irāq and the east, criticised Qutayba al-Bāhilī, the previous governor of Khurāsān, because he had not subdued these territories.¹

Yazīd realised the probability of trouble that the population of these territories would cause in the Arab controlled areas were they to ally themselves with the disgruntled indigenous Khurāsānīs. They might also cut communication between the advance troops in Transoxania and their sources of supply and reinforcement in Irāq and Khurāsān.

With a formidable army² therefore Yazīd first marched against Jūrjān. After several military operations he succeeded in subjugating the territory and reducing it to a tributary province.³ He left two representatives, each with a garrison of 4,000 men, in Jūrjān. The first was stationed in Bayāsān, with ‘Abdallāh b. Mu‘ammar al-Yashkūrī as its leader; the second in Andarastān on the border between Jūrjān and Ṭabaristān.⁴ Yazīd then advanced to

---

¹Balādhurī, Futūḥ, p.336; Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1327 (citing Madā‘ini).
⁴Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1327 (citing Madā‘ini).
conquer Tabaristan. Here he was met with stubborn resistance during which the garrison of Bayasan in Jürjan was attacked by the Jürjani who massacred the Arabs, together with their leader.\(^1\) When Yazid heard of this disaster he sent Ḥayyān al-Nabatī to negotiate peace with the Isbahānī, the prince of Tabaristan.\(^2\) Ḥayyān succeeded in his task and peace was established on exactment of enormous tribute paid by Tabaristan.\(^3\) Yazid then returned to Jürjan to avenge the outrage to his garrison. He gained a decisive victory and killed a large number of the enemy.\(^4\)

Yazid had not made major military expeditions in Transoxania although his representative in Jürjan, Jahm b. Zahr, together with his son Mukhallad, raided Buttān and subdued it.\(^5\)

In Sistan Yazid appointed his brother, Mudrik, in charge of the territory but Zumīl, the prince, refused to pay the customary tribute. Mudrik was then replaced by Mu‘awiyah b. Yazid who compelled the prince to pay a small part of the stipulated

---

\(^1\)Ibid., p.1328.
\(^5\)Baladhurī, Futuh, p.425; Gibb, op.cit., p.54; Shaban, The ‘Abbasid Revolution, p.81.
tribute. When 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz succeeded to the throne in 99/717 he appointed al-Jarrāh b. 'Abdallāh al-Ḥakamī as governor of Khurāsān. Although the Caliph ordered him not to make any military expeditions, al-Jarrāh carried out minor raids which could be interpreted rather as a show of strength than as a serious attempt at conquest. He sent Jahm b. Zahr on a minor expedition against al-Khattal and gained some booty. al-Balādhurī relates that al-Jarrāh sent his lieutenant, 'Abdallāh b. Mu‘ammar al-Yashkurī, on an expedition against the Oxus provinces. He adds that he penetrated deep into enemy territory where he was surrounded by Turks and escaped danger only by paying a ransom. This report is repeated by Barthold and Gibb but doubted by Shaban. The latter's judgment seems to be right for al-Balādhurī contradicts himself. On the authority of al-Madā‘īnī, in another account, he says that the leader of

---

1Balādhurī, Futūḥ, p.400; Bosworth, Sīstān under the Arabs, p.69.
3Dhahabī, Tārīkh al-Islām, III, p.333.
4Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1353 (citing Madā‘īnī).
5Balādhurī, Futūḥ, p.426.
6Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion, p.188.
7Gibb, op.cit., p.54.
8Shaban, op.cit., p.86.
this expedition had perished during Yazīd b. al-Muhallab's military operation in Jurjān.\textsuperscript{1} Al-Madaʾīnī's account is also repeated by Tabarī.\textsuperscript{2} Nevertheless, al-Jarrāḥ was able to retain command of Khurasān during his term of office, although his methods do not appear to have satisfied the Caliph. There were some who complained to the Caliph, describing al-Jarrāḥ as one of al-Ḥajjāj's "swords".\textsuperscript{3} They convinced the Caliph of al-Jarrāḥ's unsuitability and he was replaced by 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Nuʿaym al-Ḡāmidī.

The Caliph ordered that the Muslims should evacuate Transoxania and the new governor was commanded to refrain from any expeditions.\textsuperscript{4} He evidently complied with these instructions and there is no record of any campaign undertaken by him during 'Umar II's reign. This mild rule was, however, mistaken for Arab weakness by the Soghdians who began to challenge authority and withdrew from their allegiance.\textsuperscript{5}

In 102/720 Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik, the governor of Irāq and the east under Yazīd II, replaced 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḡāmidī with Saʿīd Khudhayna.\textsuperscript{6} The new governor tried to win the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[1]{Balāḏurī, Futūḥ, pp. 336-7; see also above, pp.56-7.}
\footnotetext[2]{Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1328.}
\footnotetext[3]{Ibid., pp. 1354-7.}
\footnotetext[4]{Ibid., p.1365 (citing Madāʾīnī).}
\footnotetext[5]{Ibid., p.1418.}
\footnotetext[6]{Ibid., pp. 1417-8.}
\end{footnotes}
allegiance of the Soghdians by peaceful means and it is said that he even consulted the dihqāns when he appointed sub-governors to the different districts of Khurāsān; some of these officials were also mawāli. At first he succeeded and was able to regain Soghdian allegiance. Soghdians allied themselves with the new Turkish kingdom which had just been established under the Khān, Sū-Jū, with Chinese assistance, in the Ili basin. In 102/720, the alliance was put into action and the Turkish force lead by the Kūrgūl advanced to help the Soghdians against the Arabs. The allied forces besieged the fortress of Qaṣr al-Bāhilī and the garrison was obliged to purchase peace. Attack and counter attack continued as long as Saʿīd Khudhayna was in office. It is said that Saʿīd crossed the Oxus twice in pursuit of the enemy but he neither went beyond Samarkand nor did he make any major offensive action.

By this time the Arabs of Khurāsān were convinced that the conciliatory attitude of Saʿīd would not put an end to enemy threat on the eastern frontiers. They resented his policy and sent a delegation to complain of it to the new governor-general

---

1 Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1420-1 (citing Madāʾīnī).
2 Gibb, op.cit., p.60.
3 Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p. 1420 (citing Madāʾīnī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, pp. 69-70.
4 Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1428-30; Shaban, op.cit., p.100.
of Iraq and the east, 'Umar b. Hubayra.\(^1\) The latter could not remain indifferent to the danger that threatened Khurasan. Accordingly he dismissed Sa'\(\hat{\text{a}}\)d Khudhayna and replaced him with the more aggressive Sa'\(\hat{\text{a}}\)d al-\(\hat{\text{H}}\)arashi;\(^2\) thus introducing a more militant policy. On hearing of al-\(\hat{\text{H}}\)arashi's appointment, the Soghdians became apprehensive and a large number decided to emigrate to Farghana and Khujanda.\(^3\) The king of the Soghdians together with 'Umar b. Hubayra tried to persuade them to remain but without success.\(^4\) Promised aid by the king of Farghana they proceeded with their plan and emigrated.

Al-\(\hat{\text{H}}\)arashi realised the effect this would have on the treasury and advanced to force their return. On his way to Khujanda he received the allegiance of Ushrusana.\(^5\) He was also met by a messenger from the king of Farghana who seems to have betrayed his clients and urged the Arabs to attack them.\(^6\)

Surprised by the treachery of the king of Farghana the Soghdians

\(^1\)Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1431 (citing Madā'īnī); p.1436 (citing Madā'īnī).

\(^2\)Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1436-7 (citing Madā'īnī); Khalīfa b. Khayyat, Tarikh, I, p.335.

\(^3\)Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1440 (citing Madā'īnī).

\(^4\)Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1439, 1440.

\(^5\)Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1442 (citing Madā'īnī).

\(^6\)Ibid.
found themselves with no alternative but surrender. According to Madā'īnī peasants and nobles, who were estimated at three to seven thousand, were massacred but the merchants, numbering some four hundred, were spared solely because they had no part in the fighting. Khalīfa b. Khayyat however, says that they were all killed. A series of operations followed as a result of which the whole of Soghdiana was restored to Umayyad authority.

Al-Ḥarashī sent one fifth of the booty not the governor-general, 'Umar b. Hubayra, but to the Caliph Yazīd II. This offended the governor and shortly afterwards a dispute arose between them concerning the income from Khurāsān. 'Umar b. Hubayra wanted some of its revenue to be remitted to the central treasury but al-Ḥarashī insisted on retaining the revenue in the province. This angered 'Umar b. Hubayra and in 104/722-3 al-Ḥarashī was replaced by the less stubborn Muslim b. Sa'id, who resumed expeditions against the Turks. The first failed and Muslim troops barely escaped danger. The second was more successful and Afshīn was subdued and peace was made with its king.

---

1Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1445-6 (citing Madā'īnī).
4Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1462 (citing Madā'īnī).
5Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1462 (citing Madā'īnī).
6Ibid.
In spite of minor successes the governors of Khurasan were unable to gain a decisive victory over the Turks during the reign of Yazid II. They continued to represent a major threat to the eastern frontiers of the empire. When Hishâm succeeded to the throne he had to make major efforts to put an end to this external menace.

Another threat came from the north during this period, from the incursions of the Khazars in Armenia and Adharbayjan. In 99/717-8 they raided Adharbayjan and killed a number of Muslims. The Caliph 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz retaliated and sent a contingent headed by 'Abd al-'Azîz b. Hâtim b. al-Nu'mân al-Bâhilî, the governor of the province, who routed the attackers and captured some of them.¹ Under Yazid II the Khazar threat expanded towards Armenia and Adharbayjan and in 103/721-2 they invaded Allan.² In the second year the Khazars went on to inflict a disastrous defeat on the Muslims at Marj al-Ḥijâra in Armenia. Their camp was seized and the remnant of the defeated army together with its leader fled to Syria.³ In 104/722-3 the Caliph Yazid II appointed al-Jarrâh b. 'Abdallâh al-Ḥakamî as

³Ibn Aʻtham, Futûh, II, p.179a; Ibn al-Athîr, Kâmîl, V, p.79.
governor of Armenia and Adharbayjān with orders to invade the enemy in its own territory. Al-Jarrāḥ marched against the Khazars who, on hearing of his advance, withdrew. Al-Jarrāḥ pursued them and their armies met on the battlefield at Balanjar where the Arabs gained a victory, captured the city and seized huge booty. Despite this the Khazars were not completely beaten. Al-Jarrāḥ, therefore, communicated with the Caliph, informing him of his success, and requesting additional troops.

During this time Yazīd II died and the task was left to his brother and successor Hīshām; during his reign the war with the Khazars increased.

On the Byzantine front the great expedition which was launched by Sulaymān b. 'Abd al-Malik in 99-100/717-8, had failed and was a grave setback to the Arabs. Emboldened by their success, the Byzantines took the offensive. 'Umar II had ordered the retreat of his advance garrisons leaving the frontiers on the Byzantine borders vulnerable. In 100/718 the Byzantine fleet attacked Al-Lādhiqiyya, destroyed the city and

---

captured many of the inhabitants whom the Caliph was forced to ransom. During the reign of Yazīd II (101-105/720-4) the war with the Byzantines was resumed but not on a large scale and the Byzantines had, sometimes, the upper hand. It is reported that the Byzantine fleet sailed to Egypt and attacked Tinnis. The governor, Muzahim al-Murādī, and some of his men were killed.

Simultaneously, the Muslims in the west were unable to report success. Near Toulouse, in 103/721, they suffered a crushing defeat by Duke Odo of Aquitania. Al-Samh, the governor of Spain, was killed and the defeated army was barely able to retreat to Narbonne which had been conquered during the reign of 'Umar b. 'Abd al- Azīz.

Kharijites and Shi'īs, the main internal opposition parties, however, had been suppressed by 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān. There were, however, some minor Kharijite uprisings which were dealt with by his successors. During al-Walīd I's reign a certain Ziyād al-A'šam, who belonged to the tribe of 'Abd al-Qays, rebelled in Baṣra. He was supported by some of his Azraqī colleagues but the

---

1Balādhurī, Futūh, p.133.
4According to unidentified authority in Balādhurī's Ansāb (II, p. 118) he was a mawlā of Banī 'Amr b. 'Awf b. 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Qays.
5An anonymous report in Balādhurī's Ansāb (II, p.118) says that he was Ibadī.
rebellion was rapidly crushed.¹

Another Khārijite named al-Haydām b. Jābir Abū Bayhas seems to have caused some trouble in Iraq although there is no report of rebellion initiated by him. Al-Hajjāj endeavoured to arrest him but he escaped to Madīna. ‘Uthmān b. Ḥayyān al-Murri, the governor, managed to capture him and killed him on the instructions of the Caliph al-Walīd I.²

During the reign of Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Malik a Khārijite uprising happened in Mawquṭ near Basra and Marwān b. al-Muhallab, who acted as his brother’s deputy in Basra, sent a force against him and the rebel was defeated and killed.³ The year 90/708-9 given for the uprising⁴ is obviously wrong as it must have happened after the year 97/715-6 for Marwān b. al-Muhallab was appointed to his post in that year.⁵ Two more minor Khārijite risings took place in the district of Basra during the reign of Sulaymān but they were also suppressed by Marwān b. al-Muhallab.⁶

---

¹Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.118 (citing Madā‘īnī).
²Ibid., pp. 118-9 (citing Madā‘īnī); Al-Waqidi (Tabarī, II, p. 1258) says that ‘Uthmān b. Ḥayyān al-Murri killed Haydām (names him Hayqam) and another Khārijite called Manḥūr. See also Tabarī, Cairo edition, vol. VI, pp. 484, 487.
³Ibid., p.127 (citing Madā‘īnī); al-‘Uyun wa’l-Hadā‘iq, p.42 (citing Madā‘īnī).
⁴Ibid.
⁵Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1310 (citing ‘Umar b. Shabba).
⁶Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, pp. 127-8; al-‘Uyun wa’l-Hadā‘iq, p.43.
The Kharijites remained quiescent\(^1\) during the reign of 'Umar II and openly proclaimed him as a just ruler.\(^2\) However, it is reported that a group of Kharijites commanded by Busīm b. Murra al-Yashkurī, known as Shawdhab, assembled in Jawkhā in 100/718-9. There was no active rebellion but they decided to contact the Caliph 'Umar II. They expressed appreciation of his justice and exhorted him to adopt their doctrine and to denounce 'Uthmān b. 'Affān and 'Abd b. Abī Ṭalib. After some correspondence with the Caliph they sent a delegation to debate upon their ideas. The envoys met the Caliph and were satisfied with their discussions although the Caliph was not converted. They then

\(^1\) On the authority of Ibn Abī Zinād, al-Waqidi maintains that a group of Kharijites had rebelled in Iraq in 100/718-9. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Abī Raḥmān, the governor of Kufa, despatched a force against them but was defeated. Accordingly, the Caliph 'Umar II reprimanded 'Abd al-Ḥamīd and sent Syrian troops headed by Maslama b. Abī Malīk and the rebellion was suppressed. See Ṭabarī, Tarikh, II, pp. 1347-8. This report is not confirmed by other available sources and is probably a brief and confused account of the revolt of Shawdhab al-Kharijī especially when it is remembered that Shawdhab's rebellion was quelled by Maslama b. Abī Malīk at the time of his appointment as governor of Iraq and the east in 102/720-1. See below, p. 69.

\(^2\) Ṭabarī, Ansāb, II, p. 165 (citing Mada'īnī); see also al-'Uyun wa'l-Hadā'iq, p. 4.

\(^3\) Ṭabarī, Ansāb, II, p. 165 (citing Mada'īnī); al-'Uyun wa'l-Hadā'iq, p. 4; according to Abu 'Ubayda (Ṭabarī, Tarikh, II, p. 1348) it was 'Umar who first communicated with the Kharijites asking about their intentions.
returned to their colleagues and decided to cancel their revolt. The Caliph on his part wrote to his governor in Kūfa, 'Abd al-Hamīd b. 'Abd al-Rahmān, telling him of his contact with the Khārijites and asking him not to fight them as long as they caused no troubles. However, they were to be kept under strict surveillance and 'Abd al-Hamīd sent a supervisory force headed by Muḥammad b. Jarīr b. 'Abdallāh al-Bajalī, numbering 2,000 men, while the Caliph sent 1,000 men commanded by Hilāl b. Aḥwaz al-Tamīmī as a precaution against any offensive act by the Khārijites who were reputed to number between 300 and 600 men.

After the death of the Caliph 'Umar II, Shawdhab and his followers moved against Mosul and killed its governor. Muḥammad b. Jarīr fought them but he was defeated and the remnant of his troops fled to Kūfa. Abū 'Ubayda states that the government troops began the attack on the instructions of 'Abd al-Hamīd b. 'Abd al-Rahmān, the governor of Kūfa, in order to gain favour.

---

1Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.166-8 (citing Madā'īnī); al-ʽUyun wa-l-Hadāʾiq, pp. 5-10; see also Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1348 (citing Abū 'Ubayda).

2Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.168 (citing Madā'īnī); Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1348 (citing Abū 'Ubayda) he does not mention the force headed by Hilāl b. Aḥwaz.

3Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.168; al-ʽUyun wa-l-Hadāʾiq, p.10; Abū 'Ubayda (Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1348) maintains that their number was estimated at 80 horsemen. This reveals his Khārijite inclinations.

4Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.168 (citing Madā'īnī).
from the new Caliph. He does not mention the attack on Mosul.\(^1\)

As Abū 'Ubayda was a Khārijite his report should be cautiously treated. For a while the Khārijite rising continued while the authorities were busy suppressing the more serious revolt of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab. The latter is said to have invited Shawdhab to join him but the Khārijite rebel refused and even struck Yazīd's envoy.\(^2\)

It is, however, related that many detachments were sent against Shawdhab by the governors of Kūfa, Jazīra and by the Caliph Yazīd II himself and all were defeated. It was not until 102/720-1 when Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik was appointed as governor of Iraq that an expedition was successful. He sent a contingent headed by Saʿīd al-Ḥarashi\(^3\) who succeeded in quelling the revolt and killed its leader.\(^4\)

---

1. *Tabarî, Tarīkh, II*, pp. 1375-6 (citing Abū 'Ubayda); *Tarīkh al-Khulafa*, p.196a (citing Abū 'Ubayda).


3. According to an anonymous report in Baladhuri's *Ansāb* (II, p. 168) al-Ḥarashi was sent by the Caliph Yazīd II at the head of 4,000 men. Abū 'Ubayda, trying to glorify the Khārijite courage, says that the number of al-Ḥarashi's troops was 10,000 men. See *Tabarî, Tarīkh, II*, p.1378. Abū 'Ubayda's report is repeated by the authors of *ʿUyun waʾl-Ḥadāʾiq* (p.28) and *Tarīkh al-Khulafa* (p.196a).

In 96/714-5 a Kharijite revolt broke out in Bahrayn, this time headed by Mas'ud b. Abi Zaynab al-'Abdi who defeated its governor, al-Ash'ath b. Abdallah b. al-Jarud. This took place at the commencement of the caliphate of Sulayman b. 'Abd al-Malik. Nothing is reported of any activities by Mas'ud during the reign of 'Umar II, but his rebellion under Yazid II was quelled by Sufyan b. 'Amr al-'Uqayli who was appointed as governor of Yamama in 103/721-2. The rebel leader was killed, as was his successor Hilal b. Mudlij.

A further Kharijite rebellion is reputed to have been led by Mus'ab b. Muhammad al-Walibi in al-Khawarnaq in 105/723-4. One report says that it was suppressed at the end of Yazid II's reign, while another says it was suppressed by Khalid al-Qasri at the beginning of Hisham's caliphate.

The most dangerous revolt was that of Yazid b. al-Muhallab who had been imprisoned by the Caliph 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz for

---

1 Khalifa b. Khayyat, Tarikh, I, p.318.
2 Badhruri, Ansab, II, pp. 230-1; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, pp. 88-9; see also Khalifa b. Khayyat, Tarikh, I, p.344. The report of al-Haytham b. 'Adiy (Badhruri, Ansab, II, p.231) which is repeated by Ibn al-Athir (Kamil, V, p.89) that the revolt lasted 19 years is obviously untrue.
3 Badhruri, Ansab, II, p.231; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, p.89; Nuwayri, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.114. A further Kharijite attempt is said to have been made by a certain 'Uqfan in 105/723-4 but the leader and his followers were said to have repudiated the idea by peaceful means. See Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, p.88.
not delivering the fifth of the booty from his expeditions in Jurjān and Tabaristān. Once he learned that 'Umar's reign was over, he escaped and went to Baṣra. He first opened negotiations with the governor of Baṣra to release his brothers and relatives whom the governor had thrown into prison. Yazīd promised to leave the city if they were liberated. The governor refused and set out to meet Yazīd on the battlefield where he was defeated and captured. Encouraged by this victory, Yazīd did his best to mobilise the Irāqīs against the central government. He stated that the war against the Syrians was more religiously rewarding than that against the Turks and the Daylamites. Posing as a devoted Muslim, he declared his oath

1 Ibn A'ītham, Futūḥ, II, pp. 166b, 167a, 169a; Mas'ūdī, Tanbih, pp. 320-1.
2 Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p. 1379; Ibn A'ītham, Futūḥ, II, p. 171a; Azdī, Tarīkh al-Mawṣil, p. 8; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 77; Tarīkh al-Khulafa', p. 190a.
3 Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p. 1382 (citing Abū Mīkhnaf); Ibn A'ītham, Futūḥ, II, 171a; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 78.
4 Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, pp. 207-8; Ya‘qūbī, Tarīkh, II, p. 372; Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1382-9 (citing Abū Mīkhnaf); Ibn A'ītham, Futūḥ, II, pp. 171b-172a; Azdī, Tarīkh al-Mawṣil, p. 8; Mas'ūdī, Murūj, pp. 353-4; idem, Tanbih, p. 321; Ghurar al-Siyar, fols. 78-9; Tarīkh al-Khulafa', pp. 190b-191a.
5 Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p. 1391 (citing Abū Mīkhnaf); Ibn A'ītham, Futūḥ, II, p. 172b; Azdī, Tarīkh al-Mawṣil, p. 9; Ghurar al-Siyar, fols. 79, 80; Tarīkh al-Khulafa', p. 192b; M.A. Shaban, The 'Abbasid Revolution, p. 93.
of allegiance to be to "uphold the book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet".\(^1\) Despite the objection of the prominent theologian al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, it seems that Yazīd's claim had penetrated to the hearts of some Iraqīs and they gathered to his support.\(^2\)

Yazīd b. al-Muhallab, well-aware of the Iraqīs' resentment against al-Ḥajjāj's policy, reminded them of his "brutality" and declared that the Syrian troops, by whose support al-Ḥajjāj had imposed it, must be prevented from entering Iraq and re-imposing a similar pattern.\(^3\) It is interesting to note that Yazīd b. al-Muhallab, who had previously relied on the Syrians to maintain his authority as governor of Iraq and Khurāsān,\(^4\) now utilised their presence in Iraq against the Caliph Yazīd II. This was, however, a good line of approach to the Iraqīs who bitterly remembered that al-Ḥajjāj had kept them constantly engaged in military campaigns. They also protested against the privileges allowed to the Syrians.

---

\(^1\)Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, pp. 1391-2, 1398.
\(^2\)Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, pp. 1391-2 (citing Abū Mikhnaf).
\(^3\)Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p. 1398 (citing Abū Mikhnaf).
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 1327 (citing Madā‘īnī).
Yazīd knew the effect of money and gave lavishly to his supporters.\(^1\) It is related that, after his victory over 'Adiyy, he seized the provincial treasury of Basra containing 10,000,000 dirhams which he distributed among his partisans.\(^2\)

Yazīd's propaganda and tactics seem to have succeeded and it is reported that he was joined by men from Kūfā as well as from the Thughūr. It also appears that his supporters comprised Yemenites as well as other tribesmen.\(^3\) This, together with the fact that some of the Azdites joined 'Adiyy b. Ārṭa'a,\(^4\) refutes Wellhausen's\(^5\) interpretation of the revolt as a tribal conflict. The regional aspect of the revolt seems to be more obvious and reasonable.

Yazīd's position became strong and his domination extended to the eastern provinces of al-Ahwāz, Kirmān, Fārs and Sind.\(^6\)

On hearing of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab's victories, the Caliph Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik was greatly annoyed and sent his brother

\(^1\) Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, pp. 1382-3 (citing Abū Mikhnaf); Mas‘ūdī, Tanbīh, p.321; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 78; Tārīkh al-Khulafa', p.191a.

\(^2\) Ibn Aṯ’tham, Futūh, II, 172b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 79.

\(^3\) Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1397 (citing Abū Mikhnaf).

\(^4\) Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1381 (citing Abū Mikhnaf).

\(^5\) Wellhausen, The Arab Kingdom, p.314.

\(^6\) Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1390; Ibn Aṯ’tham, Futūh, II, p.172b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 79.
Maslama and 'Abd b. al-Walīd, at the head of a big Syrian army, to crush the rebellion. The Syrians and the Iraqīs met each other on the battlefield at a place called al-'Aqr. The Iraqīs suffered disastrous defeat and Yazīd b. al-Muhallab was killed. The Muhallabids who survived the battle fled to the castle of Qandabīl in Sind where Yazīd b. al-Muhallab had already appointed the Azdite Wadā' b. ʿUmayd in charge. Wadā' betrayed his relatives and commanded that they should not be allowed to enter the castle. Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik sent a Syrian force headed by ʿIlīl b. ʿAbwaz al-Tamīmī in pursuit of them. The Muhallabids fought desperately against the Syrians in Qandabīl but they were defeated and massacred and survivors were taken captive together with their women and children. They were humiliated and it is reported that Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik intended to sell them as slaves, but they were redeemed by al-

---

1 Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.212; Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1389-90; Masʿūdī, Muruja, V, p.454.
3 Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1409-12; Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.177b.
4 Yaʿqūbī, Tarīkh, II, p.373; Tabarī, Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1412-3; Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.177b; Masʿūdī, Muruja, V, pp. 456-8; idem, Tamīn, p.322; Khalifa b. Khayyat, Tarīkh, I, p.334; al-ʿUyun wa-l-Hadaʾiq, p.73; Gharar al-Siyar, fol. 84.
Jarrah b. Abdallah al-Hakami.\(^1\) Other members of the Muhallabid family were sent to the Caliph where they were murdered and the heads of Yazid b. al-Muhallab and his brothers were displayed in Syria.\(^2\)

The humiliation this leading family of the Azd tribe was subjected to, had certainly aroused the indignation of the Azd of Iraq. It is, therefore, understandable why the ‘Alid rebel, under Hisham, Zayd b. ‘Alī, allied himself with the tribe of Azd and cemented the alliance by marrying an Azdite woman.\(^3\) The maltreatment of the Muhallabids must have increased the hatred of all Yemenites for the Umayyad rule which, under Yazid b. ‘Abd al-Malik, practised severe anti-Yemenite measures, especially in Iraq and the eastern provinces of the empire.\(^2\)

However, it seems that not only the Yemenites but also most of the population of these provinces were dissatisfied with Yazid's methods. He had ordered a land survey there and had levied taxes on crops. He had also re-imposed the taxes of Nayruz and Mahrajân which had been rescinded by his predecessor, ‘Umar b.

---

\(^1\)Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1413-4; Ibn A‘tham, Futuh, II, p.178; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 84.


\(^3\)See chapter II, p.98

\(^4\)Bosworth, Sistan under the Arabs, pp. 67, 70; Lammens, EI\(^1\), Art. "Yazid b. ‘Abd al-Malik".
'Abd al-Azīz. Moreover, the insistence of the governor-general of Iraq and the east on the necessity of the remittance of Khurāsān's revenue to the central government had infuriated the Arab tribesmen of Khurāsān and some of them had refrained from participating in military campaigns. At the beginning of Hishām's reign, force had to be employed against the abstainers. Later, Hishām realised the unreliability of the Khurāsānī troops and found himself compelled to send extra Syrian, Kūfan and Bagaran troops to cope with the Turkish threat on the eastern borders.

Dissatisfaction also prevailed in all the other territories of the empire. Yazīd II built up further resentment in Egypt by cancelling the stipends inserted in the Egyptian diwān by 'Umar II which doubtless angered the beneficiaries. Illegal extortions had also aroused the anger of the Copts which culminated in an open revolt under Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik.

Similar policy had been implemented in North Africa, where

---

1Ya‘qūbī, Tārīkh, II, p.376; Tārīkh al-Khulafā', p.188b. For 'Umar II's measures concerning this point, see: Abu Yusuf, Kharāj, p.49; Ya‘qūbī, Tārīkh, II, p.366; Ṭabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1367.

2See chapter, VI, p.225ff.

3See chapter, VI, pp.241, 243.

4Kindī, Wulāt, p.92.

5See chapter, IV, p.190.
Yazīd II's governor, Yazīd b. Abī Muslim the former scribe of al-Ḥajjāj, had ill-treated the Berber converts. They were enraged to the extent that they murdered the governor. This action was, in fact, a prelude to the great Berber revolt during the reign of Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik.¹

In Yemen, ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz had annulled the additional tax previously imposed by Muhammad b. Yūsuf on the Yemenīs.² When Yazīd II had come to power he ordered his governor in Yemen to re-impose it.³ By this he certainly angered the inhabitants, and perhaps encouraged their support to the Khārijīte revolts which took place in the early years of Hishām's succession.

Thus, when in 105/724 Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik died, he bequeathed to his brother and successor, Hishām, a precarious heritage.

¹See chapter III, p. 133.
²Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p. 180 (citing Mada’īnī); idem, Futūḥ, p. 73, (citing Mada’īnī).
³Ibid.
CHAPTER XI

THE SHI'I OPPOSITION.
Chapter II

THE SHI'I OPPOSITION

A. The Revolt of Zayd b. 'Ali.

After the tragedy of Karbala, the 'Alids fell back on a policy of non-aggression, no doubt through weakness. This tranquility was broken by Zayd b. 'Ali who rose in revolt in 122/740. Zayd, however, made his bid for power at the time when the 'Alids were disunited. After the martyrdom of al-Husayn b. 'Ali in 61/680, the Shi'is acclaimed Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya as Imam. 'Ali Zayn al-'Abidin, the eldest son of al-Husayn, considered that he had a prior claim as the scion of the Prophet as well as of 'Ali and accordingly he advanced his claims against those of his uncle, Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya, during the Mecca pilgrimage of 73/693 and gained some adherents.¹

The inter-'Alid conflict extended beyond the spiritual hegemony of the Imamate to such secular matters as the administration of the Sadegat of the Prophet (Padak) over which the Husaynids and the Hasanids were in opposition.² In view of this situation it would seem possible, as the Shi'ite traditions

¹Kulaynî, Kifî, p. 218; Ithbät al-Waqiyya (ascribed to al-Mas'udî), pp. 169, 172; see also Kashshî, Rijal, pp. 80, 82ff.; Mashhad edition, pp. 120-1; D.M. Donaldson, The Shi'ite religion, p.107.
record, that 'Alī Zayn al-‘Abidīn had, before his death, ap-
pointed his eldest son, Muḥammad al-Baqir, as his successor in
order to preserve what he conceived to be the rights of the
Husaynids.¹

The succession of al-Baqir was disputed by other ‘Alid
contestants, the greatest challenge being that of Zayd b. ‘Alī,
who denied his brother’s claim to be his father’s legatee.²

Their quarrel seems to have begun with the death of their father,
although the sources give no firm date. Al-Baqir appears to have
the stronger claim as he was the eldest son of ‘Alī Zayn al-
‘Abidīn. Even more important, he was an Alīd, both paternally
and maternally; his mother Fāṭima being the daughter of al-Ḥasan
b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalib,³ while Zayd was a son of a Sindī slave-
girl.⁴ Al-Baqir did not flaunt this particular aspect as an
insult to his brother, nor denounce his claim to the Imāamate on

¹ Kulaynī, Kāfī, pp. 188-9; Ibn Ḥayyūn, Sharḥ al-Akhbār, fol. 32;
² For al-Baqir’s claim to the Imāmate, see: Kulaynī, Kāfī, pp. 188-9;
Mufīd, Irshād, pp. 260-1; Majlisi, Biḥār, XI, p. 65;
³ Ibn Sa’d, Ṭabaqāt, V, p. 235; Kulaynī, Kāfī, p. 298; Mufīd, Irshād,
p. 261.
⁴ Ibn Ḥabīb, Munamma, p. 505; Balādhurī, Ansāb, I, p. 502; Ya‘qūbī,
Tarīkh, II, p. 390; Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1672, 1676; Ibn ‘Abd
Rabbih. ‘Iqd, V, p. 89; Mufīd, Irshād, p. 268; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil,
V, pp. 172, 174; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir’at al-Zaman, fols. 191,
196 (citing ‘Umar b. Shabba); Ibn ‘Utba, Umdat al-Ṭalib, p. 228;
Ibn Qutayba, Maʿarif, p. 216.
this account. Nevertheless, the prestige given to the son of free Arab parents sprung from a deep-rooted tradition in the Arab society of the time, and originated from similar prejudice during the pre-Islamic period (example: 'Antara b. Shaddād).

By this tradition the Umayyads excluded succession by the sons of slave-women regardless of efficiency and brilliance (example: Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik). This stigma was cast on Zayd b. 'Ālī by another 'Alid claimant, 'Abdallāh b. al-Hasan b. al-Hasan, who used it to discount Zayd's right to succession and to the administration of the Ṣadāqāt of the Prophet.¹

Because of this disadvantage Zayd must have known that al-Bāqir should take precedence in such society, where "privileged exclusiveness" was dominant.² To promote his cause he realised that he had to base his claims to the Imāmate, and ultimately to the caliphate, on new rules which would disregard the social status of the mother of the claimant and destroy the existing hereditary system. He accordingly adopted new tactics in his propaganda to attract followers. He stressed the Islamic principle³ of ordering good and prohibiting evil⁴ and emphasized that

¹See below, p. 96.
²See, for further information on this point: B. Lewis, "On the revolutions in early Islām", SI, XXXII, pp. 224ff.; IN², Art. "'Alids".
³Qurʾān, III, 104; XXXI, 17; XXIX, 9.
the practice of this elevated those who exercised it to the status of Müjähidun\(^1\) (fighters in a holy war). Zayd gave this principle a political significance and dimensions and stated that, if more than 300 adherents supported such an 'Alid claimant, he should resort to arms against the wrongdoers; he added that there was nothing more religiously rewarding than the jihād against them.\(^2\) Zayd adopted this principle as his slogan and declared that the true Imam, from Ahl al-Bayt, should publicly claim his right and achieve it by force.\(^3\) Certainly such a statement was a denial of the right of the hereditary system, according to which the Imamate was to be transferred from father to son (among the Husaynids) by designation, and an obvious challenge to al-Baqir. In addition it appealed to the Shi‘Is, especially those of Kūfa, who were impatient to join such an 'Alid who would lead them to open revolt against the Umayyad regime.

In connection with this principle some late Sunnī sources\(^4\)

\(^1\) Majmu‘ al-Fīḥ, p. 273; San‘āni, al-Rawd al-Nadīr, IV, pp. 619ff.
\(^3\) Ibn Ḫayyūn, Sharḥ al-Akhbār, fol. 50; Kashshāf, Rijāl, pp. 261-2; Mashhad edition, p. 416; Mufīd, Irshād, p. 268; idem, Avvā‘il al-Maqālaṭ, pp. 7-8; al-‘Alawī, Sīrat al-Madī İīā al-Haqq, p. 28; Himyārī, al-Hur al-‘In, p. 188, Shahrastānī, Milal, p. 117; Majlisī, Šīhār, XI, p. 58.
state that Zayd was a pupil of Wāsīl b. 'Ātā' who taught Mu'tazilite principles to Zayd and some modern scholars accept this statement without question. Information concerning the relationship between Zayd and Wāsīl is scanty and therefore precludes accurate and precise judgment, but it is possible to present some points which may throw light on this matter. The Mu'tazilite principles which have survived were not formulated completely by Wāsīl b. 'Ātā'; some of them were, in fact, of later fabrication and projected backwards. The Twelver Shi'i postulate that every imām was endowed with knowledge available to all prophets. It was passed, they state, from the Prophet Muhammad to 'Alī, and every subsequent imām passed it to his successors. If this pupilage of Zayd to Wāsīl were indisputable it would be a weapon used by the non-Zaydī Shi'īs, especially the imāmis, to derogate Zayd as incompetent and unqualified. Such mention is not found among Shi'i authors, not even by such writers as D.M. Donaldson, S.H.M. Jafri, W.W. Rajkowski, R.B. Serjeant, W.M. Watt, 'Amīlī, A'īyān, and others. It should, however, be noted that some of these scholars cite al-Shahrastānī alone as their source of information, while the others do not refer to their authorities.

1 D.M. Donaldson, The Shi'ite religion, p.115; S.H.M. Jafri, The early development of legitimist Shi'ism, unpublished thesis, London 1966, p.197; W.W. Rajkowski, Early Shi'ism in Iraq, unpublished thesis, 1955, p.258; R.B. Serjeant, "The Zaydis", in Religion in the Middle East, p.287; 'Alī Sāmī al-Nashshār, Nash'at al-Fikr al-Falsafī fi'l-Islām, II, p.129. It should, however, be noted that some of these scholars cite al-Shahrastānī alone as their source of information, while the others do not refer to their authorities.


3 See, for example, Kulaynī, Kāfī, pp. 135-6; 'Amīlī, A'īyān, IV, p.475.
as al-Majlisī. Moreover, neither Zaydī nor early Sunnī sources refer to any such master-pupil relationship. Ibn al-Murtada\textsuperscript{1} speaks of a meeting in Madīna which comprised Zayd, Ja'far al-Šādiq and Wāšil b. 'Āṭā'. A debate arose between Wāšil and Ja'far, probably concerned with succession to the imāmate, and Zayd sided with Wāšil and accused his nephew of envying him. Ibn al-Murtada does not vouch for the authenticity of this story which, even if confirmed, would be insufficient proof that Zayd was actually a pupil of Wāšil; neither do the reporting sources reveal at what time or in what place Zayd was his pupil.

Some analogies however appear between the principles of the two men, the most marked being an avowed championship of good and war against evil, but this does not constitute proof of Zayd's studentship, although it formed the basis of his pro­paganda which had greatly disturbed his brother al-Bāqir.

The two late authors, al-Shahrastānī and Ibn Khaldūn,\textsuperscript{2} assert that al-Bāqir argued with his brother on the issue of the imāmate and the necessity to achieve it by armed rebellion. They affirm that he accused Zayd of denying his father's right to a position which their father had never used force to achieve.

\textsuperscript{1}Ibn al-Murtada, Tabaqat al-Mu'tazila, pp. 33-4.
\textsuperscript{2}Shahrastānī, Milal, p.117; Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, Būlāq, I, p.165.
Two Shi‘I authors, Ibn Ḥayyūn and al-Majlisi,¹ state that al-Bāqir tried to induce Zayd to abandon such a futile struggle by the plea that no ‘Alid could thus achieve political status before the manifestation of their Mahdī at the end of Time, but Zayd refused to accept his brother’s representations.

Although these two Sunni and Shi‘I reports are not confirmed they, nevertheless, show that Zayd’s propaganda had seriously damaged his brother’s cause. In spite of al-Bāqir’s endeavours to preserve his position as the legitimate imām, Zayd’s continued activities had won for him the allegiance of a number of Shi‘Is who were dissatisfied with the quiescence of the legitimate imāms.

