The Heterodoxies of the Shiites in the Presentation of Ibn Hazm.—By Israel Friedlaender, Professor in the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City.

Commentary.¹

The Commentary herewith presented follows Ibn Ἡαζμ's text published in Vol. xxviii of this Journal, pp. 28–80, by page and line. In marking the lines, I have counted every line on the page, including the superscriptions. The footnotes are not quoted by the line but by the number prefixed to them. In the case of some very long footnotes, I also added the line of the footnote referred to.

I prefix a "List of Cited Works," giving all the authorities (with short biographical dates) regularly or frequently quoted in this treatise. The abbreviations under which they are quoted are made noticeable to the eye.² Books only incidentally referred to are omitted in this list. MS. before the title signifies that the book has not yet appeared in print and has been used in manuscript.

In quoting from Arabic sources I have discriminated between printed works and manuscripts. The latter I quote in the original; the former I give—except in cases of necessity—in

² To simplify the abbreviations, I purposely neglect the rules of exact transliteration.
translation, as the text itself is accessible to the specialist. In translating from the printed edition of Ibn Ḥazm's *Milal*, I usually attach the important variants from the manuscripts at my disposal.

I plead guilty to being inconsistent in transliterating the Arabic. Such inconsistencies are scarcely avoidable. The specialist will pardon them, the layman will hardly notice them. As regards the index to this treatise, I refer the reader to my remarks in Vol. xxviii of this Journal, p. 27.
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**Abulfeda.** Abū'1-Fidā [d. 732/1331], Annales Moslemici, ed. Adler, Hafniae 1789–94.
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**Bagd.** MS. On Baḡdādī [d. 429/1038] and his work, see Introduction to this treatise, p. 26.

**Blochet,** Le Messianisme et l’hétérodoxie Musulmane. Paris, 1903.—Draws largely on Persian (Shiit) sources.


**Diyarbekri.** Diyarbekrî [died after 982/1574], Ta’rikh al-Khamīs. Cairo, 1283h.


The Heterodoxies of the Shiites, etc.


Haarbrücker. German translation of Shahrastani I–II. Halle, 1850–51. Unless otherwise stated, quotations refer to vol. I.


Ikd. Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi [d. 328/940], al-ʿIkād al-farīḍ, I–III. Cairo, 1293. If not otherwise stated, quotations refer to vol. I.
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Kashi.¹ Abû ‘Amr Muhammed b. ‘Omar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azîz al-Kashshî (from Kashsh in Jurjân) [approximately 300ʰ].² Imamite], Ma‘rifat akhbâr ar-rijâl. Biographies of Shiiitic worthies chronologically arranged. Bombay 1317ʰ.—The author apparently draws on old and rare sources.
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Masudi. Mas‘ûdî [d. 345/956]. Murâj ad-dahab, ed. Barbier de Meynard, I–IX. Paris, 1861–77.—His information is incidental and brief, but extremely valuable.


¹ Mr. Ellis, of the British Museum, kindly called my attention to this work.

² I have been unable to find any statement bearing on the age of this author. The date given in the text is based on the following calculations. al-Kashshî was a pupil of al-‘Ayyâshî (edition of his work, p. 379). The latter is no doubt identical with Fîhrîst 195ʰ, and Tusy, List of Shii‘ah books, No. 690. Neither of these authors give his age. But according to Tusy, ib., al-‘Ayyâshî “heard the disciples (aṣḥâb) of ‘Alî b. al-Ḥasan b. Faḍdâl” who died 224ʰ (Tusy, No. 191). This justifies the rough estimate given in the text.
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List of Abbreviations.

Ed.=printed edition of Ibn Ḥazm’s Milal waʾn-Nihal.
Introd.=Introduction to this treatise in Vol. xxviii of this Journal, pp. 1–28.
Milal=the manuscripts of Ibn Ḥazm's Milal waʾn-Nihal:
Br = British Museum.
L = Leyden.
V = Vienna.
Y = Yale.

See Introd., p. 17.

Note, with a number following, refers to the footnotes under the Text (see next).


Small figures above large figures indicate the line on the page referred to. When underlined, the small figure indicates that the lines are to be counted from below.

[28] P. 28, l. 21 f.¹ I am not sure that I have correctly rendered the words of the original (Ed. II, 111⁰): وَإِلَٰذَ رَأَيْتَ مَا شَغَبَ بَهَا مِنْ شَغَبٍ مِنْهُمْ فِيهَا غَلَطُ فِيهِ مِنْ يَتْلِه (LVY read لَغَي). The meaning of the sentence is not quite clear. It largely depends on the interpretation of the verb شَغَب. The latter, followed by في, or ب, or جل, usually designates “to excite, stir up evil, mischief or discord, against or among people” (Lane). We have translated accordingly, taking بَهَا as referring to الإسلام and चिन्ता in the preceding sentence. But our author, who is apparently very fond of this word, seems to use it in a somewhat different sense. Thus Ed. II, 131²² فِكَلْ مَا ثَبَت

¹ The reference is to Vol. xxviii of this Journal, as already stated.
anything that has been logically demonstrated is nothing but casuistry or sophistry.” I, 207.

I say to them: “Nothing was left to him except sophistic arguments.” See also III, 2145.


We know of no proof whatever which they could casuistically bring forward in favor of this nonsense.” III, 203.

One of them sophistically assumes that the verse (Koran 17, 104) reads “alimtu” with a ‘damma’ over the ‘tá’.”—In accordance with these quotations the sentence under consideration ought to be translated: “and to expound the sophisms that were brought forward by those of them who argue sophistically” would then be the عائدة (Wright, Arabic Grammar II, 320A) of and the variant بها would be an intentional cor-20

rection.—If we translate it as “to delay,” the other from the root رجح “to inspire hope.” Comp. Shahr.

103, Makr. 3493, Goldziher, Muh. St. II, 90, note 1.

— L. 10 f. For the better understanding of this paragraph I insert here the synopsis of Murjî’ite doctrines given in Milal

L II, 162b.
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See the detailed account on the Murji‘a Ed. IV, 204 ff. On the question as to the nature of “Faith” see III, 188 ff.

— L. 11. Abū Hanifa died 767 C. E. Shahr. 105 admits that this famous Faḵīh is generally counted among the Murji‘ites. He does so reluctantly, as the latter, in spite of their close relation to the Sunna, are considered heterodox, and he explains this, in a rather far-fetched manner, as the result of a misunderstanding. But inconsistently enough, he himself later mentions him among the prominent men of the Murji‘a (p. 108).

— L. 15. Jahm was executed for his heterodox beliefs towards the end of the Omeyyad period, Shahr. 19, 60. Makr. 349.25

— Ibidem. On al-Ash‘ārī’s (873–935 C. E.) doctrine see de Boer, 56 f. At first opposed, “he was finally considered so orthodox that anyone who attacked him was regarded as an infidel who deserved capital punishment. The devout philosopher was revered as a saint” (Dozy, Isl. 255). It is highly characteristic that Makrīzī, who quotes this passage almost verbatim (34519), omits al-Ash‘ārī’s name both here and l. 17. Although himself a Ṣāḥīrite like Ibn Ḥazm,4 he did not possess his courage or consistency to charge the patron-saint of the Sunna with heterodox views. The same consideration probably accounts for the variant in L and Y (see note 6). The printer of Ed. repeatedly endeavors to defend al-Ash‘ārī against the attacks of our author. In a footnote to this passage (II, 111)

1 On the margin 

2 Comp. IKot. 301.

3 Makrīzī frequently plagiarizes Ibn Ḥazm; see Goldziher, Zahiriten 202; Muh. St. II, 269.

4 Goldziher, Zahiriten, p. 196 f.
he maintains that Ibn Ḥazm misrepresents al-ʿAshʿarī’s view, [29] ascribing this circumstance to the geographical distance between these two men (the former in Spain, the latter in Baṣra). In a footnote to III, 206 he asserts that the difference between al-ʿAshʿarī and Ibn Ḥazm is merely verbal.

— L. 16. Muḥammad b. Karrām (died 256h, Makr. 3572) is counted Makr. 349 (comp. 3572ff.) among the Mushabbihā. On his view regarding the external nature of “faith” (our text l. 21 f.) see Ed. III, 188, Bagd. 4a. Comp. de Boer, 56.


— L. 24 f. See the chapter on the Muʿtazila, Ed. IV, 192 ff.

— L. 25 f. The three Muʿtazilites named here occupy an intermediate position in the question of Kadar: It is God who creates the actions of man, but man has the privilege of giving assent to them. Shahr. 62, de Boer 56.

— L. 25. On an-Najjār (9th century C. E.) see Makr. 350 3.

— L. 26. Instead of غياب (also Ed. IV, 4519, Makr. 350 19) Shahr. 633 has عناب (Haarbrücker 94 ‘Attab).—Makr. 350 20 counts him among the Mujabbira, admitting, however, that because of his other views he is generally reckoned among the Muʿtazila. He died 218h, Fīhr. 182, n. 7.

— L. 2. See on this famous Muʿtazilite p. 66 25 and passim— His peculiar position in the question of Kadar, de Boer, 51.

— L. 5 ff. See Text 74 19 ff. and Comm.

— L. 14. The synopsis of Khārijite views given in Milal L II, 162b will serve to illustrate this passage: قالت الخوارج المعاصي كُفرُ فَلما عُزِموا علی ذلك وحققه فَقالت الصَرْفِیة إِذْ الأمر كذلك فقْتَلْهُم وسَلَموه نَسِبَه وِلِدَاوْدُ فَذَكَرْ فَحَرَبْ فَجَبَّتِ الإباضیة عن ذلك ورجعوا عن هذا الشَعْب واقتحمَ سائر الهُوَارْج فلما حققوا ذلك قالت الأُراثة فاذ الأمر كذلك فالواجب قَتَلُ النَسِاء والأَطِفال لِآنهم كُلَهم كُفَار فَجَبَت الصَرْفِیة عن ذلك واقتحمَ الأُراثة. See Ed. IV. 188 ff., Shahr. 100.
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— L. 15. The Khārijite named here was an intimate friend of the extreme Shiite Hishām b. al-Ḥakam (p. 65"), Masudi V, 343.

— L. 17 f. The names of these three heretics appear in so manifold and puzzling variations that it is well-nigh impossible to arrive at any definite conclusion.

The father's name of the first occurs in the following forms:

1) حافظ (🌠Milal V 50a, L II, 145b, Masudi III, 267, Shahr. 18, 42, Makr. 347"), de Sacy XLII footnote, also in the carefully printed manuscripts of Bagd. 49b, 136a and Isfr. 8a, 62b. We have adopted this reading in our text.—2) حافظ, very frequently: Ed Y in our passage. Ed. I, 78"¹⁷, 90"¹⁷, Milal L I, 36a, Iji 340, de Sacy, ibidem.—3) حافظ L here (so probably also V, see note 8), Ed. IV, 197-198 (several times).—4) حافظ Ed. III, 120a.—5) حافظ Br. here, L II, 162b l. 1 (🌠)

Still more numerous are the variations of the father's name of the second person. It is found written as follows¹: 1) Ed. here.—2) ياقوس Milal V, 267.—3) ياقوس Ed. IV, 198"¹⁸.—4) ياقوس Br. here (V بابوس Shahr. 43.—5) ياقوس Ed. IV, 198"¹⁸.—6) بابوس (الدابوش) Y here (L unpointed); Isfr. 63a (ic).—7) ياقوس Br. here (Ed. I, 90"¹⁷.).—8) بابوس (الدابوش) Bagd. 103b.

We have followed this reading of Bagd., owing to the careful punctuation of the manuscript (see Introduction, p. 27).—The ending =os appears in all these readings. This most probably indicates Christian origin, the more so as the views of these men (see later) distinctly show Christian influence.

¹ Note 9 contains several misprints which must be corrected in accordance with the text above.
² "Mănûsch," as Haarbrücker (II, 419) transcribes the reading of Isfr., is impossible in the manuscript.
³ Schreiner, Der Kâlâm in der jüdischen Litteratur, p. 63, note 1, is inclined to accept this reading, and to identify it with the Greek. Nâvoç which occurs as the name of several Syrian bishops (Harkavy, Ḥahôkèr II, 17). But the latter name is transcribed in Arabic as نانا (Harkavy, ibidem).
The by-name of the third as given by Ed. is no doubt incorrect, as according to the express statement Ed. IV, 197th al-Fadl was (as well as Aḥmad b.Ḥā’īt) from Bāṣra. Instead of we find: 1) Isfr. 64a 1. 3.—2) Ed. III, 1207, IV, 197th; (V here al-Fadl; Br. L here and L II, 162b, l. 1 5 al-Fāḍil); L II, 146a (sic) L5 Ji).—3) Shahr. 18; 42 Shahr. 18; 42 al-Fāḍil (falsal 6 b. al- khāḍī) 4.—Iji 340. It is impossible to decide on the proper form.

The doctrines common to these three men consist mainly of the belief in the divinity of Jesus and a fully developed theory of Metempsychosis; see the sources quoted above, especially Ed. I, 90, Shahr. 42 f., Makr. 347. They are usually mentioned together and designated as the pupils of the Mu’tazilite an-Nazzām (p. 58th), who himself betrays the influence of Christian doctrine, comp. Schreiner, der Kalam in der jüdischen Literatur, p. 4.—According to Ed. I, 90th and Bagd. 103th, Ahmad b. Yānūsh (or whatever his name) was a pupil of Aḥmad b. Ḥā’īt.

— L. 18. On the term “Rawāfiḍ” see Appendix A.
— L. 19. On the Sūfis see Text 73th. The omission in L. Y. 20 (note 11) is probably intentional. Ibn Ḥazm as Zāhirite has naturally enough a particular aversion to the allegorical interpretation current among the Sūfis.


— L. 17. Mukāṭīl is counted Shahr. 108 (comp. ib. p. 106) among the Murji’a, but later on, p. 121, among the Zeidiyya.
— L. 20. See the names of these three Shiites in the Index.

On the close relation between the Shi’a and the Mu’tazila see ZDMG. 52, 216; 53, 380, 538; 60, 225, de Boer 43 ult. Comp. Müller, Islam, II, p. 9. The Shiites mentioned here all belong to the Imāmiyya. Still closer is the relation of the Zeidiyya to the Mu’tazila. Zeid b. Ἀλί (Text 74th), the founder of the former sect, was a pupil of Wāṣil b. Ἀτά, the founder of the latter
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[31] (Shahr. 116), who in turn is said to have received the "science of Kalâm" from Muhammed b. al-Hanafiyya, Zeid. Mutaz. 10 penult. Typical is the utterance Makrizi’s (348") “Seldom is a Mu'tazilite found who is not a Râfidite, except a few.”

5 33, l. 23. "Went to the extreme," lit. "exaggerated."=

This verb, which in the form of the participle (غَلاَبِيَة or غْلاَة) has become the technical term for the Ultra-Shi‘a, originally seems to have had a wider range and to have been applied to other than Shiitic movements. Thus Ikd (249) has a special 10 chapter on "غلولو" in asceticism. Makrizi applies this expression to all sects of Islam and states in the case of each sect the nature of its "غلولو," i. e., in how far it exaggerates the correct principles of the Sunna.

— L. 24. This view is held by Abû Ismâ‘îl al-Biţîkhî (p. 15 117), Ed. IV, 1894.

— L. 26. This view is held by the Meimûniyya, a section of the ‘Ajârîa, Ed. IV, 19011, Shahr. 96, Bagd. 4b. They slavishly adhered to the restrictions in Koran 4, 27.

— L. 27. This view, too, is attributed to the Meimûniyya, Shahr. 95 f., comp. Nöldeke, Geschichte des Korans, p. 277 ff. 50

— L. 28 f. See Koran 24, 2; 5, 42 and comp. Ed. IV, 1894.

Milal L II, 25b l. 2: قال أبو حمد، وبعض الخوارج جُسَّرَ فقال:

يُقام الحدود عليهم ثم يُستنتاجون، يُقَلِّلونَ قال أبو حمد، وهذا

خلاف لإجماع المتيمق، وخلاف للفقران الجبرد.

25 — L. 33. The doctrine of Metempsychosis was current among the Mu’tazilites, Schreiner, der Kalâm in der jüdischen Litteratur, p. 62 ff. It was of vital importance for the extreme Shi‘a, to whom it served as a metaphysical substructure for many of their beliefs and practices (see Index s.v. "Transmigration of Souls"). Shahr., Makr. and others mention a special sect called Tanâsukhiyya.—See also p. 2619 ff.

[34] 34, l. 2. This view is attributed to a certain Abû Ǧifār, Ed. IV, 1917. L II, 145b is more explicit: رَأَى مَا غَفَّار احْدِ

1 I cannot identify the passage in Ed.
2 L II, 182b he is called as in Ed.
— L. 7. Ibn Ḥazm (Ed. IV, 199) quotes in the name of Ismā'īl b. ‘Abdallah ar-Ru‘ainī, an older contemporary of his, who was known for his piety and asceticism, the doctrine "that he who has reached the highest degree of righteousness and purity of soul has attained prophecy and that the latter is by no means a special faculty."
— L. 9. Instead of "pious" better translate "saints."— Comp. Ed. IV, 27°: "We often heard of Ṣūffīs who maintained that a saint was superior to a prophet;" IV, 226°, "a part of the Ṣūffīs claim that there are among the Divine Saints (أولياء الله) some who are superior to all the prophets and apostles, and that he who has reached the utmost limit of saintliness is exempt from all religious precepts, as prayer, fast, alms, etc. and is allowed all forbidden things, as adultery, wine, and so forth." IBab. Fīkādat 24° ascribes the same views to the adherents of Ḥallāj (Text 69°):

وعلامة المَلَائِجیة من الغَلَاة ذَعُویٌ التُّكَلثَّی بالعبادة مع تدیّنهم بِتَرِک الصَّلْوَة وَجَنِيع الفرَائض

وَدعوی البِعْرَة بِأَسْیاء الله العَظَمْ وَدعوی آنطِباع الحَقّ لهم وَان الولی اذ خَلْص وَعَر ف مَذھِبِهِم فَهُوَ عَنْدَهُم افْضِلٌ مِن الانبیاء علیهم السلام

Comp. also Ibn al-Athīr’s utterance p. 14°.—One might think of reading "instead of" instead of the "السرِّیة" (l. 8). But the author reviews the "exaggerations" of each of the five sects of Islam (Text 28 ult.). The Sunnites in consequence cannot be missing (cf. p. 12° ff.).
— L. 12. The belief in Incarnation (ḥulūl) forms the basis of the cardinal ultra-Shiitic belief in the Divine nature of the Imams. Most historians of religion enumerate a special sect called Ḥulūliyya. See Index sub voce "Incarnation."

---

1 The change in gender because milk naturally refers to the female.
2 See p. 82°.
[34] — L. 13. On Hallâj see Comm. to p. 6918. Ibn Hazm effectively ridicules this belief in the divinity of Hallâj, Ed. V, 117. He repeatedly quotes Hallâj as the type of a (pseudo) miracle worker, e. g., Ed. I, 11019 and elsewhere.

— L. 18. On as-Sayyid, see passages specified in the Index.
— L. 22. On Abû Mansûr, see p. 8922.
— L. 23. On Bazîq, see p. 9523; on Bayân, p. 8824.

[35] 35, l. 1 ff. Comp. a similar utterance of Ibn al-Athîr (VIII, 21). These heretics maintain "that all the religious precepts have an inner meaning, and that Allah has imposed upon his saints and those that have perceived the Imâms and the "Gates" (abwâb, şâfitic term) neither prayer nor alms nor anything else." Makr. 35218 quotes in the name of the Khâṭṭâbiyya (Text 69) the same specimens of allegorical interpretation, with a few characteristic modifications. Thus "Jibt" and "Tâğût"

(1. 7) are interpreted as referring to Abû Sufyân and 'Amr b. al-ʿÂṣ, while Abû Bekr and 'Omar are represented by "khamr" (wine) and "maysir" (a gambling game), Koran 2, 216; 5, 92. This is no doubt an attempt to soften somewhat the insult to "the two Sheikhs" implied in the original interpretation.

Interesting, because reflecting the attitude of official Shiism toward these exegetical endeavors, are the two anecdotes told Kashi 188. "Abû 'Abdallah (i. e., Ja'far as-Ṣâdiq, see Index) wrote to Abû'l-Khaṭṭâb (Text 694): 'It has come to my knowledge that thou assumest that "adultery" means a person, that "wine," "prayer," "fasts" and "abominations" (fawâḥish, Koran 6, 152; 7, 31) mean certain persons. It is not as thou sayest.'—Someone said to Ja'far: 'It is reported in thy name that "wine," "maysir," "images," and "arrows" (Koran 5, 92) stand for certain persons.' He replied: Allah would certainly not have told his people something that they could not know (i. e., understand by mere allusion)."