Zayd was shrewd enough to realise that if he were to achieve the caliphate, his ultimate purpose, he must appeal not only to the Shi‘Is but also to the Sunnis, who constituted the majority of Muslims. He therefore refrained from abusing the first two caliphs, al-Shaykhayn, and openly accorded them recognition as legally elected caliphs.² Al-Bāqir himself had never publicly condemned al-Shaykhayn. Nevertheless reports by

¹Ibn Ḥayyūn, Sharh al-Akhbar, fol. 37; Majlisi, Bihār, XI, p. 75.
both Sunni\(^1\) and Twelver Shi'\(\text{i}\)\(^2\) sources show that some Shi'\(\text{i}\)s avowed that he did so under the guise of Taqiyya, dissimulation. If this tradition were confirmed, and al-Baqir's opinions expressed in private were contrary to those he expressed in public, it gave more weight to the propaganda Zayd used both against al-Baqir and, later, his son Ja'far al-Sadiq.

Conversely some Shi'\(\text{i}\)s are recorded to have deserted Zayd because of his attitude toward the first two caliphs and to have adopted the cause of al-Baqir who assured them of their legal election.\(^3\) Yet another report affirms that a group of Shi'\(\text{i}\)s deserted Zayd and transferred their allegiance to Ja'far al-Sadiq to whom they reported Zayd's activities and his personal demand for Bay'a. It further states that Ja'far demanded them to maintain their loyalty to Zayd, adding that he was the lord and the best of the 'Alids. When they returned, they kept Ja'far's words secret.\(^4\)

---

2. Kashshi, Rijal, Mashhad edition, p. 237; see also pp. 205-6. Here al-Kashshi reports that al-Baqir attacked the first two caliphs during a discussion with the poet al-Kumayt b. Zayd.
These reports were probably right but nevertheless they do not refute the idea that al-Bāqir and his son had practised Taqiyya. That some people deserted Zayd and went over to al-Bāqir or his son Ja'far because of their attitude towards the first two caliphs, is in itself sufficient evidence that Zayd and al-Bāqir held different views about the rights of al-Shaykhayn.

The practice of Taqiyya and the attitude of al-Bāqir and his son towards Abu Bakr and 'Umar certainly gained them the sympathy of some extremists among the Shi‘is. On the other hand they lost the support of the moderates who were won over by Zayd concerning whose opinion there was no doubt about the rights of the first two caliphs.

Further reports state that some of al-Bāqir's followers, annoyed by his dissimulation, transferred their allegiance and paid homage to Zayd. The latter's open recognition of al-Shaykhayn gained him the support of some theologians and Fuqaha'. They, in turn, used their prestige to stir up the people against the ruling Umayyad dynasty. They accordingly rallied around the 'Alid rebel who, he avowed, would replace the "tyranny" of the

---

1See below, pp.119, 122, 125.
2Kashshī, Rījāl, pp. 154-5; Mashhad edition, p.237; Nawbakhtī, Firaq al-Shi‘a, p.52ff.
Umayyads by equality and justice for all Muslims. Many famous Sunni theologians had supported Zayd, among whom was the famous Abu Ḫanīfa, who not only strongly supported Zayd but offered him financial aid.

Under these circumstances, the relations between the two brothers were strained beyond compromise and al-将是ir began to openly attack Zayd and his followers. The Shiʿī biographer al-Kashshāi tells us that al-将是ir depicted Zayd as an ordinary man and therefore not infallible. Since infallibility was a quality confined to the imām, this could be understood as an open denial of his brother’s claim to the imamate. Al-将是ir extended the reproofs to some of Zayd’s most prominent supporters, condemning them as unbelievers. He went so far as to give another supporter the appellation of Surḥūb, a blind devil who lived in the sea.

---

1Baladhurī, Ansāb, I, p.506; Abu’l-Faraj, Maqātil, pp. 98ff.; Maḥalli, Hadā’iq, fol. 129; Ḥanbali, Shadharat, I, p.159.
3Murīd, Awā’il al-Maqālat, pp. 8, 35; idem, Tashih al-Ī’tiqād, p. 61; ‘Amili, A’yan, IV, I, p.374.
5He was Abu’l-Jarūd Ziyād b. al-Mundhir. See Kashshāi, Rijāl, p. 150, Mashhad edition, p.229.
After the death of Muḥammad al-Bāqir, Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq continued his father's hostility towards Zayd and his followers, and sharply attacked the Butrites, who were followers of Kuthayyir al-Nawā al-Abtar, a staunch and active auxiliary of Zayd. Jaʿfar is quoted as saying "God would not bring glory to the earth through them even if they gathered in one battle-line from east to west". ¹ Jaʿfar also described the Zaydis as nūṣab (haters of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalib). ²

Such invectives seem to have made little impact on Zayd and he continued to enjoy the support of a large number of the Shiʿīs. He even took over al-Bāqir's responsibility ³ of representing the Ḥusaynids in their dispute with their cousins, the Ḥasanids, concerning the administration of the Șadaqat of the Prophet. ⁴ Available sources give no reason why, nor state when, Zayd assumed this obligation; nor yet is any reason offered as

to why al-Baqir relinquished the leadership of the Husaynids in the dispute. The probabilities are that al-Baqir did so in order to divert Zayd's attention from his pursuit of the imamate while Zayd seems to have accepted the position in order to demonstrate to the public that he was the active leader of the 'Alids to whom allegiance should be paid.

In connexion with this, historians infer that Zayd went to Rusafa to urge the Caliph to intervene in the dispute with the Hasanids.¹ No doubt he visited Rusafa but the reasons for this are questionable as it is unlikely that the Caliph Hisham was willing to resolve such conflict between his opponents, the 'Alids. During the meeting between Zayd and Hisham, the questions of the Sadagat of the Prophet and the dispute between the Husaynids and the Hasanids are not reported to have been raised. This leads one to conclude that Hisham was well aware of Zayd's activities and had summoned him to Rusafa to keep him under strict surveillance. This is confirmed by the fact that, during their meeting, Hisham reproached Zayd and said: "I have been informed that you are longing to obtain the Caliphate al-


However, al-Waqidi states that Zayd came to Hisham as a supplicant but the Caliph refused aid and even abused him. Annoyed by this attitude Zayd left for Kufa; apparently to organise a revolt against the Umayyads. See, Ibn Sa'd, Tabaqat, V, p.325. This report is unconfirmed by any evidence and, therefore, highly doubtful.
though you are a son of a slave-woman"; Zayd did not deny this allegation and implicitly confirmed the Caliph's accusation by saying that the status of his mother was not a disgraceful matter, for the Prophet himself had descended from Ishmael whose mother had also been a slave.¹

Available sources do not reveal the date on which this meeting took place. However, it is related that, on this occasion, Hishām asked Zayd about al-Bāqir's activities.² If this statement is given credence the meeting must have occurred before al-Bāqir's death, the date of which is controversial, but it is almost certain that it took place before the year 118/736.³

The extent of Zayd's stay in Rusāfa remains obscure, although the Zaydi author, al-Mahallī,⁴ says he was placed under arrest for five months, freed and afterwards returned to Madīna.

⁴Mahallī, Haddā‘iq, fol. 125.
His arrest is not confirmed by any other extant source but his subsequent return is mentioned both by al-Baladhuri and Ibn 'Asākir. Baladhuri adds that Hishām ordered his governor in Madīna to keep Zayd under close observation. No further information is made of any activity by Zayd until the year 120/738. At that time the governor of Iraq, Khālid al-Qasrī, was dismissed and replaced by Yūsuf b. 'Umar. Khālid was charged with misusing his authority and thrown into prison. He is said to have claimed that he had deposited a sum of money with Zayd and other Qurayshites. On hearing of this Hishām summoned Zayd and his colleagues for questioning. They denied Khālid's

---

1Baladhuri, Ansāb, I, p.502.
2Ibn 'Asākir, Tarikh Dimashq, XII, p.113a.
3Baladhuri, Ansāb, I, p.502.
4Baladhuri, Ansāb, I, p.204 (citing Abū Mikhnaf), p.503 (citing Mada'ini); Ya'qūbī, Tarikh, II, p.390; Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1668 (citing Abū Mikhnaf); pp. 1670-1 (citing Abū 'Ubayda); Abu'l-Faraj, Maqatil, p.90; Mahallī, Hadā'iq, fol. 128; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p.171. However, Abū Mikhnaf, as quoted by Tabarī (II, p.1668), Ibn 'A'thām (p.205a) and the author of Akhbar al-Dawla al-'Abbasiyya, p.232), say that the litigant was Yazīd b. Khālid al-Qasrī. The report of these historians seem to be unauthentic because it is in conflict with the reports of the majority of sources. Moreover, Yazīd b. Khālid al-Qasrī had never been a governor of Iraq. It should also be noted that Abū Mikhnaf, as quoted by Baladhuri (Ansāb, I, p.204) refers to Khālid as being the litigant.
5Some sources state that Zayd was at that time in Ruṣāfa. See Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1668 (citing Abū Mikhnaf); Abu'l-Faraj, Maqatil, p.90; Zubayrī, Nasab Quraysh, p.61; Tarikh al-Khulafā', p.206a. This report is challenged by another one which says that Zayd was summoned from Hijaz. See Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1668 (citing al-Haytham b. 'Adiyy); p.1670 (citing 'Ubayd b. Jammād);
allegation and the Caliph commanded them to proceed to Kūfa where the matter could be thoroughly investigated in the presence of the litigant himself and the new governor of Iraq, Yūsuf b. ‘Umar. ¹ Zayd showed reluctance to go to Kūfa on the ground that he and his comrades would be ill-treated by Yūsuf b. ‘Umar. Hishām insisted on their going but instructed his governor in Iraq to assure their safety. ² Zayd and his fellows were confronted with Khalid who confessed that he had not deposited anything with the Qurayshites. ³ Although most sources agree on this point it would seem unlikely that Khalid al-Qasrī made such an allegation and then voluntarily refuted it.

A conflicting report states that Zayd, together with Muhammad b. ‘Umar b. ‘Ali b. Ṭalib and Dāwūd b. ‘Abdallāh b.  

---

¹Baladhurī, Ansāb, I, p.503; Ya‘qūbī, Tārīkh, II, pp. 390-1; Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, pp. 1668-9 (citing Abū Mikhnaf); Akhbar al-Dawla al-‘Abbāsiyya, p.232; Abu’l-Faraj, Maqātil, pp. 90-1; Mahallī, Hādāʾiq, fol. 128; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.171; al-‘Uyun wa’l-Hādāʾiq, p.55; Ibn ‘Utba, Umdat al-Talib, p.228. A further confirmation of this report is that which asserts that Zayd had already returned to Madīna, see above, p.  

²Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1669 (citing Abū Mikhnaf); Ibn At‘ham, Futuh, II, pp. 205b-206a; Abu’l-Faraj, Maqātil, p.91; al-‘Uyun wa’l-Hādāʾiq, pp. 55-6.  

'Abbas, visited Khalid al-Qasri, during his governorship of Iraq. He had bestowed gifts upon them and had purchased land in Madina from Zayd for which he paid 10,000 dinars but had not obtained the land. On assumption of governorship, Yusuf b. 'Umar had discovered the transaction and informed the Caliph Hishām who summoned Zayd and his confederates and questioned them. They confessed the receipt of some gifts but denied either selling land or receiving money for it. This report is repeated by Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn Khāldūn who add that the Caliph though believing them, sent them to Iraq where the matter could be investigated in the presence of Khalid al-Qasri himself.

Comparison of these accounts appears to confirm that Zayd and his colleagues received gifts but they also indicate that Yusuf b. 'Umar used the circumstance as an excuse for his ill-treatment of Khalid. This is further sustained by his accusation of Khalid as being pro-'Alid and laying the blame for Zayd's rebellion on the advice given to him by Khalid. The conclusion is also confirmed by a report which states that during his confrontation with Zayd, Khalid asked Yusuf: "how could I deposit money

---

1Tabarī, Tarikh, II, pp. 1667-8 (citing al-Haytham b. 'Adiyy); Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirzut al-Zaman, fol. 191 (citing al-Haytham b. 'Adiyy); Ibn al-Jawzī, Tadhkirat Khawass al-Umma, p.188.
2Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.171.
with him while reviling him and his ancestors from the pulpits of the Mosque?¹

Whatever truth or falsehood was in the accusation, Zayd and his colleagues were freed.² Some sources³ state that they returned immediately to Mādīna. While others⁴ affirm that Zayd remained awhile in Kūfa leaving it only because of insistence by Yusuf b. 'Umar. It is certain, however, that he ultimately returned to Mādīna. At either al-Qādisiyya or al-Thalabiyya he was overtaken by some Shi‘īs who pleaded with him to return to Kūfa and lead them in a rebellion against Umayyad authority. They avowed that government forces (Syrians) in Iraḵ were feeble enough to be easily vanquished.⁵ Zayd was advised by Dawūd b. 'Alī to place no reliance upon the Kūfans who had previously

²It is reported that the Caliph had ordered his governor in Iraḵ to get Zayd out of Kūfa as soon as the interrogation was over. See Ya‘qūbi, Tarikh, II, pp. 390, 391; Tabarî, Tarikh, II, p. 1680 (citing 'Ubayd b. Jamād).
⁴Tabarî, Tarikh, II, p. 1670 (citing Abū Mikhnaf) and p. 1678; Ibn A‘tham, Futuk, II, p. 206a; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 94; Tarikh al-Khulafa', pp. 417-8; Mahālī, Hada’iq, fol. 129; Ibn al-Jawzī, Tadhkirat Khawāss al-Umm, p. 188.
⁵Tabarî, Tarikh, II, p. 1677 (citing Abū Mikhnaf); Ibn A‘tham, Futuk, II, p. 206a; Mahālī, Hada’iq, fol. 129; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 94; Tarikh al-Khulafa', p. 207a; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p. 175.
betrayed his grandfather, al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī. As Zayd was well aware, was not single minded in his advice. He was a member of the ʿAbbāsid family whose aim was to overthrow Umayyad rule and seize the caliphate. They had already used much propaganda to this effect throughout Iraq and the eastern provinces and success by Zayd would mean the loss of the ʿAbbāsid cause. Another report states that similar advice not to trust the Kūfans was also given to him by ʿAbdallah b. al-Ḥasan. However, as a bitter feud existed between Zayd and ʿAbdallah the authenticity of this report is doubtful. Giving it credence, it is hardly tenable that ʿAbdallah was sincere in the light of the deteriorated relationship between him and Zayd.

Others were sincere in their advice not to rely on the Kūfans, amongst them his cousin Muhammad b. ʿUmar b. ʿAlī b. Abī ī

---

1 Ṭabari, Tarikh, II, p.1679 (citing Abu ʿUbayda); Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirʾat al-Zaman, fol. 191 (citing Ibn al-Kalbī); Tarikh al-Khulafaʾ, p.207a. Gabrieli accepts this statement at face value. See, Il Califato di Hishām, p.29.

2 Ṭabari, Tarikh, II, p.1679 (citing Abu ʿUbayda); Tarikh al-Khulafaʾ, p.207a; Ibn Khaldūn, Ḥbar, III, p.211.

3 Ṭabari, Tarikh, II, p.1681; Ibn al-Athīr, V, p.176; Ibn Khaldūn, Ḥbar, III, p.211; Gabrieli (op.cit., p.29) accepts this without discussion.

Tālib who had no personal political ambitions and always supported Zayd, and Salama b. Kuhayl, one of his prominent adherents.

Zayd, however, rejected all their advice, returned to Kūfa and began to launch propaganda against the Umayyads. The situation in Iraq, particularly in Kūfa, was favourable to a revolt. Khaḍīl al-Qasārī was supplanted by al-Hajjāj's cousin, Yūṣuf b. ʿUmar al-Thaqāfī, formerly the governor of Yemen. Rumour said that Yūṣuf indulged in forbidden pleasures such as wine and had practised tyranny against the Iraqīs causing them much humiliation. The report may have been exaggerated but it reflects discontent among the population. It was also said that a vast amount of provincial revenue had been transferred by him to the Caliph in Syria. This was one of the strongest motivations of the Iraqi uprisings. The Iraqīs were still cherishing the memory of ʿAlī b. Abī Tālib who had made Kūfa the

---

1. Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1685 (citing Abu Mikhnaf); Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 94; Mahallī, Ḥadāʾiq, fol. 129; Ibn Kathīr, Bidāya, IX, p.327.
2. Baladhūrī, Ansāb, I, p.503.
4. Baladhūrī, Ansāb, II, p.509 (citing Madaʿīnī); and p.511 (citing Abu ʿUbayda).
seat of the empire and the centre of Bayt al-Māl. They were harking back to those days when the revenue had remained in the province instead of being transferred elsewhere.

Added to this, the appointment of the Qaysite Yūsuf b. ‘Umar inflamed the anger of the ʿIraqī Yemenites. Their resentment to the Umayyad rule had already been strong. The Umayyads under Yazīd II had massacred their relatives, the Muhallabids.\(^1\) This led the ʿIraqī Yemenites to ally themselves with the anti-Umayyad forces, especially the Shiʿī movement to which they had already contributed considerably, and they were a prominent element in al-Mukhtār’s revolt.\(^2\)

Zayd first allied himself with the Yemenites of Kūfā and married an Azdite woman.\(^3\) However, he realised that to achieve his goal, he should seek the support of all the tribesmen, Yemenite as well as Qaysite. This was probably the main reason why he also married a Qaysite woman from Banī Sulaym,\(^4\) thus founding ties of affinity with both the southern and northern Arabs of Kūfā. Moreover, the formation of Kūfīan society was, in

---

\(^1\)See Chapter I, pp. 74–5


\(^4\)Tabarî, Tārīkh, II, p. 1685 (citing Abu Mīkhnaf); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, p. 176.
general, a fertile ground for rebellions, especially those of
the Shi'a for whom Kūfa was the traditional abode. In addition
to tribal antagonism the Arabs of Kūfa differed among themselves
culturally. The tribes of Tamīm and Tay' were bedouins. Rabī'ā
were semi-bedouin and Christian-influenced while 'Abd al-Qays
were under Persian influence. Kūfa was also inhabited by other
people of different races and creeds, among them, Syrians,
Persians, Nabataeans, Christians and Jews. Christian differed
from each other in origin and beliefs. Syrian Christians had
migrated from Hīra to Kūfa while others had come from Najrān.
Their doctrines differed and grouped them into Nestorians and
Jacobites. With such a complexity, Kūfan society could not be
homogenous and would inevitably become turbulent and dissatisfied,
each section contriving the downfall of existing order.

In addition constant military campaigns were a source of
resentment to the Iraqīs. Hishām's reign was an era of intense
wars on all fronts during which the Iraqīs were forced to serve on
prolonged military expeditions in remote and inhospitable areas

1Balādhurī, Futuh, p.280; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Nihāya fī Gharīb al-
Nadīth, IV, p.208; V, p.9; Himyarī, Muntakhabat fī Akhbar al-
Yaman, p.101; Ibn Manṣūr, Līsān al-ʿArab, VII, p.411; B. Lewis,
The origin of Ismaʿīlism, pp. 25-6; A.A. Dixon, The Umayyad
Caliphate, p.46; Masignon "Explication du plan de Kūfa (Iraq)",

2The Jews and the Christians who had migrated from Najrān settled
in Kūfa in a special quarter called Najrāniyya, see Balādhurī,
Futuh, p.66.
such as Transoxania and Caucasus. In spite of long and hard service the Irāqīs (except for a very short period under 'Umar II) had never enjoyed, during the Umayyad reign, equal rights with the Syrian Arabs. This led to underlying conflict between the two regions which had existed throughout the Umayyad dynasty and the sense of unjust treatment was expressed by the Irāqīs on various occasions. The first was made by Ibn al-Ash'ath and his followers, who called for the end of tajmīr and the dismissal of al-Hajjāj who had tried to strengthen Syrian domination. 'Abd al-Malik was well aware of their grievances and proposed the removal of al-Hajjāj from Irāq and to give equal pay to Irāqī and Syrian Arabs in order to end rebellion. Another instance was that of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab who declared the aims of his revolt were to uphold the book of God, the Summa of the Prophet and to prevent the Syrian troops from entering their land (Irāq). As has already been mentioned when Zayd b. 'Abī himself was overtaken by the Shi'īs at al-Qādisiyya or al-Tha'labiyya, they assured him that Syrian troops were not numerous in Irāq and would be easily eliminated. All these

1See Chapter, VI, p. 241; VII, p. 297.
3See Chapter I, p. 72.
4See above, p. 95.
instances point to the resentment of the Iraqis against the Umayyad regime and to the Iraqis' irritation over the Syrian forces in their province who were regarded as an army of occupation ready to execute the orders of the Syrian-based regime.

Under these conditions and circumstances Zayd began to preach his cause. He declared his aims as being to "uphold the book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet, to fight the tyrants and to defend the weak, to give to the deprived (of 'Ata') and to distribute the fay' equally among those who are entitled to it, to rectify injustice and to call back the Mujammira [the Muqatila who were kept on prolonged campaigns]".  

With the exception of some standard slogans which were used by almost every rebel, Zayd's programme seems to be specific and it was mostly concerned with the grievances of the Iraqi Muqatila.

Added to these specific promises, Zayd also adopted other propaganda slogans concerning the abolition of bida' (innovations), enlisting support for Ahl al-Bayt and the overthrow of

---


2Tabari, Tariikh, II, p.1700 (citing Abu Mihkna); Himmari, al-Kur al-'In, p.185; Sib'i b. al-Jawzi, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 195; Ibn Khaldun, Taba', III, p.212.
the "tyrannical" Umayyad rulers whose troops had burned the holy Ka'ba.¹ Zayd did not, however, confine his propagandist efforts to the declaration of his political programme but took practical measures to propagate his cause further. He sent emissaries to several places calling for support.² Baladhuri³ maintains that they penetrated Hishām's court and approached the theologian, al-Zuhrī, one of the Caliph's closest confidants,⁴ and convinced him of the worthiness of Zayd's cause. Al-Zuhrī, who was living in Ruṣāfa at that time, refused to take part so long as Hishām was in office but he promised to offer his aid after his master's death and the succession of al-Walīd II. There is no supporting evidence concerning this in other sources and the report should be accepted only with caution.

Yet another statement by Ibn Aʿtham⁵ shows Zayd to have evoked the assistance of non-Muslim communities. A message from Zayd to the residents of Mawṣil and Jazīra, preserved by him,
contains these phrases: "... 0 You people of the book, 0 you Jews and Christians, accept a creed which is common to us and know we worship only one God ... Men had been sent to destroy your religion, to shed your blood and to embezzle your fay' ... Come to me to establish the book of God and the Summa of the Prophet and to wage war against the tyrants ...". The content of this letter throws doubt on its authenticity and rather appears to appeal to the dhimmis to become Muslims. Also the embezzlement of their fay' was a matter which applied only to Muslims.

Twelver Shi'I sources maintain that Zayd was promoting his cause in the name of al-Riqa min Al Muhammad. The author of Kitab al-Irshad believes that Zayd intended to identify his nephew Ja'far al-Sadiq by "al-Riqa". This implication is repeated by al-Majlisi who ascribes the tradition to Ja'far al-Sadiq himself and to Yahya b. Zayd b. 'AlI. The fact that Zayd and his nephew were not on good terms, and held conflicting views on the issue of the imamate, presents a conclusion that these reports were fabricated by later twelver Shi'ites who attributed them to Ja'far al-Sadiq and Yahya b. Zayd to give them an appearance of authenticity. However, Zaydite sources state that

---

1Mufid, Irshad, p.268; Majlisi, Bihar, XI, p.57.
2Mufid, Irshad, p.268.
3Majlisi, Bihar, XI, p.57.
Zayd proclaimed his cause in the name of al-Rida which was the habit of the 'Alid claimants. It was probably true that Zayd preached his cause in the name of al-Rida who would be acceptable to all people but it is also certain that he saw himself in that light.

While Zayd's emissaries were canvassing the outlying districts he lived in Kufa in concealment from the authorities. He disguised himself and moved from one supporter's house to another and from tribe to tribe, always eluding discovery. His stay in Kufa was broken by a secret journey to Basra where he spent two months, no doubt to recruit support.

Zayd was successful, having won adherents in Madain, Basra, Wasiit, Mawil, Jazira, Raqqa, Khurasan, al-Rayy and Jurjan. Fifteen thousand men from Kufa alone rallied to his cause.

---

sources do not, however, reveal the identity of these supporters. From a study of the tribes with whom Zayd took refuge during his concealment in Kufa it is evident that his Arab supporters were from both northern and souther tribes, and were men from Azd, 'Abs, Sulaym, Qays, Banū Yarbu', Bakr b. Wā'il and Taghlib.\(^1\) Zayd also obtained the allegiance of some mawāli and he employed certain of them to enlist recruits in places other than Kufa.\(^2\)

How many mawāli joined him is not known, but the number appears insignificant as it is merely touched upon by the sources. Indeed, it is said that Zayd himself was killed by a Mawla;\(^3\) it may be that Zayd made no special appeal to them and that his moderate views made little impact upon them. Sunni and Zaydī sources assert that the Arab ashraf did not render Zayd any considerable support and they are reported to have opposed him and joined Yusuf b. 'Umar, the governor of Iraq.\(^4\) It is probable that the Arab ashraf had more to gain from agreement with the existing

---

\(^1\)Baladhurī, Ansāb, I, pp. 505, 509; Tabari, Tarīkh, pp. 1685; 1687 (citing Abu Mikhnaf); Ibn A'tham, Futuh, II, p. 207a; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, pp. 176-7.

\(^2\)Baladhurī, Ansāb, I, p. 506 (citing Abu 'Ubayda); Abu'l-Faraj, Maqātil, p. 99.

\(^3\)Baladhurī, Ansāb, I, p. 110.

\(^4\)Ibn A'tham, Futuh, II, p. 208b; Tabari, Tarīkh, II, p. 1702 (citing Abu Mikhnaf); Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, p. 182; Mahallī, Ḥadā‘i‘a, fol. 130; however, al-Mas‘ūdī maintains that the ashraf had supported Zayd. See, Muruj, V, p. 469.
government than with one which promised equal division of the *fay* and recompense to those who had been previously deprived. Thus it was expedient for the more prosperous members of the community to remain loyal to the regime under which they enjoyed social and financial privilege.¹

The author of *Kitāb al-Hur al-In*² affirms that Zayd gained support from complete sections of the *umma*, including *Khārijites, Murji'ites and Mu'tazilites* and after his death he was eulogised by a *Khārijite poet* who condemned the *Shī'ites* for their halfhearted support. Ibn 'Utba,³ citing Abū Mikhnaf, maintains that Zayd b. 'Alī was supported by some *Khārijites*. However, the reports of al-Ḥimyārī and Ibn 'Utba are open to doubt as they are not confirmed by more reliable sources. It is the more doubtful because the groups of *Murji'ites, Mu'tazilites and Khārijites* were not formed at that time and much of the information referring to them appears to be fabricated in retrospect without supporting evidence. The reliance of Ibn 'Utba on Abū Mikhnaf should not mislead us as such a statement does not appear in Abū Mikhnaf's more detailed narrative which is preserved in Tābarī's *Tārīkh* and Balādhurī's *Ansāb al-Ashraf*.

It is the more likely that those who actually supported Zayd were Arab tribesmen who formed the Iraqi Muqātīlā and this appears to be confirmed by the emphasis placed upon their fighting. This is supported by the fact that Yusuf b. 'Umar, after quelling the revolt, gathered the Kufans to the mosque and specially mentioned the Muqātīlā in a threat which said that he wished the Caliph had allowed him to kill their Muqātīlā and to capture their families.1

The return of Zayd to Kūfa, followed by his activities against authority, strongly angered Yusuf b. 'Umar. He accordingly sent strict orders to al-Ḥakam b. al-Ṣalt, his deputy in Kūfa, to make an intensive search to discover Zayd's whereabouts.2 He also installed police detachments along main roads who were authorised to search travellers and endeavour to acquire from them information concerning his activities. A letter sent by Zayd to al-Mawṣil was said to have been intercepted by these men.3 Bribery and espionage were also employed and we are told that the governor gave 5,000 dirhams to a slave who disguised himself as a Khurāsānī Shīʿī and was able to obtain

---

3Ibn A‘tham, Futūḥ, II, p.207b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 95.
some information about Zayd's movement in Kūfa, which he transmitted to Yūsuf b. 'Umar. The governor was finally successful in revealing Zayd's hiding place. This, it is said, was betrayed by one Sulaymān b. Surāqa al-Bāriqī, a member of the tribe which sheltered Zayd. He informed Yūsuf b. 'Umar that Zayd frequently used the houses of a certain 'Āmir from the tribe of Bāriq and another, known as Tu'ma, from Banī Tamīm. The men's houses were searched but Zayd was not found. Yūsuf realised, however, that it was only a matter of time before Zayd was caught, and Zayd himself realised this fact and decided to advance the date of his armed rebellion somewhat prematurely.

The date on which the revolt broke out is almost agreed as being the 1st Ṣafar 122/740, but the number of Zayd's supporters is open to controversy. Nine estimates ranging between merely fourteen and eight thousand men are recorded, but the majority of

---

1Baladhurī, Ansāb, I, p.507; Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1712; Tarīkh al-Khulafa', p.208a.
4Baladhurī, Ansāb, I, p.507; Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1701 (citing Abu Mikhnafat); Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 95; Ibn al-Jawzī, Tadhkira al-Khawass al-Umma, p.188; Tarīkh al-Khulafa', pp. 208a-208b; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 195; Ibn Kathīr, Bidayat, IX, p.330. However, al-Waqqīdī gives the date of Zayd's revolt and
sources put the number between 218 and 300 men. However, Zayd's ensuing victories refute this meagre figure, particularly as he was joined by Mansūr b. Khuzayma al-‘Absī at the head of 1,000 Qaysite tribesmen. With such discrepant estimates, the actual number remains obscure but it is certain that not all those who had rendered homage rallied to his support.

The revolt began by lighting reed torches and the shouting of "Ya Mansūr amit" (O Mansūr, kill). It should be remembered that when Zayd was overtaken by the Shi‘īs at al-Qādisiyya they used the same appellation when they said, "We desire that you be murdered as being Safar 121 A.H.; see Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1667 (citing Waqidi); al-Zubayrī (Nasāb Quraysh, p.61) maintains that Zayd was killed on Monday, 2nd of Safar, 120 A.H.

1 Ḥudhayfah mentioned the number as being 218 (see Baladhuri, Ansāb, I, p.507; Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1702). This figure is repeated by the author of Ghurar al-Siyar (fol. 96), Ibn al-Athīr (Kāmil, V, p.182), Ibn Kathīr (Bidaya, IX, p.330) and the author of Tarikh al-Khulafā’ (p.208b). ‘Awana b. al-Ḥakām gives the number of 250 men (see Baladhuri, Ansāb, I, p.507 citing ‘Awana). Baladhuri, on unidentified authority, gives two more figures: the first is 400 men (Ansāb, I, p.507), while the second figure is 8,000 men (Ansāb, I, p.509). Tabarī (Tarikh, II, p.1712) gives the number of 300 men. Ibn A‘thām (Futūh, II, p.208b) and Ibn Khaldūn (‘Ibar, III, p.212) put the number at 220. Ibn al-Jawzī records the number as being 120 men (see Tadhkira al-Multha‘ al-‘Imrān, p.188) while the author of Aḥkam al-Dawla al-‘Abbasiyya (p.232) says that their number was a little more than 200 men. al-Mahalli (Madā‘iq, fol. 131) put the number at 500 men. Ibn al-‘Ibri put the number as being only 14 men (see Tarikh Mukhtasar al-Duwal, p.200).

2 Baladhuri, Ansāb, I, p.509 (citing al-Haytham b. ‘Adiyy). This figure does not, however, represent the entire forces which joined Zayd.

3 Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1701 (citing Abū Mikhnaf); al-‘Uyūn wa‘l-
the mansūr, and that this be the time in which the Umayyads perish.\(^1\) Al-Mansūr was a messiah awaited by the Yemenites to restore their ancient power and glory.\(^2\) We have seen that Zayd's supporters included Yemenites as well as Qaysites and there is no evidence to suggest that the Yemenites were the dominant element among Zayd's followers.\(^3\) It is also reported that the non-Yemenite Mansūr b. Khuzayma al-'Absī, one of Zayd's prominent supporters, also used this slogan.\(^4\) Thus this war cry was adopted as an appeal to the messianic aspirations of the Shi‘īs and to their deep-rooted beliefs in the imminent coming of a leader from the Ahl al-Bayt, who would be victorious and, consequently, would obliterate tyranny and replace "social evils" by justice and equality.

The first clash between the rebels and the government forces happened when Nasr b. Khuzayma al-'Absī, whilst on his way
to join Zayd b. 'Alî, accompanied by 1,000 Qaysites, met with
the chief of the Kûfan police forces, 'Amr b. 'Abd al-Raḥmân.
A brief skirmish ensued in which 'Amr was killed, after which
Naṣr proceeded to join his master at his headquarters at
Jabbānāt Sālim, on the outskirts of Kūfa. Zayd then marched on
Jabbānāt al-Sā'idīn and there he surprised and defeated 500
Syrians. At this stage the engagement between the combatants
took the form of street fighting. Zayd chased the government
forces to al-Kunāsa, and he himself was pursued by a Syrian
detachment led by al-Rayyān b. Salama. Defeating his enemy,
Zayd was able to force his way to the main mosque of Kūfa, in
which some of his supporters had been locked. Around the mosque
the conflicting parties engaged in fierce fighting while Zayd's

---

1Balādhurī, Ansāb, I, p.509 (citing al-Haytham b. 'Adiyy).
2Balādhurī, Ansāb, I, p.509; Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1703 (citing
Abu Mikhnaf); Abu'l-Faraj, Maqātil, p.93; Maḥallī, al-Hadā'iq,
fol. 130; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 96; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamīl, V, pp.
182-3.
3Balādhurī, Ansāb, I, p.508; Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1703 (citing
Abu Mikhnaf); Ibn Al-'Aṭham, Futūḥ, II, p.208 (he put the number
of Syrians as 700 men); Abu'l-Faraj, Maqātil, p.94; Maḥallī, al-
Hada’iq, fol. 130; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamīl, V, p.183; Sibt b. al-
Jawzī, Mirāṭ al-Zaman, fol. 195.
4Balādhurī, Ansāb, I, p.508; Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1704 (citing
Abu Mikhnaf); Ibn Al-'Aṭham, Futūḥ, II, p.209b; Ghurar al-Siyar,
fol. 95; Maḥallī, al-Hada’iq, fol. 131; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirāṭ
5Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1704 (citing Abu Mikhnaf); Ibn al-Athīr,
Kamīl, V, p.183.
followers called, in vain, to those in the mosque to come out
to his aid. The "battle of the mosque" ended indecisively and
Zayd retreated to Dār al-Rizq, probably to capture his enemy's
supplies. In a surprise sortie al-Rayyān b. Salama, the leader
of the government forces, attacked Zayd at Dār al-Rizq but was
unsuccessful and he retired with heavy losses.

Angered by his general's incompetence, Yūsuf b. 'Umar re­
placed him with the chief of his police force, al-'Abbās b. Sa'īd
al-Muzānī. On Thursday, 2nd of Safar 122/740, al-Muzānī
marched on Dār al-Rizq and engaged unsuccessfully with Zayd and
was put to flight. On the evening of the same day Yūsuf b.
'Umar regrouped his shattered forces and sent them against the
insurgents. Again they were defeated and Zayd pursued them to

1Baladhuri, Ansāb, I, p.508 (citing Abū Mīkhnaf); Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1706 (citing Abū Mīkhnaf); Ibn A'tham, Futuh, II, pp.
209a-209b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 97; Maḥallī, Hada'iq, fol. 130; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.183; Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Mir'at al­
Zaman, fol. 195.
2Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1706 (citing Abū Mīkhnaf); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.183; Maḥallī, Hada'iq, fol. 131; Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 195.
3Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1706 (citing Abū Mīkhnaf); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.183.
4Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1707 (citing Abū Mīkhnaf); Maḥallī, Hada'iq, fol. 131; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.184; Sibt b. al­
Jawzi, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 195.
5Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1707 (citing Abū Mīkhnaf); Maḥallī, Hada'iq, fol. 131; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.184; Sibt b. al­
Jawzi, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 195.
al-Sabkha and then to Banī Sulaym. Al-Muzanī appealed to Yusuf b. 'Umar for help and the latter sent him a contingent of Qīqāniyya or Bukhāriyya archers who seem to have been levied either from Qīqān or Bukhara. They met Zayd on the battlefield and Zayd was struck by an arrow and died of his wound. He was buried in a pit in a water canal. A sind slave of Zayd betrayed his master’s grave to the governor Yusuf b. 'Umar, who ordered the corpse to be exhumed and crucified in Kunāsa. Zayd’s head was cut off and sent to Damascus where it was ex-

3. Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1709 (citing Abu Mikhnaf); Abu'l-Faraj, Maqātil, p.97; Mahallī, Hada‘iq, fol. 132; Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Mir‘at al-Zaman, fol. 195.
posed for a while and then displayed in Madīna.¹

By the death of Zayd b. 'Alī, the 'Abbāsids were rid of a dangerous rival. On the other hand, Zayd's death together with that of his son Yahyā shortly afterwards, stirred up great resentment, and vengeance for them became the theme for anti-Umayyad propaganda.² The 'Abbāsids were quick to exploit this opportunity to their own advantage and declared their intention to avenge the 'Alid martyr.³ Later, after their victory, the murder of Zayd and his son Yahyā was used as an excuse for their atrocities against the Umayyads.⁴

Although Zayd failed to achieve his purpose, his movement had far reaching consequences. He became the father of an Islamic sect called Zaydiyya after him. The Zaydis formed the most moderate Shi‘ite sect and the closest to the Sunni doctrine. Politically, the revolt of Zayd did not come to an end with his death but continued under the leadership of his son, Yahyā, who

¹Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1713; Ibn al-Jawzī, Tadhkīrat Khawāss al-Umma, p.189; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 195; al-Qalqashandi says that Zayd's head was displayed in Damascus then it was taken to Egypt where it was buried in a place known as Nashhad al-Ra's (see Ma'thir al-Inafa, I, p.152).
²Ya'qubī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 391-2.
³Akhbār al-Dayla al-'Abbāsiyya, p.241; see also E. Lewis, El, Art. "Alids".
had managed to escape to Khurāsān, where he remained in concealment until Hishām's death. He was later arrested by Naṣr b. Sayyār, the governor of Khurāsān. The Caliph al-Walīd II asked Naṣr to release him and Yaḥyā was given amān (amnesty) on condition that he would not resort to violence against the Umayyad government. He broke his promise and rebelled in Jūzjān where he was killed by the Umayyad general, Salm b. Aḥwaz al-Tamīmī.¹

The Zaydīs did not give up the struggle but continued to give their support to almost every 'Alid rebel against 'Abbāsid rule.² Their efforts culminated in the establishment of two Zaydī states in Tabaristān and Yemen. The Zaydī state of Tabaristān was founded by al-Ḥasan b. Zayd b. Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl b. Zayd b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalib. Al-Ḥasan revolted there in 250/864 during the reign of al-Musta'īn. He was able to subjugate Tabaristān after a bitter struggle with Muḥammad b. Ṭahīr, the governor of Khurāsān.³ This state survived until the


³Tabarī, Tarīkh, III, pp. 1523 ff.; Masʻūdī, Murūj, VII, pp. 342-3.
murder of al-Hasan b. al-Qasim in 316/928.\(^1\) The Zaydis, however, continued to exist there but after the year 520/1126 they merged in the little sect of Muktawis.\(^2\)

The Zaydi state of Yemen was established by Yahya b. al-Husayn b. al-Qasim who was proclaimed imam in Sa'da some time during the decade of the 280's of the Muslim era.\(^3\) Zaydi imams continued to rule in Yemen until the coup d'etat of 1962 when al-Badr, the last imam, was overthrown and a republic was proclaimed. A civil war followed between the republicans and the royalists and ended with the establishment of coalition government in which both sides adopted the republican system. Nevertheless, the Zaydis still constitute a considerable part, if not the majority, of the population of Yemen.

B. The Extremist Religious Agitators.

The extremists, or the ghulāt, as termed in Arabic, were those who chose to venerate 'Alī b. Abī Tālib and his descendants, and began to attribute to them supernatural and even divine powers which they finally transferred to themselves as a means of acquiring greater power.

According to some Muslim sources, 'Abdallāh b. Saba' is considered to be the first to initiate these extreme views, but modern scholars regard them as later fabrications projected backwards. It is, however, probable that Ibn Saba' and his extremist contemporaries eulogised 'Alī b. Abī Tālib and condemned his predecessors as usurpers. Such action, if it happened, was regarded as Ghuluww by Muslim historians.

There is little doubt that the introduction of doctrines such as the conception of Mahdī, the Shī'ī principles of Ghayba and Raj'a, are later projections backwards to Ibn Saba'.

The term Mahdī first appeared in its messianic context

---

during the revolt of al-Mukhtar b. Abī ‘Ubayd al-Thaqafī who was killed in 67/686. Al-Mukhtar led his rebellion in the name of one of ‘Alī’s sons known as Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya. He claimed that Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya was the true imām and the rightful head of the Muslims. Although al-Mukhtar died before his imām, his movement survived and after the death of Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, approximately in 81/700, some of his followers endeavoured to attribute to him immortality by insisting that he had not died but had retired into concealment and, in God’s good time, he would return, destroy tyranny and establish justice. A section of this group became known as al-Karbiyya, taking the name of their notorious extremist leader, Ibn Karb.

Ḥamza b. ‘Umara al-Barbarī, a disciple of Ibn Karb, claimed Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya to be God, and himself his prophet. He is said

---

1 At this time two women, Hind bint al-Mutakallifa al-Nā‘ītiyya and Laylā bint Qumama al-Māziniyya, both extremists, spread many exaggerations in Kuфа. They are said to have caused Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya to write to the Shī‘a of Kuфа warning them not to follow these Ghulāt. See Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.731 (citing Abū Mikhnaf).


to have preached libertinism and married his own daughter. He declared all forbidden things to be permissible. He further taught that the only essential aspect of the faith was belief in the imām and that this belief gave complete freedom to any action. He is said to have recognised Muhammad al-Baqir as his imām. He also claimed to have been visited at night by his imām, but sources state that both al-Baqir and his son Ja'far al-Sadīq denounced him, condemning him as an agent of the devil.

There are no reports of violence perpetrated by Hamza against his opponents; but his disciple, Bayan b. Sam'an, together with another radical extremist, al-Mughira b. Sa'id al-Ijlī, led an open revolt in Kūfa in 119/737 during the reign of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik.

Bayan was, according to some sources, a member of the southern tribe of Nahd. Other sources state that he was a tribesman of Tamīm. Whether he was of Arab origin is not clear, despite

---

1 Nawbakhtī, Fīrag al-Shī'a, p.25; Sa'd al-Ash'arī, Al-Maqālāt wa'l Fīrag, pp. 33-4.
2 Kashshī, Rijāl, Mashhad edition, pp. 290-1, 300, 302, 304, 305; Sa'd al-Ash'arī, Al-Maqālāt wa'l Fīrag, p.33; Nawbakhtī, op.cit. p.25.
3 Sa'd al-Ash'arī, Al-Maqālāt wa'l Fīrag, p.33; Nawbakhtī, Fīrag al-Shī'a, p.30; Shahrastānī, Milal, p.113 (This edition records his name Banan while in Cairo edition he is Bayan. See Shahrastānī, Milal, Cairo, 1961, I, p.152).
his tribal surname, but he was probably a Mawla. Bayan was a straw merchant (Tabbān) in the city of Kūfa.\(^1\) He has been credited with being a disciple of Ḥemza b. ‘Umāra.\(^2\) Bayan accepted the imāmat of Abū Hāshim b. Muhammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya.\(^3\) After Abū Hāshim’s death, Bayan claimed the imāmat, stating that it had been bequeathed to him by Abū Hāshim.\(^4\) Some sources go even further and state that he claimed the attributes of prophet-hood.\(^5\) Needless to say there was enmity between Bayan and the imām Muhammad al-Baqir.\(^6\)


\(^3\)Baghdādī, al-Faq bain al-Firaq, p.236; Sa’d al-Ash‘arī, al-Maqālat wa’l-Firaq, pp. 33-4, 37; Nawbakhtī, Firaq al-Shī‘a, p.30; Shahrastānī, Milal, p.113; Himyārī, al-Hur al-‘In, p.161; M.G.S. Hodgson, EI², Art. "Bayan b. Sam‘an".

\(^4\)Baghdādī, al-Faq bain al-Firaq, p.237; Ash‘arī, Maqālat, pp. 6, 23; Shahrastānī, Milal, p.113; Himyārī, al-Hur al-‘In, p.161; Sa’d al-Ash‘arī, op.cit., p.35.


\(^6\)Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.286; Ibn Sa’d, Tabaqāt, V, p.321; Sa’d al-Ash‘arī, al-Maqālat wa’l-Firaq, pp. 33, 37; Nawbakhtī, Firaq al-Shī‘a, p.30; Shahrastānī, Milal, p.114; M.G.S. Hodgson, EI², Art. "Bayan b. Sam‘an". However, Nawbakhtī (p.25) and Sa’d al-Ash‘arī (p.33) give another report stating that Bayan claimed that Muhammad al-Baqir had bequeathed the Imāamate to him.
Bayān preached a strange interpretation of the Qur'ān in which he conceived the Almighty as a figure of light fashioned in all respects like Man. The only indestructible part of this Almighty being which would not ultimately perish would be his face. In addition, Bayān claimed for himself supernatural power, and appears to have believed in re-incarnation and the transmigration of souls.

Al-Mughīra b. Sa'īd of the tribe of 'Ijl was contemporary with Bayān. Al-Mughīra was a client of the governor Khalid b. 'Abdallāh al-Qasrī, and is described by the sources as Bajalī or rather the Mawla of Bajīla. Al-Mughīra is said to have

---


3Baghdādī, al-Farq bain al-Firaq, pp.40, 237, 272; Shahrastānī, Milāl, pp.113-4; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-Arab, XXIX, p.128.


recognised Muḥammad al-Baḍīr as his Imam, but after the death of al-Baḍīr he refused to acknowledge Baḍīr’s son Ja’far al-Ṣadiq. Ja’far, on his part, denounced al-Mughīrā, and declared that he and his followers were in the habit of visiting his father, al-Baḍīr, not only spreading a tissue of lies behind his back but introducing false and extremist views into his writings. Nevertheless, it is certain that, after al-Baḍīr’s death, al-Mughīrā recognised the claims of Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya as Mahdī and advanced them in Kūfa.

Al-Mughīrā also claimed supernatural power, and practised

\^{1}Ash’ārī, Maqālāt, p.23; Nawbakhtī, Fīraq al-Shī‘a, p.54; Shahrastānī, Milāl, p.134; Baghdādī, al-Fāraq bain al-Fīraq, pp. 238-9; Ḥīmyārī, al-Ḥur al-‘īn, p.168; W.M. Watt, op.cit., p.168. However, Ibn Abī’l-Ḥadīd maintains that al-Mughīrā gave allegiance first to al-Baḍīr and then to Abu Ḥashim. Both of them denounced him and Abu Ḥashim struck him severely. Afterwards al-Mughīrā offered allegiance to Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya who made no reply. Taking silence for acceptance al-Mughīrā went to Kūfa where he preached that Muḥammad was the awaited Mahdī. See Ibn Abī’l-Ḥadīd, Sharh Nahj al-Balagha, VIII, p.121.

\^{2}Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.285; Kashshī, Rijāl, p.147.


magic and necromancy in Kufa. He also is said to have preached the doctrine of transmigration as well as anthropomorphic and dualist ideas.¹

To enforce his beliefs he and his followers terrorised those who disagreed with their teaching. It is said that they used poison or strangling, not only against opponents of their beliefs, but sometimes indiscriminately. It is reported that some of al-Mughira's followers complained of such acts to him, admitting that some of their colleagues might have suffered unrecognised at the time. Al-Mughira condoned the act by suggesting that, if such were the case, he (their colleague) had merely attained entrance to Paradise whereas, if he were not a colleague, he was only precipitated into Hell.³ Later, in 119/737, under obscure circumstances, al-Mughira and Bayan joined forces in an attempted rising against the existing authority. Al-Mughira seems

to have assumed the command of the uprising which was easily suppressed as the number of rebels was very small. Al-Mughîra and Bayân and a few prominent colleagues (wusafâ') were brought to Khalid al-Qasrî and suffered death by fire.\footnote{Balânî, Ansâb, II, p.185; Tabarî, Tarikh, II, pp. 1619-20; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, p.154; Nuwayrî, Niha-yât al-Arab, XXIX, p.128; Ibn Kathir, Bidaya, IX, p.323, X, p.20; Ibn Asâkir, al-Tarikh al-Kabîr, V, p.69; Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Mirât al-Zaman, fol. 184; Nawbakhti, Firaq al-Shi‘a, p.25; Sa‘d al-Ash’ârin, al-Ma‘âlût wa’l-Firaq, p.33; Hodgson, EI, Art. "Dayyan b. Sam‘an".}

Among the fanatical extremists of the period was a certain Abû Mansûr. Nothing is known of his parentage but report says that his foster-mother was one al-Maylā', a notorious extremist.\footnote{Ibn Qutayba, ‘Uyun al-Akhbâr, II, p.147; Jâhiz, Hayawan, II, p. 268, VI, p.391.}

Abû Mansûr was a Mawlā of the tribe of ‘Ijl and thus known as al-‘Ijlî.\footnote{Ibn Hazm, Figal, II, p. 114; Râzî, I’tiqâdat Firaq al-Muslimîn wa’l-Mushrîkin, p.58; Baghdâdî, al-Farq bain al-Firaq, p.243; Shahrestânî, Mîlâlî, p.135; Himyarî, al-Hûr al-‘In, p.168; Ash’ârin, Ma‘âlût al-Islâmiyyîn, p.9.}

He claimed special privilege conferred upon him by the Almighty who, he said, spoke to him in Syriac,\footnote{Nawbakhti, Firaq al-Shi‘a, p.34.} while other sources claim divine revelation spoken in the Persian language.\footnote{Sa‘d al-Ash’ârin, al-Ma‘âlût wa’l-Firaq, p.46; Kashshî, Rijal, p. 196; Mashhad edition, p.303; Hodgson, "How did the early Shi‘a become sectarian?", JAC, 1955, p.5.}

Accordingly, it is probable that his origin was either Syriac or Persian.

Sources\footnote{Sa‘d al-Ash’ârin, al-Ma‘âlût wa’l-Firaq, p.46; Nawbakhti,} describe Abû Mansûr as illiterate and as having
grown up in the desert and that later he was to be found in the quarter of 'Abd al-Qays of Kufa which was under Persian influence. He asserted that 'Alī b. Abī Talib was himself a prophet and messenger from God and included 'Alī's descendants al-Hasan, al-Ḥusayn, 'Alī Zayn al-'Abidīn and al-Bāqir in the same category. Of these he recognised al-Bāqir as his Imam but refused recognition to al-Ṣādiq as, after the death of al-Bāqir, he himself claimed the Imamate. From this time he appears to have claimed the attribute of prophethood which, he asserted, would continue consecutively through six of his own descendants, culminating with the last, who would be al-Mahdī.

A modicum of Christianity seems to have been introduced into his teachings by his proclamation that he was the son of God and

---

2 Nawbakhti, Firaq al-Shī'a, p. 34; Sa'd al-Ash'arī, al-Maqālat wa' 1 Firaq, p. 47.
3 Nawbakhti, Firaq al-Shī'a, p. 34; Baghdādī, al-Farq bain al-Firaq, p. 244; B. Lewis, The Origin of Ismā'īlism, p. 30.
4 It is said that Ja'far al-Ṣādiq cursed Abū Mansūr and depicted him as a messenger of the devil (Iblīs). See Kashshāī, Ri'āl, p. 196; Mashhad edition, pp. 303-4.
5 Nawbakhti, Firaq al-Shī'a, p. 34; Shahrastānī, Milāl, p. 135 (says that al-Bāqir dismissed him); Himyarī, al-Kur al-'In, pp. 168-9; Ash'arī, Maqālat, p. 9; Baghdādī, al-Farq bain al-Firaq, p. 243; Sa'd al-Ash'arī, al-Maqālat wa' 1 Firaq, p. 47; B. Lewis, The Origin of Ismā'īlism, p. 30; idem, The Assassins, p. 128; S. Moscati, "Per una Storia dell'antica Si'a", RSC, XXX, pp. 260-1.
6 Sa'd al-Ash'arī, al-Maqālat wa' 1 Firaq, p. 47; Nawbakhti, Firaq al-Shī'a, p. 34.
that ‘Īsā was the first creature.  

Abu Mansur avowed he had been raised to Heaven where the Almighty had addressed him as Son with the words "My Son, inform about me". He further claimed that the verse of the Qur'an which reads "were they unbelievers to see a piece (kisf) of the sky falling on them, they would only say: 'clouds gathered in heaps'", referred to him and he himself was the kisf. Accordingly he was known as al-Kisf. Abu Mansur credited the prophet Muhammad as the recipient of Divine Revelation and himself as sole interpreter. From this he went on to assert that Qur'anic verses and the prescription of law held allegoric and symbolic meaning which was of greater importance than their literal interpretation. The existence of Paradise and Hell, as understood by orthodox Muslims was denied. "Paradise," he said, represented the current Imām and "Hell" the man who opposed him. According to another source he stated that

1Shahrastānī, Milal, p.36.
3Qur‘an, LII, 44.
6Shahrastānī, Milal, p.136; see also Ash‘arī, Maqlāt, p.9; Himyarī, al-Hūr al-‘In, p.169.
"Paradise" and "Hell" represented respectively the pleasures and misery of the world. ¹ He exempted his followers from the performance of religious duties and preached to them a philosophy combining materialism and libertinism. ²

Together with his followers, Abu Mansur terrorised his opponents; their lives, women and property, he said, belonged to members of the sect. Assassination was carried out on unbelievers; sometimes a rope noose strangled them, at others wooden cudgels or rounded twin stones destroyed them. Death by steel was reserved for the advent of al-Mahdi when secret holy war (بُنَيْن) would then be replaced openly. Khalid al-Qasri is said to have failed in an effort to seize and kill Abu Mansur but, in the year 125/743, his successor Yusuf b. 'Umar succeeded in doing so and drastically suppressed his followers. ³

The ghulat movement in the first half of the second century

¹ Baghdadi, al-Farq bain al-Firaq, p.245; see also B. Lewis, The Assassins, p.128.
of the Muslim era brought new conceptions to the Shi'ite circles. In addition to the condemnation of the first three Caliphs and the principle of the Ghayba (disappearance) and raj'ā (return) of the Imam as a messiah, new ideas had been introduced, some of which were later adopted by the Ismā'īlī sect. One of these was that of tafwīd (delegation of power) by which the non-'Alid extremist leaders claimed that the Imamate had been passed to them by delegation from the 'Alid Imam who had either died or disappeared. In this they differed from the imāmī Shi'is who asserted that the Imamate was confined to the Alids. The ghulāt went as far in some cases as claiming divinity for the Imam who was regarded as God. The imāmī Shi'ites attributed superhuman qualities to the Imam and considered him as infallible but they did not, however, assert his divinity as God.

Interpretation of the Qur'an verses became symbolic and, as such, the verses had two meanings, one esoteric and the other exoteric, the latter of which was known to the masses. The esoteric interpretation was only for the knowledge of the Imam and his closest followers; this idea was later assimilated by the Ismā'īlis.

The extremists (ghulāt) also preached anthropomorphic ideas, depicting the Almighty as a man formed by figure of light. They also preached a form of libertinism prohibited among the Sunnīs and also by the imāmī Shi'īs.
These principles had their roots in various places. The leaders of the ghulāt during the period under discussion were mostly Mawāli, who, though adopting Islām, retained many of their former beliefs. Their ancestry was varied by Jewish, Christian, gnostic, Zoroastrian and Mazdakite backgrounds and former indoctrinations remained strong enough to blend with the Islamic faith. In addition, even after conversion, and especially the leaders of the ghulāt associated themselves with border tribes such as Kinda, ‘Abd al-Qays and more especially ‘Ijl who had been under Persian and Aramaic influence. These small tribes probably tried to enlarge their numbers and, as it has already been noted, many of the Mawāli did not entirely break with their previous creeds and beliefs, and were welcomed as neo-converts among them.

It is recorded that ‘Ijl tribe was under Persian influence prior to the advent of Islām and that a section of them had settled in Bahrayn among Persian immigrants from Istakhr.¹ Some of the tribe had been Christian before Islām and in the battle of Ullays (12/634) between Khalid b. al-Walīd and the Persians they had allied themselves with the Persians.²

¹Yaqūt, Mu‘jam al-Buldān, II, p.179; Goldziher, Muslim Studies, I, I, p.100; M. Watt, EI², Art. "‘Idjil"; J. Schleifer, EI¹, Art. "‘Idjil".
²Tabarî, Tarikh, I, p.2032ff.; M. Watt, EI², Art. "‘Idjil"; Schleifer, EI¹, Art. "‘Idjil".
So many Mawālī appear to have associated themselves with the tribes of ‘Ijl and Kinda that it is small wonder that the stranglers, followers of Abū Mansūr and al-Mughīra, were prominent among these tribes. The terrorising methods they used caused the poet A‘shā Hamadān to compose verses warning others to avoid going amongst them except in sufficient numbers to ensure self-protection. The fact that A‘shā Hamadān died in 84/703 indicates that extremism had shown itself at an early stage among the members of these tribes.

CHAPTER III

DISTURBANCES IN NORTH AFRICA AND SPAIN.
Chapter III

A. THE BERBER REVOLT

Until the accession of the Caliph ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz to the throne, the Berbers, a valiant fighting people, had only partially submitted to Arab rule and took every opportunity to revolt and secede from the faith. The sources quote that there were more than twelve occasions on which this took place.¹

‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz appointed Ismā‘īl b. ‘Abdallāh as governor of the province of Ifrīqiya. The appointment appears to have been well received by the Berbers and the governor is described in the sources as a wise and just ruler. It is said they unhesitatingly converted, en masse, to Islām.² Further report states that the custom of demanding Berber girls and children as tribute was completely discarded. The Caliph ordered the restoration of Berber girls to their families unless their owners were prepared to accept them in marriage.³

the Mawla and Hajib of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz is said to be a Berber.\(^1\) By this wise and understanding administration of government, Berber uprising ceased during the reign of 'Umar II and both Arabs and Berbers were able to live side by side as a peaceful community.

Unfortunately Umar's successor, Yazid II, replaced Isma'il b. 'Abdallah by Yazid b. Abi Muslim a former scribe of al-Hajjaj, who adopted a harsh policy toward the Berbers. Enraged by the treatment to which they were subjected they murdered him.\(^2\) The assassination was the prelude to the great Berber revolt which occurred during the reign of Hisham b. 'Abd al-Malik. It is, however, significant that the perpetrators of the murder were said to be Berbers professing Kharijite doctrine.\(^3\) This is, as Professor Lewicki says,\(^4\) the first noticeable mention of Berbers being described as Kharijites in the sources. From this point

\(^1\)Dhahabi, Tarikh al-Islam, IV, p.53.


\(^4\)Lewicki, op.cit., p.85.
in their history the Berbers gave up their old habit of secession from Islam and seemed to have found sufficient justification in the Kharijite principle of equality for a continuation of their struggle against their governors.

It is difficult to arrive at a clear decision as to how and when Kharijite views found acceptance in North Africa. Tabari and Ibn al-Athir, who quotes from his information, maintain that the Berber disobedience began after the arrival of the Iraqi da'is with propaganda which roused Berbers to revolt against Umayyad governors. Presumably the Iraqi da'is were Kharijites but the sources do not clearly state that they were so. Moreover, Tabari and Ibn al-Athir do not mention the date of the arrival of these da'is in North Africa. With the exception of casual mention by Ibn Khaldun and Ibadī literature, available Maghribi sources do not clarify this subject.

Salama b. Sa'd al-Hasrami's name is the first to be mentioned in the Ibadī sources coupled with the expansion of Ibadī doctrine. The length of his stay in North Africa, whether permanent or whether he returned to Baṣra, is not indicated. It is also unknown whether he went to North Africa on a private mission

---

1 Tabari, Tārīkh, I, p. 2815.
2 Ibn al-Athir, Kāmil, III, p. 72.
or was sent by the Ibadī leader, Abū 'Ubayda, who used to send Ibadī da'īs known as Hamalat al-'Ilm to the different parts of the Islamic Empire to preach Ibadī doctrines. 1 Salama b. Sa'd seems to have been both sincere and ambitious and it is related that he once said in Qayrawān, "I wish that this affair [the Ibadī Madhab] would manifest itself even for one day, then I would not care if I were beheaded." 2

There is, nevertheless, evidence of cooperation between the Kharijite sects as Salama b. Sa'd was accompanied by the Sufrite scholar and agitator, 'Ikrima, a disciple of the famous traditionist, Ibn 'Abbās. 3 Both Kharijite sects (Ibadī and Sufrite) appear to preach, primarily, the Kharijite principle of equality between all Muslims, and the differential principles seem to be of secondary consideration. 4 No specific date is given in the sources for the despatch of this mission but there is evidence that it took place either at the end of the first or the very beginning of the second century of the Muslim era, as

---

2 Shammakhī, Siyar, p.123 (citing the Ibadī Imam 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Rustam) and see p. 98.
Ikrima died in the period between 100/718 and 110/728-9 most probably in 105/724. Moreover al-Bakri states that Ikrima had gone to Ifriqiya prior to 104/722-3.

Professor Lewicki's suggestion that Ikrima and Salama were among the ten men sent by 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azžz to Ifriqiya may not be authentic as their names do not appear in the list of those despatched by the mentioned caliph.

However the mission of Salama b. Sa'd and Ikrima was not the first contact between the Kharijites and the Berbers. The Kharijites of the east had been almost eliminated during the reign of the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān and the remaining members had sought shelter in remoter areas away from the firm control of the government in the central parts of the Empire. It is likely that there were some Kharijites among the conquering troops sent to North Africa who remained to propagate their doctrines among the Berbers.


4. For the names of the ten men sent by the Caliph 'Umar II, see: Mālikī, Riyād al-Nufūs, I, pp.64-76; Abu'l-'Arab, Tabaqat 'Ulama' Ifriqiya wa Tūnis, pp.84-7.
Trade was probably another channel which brought Berbers into contact with the Khārijites. Basra, an important centre of the Khārijites, was linked by trade with distant territories, embracing China in the east and al-Sus al-Aqṣa in Morocco, in the west. It is almost certain that there was contact between Berbers and Khārijites during pilgrimages to Mecca and Madīna. Professor T. Lewicki says that Ibaḍī pilgrims preached their doctrines in the holy cities among pilgrims from other provinces. Other Khārijite groups also did the same, and therefore the Hajj time was a good opportunity for the different sects to preach their cause.

Prior to the revolt of the Berbers in 122/739 during the reign of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik, Sufrite propaganda appears to have met with greater success than that of the Ibaḍīs, perhaps because the Sufrites had a more militant and a more radical approach than the Ibaḍīs. Thus the Berber rebels under the rule of Hishām are referred to by the sources as Sufrites. On the

---

1Shammākhi, Siyar, p.94; T. Lewicki, "The Ibadites in Arabia and Africa", JWH, XIII, I, pp. 65, 73.
2Ibid., p.74.
3See, for example, p.176.
other hand the description of the rebels as Sufrites clearly shows the important role played by the Kharijites in stirring up the Berber population against the Umayyad regime.

The period of comparative stability which followed the murder of Yazid b. Abi Muslim in 102/720-1 was brought to an end by the arrival of 'Ubaydallah b. al-Ḥabhab in 116/734 as governor of the province of Ifriqiya. Sub-governors were replaced by new officials and harsh methods were used by the new administration. Isma'il, the son of 'Ubaydallah b. al-Ḥabhab, and 'Umar b. 'Abdallah al-Muradi were prominent in this respect. Taxes, already high, were increased drastically and the Berbers were humiliated and regarded merely as Khums or Fay of Muslims. The sources give little or no detail concerning the amount of taxes levied, but it is certain that the officials of this regime exploited and enraged the Berbers. ¹

¹ Qayrawānī, Tarikh Ifriqiya wa'l-Maghrib, p. 109; Ibn 'Idhārī, al-Bayan al-Mughrīb, I, pp. 51-2; Nuwyri, Nihayat al-Arab, XXII, II, p. 34; Ibn Khaldun, 'Ibar, IV, p. 405; VI, p. 221; Bāji, al-Khulasa al-Naqiyya, p. 14; Salawi, al-Istiqṣā, I, p. 106. The author of Kitāb Akhbar Majmu'a denies that the governors maltreated the Berbers and maintains that the Kharijite propaganda was the main reason for the Berber rebellion, see Akhbar Majmu'a, pp. 31-2.
A Berber deputation is recorded by both Tabari and Ibn al-Athir to have left Ifriqiya for Damascus. It was headed by Maysara (later the leader of the rebellion) and its mission was to complain of their maltreatment by the governors and to investigate whether the harshness suffered by the Berbers was with or without the knowledge of the Caliph. The deputation remained in Damascus for some time without being able to see the Caliph and finally sent a message by al-Abrash al-Kalbi to the Caliph Hishām and returned to Ifriqiya without any satisfactory accomplishment to their mission.\(^1\)

This story is improbable for many reasons although it is accepted without question by modern scholars.\(^2\) It is scarcely likely that such a delegation could leave and return to Ifriqiya without the knowledge of the governor of the province; alternatively, giving it credence, it is strange that Damascene officials neither notified the governor nor took any precautions against hostile activities by the delegates. The statement that they made a stay in Damascus and afterward returned to Ifriqiya, undeterred adds to the improbability. No mention is made of the

\(^1\) Tabari, Tarikh, I, pp. 2815-6; Ibn al-Athir, Kamāl, III, pp. 71-2.

\(^2\) Gabrieli, Il Califato di Hishām, p.96; 'Abbādī, Fī al-Tarikh al-'Abbāsi wa'l-Andalusi, pp. 296-7.
event in *Maghribi* sources, nor is it even mentioned by the *Mashriqi* historians, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, who give much detail on the revolt of the Berbers. Ṭabarī, the original reporter of the story, mentions it casually when speaking of events which took place in 27/647 whereas the event in question was alleged to take place in 122/739. One thing, however, is certain, namely that the Berbers received unjust treatment and their resentment was inflamed by Khārijite propaganda. In al-*Maghrīb al-Aswān*, where the revolt started, a large number of Berbers professed Khārijite doctrine.¹ It should also be noted in this connection that Islam had not penetrated their thinking deeply as some of the Berbers retained their pagan beliefs for centuries to come.²

In 122/740 ʿUbaydallāh b. al-Ḥabīb despatched Ḥabīb b. Abī ʿUbayda al-Fihrī at the head of an Arab army to conquer Sicily. He laid siege to Syracuse, conquered and exacted tribute

---


from the defeated city. The absence of the government troops opened an excellent opportunity to Berber rebellion.

In 122/740, the Berbers who had awaited such an opportunity to rebel openly, declared a certain Maysara al-Madgharī (or al-Magharī) as their caliph. They then marched on Tangier (Tanja) where they killed its governor, 'Umar b. 'Abdallāh al-Murādī. Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam and Ibn 'Idhārī report that Maysara then appointed his Sufrite colleague 'Abd al-Afāl b. Ḥudayj to be in charge of Tangier and then left for al-Sūs al-Adnā to deal with Ismā‘īl b. 'Ubaydallāh who was also killed.

---


asserts that Maysara and ‘Abd al-A‘lā b. Ḥudayj rebelled at the same time and that the latter was responsible for the death of the governor of Tangier. Maysara, according to Khalīfa, was at that time engaged with overcoming and killing Ismā‘īl b. ‘Ubaydallāh. Khalīfa adds that Maysara then sent one of his generals to Tangier and killed ‘Abd al-A‘lā b. Ḥudayj.

Khalīfa’s report seems to be unauthentic as it has no supporting evidence and it is also in contradiction with the other sources affirming that the governor of Tangier was killed by Maysara himself.

After this initial victory the revolt gained momentum and spread over al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā. Few details are recorded but those reported by the Christian author of The History of Toledo, although of interest, are open to doubt. He records that ‘Ubaydallāh b. al-Ḥabḥab instructed the governor of Spain, ‘Uqba b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Salūlī, to descend upon the rebels in Tangier. ‘Uqba first despatched troops to the area but they were defeated. Whereupon he personally headed a large force which landed on the North African coast. Every rebel who fell into his hands was put to death but he was unable to suppress the rebellion. Some modern scholars accepted this report without question.  

1Isidoro Pacense (ascribed to) in Akhbar Majmū‘a, appendix 2, pp. 157-8.
source mentions the story while most of them assert that when news of the Berber revolt reached Spain ʿUqba b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Salūṭī was deposed by his opponents and replaced by ʿAbd al-Malik b. Qaṭān al-Fihri.\(^1\)

ʿUbaydallāh b. al-Ḥabūb had no option but to recall Ḥabīb b. AbīʿUbayda from Sicily; meanwhile he sent an army led by Khālid b. Abī Ḥabīb to deal with the rebels in al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā. Khālid met Maysara and his followers at a place near Tangier. Fierce fighting broke out between them and Maysara then withdrew to Tangier.\(^2\) There is no conclusive evidence given in the sources that his withdrawal was a victory for Khālid, and shortly afterward Maysara was assassinated by his own partisans.\(^3\) The sources, however, suggest that he was killed because of his bad behaviour.\(^4\) What such conduct actually

---


\(^4\) Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Futūḥ Miṣr, p. 218 (he wrongly records his
was is not clear from extant information, but both Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam and Ibn 'Idhārī add that he did not fulfil the terms on which he had been chosen as leader.\(^1\) It was however a part of Khārijite practice to eliminate any Imam who did not meet his professed ideals.

Maysara was replaced by Khalid b. Humayd al-Zanātī\(^2\) and he resumed the offensive against the government forces which seemingly had remained in the area. Khalīfa b. Khayyāt\(^3\) maintains that he met his enemy, Khalid b. Abī Ḥabīb, by the river Kadar, while Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam gives the Shalaf river near Tahert as the place of the battle.\(^4\)


\(^2\) Qayrawānī, Tārīkh Iftīqiya wa'l-Maghrib, p.110; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p.142; Ibn 'Idhārī, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, I, p.53 (citing al-Raqqī al-Qayrawānī); Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-ʿArab, XXII, II, p.35; Ibn Khaldūn, Ibar, IV, p.405 (he records his name as Khalid b. Ḥabīb). Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's report that the Berber rebels elected 'Abd al-Malik b. Qāṭan as their chief after the murder of Maysara (Futūḥ Mīṣr, p.218) is obviously not authentic because 'Abd al-Malik b. Qāṭan was an Arab chief who replaced 'Uqba b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Salulī, as governor of Spain in 122-3 A.H. See above, p.143.

\(^3\) Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Tārīkh, II, p.368.

they fought at Tangier. Among these conflicting reports the fact remains that Maysara and Khalid b. Abi Habib had already fought each other in a place near Tangier and there is no confirmation of Khalid's withdrawal to any other place. In all probability, therefore, Ibn Abi Dinar's report is the most authentic.

No numbers of troops are given in this context but the rebels seem to have outnumbered government forces. Al-Raqiq al-Qayrawani states that the insurgents surprised the forces commanded by Khalid b. Abi Habib from the rear. After fierce fighting, the rebels were victorious and some government troops fled. Their leader together with other prominent notables refused to capitulate and continued fighting until there were no survivors amongst them. This gave the battle the name of Ghazwat al-Ashraf (the battle of the nobles). The only extant date of

---

1 Ibn Abi Dinar, Mu’nis, pp. 40-1.
3 Khalifa b. Khayyat, Tarikh, II, p.368 (he states that the leader of the rebels was Maysara. This is an obvious error as Maysara was not then alive); Qayrawani, Tarikh Ifriqiya wa’l-Maghrib, pp. 110-111; Ibn al-Athir, Kamal, V, p.142; Ibn ‘Idhari, al-Bayan al-Mughrib, I, p.54; Nuwayri, Nihayat al-Arab, XXII, II, p.35; Ibn Khaldun, Ibar, IV, p.405; Ibn Abi Dinar, Mu’nis, pp. 40-1. Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam (Futuh Migr, p.218) gives three reports on the fighting between Khalid b. Abi Habib and the rebels. He says that Khalid b. Abi Habib met with the Berbers near Tangier where he was killed and names this battle as Ghazwat al-Ashraf but does not mention the name of the Berber leader. In another report he repeats the obvious error that Khalid b. Abi Habib met Maysara on the battlefield near Tangier and Khalid was killed. In a third report
this battle is recorded by Khalīfa b. Khayyat who states that
it occurred at the end of 122/740 or during Muḥarram 123/741.¹
Nothing is known of where the rebels encamped after this battle.
On the other hand Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam² states that 'Ubaydallāh b. al-Ḥabīb sent Ḥabīb b. Ṭabī 'Ubayda against the rebels. Instead he punished Ḍūsār b. Ṭabī Ḥālid, the governor of Tilimsān (Tlemcen) in an alleged charge of trouble-making. His records give no account of any fighting between Ḥabīb and the rebels. Khalīfa b. Khayyat³ appears to be a little confused in his reports of the aftermath of the battle of the nobles. He says that 'Ubaydallāh b. al-Ḥabīb appointed 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Mughīra al-'Abdī as governor of Tilimsān where he put the Sufrites to the sword. This gave 'Abd al-Raḥmān the name of al-Jazzār (the butcher) but the rebels, in turn, attacked him fiercely and he withdrew to an unspecified place. Khalīfa then maintains that 'Ubaydallāh b. al-Ḥabīb sent Ḥabīb b. Ṭabī 'Ubayda against the rebels and arrived in Wādī Tilimsān where he remained until the end of the governorship of 'Ubaydallāh b. al-Ḥabīb; no fighting between him and the rebels is reported.

---
Thus it is difficult to obtain a precise account of the events which followed the battle of the nobles although a little clarification is possible. It is certain that Ḥabīb b. Abī ‘Ubayda arrived at the trouble-spot and was stationed in the area of Tilimsān (Tlemcen). It can also be inferred that he arrived when the battle was over as he neither sent relief nor took part in the fighting. Indeed there is no record of any fighting between the government troops and the main body of the rebels after the battle of the nobles, prior to the coming of the new governor of Ibrīqiya.

The disastrous defeat ending with the death of his Arab nobles in the Ghazwat al-Ashraf enraged the Caliph Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik. He dismissed ‘Ubaydallāh b. al-Ḥabīb from his governorship of Ibrīqiya and summoned him to Syria in Jumāda I 123/741. He replaced him by Kulthūm b. ‘Iyād. According to

---


the author of Kitāb Akhbar Majmuʿa he left Syria accompanied by 27,000 Syrians recruited from the Syrian junds and Qinnasrīn. The four Syrian junds each provided 6,000 and Qinnasrīn 3,000 men. Ibn al-Qaṭṭān gives the number of troops as 30,000, a number which is repeated by Ibn al-Qūṭiyya. Despite the apparent discrepancy, the figures are actually in agreement as it is probably that Ibn al-Qaṭṭān and Ibn al-Qūṭiyya incorporated the 3,000 men who were to join the Syrians in Egypt.

Al-Raqīq al-Qayrawānī reduces the number of the Syrians to 12,000, a figure repeated by Nuwayrī and Ibn Khaldūn.

In order to ensure firm control, Hishām entrusted the command of the army to the new governor of Ifriqiya, Kulthūm b. 'Īyād. For future security in the event of Kulthūm's death the office was to be undertaken by Balj b. Bishr, a nephew or cousin of Kulthūm, to be succeeded by Thaʿlabā b. Salāma al-ʿAmīlī, the

---

1 Akhbar Majmuʿa, p.31.
3 Ibn al-Qūṭiyya, Tārīkh Iftīthā al-Andalus, p.41.
4 Akhbar Majmuʿa, p.31.
6 Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXII, II, p.36.
7 Ibn Khaldūn, ʿIbar, VI, p.222; Salāwī, al-Istiqāṣ, I, p.110 (citing Ibn Khaldūn).
leader of the jund of Jordan, if Balj died or unforeseen circumstances made it necessary.¹

The author of Kitāb Akhbār Majmū'a² relates that the Caliph Hishām ordered Kulthūm to be counselled by the two Umayyad clients, Harūn al-Qarnī and Mughīth, because of their knowledge of the country and its people. The Caliph also contacted both the governors and people of the provinces which were on Kulthūm's route and ordered them to supply additional troops.³

Balj commanded the vanguard of Kulthūm's army which arrived in Ifrīqiya in Ramāḍān 123/741.⁴ Balj does not appear to have used diplomacy in dealing with the North African Arabs⁵ for it is said that he arrogantly ordered them to extend hospitality to the Syrians and receive them into their homes. Offended by this attitude, the North Africans shut the gates of their towns in the

¹ Aḥbār Majmū'a, p. 30; Ibn al-Qūṭiyya, Tarīkh Iftīṭah al-Andalus, pp. 40-1.
² Aḥbār Majmū'a, p. 31.
⁵ By North Africans I mean the Arab settlers in the province of Ifrīqiya prior to the arrival of the Syrian troops.
face of the Syrian contingent. They corresponded with Ḥabīb b. Abī 'Ubayda, who had remained in al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā, voicing their complaints at such treatment. Ḥabīb passed the complaint at Balj's behaviour to Kulthūm and threatened that if his forces did not leave the inhabitants at peace he would turn his arms against the Syrians.\footnote{Qayrawānī, Tarīkh Ifrīqiya wa'l-Maghrib, pp. 112-3; Ibn 'Idhārī, al-Bayan al-Mughrib, I, p.54; Ibn al-Athîr, Kāmil, V, p.143; Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, IV, p.406.}

Kulthūm replied with his regrets at the behaviour to Ḥabīb, adding that he would shortly join him.\footnote{Qayrawānī, Tarīkh Ifrīqiya wa'l-Maghrib, p.113; Ibn 'Idhārī, al-Bayan al-Mughrib, I, p.54; Ibn al-Athîr, Kāmil, V, p.143; Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, IV, p.406.} Leaving 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Uqba al-Ghifārī to govern Qayrawān he marched to join forces with Ḥabīb.\footnote{Qayrawānī, Tarīkh Ifrīqiya wa'l-Maghrib, p.113; Ibn 'Idhārī, al-Bayan al-Mughrib, I, p.54-5; Nuwayrî, Nihayat al-Arab, XXII, II, p.36; Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, IV, p.406; Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, Futuh Mīṣr, p.218 (he maintains that Kulthūm appointed another man, Maslama b. Sawāda al-Qurashi, in charge of war affairs. This report seems to be authentic as Maslama is mentioned as the leader of the Arab army sent from Qayrawān to deal with the Berber rebels in the area of Qābis. See below, p.155.)}

The two Arab armies immediately showed their incompatibility, hurling abuse at each other almost to the point of
violence, but this was apparently avoided by mediation. Ibn Khaldun's assertion that they actually fought each other is not confirmed by other extant sources, and appears to be refuted by their mutual cooperation against the Berber rebels.

There is disagreement as to the place where the joint forces fought the rebels. Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam names it as Majluba in the area of Tangier while others claim it was at Wadi Tanja (Tangier). Wadi Sebu is favoured by some and Baqdurra on Wadi Sebu is also quoted. It seems most probable that it actually took place at Baqdurra on Wadi Sebu and that Wadi Tanja is merely another name for the Sebu.