— L. 13 ff. See also Text 493. I. H. alludes to the same attitude of the Shiites, Milal L II, 83b (=Ed. IV, 83): Jahm b. Ṣafwân and Abû'l-Hudeil, as well as certain Rawâfiḍ, deny the
eternity of Paradise and Hell (comp. p. 74). He then proceeds to refute Jahm and Abūl-Hudail. As for the Rawâfîd, they deserve no refutation, as they do not rely on logical demonstration (the last sentence missing in Ed.). In another passage (Ed. II, 94) I. H. elaborately argues against those of his co-religionists who "take it for granted that religion cannot be accepted on the basis of logical demonstration, thus gladdening the hearts of the heretics and testifying that religion can be established by means of assumptions and by superior force."

How deeply seated this aversion to argumentation was in Shi'a circles can be seen from the utterances of the famous Imamite Ibn Bâbu̇ye (Fītikadat 65), who devotes a whole chapter to this subject. I reproduce this interesting chapter in its essential parts:

Bab al-‘a‘thāqāfī fī al-ma‘ām lī rā‘l-am‘āl fī tālī lihiyāt
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 I. H. elaborately argues against those of his co-religionists who "take it for granted that religion cannot be accepted on the basis of logical demonstration, thus gladdening the hearts of the heretics and testifying that religion can be established by means of assumptions and by superior force."

How deeply seated this aversion to argumentation was in Shi’ite circles can be seen from the utterances of the famous Imamite Ibn Bâbu̇ye (Fītikadat 65), who devotes a whole chapter to this subject. I reproduce this interesting chapter in its essential parts:

Bab al-‘a‘thāqāfī fī al-ma‘ām lī rā‘l-am‘āl fī tālī lihiyāt

This is the Kunya of Ibn Bâbu̇ye.

Koran 53, 43.

This is the Kunya of Ibn Bâbu̇ye.

Koran 53, 43.

Shahr. 143 mentions in the name of al-Warrâk (author of the Fihrist?) that this reply of Ja‘far was transmitted by Hishâm b. Sālim (see Index) and Muhammed b. an-Nu‘mān (p. 59), who strictly followed this injunction till they died.

I. e., Ali.
This elimination of logic from the province of religion is complemented and justified by the claim of a higher source of knowledge, the claim of inspiration (l. 14). See on this p. 54†.

— l. 22. The Ultra-Shiites are excluded from Islam by all orthodox theologians, comp. Introduction, p. 23, l. 1-2. I. H. sees in this agreement of the orthodox the force of an "ijmâ‘."

— l. 24 ff. The following significant passage was first communicated by Kremer (Ideen, p. 10) from the Vienna manuscript. Makr. 362† ff. reproduces our passage without giving credit to its author (comp. p. 8, n. 3). Ibn Hazm’s view on the origin of Shiitic heterodoxy is founded on the observation of the rôle played by the Persian element in the Shiitic movement, a view fully shared and frequently over-emphasized by modern scholars (see Introduction, p. 3, note 1). This view, which conveniently enough regards the introduction of "gušuww" (see p. 12†) into Islam as a treacherous act of revenge on the part of the subjugated nationalities, is voiced also by other Muhammedan writers, comp., e. g., the utterance of Ibn al-Athîr VIII, 21 (p. 14†) and Iji 349. I. H. gives repeated expression to this conviction in his Milal, comparing the treachery of the Persians with the deceitful attitude of the Jews towards Christianity, the latter having bribed the apostle Paul to smuggle the doctrine of "gušuww" into the new faith. Thus in the chapter dealing with Christianity (Ed. II, 38) I. H. endeavors to prove that the Apostles were infidels. "Either they sincerely and firmly believed in the divinity of Christ and "exaggerated" on his

1 Comp. Text 53† and Comm.

2 The expression كِرْم الإسلام is repeatedly found in this connection, comp. Ed. IV, 297†, and elsewhere.

3 It is worthy of notice that I. H. repeatedly quotes the latter view as being held by the Jews of his time.
behalf, in the same way as did the Sabâ’iyya' and the other sects [35] of the Gâliya as regards Ali, or as the Khaṭṭâbiyya believed in the divinity of Abû'l-Khattâb (Text 69'), the adherents of al-Ḥallâj (Text 69') in the divinity of al-Ḥallâj and the other infidels among the Bâṭîniyya . . . , or they were seduced by the Jews, as the latter claim, to corrupt the followers of Christ and lead them into error, in the same way as ‘Abdallah b. Sabâ the Himyarite, al-Mukhtar b. Abî ‘Obeid, Abû ‘Abdallah al-'Ajâni, Abû Zakariya al-Khayyât, Ali an-Najjar, Ali b. al-Faḍl al-Janâdi2 and the other emissaries of the Karmatians and Shiites3 rose to lead into error the partisans (Shi‘a) of Ali.”

Next to the Persians, the largest share in the importation of heterodox doctrines into Islam is attributed to the Jews, mainly on the ground that ‘Abdallah b. Sabâ (p. 1836 ff.), the founder of the first Shiitic sect, is said to have been a Jew. Thus I. H.15 in referring to the claim of the Jews regarding the apostle Paul, thoughtfully adds (I, 222): “This is something which we do not consider improbable on their part. For they tried the same thing towards ourselves and our religion, although this time they failed to carry out their cunning. I refer to ‘Abdallah b. Sabâ known as Ibn as-Saudâ, the Jew, the Himyarite—may Allah curse him!—who embraced Islam in order to lead into error as many Muslims as possible. He assumed the leadership of an ignoble party, who stood on the side of Ali, so that they might profess the divinity of Ali, in the same way as Paul became the leader of the followers of Christ that they might believe his divinity. These are now the Bâṭîniyya and Gâliya,

---

1 Cod. L. (I, 105") and V. (160") read Sabâbiyya, see p. 411T.
2 See on most of these men the Index.
3 “proprement les Orientaux, était en Afrique le nom par lequel on désignait les Chiites” (Dozy s. v.).
4 How widespread this belief was can be seen from the elaborate story, given by Isfr. (71") and designated by him as generally known, how Paul at the instance of the Jews became a Christian, studied in the Christian monasteries and, having gained their confidence, smuggled into Christianity the belief in the Trinity, etc.
6 Ed. 2225. L. V. correctly.
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[35] and the least heretical among these are the Imāmiyya.” See more on the relation of Judaism to Shiism, p. 19\textsuperscript{f} ff.

— L. 29. I owe the explanation of these two terms to a private communication of Professor Nöldeke: “Ibn Ḥazm’s statement with reference to the al-
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Muhammedan scholars, except Bagd. and Isfr. Tabari's account[37] (I 2941; comp. Wellhausen, Opp. 91) differs in several essential points from the reports of the theological writers. Altogether the data on this enigmatic personality are as interesting as they are conflicting; they deserve to be made the subject of special investigation. He is generally considered the founder of Shiism, and this, in connection with his Jewish origin, sufficiently explains the endeavors of the Muhammedan theologians to charge him with many a heresy which developed in the later course of Shiism. His Jewish birth was a sufficient pretext for the Sunnites to bring Shiism in connection with Judaism. We saw Ibn Hazm's remarks p. 16 f. Kashi, in the biography of 'Abdallah b. Sabâ, p. 70, plainly says: “On account of this the opponents of the Shi'a maintain that the root of Shiism and Râfidism (الشيعة وال예فر) was taken over from Judaism.” The famous theologian ash-Sha'bi (died 103) is reported to have drawn an elaborate and odious parallel between the Shiites and the Jews (Ikd 269). He says among other things, with special reference to Ibn Sabâ: “The Râfiда are the Jews of this nation. They hate Islam as the Jews hate Christianity. They embraced Islam, not because they longed for it or because they feared Allah, but because they detested the Muslims and intended to overpower them.”

On 'Abdallah's alleged participation in the uprising of 'Othmân see Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten VI, 124 f.—On l. 11 see p. 100.


— L. 13. On the Karmatians see Dozy, Isl. 268 ff., Blochet 61 ff., de Boer 82 f.—A succinct presentation of their doctrine, de Goeje, Carmathes 166 f.

— L. 15. On Mazdak see Nöldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, p. 455 ff.—Similarly I. H. expresses himself Ed. I, 34*: “As for the Mazdakiyya (written with قد), they are the adherents of Mazdak the Môbad. They are those who believe in communism as to property and women. The Khur-
ramiyya, the adherents of Bâbak, are one of the sects of the Mazdaḵiyya. They are also the secret (basis) of the doctrine of the Ismâʿiliyya and their (vital) element, as well as of those who hold to the doctrine of the Karmatians and the Banû ʿObeid (=Fatimides)."


— L. 15. The author has apparently in view the belief held in Shiitic, as well as in certain Sunnitic quarters, that the Prophet bequeathed to ʿÂisha, Fâṭima, ʿAbbâs or ʿAlî, respectively, some mystic lore; comp. Goldziher, Muh. St. II, 118.

— L. 18. Comp. Ed. V, 26 penult.: “It is firmly established regarding the prophet... that he was sent to the red and the black.”

In accordance with his Zahirite conviction, which strictly and exclusively adheres to the bare text of the Koran and the Ḥadîth, I. H. lays special emphasis on the reliability

---

1 Ed. L and V. "the worst."
2 Koran 16, 46.

40, l. 11. "The Mu’tazilites, the Khārijites, the Murji’ites[40] and the Shiites." The same enumeration of Muhammedan sects (comp. Introduction, p. 21) Ed. IV, 25: 

5 جميع اهل الإسلام: من اهل السنة والمعتربة والتجاربة (والمرجية) والشيعة.

— L. 15 (note 6). The words I interpret in the sense that nothing remains to these infidels to boast of, beyond (=except) the infamies and lies to be found in their Scriptures. The reading of L. and Br. LD.? jk. I would translate: "beyond which (sc. لدهم) no proof (is needed)," i.e., the infamies in themselves are sufficient to impeach the infidels. On this meaning of بعد see the glossary to Tabari, sub voce.

41, l. 15. Characteristic of I. H.’s truthfulness (see Introduction, p. 15) is another utterance of his, Ed. IV, 10876: "If we thought that dishonest quoting was permissible, we should use as an argument (against the Shiites) the words reported (in the name of the Prophet): ‘Follow the example of those20 after me, viz., Abū Bekr and ‘Omar.’ But this (tradition) is not true, and may Allah guard us from using as an argument anything that is not true."

— L. 17 (note 7). Comp. Text 42, l. 5 and note 8. I. H. uses a very similar phraseology Ed. IV, 20776: "We have here set forth the depravities of the adherents of heresy (he refers to the Murji’ites) in order to cause people to flee from them and to frighten away the illiterate among the Muslims from becoming familiar with them and from thinking well of their corrupt words."

42, l. 1 f. The heresies referred to are those of the Mu’tazilites. They are quoted as such Ed. IV, 192 (in the chapter on the Mu’tazila).—I. H. chooses them as specimens in his introduction because, in the original disposition of the pamphlet against the four heterodox sects, which is now incorporated25 with his Milal, the Mu’tazila occupied the first place. See my
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— L. 18. On "Rawāḍī" see Appendix A.

5 43, l. 1. The founder of the Jārūdiyya is called with his full name Abū’l-Jārūd Ziyād b. al-Mundir al-‘Abdi, Masudi V, 474, Kashi 150, Tusy, p. 146 No. 308, Shahr. 121; Fihr. 17815 and Makr. 35214 assign to him the additional Kunya Abū ’n-Najm. Muhammed al-Bākīr (died 117) called him "Surhūb," which is said to designate "a blind devil dwelling in the sea" (Kashi, Shahr. 119), because he was born blind (Fihr., Kashi, Tusy). The sect was accordingly called also the Surhūbiyya (Kashi).

As regards their tenets, the Jārūdiyya variously differ from the bulk of the Zeidiyya, whom they regard as infidels. They share with the latter the central doctrine that Muhammed appointed Ali as his successor, not, as the Imāmiyya maintain, by means of a written will which the Companions maliciously set aside, but "by a description (of his qualities) without the mention of his name" (Shahr.: بِالرِّجْفِ دُونَ التَّشْبِيَة). But they differ from them in that they regard the Companions as infidels because they did not endeavor to find out the man to whom the Prophet referred and chose a wrong one in his place. According to Shahr. 118, Abū’l-Jārūd went so far as even to deny the Imamate of Zeid b. Ali, the founder of the Zeidiyya, on the ground that the latter considered Abū Bekr and ‘Omar legitimate rulers. Isfr., however, (9a ult.) insists that the recognition of Zeid as Imam is common to all Zeiditic sects without exception. It is strange that I. H. should omit the mention of this typical heterodoxy of the Jārūdiyya: the "Takfīr as-

25 29, l. 1. As to the succession in the Imamate, the Jārūdiyya agree with the rest of the Zeidiyya that it is legitimate in the descendants both of Ḥasan and Ḥusein, and in these exclusively, on condition that they are qualified for the Imamate and present their claims with the sword in their hands. Of the three Imams quoted in our passage one is a Ḥasanide, the other two Ḥuseinides.

On the Jārūdiyya compare also the account of Bagd. 9b.
— L. 2 (note 1). "al-Husein" is also found Shahr. 118, [43] Iji 352, Bagd. 17b (also elsewhere) and Isfr. 12a. It is known how frequently these two names are confounded.—Muhammed died at the hands of ‘İsa b. Mūsa, the governor of Kufa (died 167), in 145, IKot. 192, Tab. III, 189 ff.

— Note 7. On Ra’dwa see p. 361. Bagd. 17b calls the locality حُمْطُمُforcing حب (with soft under the line). See further Text 6010 and Comm.

— L. 7–8. The belief that the Imams have not died and will reappear on earth is the central tenet of the Ultra-Shi’a, and occurs, as can be seen in this treatise, in connection with nearly every one of their sects. This belief is founded on two doctrines which must have gained wide currency in heterodox Islam at a very early period: the one is the Raj’a doctrine, the other is a doctrine derived from heterodox Christian Docetism. It is necessary to gain a clear view of these two doctrines in order to grasp in its full meaning the conception which practically lies at the bottom of all Shiitic movements.

The doctrine designated as Raj’a has apparently had its history and presents in consequence a complex appearance. Kremer (Culturgeschichte unter den Chalifen II, 397), in speaking of this doctrine “which was widely current among the Shiites of the earliest period,” gives the following definition of this belief: “For a man to believe in the ‘Return’ (Raj’a) amounted to the conviction that Ali would rise from the dead, and that he himself would, after a certain period of time (as a rule, after forty days), come to life again.” According to the national dictionaries, Raj’a signifies “the returning to the present state of existence after death, before the Day of Resurrection.” (See Lane, sub voce, and the authorities quoted there.) It would thus appear that this belief in returning to life after death, which was known to the Arabs as early as in the time of Ignorance (Lane, ib.) applied to people in general, without reference to specific personalities. Jābir b. Yazid al-Ju’fī (died 128, see p. 86”) believed in the Raj’a, Muslim, Sahih (Cairo 1283) I, 51. This is more explicitly stated by

1 The pronunciation Rij’a is recorded, although not approved of, by Nawawi on Muslim’s Sahih (Cairo 1283) I, 51.
The poet al-Bashshār b. Burd (died 167) held the same belief, *Agh.* III, 24a, and this is again explained by Bagd. 17a

It seems, however, that this belief was, or became, mainly connected with certain prominent individuals who, by reason of their prominence, deserved a return to life. We find this belief repeatedly in connection with Muhammed. When Muhammed had died, 'Omar violently rebuked those who believed that the Prophet was dead, and he gave emphatic expression to his belief that he would "return" after forty days, "just as Moses had done," Tab. I, 1815 f., *Ibab.*, *Ithbat* 31, Bagd. 5a (here Muhammed is compared with Jesus). 'Abdallah b. Sabā, the founder of Shiism (p. 18 f.), is said to have believed in the "Return" of Muhammed. Referring to Koran 28, 85, he argued: "It is strange that people who assert that Jesus will return should deny that Muhammed will return. . . . Muhammed being worthier of returning than Jesus." "And he laid down for them the Raj'a." Tab. I, 2941.

As a rule, the Raj’a belief is found in connection with the Imāms of the Shi’a, in the first place, of course, with *Alī*. The

---

1 This form of Raj’a is probably the real basis of the belief current among the Khaṭṭābiyya that they will never die (p. 725).—An allusion to this belief is perhaps found *Agh.* XI, 75a: A friend of 'Abdallah b. Muʿāwiyah (p. 4411) was called al-Baklī (p. 465) كَالبَقِيلَةُ فَادِئًا مَا تَرَجَعَ

2 Hallāj composed a book bearing on this verse under the title كتاب في أن الذي إنزل عليه القرآن لرأذل إلى معاذ (Fihr. 19213).
idea that Ali was hidden in the clouds, whence he would return on earth, was very common in Shiitic circles (see p. 42). The term Raj'a very frequently designates this belief; comp. Lisán and Táj al-'Arás, sub voce, Nawawí on Muslim, Sahih I, 51, Kremer, Culturgeschichte ib. Makr. 354:

الراجعة من أعداء

The Muhammedan writers, with extremely few exceptions, ascribe the authorship of this belief to 'Abdallah b. Sabá. Apart from the ordinary sources, see also the interesting notice IKhall. No. 645 (p. 269): al-Kalbi (died 146) “was one of the followers of ‘Abdallah b. Sabá, who maintained that Ali had not died and would return on earth.” To the references given in the course of this treatise (see p. 42 f.) may also be added Madainí (died about 225/840), who reports that al-Hasan, the son of Ali, protested against the belief that God would bring Ali to life on earth before the day of Resurrection (ZDMG. 38, 391). How deeply rooted this belief was in the masses may be seen from the curious anecdote narrated by 'Abdallah b. ‘Abbás (Ikd 269). A man called on him at a very unusual hour and asked him: “When will this man be brought to life?”—“Which man?”—“Ali b. Abi Ṭalib.” I said: “He will not be brought to life, until God brings to life those that are in the graves.” He said: “You speak like one of these fools.” I said: “Take him away from me, may Allah curse him!”

Next to Ali the Raj’a occurs in connection with his son Muh. b. al-Ḥanafiyya. It was the belief of the Keisāniyya, and its famous champions were the poets Kuthayyir and as-Sayyid al-Ḥimyari, Agh. VII, 24, VIII, 33, 34, XI, 46; see also Fawād al-Wafayát I, 24. Ikd 268 designates

1 On Tabari’s account see above. Makr. 356 ult., with characteristic eclecticism; combines both views. ‘Abdallah b. Sabá believed

2 They believed at the same time in their own Raj’a, pp. 248 and 269. Kuthayyir, who returns from a tour in the region between Mekka and Medina, reports that he has found everything absolutely unchanged

وعلى بعد موتة إلى الدنيا ورحيمة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أيضاً.

This will remain so till we return to it (after death).” Perhaps it would be more reasonable to read

يرجع وحكم المنتقم من أعداء
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[43] the belief in the "Return" of Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya as the belief of the Rawāfīḍ in general.

In the later development of the Shi'a we find the Raj'a belief in connection with nearly every Shiitic Imam. Numerous instances can be gleaned from Ibn Ḥazm's and Shahrastānī's accounts on Shiism. It was the salient feature in the controversies of the Shi'a and the belief which characterized the Wākīfīyya in distinction from the Ḥittī'iyya (p. 50).

It now remains for us to state the relation of the Raj'a doctrine to the belief in the Transmigration of Souls (Tanāsukh al-Arwāḥ). This relation is perhaps best illustrated by the amusing anecdote (told of as-Sayyid al-Ḥimyari, who believed in Raj'a as well as in Tanāsukh, l. 26 f. and p. 283⁹). A man asked as-Sayyid for a loan of a hundred dinārs, promising to repay them when he (the debtor) should return to life. As-Sayyid answered: "Yes, and even more than that, if you will give me a guarantee that you will return as a man." He said: "How else can I return?" as-Sayyid said: "I am afraid that you will return as a dog or as a pig, and my money will be lost." (Agh. VII, 8. See the same anecdote with a few variations Favāt al-Wāfayāt I, 25). The former possibility is Raj'a, the latter Tanāsukh; in other words, Raj'a signifies the return as the same person, Tanāsukh the return as a different being. The two conceptions, though related to one another and, in consequence, often found side by side, are by no means identical and are distinctly kept asunder. Kuthayyir, as well as as-Sayyid, believed not only in Raj'a but also in Tanāsukh (Agh. VIII, 27⁷; he claims to be the Prophet Jona, ib. 34). But it is expressly stated that he believed "in Raj'a and Tanāsukh" (Agh. VIII, 27³). In the same way both expressions are found side by side Shahr. 12⁵, 13². Makr. (35⁴), who enumerates a sect of Raj'iyya (see above), mentions in the same passage المَنْتَفِعَةُ القَاتِلُونَ أنَّ الأَرْاحِ تنَاسَخ

1 In a special chapter on Raj'a, I'tikadat 12⁵: He promises to write a special book on the subject which may be identical with his Ithbāt al-ġaiba. Mirza 46⁵ makes the Imamites respon-
a few isolated instances do the two terms seem to be used as syno-

nyms. Thus IKhald. (II, 164) says "in a kind of Trans-
migration or in reality," i. e., returning in spirit as a different being; or as the same person. The same close contact between the two conceptions is apparently assumed, ib. II, 169.1 Makr. 35? contradicts his own previous statements when he says: "From him (i. e., 'Abdallah b. Sabá) they also took over the belief in the concealment of the Imam and the belief in his return after death on earth, in the same way as the Imāmiyya till this day believe it of "the man of the cellar," 2 and this is the belief in Tanāsukh al- Arwāh." Apart from these instances, which are otherwise not very striking, the two ideas are clearly separated from one another.4

1 The Prophet says to Ali: "Thou art its (this nation's) Dūl-Karnein (Alexander the Great)." See de Slane's translation, II, 196, note 4, and Comm. p. 28, note 1 towards the end.