The number of the rebel army does not appear in the sources while 70,000 is confirmed as being that of the Arab

---

2 Ibn Khaldun, 'Ibar, IV, p.406; this claim is repeated by Salawi, al-Istiqsa, I, p.110.
4 Nuwayri, Nihayat al-Arab, XXII, II, p.36.
6 Akhbar Majmua, p.32; Ibn al-Qutiyya, Tarikh Iftitah al-Andalus, p.41. Baqdurra is sometimes recorded as Nafdura or Naqdura.
7 Ibn Khaldun, 'Ibar, IV, p.406; VI, p.222. However, he records Wadi Sebu as Wadi Sebus or Suwa (Suwa s.b.s).
army. It is recorded, however, that the rebels were more numerous.

The author of Akhbar Majmu'a gives the most vivid and detailed account of the battle. When the Arabs realised the numerical superiority of the rebel Berbers the Umayyad clients, Harun and Mughith, who acted as guides, advised Kulthum to entrench himself and use his cavalry to engage the Berbers and raid their neighbouring villages. Balj b. Bishr, however, persuaded Kulthum that, as the rebels had no weapons, their superiority of numbers was insignificant.

Upon the advice of Balj, Kulthum decided to meet the rebel army in the open field. Divided into four groups, his army prepared for action. The Syrian cavalry was commanded by Balj and the North African was led by Harun al-Qarni. Mughith was placed in command of the North African infantry while Kulthum himself took command of the Syrian infantry.

Kulthum had, however, underrated the rebels who, although less well equipped than his army, used a clever strategy. The

---

1 Akhbar Majmu'a, p. 31; Maqarrî, Naft al-Tîb, III, p. 20; Salâwî, al-Istîqç, I, p. 110.
2 Akhbar Majmu'a, p. 32; Nuwayrî, Nihayat al-Arab, XXII, II, p. 36; Ibn Khaldûn, 'Ibaru, VI, p. 222; Salâwî, al-Istîqç, I, p. 110 (citing Ibn Khaldûn).
3 Akhbar Majmu'a, p. 32.
4 Ibid.
government cavalry began the attack but the Berber rebels devised the use of leather bags filled with pebbles which they aimed at the horses, successfully causing confusion amongst the oncoming cavalry. A further device by the rebels was to release a number of unbroken mares driving them amongst the advancing infantry and causing devastating confusion. Balj fiercely attacked from his side with his 7,000 cavalry and, with difficulty, managed to penetrate rebel lines. This, however, had the effect of splitting the Arab forces and the groups led by Balj and Kulthum were separated. Balj found his troops in the rear of the rebels and was unable to rejoin the rest of the army.

Kulthum and his troops had fought courageously against the Berbers but he, together with Ḥabīb b. ʿAbī ʿUbayda al-Fihrī and other valiant Arab leaders had perished on the battlefield; their remaining troops scattered in confused flight.

---

1Ibid., p.33.
2Ibid., pp. 33-4.
It was now that the numerical superiority of the rebels became their advantage and, after defeating the section led by Kulthūm they attacked Balj with added ferocity and forced his army in disordered flight to the western regions of al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā. 1 Balj endeavoured to conquer Tangier but was prevented by the rebels, and retreated into the impregnable fortress of Ceuta. 2 At first the Berbers attacked the fortress with heavy losses to themselves. Realising its impregnability they ravaged the surrounding neighbourhood in a wide sweep and blockaded the town from all sides in an effective siege. 3

Threatened by severe famine and after having, it is recorded, used their animals for food Balj corresponded with the governor of Spain who at first refused help, but Balj and his remaining troops finally found refuge in that province. 4

Salāwī, al-Iṣtiqṣā, I, pp. 110-111 (citing Ibn Khaldūn). However, some of these authorities also record that Maysara, who was at that time dead, was the leader of the Berbers. See Akhbar Majmūʿa, p. 34; Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Futūh Mīr, p. 220 (citing al-Layth b. Saʿd); Salāwī, al-Iṣtiqṣā, I, p. 111 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān and Ibn Khaldūn); Maqqārī, Naṣḥ al-Tīb, III, p. 20 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān).  

1 Akhbar Majmūʿa, pp. 34-5.  
2 Akhbar Majmūʿa, p. 35; Ibn ʿAsākir, Tārīkh Dimashq, X, p. 264 (citing Khalīfa b. Khayyāt); Ibn ʿIdhārī, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, I, pp. 55-6; Maqqārī, Naṣḥ al-Tīb, III, p. 20; Salāwī, al-Iṣtiqṣā, I, p. 111 (citing Ibn Khaldūn); Ibn al-Qūṭiyya ʿs report that Balj took refuge in Tangier and was attacked and besieged by Arabs is obviously untrue. See Tārīkh Iḥtīṭah al-Andalus, p. 41.  
3 Akhbar Majmūʿa, p. 35.  
After the defeat of Kulthum's army, the whole region of al-Maghrib al-Aqsa fell into the hands of the rebels and government authority disappeared from that area.

The Berber victory in al-Maghrib al-Aqsa inspired revolt in Tunisia and Tripolitania which had hitherto borne their harsh treatment more or less in silence. Revolt broke out in Qabis, in the present-day Tunisia, led by ‘Ukasha b. Ayyub al-Fazari. From Qayrawan an army was led against him by Maslama b. Sawada. After fierce fighting Maslama was defeated and ‘Ukasha moved to Maknasa. The deputy governor of Qayrawan, ‘Abd al-Rahman b. ‘Uqba al-Ghifari, then opposed ‘Ukasha whom he defeated and put to flight. This battle occurred in Safar.
On hearing of the defeat of his forces in North Africa and of the death of the governor of Ifriqiya together with other prominent Arab notables, the Caliph Hishām appointed Ḥanzala b. Ṣafwān, the governor of Egypt, to the post; he arrived in Qayrawān in Rabī‘ II, 124/742. ²

The author of Akhbar Majmu‘a says that Ḥanzala was accompanied by 30,000 men and was then joined by another 20,000 despatched by the Caliph. ³ His first task was to crush the Berber rebels, ʿUkāsha al-Fāzārī and ʿAbd al-Wāhid b. Yazīd al-Hawwārī, who had been joint leaders but had separated in al-Zāb⁴ to descend upon Qayrawān from two directions. ʿUkāsha had taken the route via Majjāna to Qayrawān and was encamped in al-

called upon Ṣafwān b. Abī Mālik, the governor of Tripoli, to support him and that he learnt of Kulṭum’s defeat when he arrived in Qābīs. Meanwhile ʿUkāsha withdrew from Qābīs and encamped some 12 miles distant on the river Jamma. ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān al-Ghifārī then attacked and defeated him between Qābīs and Qayrawān. See Futuh Mīṣr, p.221.

¹ Khalīfa b. Khayyat, Tarīkh, II, p.372. (No other available source records the date of this battle.)
² Qayrawānī, Tarīkh Ifriqiya wa’l Maghrib, p.115; Ibn ‘Idhāri, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, I, p.58; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p.144; the report by the author of Akhbar Majmu‘a (p.36) that Ḥanzala arrived in 123/740 is obviously untrue.
³ Akhbar Majmu‘a, p.36.
Qarn. Ḥanzala’s strategy was to attack ‘Ukāša before he was reinforced by ‘Abd al-Wāḥid al-Hawwārī in order to regroup their forces in one assault. ‘Ukāša was defeated in this attack and many of his followers were killed. Ḥanzala then returned to Qayrawān, and by this time ‘Abd al-Wāḥid al-Hawwārī had arrived in Bāja (Beje). From Qayrawān Ḥanzala sent an army composed of 40,000 horsemen, led by a Lakhmite, to engage ‘Abd al-Wāḥid who defeated them after a month of fighting and forced them to retire to Qayrawān. ‘Abd al-Wāḥid followed up his victory by pressing toward Qayrawān and with intent to capture it he encamped some three miles from the city at al-Aṣnām.

The overwhelming numbers of rebel Berbers brought the realisation of the seriousness of the rebellion to Ḥanzala. He mustered every source to augment the number of his army and dis-
tributed money amongst the troops. The ‘Ulama’ and the Qurra tried their best to encourage the soldiers, declaring the forthcoming encounter as a jihad against the Kharijite forces who would massacre them and commit atrocities against their families should they fail. It was said that the women also took part in urging their men and threatened death to them if they tried to escape.

The Berbers were equally determined to succeed and fierce fighting ensued which ended with their defeat and the death of their leader, ‘Abd al-Wahid b. Yazid al-Hawwari. Their losses were estimated at 180,000 men which, although perhaps a numerical

---

1 Qayrawānī, Tarikh Ifriqiya wa’l-Maghrib, pp. 118-22 (citing Ibn Abi Ḥasan al-Yaḥṣūbi); Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p.144; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arāb, XXII, II, pp. 37-8; Ibn ‘Idhārī, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, I, pp. 58-9 (citing Ibn Abi Ḥasan al-Yaḥṣūbi). The author of Akhbar Majmu’a (pp. 36-7) maintains that the rebels were still led by Maysara whose death was recorded previously. On the other hand, he acknowledges that the rebels had split into two groups, met Ḥanzala in the battles of al-Qarn and al-Āṣmām and were defeated. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam gives a confused account of the battles of al-Qarn and al-Āṣmām, nevertheless he states that the rebels were defeated. See Futuḥ Mīr, pp. 222-3. Khalīfa b. Khayyat, in a report on the events following the death of Kulthum b. ‘Iyād, gives a completely different narrative which is confused and unconfirmed by any extant source. He does not mention the battles of al-Qarn and al-Āṣmām by name although he states that ‘Ukasha and ‘Abd al-Wahid were defeated and killed. See Khalīfa’s Tarikh, II, pp.370-1. Al-Salāwī’s account of the battles of al-Qarn and al-Āṣmām is very brief and appears to be confused. See al-Istīqqa, I, p.113.

exaggeration, reflects the disastrous defeat inflicted upon them. In addition, ‘Ukāsha whose army had already suffered defeat at al-Qarn, was captured and executed by order of Ḥanṣala. The exact dates of the battles of al-Qarn and al-Asnām are not revealed. The author of Akhbār Majmu‘a however maintains that ‘Ukāsha and ‘Abd al-Wahīd were killed at the end of the year 124/742. Khalīfa b. Khayyat says that ‘Abd al-Wahīd al-Hawwārī marched upon Qayrawān in Safar 125/742. In view of these two conflicting reports and the silence of the other sources it is not possible to give an accurate date for the two battles but it would seem that they occurred either in the end of 124/742 or the beginning of 125/742, as the news reached the Caliph while on his death bed in 125/743.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam affirms that Ḥanṣala ordered his governor in Tripoli, Mu‘awiya b. Safwān, to support him in his fight against ‘Ukāsha and ‘Abd al-Wahīd, but Mu‘awiya came too late to be of assistance and in Qādis he learned that the rebels had been defeated. Ḥanṣala, accordingly, ordered him to deal

---

2 Akhbār Majmu‘a, p.37.
with Berber rebels in Nafzāwa who are described as 'fanatic Sufrites' and were said to have captured and maltreated the Dhimīs of that area. Muʿāwiya obeyed instructions, marched on Nafzāwa where he defeated the insurgents but was, himself, killed. Ḥanṣala then made Zayd b. 'Amr al-Kalbī as leader of Muʿāwiya's forces and returned with them to Tripoli. This was the last recorded battle to have occurred between the government forces and the Berber rebels during the reign of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik.

The victories of al-Qarn and al-Asnām were effective in quelling rebellion in the eastern provinces of North Africa. There is no clear picture of the situation in al-Maghrib al-Aqsa after the defeat of Kulthūm b. 'Iyād and troops do not appear to have been sent to regain this province. This may have been due to a succession of incapable caliphs in Damascus following the death of Hishām. Also the struggle among the Arab nobles for power in Ifrīqiya was perhaps the predominant reason why Ḥanṣala made no attempt to re-subjugate the Berbers of al-Maghrib al-Aqsa. Ḥanṣala, himself, was dismissed in 127/745 by 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Ḥabīb al-Fihrī who then paid homage to the Caliph Marwān II on his accession. 'Abd al-Rahmān was recognized by Marwān as the governor general of Ifrīqiya, al-Maghrib and Spain. 'Abd al-
Rahman is said to have carried out raids to al-Maghrib and was able to subjugate it. If this report is accurate al-Maghrib must have been controlled by the governor of Qayrawan at that time. In any event, firm control of North Africa in general and al-Maghrib al-Aqsa in particular by the caliphs of Damascus had ended with the rebellion of the Berbers. Even under the first 'Abbasi caliphs - control of this region was always precarious and later the whole region seceded from the 'Abbasi Empire to be ruled by other dynasties.

1 Qayrawani, Tarikh Ifriqiya wa’l-Maghrib, pp. 121-130.
After Balj and his Syrian forces had taken refuge in Ceuta they were faced by starvation consequent upon their blockade by the Berber rebels. There was no outlet for them except by sea to Spain, and Balj applied for permission to cross the sea and seek asylum there.

The governor of Spain, 'Abd al-Malik b. Qatan, had been an eye-witness and almost a victim of the fate his compatriots had suffered when, in 63/683, the Syrian troops stormed Madina and saw their plight as an opportunity for revenge. Added to this was his apprehension of their seizure of power, for which their presence in his province would supply the opportunity. For these reasons he refused to render any kind of help. A rich Lakhmite,
‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Ziyād al-Aḥram who was resident in Spain, was stirred by pity on learning of the suffering of his fellow-Arabs and despatched two shiploads of supplies to them, an action which, though generous, was hopelessly inadequate for their needs.

His action, however, infuriated the governor, ‘Abd al-Malik b. Qātān, who, after making many accusations against the Lakhmīte, finally put him to death. This emphasized his desire for revenge against the Syrians.

At this juncture a new factor presented itself and caused ‘Abd al-Malik b. Qātān to change his attitude towards them. Berbers in Spain outnumbered the Arabs and a series of revolts began. The Berbers inhabited the mountainous areas in which they had chosen to settle in the newly conquered land of Spain. The Arabs preferred the greater fertility and consequently more

---

This account is contradicted by another report which says that ‘Abd al-Rahmān separated from the Syrians only after the murder of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Qātān by Balj. See Akhbar Majmu‘a, p. 43; Maqqari, Nafh al-Tīb, III, p. 21 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān).


2 Akhbar Majmu‘a, p. 38; Maqqari, Nafh al-Tīb, III, p. 20 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān).

3 Maqqari, Nafh al-Tīb, III, p. 20 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān).

4 Levi-Provençal maintains that the Arabs monopolised fertile areas and left only the mountainous regions to the Berbers. See Histoire de l'Espagne Musulmane, I, p. 87.
prosperous life of the plains and valleys. Their affluence roused the jealousy of the Berbers who were forced by their surroundings to lead a more frugal existence. Indeed, so great was the contrast between the lives of the two communities that the author of Akhbar Majmu'a compared the Arab way of life to the luxury enjoyed by kings.

The discontent thus engendered in Spain was augmented by the Berber revolts in North Africa where their victories, together with the resulting chaos, encouraged the Berbers of Spain into open revolt against their Arab governors. Beginning in Galicia it spread rapidly through the neighbouring areas. In all the northern districts, except in Zaragoza, which contained an Arab majority, Arabs were dismissed while numbers were killed. Those who were resident in the more distant areas fled to the central lands and all expeditions made by 'Abd al-Malik b. Qaṭan

---

1 For the location of Arabs and Berbers in Spain see: Maqqari, Nafh al-Tib, I, pp. 290-8 (citing Ibn Qalib al-Andalusi); Levi-Provençal, Histoire de l’Espagne Musulmane, I, pp. 84-9.

2 Akhbar Majmu'a, p.39.

3 Akhbar Majmu’a, p.38; Maqqari, Nafh al-Tib, III, p.20 (citing Ibn Hayyan).

4 Akhbar Majmu’a, p.38; Fath al-Andalus, p.31; Ibn ‘Idhārī, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, II, p.30 (citing Ibn al-Qaṭṭān); see also Maqqari, Nafh al-Tib, III, p.20 (citing Ibn Hayyan).
against the rebels were futile.  

Faced by these conditions and foreseeing a similar fate, 'Abd al-Malik b. Qaṭan allowed the stranded Syrian forces to cross to Spain to assist his own resistance against the rebels. He took the precaution of granting permission to the Syrians on the promise of their assistance after which he on his part would allow them facilities for their return to North Africa to a place not under Berber control. He further promised that there should be no separation of the contingent but that it should return intact in one group. Ten men from each jund were given to 'Abd al-Malik b. Qaṭan as a pledge of Syrian good faith and they were confined by him on the small island of Umm Ḥakīm.  

After long privation, Balj and his troops arrived in Spain and were met by 'Abd al-Malik b. Qaṭan himself on Algeciras. They were in bad shape and were given food and clothing.  

---

1Akhbār Majmuʿa, p. 38; Maqqari, Naḥ al-Ṭib, III, p. 20 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān); see also Fath al-Andalus, p. 31.  
2Akhbār Majmuʿa, pp. 38–9; Ibn ʿIdhārī, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, II, p. 30 (citing Ibn al-Qāṭtān); Maqqari, Naḥ al-Ṭib, III, p. 21 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān); Fath al-Andalus, p. 31; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p. 188.  
3Ibn ʿIdhārī, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, II, p. 31; Fath al-Andalus, p. 31.  
4Ibn ʿIdhārī, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, II, p. 31; Fath al-Andalus, p. 31; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p. 188; Akhbar Majmuʿa, p. 39 (says that the Syrians were supplied with provisions in Cordova).
arrival is reported as having occurred in Dhu‘l-Qa‘da, 123/741.¹

Meanwhile the groups of Berber rebels united and elected a leader.² They formed themselves into three columns which advanced respectively upon Algeciras, Cordova and Toledo. The one directed against Algeciras arrived in Medina-Sidonia and together ‘Abd al-Malik b. Qaṭan and Balj marched upon and engaged them in battle at Wādī al-Fath. This resulted in heavy defeat for the Berbers and a large amount of the rich booty seized by the Arabs was distributed among the needy Syrians.³ From there the combined Arab army advanced to Cordova and after to Toledo where the Berbers were in force. A battle took place at Wādī Salīt (Guazalate) and resulted in disastrous defeat for the Berber rebels. Many thousand Berbers were killed and their rebellion was completely crushed.⁴

With the cessation of hostilities, ‘Abd al-Malik b. Qaṭan demanded the withdrawal of Balj and his Syrian colleagues in accordance with their compact. The Syrians on their part asked

²Akhbar Majmu‘a, p.39; Maqṣarī, Nafḥ al-Tīb, III, p.20 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān).
³Ibn ‘Idhārī, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, II, p.31 (citing Ibn al-Qaṭṭān); Fath al-Andalus, p.31.
⁴Akhbar Majmu‘a, p.40; Fath al-Andalus, pp.31-32; Ibn ‘Idhārī, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, II, p.31 (citing Ibn al-Qaṭṭān).
for ratification of the treaty by which 'Abd al-Malik b. Qatan would supply ships for their transport to North Africa, and they had no wish to be returned to the Berbers of Tangier. For this reason they requested embarkation from either the coast of Tadmīr (Murcia) or Ilbīra (Elvira). On a plea that this was impossible since all his ships were located near the coast of Algeciras, 'Abd al-Malik b. Qatan proposed shipping the Syrians by groups to the North African coast, which was refused and mass transportation, as promised to them, was insisted upon.

'Abd al-Malik b. Qatan revealed his treacherous intentions by a proposal to return them to Ceuta to which Balj bitterly answered: "we would like to be thrown in the sea rather than to be delivered to the Berbers of Tangier".  

'Abd al-Malik b. Qatan, however, insisted upon their immediate departure and, roused to action, the Syrians expelled him from his palace in Cordova and Balj took up residence as governor. Some doubts exist about the timing of this event.

1 Akhbar Majmu'a, pp. 40-1; Ibn 'Idhari, al-Bayan al-Mughrib, II, p.31; Fath al-Andalus, p.32.
2 Akhbar Majmu'a, p.41; Ibn 'Idhari, al-Bayan al-Mughrib, II, p.31; Fath al-Andalus, pp. 32-3. The version given by Ibn al-Qutiyya is that Balj and his Syrian troops landed in Algeciras contrary to the will of 'Abd al-Malik b. Qatan, which caused as many as eighteen battles between them, finally resulting in the capture and death of 'Abd al-Malik b. Qatan. He does not speak of Berber revolts in Spain nor of any negotiations between 'Abd al-Malik b. Qatan and Balj previous to Balj's arrival in Spain. See Tarikh Iftitān al-Andalus, p.42. This report is obviously untrue.
Ibn 'Idhārī quotes Dhu‘l-Qa‘da of the year 123/741,\(^1\) while the author of Kitāb Fath al-Andalus\(^2\) quotes the year but gives no month. Balj and his forces were reported to have landed in Spain in Dhu‘l-Qa‘da, 123/741.\(^3\) Thus it would seem unlikely that all the succeeding events occurred in the same month. It appears probable that Balj's coup d'etat took place at the commencement of the year 124/741-2.

During the dispute between Balj and 'Abd al-Malik b. Qaṭan, the Syrian hostages on the island of Umm Ḥakīm also suffered severely from lack of provisions by the governor of Algeciras. A noble from the Yemenite Banī Ghassān tribe was said to have died from thirst.\(^4\) This angered the Yemenites among Balj's forces who demanded the death of 'Abd al-Malik b. Qaṭan as a reprisal. Realising the gravity of such a step, Balj endeavoured to pacify them by persuading them that accident and not thirst or ill-treatment was the cause of his death. He further pleaded that 'Abd al-Malik b. Qaṭan was an aged man and a Qurayshite, but all to no avail. Ibn Qaṭan's death was demanded

---

\(^1\) Ibn 'Idhārī, al-Bayan al-Mughrib, II, p.31.
\(^2\) Fath al-Andalus, p.33.
\(^3\) See above, p.166.
\(^4\) Akhbar Majmu‘a, p.41; Ibn 'Idhārī, al-Bayan al-Mughrib, p.31; Fath al-Andalus, p.33.
and Balj was accused of sympathy with his Muqarite tribesmen.¹

The pressure upon Balj was too great and he saw that a split in his army was imminent if he did not yield. This indeed would have been disastrous to all Syrians and ‘Abd al-Malik was finally killed and crucified.²

The two sons of ‘Abd al-Malik, Umayya and Qatan, had left Cordova when their father was deposed and began to recruit supporters to fight against the Syrians. They received support from ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Ḥabīb who resented Balj’s action and also that of the governor of Narbonne, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Alqama al-Lakhamī. In spite of their hatred of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Qatan, the Berbers of Spain joined forces against the Syrians and the number of troops thus recruited by ‘Abd al-Malik b. Qatan’s sons was said to have been 100,000 men.³ They met Balj at Aqua Portora near Cordova, where — in spite of numerical superiority — they suffered defeat by the Syrians. Balj himself was mortally

¹ Akhbār Majmu‘a, p.41; Maqgari, Naḥf al-Tīb, III, p.21 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān); see also Ibn ‘Idhari, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, II, p.32; Fath al-Andalus, p.33.
³ Akhbār Majmu‘a, p.43; Ibn ‘Idhari, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, II, p.32; Fath al-Andalus, p.34; Maqgari, Naḥf al-Tīb, III, p.21 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān).
wounded and died a few days later in Shawwal, 124/742. The
Syrians had now become masters of the province and chose Tha‘lababa
b. Salāma al-‘Āmilī as Balj’s successor. Further Berber revolt
broke out against him which he defeated and many of the rebels
were taken captive. The author of Kitāb Akhbār Majmū‘a and Abu
‘Amr al-Sālimī graphically picture Tha‘lababa’s harsh treatment
of the non-Syrian population in Spain. Perhaps the reports were
exaggerated, but it was said that he sold their noblemen at auc-
tion, not to the highest but to the lowest bidder. It is related

---

1 Akhbār Majmū‘a, pp. 42-4; Ibn ‘Idhārī, al-Bayān al-Mughrib, II, 
p. 32; Fath al-Andalus, pp. 33-4; Maqqari, Naft al-Tib, III, pp.
21-2 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān); Ibn al-‘Aṭīr, Kamīl, V, pp. 194-5. Ibn
al-‘Uqīyya maintains that it was ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Alqama who,
with 40,000 men, was defeated by Balj. The sons of ‘Abd al-Malik
b. Qatān and ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Ḥabīb are not mentioned as
participating in conflict with Syrians. See Tarīkh Iftītah al-
Andalus, pp. 42-3. A conflicting version of the events after
Balj’s siege in Ceuta is reported by Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, in which
he neglects the Berber revolts in Spain and provides a confused
account of the other events. See Futūḥ Misr, pp. 220-1.

32-3; Maqqari, Naft al-Tib, III, p. 22 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān); Fath
al-Andalus, pp. 34-5.

33 (citing Ibn al-Qattān and Abu ‘Amr al-Sālimī); Maqqari, Naft
al-Tib, III, p. 22 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān); Fath al-Andalus, p. 35.

34 (citing Abu ‘Amr al-Sālimī).
that for one of them a dog was offered as payment and a goat for another. All this reflects the contrasting character of Tha‘laba with that of Balj who treated his opponents courteously.

Some of the wiser and more farseeing Arab notables in Spain seem to have been aware of the danger and bitterness the civil war would engender and managed to contact Ḥanẓala b. Ṣafwān, the governor of Ifriqiya, imploring him to send a wise and capable governor to restore the stability of Muslims in Spain. They emphasized the danger that the Christians of the north districts of Spain would seize the opportunity to attack the Muslims.¹ Ḥanẓala chose his Kalbite relative, Abu‘l-Khaṭṭār Ḥusām b. Ḍirār al-Kalbī to govern the turbulent province. Abu‘l-Khaṭṭār sailed from Tunisia and he is said to have arrived in Spain in Rajab 125/743.²

Abu‘l-Khaṭṭār wisely began by liberating all captives and prisoners and granting amnesty to the two sons of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Qaṭān.³ A further action was to remove the Syrians from Cordova where the older settlers were disgusted by their behaviour.

²Fath al-Andalus, p.35; Maqṣārī, Nafḥ al-Tīb, III, p.22 (citing Ibn Ḥayyān); Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p.204.
He gave them a new location on the Mediterranean coasts of Spain and settled the lands upon them as fiefs. They were established on the same basis as in Syria and each jund was stationed in a Spanish district. The jund of Damascus was located in Elvira, Jordan in Regio, Palestine in Sidonia, Hims in Seville and Qinnasrin in Jaen, while Beja and Tadmir were allocated to the Egyptian army.¹

The wise government of Abu'1-Khaṭṭār put an end to the conflict between the Syrians and the older inhabitants of Spain but this was, unfortunately, to be replaced by the traditional enmity between Yemenites and Qaysites. Abu'1-Khaṭṭār was, however, the last governor of Spain to be imposed upon the province by the governor of Qayrawan who, in turn, acted with the approval of the caliphs of Damascus.

The civil war during this period was the first step towards the separation of Spain from the Empire. Nevertheless Arab prestige in Spain was sustained, in spite of the Berber revolts and

¹Ibn al-Qūṭiya, Tarikh Iftitāḥ al-Andalus, p. 45; Ibn ‘Idhārī, al-Bayān al-Hujrīh, II, p. 33; Maqaṣri, Naḥḥ al-Tīb, I, p. 237; Ibn Khaldūn, ‘Ibar, IV, p. 259; Fath al-Andalus, p. 36 (maintains that the Egyptian army held, in addition to Beja and Tadmir, Osnonoba). The narrative of Ibn al-Abbar differs a little from the other sources. He states that the jund of Egypt was located in Osnonoba; Beja and Tadmir; of Hims in Niebla and Seville; of Palestine in Sidonia and Algeciras; of Jordan in Regio; of Damascus in Elvira and of Qinnasrin in Jaen. See al-Hullat al-Siyra‘, I, p. 61. According to Ibn al-Khatīb the organisation was carried out by Abu’1-Khaṭṭār advised by the Count Ardabast of Spain who was responsible for the administration of Dhimmi affairs. On the other
victories in North Africa, by the arrival of Balj's defeated army. Balj and his Syrians had been vital to Arab predominance there; without them it could not have survived and the power might have fallen into the hands of the Berbers of that province. Similarly the Syrian presence in Spain proved advantageous to the Umayyad house. By their support 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Mu‘āwiya b. Hishām entered Spain and the Umayyad prince was enabled to establish an independent ruling dynasty which lasted until 423/1031.¹

CHAPTER IV

OTHER OPPOSITION MOVEMENTS.
A. The Khārijite Opposition.

After their suppression during the reign of 'Abd al-Malik, the Khārijites remained comparatively quiet. However, the Khārijites made some minor uprisings which were dealt with by 'Abd al-Malik's immediate successors.¹

Further revolts occurred during the reign of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik which were more serious and widespread; they were reported in Iraq, Yemen, Khurāsān and its dependencies. The external threats which menaced the Empire at that time probably encouraged rebellion among them.

The most serious Khārijite revolt was headed by a certain Bahlūl b. Bishr, a resident of Mosul. Prior to the uprising there is no mention of his political views, although he was registered in the diwan as he was entitled to 'ata'.² He had courage which the Caliph himself apparently appreciated, for when revolt broke out he nominated Bahlūl as leader of the government troops which were to be sent to suppress it.³

¹See above, pp. 65ff.
²Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p. 263 (citing Madā’īnī).
³Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, pp. 263, 265 (citing Madā’īnī); Tabarī,
Bahlūl was obviously Khārijite, but of which sub-sect no mention is made in the available sources. He first expressed resentment against the government during his pilgrimage to Mecca in 119/737. On his way to Ḥijāz he sent a servant to buy vinegar and the shopkeeper, probably in error, gave him wine. The vendor refused to change it when the correct article was again requested. Upon this Bahlūl made a complaint to the headman of the village who instead reproached him and refused to be drawn into the protest. This incident is quoted by the sources as the root of Bahlūl's actions. It would however seem an exaggeration to suggest that this was the real motive behind his revolt although it could have been the immediate cause. Be that as it may, Bahlūl proceeded on his way to Mecca. Whilst there, and with his resentment gaining momentum, he began to use the incident as propaganda and won some supporters. The group thus formed decided upon a village adjoining Mosul as their rendezvous.

---

1 Tarīkha, II, p.1625 (citing Abū ‘Ubayda); Nuwayrī, Niḥayat al-ʿArab, XXIX, p.128; al-Yaʿqūbī's statement that Bahlūl revolted after the death of Hishām and was eliminated by Khālid al-Qasrī is obviously untrue, see Yaʿqūbī, Tarīkha, II, p.387.

When the pilgrimage rites ended, the group which seems to have expanded, marched on Wasit with intention to kill the governor of Iraq, Khalid b. Abdallāh al-Qasrī, who, they stated, destroyed mosques to erect churches. They further said that he appointed Magians in charge of Muslim affairs and allowed dhimmīs to marry Muslim women. Such accusations appear to have been exaggerated. Certainly Khalid built a church for his Christian mother, but there is no supporting evidence for the other allegations.

The slogans thus adopted were sufficiently strong to attract adherents to a rebellion against existing authority. On the road to Wasit they passed by the village where the incident of wine instead of vinegar had occurred, and the opinions between Bahlūl and his followers conflicted. He first desired the death of the village headman whilst the rest preferred to proceed to murder Khalid al-Qasrī. Bahlūl's will, however, prevailed and the headman met his death.


3Baladhurī, Ansāb, II, p.263 (citing Mada’inī); Ṭabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1623 (citing Abu ‘Ubayda); Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, Mir‘at al-Zamān, fol. 184; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-Arab, XXIX, p.128; Ibn al-Athir, Kāmil, V, p.156.
The identity of Bahlūl had, until this action, remained unrecognized as a leader of revolt for he and his adherents had disguised themselves as officials sent by Hishām to Khālid al-Qasrī and they moved towards their target with the Barīd caravan. Their identity had been revealed by the murder of the chieftain and Khālid al-Qasrī was informed of their plans. He left Wāsiʿ for al-Ḥira where some Syrian troops had arrived en route to India. Their destination did not attract them and Khālid was able to utilize their reluctance. By the promises of extra ʿatta? and that they would not be required to go to India, Khālid persuaded their leader, al-Qaynī, to march against the rebels and reinforced their number by the addition of 200 men from the Shurta of Kūfa. They met and engaged with the rebels at Laʿlaʿ on the Euphrates where the government forces were defeated and al-Qaynī met his death. Disorganized by the death of their leader the Syrians and the Kufans fled to Kūfa. Simultaneously a group of Kufan Khārijites left the city to join Bahlūl, but were killed by the villagers of Sarīfīn. Bahlūl avenged their deaths by taking the lives of some of the villagers.

1Baladhuri, Ansāb, II, p.263 (citing Madaʾinī); Tabarī, Ṭārīkh, II, pp. 1622-3 (citing Abū ʿUbayda); Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, p.156; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-Arāb, XXIX, p.128.
3Baladhuri, Ansāb, II, p.264 (citing Madaʾinī); Tabarī, Ṭārīkh.
Khalid was informed of the defeat of his troops and the murders in Sarīfīn and sent new forces headed by a Shaybanite from Banī Hawshab b. Yazīd b. Ruwaym. They engaged with the Khārijite rebels somewhere between Kūfa and Mosul. Again the government troops were defeated and returned to al-Ḥīra while Bahlūl advanced on Mosul.¹

Intoxicated by their victories the Khārijites announced their intention to march to Rusāfa and to eliminate the Caliph himself.² The governor of Mosul, however, warned the Caliph of this Khārijite threat and he sent Syrian troops to aid the governor who were also supported by contingents from Iraq and the Jazīra.³ The joint forces were estimated to number 20,000 men while Bahlūl was credited with a mere 70 followers.⁴ Such

¹Baladhuri, Ansāb, II, p.264 (citing Madā'iñī); Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1625 (citing Abu ‘Ubayda); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.157; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.128. Madā'iñī put the number of the Khārijite group as 10 while the other sources put the figure as being 6.
⁴Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1626 (citing Abu ‘Ubayda); Ibn al-Athīr repeats the same figure, Kāmil, V, p.157.
numerical disparity is scarcely acceptable and the fact that they are reported by Abū 'Ubayda, himself a Khārijite, supports the conclusion of exaggeration and a desire to glorify the courage of the Khārijites against overwhelming odds.

The government troops met the insurgents at al-Κuḥayl near Mosul but although the Khārijites fought with indisputable courage they were defeated and Bahlūl was mortally wounded. He had chosen Du‘āma al-Shaybānī as leader of the rebellion, but unable to face such an assured risk he defaulted. 'Amr al-Yashkūrī who had been a further nominee for leadership assumed the command of the rebels but he was killed. He was followed by a certain al-‘Anṣūrī, known as Šāhīb al-‘Ashhab, and Khālid al-Qasrī sent against him a contingent headed by al-Sīmṭ b. Muslim al-Bajalī. Abū ‘Ubayda states that the number of the government troops was 4,000 men while the Khārijites were a mere handful numbering 60 men. Madā‘inī agrees with Abū ‘Ubayda concerning the Khārijite

---


3Ṭabarī, Tārīkh, II, pp. 1627-8 (citing Abū ‘Ubayda), the same figure is repeated by Ibn al-Athīr, (Kāmil, V, p.158) and Ibn Khaldūn (‘Ibar, III, p.349-50).
number but estimates the government troops at 700\(^1\) which appears to be a more reasonable statement. The combatants met near Kūfa on the Euphrates where the rebels were defeated and dispersed to Kūfa and were stoned to death by its inhabitants.\(^2\) The report given by Abū ‘Ubayda again reflects his Khārijite inclinations for he says that the fugitives met their death from the slaves and the despicable people of Kūfa.\(^3\) This statement is, however, repeated by Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn Khaldūn who seem to have quoted their information from Abū ‘Ubayda.\(^4\)

There was a further Khārijite uprising at al-Ḥira in 119/737 led by Wazīr al-Sikhtānī. It was reported that he and his followers not only looted and laid waste the neighbouring areas but that they also seized and looted the provincial treasury. Khalīd al-Qasrī, the governor of Iraq, sent a contingent of Kūfan Shurta headed by one of his generals to quell this fresh outbreak. His troops defeated and killed most of the rebels, and their leader, al-Sikhtānī, was wounded and taken captive. The sources agree that so great was Khalīd’s admiration for al-

\(^1\)Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.263 (citing Madī‘inī).
\(^3\)Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1628 (citing Abū ‘Ubayda).
Sikhtianî's eloquence and learned recitation of the Qur'ân that he spared his life. When the Caliph learned of this he reprimanded Khalîd and ordered him to execute his prisoner. He had no choice but to obey and al-Sikhtianî and the remnant of his followers suffered death by fire.¹

In 119/737 al-Šaharî b. Shabîb led another Khârijite revolt in Jabbul.² It is related that he had visited Khalîd al-Qasrî requesting a pension (Farīda) which was refused. It is significant that sources agree that al-Šaharî was not in need of Farīda but tried to find an excuse to kill al-Qasrî to revenge the death of a Sufrite Khârijî the governor had previously executed.³ Accordingly al-Šaharî went to Wâsit, disguised himself and proceeded to Jabbul which was occupied by the Tamîmite clan of al-Lât b. Thâlaba. He urged them to join him in rebellion against Khalîd al-Qasrî but received little support, acquiring a mere 30 men from among them.⁴ His first objective

²Jabbul is a place located east of Wâsit between it and al-Nu mânîyya. See Yaqtû, Mu’jam al-Buldan, II, p.23.
³Baladhuri, Ansâb, II, p.266 (citing Madâ‘înî); Tabari, Târikh, II, pp. 1633-4 (citing Abu ‘Ubayda); Ibn al-Athîr, Kamîl, V, p.159; Sibî b. al-Jawzî, Mir’ât al-Zamân, fol. 185; Nuwayrî, Nihayat al-Arâb, XXIX, p.129.
⁴Tabari, Târikh, II, p.1634 (citing Abu ‘Ubayda); Ibn al-Athîr, Kamîl, V, p.159; Sibî b. al-Jawzî, Mir’ât al-Zamân, fol. 185;
was to destroy the al-Mūbarak canal which had been made by order of Khalīd al-Qasrī. The news of his intention reached Khalīd, who sent troops to foil the plan. The troops met and fought the rebels at a place called al-Manādhīr and al-Sahrī and his followers were completely annihilated.\(^1\)

In addition to these revolts, Iraq was also a theatre of other Khārijite uprisings of less importance. Madaʾinī speaks of one which broke out in Mosul during the governorship of al-Ḥurr b. Yusuf who died in 113/731-2.\(^2\) No name of the leader is given while the date of Yusuf’s death affirms the conclusion that the rebellion occurred before 113/731-2. In this case of revolt the rebels are reported as being only 13 in number. Al-Ḥurr b. Yusuf sent a detachment led by al-Mustansīr b. ‘Ajlān al-‘Anzī to suppress them and the rebels were eliminated without difficulty.\(^3\)

A report\(^4\) is also given of a Khārijite uprising in Mawqūf near Basra toward the end of Hisham’s reign. Again the number of the rebels is small, and they are estimated at about 20 persons, one of whom was said to be a woman. The report states

---

\(^1\) Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.266 (citing Madaʾinī); Tabarī, Tārīkh, II, pp. 1633-4 (citing Abū ‘Ubayda); Ibn al-Athir, Kamīl, V, pp. 158-9; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir`at al-Zamān, fol. 185; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-Arāb, XXIX, p.129; Ibn Kathīr, Bidāya, IX, p.324.

\(^2\) Azdī, Tārīkh al-Muṣili, p.33.

\(^3\) Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.263 (citing Madaʾinī).

\(^4\) Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.263 (citing Madaʾinī); al-‘Uyun waʾl
that all of them were killed by government troops and the woman was captured and sent to Qāsim b. Muhammad al-Thaqafi, the governor of Baṣra. He, in turn, passed her to Yūsuf b. 'Umar al-Thaqafi, the governor general of Irāq, who put her to death.

Some Khārijite uprisings were reported in the eastern provinces. Bishr al-Ḥawari, the ṣāḥib al-Shurta in Sīstān was said to have been a victim killed by a group of Khārijites numbering 5 men. This event took place in 107/725.\(^1\) A more serious revolt was that of Ṣubayh al-Khārijī who had been one of the Azāriqa captives. He was purchased by Suwar b. al-As‘ar al-Māzini who afterwards freed him.\(^2\) Ṣubayh managed to collect some 400 followers from Sīstān. He then moved to Hamāt where he raided the camels of Banī Sa‘d and killed some of their men. The governor of Khurāsān, al-Junayd b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Murrī, sent his deputy in Marw ar-Rūḍh, Ḍirār b. al-Hilqām al-Tamīmī to crush the rebellion. Although Ṣubayh lost 50 of his followers, his forces won the fight and they returned to Sīstān. At this stage

---

\(^1\) Tarīkh-i-Sīstān, p.126; Bosworth, Sīstān under the Arabs, p.73. Al-Ya‘qūbī, however, maintains that it was Yazīd b. al-Ghurayf al-Hamadānī, the governor of Sīstān, who was killed by the Khārijite group. See Ya‘qūbī, Tarīkh, II, p.383; Bosworth, op. cit., p.73, note 2.

the situation became very serious and Khalid al-Qasri himself, interfered and sent a further force under 'Abdallāh b. Abī Burda to put down the revolt, but there is no record of any fighting between the forces. It is, however, related that Subayh was betrayed and captured by the inhabitants of an Arab tributary village who handed him over to 'Abdallāh b. Abī Burda upon receiving a promise from him to lessen their tribute to the State. Whether this narrative was authentic or fabricated, the fact remains that Subayh was captured and crucified. His followers received harsh treatment and were firmly suppressed by al-Junayd b. 'Abd al-Rahmān. No firm date, either of the commencement of Subayh's revolt or of his death, is given but available sources confirm that it was during the governorship of al-Junayd b. 'Abd al-Rahmān between 111/729-116/734.

This and similar repressions did not, however, succeed in ending Kharijite revolts. One such uprising, led by one Khalid, began in Pushang and Harāt and spread into adjacent areas. No specific number of the rebels is provided but it is stated

---

1Baladhurī, Ansāb, II, p.262 (citing Māda'inī); see also al-'Uyun wa'l Ḥadā'iq, p.70.
2Baladhurī, Ansāb, II, pp. 261-2 (citing Māda'inī); al-'Uyun wa'l Ḥadā'iq, p.70; Nuwayri, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.129; see also Vol. VI, pp. 179-180; here he says that Subayh was captured by al-Junayd b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Nurri. See also Bosworth, Sīstān under the Arabs, p.73.
that they were numerous.¹ The rebels attacked Marw ar-Rūḥ governed
by Dirār b. al-Hilqām, who had previously been in conflict with
the rebellion led by Subayh. Dirār realised the strength of the
insurgents and would have endeavoured to negotiate a peace with
them. His wisdom was frustrated by the stubborn attitude of his
men and a clash was inevitable. After fierce combat Dirār and a
large number of his forces perished. Khalid, the leader of the
rebellion, was mortally wounded and met his death, after which
there is no information concerning the revolt which seems to have
faded away.²

Yemen also appears to have produced some Kharijite
activities. During the reign of Hishām, a Kharijī, one 'Abbād al-
Ruʿaynī, was concerned in a revolt against the existing authority.
It is said that he was supported by 300 followers.³ The specific
date of this revolt is somewhat confused. Mada'inī gives it as
the year 106/724-5⁴ while Tabari and Ibn Kathir refer to it as an
event of the year 107/725-6.⁵ The probability is that it was
initiated at the end of 106/725 and was continued until 107/725.

¹Baladhuri, Ansāb, II, p.262 (citing Mada’inī); al-‘Uyun wa’il-
Hada’iq, p.70.
²Baladhuri, Ansāb, II, pp. 262-3 (citing Mada’inī); al-‘Uyun wa’il
Hada’iq, pp. 70-1; Bosworth, Sistān under the Arabs, p.73.
³Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1487; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.104;
Nuwayri, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.124; Ibn Kathir, Bidāya, IX,
p.244.
⁴Baladhuri, Ansāb, II, p.263 (citing Mada’inī) he records his name
⁵Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1487; Ibn Kathir, Bidāya, IX, p.244.
Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ declares the year to be 108/726, the place being al-Rayy and suppressed by Yūsuf b. ‘Umar. This, however, appears to be incorrect as Yūsuf b. ‘Umar was at that time the governor of Yemen.

Mada’inī and the author of Kitāb al-‘Uyun wa’l-Hadā’iq state that Mas‘ūd b. ‘Awf al-Kalbī was the governor of Yemen when the revolt started and he was shortly afterwards replaced by Yūsuf b. ‘Umar. Mas‘ūd had begun the attack against the Khārijite rebels but was unable to put down the revolt. His successor, Yūsuf b. ‘Umar, took the offensive against ‘Abbād and his Khārijite followers and the rebels were defeated and ‘Abbād himself was killed.

Mada’inī speaks of another Khārijite revolt led by a certain Zaḥhāf al-Himyarī. Yūsuf b. ‘Umar sent a force against him headed by Abu’l-‘Āj al-Sulamī who, by killing Zaḥhāf, was finally able to completely suppress the revolt.

---


2 Baladhurī, Ansāb, II, p. 263 (citing Mada’inī); al-‘Uyun wa’l-Hadā’iq, p. 71.


4 Baladhurī, Ansāb, II, p. 263 (citing Mada’inī).
In 117/735 a minor Kharijite revolt broke out in Egypt led by Wuhayb al-Yahsubi who had previously come from Yemen. The governor, al-Walid b. Rifa‘a, had permitted a Christian church to be built in al-Ḥamrā' (known as Abū Mīnā in al-Kindī’s time) and this was cited as the cause of the revolt. Wuhayb is said to have made an attempt to assassinate the governor. He, himself, was killed in obscure circumstances and no fighting is recorded.

To avenge his death it is said that the Qurra' commanded by Shurayh b. Safwān al-Tajibī, rebelled against the governor in Jazīrat al-Fustāt. There are no details extant concerning this but it is certain that the rebels were defeated and the insignificant protest was shortlived.¹

B. The Coptic Revolts.

there were few insurrections in the province of Egypt during the Umayyad period and, apart from Syria, it was, in fact, the most peaceful part of the Arab Empire. The minor uprisings of the Kharijites were very insignificant, neither was the trouble caused by the Copts an even remotely grave threat.

¹Kindī, al-Wulāt wa’l-Qudāt, pp. 77-8; see also Ibn Taghri Bardī, Nujum, I, p. 265.
The first recorded uprising by the Copts took place during the governorship of 'Abd al-'Azîz b. Marwān (Rajab 65/685 - Jumâd I 86/705). This is only mentioned on papyri and no exact date is given. Al-Asbagh, 'Abdal-'Azîz's son and deputy for a while, is said to have compelled the Coptic monks to pay a tax of one dînâr per person. This was the first Jizya imposition on the Coptic clergy, and was continued by the successors of 'Abd al-'Azîz and his son. The Christian historian, Severus Ibn al-Muqaffa, writes upon this point and although he may have exaggerated abuse in the exercise of their authority by respective governors, there is also truth in his reports. Not long prior to Hishâm's accession, the 'Amîl al-Khârâj in Egypt during the reign of Sulaymân b. 'Abd al-Malik (96/715-99/717) had taken a census of Coptic monks and had asked that no new monks should be added. He branded the left hand of the existing monks with an iron ring which bore the name of the church and monastery to which he was attached together with the date according to the Muslim Calendar. Any fugitive or unbranded monk was brought to

1 H.I. Bell, "Two official letters of the Arab Period", Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 1926, XII, pp. 265-274; idem, "The administration of Egypt under the Umayyad Khalifs", BZ, XXVIII, 1928, p.281; D.C. Dennett, Conversion and the poll tax in early Islam, pp. 80-1.
2 Kindî, al-Wulât wa'l-Qudât, p.51.
the governor and one of his limbs was severed. Many were also either put to death or died under the lash.\(^1\)

The clemency of Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz exempted the monks from taxes imposed on their property and churches\(^2\) but the respite was brief. His successor, Yazīd II, reimposed the tax.\(^3\) The social and financial grievances of the Copts were enhanced by the fiscal measures of 'Ubaydallāh b. al-Ḥabḥāb who had been the financial director of Egypt (105-116) under Hīṣām b. 'Abd al-Malik and led to the rebellion of 107/725.

Shortly after his arrival in Egypt, 'Ubaydallāh b. al-Ḥabḥāb made a comprehensive survey of the land, vineyards, and a census of the population and enumerated their cattle.\(^4\) From this survey the Copts suffered an increase of taxes in addition to those already levied. In one statement Severus claims that he doubled the Kharāj of Egypt,\(^5\) while in another he states that an

\(^1\) Severus, Tarīkh al-Batārīqa, p.151; Tritton, op.cit., p.125.
\(^5\) Severus, Tarīkh al-Batārīqa, p.154.
eighth of a dinār was added to every dinār levied on the Copts.\textsuperscript{1} It would appear that Severus exaggerated these amounts as Muslim sources maintain that only one qirāf was added to each dinār taxed.\textsuperscript{2} This, however, was a burden to the Copts who had suffered from abuse and discrimination practised by several Umayyad governors and rebellion broke out among many groups. The Copts of Natto, Tumayy, Qurbayt, Ṭarābiya and the region of al-Ḥawf al-Sharqī could stand no more and broke into open revolt.\textsuperscript{3} Severus describes it graphically. He says, "war broke out between the Christians and Muslims so that much blood was shed in the land of Egypt between the two factions (مسانن) first of all in the city of Bana, the city of Sa, the city of Sammanūd and their neighbourhood, and in many places in lower Egypt; and there was likewise fighting on the roads and mountains and by the Canals".\textsuperscript{4}

Forces (Ahl al-Dīwān) were sent by the governor, ʿal-Ḥurr b. Yusuf to quell the revolt while the governor himself went to Dimyat where he remained for three months, probably to preside over the military operations against the rebels in lower Egypt

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p.159.
\textsuperscript{2}Kindī, al-Wulāt waʾl-Qudāt, p.73; Maqrīzī, Mawāʿīz, I, p.333, see also Becker, op.cit., p.109.
\textsuperscript{3}Kindī, al-Wulāt waʾl-Qudāt, p.73; Maqrīzī, Mawāʿīz, I, p.333.
\textsuperscript{4}Severus, Tarikh al-Beṭāriqa, p.154.
where the revolt was prevailing. Although there is no record concerning the fighting, both Muslim and Christian sources agree that the rebellion was suppressed and that many Copts were killed.

Another uprising by the Copts occurred in the Sa'īd in 121/738-9, during Hishām's reign, which was again doomed to failure and crushed by Ḥanṣala b. Ṣafwān, the governor of Egypt.

The Coptic rebellions which took place during the period under consideration were not well-organised, neither do we hear of any of their leaders or even other prominent participants. The rebellions were not motivated by national feeling, neither were they directed against Arab rule, as such, but rather appear as expressions of exasperation against heavy taxation.

---

1Kindī, al-Wulāt wa'l-Qudāt, pp. 73-4; Maqrīzī, Mawahīb, I, p. 333; Ibn Ṭabarī, Ṭabarī, I, Nujum, p.259.
2Kindī, al-Wulāt wa'l-Qudāt, pp. 73-4; Maqrīzī, Mawahīb, I, p. 333; Severus, Tarikh al-Batariya, p.154; Ibn al-Ṭibrī, Chronicle, I, p.110.
3Kindī, al-Wulāt wa'l-Qudāt, p.81, Maqrīzī, Mawahīb, I, p.333.
CHAPTER V.

THE REVOLT OF AL-HARITH B. SURAYJ.
The revolt of al-Harith b. Surayj is perhaps one of the most difficult as well as being a most interesting study. There is no relevant information concerning his early life and this makes his later political behaviour difficult to assess.

Arabic sources describe him as Murji’i or Kharijite. The definition is followed without question by modern scholars. In view of the information provided by the sources it is almost impossible to give a precise judgment on al-Harith's doctrines. Neither association with, nor support from, any Kharijite or Murji’ite group for al-Harith has been reported. It is, however, related that his secretary (Katib) was Jahm b. Safwan. The latter's doctrinal views are rather obscure and his presence in al-Harith's camp does not help to clarify al-Harith's own beliefs. Nevertheless it was

---


4Ibn Hazm, Fīsāl, IV, p.204; Tarikh al-Khulafa, p.211b; see also Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp.1919-20.

the habit of the Muslim historians to attribute certain doctrines and ideas to almost every rebel leader and al-Harith was not exempt from such ascription.

In 116/734 al-Harith suddenly came into an open revolt and with 4,000 tribesmen from Azd and Tamim he marched from an-Nakhudh upon Farayab. 'Asim, the new governor of Khurasan, sent envoys to al-Harith to endeavour to find a peaceful solution. He arrested the delegates who contrived afterwards to escape and returned to Marw where they lost no time in exposing al-Harith's "evil deeds". Al-Harith next turned his attention to Balkh and with his scanty following of 4,000 men, who were outnumbered by 10,000 of the governor's troops, captured the city while the governor, Nasr b. Sayyar, fled together with his troops.

According to Professor Gibb the versions leave it uncertain whether al-Harith defeated Nasr and then captured the city or whether he entered the city first and beat off an attempt at recapture by Nasr. However, Tabari, Sibt b. al-Jawzi and

---

al-Nuwayrī make it clear that Naṣr met al-Ḥarīth outside the city, was defeated and made no attempt at its recapture.

Al-Ḥarīth then marched on Juzjān and after a short delay spent in consultation with his prominent colleagues on the next step, decided to march on Marw. On his way he was joined by dihqāns of Juzjān, Faryāb, Talaqān and Marw ar-Rūdīh probably in anticipation of achieving their independence. By this time his army was estimated at 60,000 men. Professor Gibb states that the dihqāns of these territories had accompanied al-Ḥarīth to Balkh. This however seems unlikely as his followers then numbered a mere 4,000 men. Moreover, the report of the sources as well as the geographical situation of these territories suggests that their dihqāns joined al-Ḥarīth after the capture of Balkh.

‘Aṣim, who was aware of al-Ḥarīth’s intention, and had been informed that he had allies among the people of Marw, planned to

---

1Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.125.
3Gibb, The Arab Conquest in Central Asia, p.76.
withdraw to Nishāpur. There he hoped that the Caliph would add a contingent of 10,000 Syrians to enable him to defeat al-Ḥarīth. The Arab tribesmen of Marw offered their help to the governor but stipulated that money should be distributed among them. ‘Āṣim accepted these terms and with their help he won a battle against the rebels. This setback cost al-Ḥarīth the loss, by defection to ‘Āṣim, of more than half of his original followers. Among the deserters were 2,000 men from the Azd; while the Dihqāns left their ally and returned to their territories, probably having lost confidence in his capacity to win the fight against the government.

In spite, however, of his victory, ‘Āṣim attempted to formulate a peace, but due to al-Ḥarīth's stubbornness, ‘Āṣim's efforts were futile and another round of fighting began between them; al-Ḥarīth was defeated and his troops dwindled to a mere 3,000 men. This ended the encounters between the rebels and the government forces during the year 116/734-5.

---


2 Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1569-70 (citing Madaʿīnī); Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt al-Zaman, fol. 176.

3 It is said that some Tamīmites also deserted him.


5 Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1571-2 (citing Madaʿīnī); Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt al-Zaman, fol. 176; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.126.
The situation in Khurāsān had become serious. Revolts were spreading all over the province and Khalid b. 'Ubaydallāh al-Hajarī was leading a rebellion in Amul and its surroundings while there were pockets of revolt in Zamm led by al-Haytham al-Shaybānī. Al-Harīth had entrenched himself in a village belonging to Banī 'l-'Anbar near Marw and the whole area between Marw and the Oxus was seething with rebellion.

In view of this situation 'Āṣim advised the caliph to place Khurāsān and Iraq under one administration in order to facilitate transference of supplies and troops and strengthen the government's position. The caliph Hishām complied with this suggestion and combined the two provinces under the governorship of Khalid b. 'Abdallāh al-Qasrī. The caliph also asked Khalid to send his brother, Asad, to govern the turbulent province.

The sources infer that 'Āṣim's suggestion was prompted by ambition and that he hoped to secure the governorship for himself.

---

2. Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1579 (citing Madā'inī). Dr. M.A. Shaban maintains that al-Harīth returned to An-Nakhud (The Abbasid Revolution, p.120) but there is no evidence in the sources to confirm this statement.
Frustrated by the appointments of Khalid al-Qasrī and his brother he attempted conciliation with al-Ḥarīth offering him settlement where he wished in Khurasan. He further offered to write to the caliph Hishām demanding the establishment of the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet. If the demand were not met he would join al-Ḥarīth in his rebellion. This agreement is said to have been opposed by the Syrian Bakrite Yahyā b. Ḥuḍayn who regarded it as a deposition of the Caliph. Whether this was true or not, it is however certain that ‘Āṣim and al-Ḥarīth reached no definite agreement, as a further clash between them was reported in the year 117/735. In this al-Ḥarīth suffered defeat and no further encounters between him and ‘Āṣim are recorded. Al-Ḥarīth then retired to Marw al-Rūdūh.

‘Āṣim was, however, arrested by Asad, the new governor of Khurasan, on a charge of embezzlement, which appears to refute the report of collaboration, as the governor did not charge ‘Āṣim with compromise with al-Ḥarīth but of misappropriation of the province’s funds. Proof of collaboration with al-Ḥarīth would have given him an excellent excuse for the execution of ‘Āṣim.


The government's authority in Khurasān was at a low ebb when the new governor assumed control. Nishāpūr and Marw are said to have been the only districts which had not seceded to rebellion.\(^1\) Asad accordingly sent a contingent of government troops under the command of 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Ghamīdī to quell al-Hārith in Marw ar-Rūdh. Al-Hārith withdrew to Transoxania as he apparently realised his inability to overcome the strength of his opponents;\(^2\) no fighting is recorded to have taken place in Marw ar-Rūdh.\(^3\)

Another division led by Asad himself marched to wrest Amul from the rebels.\(^4\) Dr. M.A. Shaban\(^5\) maintains that Asad's army was composed "mostly of tribesmen from Basra, from the newcomers."\(^6\) There is no evidence in the sources to confirm Shaban's statement.\(^7\)

---

\(^1\) Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1582 (citing Mada'īnī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.139; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arāb, XXIX, p.126; Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, III, p.198.

\(^2\) Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.204b; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirʾat al-Zamān, fol. 179.


\(^4\) Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1582 (citing Madaʾīnī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.139; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirʾat al-Zamān, fol. 179; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arāb, XXIX, p.126.

\(^5\) M.A. Shaban, The 'Abbāsid Revolution, p.122.

\(^6\) The new comers were the tribesmen of Basra and Kūfā who arrived in Khurasān in 112/730-1. See chapter, IV, p. 241.

\(^7\) Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1582 (citing Madaʾīnī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.139; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirʾat al-Zamān, fol. 179; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arāb, XXIX, p.126.
It is also contradicted by the presence of al-Ḥawthara b. Yazīd at the head of Tamīmite troops in the vanguard of Asad's army.¹ Al-Ḥawthara had been in Khurāsān long before the arrival of the Bāgrans and Kūfans in 112/730-1.²

The vanguard under al-Ḥawthara gained an initial victory over the insurgents.³ Asad then captured Ṭāmul with little effort and appointed Yahyā b. Nuʿaym al-Shaybānī as governor of the town and its dependents.⁴ Asad then marched to capture Balkh which had been seized by al-Ḥarith in 116/734-5, who had then appointed a man from the descendants of ‘Abdallāh b. Khāzim as his representative there.⁵ On his way Asad was informed that the inhabitants of Balkh had selected Sūlaimān b. ‘Abdallāh b. Khāzim as their chief.⁶ This Sūlaimān was probably the same man designated by al-Ḥarith. Asad, nevertheless, proceeded to Balkh.

---

¹Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1582 (citing Madāʾinī); Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt al-Zaman, fols. 179-80.
²Baladhurī, Ansāb, II, p.1090; Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1481; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arāb, XXIX, p.121. According to Tabarī the number of al-Ḥawthara's troops was 4,000 men. Nuwayrī gives two figures, the first was 4,000 men under al-Ḥawthara's command in the year 106 A.H. The second was 5,000 men from Banī Tamīm who marched with him on Ṭāmul (Nuwayrī, XXIX, pp. 116,121).
³Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1582 (citing Madāʾinī); Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt al-Zaman, fol. 180.
⁵Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1568 (citing Madāʾinī).
⁶Ibid., p.1583 (citing Madāʾinī), Ibn al-Athīr, Kamīl, V, p.139.
but the rebels seem to have surrendered without resistance and no fighting is recorded. ¹

Asad equipped himself from Balkh and set out to cross the Oxus and confront al-Ḥarīth who was besieging Tīrmīdḥ, in which he was supported by the native rulers of Khuttal, Nāṣaf and Ṭukḥaristān. The residents of Tīrmīdḥ had been bombarded by a propaganda of weeping and complaints against Umayyad injustice and pleas for assistance against the "common foe". These tactics of al-Ḥarīth were, however, distasteful to As-Sabl, the king of Khuttal, who deserted him and withdrew to his own territory. Al-Ḥarīth was unable to conquer the town and Asad failed in his attempt to cross the Oxus to do battle with him. The residents of Tīrmīdḥ themselves rallied to rout their besiegers and defeated them. ² Consequently al-Ḥarīth retreated to upper Ṭukḥaristān and took refuge with his brothers-in-law, the Taghlibites of Tabushkan. ³

Asad now marched to Zamm to deal with the rebel al-Haytham al-Shaybānī where he offered him and his supporters amnesty. They surrendered, were rewarded with double pay and joined Asad's troops. ⁴


² Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1589 (citing Mada’inī).

³ Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1589 (citing Mada’inī).

After unsuccessful attempts to reconquer Samarqand, apparently from unbelievers, Asad returned to Balkh.\(^1\)

Asad realised the strategic importance of Balkh and in the year 118/736 he transferred the provincial capital of Khurasan from Marw to that city.\(^2\) Both Turks and rebels continued to be a major threat to Arab rule in Transoxania and the change of capital was a move of shrewd military foresight against the machinations of both. From Balkh Asad despatched Juday\(\acute{a}\) al-Kirmani together with 6,000 men, of whom 2,500 were Syrians, to crush al-Harīth in Tabushkan. The citadel was taken and Juday\(\acute{a}\) showed little mercy to the residents. It is said that hundreds of them were killed and numbers, including the Arabs, were taken captive and sold by auction in Balkh. The report may have been exaggerated but there is no doubt that the inhabitants received harsh treatment.\(^3\)

Al-Harīth appears to have withdrawn from Tabushkan before the garrison was stormed and to have joined forces with the Turkish

---


Khaqān in Tukhāristān.¹ From this time (118/736) until the year 126/744 he only appears in the sources as a Turkish collaborator.²

In 119/737 al-Hārith is recorded to have advised the Khaqān to undertake a winter expedition against Asad while the Arab troops were dispersed.³ The Khaqān complied with al-Hārith's advice and summoned supporters from Soghdianā and the principalities of Tukhāristān. In the ensuing battle⁴ with Asad and his troops, al-Hārith and his followers are said to have fought well and they, together with other elements, inflicted considerable losses on the left wing of Asad's army.⁵ When the Khaqān withdrew, al-Hārith and his colleagues protected the rear of the retreat.⁶

Upon the death of Asad al-Qasrī in 120/738 the caliph appointed Naṣr b. Sayyār as governor of Khurāsān. Al-Hārith was at this time encamping near Shāsh and Naṣr was instructed by Yusuf b.

¹It is however reported that about 450 men of al-Hārith's supporters had deserted him and remained in Tabushkan. They tried to negotiate peace with Asad, who treacherously agreed but when Tabushkan was stormed they, together with the residents, received harsh treatment. See Tabari, II, pp. 1589-91.
²See chapter VI, p.248ff.
⁴For detailed account and discussion of this battle, see chapter VI, p.249.
⁵Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1609 (citing Mada'īnī).
'Umar, the governor general of Iraq and the east, to march against him. The expedition ended by concluding a peace treaty between Nasr and the king of Shash, stipulating, among other terms, the dismissal of al-Harith to Farab.¹

Until 126/744 al-Harith remained in Farab and there is no further mention in available sources either of him or of any activities by him prior to this time. Thus there is a gap in the information concerning al-Harith's movements during this period which must remain unless new material becomes available.

During this period, however, several changes occurred. The caliph Hisham died in 125/743 and was succeeded by al-Walid II who, in turn, was murdered in 126/744. His successor Yaqub III appointed Mansur b. Jumhur as governor of Iraq and the east.² This appointment seems to have angered Nasr b. Sayyar who refused to surrender his province to Mansur, and when the latter appointed his brother, Mansur, to govern Khurasan, Nasr refused to recognise Mansur's appointment and prevented the arrival of the new governor in Marw. He also designated some of his men as sub-governors of the several districts of Khurasan.³

¹See chapter, VI, p. 256.
²Tabari, Tariikh, II, pp. 1836 ff.
³Ibid., pp. 1845–9.
The dispute between Mansur and Nasr was ended by the dismissal of Mansur when 'Abdallah b. Umar b. Abd al-Aziz was appointed to his post. 'Abdallah b. Umar maintained Nasr as governor of Khurasan. This alarmed Nasr's old rival, Juday' al-Kirmani, who had already been imprisoned by Nasr but managed to escape by the aid of one of his partisans. Al-Kirmani caused a revolt and used the time-honoured religious propaganda of upholding the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet. The bid for power between Nasr and Al-Kirmani developed into a tribal feud led on the one side by Asd and Rabia and Muqar on the other.

Nasr seems to have concluded that if al-Harith were granted an amnesty he would be less likely to incite Turks against him at this crucial time. He accordingly petitioned the Caliph Yazid III to this end. A further inducement to Nasr may have been that al-Harith, who was of northern Arab stock, would fight with him against the Yemenite, Al-Kirmani. Al-Harith returned from his exile and arrived in Marw on 27 Jumada II 127/April 745. Nasr not only

---

1 Baladhuri, Ansab, II, pp. 170-1; Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1854 (citing Abu 'Ubayda).
2 Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1855 (citing Mada'in).
3 Baladhuri, Ansab, II, p.693; see also Tabari, II, pp.1855,1861.
4 Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1930; F. Omar, The 'Abbasid Caliphate, p.86.
5 Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1867-8, 1888 (citing Mada'in); Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, p.233; Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 211.
endowed him with 50 dirhams a day, but released all those of his relatives who had previously been arrested. In addition he is said to have been presented with a fur coat by Naṣr's wife which he promptly sold for 4,000 dinars and distributed the proceeds amongst his followers. If this report was true, it would clearly indicate that al-Ḥarīth had not dispersed his adherents and he accordingly endeavoured to ensure their future cooperation for any further plans he may have had in mind. On the other hand, Naṣr seems to have sought a genuine and lasting peace with al-Ḥarīth which he hoped would leave him free to cope with al-Kirmanī. As a further inducement to al-Ḥarīth, Naṣr offered him an important post together with 100,000 dinars. This was refused by al-Ḥarīth who claimed that his sole desire was the establishment of the Book of God, the Sunnah of the Prophet and to ensure that the province would be governed by virtuous men.

Al-Ḥarīth's ambitious desires led him beyond a sub-governor to Naṣr. His refusal to accept the proffered post was indicative of a greater ambition which soon became manifest. He aimed to be governor of Khurasan and immediately summoned the Tamīmite

---

1Tabarî, Tarîkh, II, p.1888 (citing Madâ'inî); Ibn al-Athîr, Kamil, V, p. 249.
2Tabarî, Tarîkh, II, p.1889 (citing Madâ'inî); Ibn al-Athîr, Kamil, V, p.249.
tribesmen to support him. Three thousand of them paid him homage. He treacherously contacted al-Kirmānī with the somewhat hypocritical plea that unless Naṣr appointed virtuous officials to hold the key positions he would support al-Kirmānī. The Book of God was again requisitioned as a reason for his offer which appears to have served an excuse to await the first favourable opportunity to re-open hostilities against Naṣr.

The death of the caliph and the accession of Marwān II to the throne provided the opportunity. The new caliph appointed Yazīd b. 'Umar b. Hubayra as governor of Iraq and the east and Yazīd retained Naṣr as viceroy in Khurāsān. Al-Ḥarīth claimed that the amnesty granted by Yazīd III would not be ratified by Marwān and that, as a consequence, he was under no obligation to acknowledge him. He also reviled the new caliph. His concealed ambition was now revealed and caused him to ask for Bay'ā, no doubt for himself. In spite of al-Ḥarīth's behaviour, Naṣr continued his efforts for peace with him, offering appointments to

---

1Tabarî, Tārîkh, II, p.1890 (citing Madaʿ'inī); Ibn al-Athîr, Kāmil, V, p.249.
2Tabarî, Tārîkh, II, pp. 1889 (citing Madaʿ'inī); Ibn al-Athîr, Kāmil, V, p.249.
3Tabarî, Tārîkh, II, p.1917 (citing Madaʿ'inī).
4Ibid.
5Tabarî, Tārîkh, II, p.1917 (citing Madaʿ'inī); Sibt al-Jawzî, Mirʿat al-Zaman, fol. 228.
candidates recommended by him and even deposing the commander of his shurta in order to placate him. Four men were jointly chosen by al-Ḥārith and Naṣr to select suitable candidates for the governorships of Samarqand and Ṭukharistān. The committee seems not to have reached any substantial decision and consequently al-Ḥārith and Naṣr resorted to arbitration. Naṣr chose as his representative Muqātil b. Ḥayyān while al-Ḥārith nominated his secretary, Jahm b. Ṣafwān. Finally it was suggested that Naṣr should resign his post and a new governor should be selected by means of shura. Naturally Naṣr refused such terms but al-Ḥārith adopted the proposal as an excuse for further opposition. This he expressed personally by saying "we do not accept you as our Imam". Naṣr b. Sayyār replied, "how can you have a mind since you have spent your life in the land of the infidels and you have collaborated with them and invaded the Muslims; do you think I will beg you further?" Naṣr's patience was, by this time, exhausted and he realised that al-Ḥārith had no intention of settling matters by peaceful negotiation. Only one course was open and that was warfare. He attacked al-Ḥārith and defeated him in

---

1Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1918 (citing Mada'inī).
2Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1918–9 (citing Mada'inī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.261; Sibt al-Jawzī, Mir'āt al-Zaman, fol. 228.
3Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1924 (citing Mada'inī).
Jumādā II, 128/February 746 whereupon al-Ḥarīth immediately allied himself with al-Kirmani. Together they marched upon and occupied Marw forcing Naṣr to withdraw to Nishāpur. The alliance was, however, ill-assorted and quarrels broke out between their followers. The Tamīmites were not friendly disposed to the Azd of al-Kirmani and as soon as the battle against Naṣr was concluded, there was open hostility between them. The Azdites ridiculed and mocked the Muṣarites while Tamīmite resentment seethed against co-operation with al-Kirmani. His treatment of their comrades and relatives after he had stormed the citadel of Tabushkān and the ensuing massacre still rankled, together with the humiliation they had then received. Some of al-Ḥarīth's followers led by Bishr b. Jurμūz al-Ẓabī left him. Al-Ḥarīth, deserted by a large number of his adherents, wanted to explore al-Kirmani's intentions and asked that Shura should be held to select a new governor (no doubt with himself in mind) but al-Kirmani refused and al-Ḥarīth had no option but to rejoin his

2Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1928 (citing Mada'īnī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p.262; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 229.
3Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1928; see also above, p.203.
4Ibid., p.1931 (citing Mada'īnī); the number of deserters ranges between 4,000 and 5,500 men.
followers. The alliance between the two leaders broke and they again became enemies; once more to meet in battle. Al-Kirmānī was victorious while al-Ḥārith, his brother, and some of his more notable adherents perished. This was in Rajab 128/746.2

Al-Ḥārith b. Surayj was thus killed without having achieved his aims. Nevertheless, he had contributed considerably to the chaos which prevailed in Khūrāsān during the period prior to the Umayyad fall, and unwittingly shared in paving the way for the 'Abbāsids.

Various interpretations have been given of the motives which inspired al-Ḥārith's rebellion. Amongst others, Van Vloten3 credits him with being a pious reformer and reaches the conclusion that al-Ḥārith followed the example of Abu'l-Ṣaydā' who also protested strongly against the taxes levied upon the Soghdian converts which were equivalent to those levied on non-Muslims. J. Wellhausen,4 F. Gabrieli,5 M.J. Kister6 and G.H. Sadighi7 are also in

---

agreement with Van Vloten. Such conclusion appears strange in view of the fact that al-Ḥarīth was with Ashras’s camp when in 110/728-9 he re-imposed the tax on the Soghdians. Abu’l-Ṣaydā’ and some of his colleagues supported the cause of the Soghdian converts but, at that time al-Ḥarīth was still loyal to the government and his revolt began some six years later.¹ There is also no evidence that al-Ḥarīth ever raised his voice in support of non-Arab Muslims prior to his rebellion in 116/734. Even after the commencement of his revolt, there is no reason to believe that he rebelled entirely for the sake of justice to the Mawālī. Gardīzī,² the author of Kitāb Zain al-Akhbār, however, maintains that al-Ḥarīth promised not to levy tribute on Muslims, to observe the contract made with Ahl al-Dhimma, and to oppress no one. No other source records such definite promise which seems to have been directed to all communities not only to the neo-converts, neither does Gardīzī state the origin of his information. Without more supporting evidence, it is not in itself sufficient to conclude that al-Ḥarīth’s rebellion was initiated for the defence of neo-converts. If such a promise were made it would be a pro-

¹Tabārī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1508-9, 1513; Nuwayrī, Niḥayat al-Arab, XXIX, pp. 116-7 (Nuwayrī maintains that al-Ḥarīth fought against Abu’l-Ṣaydā’ and his colleagues and he was slightly wounded, see p. 116)
²Gardīzī, Zain al-Akhbār, pp. 87-8; W. Barthold (Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion, p.190) takes this statement at face value.
paganda slogan designed to recruit followers from all communities regardless of their religious beliefs. It is also hardly conceivable that al-Ḥārith and his Arab tribesmen in the garrison of an-Nakhudh rebelled against their Arab government only to support justice for non-Arab Muslims, neither is it feasible that such piety would allow him to ally himself with the Turkish infidel enemies of Islam in order to impose Islamic principle upon an Islamic government. As Professor M.J. Kister justly says, "al-Ḥārith and his followers are the only group in early Islam which seceded from the community and aided the unbelievers against their brethren". It would appear that the conclusion of Van Vloten and his successors is based upon religious propaganda slogans which al-Ḥārith used in support of his rebellion. 

Professor Gibb rejects Van Vloten's description of al-Ḥārith as "pious Muslim, ascetic and reformer" whom he (Van Vloten) contrasts sharply with the contemporary government officials. Gibb considers al-Ḥārith and his followers as tools rather than leaders of those elements who sought the overthrow of the Umayyad administration in Khurasan. Gibb does not, however, specify the movement or the elements of which al-Ḥārith and his partisans were tools.

1M.J. Kister, EI2, art. al-Ḥārith b. Suraydji.
2See below, pp. 218ff.
3Gibb, The Arab Conquest in Central Asia, p. 78.
A theory put forward by Dr. M.A. Shaban refutes the conclusions of all his predecessors but in itself presents some deficiencies. He maintains that the rebellion was a protest from those Arab tribesmen of Khurasan who had been removed from Marw to make room for a fresh contingent from Basra and Kufa, consisting of 20,000 tribesmen. The tribesmen of Khurasan, to quote Shaban, "enlisted in the diwan were moved out of Marw, to new locations where they could defend Khurasan itself against outside attacks, particularly from the Turgesh."¹ He reaches a strange conclusion, however, when he says that "following this re-organization the Arab army Mucratila of Khurasan was composed of 15,000 men from the Arab tribesmen and the Mawali of Khurasan and 20,000 new tribesmen from Kufa and Basra."² in addition to a contingent of Syrian troops.³ The sources give the number of the Syrians as being less than 4,000 men. ⁴ It is known, however, that the garrison of Balkh comprised 10,000 men of whom 2,500 were Syrians.⁵ Samarqand was also occupied by, at least, 800 tribesmen.⁶ An-Nakhdudh was garrisoned by 4,000 tribesmen from Azd and Tamīm headed

¹M.A. Shaban, The ‘Abbasid Revolution, pp. 117-8, see also pp. 114 ff.
²M.A. Shaban, op.cit., p.117.
³The Syrians in Khurasan and Transoxania were: 2,500 men in Balkh, 1,000 men in Marw and 150 in Tirkhen. See Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1579, 1583, 1590; see also M.A. Shaban, op.cit., pp. 117, 120.
⁴Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1567; M.A. Shaban, op.cit., p.117.
⁵See chapter, VI, p.240-1.
by al-Ḥarīth b. Surayj. Since 106/725 there had been a contingent of approximately 4,000 Tamīmite tribesmen stationed in Marw itself under the leadership of al-Ḥawthara b. Yazīd al-Anbarī. Thus if all the 15,000 (even more) tribesmen of Khurāsān were located in Balkh, Samarqand, an-Nakhudh and Marw and if all the newcomers from Baṣra and Kūfa were stationed in Marw, then such garrisons as Marw ar-Rudh, Zamm, Āmul, Tirmidh, Dabūsiya, Tabushkān, Bukhāra and others must have been empty of warriors and this is quite unreasonable.

It also appears to be a contradiction on the part of Shaban when he suggests that the Baṣran newcomers joined their akhnās in Khurāsān. If they did so, it would mean that they were stationed out of Marw with their kinsmen from the Khurāsānī tribesmen who, according to Shaban, had been removed from Marw to new locations on the borders.

One should also add that there is no evidence in the sources of the theory that such re-organization of Muqātila in Khurāsān took place during the period under consideration.

---

1Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1567; M.A. Shaban, op.cit., p.117.  
2Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1481, 1582; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, pp. 115-6.  
3In 110-111 A.H. this garrison was occupied by 10,000 Muqātila and there is no evidence whatever of their withdrawal to any other place, nor is there evidence of the garrison's fall into enemy hands. See chapter, VI, p.235.  
4M. A. Shaban, The 'Abbasid Revolution, p.115.
On the other hand, Madā'īnī\(^1\) states that the Kufan and Baṣran newcomers were sent to Samarqand. The later two historians, Nuwayrī and Sibt b. al-Jawzī, confirm their arrival in Samarqand.\(^2\) The fact that we do not hear of their withdrawal from this place is not substantial evidence that they retired to Marw. There is a probability that the troops were stationed in positions more vulnerable to enemy attack, and some may have been garrisoned beyond the Oxus, most likely in Bukhārā. The continued loyalty of this city to Arab rule\(^3\) confirms its occupation by a sizeable Arab garrison. It should also be noted that none of the available sources give information about the removal of the Khurāsānī tribesmen from Marw to new locations.

In view of this discussion, it is crucial to the proper understanding of the revolt to take account of the grievances and the motives of all the different elements who took part in it. There is little doubt that the leader, al-Harith b. Surayj was motivated by ambition and this is emphasized by his refusal to be a

\(^{1}\)Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1552—3 (citing Madā'īnī); see also Gibb, op.cit., p.75; M.A. Shaban, op.cit., p.113 (he states that they joined al-Junayd in Chaghanian but omitted the other part of al-Madā'īnī's report which says that al-Junayd sent them with al-Hawthara b. Yazīd al-'Anbarī to Samarqand).