2 I read 'Ajīb instead of 'Ughībī.

3 The twelfth Imam, the Mahdi.

4 We have dwelt on this point at some length because Wellhausen, Opp. 98, denies the explanation set forth above, and insists that Raj'a is originally identical with Tanāsukh, and that the meaning usually attached to it is a later development. His contention, however, practically rests on a single passage (Agh. VIII, 34) which, even if taken in Wellhausen's interpretation, cannot stand against the numerous passages to the contrary. But the passage in question does not necessarily prove Wellhausen's assertion. We are told that Kuthayyir used to give money to the little sons of Hasan b. Hasan (b. Ali; not, as Wellhausen erroneously has it, "Hasan and Husein") and to call them "little prophets":

وَكَانَ يَرْجُونَ بِالرَّجُوعِ (similarly on the same page before).

Wellhausen assumes that these words are meant to explain Kuthayyir's
It can be seen from the preceding expositions that Raj’a as such leaves the question open whether the Imam had really died, or whether he had merely disappeared and abides in concealment pending his reappearance. On the strength of the instances quoted above one is inclined to assume that the former belief is the original one, while the latter is the later but the more popular one. It is in this form—as a correlative of “gaiba” (“concealment” of the Imam)—that Raj’a became a predominant factor in Shiism and still is the official belief of the Shiites of today.¹

action, which can only have been the outcome of his belief in the Transmigration of Souls, and that consequently the two beliefs are identical. That Kuthayyir was an adept of Metempsychosis is repeatedly stated in Agh. (see in the text above). But the construction put on the explanatory words is not irrefutable. On the same page a similar action of Kuthayyir (he hugs Mu’awiya b. ‘Abdallah b. Ja’far (see p. 45), who was a schoolboy at the time, and calls him a little prophet) is recorded without the explanation appended here. The words كَانَ بِرَجَعَةٍ بالرَّجَعَةِ may signify here as little as in the statement regarding as-Sayyid (Agh. VII, 24¹⁸) يشرب الخمر يومين بالرَّجَعَة. In both cases the explanatory remark may simply mean to imply that the man in question was an abominable heretic, the belief in Raj’a being regarded as a sign of extreme heterodoxy (comp. Agh. III, 24⁹). At any rate, the weight of the passage referred to by Wellhausen is largely counterbalanced by the statement, Agh VIII, 27⁰, that Kuthayyir believed in “Raj’a and Tanásukh,” where the two ideas appear as distinctly different.

¹ By way of appendix a few isolated usages of the term Raj’a may find place here. Extremely interesting, but somewhat obscure, is the passage Agh. III, 188. Omayya b. Abi Salt, who is anxious to become a prophet, goes to Syria and repeatedly enters a church, while his companions have to wait outside. A monk who lives in that church had told him that there were to be six Raj'āt (see the remark on the margin of Agh.) after Jesus, of which five had already come to pass. When he comes another time, he is told by the monk: “The Raj’a has already come and a prophet has been sent from among the Arabs.” Thereupon he gives up his prophetic ambitions.—A very peculiar interpretation of the Raj’a belief is found Mirza ⁴⁹⁵, but, in view of the polemical tendency of his treatise, this interpretation may only reflect his own individual conception of the Shiitic doctrine. He says: مَرَادُهُم مِن الْرَّجَعَةِ يَمْعَلُ الْأَمْيَةَ وَلاَ يَكُونُ فِي أُخْرِ الرَّجَعَةِ وَمَرَادُهُم مِن الْرَّجَعَةِ اِنَّ النَّبِيَّ عَلَيْهِ السَّلامَ وَلاَ يَكُونُ فِي أُخْرِ الرَّجَعَةِ
This conception, which regards the death of the Imams as a mere disappearance, indispensably needs a complement which should account for the fact of their apparent death, the more so as the Imams of the Shi'a, with scarcely any exception, all died an unnatural death. This complement is supplied by a heterodox Christian doctrine borrowed from Docetism. It cannot be our task here to trace the influence of Docetism on Islam. But it seems highly probable that this doctrine came to the Muslims through the medium of Manichaeism, which adopted this belief and gave it a definite shape. "The Jesus of the Manichaeans then had no objective reality as man. His whole human appearance, birth and baptism were a mere apparition, and so were his sufferings. For it was not he who was really crucified, but it was an emissary of the devil who tried to frustrate the instructive activity of Jesus, and who, as a punishment for his wickedness, was fastened to the cross by Jesus himself" (Kessler, Article "Manichæer," PRE, XII, 218. Comp. Flügel, Mani, 124, 336 f.).

The word is used by Ibn Hazm (Ed. I, 189) to indicate the return (of a nation) to its former state of power and prosperity: And he who was de Slane (Prolegomènes d'Ibn Khaldoun II, 196 note 5): a new period of time during which every past event will return, or repeat itself. The passage referred to proves nothing of the kind. It merely says which has nothing to do with the term Raj'a. In Ibn Khaldun's text (II, 169) the meaning of the word is probably close to that of Transmigration of Souls, see p. 277.

1 On Docetism see Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte (2nd ed.) I, 164, and the passages specified there in the index.
This docetic belief, which afforded a satisfactory explanation of the alleged death of the Shiitic Imams, was readily adopted by the radical Shiites, and it often occurs in the very same form which Manichaeism had given it: that not the Imam was really killed, but a devil who assumed his shape (شیطان تصور بصورته). We find this belief in connection with nearly every Imam of the Ultra-Shiites. On its application to Ali, which is undoubtedly historical, see p. 43 f. Bagd. and Isfr. mention this theory in connection with the following Imams: Ali (in the name of ¹Abdallah b. Sabā) Bagd. 94ᵃ, Isfr. 55ᵇ f.; Abū Muslim (see Index), Bagd. 100ᵃ, Isfr. 59ᵃ; Muhammed b. ¹Abdallah b. al-Hasan b. al-Hasan (p. 87), Bagd. 18ᵃ f., 97ᵃ; Ḥallâj (Text 69ⁱ), who is said to have stamped his features on someone else, Bagd. 102ᵃ, Isfr. 61ᵇ. The Imamites who believe in the "return" of the twelfth Imam, the only one who was not murdered (at least according to the Imamitic belief), and therefore insist that the preceding Imams are really dead, have no room for this belief. But it can be seen from the polemics of Ibn Bâbûye that this docetic belief was widespread in Shiitic circles. After having described the manner of (violent) death of the eleven Imams—a favorite topic in Imamitic works—IBab. thus sums up his position (Fītikadat 23ᵇ, in the chapter ¹تکیه الغریب والتفریغ):

واعتقدنا في ذلك إنن جرى عليههم على الحقيقة وأنه ما اشتهية للناس أوهموه كما يزعم ما (من) (read) يتجاوز الخذل فيهم بل شاهدوا قتلهم على الحقيقة والمصحبة لا على المحسن والمحبلة ولا على الشک والمسبحة فمهزهم أنهم شيدوا أو واحد منهم فليس من ديننا على شيء وحسن منه يراه.

This docetic belief, in conjunction with the Raj’a doctrine, enabled the Ultra-Shiites to assume a position which made them practically invincible. The former made their Imams invulnerable: they were immune from death or murder. The latter made them immortal and carried over their living influence to posterity.

— L. 9. حتَّی يمَلَأ الارض عدَّلًا كما ملئت جَبْرُوا. This phrase, as is well known, forms a part of the Mahdī tradition, IKhald.
II, 142 ff.; Snouck Hurgronje, Der Mahdi p. 13 ff. Apart from this generally accepted form of the hadith, we also meet with the variant ṭayyibāʾ al-ʾarḍ ʾisṣṭa’ā wa-ʿudā’ā lā kama māliʿt ḥawwāʾa ḥa’il al-Mahāsīn (Leyden, 1855) I, 243. Bagd. repeatedly quotes the reading ṭayyibāʾ instead of ṭayyibāʾ. One might think of a scribal error. But the following story (Bagd. 96b) makes this supposition impossible. Muğira b. Saʿīd (p. 79 ff.) acknowledged Muḥammad b. Ẓād al-Mustaʿin in 250h, Tab. III, 1515 if., Shahr. 119. The general of the Zenj (p. 98) pretended to be this Muḥyī, Tab. III, 1745 (anno 255).

— L. 12 ff. The same fact is recorded Tab. III, 1518 (MCC) and Isfr. 12a, who gives on the same page the conventional form of the Mahdi tradition. See also fol. 9a and Isfr. 12a, who gives on the same page the conventional form of the Mahdi tradition.

— L. 10. I have restored Yahyā's genealogy with the help of 15 Gen. Leyd. Comp. Tab. III, 1515 note i and 1403 (Addit.), where the editor equally substitutes Hūseyn (not al-Hūseyn, as he expressly remarks). Iji 352 has Yahyā b. Ẓād aṣ-Šāb. — Yahya was killed during the reign of Muḥammad b. Ẓād al-Mustaʿin in 250h, Tab. III, 1515 ff. His pedigree, as given in our text and confirmed by Tab. and IKhall. (who deals bio-

† Masudi V, 181 gives also the variant ṭayyibāʾa ḥawwāʾa ḥa’il al-Mahāsīn.

‡ This Muḥammad cannot very well be identical with the one mentioned Tab. III, 18111 who died eleven years earlier. They are erroneously identified in the Tabari index. In the last mentioned passage ṭayyibāʾ al-ʾarḍ is to be struck out with Cod. C.
I. Friedlaender, [1908.

[43] graphically with everyone of his ancestors), is absolutely assured. Just as certain is the genealogy of Ḥusein b. Ismā‘īl, whose uncle, Ishāk b. Ibrāhīm (l. 16), accepted a prominent post in the police of Bagdad in 207h, Tab. III, 1062. Under these circumstances it is difficult to account for the apposition "the son of his paternal uncle" (l. 15). Perhaps our author confounds the fact mentioned here with the one recorded Tab. III, 1405 (anno 236), that Muhammed, the son of Ishāk b. Ibrāhīm, dispatched Ḥusein b. Ismā‘īl, this time his real cousin, to put down a rebellion in Fāris. Another not impossible, though less probable, solution would be to explain as a cousin of a remoter degree,—in this case a third cousin. Thus Tab. I, 510 (=IAth. I, 142) Moses is called the "'amm" of Phinehas. So far the reading of L. Br.—As for the genealogy given in Ed. and the other codices, it can scarcely be correct and seems to be an attempt to explain.


---

1 The relation of the three men mentioned in our text presents itself as follows:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muṣ'ab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāhir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismā‘īl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishāk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdallah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muṣ'ab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāhir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismā‘īl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdallah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
and he died there, Tab., Masudi, Shahr. According to Masudi [44] (VII, 117), there were many Zeidites at the time he was writing his history (332h) who believed in the "return" (Raj'a) of Muhammed. His followers were especially numerous in Kufa, Tabaristân and Deilam.

— L. 6 ff. Ibn Ḥazm's references to the Keisâniyya, which are frequent, though brief, substantially enrich our knowledge of this important sect. This at once shows itself in the explanation of the name, which is the only correct one among the numerous interpretations offered by other writers. The conventional explanation derives the name from Keisân, which is declared to have been a nickname of Mukhtâr (p. 79), so the Dictionaries: Jauharz (comp. IKhall. No. 570), Kânâs, Lisân and Tâj al-'Arâs, sub voce كيسان; IKot. 300, Ikd 269â', Makr. 351â' (=de Sacy II, 592), Bagd. 11b. On the other hand, endeavors were made to connect the founder of this sect in some way with Ali, or with his son Muhammed b. al-Ḥanafiyya, whom the Keisâniyya regard as his successor and the heir of his mystic knowledge (a point on which this sect lays great stress). As there was a maula of Ali named Keisân (he falls, while defending his master, in the battle of Siffin, Tab. I, 3293 =IAth. III, 247), he was declared the founder of the Keisâniyya and the disciple of Ali, or of Muhammed b. al-Ḥanafiyya, in the lore of mysticism, see Shahr. (who distinguishes between the Keisâniyya and the Mukhtâriyya), similarly Abu’l-Maali 157, IKhall. ib. (who also quotes the preceding explanation, with the confession لا الله علم), IKhald. I, 357, Makr. ib., Kremer, Ideen 375. An attempt to reconcile both derivations is the interpretation quoted by Bagd. (11b) "that Mukhtâr acquired his heterodox opinions from a maula of Ali by the name of Keisân," or the explanation recorded by Kashi 75 that Mukhtâr was called Keisân after Ali's maula, "who induced him to seek revenge for al-Ḥusein's blood and pointed out to him his murderers." Closest to the facts is Masudi V, 180: "They were called Keisâniyya because of their relation to

---

1 The suffix in 8م literally refers to Muh. b. al-Ḥanafiyya, and so it is taken by de Slane, p. 408. In accordance with our expositions, however, the suffix must be referred to Ali, who is mentioned a little earlier.
[44] al-Mukhtâr b. Abî 'Obeid ath-Thakafi, whose name was Keisân and whose kunya was Abû 'Omra . . . Some of them, however, hold that Keisân Abû 'Omra is not identical with al-Mukhtâr" (he refers for further information to his Makâlât).

The only correct explanation is the one offered by Ibn Ḥazm (here and Text, p. 771), who designates Keisân Abû 'Omra as the follower (sâhib) of Mukhtâr. The person referred to is Keisân, the chief of Mukhtâr's body-guard, Tab. II, 671' (= IAth. IV, 187). He was a maula of the 'Oreina, a clan of the Southern Bajila (Wüstenfeld, Tabellen, 91), and stood at the head of the Mawâli. As the latter were the main actors in Mukhtâr's uprising (comp. especially the characteristic notice Tab. II, 651'), the sect, which first asserted itself on this occasion, received its name (perhaps as a nomen odiosum) from the leader of the Mawâli.

So far the name of the sect. As for its tenets, they contain elements both of the Zeiditic and the Imamitic creed, a circumstance which renders the classification of the Keisâniyya within the bipartite division of Shi'ism extremely difficult. Their cardinal doctrine is the recognition of the Imamate of Muhammed b. al-Ḥanafiyya. But while agreeing with the Zeidiyya in rejecting the strictly legitimate principle in the Imamate and basing the claims of the Imam on his personal qualifications, they strongly emphasize with the Imâmiyya his supernatural knowledge of mystic lore. In consequence of this ambiguous position, the theologians often count the Keisâniyya as an independent sect, on an equal footing with the Zeidiyya and Imâmiyya, thus, e. g., Shahr. 109, Bagd. 91, Isfr. 7a. The latter two, however, become unfaithful to their own classification and occasionally reckon the Keisâniyya among the Imâmiyya: والكيسانيّة يُعَدُّونَ في الإمامیة Isfr. 14b (the same Bagd.). I. H., too, appears to

---

1 Kashi 75 strangely misses the point when he states that Mukhtâr was called Keisân "after his sâhib ash-Shortâh whose kunya was Abû 'Omra and whose name was Keisân." See his other explanation above.

2 Comp. Wellhausen, Opp. 89, and the footnote.

3 Ibn Ḥazm can scarcely be correct when he incidentally remarks (Ed. IV, 1038) that according to the Keisâniyya, Muhammed b. al-Ḥanafiyya was Imâm through a written statement (النصّ).
waver on this point. While in our passage he expressly designates them as a branch of the Zeidiyya—and he is the more justified in doing so, as, in distinction from all other writers, he regards as the cardinal doctrine of the Zeidiyya the recognition of the Imamate in all the descendants of Ali (not Fāṭima),—he counts them repeatedly (Text 4514, 5312, 5411) among the sects of the Imāmiyya.

After the death of Muh. b. al-Ḥanafiyya, the Keisāniyya fell asunder into a number of factions. The most important of these was the Ḥāšimiyya, which transferred the Imamate to his son Abū Ḥāshim and considered him the heir of his father’s mystic knowledge, Shahr. 112. Abū Ḥāshim having died without offspring, the Ḥāšimiyya were again divided into a large number of factions, which assigned the Imamate to various pretenders. Only a fraction of the Keisāniyya, stimulated by the mystery that surrounded Muh.’s death,3 denied his death altogether, and believed that he was hidden in the Ṣa‘dwa mountains, whence he would “return.” This belief, as is well-known, found its poetical expression through Kuthayyir and as-Sayyid, and became through them known as specifically Keisanitic.4 A notice by Bagd. (11b) has luckily preserved the name of the originator of this belief:

Then the priests, saying: 

قالوا بابامـة عبد بن الحنـفيـة فرعم ترجم منهم يقال لهم الكربئية احتجاب ابي كرب الضرير ان عبد بن الحنفيـة حي لم يمت وانه في الجبل برضيق وعندئ عين من الاماء وعين من العـسال يأخذ منهما زلما وعن يمينه أسدا وعن يساره تنير.

1 See Introduction, p. 23.
3 The year of his death fluctuates between 80 and 114! See IKot. 111, Masudi V, 267, IKhall. No. 570, and especially Nawawi, Tahdīb 113. The same uncertainty exists as regards the place of his death. See the above-mentioned sources and Barbier de Meynard in Journal Asiatique, 1874, p. 165.
4 The dogmatic historians are very well aware of these differences within the Keisāniyya. See also Istakhri 21 (=IHaukal 28), Yākūt II, 79050, Masudi V, 180.
Similarly Isfr. 10a.¹

The Radwa mountain (or rather mountains) is situated at a distance of seven days from Medina, Yakut II, 790. It was considered extremely fertile, and was believed to be one of the mountains of Paradise.²

The individual traits, with which the belief in Ibn al-Hanafiyya's sojourn in Radwa has been embellished, are properly intelligible only when we bear in mind their origin, as well as the origin of the underlying conception, which is no other than the Messianic idea. On the overwhelming influence of this idea over Islam, see de Sacy XXXI ff., van Vloten, Chiittisme 54 ff. and my essay "Die Messiasidee im Islam" (in Festschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstage A. Berliner's, Frankfurt a. M. 1903, pp. 116–130, especially 121 ff. and 127). This influence also shows itself in numerous minor details which the Muhammedan theologians, being unaware of their origin, were bound to misunderstand, and which they in consequence purposely modified. A striking example of this tendency is offered, in our opinion, by the detail, also recorded by I. H., that Ibn al-Hanafiyya was surrounded by beasts of prey. The original significance of this conception can scarcely be doubtful when examined in the form in which it appears in a poem of as-Sayyid (Agh. VII, 4). In view of the importance of the question, I quote the decisive verses in the original, adding the vowels and a translation:

¹ Makr. 352¹ says briefly وقالت الكربيئة اتباع أبي كرب بأنّ ابّن
الخنفية حتى لم يبعث وهو الإمام المنتظر

Still briefer Abu'l-Maali

الكربيئة اهّصّاب أبي كرب الضّرير

_is this Abu Karb, of whom nothing else is known, identical perhaps with

ابّر الكروس_ whom Ali banished for his extravagant doctrines, Ikd 269?

² Interesting in this connection is Burton's remark (Pilgrimage to al-Medinah and Mecca, ed. 1898, I, 222): "I heard much of its valleys and fruits and bubbling springs, but afterward I learned to rank these tales with the superstitious legends attached to it. Gazing at its bare and ghastly heights, one of our party, whose wit was soured by the want of fresh bread, surliy remarked that such a heap of ugliness deserved ejection from heaven, an irreverence too public to escape general denunciation."
"Years and months (has Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya been hidden). But he can be seen in Radwa in a glen among leopards and lions. He resides between landmarks (?), while big-eyed kine and the young ones of ostriches walk about at evening tide in the company of speckled goats. Together with them graze beasts of prey. Yet none of them attacks them to tear them with the point (of their teeth?). They (the tame animals) are through him secure from destruction, and they feed together without fear on the same meadow and at the same drinking place."