\(^{2}\)Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-Arab, XXIX, p.121; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir'āt al-Zaman, fol. 171.

\(^{3}\)Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1585—6; Gibb, op.cit., pp. 78—9, see also chapter, VI, 237.
Janība of another person. This was probably the main reason why he was flogged by the governor of Balkh, perhaps by the order of al-Junayd b. 'Abdal-Rahmān, the governor of Khurāsān.

One of al-Ḥarīth's supporters attempted to justify his attitude by saying, "Ibn Surayj refused to be a Janība of Murra: when they went astray and their Imam committed injustice." Khalīd al-Qasrī, the governor of Iraq and the east, treated both the remark and its attempted justification by the scornful retort, "the son of a saddle aspires to be a caliph: How remote are the means of the caliphate from a saddle."

Sibt b. al-Jawzī asserts that al-Ḥarīth declared the Caliph Hishām to be deposed. It is also beyond doubt that the flogging he received by the order of al-Junayd embittered him against au-

---

1 Janība means a horse led alongside but here it means follower or adherent.
2 Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p. 898.
3 Taḫārī, Tārikh, II, p.1567; Gibb, op.cit., p.76; M.J. Kister, EI², art. al-Ḥarīth b. Suraydī.
4 Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.898.
5 Here he plays upon the name Surayj and called him Sarj (saddle).
6 Balādhurī, Ansāb, II, p.898. Professor M.J. Kister maintains that this verse was said after the death of al-Ḥarīth (see EI², art. al-Ḥarīth b. Suraydī). However, if this verse was said by Khalīd al-Qasrī as reported by al-Balādhurī it must have been composed before 120 A.H. when Khalīd was still the governor of Iraq and the east. Khalīd also died in 126 A.H. while al-Ḥarīth died in 128 A.H.
7 Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirāt al-Zaman, fol. 176.
authority, augmenting his desire for personal power. His ambition rendered him a willing partisan of any force opposed to the Umayyad government. He did not hesitate to collaborate with the Turks in their pressure on the eastern borders of the Arab Empire and, later, even collaborated with his enemy Juday' al-Kirmānī against Nasr b. Sayyār, the governor of Khurāsān. Nasr b. Sayyār, as we have seen, made every possible concession to al-Ḥarīth and complied with all his demands except that of his own deposition, but to no avail. Thus al-Ḥarīth's obstinate refusal to come to terms with Nasr is further evidence of his personal ambition for power, rather than of a desire for the establishment of justice and equality among Muslims.

To achieve his purpose, al-Ḥarīth required supporters and accordingly adopted a propaganda which would attract the people to his cause. He was aware of the grievances of neo-converts in Transoxania and used their discontent to conceal his own ambition. He declared the establishment of the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet to be his ideal. He also cited al-Rida, who would

---

1See above, pp.205ff. Al-Balāḍurī however states that Nasr complied with all the demands put forward by al-Ḥarīth including the deposition of all the governors he disliked, but due to al-Ḥarīth's evasion they reached no conclusion. See Ansāb, II, pp. 897-8.

2Tabari, Tarīkh, II, pp.1567, 1889.

be acceptable to all classes, as the would be ruler but gave no
clue to the identity of such a person except by inference of his
own ability to fill the position. Sibt b. al-Jawzi\textsuperscript{1} seems to
have been misled by this slogan and states that al-\textsorted{H}arîth pro-
moted his cause in the name of \textsort{al-Ri\textsorted{D}a \textsort{min} \textsort{al-Mu\textsorted{H}ammad}. Ibn Khal-
dûn\textsuperscript{2} maintains that al-\textsorted{H}arîth echoed the propaganda of the 'Abbâ-
sid dâ‘îs but neither Ibn Khaldûn nor Sibt b. al-Jawzi\textsuperscript{1} produce
any confirmation of their theories in this respect. A brief state-
ment by the author of \textit{Akhbâr al-Dawla al-‘Abbâsiyya} shows that al-
\textsorted{H}arîth b. Surayj had led a separate rebellion which had no connec-
tion with the ‘Abbâsids.\textsuperscript{3} Moreover, there is no evidence that al-
\textsorted{H}arîth had ever come into contact with the ‘Abbâsîd dâ‘îs or any
person from the \textit{Ahl al-Bayt}. Nor is there any information about
al-\textsorted{H}arîth’s relations with any Shi‘î movement.

To emphasize the allegedly religious aspect of his movement
al-\textsorted{H}arîth claimed a messianic aspiration asserting that he was the
man of the black banners (صامبي الرائها بسعود) who would
destroy the wall of Damascus and bring about the fall of the Umay-
yad rule. He adopted black as his symbol and as an appeal to the

\textsuperscript{1}Sibt b. al-Jawzi, \textit{Mir’ât al-Zaman}, fol. 176.
\textsuperscript{2}Ibn Khaldûn, \textit{Ibar}, III, p.197.
\textsuperscript{3}Sibt b. al-Jawzi, \textit{Mir’ât al-Zaman}, fol. 176.
\textsuperscript{3}Akhbâr al-Dawla al-‘Abbâsiyya, p.208.
messianic expectation of the oppressed people.\(^1\) Al-Ḥarīth himself did not claim, openly, to be al-Mahdi but some traditions, attributed to the Prophet and transmitted on the authority of such prominent men as 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalib, prophesied a rebellion in ma-warā al-Nahr of a man named al-Ḥarīth who would come preceded by black banners and urged all Muslims to gather to his support. They added that his vanguard would be headed by a man called al-Mansūr.\(^2\) These traditions were certainly fabricated, probably by al-Ḥarīth and his followers in order to attract supporters, but their messianic connotation is obvious.

Many men of religious conviction seem to have been misled by this propaganda and joined him. They were known as \(\text{ahl al-}\)Bāṣīr and some of them had already participated in Abu'l-
Sayda's support of neo-converts and hoped to find in al-Harith the champion of their religious aspirations. However, some who resented his behaviour deserted him later.¹

The motives behind the initial support given to al-Harith b. Surayj by the Arab tribesmen of the garrison of an-Nakhudh can be seen in the opposition of the Khurasani tribesmen to the policy of the protracted war. From the commencement of the reign of Caliph Yazid II, the Arab tribesmen of Khurasan had been engaged in a continuous war with the Turks. This was a constant cause of resentment against the government, and force had, at times been necessary to get some of them on to the battlefield.²

Al-Harith's Azdite supporters however appear to have disliked command from a Tamimite leader and they deserted him at the first encounter with the governor of Khurasan.³ From this time the insurrection began to assume tribal character and al-Harith's Arab partisans were mainly tribesmen from the northern Arab stock particularly from Tamim. When Nasr b. Sayyar met al-Harith and the Shash army on the Jaxartes in 122/740, al-Harith is said to have

¹Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1932 (citing Mada'ini). It should be noted that the Tamimites who deserted al-Harith because of his collaboration with al-Kirmâni were led by Bishr b. Jurmu, one of ahl al-Baṣa'ir. He accused al-Harith of self seeking and described his own colleagues as al-Fi'ah al-'Adilah, the just group. (Tabari, II, p.1931).

²Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1477-8 (citing Mada'ini); M.A. Shaban, The 'Abbasid Revolution, p.103.

³See above, p.197.
directed two 'Arrādas1 (عرادات) towards particular groups of Naṣr's army but upon receiving information that this group was from Tamīm, they were immediately directed at the Azd.2 Later, when he returned to Marw after receiving amnesty, his partisans were almost exclusively Tamimites as has been shown by the homage he received from 3,000 of them.3 Baladhūri's4 description of al-Ḥārith as the man of the tribal 'asabiyya in Khurāsān is therefore apt. It has also been noted that the native rulers of Tuḵharistān and the Oxus territories also gave occasional help to al-Ḥārith, probably hoping to create chaos in the Arab dominion of Khurāsān and Transoxania which would result in their independence.

People of mixed communities, who were attracted by al-Ḥārith's practice of distributing booty among his supporters, also aided him in the hope of reaping fringe benefits. They were not inspired by political motives and Ibn Aṭham described them as Ahl al-Daʿāra wa'l-Fasād.5

---
1For the meaning of 'Arrāda see Cl. Cahen, EI2, art. 'Arrāda.
2Ṭabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1692 (citing Mada'īnī).
3See above, p. 208.
4Baladhūri, Ansāb, II, p.898.
5Ibn Aṭham, Futūh, II, p.204a.
It is thus a great error to describe the revolt of al-Ḥarīth as though it was homogeneous. The slogans used by al-Ḥarīth and some of his supporters are not necessarily the criterion upon which judgment of this revolt can be based. Many groups contributed to the uprising, each with its own motives and hoping for the fulfilment of its own particular ambition.
CHAPTER VI

THE ARAB CONQUEST IN TRANSOXANIA.
Chapter VI.
THE ARAB CONQUEST IN TRANSOXANIA

When the Caliph Yazid II died and his brother Hisham succeeded him in 105/724 the governor of Khurasan was Muslim b. Sa'id. In 106/725 Muslim b. Sa'id crossed the Oxus in an expedition against Farghana. Although the Arab tribesmen of Khurasan had received their 'ata', they were reluctant to continue service in the protracted war against the Turks and their allies beyond the Oxus and preferred a life of peace and settlement in their own province. The governor, however, refused to allow any dissidence and sent a force under Na'ir b. Sa'ayr, aided by troops from Chaghānīān, to compel their obedience. With a force mostly composed of Mu'darites he camped at Barūqān and engaged and defeated the rebels, forcing them to join the campaign.

Although there were Tamīmites and Bāhilites among the rebels, the sources refer to the event as a conflict between Yemenites and Mu'darites. This statement should not be taken at

1 Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1473.
face value. In addition to the non-Yemenite participants among the rebels, al-Bakhtari, a prominent and co-leader of the rebels was, most probably, not of Yemenite origin, as his name appears with the Mudarite group which later was maltreated by Asad al-Qasri. Moreover, Ibn A' tham and the author of Ghurar al-Siyar assert that al-Bakhtari was a Qaysite, while Tabari states that he was a Bakrite. The second leader 'Amr b. Muslim al-Bahili was, without question, a non-Yemenite. This was, however, the first open revolt by tribesmen of Khurasan against compulsory military service. Nevertheless, it did not constitute an immediate impasse for the governor of Khurasan.

With his force augmented by the unwilling tribesmen, Muslim b. Sa'id proceeded to advance upon Farghana and on arrival in Bukhara was informed that he had been replaced by Asad b. 'Abdallah al-Qasri. His orders were, however, to continue with his expeditions. Among his forces were Nawal together with local troops of Samarqand led by Ghurak's brother, who later met his death in a clash with Turks by Wadi Sabuh. They crossed the Jaxartes and laid siege to the capital of Farghana, devastating

---

3 Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1605.
4 Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1478 (citing Mada'InI).
its surroundings. With a formidable army the Turks, headed by the Khaqān himself, advanced to confront the invaders and Muslim b. Sa'īd, seeing inevitable defeat, hurriedly retreated, harassed by the Khaqān's forces.

As commanded by Asad al-Qasrī, Muslim b. Sa'īd, upon arrival at Khujanda, relinquished his leadership to 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Nu‘aym al-Ghāmidī, a former governor of Khurāsān, who proceeded to join Asad in Samarqand. The sources name this expedition as the "day of thirst" because the Arab troops suffered so greatly from lack of water.

Despite its prominence in the sources there is no record of any major battle on this occasion between Arabs and Turks, and engagements appear to have been confined to clashes between detachments of their main armies. The expedition, however,

---

1 Baladhuri, Futūh, p.428.
2 Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1477 ff (citing Nadī'īnī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, pp. 96-8; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir'āt al-Zaman, fol. 160; Nuwayrī, Nahayat al-Arab, XXIX, pp. 115-6; Khalīfa, Khayyat, gives a brief, ambiguous and inaccurate account of this expedition. He says that in 106 Muslim b. Sa'īd, during the governorship of Ibn Hubayra, invaded Farghana, killed the nephew of the Khaqān and a number of infidels. Then Khalid al-Qasrī was appointed governor of Iraq and he designated his brother Asad as governor of Khurāsān, who met Muslim b. Sa‘īd and led the army back home in Rabī’ II, 106/724. See Khalīfa's Tarikh, II, p. 349. Some later historians such as Dhahabī, Ibn Kathīr and al-Hanbali erroneously maintain that the Arabs were victorious in this expedition. See Dhahabī, Duwal al-Islām, I, p.55; idem, 'Ibar, I, p.130; Ibn Kathīr, Bidāya, IX, p.234; Hanbali, Shadharat, I, p.133.
appears to have been the climax to the Arab policy of conquest, for it was fifteen years before they again crossed the Jaxartes.

Among the reasons why they refrained was perhaps the predominating fact that for the first time Turkish might was mustered against Arab supremacy beyond the Oxus. The Arabs appear to have realised this and chose the wiser expedient of confining their campaigns to the less dangerous areas of Khuttal and Ghūr.

Arab authority in Khurāsān and Transoxania was, at that time, threatened by internal problems. There was bitter resentment by the Soghdian converts against a taxation which imposed upon them levies similar to those paid by non-Muslims. Many of them reverted to their previous faith and a number migrated to Farghāna. During the campaign previously referred to, they fought with the troops of Farghāna and Shāsh against the Arab army.

‘Abbāsid dā‘īs were also active in Khurāsān. Disguised frequently as traders, they penetrated the Oxus regions. Although several of them were caught and executed their increasing activities, aimed at winning supporters, undermined Umayyad

---

2 See chapter I, p.61.
authority. The revolt of al-Ḥarīth b. Suraqī, which broke out in 116/734, added to the crisis in the Arab administration of Khurāsān. Even more dangerous was the disobedience and reluctance of Arab tribesmen to participate in military campaigns. For all these reasons, the Arabs suspended, for some years, their military operations in the remote areas of the Jaxartes.

With the exception of al-Ḥarīth’s rebellion all the other problems were prevailing upon Asad’s arrival as the new governor of Khurāsān. Aware of these difficulties, Asad al-Qasrī began his rule by instituting measures which would strengthen Arab supremacy in Khurāsān and Transoxania. To this end he retained Tawba b. Usayd, the Mawla of Banu’l-‘Anbar, an efficient and reliable man, in his office of Khātem. Even more important was the fact that Tawba was respected by the Muqātila, the back-bone of Arab rule in Khurāsān. As a Mawla he was not opposed by the neo-converts. Asad also wisely chose al-Ḥasan b. Abī’l-‘Amarrāt, a supporter of conciliation with the Soghdians, as his representative in Samarqand.

2 Tābarī, Tarikh, II, pp. 1478, 1482; M. A. Shaban, op. cit., p. 103.
3 Tābarī, Tarikh, II, pp. 1481-2 (citing Mada’inī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p. 98.
4 Tābarī, Tarikh, II, p. 1508; see also below, p. 233.
while Asad himself returned to Marw.

Apparently apprehensive of confrontation with the Turks, al-Ḥasan b. Abi'l-ʿAmarraṭa, the new governor of Samarqand, remained on the defensive and when, with some 7,000 men, they raided the district they did so with impunity. Nevertheless during al-Ḥasan's government Arab authority in Samarqand remained unbroken, despite the enemy encursions, but the Muqāṭila were dissatisfied with his policy towards the enemy.

During the year 106/724-5 there is no record that Asad undertook any military campaign. In the following year he concentrated his attacks upon the principalities of Ghārchistān and Ghūr. These territories appear to have been aware of the growing weakness of Arab domination and endeavoured to shake it off, while Asad was equally determined to preserve it intact. Had Asad shown weakness and leniency towards these Hepthalite territories, he would have put his troops between two fires, the Hepthalites in the south and the Turks and their allies in the east. Accordingly in 107/725 Asad led an army against Ghārchistān whose king capitulated to Islām. In the same year, Asad launched

---

2Taḥbīrī, Tarīkh, II, p.1486 (citing Madāʾinī); Balāḏurī, Futūḥ, p.428.
3Balāḏurī, Futūḥ, p.428; Taḥbīrī, Tarīkh, II, p.1488; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p.102; Ibn Kathīr, Bitāwa, IX, p.244. However, Dhahabi's statement (Tarīkh al-Islām, IV, p.89) that the Arabs
an expedition against Ghūr. This would appear to have been less effective as military operations continued against the territory, during 108/726 and 109/727, until the nomads of this mountainous area were temporarily brought under subjugation.\(^1\)

Asad's sole expedition in the east was against Khuttal in 108/726. According to Mada’inī he avoided any engagement with the Turks and withdrew when he was made aware that they were advancing to assist al-Sabl, the king of Khuttal.\(^2\) Abu ‘Ubayda, however, maintains that he actually met and was defeated by the Turks.\(^3\)

Asad b. 'Abdallah al-Qasri was dismissed from his post in 109/727 and Khurasan's governorship passed to al-Ashras b.

---


\(^2\) Tabari, Tanīkh, II, pp. 1492-3 (citing Mada’inī); the same report is repeated by Nuwayri, Nihayat al-ʿArab, XXIX, p. 116.

\(^3\) Tabari, Tanīkh, II, p. 1492 (citing Abu ‘Ubayda). However, Ibn al-Athīr and Sibt b. al-Jawzi provide both the report of al-Mada’inī and Abu ‘Ubayda without reference to them. Thus each gives two contradictory reports. See Kāmil, V, p. 103; Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 163. Ibn Kathīr's statement (Bidaya, IX, p. 256) that Asad inflicted a disastrous defeat upon the Turks is not confirmed by any other source and it is accordingly open to doubt.
‘Abdallāh al-Sulami who was appointed by the Caliph himself. His first act as governor was to appoint new officials to the key posts in Khurasan. He also created a garrison unit, entirely composed of horse-mounted fighters, under the command of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Dīthār al-Bāhilī. This garrison was known as the rābiṭa. Its role appears to have been that of a mobile force ready for action in any emergency. It would appear to have been stationed near a border, where it could be sent effectively to relieve any Arab garrison threatened by attack.

Dr. M.A. Shaban does not agree with the theory that the rābiṭa could have been quartered near the Transoxanian border as no mention was made of their participation in Ashras’s campaign. He suggests that their probable station was Guzgān "to protect the right flank of Khurasan against any possible attack from the Turgesh through Khuttal, particularly while Ashras was campaigning in Soghdiana." This, however, contradicts the fact that ‘Abd al-Malik b. Dīthār al-Bāhilī, the leader of the rābiṭa, was killed whilst serving in Ashras’s campaign and some of his men were taken captive.

---

1 Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1504 (citing Madaʾin); Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Ṭabarī al-Zamān, fol. 164; Ṭabarī al-Khulafāʾ, p.211a.
3 Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1514 (citing Madaʾin); Ibn al-Athīr, Ṭabarī, V, p.112; Ibn Khaldūn, ‘Ībar, III, p.188.
4 Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1518 (citing Madaʾin).
Ashras endeavoured to find a just solution for the grievances of the Soghdians and invited them to embrace Islam, promising them exemption from Jizya. He sent Abu'l-Ṣayda' Ṣalih b. Ṭarīf, a Mawla of Banī Ḥabba, who was on good terms with the Soghdians, to carry out these measures in co-operation with Ashras's representatives in Samarqand, al-Ḥasan b. Abi'l-ʿAmarratā al-Kindī. Although his policy gained co-operation from the Soghdians, it had an adverse effect on the treasury which dwindled considerably when the Jizya lacked enforcement. Ashras, realising this, reversed his policies and the Jizya was again levied on the neo-converts. Open revolt ensued which was joined by some apparently devout Arabs, and, on this occasion, it was rapidly crushed.¹

During the same year (110/728-9) the people of Kurdar in the district of Khwārizm repudiated Islam, probably for similar reasons, and came out in open revolt. The rebels were assisted by Turks; Ashras sent a force of 1,000 men to assist the resident garrison and the rebellion was short-lived.²

The chief threat to Arab supremacy was by Turks and their allies beyond the Oxus. Soghdians and the people of Bukhārā joined them in an attempt to gain independence from the Arab rule. Realising that Arab garrisons on the Oxus were inadequate to cope with such strong opposition, Ashras set out from Marw with a powerful force in an endeavour to master the situation. Upon his arrival in Āmul he found his route blockaded by the enemy, but his vanguard consisting of 10,000 men led by Qaṭān b. Qutayba had already crossed the river. Although hemmed in and harassed, the contingent seems to have been well entrenched and was able to withstand the enemy until Ashras arrived with the bulk of his forces.

When the contingents under Ashras and Qaṭān were able to join forces, the Arab army defeated their enemy and advanced upon Bīkand. They found that water supplies had been cut but, notwithstanding, they made a determined thrust through enemy lines and marched upon Bukhārā and invested it.¹

Arab victories do not appear to have been decisive and Turkish troops and their allies, contrary to a withdrawal, be-

siegèd the garrison of Kamarja. Unable to capture the garrison by force, the Khāqān sent a delegation to induce a peaceful settlement with the Arabs and to obtain the fortress by negotiation. The Arabs were promised amnesty if they would surrender. The offer was refused and a further delegation led by a certain Bazaghrā, a prominent adviser of the Khāqān, tried further persuasion. The besieged garrison was offered collusion with the Khāqān as mercenaries and double ʿaṭāʾ for their services. At first the offer was contemptuously rejected and fighting again ensued but without decisive result for any of them. After two months' siege the Kamarja garrison realised the hopelessness of a result in their favour and accepted the proposal of safe conduct to withdraw either to Samarqand or al-Dabūsiyya. They chose the latter which was occupied by 10,000 Muqātīla and thus the fortress of Kamarja fell into the hands of the Turks and their allies.¹

¹Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1516-25 (citing Madaʿīni); Ibn al-Athīr, Kamīl, V, pp. 112-4; Nuwayrī, Niḥayat al-ʿArab, XXIX, p.117; Ibn Khaldūn, ʿIbar, III, pp. 188-9. The statement by the sources that the siege of Kamarja continued until the arrival of Arab troops in Farghana is obviously untrue. Farghana was not under Arab rule nor was there any Arab expedition against it at that time. It was impossible for the Arabs to sent troops beyond the Jaxartes while they were facing a serious threat in Soghdiana. For this inaccurate report see: Tabarī, II, p.1520; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamīl, V, p.113; Ibn Khaldūn, ʿIbar, III, p.189.
Although Ashras was campaigning in the district of Bukhāra, his failure to send help to Kamarja suggests that he was in a critical situation.

It was during this time that he was replaced by al-Junayd b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Murrij in 111/729-30. Accompanied by only 500 men1 from his own tribe he proceeded to join Ashras in as short a time as possible. He refused to remain in Āmul and in his haste neglected the precaution of taking reinforcements from the garrison of Zamm to reinforce him. He realised his mistake after crossing the Oxus where he found the enemy very active. He was compelled to ask Ashras for help to break through enemy (Turks and Soghdians) resistance. Headed by ‘Āmir b. Mālik al-Himmanī a force of 7,000 men, sent by Ashras, managed to reach al-Junayd, but only after fighting a minor battle with the Turks and the Soghdians. As the joint forces advanced toward Ashras another clash with the enemy took place at a spot some two leagues from Bīkand and al-Junayd himself had a narrow escape from danger.2

Upon joining Ashras, al-Junayd took command and engaged the enemy near Zarmān, seven leagues from Samarkand. A decisive battle resulted in victory for the Arabs, and the nephew of the Khāqān fell captive and was sent to the Caliph.¹

Special prominence to this battle is not given in the sources, yet it was a decisive victory, for Bukhāra² never again fell into enemy hands during the reign of Hishām and, though temporarily, all the area beyond the Oxus including Samarkand was once again brought under Arab domination. Al-Junayd then returned to Marw where he completely re-organised the administration of almost all districts and changed many key appointments in the province. He seems to have refrained from further expeditions during the remaining part of the year 111/729-30.³

In 112/730 al-Junayd left Marw and encamped by the river Balkh. From there he despatched several expeditions against different places between Tukhāristān in the east to Harāt in the west. It would seem that there were signs of unrest among the

²There is no record of a battle taking place in Bukhāra on this occasion but it is certain that it fell into Arab hands and Qatan b. Qutayba was appointed as its governor. See Tabarî, Tarikh, II, p.1529.
population of these areas and al-Junayd determined to bring them under control in order to protect his army from rear-attack in any further expedition beyond the Oxus. The sizeable army units sent against some of these territories show the seriousness of the situation. Nevertheless, the sources give no details of these events, simply because they were overshadowed by the more dangerous threats, from the Turks, to Arab supremacy in Samarkand and the adjacent districts. While these operations were in process, the Turks advanced upon Samarkand and its governor, Saura b. al-Hurr, appealed to al-Junayd for assistance. Turkish troops were assisted and augmented by the Sogdians in addition to those of Shash and Farghana. Ghurak, the prince of Samarkand, Jabghu of Tukharistan and Ishkand of Nasaf are also reported to have appeared with the Khagan's army. Al-Junayd suspended his expeditions west of the Oxus which later joined him at an unrecorded place and time. When the Arab troops were only four leagues from Samarkand they were surprised by Turkish troops,

---

1 For these expeditions see: Tarikh, II, pp. 1532-3 (citing Mada'in); Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, p.121; Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 171; Nuwayri, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.119; Ibn Khaldun, 'Ibar, III, p.192.

2 Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1534 (citing Mada'in); Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, p.122; Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 171; Ibn Khaldun, 'Ibar, III, p.193. However, the collaboration of Ghurak, the prince of Samarkand, with the Turks in this expedition appears to have confirmed an earlier report (Tabari, II, p.1516) that he had defected to the Turks during Ashras's campaign in 110 A.H.

headed by the Khaqan himself, at al-Shi' b (the defile). Al-Junayd's vanguard was routed and in the fierce fighting which followed the slaves ('Abid) who had been promised freedom, fought valiantly. Neither side appears to have gained a decisive victory and al-Junayd seems to have realised his inability to defeat the formidable army of his enemy, and managed to persuade Sawra b. al-Ḥurr to leave Samarqand and join him hoping thus to reduce enemy pressure. After some hesitation, Sawra left Samarqand at the head of some 12,000 men, but the Khaqan, who had been informed of Sawra's advance, intercepted and engaged him at one league's distance from al-Junayd's camp, and annihilated him together with ten or eleven thousand of his men.

1 These were probably the state-owned slaves (Raqq al-Imara) who were levied from the conquered territories as its share in the ghanima. For further information about these slaves see: Śalih Ahmad al-'All; al-Tanzimat al-Ijtima'iyya wa l-Iqtisadiyya fi al-Basra, pp. 58-9.
2 Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1536, 1543, 1547; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, pp. 122, 125.
3 Tabari, Tarikh, II, p. 1540 (citing Nāda'i'ī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p. 124; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mīrāt al-Zaman, fol. 171; Nuwayri, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p. 120; Ibn Khaldun, 'Ibar, III, p. 193; Ibn Aṭhām maintains that Sawra was leading 20,000 men. See Ibn Aṭhām, Futuh, II, p. 203b; see also Bal'amī, IV, p. 296.
4 Tabari, Tarikh, II, p. 1541; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p. 124; Nuwayri, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p. 120; Ibn Aṭhām says that Sawra with all his men (according to him 20,000 men) were killed. See Ibn Aṭhām, Futuh, II, p. 203b; Khalīfa b. Khayyat also reports that all of Sawra's men perished but he does not specify their number. See Khalīfa's Tarikh, II, p. 358.
It is, however, strange that al-Junayd, instead of regrouping his troops with those of Sawra, marched on Samarqand. Ibn A'θam\footnote{Ibn A'θam, Futūh, II, p. 203b.} maintains that al-Junayd was not aware of the engagement but this report is open to doubt for it was al-Junayd who requested Sawra to come to his aid. It is also unbelievable that he did not know about a battle between Sawra and the Turks which took place at only one league's distance from his own troops. Mada'ini's\footnote{Tabarî, Tarikh, II, p. 1539 (citing Mada'ini).} report that al-Junayd preferred the elimination of Sawra and his troops rather than his own appears to be more reliable.

Whatever the truth was, al-Junayd did not take part in this round of fighting and marched on Samarqand leaving Sawra and his forces to face disaster. Nevertheless, he, also, was intercepted by enemy contingents which he defeated and then continued his advance to Samarqand where he remained until the end of the year (112 A.H.). The Turks and their allies then advanced on Bukhāra which was governed by Qaṭan b. Qutayba but he valiantly withstood the siege.

After consultation with his colleagues al-Junayd left 800 men in Samarqand and decided to attack the enemy who were deploying
their forces between Samarqand and Bukhara. He engaged them at Karminiya and again defeated them. Yet another clash occurred at Tawâwis in which the Turks were again the losers and withdrew to their own territory, whilst the Arab army advanced on Bukhara which lay on their return route to Marw. In Chechaniyân they were reinforced by 20,000 men who were sent by the Caliph from Kôfa and Basra. One account states that they had been sent to Samarqand with orders to evacuate Muslim families and to establish the Muqatila there. Ibn A‘tham gives a completely different account on the aftermath of the disaster suffered by Sawra b. al-Ḫurr and his contingent. He maintains that al-Junayd summoned the Muslims of Khurâsân to aid him against the Turkish enemy and 43,000 men assembled to him. Together with them he marched against the Khâqân who was investing Samarqand and, after a bitter and fierce fight, the Khâqân was defeated and withdrew to his own territory. Ibn A‘tham states that al-Junayd left a garrison of 5,000 men headed by Musâ b. al-ʿAsr of the tribe of Bani Ḥadiyy.

---


2. Tabarî, Tarikh, II, pp. 1552-3 (citing Mâdâ‘înî); Ibn al-Athîr, Kāmil, V, pp. 125, 128; Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Mir‘ât al-Zaman, fol. 171; Nuwayrî, Niḥayat al-ʿArab, XXIX, pp. 120-121.

3. Ibn A‘tham, Futuh, II, pp. 204a-204b; see also Bal‘amî, IV, p. 296.

4. Bal‘amî (IV, p. 296) maintains that the garrison was put under the command of Naṣr b. Sayyâr.
as a defence against further attack and then he returned to Marw. The narrative given by this source about al-Junayd's expedition is, however, confused, and Ibn A'(tham appears not always to be authentic in his descriptions of events in Transoxania. His statements therefore require careful evaluation. Nevertheless, one can deduce from the report of the sources, including Ibn A' tham, that Samarqand remained under Arab domination and, in spite of some serious setbacks and heavy losses, Samarqand and Soghdiana were successfully retained. Al-Junayd's success was sufficiently significant to win the respect of the Turks since no further attacks are recorded by them whilst he remained in office. The abstention of the enemy from raiding the area was probably the main reason why al-Junayd made no further incursions into Transoxania. There was also no sign of unrest in Soghdiana and the population of the Arab controlled territories beyond the Oxus enjoyed two years of comparative stability.

The lull was broken in 116/734 when 'Āsim b. 'Abdallah al-Hilalī assumed the governorship of Khurāsān which was coincident with the serious revolt led by al-Ḥarīth b. Surayj. His short term of office was spent in quelling this rebellion and there is

---

1 Khalīfa b. Khayyāt's statement that al-Junayd b. 'Abd al-Rahmān led, in 114/732, an expedition against Chaghānīān is not confirmed by any other extant source. See Khalīfa's Tarikh, II, p. 360.
no record of any campaigns against the Turks or any others during that time.¹

In 117/735 ʿĀsim b. ʿAbdallāh al-Hilālī was replaced by Asad b. ʿAbdallāh al-Qasrī. The author of Kitāb Tarīkh al-Khulafāʾ affirms, in a statement unrecorded elsewhere, that he was accompanied by 20,000 men headed by Jaʿfar b. Ḥanẓala al-Bahrānī.² It would, however, appear certain that the new governor was accompanied by some troops although not as large a number as is reported by Tarīkh al-Khulafāʾ. This conclusion is supported by the presence of Jaʿfar b. Ḥanẓala al-Bahrānī, the reported leader of the contingent, in Khurāsān, for the first time, after the appointment of Asad al-Qasrī as governor of the province in 117/735; afterwards al-Bahrānī held prominent posts in Khurāsān.³ Further support can be deduced from the report that when Asad al-Qasrī arrived at al-Dandaqān en route to Marw he was preceded by Muḥammad b. Mālik al-Hamadānī at the head of his vanguard.⁴

On the other hand, it would seem that some of the newcomers

¹See chapter, v, pp. 195-9.
²Tarīkh al-Khulafāʾ, p. 211b.
³Ṭabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1609, 1612, 1635.
were Syrians. This is confirmed by the significant role played by them in Asad's campaign of 119/737. In this expedition there is mention of forces from Damascus, Palestine, Qinnasrīn and Ḥims; the latter's jund were led by Ja'far b. Ḥanbalā al-Bahrānī himself.¹

To crush the revolt of al-Ḥarīth b. Surayj was Asad's immediate task and during the first two years of his rule major offensive expeditions beyond the Oxus were excluded. It was, however, stated by Khalīfa b. Khayyat and some later sources that Turks had joined al-Ḥarīth in Marw ar-Rūd̄h when Asad marched against it in 117/735.² Such a statement is open to doubt as Turks had not reached as far, not even at the peak of their power during the governorships of al-Ashras and al-Junayd.

Mada’inī and other later historians give the information that when Asad had pacified the rebels in Zamm (117/735) he advanced upon Samarkand to snatch it from the hands of unnamed infidels. Although there is confirmation that al-Junayd b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Murri successfully held Samarkand under Arab rule,³ it seems that it fell again into enemy hands at an unspecified time. There is, however, no mention in the sources that it was

¹Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1609 (citing Mada’inī).
³See above, pp.240-2.
attacked by the Turks subsequent to al-Junayd's expedition in 112-113/730-1, but it is possible that they, in connivance with Ghurāk, the prince of Samarqand, took advantage of internal troubles caused by al-Ḥārith b. Surayj to snatch at the opportunity to re-occupy the city. Asad appears to have contented himself by cutting its water supplies from Waraghṣar and Samarqand remained in the enemy hands until it was captured by Naṣr b. Sayyar in 121/739.

In the year 118/736 Asad continued his efforts to suppress the revolt led by al-Ḥārith b. Surayj. One report states that he also invaded the land of Jābghu, the king of Tukhāristān, perhaps in revenge against its king who had collaborated with Turks in previous years, or to suppress an uprising by the local population.

It was not until 119/737 that Asad al-Qasrī seriously took the offensive. In al-Khuttal, its king, al-Sabl, died and his heir, al-Ḥanash (or Khadash), had fled together with some forces to China, possibly because of internal dispute in Khuttal. This

---

1 Tābarī, Tārīkh, pp. 1585–6 (citing Madaʾīnī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p.140; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-Arāb, XXIX, p.127; Sibt b. al-Jawzī (Mirʾat al-Zaman, fol. 179) maintains that Asad arrived in Samarqand itself but he records no further information which would throw light on the result of the expedition.

2 Tābarī, Tārīkh, II, p.1591 (citing Madaʾīnī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p.147; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-Arāb, XXIX, p.127.
seems to have happened before the death of al-Sabl who had nominated Ibn al-Sāʾijī, of whom nothing is known but it is certain that he was not a member of the royal family, to be in charge of the territory. Such an opportunity to re-assert Arab control in that province was seized upon by Asad who invaded Khuttal and gained an easy victory and much booty. Ibn al-Sāʾijī appealed to the Khāqān for assistance, who hastened to attack while the Arabs were somewhat scattered over the area.

The prince of Khuttal, who appears to have played a double game, informed Asad al-Qasrī who, though reluctant and suspicious, acted on the information and retreated before the Khāqān's arrival. Baggage, valuable movable property and the aged men were withdrawn in advance, guarded by a force under Ibrāhīm b. Ṭāşim al-‘Uqaylī, supported by Chaghānian troops commanded by Chaghān Khuda, prince of Chaghānīa.

On his part, the Khāqān was supported by the prince of Nāsā and the Soghdians. His forces were said to number 50,000 men.

---

1 Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1593, 1618 (citing Māḏāʾinī); Gibb, The Arab Conquest in Central Asia, p.82.
2 Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1593 (citing Māḏāʾinī); Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir`at al-Zaman, fol. 183; Ibn Kathīr, Bidāya, IX, p.321.
4 Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1598 (citing Māḏāʾinī); Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir`at al-Zaman, fol. 183; Ibn Kathīr, Bidāya, IX, p.323.
This figure is, most probably, exaggerated since it is known that, after his confrontation with Asad, and after being joined by some troops in Tukharistān, the Khaqān's forces numbered only 30,000 men and there is no record that his troops suffered heavy casualties in his engagement with Asad.

The Khaqān and his army overtook Asad's troops as they were crossing the river Balkh and inflicted heavy losses. Confident that the Turks would not follow him to the other side Asad encamped and sent to Ibrāhīm b. 'Āsim al-'Uqaylī to halt his march and to entrench his position. Contrary to Asad's imagination, the Turks succeeded in crossing the river and engaged Asad's forces and again inflicted losses although gaining no decisive victory. The Turks then proceeded to make a surprise attack on the vanguard led by Ibrāhīm al-'Uqaylī and also inflicted heavy defeat on this contingent. The prince of the Chaghānīan troops was killed, as were many of his followers, while many others were captured, as was also the athqāl. Total annihilation was avoided only by the arrival of Asad with his troops and the battle was thereafter known as the "day of al-Athqāl." Asad returned to Balkh and from this year, 118/736, he

---

1 See below, p. 248.
2 Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1593-1602 (citing Mādā'inī); Ibn al-Āthir, Kāmil, V, pp. 148-50; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir'āt al-Zaman, fol. 183; Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, III, pp. 200-202; Ibn Kathīr (Bidaya, IX, pp. 321-322) does not mention the contingent led by Ibrāhīm b. 'Āsim al-'Uqaylī. Mādā'inī gives another but brief report maintaining that the Turks re-attacked Asad's camp on the
adopted the city as his capital. His enemy, the Khāqān, and his army withdrew to Tukharistān.

The Khāqān was, at this stage, joined by the Arab rebel al-Ḥarīth b. Surayj and, counselled by him, the Khāqān planned a winter expedition against Asad while the Arab troops were dispersed. He summoned men from Soghd and the territories beyond the Oxus and even the Jaxartes. In addition to his own Turkish troops and al-Ḥarīth's, the Khāqān is said to have received support from the king of Tukharistān, the king of Soghdiana, and the princes of Ushrusana, Shāsh and Khuttal and his army was said to comprise 30,000 men.2

With an army which was impressively large, though probably numerically exaggerated, he marched on the Arab garrison of Khulm but was repulsed. He marched thence, to Jūzjān where he encamped. Instead, however, of making a concentrated attack, he sent raiders in many directions and depleted his main force to 4,000 men.4

On hearing of the Khāqān's attack, Asad b. 'Abdallāh al-

day following that of the battle of al-ATHqāl. See Tabarī, II, p.1602.