There is no need to prove that this description is a reflex of the Messianic prophecy Isa. 11, and the parallel is far more striking when we take into consideration the orthodox Muhammedan belief that at the end of Time, when Jesus shall have re-appeared and introduced the Golden Age, "lions and camels, tigers and oxen, wolves and lambs will graze peacefully together, and boys will play with snakes without danger." This original idea of the eternal peace extending over the wild animals can still be discerned in I. H.'s words, if we vocalize (Ed. IV, 17921)

\[\text{спешب تیبی انثار وسید مقيم بیس آرام وعین تراهبها آلسیناپ وليس میدا ملاقیهین مفرسما بیدل بلا خویل دلی بیعنی ووردن}\]

\[\text{عین بیینه أسذ وعین پساره نمر} \]

1 Comp. Lane s.v. 2

2 Through Muh. b. al-Ḥ. If the suffix referred to , we should expect . [See, however, p. 38, n. 1.]

3 Snouck-Hurgronje, Der Mahdi, p. 9.

4 In our translation, p. 4410 f., we have followed the ordinary conception.
the singular, and in explanation the dual was added, which gives an entirely different appearance to the whole description, thus, e.g., Shahr. 111 penult., Favāt al-Wafayāt I, 24, Bagd. 11b, Isfr. 10a.

5 The other details recorded in this paragraph equally show traces of the Messianic idea.

"Conversing with angels" (l. 11) has its source apparently in the words of as-Sayyid (Agh. VIII, 32, Masudi V, 183)

The Messias residing in Paradise (comp. Bet Hamidrash, ed. Jellinek II, 29), he naturally holds intercourse with the angels.

L. 12 apparently rests on as-Sayyid's verse

Here the original conception obviously is that the Messiah gets his food from the outside. I. H.'s words remind one vividly of I Kings 17, 6.

Another form of this conception which strongly indicates Messianic influence is that which makes Ibn al-H. derive his sustenance from two fountains, one of honey, the other of water, both flowing near him. Bagd. 11b (and Isfr. 10a):

This statement is probably derived from a Keisanite poem which is generally assigned to Kuthayyir, Agh. VIII, 32, Masudi V, 182, 25 Shahr. 111, IKhald. I, 358. The real character of this conception

1 Ms. Strassburg (Spitta No. 12), in the biography of Muhammed b. al-Ḥanafiyya. The Ms. is not paginated.—Comp. Yāḳūt II, 790—

2 Only IBab., I thermometer it to as-Sayyid. Similarly Agh. VII, 10, contrary to VIII, 32, and omitting the decisive verse,

Just what considerations led Barbier de Meynard (Journal Asiatique, 1874, p. 247) to decide in favor of as-Sayyid's authorship is difficult to understand.
is revealed in the undeniably older form which is preserved \[44\]. Ibn as-Saudâ (p. 1836) is quoted as saying: 

\[
\text{لا بِبَعْصٍ يُقِدِّمْ وَلَوْ لَيْفَانُ عِينَانُ تَفْيضُ إِحْدَاهُمَا عَسَلًا}
\]

which, to which assertion Bagd. 95a reasonably replies (95a):

\[
\text{عَطَّشَا وَلَم يَنْبَعٌ لَهُمَّ مَاءٌ فَضَلَّ عَنِ عَسَلٍ وَسَمَٰئٍ.}
\]

This "honey and butter" which is the food of the Messias seems nothing but the קָנָהָה קָרָאָה which, according to Isaiah’s prediction (7, 22), "everyone shall eat that is left in the land. It is but natural that to Kuthayyir, who was at home in Najd and Hijâz, water appeared a more appropriate article of food than butter (or cream), which was accessible to every Bedouin, the more so, since the Radwa mountains were believed to be very rich in water.

— L. 16. Mûsâ b. Ja‘far, with the by-name al-Kâzîm, was born 129 and died between 183–186, IKhall. No. 756, Tab. III, 649, see also ib. 2509. He was imprisoned by the Caliph Mahdi and, having been released for a time, again imprisoned by Rashid. It is assumed that he was poisoned in prison, IKhall. ib., Shahr. 127. He was buried in the Kureish cemetery (Bagd. 19a).
The sect which recognizes Mūsa as Ja'far's successor in the Imamate, his elder brother Ismā'īl having died before his father, are called the Mūsawiyya (مُوسوَيْيَة), Shahr. 126, Bagd. 19, Isfr. 13, Ithbat 65 and others. After his death his followers still denied that he was dead and believed in his "return." They were for this reason designated by a more comprehensive term as the Wākifa or Wākjīfiyya (see p. 51), Shahr. 127; IBab., Ithbat 36. Probably in consequence of their having been deceived in this expectation, the Mūsawiyya were branded by their opponents as the Mamtūra: "those that were rained upon." "The belief of the Wākjīfiyya attaches to Mūsa b. Ja'far. They are identical with the Mamtūra, and it is by this name that this party is known in distinction from other sects of the Shiites" (Masudi VII, 117). Zeid. says

1 Kashi 286 tells a story which satisfactorily accounts for the rise of this belief. Two trustees of Mūsa, who were in charge of a fund of 30,000 dinārs consisting of taxes that belonged to Mūsa, had squandered the money while the latter was in prison. When Mūsa died, the trustees, fearing the claims of his heirs, denied Mūsa's death, and endeavored to spread the belief in his "return."

2 The opposition of the "Twelvers" to this belief vented itself in the invention of utterances, usually put into the mouth of Ja'far, which violently protest against the Mūsawiyya doctrine. Some very characteristic specimens may be found in Kashi 284-288.

3 One of Mūsa's adherents, Fihr. 220; comp. Tusy, p. 366 f.
The name of this sect is spelt 'al-Basri' instead of 'al-Misri' adopted in our text is, apart from general considerations, confirmed by the notice Isfr. 13. Isfr. mentioned among the celebrities of the Imamiyya Shahr. 145 identical with our UkdUl? -Tusy, p. 186 (No. 400), says of a certain 'Abdallah b. Ahmad b. Abi Zeid al-Anbari that he was a member of the party of Ja'far. See also Blochet 12. Ja'far occupies a central position among the Imams of the Shi'a. His authority is considered final. See on this unique position of Ja'far pp. 79, 89 and Index. 15

45, l. 1. On Ismā'īl, see Index.

—Ibidem. The reading Sababiyya (note 1) is frequently to be met with in MSS. See, e. g., Text, p. 71, note 13; Comm. p. 27, n. 2; Tab. III, 29, note k; Lubb. al-Lubāb s. v. note d; the examples can be easily multiplied. The manuscripts of Bagd. and Isfr., which bestow great care on the diacritical points, consistently read the same way. This coincidence cannot be accidental. The reading is satisfactorily accounted for when we bear in mind that the characteristic and most objectionable feature of Shiism, in the eyes of the orthodox, is the "the denunciation of the Companions," especially

1 Yakut IV, 733 mentions a place near Hamadan. It is difficult to state whether this is the place to which Shahr. refers.

2 Isfr. 126 is in doubt as to whether this name is derived from a man or a place. The other sources have nothing to offer on the subject. The reading al-Basri (instead of al-Misri) adopted in our text is, apart from general considerations, confirmed by the notice Isfr. 13.
I. Friedlaender,

[45] of Abū Bekr and ‘Omar. Attachment to Ali without this
denunciation is تشهب حسن, Goldziher, Shi‘a 443, n. 3, comp.
ZDMG. 50, 115. See Text 72, n. 2, and the characteristic anec-
dote, below p. 65. Typical is also the notice Agh. XI, 46: The
5 Keisânite Khandak al-Asadî, having been assured by Kuthayyir
that his family would be taken care of, denounces in Mekka,
during the pilgrimage, Abū Bekr and ‘Omar and suffers mar-
tyrdom for it. The Sunnites therefore designate the Shiites
as Sabbâbûn, "denouncers", Goldziher, ZDMG. 36, 280, n. 1.
10 As the name Sabâiyya is frequently applied to ultra-Shiitic
sects in general (p. 100), it was for polemical purposes, with a
slight change in the diacritical points, transformed into Sabâ-
biyya, or more correctly, Sabbâbiyya.1

—L. 2. On Ibn Sabâ, see p. 186 ff.

—L. 3. The belief that Ali was hidden in the clouds whence
he would return on earth is ascribed by all theological writers
(Shahr. 132 ult.; Iji 348; Makr 3571; see also IKhald. I, 358)
to Ibn Sabâ. While many, or most, doctrines attributed to this
founder of Shiism are apocryphal or of later origin, this belief
is no doubt authentic. This conception must have become
extremely popular among the Shiites at an early period, as
numerous early authorities bear witness to it. Muslim, Sahîh
(Cairo 1284b, I, 51) in the name of Sufyân (ath-Thaurî, died
161): أن الرافضة تقول أن عليّا في السحاب: 104

mentions a special sect called as-Sahâbiyya يُقال لهم alice
مهم يزعمون أن عليّا هو لم يسبوق
العرب والجم بعصاه وهم يزعمون أن عليّا في السحاب. Abu’l-
Maali 158 calls the founder of this sect Muhammed b. Ya’kûb
by the appellation Sahâbiyya îskand bin يعقوب ايشاش ٌبوبن على هركه

1 Curiously enough there was also a sect called Sabbâbiyya, named
after Sabbâb, a client of the Omeyyad family, which throughout the
Omeyyad reign stood up for this dynasty and denounced its enemies,
Agh. XIV, 162. A certain ‘Abdallah b. Sabbâb is mentioned Ikd 269,
immediately after ‘Abdallah b. Sabâ, as one whom Ali banished for his
extravagant doctrines. But I have nowhere found any reference to
this person.
The Heterodoxies of the Shiites, etc.

... Dr. Abdallah b. Lahi‘a, the well-known [45] Shiitic traditionist (died 174), "who was a silly, weak-minded old man, believed that Ali was in the clouds. He would sit in our midst, then look up to the clouds and exclaim: 'Here is Ali, passing in the clouds!'" (IKhald. II, 155, quoting from an-Nasâ‘î, died 757h). The poet Ishâk b. Suweid al-‘Adawi ridicules in a much-quoted poem "the people who greet the clouds when they mention Ali." This belief spread the more easily, as Ali’s grave was unknown, Damiri, Ḥayât al-Ḥayawān (Būlāk 1284h) II, 267. According to Ibn Asâkir (died 571), the camel which was carrying Ali’s body to Medina to be buried there disappeared with the body: "for this reason the people of ‘Irāk say he is in the clouds."

On the Messianic basis of this conception, see my essay "Die Messiasidee im Islam," p. 125.

—L. 9 ff. This utterance of Ibn Sabā is in all probability derived from the anecdote told by Jāḥiz, Bayān (Cairo 1313h) II, 73, on the authority of ash-Sha‘bī (d. 103). A certain Jarir b. Keis met Ibn as-Saudâ (=Ibn Sabā) in Madain. "He (Ibn Sabā) said: What is the news? I said: the Commander of the Faithful (=Ali) has been killed . . . He said: Even if you had brought us his brain in a hundred bags, we would surely know that he would not die till he should drive you with his stick." Bagd. 94 tells the same story, perhaps drawing...
The reading adopted in the text (note 6) is in accordance with these quotations.

5 On the two doctrines (Raj'a and Docetism) underlying Ibn Sabâ's utterance, see p. 23 ff.

—L. 12 ff. The following are counted among the Keisâniyya, because they regarded their Imams as the successors of Abû Hâshim, the son of Muhammed b. al-Ḥanafiyya (p. 891).

10 —L. 13. On Abû Muslim, see Index.

—L. 15 ff. 'Abdallah rose under the last Omeyyad Caliph in 127, see the elaborate accounts of Agh. XI, 66 ff.; Tab. II, 1879 ff.; I Ath. V, 246. He was forced to give up Kufa and to retreat into the mountains of Media. He was in temporary possession of the province of Fâris, and—this is significant in connection with l. 16—the mountains of Isbahan. He went so far as to strike his own coins (ZDMG. 46, 443). He was killed in 129 by order of Abû Muslimī, Tab. II, 1976=IAth. V, 282. See about him also Text 71. Gen. Leyd. has the following notice about him:

بلى وانفرض.

His followers were called Janâhiyya, Bagd. 97b, 103b; Isfr. 57a; Iji 345; Makr. 353, because his father Mu'awiya bore the by-name Dâl-Janâhein, see especially Nawawî, Tahdib 339.

On the Imamate of the descendants of Ja'far b. Abî Ṭâlib see I. H.'s remark (Ed. IV. 9019): "one party says: the

The text is corrupt أَنْبَعَ عبد الله بن الحَوْرَة (sic) (on) ابي جعفر بن ابي طالب بن عون (sic)

On the sects deriving their name from the father's name of the founder see Goldziher, ZDMG. 61, 75, n. 2.
Imamate is permissible only in the descendants of Ja'far b. Abi Talib. Subsequently they confined it to 'Abdallah b. Mu'awiya b. Abdallah b. Ja'far b. A. T."

His father Mu'awiya must already have enjoyed a similar distinction. When he still was a school boy, the Keisanite—this is important on account of l. 14—Kuthayyir would hug him fondly and say to him: "Thou art one of the little prophets"

(Agh. VIII, 34, see p. 27, note 4.)

—L. 20. 'Abdallah's teachings as described by Bagd., Iji and Makr. are in the nature of other ultra-Shiitic doctrines: God's successive incarnation in the prophets and Imams, the belief in Transmigration of Souls coupled with the denial of Resurrection (see p. 74) and the allegorical interpretation of the Koran, Iji, Makr. = de Sacy II, 595.

1 Ed. erroneously Ali. Cod. L. II, 86* has the correct reading.

2 Interesting is the remark of Sibt, Imams: (read "ولم يسيء أحدا (أحد)

من بنى هاشم ولد معاوية ألا عبد الله بن جعفر فهجره

بنو هاشم لذلك ولم يعتن (يعتني) عليه أحد منهم إلا الاقليل.

—Of his offspring Gen. Leyd. says: ولده باصبهان وغيرها من الجبال ورأيت مع الصوفي رجلاأ

صوفي وُلد في اصبهان . . يذكر أنه من ولد عبّد بن صالح

بن معاوية بن عبد الله بن جعفر ولم يتسع للرمان في

عنى سلّفه وما بقي من اهل هذا البيت.

3 Bagd. 97b وزعم أنه هو الإمام بعد علي وعُلامة من صلّبه

فبابعه على امامته ورجعوا إلى الكوفة وحكوا لأنباههم أن

عبد الله بن معاوية بن عبد الله بن جعفر زعم أنه رجل وان روح

الله كانت في آدم ثم في شيطان ثم دارت في الإنساء.

Here the text breaks off. Between 97b and 98a something (in all probability one leaf) is missing. This is to be added to Ahwardt's Catalogue No. 2800. On this doctrine of successive incarnation see Text 681 and Comm.
On the belief in 'Abdallah's concealment (gaiba) in the mountains of Isbahân see especially Iji (who writes اسفهان) and Isfr. 57a.

— L. 22. On the Dahriyya see de Boer 80.—One of his stable companions was called al-Baklî, because he was of the opinion that man is like a vegetable (al-bakl) “and when he dies, he does not return (on earth)”, see p. 24, n. 1, Agh. XI, 75. ‘Aḍdallâh’s Sahib ash-Ṣāhib ash-Shorṭah is said to have been a Dahrite, ibidem.

46, l. 2 ff. The same belief of the Jews in four Immortals is mentioned by I. H., Ed. I, 187, in a brief survey on Jewish history. After Joshua it was Phinehas who ruled over the Jews for twenty-five years. "A large section of them (the Jews) maintain that he is alive till this day, he and three persons besides him, viz., Ilyâs (Elijah) the Prophet, the Aronide, Malkišidek b. Fâlig b. ‘Abîr [b. Shâhîh] b. Arfaḥshād b. Sâm b. Nûh, the servant whom Ibrâhîm dispatched to woo Ribkâ, the daughter of Batuil, the son of Nâkhûr, the brother of Ibrâhîm.”

In our passage (p. 46, note 1) L. Br. also add the name of Methuselah. But it is clear from the parallel quoted here that the name came in by mistake.

As to the four others above-mentioned, there can scarcely be any doubt that, as far as Malchizedek is concerned, I. H. con-

1 The following variants are taken from Codd. L. and V.—L. agrees with Ed. See Introd., p. 18.
2 V. missing. See p. 4780.
3 V. missing.
5 V. من مالح رفقة.
6 So L. V.—Ed. بتوال.
7 L. V. ملاكم يبوب.
8 Methusaleh is reputed in Jewish tradition as a "a perfectly righteous man," Aboth di R. Nathan, ed-Schechter, ch. 33, and he is counted among the seven Long-lived, Baba Bathra, fol. 121b, comp. Goldziher, Kitâb al-Mu'ammarat, p. xlvi. But this has nothing to do with immortality. Perhaps he is confounded here with his father Enoch.
founds the Jews with the Christians. M.'s immortality is taught [46] as early as in the Epistle to the Hebrews 1, 8; 7, 3 ff., and it is known from the polemics of the Church fathers to what extent this belief, which found expression in a special sect called Malchizedekites, was spread among Christian sectarians.

The genealogy of M. as given by I. H. (and other writers) is only a modification of the early Jewish tradition (also recorded by the Church fathers) which identifies him with Sem, the son of Noah; see Louis Ginzberg, *Die Haggada bei den Kirchenväter* I, 118, II, 104.

Eliezer, “the servant of Ibrahim,” is mentioned among the nine Immortals who entered Paradise while still alive, *Derekh Eres Zuta*, ch. 1. It is worthy of notice that in neither passage is Eliezer mentioned by name. He was probably designated in Jewish circles merely as אלעזר אברם.

Elijah’s immortality, which is, of course, a direct consequence of the Biblical report, is already implied in Sirach 48:8-11. On the Rabbinical legends clustering around Elijah see the exhaustive article (by Louis Ginzberg) in *Jewish Encyclopedia* V, 122 ff.—The notion that he was a Kohën, “an Aronide,” is very old and already known to the Church fathers, *Jew. Enc.* V, 122a bottom; Ginzberg, *Die Haggada* II, pp. 76–80.

Phinehas is in Jewish tradition commonly identified with Elijah. This identification is very old and already known to Origen, Ginzberg, *Die Haggada* II, p. 78.

— Note 7, 1. 2. Read "brainless" (Turkish).

— L. 8. The literature on al-Khadir is too extensive to be recorded here in detail. The best accounts on the Khadir legends are found in Tha’labi’s ‘Arā’s (Cairo 1306h), p. 137 ff., Damiri, *Hāyāt al-Hayawān* (Bulāk 1284h) I, 338 ff. (sub voce حوت مرسي) and *Tāj al-‘Arūs* III, 187 (sub voce الخضر). The ubiquitous prophet is particularly popular with the Sūfis (see espec. *Tāj* ib.), just as Elijah is with the Jewish mystics. The famous Sūfī Ibn al-‘Arabī (died 638h)—to quote one instance out of many—records in his al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya numerous conversations with al-Khadir, Kremer, *Ideen*, p. 103, comp. p. 71 note.

The Shiitic sects which believe in the “concealment” and “return” (gāiba and raj’a, p. 28) of their Imams quote in con-
firmation of their belief the continued existence of al-Khadîr and Elijah, Shahr. 131, IKhald. I, 358.

— L. 10. Elijah is usually associated with deserts and ruins, see, e. g., Pirke Aboth, ch. 6, Berakhot 3a, Sanhedrin 98a. — al-Khadîr ("the green Prophet") is, on account of his name, brought in connection with water and vegetation.

— L. 13. The same objection is found in connection with Elijah, who in the belief of the people is present at every circumcision. "How can it be imagined that Elijah should be present at every circumcision that takes place in Israel? How can he accomplish it, since, Israel being a nation scattered and divided, many circumcisions take place simultaneously in the East of the World and the West thereof?" Glasberg, Zichron Brith la-Rishonim (Berlin 1892) p. 233.

15 47, l. 3. "'Abdallah b. Salâm" is a lapsus calami for "'Abd as-Salam."—Muhammed b. 'Abd as-Salam is identical with Ibn 'Abd as-Salâm, who defends the belief in al-Khadîr, Tâj al-'Arâs III, 187. He is mentioned by Ibn al-Abbâr, Complementum libri as-Silah, ed. Codera, Madrid 1887, p. 136, No. 483:

Taîlabira is situated on the Tajo, in the district of Toledo, Yakut III, 542.

— L. 6. I have not been able to identify this Kâtib with the not unusual name. He is mentioned by I. H., Ed. I, 111:

20 He takes I. H. to a friend of his to show him the miracles he is working. But I. H. succeeds in unmasking him as a juggler.

— L. 11. This hadith, which is recorded both by Muslim and Bukhârî and is in consequence canonical, reads fully as follows:

The Prophet says to Ali

أَمَا تَرَأَى أَن تَعْتُرَى مَن تَعْتُرَى بِمَنْزَلَةِ هَارُونَ

Nawawi, Tahdîb 438, Ibn al-Athîr, Usd al-Gâba IV, 26 (with the variant لَدَيْهَا بَعْدَهَا) comp. ZDMG. 50, 119. The tendency of the hadith is transparent. It is directed against the extravagant worship of Ali (and the Imams) by the Gâliya. On the beginning of the

1 Whether "Abîn b. 'Abd al-salam al-ghâni repeatedly quoted by I. H. in Isnâds (e. g., Ed. I, 109 ult, V, 5th) is identical with our Muhammed I am not in a position to determine.
ḥadīth see p. 135⁵⁶. — A similar tradition with the same tendency is quoted by Goldziher, *Muḥ. St.* II, 105.

— Note 8. Cod. L. contains the following marginal note (in extremely illegible and unpointed characters)

الطاعُر من

معناه أنَّهُ لا يُقَدَّمُ بعدها علَيْهِ وَإِنْ شَرِيعَتهُ قَابِلَةٌ عَلَى جَمِيع

الشروط لا يُجَرَّدُ لأَحَدٍ يُوجِّدُ بعدها أن يُفْلَحَهُ في شِرِيعَتهُ ولِذلِك

قَالَ صَلِّي الله عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لَوْ كَانَ مُوسِى حُيٍّ فَيَنْبِعُهُ إِلَّا أَنْبَاعٍ

وَلِذلِكَ كَانَ المَحْضُ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامَ فِيْمَا يُقَبِّلَ عَنْهُ أَنْهُ يَعْبَدُ الله

تَعَالَى عَلَيْ شَرِيعَةِ دِينِيَّةٍ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامَ. The gloss is apparently that of a reader. It is missing in Br. which is otherwise identical with L.

— L. 15. I. H. expresses himself similarly Ed. I, 77⁴: “It is well-established that the Prophet said that there would be no prophet after him, with the exception of what the reliable traditions contain regarding the advent of Jesus, who was sent to the Jews and whom the Jews pretend to have killed and crucified. It is necessary firmly to believe in all this and it is well-established that the existence of prophecy after the Prophet is absurd.”

— L. 17. The Berber tribe *Baraḡwāṭa* in the extreme North-west of Africa formed an independent commonwealth under Tarif, who claimed descent from the tribe Simeon. His son Ṣāliḥ pretended to be a prophet and composed a new Koran of eighty Suras in the Berberic language, Ibn Adhari, ed. Dozy I, 44. For their doctrine, see ibidem 234 ff. During the reign of their seventh king they still expected the “return” of Ṣāliḥ; Dozy, *Isl.* 348 ff., Kremer, *Ideen* 200, 372.

— Note 12. The Baraḡwāṭa Commonwealth was destroyed by the Almoravides in 1030, Dozy, *ib.*, Kremer, *ib*.

— L. 19. The name of this sect alternates between *Katṭiyya* and *Kiṭṭiṭiyya* (*قَطِيعِيَّةَ*). The former is found, e. g., Masudi VIII, 40; Shahr. 17, 127, 128, 147; Makr. 351⁴. The latter form is consistently used by I. H., Bagd. and Isfr., also Masudi V, 443, 475. The form *Kiṭṭiṭiyya* as the more unusual one seems to be original.
The nature of the Kittiiyya can best be understood when contrasted with its antithesis, the Wakiifiiyya or Wakiifa, p. 40. The point of controversy is the reality of the Imam’s death (see p. 30) and the question, dependent on it, of the election of a successor. توقف في موتة or وقف في موتة means “to be uncertain, to be in doubt,” as regards the Imam’s death,” i.e., refuse to believe that the Imam is dead and, still recognizing him as Imam, refrain from electing a successor. The exact reverse of it is قطع بموتة “definitely to assert his death,” to believe that the death of the Imam was real and, in consequence, transfer (سابق) the Imamate from the dead Imam to his successor. This state of the case is still perfectly clear in Shahr., as the following examples will show: 173 ... 128 قطع بموتة وساسا ... ناسا الإمامية بعدة (in opposition to the Wakiifiiyya, p. 40). Then قطع وقف (وقف) were interpreted in their literal meaning “to stand still” and the construction (وقف عليه) came in use in the sense: “to stand still at him (at the Imam),” i.e., to uphold his Imamate without electing a successor because of the unreal character of his death. Substantially then this expression is identical with the phrase قطع بموتة and both are opposed to وقف (وقف) في موتة “to believe in the Imam’s death and elect a new Imam.” Thus Shahr. 127 ومنهم قطع ومنهم من قطع وقف عليه منهم (يعنى وقف موسى بن جعفر) ويقال لهم القاطعة ومنهم من قطع عليه وقال انه لم يمض وسخراج بعد الغيبة ويقال ثم منهم ومنهم وقف وقال بالرجة ومنهم: 16

1 See, e.g., Shahr. 131. 121. “Then we are in doubt concerning this.”
2 See on this meaning of قطع my Sprachgebrauch des Maimonides, I, (Frankfort on M., 1902) sub voce.
Both the beliefs of the Kitṭī‘īyya and Wakīfīyya are in themselves merely relative conceptions and express but a certain attitude of mind. They become real only when applied to certain definite individuals. In consequence of this their relative character, their contents are somewhat elastic and change in accordance with the person to whom they are applied. As a rule, the contrast between the two sects hinges on the person of Mūsa b. Ja‘far (p. 3915), the succession down to Ja‘far, his father, being a matter of common agreement among the Shiites (p. 10429). Those that refuse to admit his death and await his “return” are called Wākīfīyya (also Mūsawīyya and, with their nickname, Mantūra, p. 4012). Those, on the other hand, who admit his death and in consequence transfer the Imamate to his descendants are called the Kitṭī‘īyya. Comp. the passages quoted above from Shahr. See Masudi V, 443: Hishām b. al-Ḥakam (p. 6511) was an intimate friend of Mūsa b. Ja‘far. Yet he was a Kitṭī‘iy, i. e., he believed that Mūsa was dead. Bagd. 19a:

Kashi in a special article on the Wakīfīyya, p. 284–288, understands and applies this term in the same manner.

The name, however, occurs also in connection with other individuals of the Alidic family.

Thus Wākīfīyya is found as another designation for Ismā‘īliyya, those who believe in the “return” of Musa’s brother Ismā‘īl, Shahr. 127.

1 I have dwelt at some length on this point, as Haarbrücker in his Shahr. translation utterly misunderstood the whole matter. He takes it in its ordinary meaning “to cut off” (abschneiden) and interprets it in the sense “to cut off the series of Imams” and allow no further Imam. In consequence, the contradictio in adiecto that those who cut off (i. e., close) the series of Imams transfer the Imamate to their descendants, is repeatedly to be met with in his translation. E. g., I, 25: “Andere machen mit seinem Tode einen Abschnitt und führen das Imamat auf seinen Sohn über,” or, still more nonsensically, 192: “Andere schnitten mit seinem Tode (die Reihe der Imame) ab” and so forth. The same, Wolff, Drusen, p. 82 ff. —It is difficult to see how these authors could make any sense out of this translation.
The name Kitṭi‘iyya is found in connection with Ali, the son of Mūsa, Makr. 351. Zeid. 104 applies this term to the “followers of Ali b. Muhammed,” apparently referring to Ali an-Nakī (died 254), the grandfather of the Shiitic Mahdi, the man of the cellar. Gradually, however, the two terms were used pre-eminently in connection with the Mahdi, the Imam of the “Twelvers.” Those who did not admit the death of his father, al-Hasan al-‘Askari, and consequently rejected his own claims to the Imamate are called the Wākfīyya, IBab., Ithbat 39 (p. 36, however, this term is used as a synonym for the Mūsawiyya). Those again who believed in al-Hasan’s death and transferred the Imamate to the Mahdi, were called the Kitṭi‘iyya. With the spread of the “Twelvers” and the extinction of the other Shiitic factions, the term Kitṭi‘iyya became the exclusive possession of this sect and was generally used as a synonym for Ithnā‘ashariyya, which is probably of later origin (I. H. does not use it in his Milal), comp. I. H. in our passage; Shahr. 17, 127, 147; Masudi V, 475; Bagd. 19b expressly ويفال لهم الإمام什ميّة and in the same way Isfr. 13b وهاولا يُدْخَوَن الإمام什ميّة. The old Marracci recognized the identity of the Kitṭi‘iyya with the Ithnā‘ashariyya. The rebuke preferred against him by de Sacy (II, 590 n. 1 = Wolff, Drusen, p. 83, n. 1) is without justification. 48, l. 3 ff. See I. H.’s remarks on the same subject, Text p. 76 ff. I. H.’s account on the Mahdi is extremely interesting and in many a detail quite novel. — L. 5. The year of al-Hasan’s death is unanimously given as 260. All other dates and facts of the Mahdi’s life were early entangled in myth and legend. This shows itself at once in the question as to the date of his birth, which is extremely problematic. Conspicuous in its tendency is the notion that he was born on the day on which his father died, Blochet 21. It betrays itself through the explanatory remark that the Mahdi has, just like Jesus, been Imam since his infancy. According to another supposition (comp. 1 Sibt, Imams, remarkably enough says nothing about the twelfth Imam.
Text here, l. 7) he was born eight months after his father's death, Shahr. 130°. Repeatedly to be found as the year of his birth is 258, i.e., two years before his father's death, IBab. Ithbat 441. 2 (read مولدة instead of ولادة); Ibn Zulak (died 387h) in IKhall. No. 573; Diyarbekri, II, 288. Very frequently the year 255 is given, Abul'Maali 164; Anon. Sufi 170a; Abulfeda II, 222; IKhall. ib. See the various suppositions Shahr. 129–130.

The insinuation that the Mahdi was not born at all I have not met with outside of I. H. He repeats the same charge Ed. IV, 109: "If so, what need is there for them (the Imams), especially so for the last 180 years? (see Introduction, p. 19). For they pretend to have a lost Imam who (however) was never created, just like the fabulous griffin." Gen. Leyd. omits the Mahdi altogether, as it only records the Alides who had off-

spring. Al-Hasan, however, is designated as Abū Muhammed. The identity of the Mahdi's name with that of the Prophet which is demanded by the Mahdi traditions is regarded by the Shiites as proof of the legitimacy of the twelfth Imam. To the same end the Prophet's kunya Abīl-Kāsim was conferred on him. The generally accepted Mahdi tradition demands, besides, identity in the father's name. But there are variations of this tradition which are so trimmed as to meet the special circumstances of the twelfth Mahdi, comp. IKhald. II, 144 ff.; Diyarbekri, II, 288.

A more elaborate form of this anecdote see Blochet 22 (who writes Hakimeh). The motive of the anecdote is the Shiitic tendency to pattern the image of the Mahdi after that of Jesus, whose advent at the end of time is expected by all Muhammedans. The miracle of "talking in the cradle" is ascribed to Jesus, Koran 3, 41; 5, 109; 19, 30 ff.; comp. Gerock, Versuch einer Darstellung der Christologie des Quran.

---

1 The latter gives besides 256, which he considers correct. Anon. Sufi ib. quotes Ya'fi't's Ta'rikh to the effect that al-Hasan died when the Mahdi was six or five years old, which would imply 254 and 255 respectively.

2 Already as-Sayyid al-Himyari refers to such a tradition, Agh. VII, 4.

3 Zeid. Mutaz. 111 quotes a tradition according to which Muhammed ordered Ali to give his son his (the prophet's) name and kunya. He was referring to Muhammed b. al-Ḥanafiyya.
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[48] (1839), p. 47. The Sunnitic protest against the transferring of this miracle to the Mahdi found expression in an interpretation forcibly put upon the well-known hadith—in itself an anti-Shiitic protest—لا مهدي إلا عيسى بن مريم “there is no Mahdi except Jesus”¹: آي على يتكلم في المهدى إلا عيسى “that is, none except Jesus talks in the cradle (al-mahd).” See IKhald. II, 163 and 169.

— Lines 13, 15, 16. On the name or names of the Mahdi’s mother see Diyarbekri, II, 288, IKhall. No. 573, who also adds خمط “there is no Mahdi except Jesus” (readاجن). شمس “that is, none except Jesus talks in the cradle (al-mahd).” See IKhald. II, 163 and 169.

⁵ Lines 13, 15, 16. On the name or names of the Mahdi’s mother see Diyarbekri, II, 288, IKhall. No. 573, who also adds خمط “there is no Mahdi except Jesus” (readاجن). شمس “that is, none except Jesus talks in the cradle (al-mahd).” See IKhald. II, 163 and 169.

⁴⁹, 1. 4. The Dictionary of Technical Terms (ed. Sprenger), p. 1308, gives the following definition of “Inspiration” (al-ilham): الإلهام معدى في القلب بطريقة الفيض أي بلا اكتساب وفيك ولا استفادة (استفادة) بل هو وارد عيب. It mentions a Sufi sect called al-Illamiyya ولايشان موافق اند بقراطة ودفترية كده از خواندن راموثي قران وكيلام ديني إغراض.

This claim of Inspiration is the reason why the Shiites object to religious discussions, p. 16⁴.

In the same way as here and Text p. 35² ff., I. H. expresses himself Ed. IV, 104*: “Some of them (the Imamiyya) when asked (to prove) the truth of their claim regarding the Imams (i.e., that the Imams are the only source of religious knowledge) take recourse to the claim of Inspiration in this matter.

¹ Comp. Snouck-Hurgronje, Der Mahdi, p. 16.
² Ed. de Slane, p. 632, has خمط; ed. Wüstenfeld has incorrectly خمط.
But if they arrive at this sophism,¹ then the latter is not beyond reach of any one man, and their opponents are very well able to pretend that they have been informed by way of inspiration of the absurdity of their claim.”

A Shiitic writer of the eleventh century (Hijra) uses the following characteristic argument to prove the superiority of the Imams and scholars of the Shi‘a, Goldziher, Shi‘a, p. 509: “because their words are not a matter of opinion or effort, but of true knowledge. Their source is either a tradition which every one of them has received from his father, the latter from his own father and so on up to the Prophet, or Revelation and Inspiration, so that both small and big are equal in this respect among them. For this reason it has never been recorded of any of them that he has ever gone to a teacher, or studied under a master, or asked any question.”

— Note 5. The reading of Ed. and Codd. presupposes and the same word is found in Ed. Text 573, 64⁵ (see also Ed. IV, 97⁹). It is possible to get along with the ordinary meaning of “clever, ingenious.”

— L. 9 (note 10). I took this as an example of some monstrous (of course, imaginary) charge for which Inspiration might be invoked. See a similar charge note 9. Prof. Nöldeke (in a private communication) objects to this interpretation. He prefers to retain مئ جَنون "or that all of them have a piece (lit. a branch) of madness in their heads."

— L. 13 ff. (and previously). The tone in which I. H. speaks of this charge of illegitimate birth shows that he takes it quite seriously. I have not found any reference to it elsewhere.² The concluding words of this paragraph are characteristic of I. H.’s biting sarcasm: It is possible that you all may still be saved by becoming orthodox Muslims. But then you

¹ One is vividly reminded of the frequently quoted sentence "as he is so impudent, it is clear that he is a bastard." Comp. S. Krauss, Das Leben Jesu (Berlin 1902), pp. 188, 278.

² One is vividly reminded of the frequently quoted sentence "narrow path” ought to be read, comp. Text p. 78-79 (repeatedly).
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[49] will have proved, according to your own contention, that you are all bastards.

[50] 50, l. 9 ff. Comp. I. H.'s notice (Ed. IV, 1951): 

اعبى عنسان

 عمرو بن (مجرر) (Cod. L. +) 

الكتراني صليبه (صليبة) (read: ( Cod. L. +) +) وقيل بل مولي وهو تلميذ النظام

 واحدة شموخ المعتزلة.

Jahiz died in Basra in 255/869, over ninety years old, IKhall. No. 479, 586; Brockelmann I, 152. He was a pupil of an-

Naẓẓām (p. 58), whom he quotes in this passage. He himself figures as the founder of a sect bearing his name, de Boer, 53. 

I. H.'s remark bearing on Jahiz is reflected in the attitude towards him of the Arabic literary critics, which is on the whole more hostile than favorable. "The style of his genius is mediocre" is the verdict of de Boer (p. 54). The Muh-

amedan writers, however, are ready to appreciate his literary talent and particularly his eloquence, e. g., Masudi VIII, 34; Shahr. 52; Iji 341. But his orthodoxy is held in great suspicion, Goldziher, Zahiriten, p. 100. IKhall. (No. 186, p. 125), after stating that Jahiz declared Ibn Mokaffa to be an infidel, sarcastically adds: "But, as someone remarked, how could Jahiz have forgotten himself?" Still less favorably than his ortho-

doxy is judged his moral character. Masudi VIII, 34 says of him briefly but poignantly 

انصرافه مشهور.

He sells his literary talent to the highest bidder and writes successively in favor of the 'Abbasides, the 'Othmanides and Merwanides, ib. p. 56. For an instance of his unprincipled attitude see later (p. 104 ff.). 

Extremely interesting is the crushing criticism of Jahiz as man and writer, by Bagd. and Isfr. I give the essential parts of Bağdâdi's remarks (fol. 69a) as they are apt to illustrate 

I. H.'s utterance in our passage: 

ذكر الجامعية منهم (يعتني من) المعتزلة

الجاحظ رهم الذين

1 Comp. Kashi 38.
2 Kremer, Ideen, p. 126, note 17 gives the erroneous date 235/849-850.
3 See Goldziher, Muh. St. II, 120.
4 Isfr. 37* gives substantially the same. But the wording is quite different.
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[50] اغتربوا بصsense بدءة المجاحظ في كُتُبهم التي بها تُرجمة تروق بلا معنی واسم يُهوّل بلا جسُم ولو عنروا جهالاته في ضلالاته للعُطِفُوا وَلله تعالى من تسبيتهم إياها انسانًا فضلًا عن ان ينسوا الله إحسانًا ...

وقد افتخر الكَعْبَیٰ بِالمجاحظ وَزمم اتِّه من شيوخ المعتزلة وَافتخر بتصاصيفه الكثيرة وَزمم اتِّه كناثي من بنى كنانة بن خرَّيْمَة بن مَدْرَكة بن الياس بن د (صِنْفْ)

كتَاب مفاخر الفُطْحِانِيَّة على الكَناثيَّة وسأر العَدُنِيَّة وإن كان عربيًا فلم صنف كتاب فضل الموالي على العرب ... وأما الكِتَاب المُرْحَفُة فَأشَاهُ منها كتابه في جييل النصوص وقد عُلّم بها الفسقة ووجبة السرقة ومنها كتابه في عُشر الصناعات وقد افسد بها على الاتجار سلّعتهم ومنها كتابه في المواد وهو ذريعة للحُسبَاليين يجتذبون بها ودائع الناس واموالهم ومنهم كتابه في الفتيان وهو مmaktون بفعن أستاذة النظام على أَعْلام الحساب ومنها كتبه في القصاص والكباب واللائحة وفي جييل المّكْتَسِبِيْن وِمعانى هذه الكِتَاب لائقة به وبصنعته وأسرته ومنها كتاب طبائع الحيوان وقد سلَح فيه معانى كتاب الحيوان لأسطوالييس وضبط إليه ما ذكره المدائني من حُكم العرب وأشعارها في منائف الحيوانات ثم إنّه مكن الكتاب بمناظرة بين

1 See Makr. 348. 
2 Is this identical with his Kitāb al-Bukhāl? 
3 Isfr. declares it to be his most important (آَعْلِيّ) work.
Abū Ishāk Ibrahim b. Sayyar an-Nazzām, a pupil of Abū'l-Hudeil (p. 55) and teacher of al-Żālib, was one of the most respected leaders of the Muʿtazila, "noteworthy as a man and a thinker," de Boer 51. He flourished about 221h, Kremer, Ideen 31; Shahr. 18, 37, 39 ff.; Iji 337 ff.; Makr. 346. He leaned towards Shiism ("Rafid"), Shahr. 39; Iji 338.

Bishr b. al-Muṭamīr, the founder of the Bishriyya sect. He is mentioned together with an-Nazzām, Shahr. 18; Zeid. Mutaz. 30; comp. Shahr. 44; Iji 338 and others. I. H., too, frequently refers to him in his Milālat. Ed. III, 126, I. H. mentions an-Nazzām, Abū'l-Hudeil, Bishr b. al-Muṭamīr and al-Jubbā'ī as remarkable for their speculative and argumentative powers.

I. H.'s (or the copyist's) mistake in our passage may perhaps be explained by assuming that Bishr's kunya was Abū Khalīd. For a similar mistake see p. 59.

According to Zeid. Mutaz., Bishr was imprisoned by Rashīd on the charge of being a Shiite (Rāfīḍi). But he denied it in one of his poems.

---

1 See van Vloten, Worgers 59, n. 16.
2 Jāḥīz was frightfully ugly, Brockelmann, Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur, popular edition, Leipzig 1901, p. 98.
I. H. consistently designates this Muhammed as the son of Ja'far. All other sources call him “b. an-Nu'mân,” Fihr. 176; Bagd. and Isfr. frequently; Tusy No. 698; Shahr. 142; Iji 347; Makr. 348, 353; IKhall. No. 166; Kâmuṣ s.v.

His nickname was Sheitân at-Tâk (see the sources quoted above), which, according to Kâmûs, signifies “the devil of at-Tâk, a citadel in Tabaristan.” The Shiites, however, call him Mu'min at-Tâk, Tusy ib.; Kashi 123. The sect founded by him is generally called Sheitâniyya. Shahr. calls it Nu'maniyya, (comp. Goldziher in ZDMG. 61, 75, n. 2). He was an adherent of Ja'far as-Sâdîk (died 146), who valued him highly, Kashi 15122. He had a dispute with as-Sayyid al-Ḥimyari about the Imamate and came out victorious, Agh. ib.