1 See Chapter, V, p.204.
2 Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, pp. 1604, 1609 (citing Mada'īnī); Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 184.
3 Tabarī, Tarīkh, II, p.1604.
al-Qasrî began his preparations to meet the enemy on the battlefield. With an army composed of Syrians and Khurâsânī tribesmen from Balkh and the adjacent villages he marched upon Jûzjân. On his way he was joined by the Arab garrison of Jûzjân under the command of al-Miqdâm b. 'Abd al-Rahmân as well as by the king of Jûzjân and his troops. The attack took place in the neighbourhood of Khâristân and Asad gained a decisive victory, routing the Khâqân and his allied forces and putting them to flight. The Khâqân rapidly retreated to the land of Jabghu, king of Tûkhâristân. A contingent of Asad's army, mainly composed of Syrians and Irâqîs, headed by Ja'far b. Hânzala al-Bahrânî, closely pursued them to the city of Ward in the district of Jazza and then rejoined Asad who returned with his army to Balkh. While on his way he met some Turkish raiders who had been operating between Marw ar-Rudh and Balkh, attacked and killed many while the remainder fled. Reports assert that he sent al-Kimânî in search of any other raiders who may have been part of the Khâqân's forces, but few were found and the insignificance of

---

1 Tabarî, Tarîkh, II, p.1605 (citing Mâdînî); see also p.1603.
3 Tabarî, Tarîkh, II, p.1612 (citing Mâdînî); see also Ibn al-Athîr, Kâmil, V, p.152.
4 Tabarî, Tarîkh, II, p.1612 (citing Mâdînî); Ibn al-Athîr, Kâmil, V, 152.
their number indicates that Turkish invaders had been eliminated from that area and had returned to their own territory.

Nevertheless relations between Turks and Arabs remained hostile and this is confirmed by the participation of some Turks with the Shāsh army against the Arabs in 122-3/741.¹ It was however somewhere during the reign of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik that an embassy was sent to the Khāqān of the Turks together with an invitation to embrace Islām.² Available historical sources make no mention of this embassy and geographical references do not record any exact date on which it was despatched.

Such mention however clearly portrays the continued existence of Turkish power at that time and underlines the ability of the Khāqān to muster a powerful force. The existence of such slender evidence indicates such an embassy would have been sent prior to the years 119-120/737-8, after which there was disruption among the Turkish people and they no longer constituted a threat to the Arabs on the Khurāsānī border. There is no extant evidence of any conclusion reached by the delegation.

¹See below, p.254.

After the battle of Kharistan and until the close of the Umayyad era, Arabs no longer played a defensive role in Transoxania. This was not only due to the result of Asad's victory but also to the confusion of internal strife among the Turks. The decisiveness of this defeat removed Turkish challenge from Transoxania, and instead of raiding Arab-controlled territories the Turks turned to civil strife and raided each other.\(^1\) The Arabs once again established predominance over Soghdiana and territories east of the Oxus and even made expeditions into the lands across the Jaxartes.

Another expedition, although its date is open to doubt, was said to have been launched against al-Khuttal by Asad in 119/737 secondary to that already reported against the Turks in Kharistan which had taken place around the 20th of Dhu'l-Hijja, 119/737.\(^2\) Consequently, it is improbable that both expeditions were undertaken in the second half of the same month. The more likely date of the expedition against al-Khuttal would be the commencement of the year 120/737-8. This expedition was against Badr Tarkhān who originated from Bāmyān. The date of his self-establishment as

---


king of Khuttal is not known but it was probably whilst Asad was campaigning against the Turks and al-Ḥarīth b. Surayj. We have seen that al-Ṣabl, the king of Khuttal, had nominated Ibn al-Sā'īji in charge of the territory before his death in the early part of 119/737 and when Asad raided the country at that time there was no mention of Badr Ṭarkhan. Accordingly it is quite possible that Badr Ṭarkhan usurped the throne of Khuttal at some time in the year 119/737 but how he managed to achieve his aim is a question which cannot be answered because of scarcity of information. However, Asad's expedition ended with the defeat and subsequent murder of Badr Ṭarkhan and the resumption of Arab domination over al-Khuttal.

Asad b. 'Abdallāh al-Qasri died in Balkh early in 120/738 and left Ja'far b. Ḥanṣala al-Bahrānī as his successor. He held it for a brief four months and was then replaced by Naṣr b. Sayyār. Naṣr was a distinguished leader, well familiar and acquainted with the situation in his province. He came, however,

---

1See above, p. 245
2Tabarī, Tarikh, II, pp. 1626-32 (citing Madā'īnī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kamīl, V, pp. 159-60; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 185; Nuwayrī, Niḥāyat al-Arab, XXIX, p. 122; Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, III, p. 304.
3Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p. 1638 (citing Madā'īnī). According to another tradition, Ja'far b. Ḥanṣala was dismissed in favour of Juday b. 'Alī al-Kirmānī. Juday was then replaced by Naṣr b. Sayyār, see Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p. 1659.
at a time when there was no longer a threat from Turks and accordingly he concentrated upon re-establishing Arab supremacy in Soghdiana, dealing with internal problems and crushing the revolt of al-Ḥarith b. Surayj.

Two expeditions were said to have been made by Naṣr across the Oxus during 121/739.¹ The first was intended to re-establish Arab control in Soghdiana and passed via the Iron Gate. The second was into Waraghsar and Samarqand. No fighting is recorded in either expedition. This was due to a realisation by the princes of the concerned territories that any further opposition to Arabs would bring them only disaster and humiliation, especially after the defeat and the withdrawal of their strong ally, the Turks, at the hands of Asad al-Qasrī in 119/737. Consequently, they appear to have surrendered to Naṣr without serious resistance.

A third campaign is reported in 121/739 against Shāsh. It appears unlikely, however, that all three would have taken place in the same year, particularly as it was customary for Arab troops to disperse during winter. It was, however, during this year (121/739) that Naṣr changed the capital of Khurasan from Balkh to its traditional place, Marw² and, as a consequence, a longer

¹Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1688-9 (citing Mada‘inī); Ibn al-Athīr, Ḳāmil, V, p.177; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.122.
²Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1688, 1689 (citing Mada‘inī).
period for preparation was necessary for any expedition beyond
the Jaxartes.¹ As it will be seen, the king of Shāšh sued Naṣr
for peace as a result of this expedition and it was offered, but
Chinese records state that in the year 741 an embassy was sent to
China, expressing fear of Arab incursions into Shāšh.² If this
report is correct Naṣr's campaign would not have taken place be­
fore the year 741/122-3.

Several reports of this event are given by the sources.
When compared, they show little variance and some are supplemen­
tary. The thread of their theme is presented here, with considera­
tion having been given to their slight divergence.

Instructed by Yūsuf b. "Umar, Naṣr campaigned against Shāšh
where al-Ḥarīth had taken refuge.³ As he crossed the Oxus and
passed through Soghdiana he was joined by 20,000 men from Bukhāra,
Samarqand, Kish and Usrusana.⁴ When Naṣr reached the Jaxartes he
found his crossing opposed by the allied forces of Shāšh, al-
Ḥarīth b. Surayj and some Turks. The forces skirmished but there
was no tangible result. One narrative asserts that Korsūl, the

¹It should be noted that the expedition against Shāšh was sent out
from Marw. See Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1689; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil,
V, p.177.
²Chavannes, Documents, p.142; Gibb, op.cit.; p.90.
³Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1692 (citing Mādā'īnī); Ibn al-Athīr,
Kāmil, V, p.178; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir'āt al-Zaman, Fol. 190;
Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.122.
⁴Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1690 (citing Mādā'īnī); Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil,
V, p.177; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.122.
Turkish leader, was captured and executed by Arabs. It further says that Korsûl's soldiers burned their tents, cut off their ears, and scratched their faces.¹ This appears to be extremely unlikely, and seems to brand the report as a forgery.

Another tradition claims that it was al-Akhram, a prominent Turkish horseman, who was caught and killed.² It is however possible, as Professor Gibb³ maintains, that the first account wrongly refers to the cavalryman as Korsûl.

It is, however certain that Nasr was not defeated during this skirmish and that he was finally able to force his way to Shash. It would appear that the king of Shash realised his inability to repulse the invaders after the preliminary skirmish on the Jaxartes and endeavoured to conciliate the Arab leader. Alternatively Nasr's confidence in gaining a decisive victory had lessened and realised that even a minor Arab defeat might be disastrous in such a remote area; it could also restore the confidence of the Soghdians and other recruits from Transoxania in the Turks and their allies. This, he knew, might lead to

¹Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1690-1; Ibn al-Athîr, Kâmîl, V, pp. 177-8; Nuwayri, Nihayat al-Arâb, XXIX, p.122; Sibt b. al-Jawzî, Mir'ât al-Zaman, fol. 190; Ibn Kathîr, Bidâya, IX, p.327.
³Gibb, The Arab Conquest in Central Asia, p.91.
their desertion from, and thus the weakening of, his army. Naṣr wisely accepted the proffered peace and concluded a treaty by which al-Ṭarīḥ b. Surayj was banished from Shāsh to Farāb and Arab representation was established in Shāsh.¹ Naṣr then raided Farghāna and also made peace with its prince and then returned to Marw.² No further military expeditions were made by Naṣr during the period under discussion.

¹Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1694-5; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.178; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.122; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirʿat al-Zaman, fol. 190 (he maintains that, after the clash on the Jaxartes, Naṣr returned to Samarqand and then marched on Shāsh). A similar tradition is also related by Tabari, II, pp. 1693-4. However, this account is open to doubt for there was no reason for such unwise and costly action.

²Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1695-6; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.179; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirʿat al-Zaman, fol. 190; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.123. According to another tradition, Naṣr appointed Muḥammad b. Khalid al-Azdi as his representative in Farghāna, see Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1694. A third tradition states that Farghāna was subjugated immediately after the preliminary clash on the Jaxartes. See Tabari, Tarikh, II, pp. 1691. However, despite all these different accounts on the subjugation of Farghāna, they all agree that it surrendered to the Arabs.
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THE ARAB CONQUEST IN CAUCASUS.

After al-Jarrāḥ b. ‘Abdallāḥ al-Ḥakami gained a major victory over the Khazars in 104/722-3\(^1\) he sent to Caliph Yazīd II requesting re-inforcements which he probably hoped would assist him in ending any further appearance from them in the Caucasus. His envoy, however, only reached Damascus after Yazīd had died in Rabī‘ II, 105/724. His brother and successor Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik confirmed al-Jarrāḥ's position as governor of Armenia and Adharbayjān and head of the Arab armies there. He promised the desired re-inforcements but there is no record that this promise was kept at that time.

Some sources, however, mention a battle which took place in Ramdaḥan 105/724 between al-Jarrāḥ and Khazar troops led by the Khāqān in person and of the defeat and flight of Khazars.\(^2\) Khalīfa b. Khayyāt\(^3\) places the encounter at the confluence of the rivers Kur and Araxes; but the later historians, Dhahabi and Ḥanbalī, say the engagement took place in Armenia.\(^4\) More reliable

---

\(^1\) See Chapter I, p.64.


\(^4\) Dhahabi, 'Ibar, I, p.128; Ḥanbalī, Shadharāt, I, p.128.
sources\(^1\) state that al-Jarrah's campaign in 105/724 was against the Alans and that he destroyed some towns and fortresses and captured considerable booty.

In view of the devastating defeat suffered by the Khazars at the end of 104/723 it is improbable that they could rally a sufficiently strong force to advance into Armenia in so short a time and suggests the greater authenticity of the last-mentioned sources. Nevertheless, the success of this campaign does not appear to have been conclusive as al-Jarrah led yet another expedition against them in 106/724-5, reached beyond Balanjar, and forced the Alans not only to capitulate but to pay tribute.\(^2\)


\(^{2}\) Khalifa b. Khayyat, Tarikh, II, p.349 (citing Abu Khalîd); Ya’qubi, Tarikh, II, p.394; Ibn al-Athîr, Kamil, V, p.100; Nuwyari, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.116; Dhahabi, Tarikh al-Islâm, IV, p.88; however, Tabari (Tarikh, II, p.1472) and Sibî b. al-Jawzi (Mir’at al-Zaman, fol. 160) report this expedition but maintain that the leader was al-Hajjâj b. ‘Abd al-Malik. This statement is quoted by Gabrieli, Il Califato di Hisham, p.76 (he relied on Tabari). Azdî (Tarikh al-Mawsil, p.22) makes a very brief and unreliable statement when he says that al-Jarrah invaded Armenia, penetrated Khazaria and compelled the Khazars to pay tribute. Armenia was at that time under Arab control and showed no sign of unrest. There is also no report that the Khazars paid tribute as a result of the expedition of al-Jarrah in 106/724-5. It is likely that al-Azdî confused the Khazars with the Alans. It is noteworthy that many Arab historians appear to regard the land of Alans as a part of Khazaria. The report of al-Azdî is, however, repeated by al-Hanbalî (Shadharat, I, p.133) who does not mention the raid against Armenia. Ibn Kathîr (Bidaya, IX, p.234) speaks of two expeditions: one led by al-Jarrah against the Khazars and the other by al-Hajjâj b. ‘Abd al-Malik against the Alans.
Perhaps al-Jarraḥ's ambitions were a little too advanced, as in 107/725-6 he was replaced by the Caliph's brother, Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik. ¹ During the early stages of his governorship Maslama appointed al-Ḥarīth b. ‘Amr al-Ta’ī as his deputy. ² No reason for this is given in extant sources or why the Caliph concurred in the arrangement. Maslama was, at the time, campaigning against the Byzantines in Asia Minor and, in 107/725-6-108/726-7, was leading expeditions against their territory in that sector. ³

This arrangement would seem to confirm the suggestion that the Caliph was not, at the time, inclined to make a major military enterprise on the Caucasian front.

It was not a great while, however, before al-Ḥarīth was engaged in campaign against the Khazars and the sources relate that


²Baladhurī, Ibn Aḥām, the author of Ghurar al-Sīyar and Bālāmī show that al-Jarrah's governorship continued without interruption until he fell in battle in 112/730. By comparing their narratives with those of other extant sources it becomes clear that they disregard the events following al-Jarrah's great victory of 104/722-3. They resumed their account with the reappointment of al-Jarrah in 111/729-30. See Baladhurī, Futūḥ, p. 206; Ibn Aḥām, Futūḥ, II, pp. 181b-184a; Ghurar al-Sīyar, fols. 98-9; Bālāmī, IV, pp. 274-5.

he invaded their land in 107/725-6 conquering *rustaq* and several towns. However, their location is unknown but it is hardly tenable that they were in Khazaria. Nevertheless, his victories were indecisive and in 108/726-7 the khazar army advanced south as far as Warthān on the northern frontier of the province of Adharbayjan and laid siege to it. The leader of the Khazars was reported as the son of the *Khaqān* who was met by al-Ḥārīth and was defeated and his army put to flight. The place of battle is not specifically stated but Khalīfa b. Khayyāt and al-Azdī infer

---

2. The name of the son of the Khaqān is variously recorded by the sources. Khalīfa b. Khayyāt (*Tārīkh*, II, p.351) records it as Yarshīk or Yarashaynak; Ibn Aʿtham records it variously as Barsīk (*Futūh*, II, p.182b), Barsīk (p.183a), Barsībīk (p.185a), Barsībīk (p.185b), Barsībīk (p.186b; 187b; 188a; 188b). Balʿamī (IV, pp. 271,274) records it as Barḵhebek but the translator, Zatenburg, added a query. Dunlop (History of the Jewish Khazars, pp. 63,69) prefers Barjīk; Minorsky (A new book on the Khazars, *Oriens*, II, p.126) suggests that the name should be read as Barḏing; A.N. Kurat prefers Barsībīk which he compares with the name of the Khaqān’s widow, Parsbit, and considers that they both signify the same thing, namely leopard. See A.N. Kurat, “Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd b. ʿAṭhaḥ al-Kūfī’s Kitāb al-Futūḥ and its importance concerning the Arab conquest in Central Asia and the Khazars,” *AUDTCFD*, VII, 1949, p. 280; Artamonov (History of the Khazars, pp. 211-2) prefers Bar-daǰīl but suggests that it was a title of the son of the Khaqān and not his actual name.
that it was somewhere beyond the river Araxes. Ibn al-Athīr and Nuwayrī mention two battles, one before and the other beyond that river. Some sources say that al-Ḥarīth b. 'Amr, the Arab leader, was killed on the battlefield. This report is untrue because he appears as a participant in later battles against the Khazars.

The aggression of the Khazars in Adharbayjan appears to have disquieted Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik as he relinquished his wars against the Byzantines and resumed the leadership of the army which invaded the Khazars via Adharbayjan in 109/727-8, returning with booty and captives. No mention is made of any specific battle fought by Maslama during this expedition but the information that the Khazars had retreated beyond the Araxes during the previous year suggests that his operations took place in the same area, probably in the Arrān district between the rivers Araxes and Kur.

---

1 Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Tarīkh, II, p.351; Azdī, Tarīkh al-Mawsil, p.27.
4 See below, pp. 265.
Ya‘qūbī, in an unconfirmed account, relates that Maslama advanced into Khazaria through Bāb Allān (Darial pass) and met the Khāqān himself, no doubt on the battlefield. This statement seems to be anticipatory of the campaign which was to take place in the next year (110/728-9) particularly when it is remembered that he neglects to mention this expedition.

The first major expedition undertaken by Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik against the Khazars was in 110/728-9. He advanced through Bāb Allān and then marched eastwards and confronted the Khazar army, led by the Khāqān in person, near Bāb al-Abwāb, and defeated them after a month of fighting. Some of the sources give 7 Jumāda II, 110/728 as the precise date of Maslama's victory. There were heavy rains during the campaign which

---

1 Ya‘qūbī, Tarīkh, II, p.395. D.M. Dunlop (History of the Jewish Khazars, pp. 67-8) seems to have relied on this narrative of al-Ya‘qūbī and states that Maslama advanced through Adharbayjān, reoccupied the Darial pass and then marched into Khazaria where he met the Khāqān himself and returned with booty and prisoners. Dunlop, however, refers to Ibn al-Athīr as another source of information concerning this event but this work does not provide such details.


some sources erroneously name as Waq‘at al-Tin (the battle of mud). This would appear to be confused with a later battle when the army was commanded by Marwan b. Muhammad. A contradictory account of Maslama’s expedition, given by the Christian author Michael the Syrian, states that it was a set-back for him and his army. That it was not completely decisive in favour of the Arabs is confirmed by the re-appearance of the Khazars in Adharbayjan itself during the next year. A further evidence of the indecisiveness of this expedition can be deduced from the report which says that Maslama was intercepted on his return journey by Khazars near Bāb Allān but reached Adharbājjan safely after a minor clash with them.

In 111/729-30 Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik was replaced by al-Jarrāḥ b. ‘Abdallah al-Hakamī as governor of Armenia and Adharbājjan and the supreme commander of the Arab army in that region.

2 See below, p.295.
Previous to his arrival the Khazars had descended upon Adharbajjan and had been routed by al-Ḥārith b. Ṭaʾī, but the sources give no details of the skirmish which appears to relegate the incident into insignificance. Also according to the sources, al-Jarrah advanced into Khazaria, defeated the Khazars and captured their capital al-Bayda on the lower Volga. This is said to have immediately followed his arrival in Armenia and to have taken place in the same year. It would seem that al-Jarrah's victory had been exaggerated, particularly as there is no supporting evidence that his army was sufficiently formidable to attempt a campaign on such a large scale. Indeed, in the following year he appealed to the caliph for re-inforcements against the new threat by the Khazars. Had the Khazars suffered such an ignominious defeat, it is doubtful that they could so quickly recover and, in the following year, inflict a disastrous defeat upon the Arabs right in the heart of Adharbajjan.

1Ṭabarî, Tarīkh, II, p.1526; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.117; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arāb, XXIX, p.118; Artamonov, History of the Khazars, p.211, Dunlop, op.cit., p.68.


3See below, p.269.
Baladuhr I's account concerning this event is of an entirely different nature. It lacks chronology but states that al-Jarrah arrived in Armenia and stabilised weights and measures. For the latter he standardised the bushel which became known by his name and al-Baladur I says it remained in use in his time. When he completed the business of administration he turned his attention to campaigning. He crossed the river Kur advancing first east and then north crossing the river Samur where he met the Khazar army presumably between that river and Hamzin. The Khazars seem to have been defeated and al-Jarrah then attacked the people of Hamzin and forced them to capitulate and to settle in two villages which belonged to Khaysan territory. From thence he advanced into Ghuimiq, capturing many of the inhabitants. This operation concluded and he then returned to Shakk which he made his headquarters for the winter.

Baladur I's account seems to be the more reasonable as he makes no mention of any deep penetration into Khazaria nor does he claim that al-Jarrah occupied al-Bayda', the Khazar capital. He gives as the furthest point reached during this expedition, Ghuimiq, south of the land of Sarir (Avaria). All accounts agree

---

1Baladuhr I, Futuh, p. 206.
that al-Jarrah spent that winter in Shakki.\(^1\) The sources\(^2\) state
that the caliph sent him a letter whilst he was wintering there,
promising reinforcements and ordering him to move against the
Khazars. As no reinforcement arrived and the Khazars did not ap­
pear in the area at that time, the report should be carefully

treated. If such a letter was actually sent to al-Jarrah, it was
most probably sent after his return to Adharbayjan and the enemy's

arrival in that district.

When winter was over al-Jarrah returned to Adharbayjan via
Bardha'a, Baylaqan, Warthan and Bajarwan to Ardabil\(^3\) which was in­
habited by 30,000 Muslims.\(^4\) Khalīfa b. Khayyat\(^5\) together with
the later historian al-Ḥanbalī\(^6\) maintain that it was the Khazars
who first moved to Ardabil and that al-Jarrah marched to its res­
cue. This statement appears unlikely particularly when it is re­
membered that Ardabil was besieged and stormed after the death of
al-Jarrah.\(^7\)

\(^1\)For the location of Shakki see Minorsky, Hudud al-Ālam, p.398;

idem, E.I.(1), Art. "Shekki".

\(^2\)Ibn A'tham, Futūḥ, II, p.182a; Bal'amī, IV, p.274.

\(^3\)Ibn A'tham, Futūḥ, II, p.182a; Bal'amī, IV, p.274; Ghurar al­
Siyar, fol. 98 (says that al-Jarrah advanced from Armenia); see
also Turkish Ṭabarî, English translation by Kazem-Beg, in
Derbend-Namuh, appendix, extract V, pp. 175-6.

\(^4\)Ibn A'tham, Futūḥ, II, pp. 182a-182b; according to Bal'amī (IV,
p.274) and the Turkish Ṭabarî (op.cit., p.176) the number was
3,000.


\(^6\)Hanbalī, Shadharat, I, p.144.

\(^7\)See below, pp. 270-1.
In 112/730 Arabs and Khazars met in Adharbayjan in one of their most serious battles. After his arrival in Ardabil, al-Jarrah sent contingents to raid in all directions, many of them were said to have been directed against Muqan and Jilan and the adjacent areas. As these territories were already under Arab control, the raids would appear to have been punitive, probably because of suspected collusion with the Khazars, or, alternatively, because of attempted breakaways during Arab engagement with the Khazars in previous years. However, during this period the Arab army was scattered and offered the Khaqan, who was well aware of this fact, an opportunity to amass his men against the depleted Arab forces. With an army, said by some to have numbered 300,000 men while others estimated it at 100,000 which is perhaps nearer to the actual number, the Khazars advanced upon the Arabs. They were led by the son of the Khaqan with orders to rout the Arabs and put an end to their menace to the Khazar kingdom from the south.

1 Ibn A'tham, Futuh, II, p.182b; Ghurar al- Siyar, fol. 98 (erroneously records the names of the places as Mawqalân and Khaylan); Bal'ami, IV, p.274.
2 Ghurar al- Siyar, fol. 98, Artamonov, op.cit., p.213; Dunlop, op. cit., p.69.
3 Ibn A'tham, Futuh, II, p.182b; Bal'amî, IV, p.274; Turkish Tabari, op.cit., p.176.
4 Ghurar al- Siyar, fol. 98.
On hearing of the Khazar advance, al-Jarrāḥ appealed to the caliph for help to fight this formidable army but no information is recorded of auxiliary troops. Perhaps the request arrived too late especially when it is remembered that the appeal for additional troops was made after the enemy advance upon Adharbayjan.

The Khazars swarmed through Bab Allan (Darial pass) southward to Adharbayjan. North-east of Adharbayjan they stormed Warthān and then advanced to Ardabil, encamping near the town. Al-Jarrāḥ was, on this occasion, joined by Mardānshāh, the dih-ğan of Adharbayjan, who had been a magian but converted to Islam. His presence in al-Jarrāḥ's camp suggests the presence of also local troops among the Arab army. Mardānshāh is said to have advised al-Jarrāḥ to await the arrival of reinforcements from Syria before engaging in any major battle against the Khazars but al-Jarrāḥ, with foolish egotism, decided to fight. Several places are cited by the sources but it is certain that the battlefield

1Ibn A'ṭham, Futuh, II, p.182b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 98.
2Ibid.
3Ibn A'ṭham, Futuh, II, p.182b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 99, Bal'ami, IV, p.275. Turkish Tabari also reports the conversion of Mardānshāh but Kazem-Beg omitted it in his translation. See Derbend-Nameh, appendix, p.176, note 53.
was in the neighbourhood of Ardabil. It was the most furious of all battles fought between the contestants and the numerical superiority of the Khazars over the Arab army resulted in almost

---

1 Some sources state the battlefield was at Marj Ardabil. See Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1531; Khalifa b. Khayyat, Tarikh, II, p.357 (citing Ibn al-Kalbi); Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, p.118; Nuwayri, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.118; Ibn Kathir, Bidaya, IX, p.303. Ibn A'tham (Futuh, II, p.183a) places it near the village of Shahrazad; the author of Ghrurar al-Siyar (fol. 98) cites the village of Shahrawaran; Bal'amî (IV, p.275) states it was the village of Shirwan (Schirwan). However, it would seem that the village cited by Ibn A'tham, Ghrurar and Bal'amî was the same town but it was differently recorded due to diacritical error. However, all these authorities agree on positioning it near Mount Sabalan, erroneously recorded as Sîlan. The same error is repeated by both Gabrieli (Il Califato di Hisham), p.77, n.2 and Artamonov (History of the Khazars, p.213). Mount Sabalan was three leagues distant from Ardabil. See Ibn Hawqal, Masa'lik, Leiden, 1872, p.238, see also Hudud al-‘Alam, p.66.

Some sources erroneously maintain that Balanjar was the battlefield. See Tabari, Tarikh, II, p.1531 (citing Waqidi); Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, p.118; Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Mir‘at al-Zaman, fol. 172; Ibn Khaldun, ‘Ibar, III, p.190. Khalifa b. Khayyat (Tarikh, II, p.356) gives Arshaq while Sibt b. al-Jawzi (Mir‘at, fol. 172) in another report, asserts that al-Jarrah met death in Asaq. The two villages are probably synonymous but diverge nominally due to diacritical error. However, Sibt added that the village was near Balanjar which was far from the place of conflict.

Baladhuri (Futuh, II, p.206) gives the position near a watercourse, then known as Nahr al-Jarrah, four leagues distant from the borders of Armenia. However, Ibn A'tham (Futuh, II, p.182b) and the author of Ghrurar al-Siyar (fol. 98) maintain that al-Jarrah moved from Sabalan and crossed this watercourse to the village (Shahrzad or Shahrawaran) where the battle took place. Thus Nahr al-Jarrah seems to have been located near Mount Sabalan, which was four leagues from Arbadil. The author of Ghrurar even identifies it as Nahr Arbadil. Accordingly Baladhuri's statement that it was four leagues from the Armenian border is most probably not authentic.
total annihilation of the Arab forces. Al-Jarrah, who was reputedly a brilliant general, was killed and the survivors of his army were said to have been less than 700 men. According to another tradition they were a mere 100 men. In the barbarous custom of those times al-Jarrah's head was severed and his wife and children were taken into captivity. The majority of the Arab survivors met the same fate while a very few escaped. Loaded with booty, the Khazars marched upon Ardabil. After a heavy siege the city fell. The Muslims despaired of relief and capitulated and the Khazars sacked the city and many adjacent towns. Some sources maintain that the victors ad-

---

1 Ibn A'tham, Futuh, II, p.183a.
2 Bal'ami, IV, p.275; Turkish Tabari, op.cit., p.177.
vanced southwards to Mosul, ravaging its outskirts and threaten­ing the city itself.

The sources also relate that in the same year (112/730) Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik led an Arab army against the Khazars, advancing beyond Bāb al-‘Abwāb where he left al-Ḥarīth b. ‘Amr al-Ṭā‘ī as governor of the city.¹ This appears to be unlikely because Maslama was not governor of Armenia and Ḍaḥarbayjān at that time; al-Jarrāḥ who had held office since 111/729 was killed during Ramadan 112/730.² Ibn al-Kalbī³ says that Maslama’s expedition took place in Shawwāl of the same year. It would, indeed, be strange if Maslama were so quickly able to rout a victorious enemy which threatened Mosul after such a recent and disastrous defeat. Moreover the expedition is mentioned as a mere routine military operation to which little prominence is given. It would seem that the account is either anticipatory of Maslama’s campaign at the end of 113/731-2 or a probable duplication of that of 110/728-9 when there had been

³ Ibid., p.357 (citing Ibn al-Kalbī).
heavy rains. In this connection it is noteworthy that the account places the expedition in the winter.

The disastrous defeat ending with the tragic death of al-Jarrah in the year 112/730 was a severe blow to the caliph Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik. He was, however, resolved that the Khazars should not put an end to Arab domination in Adharbayjan and the Caucasus and immediately began preparations for a major attack upon them. To this end he summoned Sa'id al-Ḥarashi from Manbij and invested him with leadership of the army, which was to restore Arab predominance in Armenia, Adharbayjan and the

1See above, p. 263.
3Ibn Aʿtham (Futūḥ, II, p. 183b) says that news of al-Jarrah's defeat was brought to Hishām by an army straggler named Saqlab. Accordingly Artamonov (History of the Khazars, p. 213, n. 47) suggests that there were Ṣaqāliba (Slavs) among al-Jarrah's army. This suggestion has no support and even Ibn Aʿtham does not give such information. There is much confusion concerning the spelling and diacritics of names and places and it is impossible to know whether the name Ṣaqlab was accurately quoted. The name, however, has little actual significance. The messenger was probably an Arab or Adharbayjānī Muslim from the followers of Mardānshah, the dihğan of Adharbayjan, who had converted to Islam and was killed with al-Jarrah while fighting the Khazars, but such a mission would scarcely have been entrusted to a stranger at a critical time.
Caucasus.\(^1\) Baladhuri\(^2\) and Ya'qubi's\(^3\) accounts maintain that Hisham appointed his brother Maslama as governor of Armenia and Adharbayjan in addition to making him leader of the Arab army, giving Sa'id al-Harashi command of the vanguard. The fact that Maslama did not appear in Adharbayjan prior to Sa'id's victory over the Khazars causes doubt of their account. Neither would it be likely to use a vanguard to engage the enemy in such an important operation, or how - if permitted - it could alone achieve such a brilliant victory. Ya'qubi, though speaking of event after al-Jarrah's death, maintains that Maslama's appointment was in 107/725-6. He seems to be confused over the two appointments of Maslama, that in 107/725-6 and that which took place after Sa'id's deposition. However, even during the first appointment, it was al-Harith b. 'Amr al-Ta'i, not Sa'id, who was Maslama's deputy\(^4\) and Sa'id's appearance at the head of the


\(^2\) Baladhuri, Futuh, p. 206.

\(^3\) Ya'qubi, Tarikh, II, pp. 380-1.

\(^4\) See above, p. 260.
army was not before 112/730. Balādhuṟī and Ya‘qūbī’s confusion appears to have arisen over Saʿīd’s maltreatment by Maslama when the latter supplanted him. This habit of maltreating a predecessor was not unusual among Arab governors and Saʿīd’s case should not be regarded as exceptional.

In view of this discussion and relying on the reports of the majority of the extant sources it is certain that al-Jarrāḥ was succeeded by Saʿīd b. ‘Amr al-Ḥarashi. He was provided with weapons and equipment and advanced to al-Raqqa. He was accompanied by some prominent Syrians and his own relatives and was instructed to wait at al-Raqqa for the arrival of the main army. Here he was joined by 30,000 men¹ and Hishām also sent 100,000 dirhams² for distribution among the warriors. Another report³ states that Saʿīd left for al-Raqqa with 40 post horses. He asked the caliph for the daily despatch of another 40 and also to order the military chiefs en route to join him. The first mentioned report of 30,000 reinforcements appears the more likely at a time when an Arab victory was crucial to the caliph.

¹Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.184b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 99; Turkish Ṭabarī, op.cit., p.177.
²Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.184b; Ghurar al-Siyar (fol. 99) gives the figure as being 200,000 dirhams; see also Balʿamī, IV, p.276.
This appears to receive confirmation by Ibn A‘tham\(^1\) when he states that, during the engagement with the enemy, Syrians comprised the bulk of the army.

Sa‘id left al-Raqqā at the head of a strong force augmented on route by Muslim residents from every city he passed in the Jazīra. At Arzan (Arzen), in the north-east of Jazīra, he met the few survivors from al-Jarrāh’s army. They were given food and equipment and their number was added to Sa‘īd’s army.\(^2\) In Armenia he had to overcome some chiefs who had taken advantage of al-Jarrāh’s defeat and declared independence. Sa‘īd first conquered Akhlāṭ (Khilat) on the lake Van and proceeded to subdue all fortresses on his way to Bardha‘a.\(^3\) The statement by Dunlop\(^4\) that Sa‘īd found the Khazars in possession of Akhlāṭ appears to be unsupported by evidence. No report of their presence in that area is found even after their victory

\(^1\) Ibn A‘tham, Futūḥ, II, p.188b.

\(^2\) Ibn A‘tham, Futūḥ, II, p.184b; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.118; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-Arab, XXIX, p.119; Ibn Khaldūn, Ibar, III, p.191 (records the name of the city as Azūr); Bal‘amī, IV, p. 276; Turkish Tabārī, op.cit., p.177 (records the city as Arden–den but Kazem-Beg prefers to call it by one of the following names: Ardenok, Arden on Arzen. See note 55 of the same page).


\(^4\) Dunlop, History of the Jewish Khazars, p.72.
over al-Jarrāh. Had they been in occupation, Sa'īd would probably have found Akhlāṭ and the other fortresses en route less easy to subdue.

In Bardha‘a Sa'īd harangued his troops, exhorting unity and co-operation among them and asking the richer members to help the poorer in brotherly unity. His words were received with enthusiasm and the army urged him to hasten the attack.¹

Sa'īd employed a brilliant strategy in his advance to meet the Khazars. He had marched northwards from Armenia to Arrān and then moved south upon Adharbayjān and cut the supply route of the enemy from Khazaria. After seizing Bardha‘a he next marched upon Baylaqān. There he was approached by one of the local inhabitants and informed that a division of Khazars, commanded by one of the Khazar Tarkhāns, was in the vicinity. The man further informed him that the enemy commander had abducted his daughters, that he drank heavily and was completely unaware of any Arab army in the district. At the head of a contingent of horsemen, the Syrian ‘Abd al-Malik b. Muslim al-‘Uqaylī was sent to the village where the Tarkhān was reputed to be carousing. Whilst in a drunken sleep he was surprised by an Arab attack and

¹Ibn A‘tham, Futūḥ, II, p.185a; Bal‘amī, IV, p.277; Turkish Ta- bārī, op.cit., p.178.
was cut to pieces and his men were eliminated. The girls were freed and were returned to their father.\footnote{Ibn A’tam, Futuh, II, pp. 185a-185b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 99; \textit{Bal’ami}, IV, p.277; Turkish \textit{Tabari}, op.cit., p.178, n.56.}

Although accepted at face value by modern scholars,\footnote{Dunlop, op.cit., p.72; Artamonov, op.cit., p.214.} the account appears a little romantic and exaggerated. It was in all probability a small number of \textit{Khazars} who were in Baylaqān district at that time. Nevertheless, the sources give the description of al-‘Uqaylī’s engagement with the \textit{Khazars} as the first victory achieved by Sa‘īd al-Ḥarashī’s forces, and confirm that it was won in the district of Baylaqān.\footnote{Ibn A’tam, Futuh, II, p.185b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 100; \textit{Bal’ami}, IV, p.277.} It was here that Sa‘īd learned that the \textit{Khazars} were besieging Warthan. According to reports a certain Bazdak al-Baylaqani,\footnote{The sources say that he was a Muslim of Persian origin, but his nisba infers that he was a citizen of al-Baylaqān. \textit{Bal’ami} (IV, p.278) records his name as Yazdak.} was sent to the city with news that the Arab army was moving rapidly to its relief and that they should not surrender. He was said to have been intercepted by the enemy who afterwards released him on condition that he changed the gist of his message. He was to tell the Muslim residents they could not hope for imminent relief. He gave the required promise which he broke immediately.
he reached the city walls and announced that al-Ḥarashī's army would relieve them in two days. He paid the penalty of death at the hands of the Khazars as soon as the words were spoken. ¹

Whether this report is accurate is a matter for conjecture but it would appear to be certain that news of al-Ḥarashī's arrival had been somehow circulated and the Muslim resistance there was undiminished. The Khazars also seem to have been aware of the imminent arrival of the Arab army as they lifted the siege shortly before its arrival, possibly to avoid being entrapped between the garrison of the town and the on-coming forces. Thus the town fell, without difficulty or engagement, to al-Ḥarashī. Meanwhile the Khazars retreated southwards to Ardabil. Al-Ḥarashī who was joined by a further 2,000 men from Warthan began his pursuit of the enemy and arrived in Bājarwan which he used as his military base. ² Here he received information that some 10,000 Khazars were encamped in a place some four leagues away and were holding some 5,000 Muslim prisoners. ³ His

¹ Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, pp. 185b-186a; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 100; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p. 119; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-ʿArab, XXIX, p. 119; Balʿamī, IV, p. 278; see also Ibn Khaldūn, Ibar, III, p. 191
² Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p. 186a; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 100, Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-ʿArab, XXIX, p. 119; Balʿamī, IV, p. 279.
³ Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 100; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p. 119; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-ʿArab, XXIX, p. 119; Balʿamī, IV, p. 279; Turkish Tabarī, op.cit., p. 180. Ibn Aʿtham (Futūḥ, II, p. 186a) does not mention the Khazar number and appears to confuse number of Muslim prisoners with that of the Khazars, stating that they were 10,000.
informant was said to have been the rider of a white horse, describing himself as a servant of God.\(^1\) This mysterious person appeared on several occasions, often repeating such missions. His only identification by the sources is given by Ibn Khaldūn,\(^2\) who calls him al-Ḥarashi’s spy.

There was doubtless a germ of truth in this mystical and legendary story. It would seem that the rider was one of an advance reconnaissance squadron despatched by al-Ḥarashi to acquire information concerning enemy movement. This theory gains further credence from the statement that Ibrāhîm b. ʿĀqīm al-ʿUqaylī, who knew Khazar language, was sent to investigate their whereabouts.\(^3\) This confirms that it was al-Ḥarashi’s practice to use reconnaissance patrols and Ibrāhîm al-ʿUqaylī was probably the mysterious horseman of whom the sources speak.

Ibrāhîm al-ʿUqaylī appears to have been of great value to al-Ḥarashi as he was said to have slipped in amongst the enemy soldiers, gleaning information from listening to their conversation and passing it to his chief. He also informed al-Ḥarashi

---

\(^1\) Ibn Aṭham, Futuh, II, p.186a; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 100; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p.119; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.119; Balʿamī, IV, p.279; Turkish Tabarî, op.cit., p.180.