His ready wit is attested in several instances quoted by Tusy and Kashi.

His book on the Imamate referred to on l. 17 is duly recorded by Fihr. and Tusy.

This verse plays a prominent part in the polemics between Shiites and Sunnites. Abû Ja'far at-Ṭûsî, the author of the List of Shy'ah books, wrote a کتاب التّقّض على ابن شادان في مسألة الغار, p. 355, No. 771. Hîshám b. al-Ḥâkam is the author of a كتاب الرّد على إحصاب أئذان by which most probably our verse is meant. The Caliph al-Ma'mûn anxiously endeavors to refute the consequences to be drawn from this verse in a discussion with a Sunnite, Ikhd II.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Kashi explains the name in a very artificial manner. He was once shown a Dirhem and he said: فقالوا ما هو إلا سوق شيطان الطاق. Comp. Barbier de Meynard in Journal Asiatique 1874, p. 245 note: “Quant an surnom Satan du portique, je n'en ai trouvé l'explication nulle part.” Correct ibidem Hîshám b. al-Ḥâkam for Hi-cham b. Malek.

\(^2\) I have unfortunately lost the reference to the page.
I. Friedlaender, [1908.]

[50] I. H., too, lays great stress on this verse as proving the legitimacy of Abū Bekr's Imamate, Ed. IV, 144 ff.

[51] 51, l. 1. The objection appears ridiculous in his eyes because in his belief the verse is an interpolation of the Ašḥāb, see p. 61 f.

— L. 3. His full name is Ali b. Ismā'īl b. Mitham at-Tammar (see the references later), but he is frequently called Ali b. Mitham, so here and Text p. 75, Bagd. 21b. The variant ميثم (instead of ميثم) occurs frequently, see Text p. 75, note 12; Masudi VI, 369; Tab. (in the variants to the passages quoted below n. 1); Makr. 351 (de Sacy II, 589 has, however, Maitham). The reading and pronunciation Mitham is confirmed by Bagd. See also Fīhr. 174 note 4. Instead of at-Tammâr, Fihrist gives at-Tâyyâr. The by-name as-Sâbûnî (the soap boiler) is not found elsewhere.

His grandfather Mitham at-Tammâr was an esteemed follower of Ali, Fīhr. ib.; Tusy p. 212, No. 458; Kashi (in a separate article) 53–58. Makr. 351 (de Sacy II, 589) erroneously refers this adherence to Ali b. Ismā'īl himself.—Ali was by origin from Kufa and was a client of the Banû Asad, but he lived in Basra. He participated in conjunction with those named Text p. 75 in a discussion in the Majlis of the Bar-mekide vizier Yaḥya, Masudi VI, 369. He had a dispute with Abû'l-Hudeil and an-Nazzâm, Tusy ib.

25 He is regarded as the originator of the Imamite doctrine, Masudi, Fīhr., Tusy, Makr. (=de Sacy). Bagd 21b: من شبوخ الرافية. In spite of it, he is reported to have been moderate in the denunciation of Ali's opponents, see Text p. 79; comp. Wolff, Drusen, p. 80, 82.

30 He is in all probability identical with Ali b. Ismā'īl, who gave the Mūsawiyya the nickname Mamṭūra, p. 40.

1 Tab. III, 249, 254, 288 inserts between Ismā'īl and Mitham the name Sāliḥ. See, however, ib. 288 note a.

2 Kashi 170 calls him repeatedly ابن ميثم, also ابن اسمعيل. Goldziher, Shi‘a 510f. (cf. ib. n. 5).

3 There is one mentioned Kashi 176 among the intimates of Ja‘far as-Ṣādik who may be identical with him. Ja‘far alludes to the meaning of the name (179), so that a mere copyist's error is out of the question.
Perhaps the reason for it is that the Rawâfid have no hesitation to change their minds, as they attribute the same (see on the Bâdâ doctrine, p. 724) to God.

The belief in “tabdîl” is, properly considered, the basis of Shiitic doctrine. It accounts for the lack of the Prophet’s written announcement regarding the succession of Ali and justifies the distrust toward the bearers of the Sunna, which again is the starting point for a complete remodelling of Islam. Isfr. 14th ably summarizes the far-reaching consequences of this belief:
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More comprehensively, and, as is to be expected, from a higher point of view does I. H. deal with this problem. Having proved that the Gospels had been interpolated, I. H. (Ed. II, 76'ff.) quotes two Christian counter-arguments which he tries elaborately to refute. The first is that the Caliph Othman removed numerous readings from the Koran, and the other
that the Rawāfiḍ maintain that the Companions of your Prophet altered the Koran by way of omissions and additions.” The first objection I. H. discards briefly, though somewhat superficially, by pointing out that in the time of Othman the Koran text was already so wide-spread and so firmly established, that the Caliph could not, even if he would, change it. “As for their argument regarding the Rawāfiḍ and their contention that the Koran readings were interpolated, the Rawāfiḍ do not belong to the Muslims. They consist of a number of sects, the first of which arose twenty-five years after the Prophet’s death. It was originally the response of some people abandoned by Allah to the call of those who beguiled Islam, a party which followed the course of the Jews and Christians as regards falsehood and heresy. They are divided into various sections. The most extravagant of them assume the divinity of Ali b. Abi Talib and of a number of people besides him. The least extravagant of them believe that the sun was twice turned backwards for Ali. How can one be indignant over lies coming from people whose lowest rank in lying is such (as described)?” He then proceeds elaborately to refute this charge. He cleverly beats the Rawāfiḍ with their own weapons by pointing (Ed. II, 80") to the fact that Ali himself, “who according to most of them is a god, a creator, and, according to some of them, a prophet endowed with speech, while in the opinion of the rest he is an infallible Imam, the obedience to whom is a religious command imposed by Law,” did not object to the Koran in its present shape and, while Caliph, did not fight the interpolators, which would have been his sacred duty. “Thus the mendacity of the Rawāfiḍ becomes evident, and praise be unto Allah, the Lord of (all) Created Beings!”

A brief reference to the same subject is contained Ed. IV, 146": “unless the Rawāfiḍ fall back on ignoring the Koran and (assuming) omissions and additions in it. This is something whereby becomes evident their impudence, ignorance and stupidity.”

A thorough discussion of the whole question and a refutation of the charges raised as well by modern scholars can be found in Nöldeke, Geschichte des Qorans, p. 217 ff. See also Goldziher, Muh. St. II, 111 ff.

1 Ed. II, 78a. 2 See p. 16, n. 2. 3 See p. 68.
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—Note 12. “Better to be translated: ‘yet at the same time he openly and publicly declared himself a Mu‘tazilite.’ (The same in Text 1. 20.) Otherwise or or 

—L. 21 f. I could find nothing bearing on Abū Ya‘la. As a possibility I would suggest his identity with at-Ṭusi, the author of the frequently quoted List of Shī‘ah books. He calls himself a pupil of Ali al-Murtadā (List. p. 218, No. 472). He is counted Shahr. 145 among the writers of the Imāmiyya. A catalogue of his own writings, List, p. 285, No. 620.—Siby as a proper name occurs Fīhr. 180°. The variant ميلاد seems much easier. But ميلاد designates the date, not, as we expect here, the place of birth.

52, l. 1. I have not been able to identify this Abū’l-Ḵāsim. [52]

—L. 5 f. The belief in Transmigration is not characteristic of the Keisānīyya, but is rather, as I. Ḥ. himself points out (Ed. IV, 198°), a logical consequence of the Mu‘tazilite doctrine of Divine Justice which necessitates an exact retribution after death.1 This belief, however, is attributed to several men known as Keisānītes, so to as-Sayyid al-Ḥimyari (in our passage),2 Kuthayyir (p. 26°), ‘Abdallah b. Mu‘āwiya (p. 44°),3 Abū Muslim, (p. 64°).—Makr. 3542 mentions a special sect "Tanāsukhiyya."

On the relation between Tanāsukh and Raj’a, see p. 26 f. See also next note.

1 See Schreiner, Der Kalām in der jüdischen Litteratur, p. 62 ff.

2 Dahabi, Ta’rīkh al-Īslām, vol. VII (MS. Strassburg, not paginated) in the biography of as-Sayyid, quotes I. Ḥ. as authority for the assumption that as-Sayyid shared this belief.
The peculiar procedure described in this paragraph is the outcome of the belief in Transmigration. I. H.'s own expositions on the subject of Tanásukh (Ed. IV, 901ff. in a special chapter) are apt to illustrate and explain our passage.

Those that believe in the Transmigration of Souls are divided into two sections: one section holds that the souls on leaving the bodies are transferred to other bodies which are different from the kind of bodies they had left. This is the belief of Ahmad b. Ḥā'it [V + the pupil of an-Nazzám], of Ahmad b. Nándás, his pupil [V.: the pupil of Ibn Ḥā'it], of Abū Muslim of Khorásân, of Muhammed b. Zakariyâ ar-Râzi, the physician, who expressly advocates this (doctrine) in his book entitled "al-İlm al-İlahî." This is also the belief of the Carmathians [V + the Keisâniyya and some of the Râfïda]... These people are of the opinion that the Transmigration of Souls takes place in the form of Punishment and Reward. They say: the soul of the sinner who has made himself guilty of bad actions is transferred to the bodies of repulsive animals which wallow in all kinds of filth, which are forced to work, are inflicted with pain, and are used for slaughtering." See also Ed. IV, 198'ff.

An instance of the intense hatred of the Shiites towards the "two Sheikhs" which is as curious as it is typical is quoted Mirza fol. 52b:

plet sz. o i"jJt. o x). (

I add a few important variants from Cod. V (50a), L siding with Ed.

Ed. I 9016 strike out [1908.

See de Boer, p. 77ff.

The following differently worded in V.

= L. I, 436. I cannot identify the passage in Ed.

1 I add a few important variants from Cod. V (50a), L siding with Ed.

2 Ed. I 9016 strike out

3 Ed. I add, see p. 1011.

4 See p. 586.

5 V. Qâbûs p. 1019 29.

6 See de Boer, p. 77ff.

7 The following differently worded in V.

8 = L. I, 436. I cannot identify the passage in Ed.
The story is not impossible. At any rate: se non e vero . . .
— L. 17. On Hisham see also Text p. 74\textsuperscript{22} ff., 75\textsuperscript{22}.—Hisham 10
b. al-Ḥakam Abū Muhammed al-Āḥwal ar-Rāfīḍī (al-Harrār, Masudi VII, 231) was born in Wāsīt (Kashi 165), but lived in Kufa as a client of the Banū Asad (Text 52, note 10), or of the Banū Kinda (Kashi; Fihr. 175; Tusy, p. 355, No. 771). He moved to Bagdad\textsuperscript{3} in 199 and is said to have died in the same year.\textsuperscript{4} He belonged to the intimate circle of Mūsa b. Ja'far (p. 39\textsuperscript{15}), but he had also, when still a young man (Kashi 167), come in contact with Ja'far (Fihr., Tusy), who converted him from his heresies to the orthodox Imamitic belief (Kashi). In spite of the difference in opinion, he held intimate intercourse with 20 'Abdallah b. Yazīd, the founder of the Kharijite sect Ibādiyya, Masudi V, 343.

He was considered an authority on the Imamate question. When a Syrian once came to Ja'far and insisted, among other things, on having an argument about the Imamate, he was referred to Hisham (Kashi 179). The theory of the Imamate is the central point of his doctrine. He compared the Imamate

\footnotetext[1]{Ja'far as-Sādīk.}
\footnotetext[2]{This either refers to Sheīṭān at-Tāk (p. 59\textsuperscript{6}) or to Hisham b. al-Ḥakam, this page, l. 11. They both bore the nickname al-Āḥwal.}
\footnotetext[3]{Kashi quotes an exact topographical description of his Bagdad residence by an eye-witness.}
\footnotetext[4]{According to Kashi, he died in Kufa twenty years earlier, 179, during the reign of ar-Rashid. But this can scarcely be correct, as he was a young man during Ja'far's (died 146) lifetime. See the following.}
I. Friedlaender,

[52] with the heart in the human body, Masudi VII, 234, 236. See his pretty and elaborate comparison of the limbs with the Imamate, Kashi 176. He belonged to the Ḫīṭṭāʾīyya, who admitted Mūsā b. Jaʿfar's death, p. 5117.

5 In the domain of Kalam, Hishām occupied a prominent position. He was the representative of a grossly anthropomorphistic doctrine and, in conjunction with Hishām al-Juwālīki (p. 13326), was considered the founder of the Hishāmiyya sect, Bagd. 19b, 125a; Isfr. 14a, 15a, 54b; Shahr. 18, 60, 76, 141 ff.; Iji 346.

— L. 18. See Text 75⁴. Abū Ali is called the pupil or adherent (ṣāhib) of Hishām in the other sources as well. His by-name is uncertain; see the variants p. 52 note 12 and 75 note 13. Masudi VI, 369 has شكال the same

Fihr. 176 (var. سكال). I have adopted the reading of L Text 75⁵: “ash-Shakkāk,” “the sceptic.” Masudi expressly designates him as Imamite. Shahr. counts him among the writers of the Imamiyya. The title of his book recorded Fihr. ib. points to the same thing:

كتاب علم من أبني رجوب الإمامَة بالدكت.

— L. 19. Comp. the discussion of this question Ed. II, 128. An elaborate account of Hishām’s theory of Divine Knowledge is given Bagd. 20⁶ and Shahr. 59 ff. It became popular not only with Shiites, e. g., the Sheiṭāniyya (p. 5913), Isfr. 54b; Shahr. 142; Iji 347; Makr. 353; or Zurara b. Aʿyun (Shahr., Makr.), but also with Muʿtazilites, the famous al-Jubbāʾī approving of it (Shahr. 59).

[53] 53, l. 1. “Abūl-Hudeil b. Makhūl al-ʿAllāf,⁷ a client of the ‘Abd al-Keis of Basra, one of the leaders and foremost men of the Muʿtazila” (Ed. IV, 192”), died about 235 (Shahr. 37; IKhall. No. 617 ⁸; Zeid. Mutaz. 28) at an extremely old age

Jaʿfar is so delighted with his expositions that he exclaims

عذدا مكتوب في خُصُف آبراهيم ومسى, ib. 177. [Cf. I Cor. 12, 12 ff.]

Makr. 348⁹ calls it also al-Ḥakamiyya, after the name of his father (comp. Goldziher, ZDMG. 61, 75 n. 2).

Zeid. Mutaz. 25 has erroneously 135.

4 IKhall. gives besides 226 and 227. Iji 336 has erroneously 135.
(Zeid. Mutaz.).—He was an opponent of anthropomorphism. [53] On his doctrines see de Boer 49 ff.

On his disputes with Hishâm b. al-Ḥakam see the sources quoted p. 66, ll. 12–13, espec. Shahr. 18, 141. According to Zeid. Mutaz. 26 and somewhat in contradiction with 53 note 1 and this page, l. 27, Abûl-Hudeil, while on a pilgrimage to Mekka, paid a visit to Kufa and there met Hishâm and other opponents, with whom he victoriously argued about subtle Kalâm matters.

— L. 2. This utterance is attributed—erroneously as Makr. 348⁸ points out—to Muḥṭâlí b. Suleimân (p. 11⁹), see also Shahr. 141.—The purport of this utterance is rather obscure, in spite of the following two notices which sound more intelligible. Bagd. 20⁹:

وحكى بعضهم عن هشام أنه قال في معبودة: إلى سعبعة أشباه بشير نفسه كان قاسة على الإنسان لأن كل الناس في الغالب من العادة سعبعة أشباه بشير نفسه.

Similarly 15 Mirza fol. 80⁰ from Imam ar-Râzi’s (died 606/1209) Milâl wa’n-Nihâl ويعاقبنا رأى أو بدان قرار كردت كه هفت بلست است ديركة ابن مقدار از همه مقدارها معتمدترست. Accordingly, the most proportionate human figure is that whose height (“length,” 53 note 2) is seven times the size of its own “span,” 20 and Hishâm, who was excessively anthropomorphistic (p. 66⁰), conceived God as a human figure of the most proportionate size. But “span” (shibr) is too large in this connection. Perhaps it signifies here a smaller measure (see Dozy sub voce).

Interesting and characteristic of Hishâm’s doctrine is the 25 notice Bagd. 20⁹: 

وذكر أبو الهدیل في بعض كتبه أنه لقي هشام بن الحكم بیبكة عند جبل ابي قوسنفائه أيما اکبر معبوده ام هذا الجبل قال فشاش إنه الجبل ذي الیه علیه تعالی (أي) إن الجبل اعظم منه. “Hishâm indicated that the mountain towered above Him the Exalted, i. e. (he meant to say) that the mountain was bigger than God.”

— L. 3. The reading adopted in the text is found Text p. 75² and Bagd. 124⁴ (with a soft ح under the line).
I. Friedlaender,

[53] 77 (=Haarbr. 115); Wolff, Drusen 48. is found Shahr. 143 (Haarbr. 215); Isfr. 55 and is also reflected in the reading of Ed. in our text, note 4.—On his extravagantly anthropomorphic doctrines see the sources just quoted, espec. Shahr. 143.

— L. 6. I. H. refers twice to the same belief in his Milal. Ed. II, 78*: "Those of them (the Shiites) who are the least extravagant (still) believe that the sun was turned back twice for Ali b. A. T." Ed. V, 32, in discussing the question whether miracles can be performed by non-prophets, he refers to "the claim of the Rawâfid that the sun was turned back twice for Ali b. A. T." He quotes as illustration a poem of as-Sayyid al-Himyari referring to the turning back of the sun, in order to enable Ali to recite the prescribed prayer (see later), and to the same miracle happening a second time—if the reading be correct—in Babylon (Irâk). He further quotes a poem by Ḥabib b. Aus (Abû Tamâm, died 231) of which the last verse reads thus: "By Allah, I do not know whether Ali has appeared to us and the sun has been turned back for him, or whether Joshua has been among the people." He points out, however, that the verse in this form is a forgery and that the correct reading offers something entirely different.  

1 The quotation from as-Sayyid which is found in L. II, 166 is omitted in Ed. and runs as follows:

2 This remark is missing in Ed. In the second verse L offers the undoubtedly correct reading
The miracle of the standstill of the sun is reported in connection with Ali in two cases. In one case the sun halted to enable Ali to complete the conquest of a besieged city. The Sunnites claim this miracle for the Prophet (see Goldziher, Muh. St. II, 331 and at the end of this note). In the other case Mohammed bids the sun to rise again to enable the belated Ali to recite the afternoon prayer, Goldziher ib., and note 9. It seems that official Shiitic tradition takes cognizance merely of the latter case. At least it is the only one which figures as "the Hadith of the Turning back of the Sun" recorded by Sibt, Imams fol. 32a. I reproduce the chapter in extenso as it gives an exhaustive presentation of the subject and contains, besides, numerous points of interest.
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\[\text{شدة الشمس، أتا أبو القاسم عبد الحكيم بن عبد الله بن أحمد طلوي قال: أخبرني والد أبى عبد الله بن أحمد طلوي قال: أخبرنا أبو الحسين بن النضر أخبرنا ابن خبارة بناء السقى لنا طلوات بن عباد بن إبراهيم بن الحسين عن فاطمة بنت الحسين عن أسماء بنت عميس كانت كان رأس رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في حرم على علي عليه السلام وهم يُوحى إليه فيصل العصر حتى غزت الشمس فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم:}\\

\[\text{الله عليه الهمم} \frac{1}{2} \text{كان في طاعته وظاهرة رسولك فرّداً عليه الشمس فردنا الله له وقد ضعف قوم هذا الحديث وذكره جديء في كتاب الموضوعات وقال} \frac{2}{3} \text{في إسناده جماعة ضعفاء وساهم ثم قال وصلت العصر صارت قضاء لا يُفيد رجوع الشمس [32b] قلتم قد حكي القاضي يعيش في كتاب الشّيفة}\\

1 Jamāl ad-Dīn Abūl-Faraj al-Jauzī, died 597/1200, Brockelmann I, 500.
2 Here begins the quotation.
3 See the definition given by Ta‘rifât in Freytag’s Lexicon sub voce.
4 Died 544/1149, Brockelmann, I, 369.
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1. Friedlaender, [1908.

M. Friedlaender, Die hadithiologie, 1891, 65, says that he was not convinced by the arguments of the author of Disputatio pro religione Mohammedanorum adversus Christianos (wrote about 942/1535), ed. van den Ham, Leyden 1890, p. 243, quotes this hadith almost verbatim.

Died 321/933, Brock., I, 173.

The author of Disputatio pro religione Mohammedanorum adversus Christianos (wrote about 942/1535), ed. van den Ham, Leyden 1890, p. 243, quotes this hadith almost verbatim.
In conclusion follows a lengthy poem bearing on this hadith by Ibn ‘Abbâd called Kâfîl-Kufât (died 385).

It is clear from this account that the legend wavers between the standstill of the sun (see the legend quoted at the beginning; the verses just quoted speak in the same way of "Wukûf") and its rising again, the latter being represented in the hadith attributed to Asmâ. The two forms of the legend bear the same relation to one another as the solar miracle of Joshua (Joshua 10, 13) to the one under Hezekiah (II Kings 20, 11; Is. 38, 8).

The hadith owes its origin to the Shiitic tendency to pattern the biography of Ali, the "wâsî" (legatee, cf. Introd. p. 22) of Muhammed, after Joshua, the wâsî of Moses. See another instance of this tendency, Shahr. 132. I believe for this reason that the miracle referred to p. 69 is originally a Shiitic invention and its transfer to Muhammed a polemical attempt on the part of the Sunnites.

1 Died 547.

* Or رومى. I am not quite clear as to the meaning of this sentence.
I am not certain as to the meaning of this line. Does the reference to the nearness of age (see note 9) imply a reproach against Asmā, the author of the hadith? I cannot make out what the reference to the multitude of people, which is missing in L. Br., is meant to convey here.

The doctrine of Badā (i.e. “pleasing”: if anything pleases God, he may change a previous decision) presupposes the belief in the changeability of the Divine Will (cf. p. 66) and is a counterpart of the orthodox belief in Naskh (the abolition by God of a previously revealed Law). Generally this doctrine is regarded as a specific tenet of the Keisāniyya, Bagd. 11; Makr. 353; Iji, who makes no mention of the Keisāniyya, enumerates in their stead the Badā’iyya (348). This belief is supposed to have been invented ad hoc by Mukhtar (p. 79) when, contrary to his prophecies, he was defeated in battle, Bagd. 15; Isfr. 11; Shahr. 110. Wellhausen, however, points out (Opp. 88) that, according to Tab. II, 733 and 706, it was ‘Abdallah b. Nauf who originated this doctrine, in opposition to Mukhtar.1

The Zeidite Suleimān b. Jarir (p. 136) makes the Rawfīd (= Imāmiyya, Appendix A) in general responsible for this belief, Shahr. 119 penult.2 IBab., however, (I’tikadat fol. 6) protests against those who charge the Imamites with Badā. These people merely imitate the Jews who prefer the same charge (he apparently means Naskh) against the Muslims. He quotes Ja’far aṣ-Ṣādik as saying that he who believes in Badā is a Kāfir.3

A curious instance of the application of the Badā doctrine is quoted IAth. VIII, 21. Abūl-Khattāb (p. 112) and his adherents claimed that no sword could do them any harm. But when some of them had been executed, he resorted to the pretext: “since it pleased God to do otherwise, how can I help it”?  

اذًا كان قد بدأ الله نما حينا

---

1 It must be remarked, however, that Tab. II, 732, a variant, reads Mukhtar instead of ‘Abdallah b. Nauf.
2 This passage is quoted Anon. Sufi fol. 120 in the name of Fakhr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī (died 609).
3 The text of this passage is apparently corrupt and does not allow of a reproduction.
— L. 13. I have not been able to find an authority for this statement. The number of (official) wives legally permitted by law is four, Koran 4, 4.

— L. 14. On similar dietary restrictions by a Carmathian missionary see later p. 764. The prohibition of cabbage is very old. The pagans considered the eating of it disgraceful and the Harranians in later times clung to the same custom, Chwolsohn, Sabier II, 110. In our passage apparently the red cabbage is referred to. The reason given for the prohibition reminds one vividly of the popular Shiitish notion—which originally was no doubt but a poetical figure—that the sunset glow represents the blood of al-Husein and never existed before, Goldziher, Muh. St. II, 331.

— L. 18. This notion is probably the consequence of the great emphasis laid by the Shiites on the significance of the name Ali (“Exalted”). One is reminded of Koran 19, 8, where the prediction of Yahya’s (John’s) birth is followed by the solemn declaration لَمْ تَجَعَلْ لَهُ مِنْ قَبْلُ سِيَّا. Comp. also the stress laid on the identity of the Mahdi’s name with that of the Prophet, p. 53.


— Note 1. See Wüstenfeld, Tabellen C 13.

— L. 3. Azd. see ib., e. g., 1118,21; Bajila, e. g., 918.


— L. 5. ‘Âmir b. at-‘Ufeil, a contemporary of the Prophet, ib. E 20. His kunya Abû ‘Ali, see Agh., Tables sub voce

ابو علي.

— L. 9. This conception is not specifically Shiitish but rather belongs to the domain of Kalâm. Makr. 34810, at the end of his account on the Mu‘tazila, mentions a special sect المُفَتَّنَةُ القائِمُون ابنة الحَتَّة والنَّار. I. H. refers to it more explicitly Ed. IV, 8311 ff. in a special chapter on “the eternal existence of the
residents of Paradise and Hell”: “All sects of the (Muhammedan) Community agree that there is no decay for Paradise and its pleasure nor for Hell and its pain. The only exceptions are Jahm b. Ṣafwān, Abū’l-Hudeil al-ʿAllāf and some of the Rawāfid. Jahm maintains that both Paradise and Hell will decay and their residents as well. Abū’l-Hudeil, however, maintains that neither Paradise and Hell nor their residents will decay. But the movements of the latter will decay and they will remain in an immovable state like a mineral. In spite of it, they will be alive and enjoy pleasure and suffer pain respectively. The party of the Rawāfid referred to above believes that the residents of Paradise will leave Paradise and the residents of Hell will leave Hell for some unknown destination (lit.: whither it is Allah’s desire).” See Iji 336; Makr. 349.

A certain heretic by the name of ‘Abdallah b. ‘Abdallah b. Shuneif attacks a friend of I. H. on account of his belief in the eternity of Paradise and Hell, Ed. I, 19.

— L. 11. The eternity of the world is taught by the Mu’ammariyya, a section of the Khaṭṭābiyya, p. 114, see Shahr. 137 = Makr. 352; Iji 346. This belief is the outcome of the doctrine of Transmigration (Makr.), as the latter, taking the place of Reward and Punishment after death, dispenses with Resurrection and accordingly with the establishment of a new world. Isfr 57b is apparently aware of this connection when he curtly remarks: 

The way this view is contrasted with the belief in the decay of Paradise and Hell suggests a connection between them. In point of fact, the belief in Transmigration, when carried out logically, not only necessitates the eternity of this world, but, fulfilling the function of Reward and Punishment, dispenses altogether with Paradise and Hell. IBab., Itikādāt 13b

1 Comp. Kashi 177: an-Nazzām (p. 58b) said to Hīshām b. al-Ḥakam (p. 6511): “The residents of Paradise will not exist in Paradise an eternal existence” and so forth.

2 The last words most probably refer to the belief mentioned later, p. 85ff.
fully recognizes this connection:

— L. 12, ff. Bekri, Description de l'Afrique Septentrionale, ed. de Slane, Alger, 1857, p. 161, gives a brief description of this sect which offers several important points of comparison with the account of I. H. I give Bekri's passage in translation: "To the right of the Banû Mâghûs there is a tribe called Banû Lamâs. They are all Rawâfîd and known under the name Bajâliyyûn. There settled in their midst a Bajalite of the people of Nafta in Kasîlia, before Abû 'Abdallah ash-10 Shi'i entered Ifrikiya. His name was Muhammed b. Wrsâd (وردام عيل). He called upon them (read لدا) to denounce the Companions (of the Prophet) and permitted them forbidden things . . . They still adhere to his doctrine to this day and (believe) that the Imamate is permissible only in the descend-15 ants of al-Hasan, not in those of al-Ḫusein. Their ruler was Idrîs Abû'l-Kâsim b. Muhammed b. Ja'far b 'Abdallah b. Idrîs."

The name of the founder of this sect appears here in a different form. IḪaukâl 6521 (=Yakut I, 320) agrees with I. H. in calling him أه وصاند, but they omit the mention of his first 20 name. The name and pedigree of their ruler are altogether different and I have no means to decide which are the correct ones.3

As regards the cardinal doctrine of this sect—the limitation of the Imamate to the Ħasanides—Bekri agrees with I. H. (55, l. 5). 25 In contradiction with it, IḪaukâl (=Yakut) reports that they were Mûsawîtes (cf. p. 40), i. e. acknowledged the Imamate of Mûsâ b. Ja'far, who was descended from al-Ḫusein. The former statement is no doubt correct, as the Idrisides who ruled over them were Ħasanides.

— L. 14. On Nafta see Yakut IV, 800. It is two days' journey from Kafsa, mentioned in the same line, ib. Kafsa, a small place (بلدة صغيرة), lies three days from Keirowan, ib.

1 جمل بجد. of the tribe Bajîla?
2 i. e. before 280h.
3 Gen. Leyd. omits the Idrisides in Africa.
IV, 151. Kastilia mentioned here is not the Spanish province, but a region in Northwest Africa on the great Zâb, Yakut IV, 97; see also I, 892, IV, 151. The emendation proposed, note 11, is not necessary.

It is worthy of notice that the people of this region, from which the founder of this Shiitic sect came, were Khârijites, Yakut IV, 97, 800.

— L. 16. The city mentioned here is as-Sûs al-Âksa. It is fully two months' journey from as-Sûs al-Adna, Yakut III, 10189.—On the Maṣmâda tribes, see Kremer, Ideen 383, note.

55, l. 2. According to Hâaukal (=Yakut) ib. the two parties of the city (the others were Mâlikites) alternately worshipped in the same mosque.


— Note 1. On ʻAbdallah b. Yâsin, the founder of the Almoravide dynasty (middle 11th century), see Dozy, Isl. 359 ff.

The by-name al-Muṭṭawwi I have not found elsewhere.

— L. 7. See also Text, p. 80, l. 2. On Abû Kâmil, see Bagd. 1218, 1368; Shahr. 133; Iji 343; Makr. 352.

— L. 17. See also Text 80, l. 4. The author of this contention, which is certainly not unjustified, is unfortunately not known. The contention itself is not mentioned in the other sources.

— L. 22. "who occupy the middle as regards 'extremism'." From the point of view of ġuluww the Shi'a appears divided into three parts: the Zeidiyya who are entirely free from it, the Imâmiyya who partly adhere to it (comp., e. g., Raja, Tanâsukh, etc.), and the Gâliya who unflinchingly profess it. The reading of L. Br. (note 6) "who keep back from ġuluww" is thus justified. However this may be, the Imamites themselves protest against any affinity with the Ġulât. IBab., I'tikādât 22b (in a special chapter emphatically declares that they are infidels.

— Note 7. They betray Islam, because both Koran and Hadith insist that Muhammad is the last prophet, comp. Text 47, l. 8 f.
Note 8. The reading of L. Br. is no doubt correct. Polytheism is not the charge usually preferred against the Jews by Muhammedan theologians. This would confirm our supposition as to the later date of Codd. L. Br., see Introd. p. 19.

56, l. 3. On the Ġurābiyya see IKot. 300; Iji 346; Makr. 353; Bagd. 98a; Isfr. 58b. The latter two and Iji state the comparison more elaborately: “more than one raven the other one and one fly the other one.” The adherents of this sect curse the “ṣāḥib ar-rish,” i.e. Jibrīl. In a parallel between the Rāfīḍ and the Jews put into the mouth of ash-Sha’bī (Ikd. 269, comp. p. 199) the two are identified because of their dislike of Gabriel. Bagd. 98b sorrowfully remarks that the Ġāliya are even worse than the Jews, for the latter, though disliking Gabriel, yet abstain from cursing him.

In his polemics against Judaism, I. H. (Ed. I, 138") very cleverly draws a parallel between the Jews who believe that Isaac confounded Esau with Jacob and the Ġurābiyya. “This contention (of the Jews) very closely resembles the stupidity of the Ġurābiyya among the Rāfīḍa who believe that Allah dispatched Jibrīl to Allāh, but Jibrīl erred and went to Muhammed. In the same way Isaac blessed Esau, but the blessing erred and went to Jacob. Upon both parties (may rest) the curse of Allāh!”

— L. 13f. Ali was about thirty years younger than the Prophet (comp. Kremer, Ideen, p. 315). Consequently he was ten years old when Muhammed made his first appearance. The same is assumed Ed. IV, 142 and in the variant of L. Br. to our passage (note 7): The reading of Ed. seems to be incorrect. But there is a difference of opinion as to the date of Ali’s birth, see I. H in the quoted passage and Tab. I, 3467 ff.

— L. 15 ff. On Muhammed’s physical appearance see Ibn Hishām I, 266; Tab. I, 1789 ff.; Nawawi, Tahdīb 32–33. It is interesting to observe that I. H is unprejudiced enough to point out that Muhammed was above middle-size. The other writers

2 Ed. has al-Galilat, but V 80a, and L I, 54b (which in this section of Mital sides with Ed.) have the correct reading.
3 V. + Ḡalibā‘ wa-r螳ilā‘ Ed. L. missing.
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[56] anxiously insist that the Prophet was neither short nor tall, but the exact medium between the two.

[57] 57, l. 1 ff. On Ali's appearance see Tab. I, 3470 (=I Ath. III, 333); Tahdib 441 penult.—Sibt, Imams fol. 4a, gives a similar description of Ali: 

كان آدم شديد الأذمة عظيم العبدين غليظ الساعديين أقرب إلى القصر من الطول عريض الرأس والخيمة (read أصلع). Ali looked particularly short because of his corpulence. Whenever Ali appeared on the market of Kufa, the satirical Persians would exclaim 10

برزن اشكنب آمد "Here comes the big-bellied man!" (ZDMG. 38, 392, from Mâdâînî). It is characteristic that both Sunnitic and Shiitic writers anxiously avoid to mention this feature of Ali which is so repugnant to the Arabic taste. Of all the sources at my disposal I find, besides the reference quoted above, only one more allusion to it in Ikd II, 274 (بطينًا).

— L. 11. The number 23 is not exact. The interval between Muhammed's first appearance and his death was 213/2 lunar years; see the list in Sprenger, Leben Muhammed's I, 205.


[58] 58, l. 3. The exclusive (note 3) reverence of Ali is characteristic of several sects: the Sabâiyya (Text 71) and the 'Ulyâniyya and Nušerïyya, which, according to I. H. (Text-66, l. 17 and 71, l. 18), are branches of the former.

— L. 4 ff. The persons named in the following are the twelve Imams of the Ithnâ'ashariyya. The biographical data concerning these Imams can best be learned from the list in Abu'l-Maali, p. 164–165, see Schefer's Introduction, p. 184 f. A more detailed account Diyarbekri II, 286–288. The omission (in l. 6) of the tenth Imam, Ali b. Muhammed (al-Hâdi at-Takî, born 214, died 254), is, it seems, not accidental. For in accordance with it, Ali (l. 7) is changed to Muhammed. The same omission and the same change are exhibited by Codd. L. Br. Text p. 76, note 4 and 5. Whether this peculiar error is due to his proximity to the eighth Imam, who bears the same name, or to some more significant circumstance, is difficult to determine.

1 Ed. IV, 103 19,1 his genealogy is given correctly.
— Note 6. It is worthy of note that the benediction ḥafir is added only after the name of Ja‘far. Ja‘far as-Sādik (died 146) was not only the patron-saint of the Shiites. He was also highly esteemed by the Sunnites, see p. 1055. Cf. ZDMG. 50, 123.

— L. 10. On the Carmathians, see p. 19, l. 32. Muhammed b. Ismā‘il at-Tāmīn, “the Completer,” is the seventh and last “open” Imam in the belief of the Sab‘iyya, or “Seveners.” After him begins the series of hidden Imams, Shahr. 127 ff., 146. The Carmathian missionary Yahya b. Dikrweh pretended that he was this Muhammed, Tab. III, 2218 (anno 289).

— L. 12. Read: “This is a party.” On the Keisānīyya, see p. 33 ff. The Keisānīyya do not agree as to whether Muhammed b. al-Ḥanafīyya inherited the Imamate directly from Ali, or indirectly through Ḥasan and Ḥusein, Shahr. 110. Kuthayyir (p. 1345) speaks of four Imams, comp. Barbier de Meynard in Journal Asiatique, 1874, p. 164.

— L. 13. On Mukhtār, see Shahr. 110 (he distinguishes between the Keisānīyya and Mukhtāriyya). Very elaborate accounts on Mukhtār with specimens of his saj can be found Bagd. 126 ff.; Isfr. 106 ff. Wellhausen, Opp. 74 ff., gives an elaborate sketch of his personality.

59, l. 1 ff. On Muğīra see the passages in Index.—Text 34, [59] n. 5, Ed. and Codd. have bnu Abi Sa‘id. Ed. I, 112 ult. and elsewhere correctly. Sa‘d instead of Sa‘id occurs Agh. XIX, 58, Ḳd 267. Abu‘l-Ma‘ali 157, gives him the by-name Ḳābīl. According to Shahr. 134, Makr. 353 (=de Sacy XLVI) he was a “client” of Khālid al-Ḳasrī, who afterwards executed him. It is possible, however, that this is a mere inference drawn from the fact that Khālid’s clan Kaṣr belonged, as did Muğīra (l. 2), to the Bajīl tribe (IKot. 203; Ḳhall. No. 212). He is specifically designated as al-‘Īlī (of the Banū ‘Īlī) Shahr. 134; Ḳī 344; Makr. 3495, 3531; Bagd. 956; Isfr. 546, 566; Tabarī Index (in the text the statement is missing). This is significant in connection with van Vloten, Worgers, p. 57, and later, p. 8925 ff. Muğīra rose against Khālid b. ‘Abdallah al-Ḳasrī, the wāli of Kufa, in 119, accompanied by twenty (Ḳamīl ed. Wright 2015; Makr. 3535), according to Tab. II, 16215 only by seven men. Despite their small number they spread such terror around them (the reason, see p. 9215 ff.), that Khālid, who chanced
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[59] to be in the pulpit when he heard of their uprising, came near fainting and asked for a glass of water, an action which made him the object of general ridicule, Kāmil ib., Agh. XIX, 58, XV, 121 (here they are called by the general name al-Jaʿfariyya, see p. 107''), Makr. 353', van Vloten, Worger, 58. The rebels were crucified, Tab. I, 1620'; IKot. 300 ("in Wāsīṭ"); Ikd 267 (probably quotation from IKot.). According to another version (Tab. 1620′′; I. H. Text 60, l. 17; Ikd ib.), they were burned at the stake.

An exposition of Muqīrā's doctrines is found Shahr., Iji, Makr., IKot., Ikd, very elaborately Bagd. 95′ and, more briefly, Isfr. 56′. His tenets, which show all the earmarks of "guluww," seem to have exercised a powerful influence in ultra-Shiitic circles. The Imamites solicitously reject any connection with Muqīrā, see the article on Muqīrā, Kashi 145 ff. Jaʿfar as-Sādik is reported as saying that all the extravagant views to be found in the writings of his father's (Muḥammed al-Bākūr's, died 117″) followers are forgeries of Muqīrā, ib. 146, 147.

His system, if system it be called, presents an odd mixture of ancient Eastern beliefs and distinctly shows the influence of gnostic, notably of Mandaean and Manichæan, doctrines. The Mandaens were very numerous in Irāk; at the time of the Abbassides they are said to have had there 400 churches. Their head resided in Bagdad.1 The Manichæans, too, were identified with 'Irāk. Mani was born in Babylonia, and he was believed (according to al-Birānī) to have been sent to the people of Babylonia only. Their head had to reside in Babylonia.2 The Harrānians, too, who may be mentioned in this connection, were very numerous in 'Irāk.3 On these influences see van Vloten, Chittisme 47; Blochet 135, the latter also in Revue de l'histoire des Religions, XL (1899), p. 25, note 1.4

It can scarcely be doubted that ultimately all these influences root in the ancient religion of Babylonia; see Kessler ibidem,

---

2 Kessler, Article "Manichaeer" ibidem, p. 236, Flügel, Mani 97, 105.
3 Chwolson, Ssabier I, 482 ff.
4 It is perhaps not insignificant that a part of the Banū 'Ijl (see above p. 79″) who lived in Bahrein "completely passed into the Persian nationality," Goldziher, "Islamisme et Parsisme" in Revue de l'histoire des Religions XLIII (1901), p. 23.
The Heterodoxies of the Shiites, etc.


In the following an attempt is made to point out the various sources of Muğira’s doctrines. It does not claim to be more than an attempt. A closer acquaintance with the religions and literatures under consideration will no doubt bring to light far more numerous points of contact.¹

— L. 5. The corporeal conception of the Godhead was current in Shiitic circles, see, e. g., p. 67. The crown in this connection is found in various philosophemes. In the Cabbala the “Crown” (ךיָוֶן) is the highest of the Ten Sefiroth (Spheres). The latter are represented in the shape of a man with a crown on his head; comp. the diagram in the Jewish Encyclopedia I, 181² and in the Hebrew Encyclopedia ( نها וֹיָא), New York, 1907, I, 183. See also later, p. 83.