\(^3\) Ibn Aṭham, Futuh, II, p.186b; Balʿamī, IV, p.279; Turkish Tabarî, p.180.
that he had witnessed one of the Khazar Tärkhän̄s trying to harm one of al-Jarrah's slave-girls who had fallen into their hands after her master's defeat and death. Sa'īd together with 4,000 of his men marched against the enemy at dawn from four directions in a surprise attack. The result was a merciless massacre of the Khazars and the liberation of their Muslim captives. With spoils gained by their victory the Arab contingent returned to Bējarwan.¹

Twenty-thousand² of the Khazars were also reported as being stationed in Mīmādh³ and al-Harashī attacked them there. The battle was fierce and many more Khazars died while the remainder fled leaving a quantity of booty for the Arab army to seize and carry to Bējarwan.⁴

The son of the Khaqān, who had remained with the bulk of the army, which had not yet been involved in the disastrous defeat

---

¹ Ibn A'tham, Futūḫ, II, pp. 186b-187a; Ghurar al-Siyar, fols. 100-101; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p. 119; Nuwayri, Niḥayat al-Arab, XXIX, p. 119; Bal'āmī, IV, p. 280; Turkish Tabarî, p. 180 (thoughout his narrative concerning these events he gives Bakhū (Bāku) instead of Bajarwan, see pp. 179-184).
² Ibn A'tham, Futūḫ, II, p. 187a; Bal'āmī, IV, p. 280; Turkish Tabarî, p. 181.
so far inflicted, determined to avenge them and gathered together the strength of the Khazars and marched against al-Ḥarashi. He encamped in Barzand.¹ Al-Ḥarashi who realised that this would be probably fought to the death, rallied more recruits from Baylaqan, Warthan and the districts of Armenia. Some of them were volunteers while others were mercenaries.² Each side was determined to be declared victorious and fought fiercely to that end. In the early part of the battle it appeared probable that the Khazars would win as they seemed to be routing the Arab forces. This was almost a spur to the Arabs who were determined not to give way while an even greater incentive came with the report that many more Muslim prisoners clamoured for release to freedom. Victory finally fell to the Arabs who with booty and liberated prisoners returned to Bajarwan while the Khazars withdrew to Muqan.³ Here they regrouped and the sources state that at this stage they numbered not less than 100,000 men. Al-Ḥarashi also remobilised his troops and

¹Barzand was twelve leagues distant from Warthan. Ibn al-Faqīh, Buldān, p.286; Ibn Khurradādhbih, Masālik, p.121; According to Istakhrī (Masālik, p.192) it was 15 leagues from Ardabīl.
³Ibid., pp. 178b-188a; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 101; Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, V, p.120; Nuwayrī, Niḥāyat al-Arab, XXIX, p.120; Ibn Khaldūn, ‘Ibar, III, pp. 191-2 (names the rendezvous as Razand).
leaving some of his reliable men to guard Bajarwan, he again marched at the head of 50,000 men to do battle with the Khazars. The armies met near the river Muqan and an even more fierce battle ensued in which many were killed on both sides while others were drowned. Again the Khazars were defeated and fled towards the Caspian Sea, thence to the north, closely pursued by the Arab forces to the juncture of the rivers Araxes and Kur.

From this point the Arabs withdrew to their base in Bajarwan. Al-Harashi assessed the spoils and extracted the fifth part (Khums) which was sent to the Caliph and distributed the rest among the warriors. This was undoubtedly large, indeed Ibn A'atham and the author of Ghurar al-Siyar assess the sum to

1Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 101; Bal'amī, IV, p.282; Turkish Tabarī, p.183. Ibn A'atham (Futuh, II, p. 188b) gives Khazar numbers as 190,000 and al-Harashi's as 53,000.

2Ibn A'atham, Futuh, II, pp. 188b-189a; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 101; Bal'amī, IV, p.282 (does not mention the place of the battle); Turkish Tabarī, pp. 183-4 (place of the battle is not mentioned); Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, p.120; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.120; Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, III, p.192 (the last three sources say the battlefield was near the river al-Baylaqān). For a brief account of al-Harashi's operations, see: Khalīfa b. Khayyat, Tarikh, II, pp. 356-7; Tabarī, Tarikh, II, p.1531; Azdí, Tarikh al-Mawṣil, p.32; Ya'qūbī, Tarikh, II, p.381; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt al-Zaman, fol. 172 (Ya'qūbī and Sibt assert that the son of the Khāqān was killed but this is not mentioned by other reputable sources.)
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every man at 1,800 dīnārs, while Bāl‘āmī asserts that each received 1,700 dirhams while yet another source, that of the author of Turkish Ṭabarī, \(^2\) gives the figure as 1,007 silver pieces of money. When it is remembered that Arab troops were said to number not less than 50,000\(^3\) it would appear that both exploits and the sums distributed were exaggerated for the glorification of al-Ḥarashī's victories.

The author of Ghurar al-Siyar\(^4\) together with Ibn Aʿtham\(^5\) states that after he had distributed the booty, al-Ḥarashī, at the head of his army, further pursued the Khazars to the land of Shirwān from whence they continued their flight but nothing is recorded of any other major battle between them. Al-Ḥarashī remained in Shirwān awaiting the Caliph's instructions and there is no evidence to confirm al-Azḍī's\(^6\) statement that he went beyond Bāb al-Abwāb. This appears to show some confusion by al-Azḍī with the expedition made by Maslama some time in 113/713-2 after al-Ḥarashī had been dismissed.

---

\(^1\)Bāl‘āmī, IV, p.282.
\(^2\)Turkish Ṭabarī, p.184.
\(^3\)See above, p.283.
\(^4\)Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 102.
\(^5\)Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.189a.
\(^6\)Azḍī, Tārīkh al-Mawṣil, p.32.
According to Baladhurī, 1 al-Ḥarashi, on the instructions of Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik, was replaced by 'Abd al-Malik b. Muslim al-'Uqaylī during his preparation to meet the Khazars at Mīmādh. Ya‘qūbī 2 reports similarly but specifies no time for this happening. That these two historians were mistaken appears certain when the authenticity of their statements that al-Ḥarashi was merely the deputy of Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik was discussed and refuted earlier in this Chapter. 3 Neither is there confirmation of the report by any source which otherwise supplies meticulous details. The battle of Mīmādh and the succeeding battles were fought under al-Ḥarashi's leadership and only once the name of 'Abd al-Malik appears as the leader of a detachment sent by al-Ḥarashi to deal with the Khazars. This was in the district of Baylaqān near the commencement of his campaign 4. Moreover, the majority of the sources support the assertion that Maslama's replacement occurred after al-Ḥarashi had ejected the Khazars from Adharbayjān. 5 Instead of expressing ap-

1Baladhurī, Futūh, p.206.
2Ya‘qūbī, Ta‘rikh, p.381.
3See above, p. 274.
4See above, p. 278ff.
preciation of al-Ḥarashī’s efforts, Maslama accused him of mil-
itary disobedience in not halting operations until he had ar-
rived. It is noteworthy that most of the sources clearly de-
fine al-Ḥarashī as the independent governor of Armenia and Adhar-
bayjan and supreme commander of the Arab forces fighting the Khaz-
zars.1 Thus Maslama’s orders must have been made after his ap-
pointment to the new post and whilst en route to take over from
al-Ḥarashī. Al-Ḥarashī, however, asserted that he received
Maslama’s instructions after the defeat of the Khazars, which
Maslama denied, threw his predecessor into prison and maltreated
him.2 When Maslama’s behaviour was made known to the Caliph it
aroused his anger. He reprimanded his brother and ordered the
release of al-Ḥarashī who was to be sent to him and to receive
honourable treatment. The Caliph would himself reward his ser-
vices. Records show that he was presented with some Qaṭā‘ī’ and
these passed later into the possession of his descendants.3

---

1 See the previous note.
2 Ibn A’tham, Futūḥ, II, p.189b; Ghorar al-Siyar, fol. 102; Bal‘amī, IV, p.283; Turkish Tabari, p.185; see also Khalīfa b. Khayyat, Tarīkh, II, p.358; Balādhuri, Futūḥ, p.207; Ya‘qūbī, Tarīkh, II, p.381.
3 Ibn A’tham, Futūḥ, II, p.189b; Ghorar al-Siyar, fol. 102, Bal‘amī, IV, p.283; Turkish Tabari, p.185; see also Khalīfa b. Khayyat, Tarīkh, II, p.358; Balādhuri, Futūḥ, p.207; Ya‘qūbī, Tarīkh, II, p.381.
It was, however, Maslama who gained the leadership when Armenia and Adharbayjān together with Arrān had been cleared of Khazars put to flight by al-Ḫarashi. Maslama continued the struggle to restore and consolidate Arab supremacy over the Caucasus. To this end he first laid siege to the fortress of Khaydan in the district of Shirwan and after a long siege he finally achieved its conquest which he followed by the massacre of its inhabitants.

The garrison was reputed to number 1,000 men but it would appear to have been nearer the 2,000 estimate given by the author of Ghurar al-Siyar. It is difficult to conceive that Maslama found so much effort necessary to overcome a mere 1,000 men.

---

1 This place is variously recorded by the sources. Ibn A'ṭham (Futūḥ, II, p.190a) names it as Jābrān; Ghurar al-Siyar (fol. 103) as Ḥayrāz. Khalīfa b. Khayyāt (Tarikh, II, p.358) and Dhahabi (Tarikh al-Islām, IV, p.227) as Ḥīzān; Baladhuri (Futūḥ, p.207) as Khayzān. Marquart suggests that it should be named as Khaidan (Khaydan). See Osteuropäische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge, Leipzig, 1903, pp. 20, 492.

2 Ibn A'ṭham, Futūḥ, II, p.190a; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 103; Bal'amî, IV, p.284; Turkish Taḫārī, p.184 (the last two sources do not mention the name of the fortress). See also Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p.207; Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Tarikh, II, p.358; Dhahabi, Tarikh al-Islām, IV, p.227.

3 Ibn A'ṭham, Futūḥ, II, p.190a; Bal'amî, IV, p.284; Turkish Taḫārī, p.186.
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He next made peace with Shirwāns̄hāh, Līz̄ānshāh, 1 Tabarsaran-shāh, 2 Fīlānshāh, Jarshānshāh 3 and the lord of Masqat, 4 and the entire area of southern and middle Dāchistān were thus brought under Arab domination. It is related that the lords of these areas together with their local troops formed Maslama's vanguard during his campaign against the Khazars north of Bāb al-Abwāb. 5 Assured of the cooperation of the principalities of Dāchistān, Maslama advanced to meet the Khazars. He passed Bāb al-Abwāb making no effort to conquer it and advanced northward

1Balādhūrī, (Futūh, II, p. 207) records it Līran-Shāh and so does Gabrieli, op.cit., p.80, n.3. For the identification of this place, see Minorsky, Hudūd al-‘Alam, pp. 144, 402, 404, 406-10.

2According to Derbend-Nāmeh Maslama killed many inhabitants of Tabarsaran (erroneously recorded Tabasaran) and converted the remainder to Islam. He appointed Muhammad Ma’sum as governor of this territory and he was assisted by two qādis to instruct in Islamic tradition. See Derbend-Nāmeh, p.91; Kazem-Beg's remarks, pp. 102ff.

3There is no place called Jarshān. Accordingly Jarshānshāh should stand for Hārsānshāh, a title of the king of Lakz. See Balādhūrī, Futūh, p.196. Another suggestion is Khursānshāh, the lord of Khursān. See for the location of Khursān, Minorsky, Hudūd al-‘Alam, pp. 144, 411, 455.

4For conquest of these territories, see: Balādhūrī, Futūh, p.207; Ibn A‘tham, (Futūh, II, p.190b). The author of Ghurar al-Sīyar (fol. 103); Bal‘ami (IV, p.284) and the author of Turkish Tabārī (p.187) state that all towns and fortresses en route to Bāb al-Abwāb (Derbend) capitulated.

5Ibn A‘tham, Futūh, II, p.190b; Ghurar al-Sīyar, fol. 103; see also Bal‘ami, IV, pp. 264-5; Ya‘qūbī, Tārīkh, II, p.381.
to Samandar without meeting resistance. The Khazars, however, had become aware of the danger which threatened to overwhelm their country and assembled a massive army which the sources describe as innumerable. Maslama, warned of this, decided it would be wiser to retreat and not engage with them at this remote and isolated place. He was forced to leave his heavy baggage and his tents, which had been pitched, in order to delude the Khazars. He withdrew and encamped at a place near Bab al-Abwāb where he was followed by the enemy. Fierce fighting took place, which lasted for several days and ended with the defeat and flight of the Khazars who left their equipment, baggage and other property on the battlefield. The booty was divided among the army after the Caliph's customary fifth share had been extracted. Maslama was now free to attack the enemy garrison in Bab al-Abwāb. The number of this is controversial, but both

---

1 Ibn A'θam, Futuh, II, pp. 191a-191b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 103; Bal'amī, IV, p. 285.

2 Yaʿqūbī (Tarikh, II, p. 381) states that the battle took place at Warthan. This is doubtless confused with North Warthan (Varchān) located north of Bab al-Abwāb. Khalīfa b. Khayyat (Tarikh, II, pp. 358-9) names the battlefield as Ghazāla but does not identify location.

3 Ibn A'θam, Futuh, II, pp. 190b-192b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fols. 103-4; Bal'amī, IV, pp. 285-6. For briefer and more generalised information, about Maslama's confrontation with the Khazars, see: Khalīfa b. Khayyat, Tarikh, II, pp. 358-9; Tabari, Tarikh, II, p. 1560; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, V, pp. 129-30; Sibt b. al-Jawzī, Mir'at al-Zaman, fol. 173; Ibn Kathīr, Bidaya, IX, 304. Some of sources maintain that the Khaqān or his son was killed. Most pro-
Baladhurī and Balʿamī state that it was occupied by 1,000 Khazar families (أهل بس). Ibn Aʿtham, in one report, says that it comprised 1,000 Khazar Târkhāns, and in another states 1,000 Khazar families.

Maslama met with enormous strength of resistance when he attacked and besieged the city. This appears to support the statement given by the author of Ghurar al-Siyar who affirms that Bāb al-Abwāb was stocked with Khazar men which suggests that their number was underestimated by Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī. Maslama was already victorious over the formidable Khazar army and it is improbable that so few would baffle conquest. When force failed Maslama resorted to a strategy common to the warfare of the time. A number of cows and sheep were slaughtered and their blood mingled with sewage to pollute the canals which supplied the fortress with water. The strategy broke the spirit of the defenders who fled under cover of dark, leaving the fort-

1Baladhurī, Futuh, p.207.
2Balʿamī, IV, p.286.
3Ibn Aʿtham, Futuh, II, pp. 190b, 192b.
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ress to the occupation of Maslama and his army.¹

The Citadel and city were rebuilt and refortified and Maslama constructed depots for the storage of wheat, barley and weapons.² He settled 24,000 Syrians in the city, which he divided into four quarters. One was allotted to the jund of Damascus, a second to the jund of Hims, a third to the jund of Palestine and the fourth to the remaining Syrian junds and the Jazīra.³ He fixed every soldier's allowance at a yearly rate of 110 dinars in addition to monthly supplies of wheat, oil and other provisions.⁴

A different version of Maslama's measures is given by the author of Derbend-Nameh in addition to information lacking in other sources. His records state that the city was divided into seven parts, each with its own mosque named after the inhabitants.

¹Baladhūrī, Futūh, p.207; Ibn Aʿtham, Futūh, II, pp. 192b-193a; Balʿamī, IV, p.287; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 104. Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī maintain that Maslama poisoned the course of their water supplies aided by an internal traitor. The man together with his wife, family and property were protected and rewarded. The author of Ghurar al-Siyar says that the accomplice to this act was a resident Muslim whose clan was rewarded with protection.
²Baladhūrī, Futūh, p.207; Ibn Aʿtham, Futūh, II, p.193a; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 104; Derbend-Nameh, p.89; see also, Balʿamī, IV, p.287.
³Ibn Aʿtham, Futūh, II, p.193a; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 104 (does not identify the four quarters); Balʿamī, IV, p.287.
and that Maslama converted many of the original inhabitants to Islam. The first of these mosques was that of Khazar; the second, the mosque of Palestine; the third, the mosque of Damascus; the fourth, the mosques of Hamas (Hims); the fifth, the mosque of Ghaisar;¹ the sixth, the mosque of the Jazîra and the seventh was that of Mawsil.² The account credits Maslama with building six iron gates and naming each of them.³ This author further states that, when he completed his task in the city, Maslama campaigned against Gkum'ukh (Ghumiq) which, after a brave resistance, surrendered and embraced Islam. There Maslama appointed Shahbal (Shehbal) b. 'Abdallah b. 'Abbas, one of his great generals, as its governor. He also built a mosque and appointed a Qâdî to instruct the inhabitants in the religion of Islam.⁴

Maslama then attacked the mountainous tribes of Qara-Qaytaq, who after various encounters were said to have surrendered and many converted to Islam while a number perished. He ended

¹As each quarter was actually named after its inhabitants it would appear that "Ghaisar" should read "Qinnasrin". Compare with Kazem-Beg, Derbend-Nameh, p.99, remark 5.
³Derbend-Nameh, p.90; Kazem-Beg's remarks, pp. 99ff.; see also Klaproth, op.cit., p.459.
his campaign by appointing one of his relatives, a certain Ḥamza, as governor of the region.\(^1\) He next attacked the tribes of Ṭaw and Awar\(^2\) forcing their members to adopt Islam, and erecting mosques and appointing ǧādīs to preach Islam. The ǧādīs seem to have assumed the rule of these tribes.\(^3\)

So many achievements in so short a space of time as one year, which was the span of his governorship, would appear to be an exaggeration, and probably the subjection of all these territories north of Bab al-Abwāb was a purely temporary matter. The supposition is confirmed by the fact that further battles for Arab supremacy over these districts were fought by his successor.\(^4\)

Before Maslama returned to Syria he appointed one of his generals, Farīd b. Suwayd al-Tha‘labī as governor of Bab al-Abwāb\(^5\) and entrusted the rule of Armenia and Adharbayjan and the supreme command of the Arab army there to his cousin Marwān b. Muḥammad.\(^6\)

\(^1\)Derbend-Nā‘meh, p.91; see also Klaproth, op.cit., p.460 (citing the governor H‘amseh).
\(^2\)See for the identification of these, Kazem-Beg, Derbend Nā‘meh, remark 31, p.34.
\(^3\)Derbend-Nā‘meh, p.91.
\(^4\)See below, 303ff.
In the same year (114-732) this appointment was confirmed by the Caliph Hishām who added to Marwān's governorship the province of Jazīra. This arrangement was probably made in order to assist recruitment of more fighting men to cope with the threat from Khazars and their allies added to internal revolts in the newly conquered districts.

Some sources indicate that Marwān had gone to the Caliph and complained against the ineffectual measures taken against the Khazars after the defeat of al-Jarrāh. They assert that he specified the feebleness of Maslama in this respect and managed to convince the Caliph of his own special suitability to fill the post. The same sources, however, erroneously state that Marwān was appointed in 114/732 and remained in office until 126/743, when he became involved in the dynastic conflict concerning the caliphate.

This report is challenged by the statement in other sources that Marwān was first appointed to the post by Maslama when he returned to Syria and the sources make no mention of bad relations between the two generals. Further refutation is that Maslama was quite successful in his campaigns and, as Barthold...
justly says,\textsuperscript{1} he was the real founder of the city of Bāb al-Abwāb. It is also more than likely that the Caliph would have reprimanded him for any corrupt practices or inefficiency, but there is no report to this effect not even by the sources which speak of Marwān's complaint to the Caliph. Moreover Marwān, during this governorship, remained in office only for a few months and he was replaced by Saʿīd b. ʿAmr al-Ḥarashi in the second half of the year 114/732.\textsuperscript{2} Nevertheless this first governorship of Marwān,\textsuperscript{3} although of short duration, was not without its achievements. In the winter of that year the Khazars took the offensive and regained all the territories north of Bāb al-Abwāb. Marwān's troops, numbering some 40,000 men, attacked and pursued the Khazars beyond Balanjar. No record of any specific battle has been preserved beyond the reference that many of the enemy were killed. It is recorded that Marwān ordered the tails of the horses to be cut to avoid them being hampered by the thick mud generated by heavy winter rains and that this expedition was thereafter described as Ghazwat al-Tīn (the expe-

\textsuperscript{1}Barthold, ET\textsuperscript{1}, Art. "Derbend".
\textsuperscript{2}See below, p. 296.
\textsuperscript{3}According to Khalīfa b. Khayyat (Tārīkh, II, p. 359) and al-Azdī (Tārīkh al-Mawṣil, p. 34) the governorship began in Muharram 114/732. 
dition of the mud). After the expedition he returned to the city of Bab al-Abwāb. There is no record of any major attack being made by the Khazars during the two following years, which emphasizes the effectiveness of Marwan's expedition.

During the spring of 114/732 Marwan was supplanted by Sa‘īd al-Ḥarashi who is stated to have held the post for two years. If we are to believe the statement that Sa‘īd assumed governorship in the spring of 114/732, he must have remained in office a little more than two years, especially if it is remembered that his successor, Marwan, did not appear in the region until 117/735.

---


2 Ibn A‘tham, Futuh, II, p. 193b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 104; Bal‘amī, IV, p. 288; Turkish Tabari, p. 189; Baladhuri, Futuh, p. 207 (ignores Marwan's governorship and maintains that Sa‘īd took over directly from Maslama).

3 Baladhuri, Futuh, p. 207. Gabrieli (op.cit., p. 81) states that Sa‘īd's governorship must have been restricted to a few months only because some sources assert that Marwan was appointed to his governorship in 114/732. Indeed Marwan was appointed first in 114/732 but he was replaced soon afterwards by al-Ḥarashi. The fact that the sources do not mention any activity by Marwan during the years 115/733 and 116/734 is an obvious evidence that he was not governor at this period. When comparison is made between the report of the sources which maintain that Marwan remained in office without interruption since 114/732 and those of other sources it appears that the first group have confused the date of many activities, attributing some of them to the year 114/732-3, while they were actually connected with later periods. In general, the narrative, by these sources, of Marwan's activities during 114/732 is in fact an abridgement of his achievements during his second governorship, which commenced, in all probability, during the year 117/735.
Saʿīd was said to have continued the struggle against the Khazars but again there is no reference to any specific battle against, or attack from, them. Doubtless any major attack against or by the Khazars would have been recorded in detail had they taken place particularly when taking into consideration the meticulous records of events occurring in the Caucasus.

Saʿīd al-Ḥarashi, who suffered from cataracts, pleaded his advance age to obtain release from this post and the Caliph Hishām re-appointed Marwān b. Mūḥammad. Together Hishām and Marwān appear determined to end Khazar incursions and to firmly consolidate Arab rule in Armenia, Adharbayjān and the Caucasus. With a force of some 120,000 men recruited from Syria, Jazīra and ʿIrāq Marwān first advanced to Armenia. He established his headquarters at Kazak, about 40 leagues from Bardhaʿa and approximately 20 leagues from Tiflis. From here he directed his military operations against some internal rebels until he was able to restore stability and re-establish Arab rule in Armenia.

---

1Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.193b; Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 104; Balʿamī, IV, p.288; Turkish Ṭabarī, p.189; Balāḏurī, Futūḥ, p.207.
2Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.193b; Balʿamī, IV, p.288; Ibn Khaldūn, Ibar, III, p.196; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.132; Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.121 (the last two sources erroneously report this as during the year 114/732); Ghurar al-Siyar, fol. 104 (estimates their number at 60,000 men).
3Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.193b; Balʿamī, IV, p.288 (calls it Keṣar); Balāḏurī, Futūḥ, p.207 (names it Kīṣāl).
and Georgia.\(^1\)

His next move was to campaign against the adjacent areas and in 117/735 he sent a detachment against the Alans which conquered three fortresses. A second detachment was sent against the land of Tūmānshāh (Tūmān). Tūmānshāh himself is said to have been captured and sent to the Caliph Hishām who released him and allowed him to go back to his dominion, probably on paying tribute.\(^2\) In the next year (118/736) Marwān turned his attention to the land of W.r.t.nīs (وَرْنِيْس) and attacked it from three directions. The king fled and was killed, some reports say by passers by and others say by the residents of Khumārīn and his subjects were forced to capitulate on Marwān's terms.\(^3\) Neither geographical nor historical sources indicate the location of this land but the sources show that W.r.t.nīs (وَرْنِيْس) was the name of its ruler and may be synonymous with Arnīs (آَرْنِيْس) or W.r.nīs (وَرْنِس), king of Laikz.\(^4\) If this conclusion is cor-

---

\(^1\) Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.193b; Balʿamī, IV, p.288.


\(^3\) Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Tarīkh, II, p.363; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, V, p.147 (calls him W.r.nīs (وَرْنِيْس); Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-Arab, p.121 (also names him W.r.nīs (وَرْنِس)); Dhaḥḥābī, Tarīkh al-Islām, IV, p.230; Ibn Khaldūn, Iʿbar, III, p.286 (names him W.r.qīs (وَرْقِيس)).

\(^4\) Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, pp. 195b, 196a.
rect, the report must be anticipatory of a later event in which Marwan besieged and raided Lakz for about a year. In that time its king (Arnis or W.r.nis) was reputed to have fled and have been killed by a shepherd.\(^1\) Granting the accuracy of this report, the expedition must have met with only temporary success as, at a later date, further military operations were undertaken against Lakz.

An expedition, destined to become the most important and successful, was undertaken in 119/737 by Marwan against the Khazars. At the head of his army he passed through Bāb Allān (Darial pass) subduing all the territories on route to Khazaria. He summoned Asad b. Zāfir al-Sulami,\(^2\) at that time in charge of Bāb al-Abwāb, to head an army which was to meet him at Samandar.\(^3\)

\(^1\)See below, p. 306.

\(^2\)Asad b. Zāfir (probably Zāfir) al-Sulami is said to have been appointed governor of the city of Bab al-Abwāb, by the Caliph Hishām, in 118 A.H. Asad is stated to have been accompanied by 400 Arab nobles and unspecified number of Arab tribesmen. See extract from Dorn’s version of Derbend-Nāmeh, published in Kazem-Beg’s edition of Derbend-Nāmeh, pp. 108ff.; Klaproth’s version of Derbend-Nāmeh (op.cit., p. 462) names the governor as Asad b. Iafir-es-Selman. It also states that he was accompanied by 4,000 brave Arab warriors and some other tribesmen. Balʿamī (IV, p. 289) records his name as Osaīd.

\(^3\)Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p. 194a; Balʿamī, IV, p. 289; see also Baladhuri, Futūḥ, pp. 207-8.
He suppressed all knowledge of his actual intentions but allowed the assumption that he was on his way to attack the Alans. As a further deception he despatched an envoy to the Khāqān proposing a peace pact between the Arabs and the Khazars. A return envoy was sent from the Khāqān in order to negotiate peace terms whom Marwān detained until he had completed preparations for attack on Khazaria. Marwān then released the envoy to carry news of war and not peace to the Khāqān. He was also conducted by a long route to his country while Marwān and his troops went by the shortest. After being joined by Asad b. Zāfir al-Sulamī he is said to have led 150,000 men¹ against al-Baydā', the capital of the Khazars.

Taken by surprise and totally unprepared, the Khāqān retreated to the mountains, apparently the Ural mountains. A force of 40,000 picked troops remained in the capital headed by one of his Türkhāns. This seems to have been in the hope of warding off the enemy until the Khāqān was able to recruit reinforcements for the encounter. Instead, however, of attacking the capital, Marwān by-passed the city along the right bank of the Volga travelling north into the heart of Khazaria. The force which had remained in the capital followed Marwān along the left bank of the Volga. Marwān received information of this from one of his

¹Ibn A‘tham, Futūh, II, p.194a; Bal‘amī, IV, p.289.
spies and ordered Kawthar b. al-Aswad al-'Anbari, the leader of his shurta to cross the river with an equal number (40,000 men) and ambush the enemy; Kawthar was promised that Marwan would join him the next day with the rest of the Arab army. The Khazars were surprised and suffered disastrous defeat. It was said that 10,000 of them died and 7,000 were captured by this contingent before Marwan joined them with the rest of the army. It is also stated that, during this expedition, Marwan took 20,000 families from Saqaliba (Slavs) living among the Khazars and resettled them in Khakhit (Kakhetia). They killed their governor and fled pursued by Marwan who killed them. The author

---

1 Ibn A'tham, Futuh, II, p.194a.
2 Ibid., pp. 194a-194b.
3 Baladhuri, Futuh, p.208; Ibn A'tham, Futuh, II, p.194a (does not say where they were settled); Bal'ami (IV, p.289) says that Marwan destroyed 20,000 houses. Minorsky says that the mention of Nehr al-Saqaliba and the 20,000 Saqaliba prisoners by Marwan suggest that military operations were conducted on the Don river not on the Volga. Accordingly, al-Bayda' might stand for Sarkel. See Minorsky, "A new book on the Khazars", Oriens, II, 1958, p. 128. Dunlop (op.cit., p.83) and Artamonov (op.cit., p.220) suggest that the Saqaliba prisoners were Burtas whose territory lay between the Khazars and the Bulghars. Artamonov adds, as an evidence, that the Arabic sources are not precise in their use of the term Saqaliba. Dunlop and Artamonov's interpretation is more acceptable. It is confirmed by Ibn A'tham (Futuh, II, p.194a) who says that Marwan crossed over Khazaria leaving the defeated Khazars behind. He then passed northwards, invaded the Saqaliba and captured 20,000 families. Thus the geographical siting suggests that he defeated the Burtas who, probably erroneously, were called Saqaliba by the Arabic sources. However, it would seem that even if the prisoners were Saqaliba, the operations must have
of Ghurar al-Siyar, reports the number of 10,000 families and this account appears more reasonable. Another report states that a large number of Khazars were captured and re-settled in the lowlands of Lakz between the rivers Samur and Shabiran. Their number is recorded by Ibn A’tam as 40,000.

On learning of the disastrous defeat of his army, the Khaqan realised the futility of further action against the Arabs and asked Marwan to disclose his intentions concerning his country. He was given the choice of adopting Islam or to lose both life and throne. With little option he was forced to adopt Islam and Nuḥ b. al-Ṣā’ib al-Asadī and ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Khawlanī were sent to instruct him in its principles. Transporting tre-
mendous booty Marwān then withdrew to Bāb al-ʿAbwāb where, after despatching the customary one-fifth share to the Caliph, the remainder was distributed among the Muqātila.\(^1\) This most successful expedition is designated by some sources as al-Sāʾīha\(^2\) and its effectiveness made it the last against the Khazars during the period under consideration.

Marwān was now able to concentrate his efforts on the several principalities of Caucasus and the mountainous tribes of Dāghistān. In 120/738 ʿIṣḥāq b. Muslim al-ʿUqaylī, one of Marwān’s lieutenants, invaded the land of Tūmān laying waste to it and conquering the fortress.\(^3\) The invasion was not as effective as reports showed for in the following year another invasion was necessary to completely subdue its Lord Tūmānshāh.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Ibn Aʿthām, Futuh, II, p. 195a.

\(^2\) Khalīfa b. Khayyat, Tārīkh, II, p. 364; Dhahabī, Tārīkh al-Islām, IV, p. 230; idem, Duwal al-Islām, I, p. 61. Due to diacritical error, al-Azdi (Tārīkh al-Kawgīl, p. 390 calls it al-Sābiʿa while al-Ḥanbālī (Shadharat, I, p. 156) calls it al-Sāniḥa. It should be noted that these sources, together with Ibn al-Athīr (Kāmil, V, p. 160) give very brief accounts of this expedition.


In 121/738-9 Marwân led an invasion into the land of Sarîr (Avaria) and forced its king to capitulate after a bitter struggle. He was compelled to purchase peace from his conquerors by paying an annual tribute of 1,000 slaves together with 100,000 mudd of wheat.¹ In the same year other principalities fell to Arab conquest, among them Hāmzîn,² whose lord was compelled not only to pay a tribute of 500 slaves but also an annual tribute of 30,000 mudd of wheat. It was stipulated that it was to be brought to the city of Bāb al-Abwâb.³ Ibn A‘tham⁴ assesses the tribute from Hāmzîn at 500 slaves and 500 mudd of wheat annually. Tabarsan⁵ was also subjected and made to yield an annual tribute of 500 lads and 500 maids, each with black hair and eyebrows and with long eyelashes; Ibn A‘tham, Futūḥ, II, p.195b (says the tribute was 500 maids, 500 lads, 10,000 dinâras and 500 mudd); Tabârî, Tarîkh, II, p.1667 (says that the tribute was 1,000 slaves); Ya‘qûbî, Tarîkh, II, p.382 (says the tribute was 1,500 lads); Sibî‘ b. al-Jawzî, Mir‘ât al-Zaman, fol. 192 (says the tribute was 6,000 slaves and an unspecified amount of riches); Abu‘l-Fida‘, Mukhtasar, p.215 (says the tribute was 70,000 slaves), the same report is repeated by al-Qalqashandî, M‘athir al-Inâfâ, I, p.151.

¹ Khalîfah b. Khayyāt, Tarîkh, II, p.367; Ibn al-Athîr, Kāmil, V, p.180; Nuwaysîr, Nihayat al-‘Arab, XXIX, p.123; Azdî, Tarîkh al-Mawṣûl, pp. 42-3; Dhahâbî, Duwal al-Islâm, I, p.62; idem, ‘Ibar, I, p.153; Hanbâlî, Shadharât, I, p.158; Baladhurî, Futūḥ, p.208 (says that the slaves were 1,000: 500 lads and 500 maids, each with black hair and eyebrows and with long eyelashes); Ibn A‘tham, Futūḥ, II, p.195b (says the tribute was 500 maids, 500 lads, 10,000 dinâras and 500 mudd); Tabârî, Tarîkh, II, p.1667 (says that the tribute was 1,000 slaves); Ya‘qûbî, Tarîkh, II, p.382 (says the tribute was 1,500 lads); Sibî‘ b. al-Jawzî, Mir‘ât al-Zaman, fol. 192 (says the tribute was 6,000 slaves and an unspecified amount of riches); Abu‘l-Fida‘, Mukhtasar, p.215 (says the tribute was 70,000 slaves), the same report is repeated by al-Qalqashandî, M‘athir al-Inâfâ, I, p.151.

² It is variously recorded by the sources: Khalîfah b. Khayyāt (Tarîkh, II, p.367) records it as Khuramîn, Azdî (Tarîkh al-Mawṣûl, p.43) and Hanbâlî (Shadharât, I, p.158) as H. mrdîn (‘مريدن’); Ibn Khalîdîn, (‘Ibar, III, p.286) as H. mrdîn (‘مريدن’).

³ Baladhurî, Futūḥ, p.208.


⁵ Azdî (Tarîkh al-Mawṣûl, p.43) records it Tabarsan (‘تبايران’).
tribute of 10,000 mudd delivered to the city of Bab al-Abwāb.¹ Filānshāh,² king of Filān, who seems to have voluntarily surrendered, is claimed by Balādhurī³ to have been honourably treated and exempted from tribute; while Zirikrān's⁴ tribute of 50 slaves and 10,000 mudd of wheat was ordered to be delivered to the Arab authority in Bab al-Abwāb.⁵ S.n.dān⁶ (سُنَان) made one payment of 100 slaves and 5,000 mudd annually.⁷

¹Balādhurī, Futūh, p.208.
²Filān is recorded by al-Asdī (Tarīkh al-Mawsil, p.43) as Qad.lān (قَدَّلَان) while Nuwayrī (Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.123) names it Qab.lān (قَبْلَان).
³Balādhurī, Futūh, p.209.
⁴Khalīfa b. Khayyat (Tārīkh, II, p.367) records it as Zarūbkān (زاروبيكان); Asdī (Tārīkh al-Mawsil, p.43) as D.M.K.ān (د.م.ك.ان); Ibn al-Athīr (Kāmil, V, p.180) as Az.rūb.t.ān (ازروبيتان). Minor-skīy (Hudūd al-Ālam) p.450) records it as Zirīgaran.
⁵Balādhurī, Futūh, p.208.
⁶Khalīfa b. Khayyat (Tārīkh, II, p.367); Nuwayrī (Nihayat al-Arab, XXIX, p.123) and Dhahābī (Duwal, I, p.62) record it as M.S.dāz (مُسْمَاد); Asdī (Tārīkh al-Mawsil, p.43) as M.S. dān (مُسْمَان); Balādhurī (Futūh, p.208) as S. dān (سُمَان); Ibn al-Athīr (Kāmil, V, p.180) as M.s.dāz (مَسْمَاد); Ḥanbalī (Shadharāt, I, p.158) as M.S.dāra (مُسْمَية).
⁷Balādhurī, Futūh, p.208.

Although reputed to have taken place during the space of one year, it is improbable that all of these territories capitulated in so short a period, and more likely that the campaigns lasted into the following year. Nevertheless they were conquered by Marwān who continued his military operations until the end of his appointment which lasted for about ten years (117-126). It is recorded that the king of Lakz, Arnīs or Warnīs b. Nasnās, strongly resisted the attempt to subdue his kingdom and that it took many raids and a whole year passed before the Arabs besieged him in his own fortress from which he managed to escape. He met his death mysteriously while in flight and the people of Lakz finally capitulated and were forced to pay tribute of 10,000 mudd of wheat yearly. There is

1 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.197a.
2 A probably legendary story by Ibn Aʿtham and Balʿamī maintains that the king of Lakz fled with some of his entourage. He passed the city of Bāb al-Abwāb where he met a shepherd, took one of his sheep and ordered his companions to prepare it while he rested under a tree. The shepherd shot him with an arrow and killed him before he overheard a conversation, by his colleagues, saying that the king had been killed. The shepherd hastened to inform his father, who informed Asad b. Zāfir, the governor of Bāb al-Abwāb. Asad went to the place where the king's body was lying and recognised Arnīs or Warnīs (أرنينس، ورنينس), the king of Lakz. He ordered his head to be removed and sent it to Marwān who was besieging the dead king's fortress. The head was raised at the point of an arrow which caused the garrison to surrender. See Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.197b; Balʿamī, IV, p.293. Baladhurī (Futūḥ, p.209) says that the king intended to go to the Khāqān of the Khazars, apparently to appeal for assistance, but was killed by a shepherd.
3 Ibn Aʿtham, Futūḥ, II, p.197b; Balʿamī, IV, p.293; Baladhurī, (Futūḥ, p.209) says that they paid 20,000 mudd annually and Marwān appointed Khashram al-Sulamī as his representative there.
no date given for these operations against Lakz but it would appear to have been after the year 121/738-9.

Marwan then marched southwards to Shirwan, \(^1\) Muqan, Jilan and other strongholds in Adharbayjan and Armenia which he subjected. \(^2\) According to Baladhuri \(^3\) some of these territories were committed to supply troops during times of war. Throughout his governorship Marwan ceaselessly campaigned for the subjection of the whole region which lay between the Volga in the North, Adharbayjan in the south, the Caspian sea in the east and Armenia and Georgia in the west. When the Caliph al-Walid II died in 125/743 Marwan was invading al-Dudaniyya, the inhabitants of the region of Dido. \(^4\) Ibn A'tham \(^5\) reflects his strong position by saying that Marwan had conquered all the regions, towns and fortresses and there was no enemy left to fight. The description

---

\(^1\) According to Baladhuri (Futuh, p.209) its lord had to pay a tribute of 10,000 mudd of wheat annually.

\(^2\) Ibn A'tham, Futuh, II, p.197b; Bal'amî, IV, p.293.

\(^3\) Baladhuri, Futuh, p.209.

\(^4\) Ibid., For the identification of these mountainous tribes see Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian history, p.28. He suggests that the name should be corrected to Diduvan (الدروانيه).

\(^5\) Ibn A'tham, Futuh, II, p.197b.
may be an exaggeration but it is certain that in his time Arab predominance had been cemented over the provinces of Armenia, Adharbayjān and Caucasus, and there is no evidence to prove that Khazar incursions were made into Caucasus after the year 119/737.

One fatal error had, however, been made by Marwān. He had assumed the permanent subjection of the Khazars and had left no Arab governor or garrison to ensure control. While Arab rule was supreme in the region, the Khazars made no effort to attack but as the supremacy weakened they began hostile operations. The death of the Caliph Hishām and the succession of weaker caliphs, the dynastic struggle among the Umayyads and opposition to them at the end of the dynasty culminating in its overthrow by the ‘Abbāsids, halted Arab conquest on the Caucasian front.
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