According to Shahr.; Makr. 349³; Bagd. 95⁴ f. and others, Muğira believed that God was a man of light bearing a crown of light. This reminds one of the Mandaean doctrine of the “King of Light.” Brandt, Mandäische Religion (Göttingen 1889) §§ 19–20, 80–81; the same, Mandäische Schriften (Göttingen 1893), p. 13–19.

— L. 6. Bagd. 96⁵ is less scrupulous and adds two more instances: ‘Ain for the eye and Hā for the pudenda. A very similar description of God is quoted in the name of the Gnostics by Irenaeus, adversus Haereticos² XIV, 3. A Jewish parallel, see in Gaster, “Das Schiur Komah,” Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums 37 (1893), p. 225. Similar speculations about the shape of the letters in the name الت and ַת (the latter in Kūfic), see Blochet, 133, 192.

— L. 12 ff. This peculiar theory of Creation is evidently the reflection of a Gnostic doctrine. Irenaeus, adversus Haeret. XIV 1, reports a similar theory in the name of the Gnostic

¹ I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to my friend and colleague, Prof. Louis Ginzberg, who lent me his effectual aid in pointing out the Rabbinical illustrations, the latter, too, bearing witness to the same influences. I profited by his valuable advice also in other parts of this treatise.

² The following quotations all refer to the first Book.
When first the unoriginated, inconceivable Father, who is without material substance, and is neither male nor female, willed to bring forth that which is ineffable in Him, and to endow with form that which is invisible, He opened His mouth, and sent forth the Word, similar to Himself. Moreover, the pronunciation of His name took place as follows: He spake the first word of it which was the beginning [of all the rest] and that utterance consisted of four letters. He added the second, and so forth. In Jewish Mysticism similar notions can be traced. Comp. Menakhot 29b: “God created the two worlds (this and the future world) through the letters Hê and Yôd (constituting the Divine name Yâh).” See also Berakhot 55a. A similar theory is elaborately set forth in Sefer Yêšîrah and is to be found in other ancient mystical works. It may be mentioned in this connection that under the influence of a similar notion the Mandaean verb {Name} “to call” has assumed the meaning “to create.” See Kessler, art. “Mândäer” ibid. p. 164 and p. 165.

— L. 12. The “Greatest Name” is, as was already pointed out by de Sacy XLVII, note, identical with the “Shêm ha-Mephôrash,” the “Ineffable Name” which occupies so prominent a place in the Jewish mystical speculations of all ages (see M. Grünbaum, Gesammelte Aufsätze (Berlin 1901), p. 238 ff.; Revue des Études Juives 19, 290 f.). It plays an important part in Islam as well, and here, too, the belief is current that by means of the Ineffable Name all miracles can be easily performed; see, e. g., Ikhd 396, and (as an illustration) IKhall. No. 756.

Most of the sources dealing with Muğira report that he claimed...

---

1 I quote the translation of Roberts and Rambaut, Edinburgh, 1868.
2 According to I. H., the Jews believed that the sorcerers were able to resuscitate the dead by means of Divine names and that Jesus was able to do the same and to perform miracles generally by the same means, Cod. V 92b (missing in Cod. L and Ed. I, 156, which is shorter in this part of the work): 

فإنهم كلّهم متفقون على أنّ الله 

بَخْطَرَهُنَّ المَوْتَيَ حَقَيْقَةً بِإِسْمَاءِ اللهِ . . . وَهُمْ لا يَخْتَلِفُونَ فِي اٍنَّ عِبَّاسِ عَلَيْهِ السَّلامُ كان يَعْمَل الْآيَاتَ بِتَلَكَ الآسِمَاءِ القَاذِئَةَ الَّتِي

to be able to perform miracles and resuscitate the dead through his knowledge of the "Greatest Name." Tab. ib. puts into his mouth the typical utterance that he had the power to bring to life the `Âd and Thamûd and the generations that were between them.¹

— L. 13. Instead of "and it (the Greatest Name) fell (L. Br.: flew and fell) on his crown," Bagd., Shahr. and Iji 343 give the important variant "fell upon his head as a crown." He referred, as Shahr. and Bagd. tell us, to Koran 87, 1:

\[ \text{veis\'im aksem ri\'ik \'al\'um al-di\'i} \]

and, as Bagd. explains, "he assumed that the Highest Name was identical with this very crown." The same conception of the identity of the "Shêm ha-Mephôrash" with the Crown is frequently found in the Cabbala. It takes the form that the name was engraved upon the Crown, see Jew. Enc. IV, 370ᵃ and 372ᵇ (the references can be multiplied).—On the crown of the Mandæan "King of Light" see Brandt, Mandäische Schriften 13–19. The Mandæan priests wear during the service a crown (tâj) on the right upper arm, Kessler, article "Mandäer," p. 214 ult.²

— L. 14. Apart from the words left out in Ed. (note 6), the passage reflects the ancient idea, also found in the Bible, that man's actions are written down in heaven. The additional words of L. Br. are confirmed by Shahr. 135³:

\[ \text{owd kantahaa u\'il} \]

— L. 15 ff. This queer notion, too, has its root in some Gnostic doctrine. Irenæus, adv. Haeret. IV, 2, commenting upon the Gnostic belief that from the tears of Achamoth

¹ This is no doubt the original version. According to IKot. and (probably quoting) Ikd 267, he claimed this power for Ali. This may partly be the reason why these two writers designate Muğfra as one of the Sabâïyya. For the latter was considered as the party of Ali kar' ézôxîv, see p. 101⁷.

² Prof. Ginzberg suggests a connection with Is. 49, 16: "Behold I have engraved thee on my palms." It may be the consequence of some mystic interpretation of this verse.
"all that is of a liquid nature was formed," funnily remarks that he could easily enlarge upon it. "For when I perceive that waters are in part fresh . . . and in part salt, . . . I reflect with myself that all such waters cannot be derived from her tears, inasmuch as these are of a saline quality only. It is clear, therefore, that the waters which are salt are alone those which are derived from her tears. But it is probable that she, in her intense agony and perplexity, was covered with perspiration. And hence, following out their notion, we may conceive that fountains and rivers, and all the fresh waters in the world, are due to this source." A somewhat similar idea is found in the Talmud (Hagiga 13b): "Whence does the stream Dinûr (Daniel 7, 10) come? From the perspiration of the Holy living Creatures." [Cf. Bereshith Rabba, ch. 78.]

The two lakes, then, are formed of the Divine tears and the Divine perspiration respectively. They no doubt correspond to the mâyê siyâvê and the mâyê hîvârê, the "dark and white waters" of the Mandaeans; see Brandt, Mandäische Religion, pp. 30, 43, 51, etc.—Instead of "sweet" (ll. 17 and 22) read "fresh."

— L. 18 ff. The same conception is found in several Gnostic systems, notably among the Mandaeans. "When Life . . . had thus spoken, Abatur rose and opened the gate. He looked into the Dark Water, and at the same hour was formed his image in the Dark Water. Ptahill was formed and he ascended the Place of the Borders."

Illustrative of l. 19 is the passage in Irenaeus XIV, 1: "The world, again, and all things therein, were made by a certain company of seven angels. Man, too, was the workmanship of angels, a shining image bursting forth below from the presence of the Supreme power; and when they could not, he says, keep hold of this, because it immediately darted upwards again, they exhorted each other saying: let us make man after our image and likeness."

— L. 20. Out of the two eyes of the shadow only two luminaries could naturally be formed. For this reason I disre-

1 Comp. also Kessler, article "Manichaer," p. 236 ult.: "The rain was considered to be the perspiration of the toiling archont."

2 =Gabriel, the Demiurge of the Mandaeans.

gard the additional reading of L. (note 12).\textsuperscript{1} Shahr. 135\textsuperscript{4} and [59] very similarly Bagd. speak of the sun and the moon. But our text seems to reflect a more complicated and, consequently, more original conception. Perhaps one may combine it with the well-known Jewish legend that originally the two luminaries were of equally large size and that the moon was subsequently reduced in size on account of its jealousy.

— L. 22. Sin, and correspondingly Evil as being primitive and co-existent with Creation, is a widespread Gnostic doctrine and is a consequence of Dualism, which is at the bottom of all Gnostic systems. According to Irenaeus XXIV, 2, Saturninus "was the first to affirm that two kinds of men were formed by the angels,"—the one wicked, and the other good."\textsuperscript{8}—On the lakes see before.—Instead of "the Faithful," Makr. 353\textsuperscript{5} has "the Shi'a." Bagd. says more explicitly: ظلم

 Extremely interesting in this connection is the passage Ed. IV, 69': "Some people among the Rawafid are of the opinion that the spirits of the Infidels are in Burhút—this is a well in Hadramaut— and that the spirits of the Faithful are in another place, I think it is al-Jâbiya."\textsuperscript{5}

60, 1. 1. This view is in all probability a reflection of the Clementine doctrine of the "True Prophet" who appears in various ages under different names and forms, but is in reality one, Clementine Homilies III, 12 ff., 20; Recognitiones I, 16. He is called Christ but he is also identical with Adam, Recogn. I, 45, 47. The persons in whom the true Prophet revealed himself are given Homilies XVII, 4 (in a statement by Simon Magus) as Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses; in XVIII, 13 (in a reply by Peter) as Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob [and Christ]. In both the number

\textsuperscript{1} Br. reads like Ed.—Note 12 is to be corrected accordingly.

\textsuperscript{2} See above p. 84\textsuperscript{9}.

\textsuperscript{3} See a similar conception of the origin of evil, Clementine Homilies XX, 8, 9; XIX, 12 ff.

\textsuperscript{4} See Yakut I, 598, where this belief is derived from a tradition transmitted from the Prophet, Ali and Ibn 'Abbâs. Interesting is the remark that the water of this well is dark and stinking. al-Jâbiya is in Syria, ibidem and II, 4.

\textsuperscript{5} Comp. Ma'âni an-Nafs, ed. Goldziher, p. 62\textsuperscript{*}. 
seven is evidently intended. This is important in view of the numerous Shiitic doctrines which are based on the same number of prophets (see Index s.v. Seven).—The conception of the "true Prophet" is complemented, it seems, by the Clementine belief that God has the power of changing himself: "for through his inborn Spirit He becomes, by a power which cannot be described, whatever body He likes" (Homilies XX, 6). This is practically the doctrine of Incarnation, which is of such fundamental significance for the Ultra-Shi‘a.—Another instance of the adaptation of a Clementine doctrine, see p. 116 n. 2.

— L. 2. Jābīr died 128 or, according to another version, 132 (Tab. III, 2501). Either date contradicts the statement Bagd. 97a that he was among those who expected the "return" of Muhammed b. ‘Abdallah (see l. 10) who died in 145: واَدَعُوهُمُّ فِي الْبُحْرِ وَلَمْ يَكُونَ لَهُمُ الْبَعْضُ لِلْفَرَاغُ إِلَّا أَنْ نَظَرُ بِهِ مَعْلُودٍ بِنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِبِنِ الحَسَنِ دُنْيَا الْبُطْحَابِ، see also 17b. Jābīr was a passionate admirer of Ali and maintained that the latter was meant by "the beast of the Earth" (Koran 34, 13); Goldziher, Muh. St. II, 113, comp. ZDMG. 38, 391.—The Imamites consider his traditions trustworthy, Kashi 126. He is briefly mentioned Tusy p. 73, No. 139.

— L. 3. ‘Āmir b. Shurāhīl ash-Sha‘bī (ash-Shu‘bī is misprint) died 103 or 104. The sources dealing with this celebrated traditionist are enumerated Fihr. 183 note 14.—Shahr. 145 counts him among the Shi‘a. He appears Ikōd 269 (=Isfr. 15a) as a bitter enemy of the Rawāfid. But the utterances put into his mouth are no doubt spurious. [See Index s.v. ash-Sha‘bī.]

— L. 4. Khālid al-Ḵasrī (Ḵasr, a clan of the Bajila) was executed in the year 126 by his successor in the governorship of Kufa, Yūsuf b. ‘Omar ath-Thakafi, in a most barbarous manner. See on Khālid, IKhall. No. 212; IKot. 203; Agh. XIX, 53 ff.; Flügel, Mani 320–322. He frequently appears in our text as a relentless persecutor of heretics. But the motive for his attitude was evidently not religious zeal but loyalty to the Omeyyad dynasty, which was threatened by these heretics. His own orthodoxy was of a rather problematic nature. He was a
powerful protector of the Manichæans (Flügel, Mani, p. 105),[60] and his mother was a Christian. His achievements in the extermination of heretics were rewarded by a hadith in which the Prophet announces to his ancestor Asad b. Kurz that Islam will be victorious through his descendants, Goldziher, Muh. St. 5 II, 45 f.

— L. 6. I find no reference bearing on Bekr, except the notice Bagd. 97a:

فِلَسَّا مَاتٍ جَابِرٍ أَدْعُى بَكْرَ الْأَمْوَى الْكَحْـجَّرِيَّ

...لَ وَرَضَى عِنْهُ مَنْ لاَ يَمْتَعُ وأُعْلِمَ بِذَلِكَ أَمْوَال

المَغِيْرِيَّة عِنْهُ وَرَضَى عِنْهُ مَنْ فِلَسَّا مَاتٍ بَكْرُ عَلَءْمَا أَنَّهُ كَان

كَلِبًا فِي دَعْوَاتِ فَلَعْنَةِ...

— L. 10. On Muhammed see Text 43. I have not been able to fix the date of his birth and cannot therefore confirm the statement preserved in L. Br. (note 5). Bagd. 17b and more elaborately 96a reports that after Muhammed’s death the Muğiriyana claimed that a devil was executed in his stead (comp. p. 3013) and that he himself was hidden in Hâjir, in the mountains of Radwa (Text 43 n. 7). They also believed that Muhammed would bring to life seventeen men whom he would endow with the seventeen letters of the “Greatest Name”, so as to enable them to perform miracles (see p. 82). They adduced in proof of his Imamate his identity in name and father’s name with that of the Prophet (comp. p. 5311).3

The Muğiriyana referred to here are, of course, the followers of Muğira, not Muğira himself, who died (anno 119) 26 years before Muhammed (145). Bagd. reports the same beliefs in the name of Jâbir al-Jufî.

— L. 12. On the sanctity with which water is invested among the Mandæans and which is no doubt of old Babylonian

1 See for a similar claim p. 11326.
2 Isfr. 12a gives a similar account which is extracted by Haarbrucker II, 412.—It is remarkable that Iji 344 mentions as the Imam of the Muğiriyana not Muhammed but a man named زكريّا بن محمد بن عليّ بن المحسّن بن عليّ (Ibidem read حاجز instead of حاجر.)

— L. 16. The name of this sectarian appears in the form بنان and لبان. Ed. as well as Codd. have indiscriminately both (comp., e. g., Ed. I, 112 ult. and Text 34 note 8). The general form, however, is لبان. It is found Shahr. 113 (Haarbrücker 171: Bunân; Barbier de Meynard, *Journal Asiatique* 1874 p. 169: Bennân), Kashi (consistently, e. g., 188¹, 195¹¹,¹⁵ 196¹⁰ etc.); Iji 344 (also quoted in *Dictionary of Technical Terms* sub voce); Mirza repeatedly; Lubb al-Lubâb s.v. الياناني (see Appendix s.v. الياناني where the editor argues against the form لبان). In spite of this consensus, the only correct form, as is apparent from the application of the name p. 61, l. 17, also لبان.

On Bayân’s teachings see Makr. 349¹, 352²; Bagd. 12ᵃ, 91ᵃ, very elaborately 95ᵇ; Isfr. 56ᵃ. Most writers ascribe to him the same doctrines as to Muğîra. According to Kashi 196, he believed, on the basis of Koran 43, 84, that the God of Heaven and the God of Earth are two different beings. For a similar doctrine see later p. 127².

— L. 17 ff. The following story is given Tab. II, 1620 (anno 119) = IAth. V, 154 in a different presentation.


— L. 16. For a very similar example see Text 62, l. 4. I. H. (Ed. IV, 198¹⁹) reports that Ahmad b. ʿYânush (Ed. has سابروس, see p. 10²⁷) “pretended to be a prophet, maintaining that it was he who was meant by the saying of Allah (Koran 61, 6): ‘Announcing an apostle who will come after me, whose name will be Ahmad.’”

¹ Whether the application is historically true or not, makes no difference.

² ابن رکیع الياناني who is mentioned *Fihr.* 180⁸ among the متكلمین المختارة has certainly nothing to do with Bayân, as is assumed by the editors in note 5.
— L. 18. Abū Hāshim died in Ḫumeima (Palestine) in 78 [61] or 79, Nawawi, Tahdīb 369; van Vloten, Chiitisme 45. On his alleged concession of the Imamate to the Abbassides see Tab. III, 24, 2500; IKhald. I, 360. Van Vloten (ib. 44) is inclined to ascribe to the Ḥashimiyya the initiative to a systematic Shiitic propaganda. However this may be, certain it is that Abū Hāshim, who left no children, presents a turning point in the development of Zeiditic or anti-legitimistic Shiism, in the same way as does Jaʿfar as-Ṣādik, on account of his numerous children, in the history of Imamitic or legitimistic Shiism.

— Note 17. This addition is in keeping with the Zeiditic principle which demands the personal qualification of the Imam, see Text 75, l. 9.

62, l. 1. On Abū Manṣūr see IKot. 300; Ikd 267; Shahr. [62] 135 f.; Ijj 344; Makr. 353 f.; Bagd. 91, 97; Isfr. 56; particu-
larly van Vloten, Worgers 58. The appellation al-Mustanir, which is not quite clear, does not occur in the other sources. His nickname “al-Kisf” is explained Shahr. 136 in connection with his assumption that he was lifted up to heaven, then hurled downwards and thus became “a fragment falling down from heaven.” According to Ikd and Shahr. 136 (the later in contradiction with himself), Abū Manṣūr applied this designation to Ali.

— L. 2. Abū Manṣūr was by descent (note 3) a member of the ‘Ījl to which Muğira attached himself as maula (Text 59). Interesting in this connection is the remark of Ibn Faḵīh (ed. de Goeje), p. 185: ‘وكان منهم أبو منصور الحذاق وكان يترّفيت
سبعةٍ أُنباءٍ من بني قريش وسبعة من بني عيَّن’ “To these (the inhabitants of Kufa who pretended to be prophets) belonged Abū Manṣūr the Strangler (see later, p. 92). He chose for his friends (?) seven prophets out of the Banū Kureish and seven out of the Banū ‘Ījl.” Comp. van Vloten, Worgers 58. On the Banū ‘Ījl, see p. 80, note 4. This remark alludes perhaps

1 Gen. Leyd., which enumerates only the Alides who left offspring, does not enumerate Abu Hāshim among the children of Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya.

2 Or “favored.” The meaning of ٌتولَى is not quite clear. See, however, next note.
The significant passage Kashi 187 (parallel 195) may bear some relation to the subject in question. Ja‘far as-Sādīk makes the following statement: “Allah revealed in the Koran seven (pseudo-prophets?) with their names. The Kureish, however, struck out six and left only Abū Lahab.” When subsequently asked about the saying of Allah (Koran 26, 221–222): “Shall I inform you of those on whom the Satans have descended? Descended they have on every sinful liar,” he replied: “They are seven: al-Muğīra b. Sa‘īd, Bunān (see p. 88°), Sā‘īd an-Nahdī, al-Hārīth ash-Sha‘mī, ‘Abdallah b. al-Hārīth,° Hamza b. ‘Omāra az-Zubeiri” and Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb (p. 112).” Abū Manṣūr is not mentioned.

According to Makr. 478 ult., the Jewish sectarian Abū 'Isa al-Iṣbāhānī similarly claimed “that he was lifted up to heaven and the Lord patted him on his head.” The early Jewish sects under Arabic dominion show a great many traces which remind one of the early Muhammedan sects, especially those of the Shi‘a.

Curiously enough Kashi 196 relates in the name of a man who had it from Abū Manṣūr himself that God addressed the latter in Persian یا پیامبر — The reading adopted in our text (note 8) is confirmed by Shahr. 136 l. 4.

The “Word” (Logos) is Christ, as he is often styled in Arabic. Comp. Ed. IV, 197: Ahmad b. Ḥā'iṭ and Ahmad b. Yānūṣh, the pupils of an-Nazzām (see p. 10 f.) “both maintained that the world had two creators: one who is eternal

1 I am not certain, however, as to the meaning of the passage. which is difficult (see preceding note) may signify “to become a maula” (see Dozy s.v.). Then the nominative ought to be read: ... سبعة انبیاء... and the meaning would be the following: Among the pseudo-prophets in Kufa seven attached themselves as maulas to the Kureish and seven to the ‘Ijl. The number seven is in any case noteworthy and hardly accidental. See the Index to this treatise s.v. Seven.

2 P. 195. See p. 1244.

3 Var. on the margin ...
and this is Allah, and the other one who is created and this is [62]
the Word of Allah (السِّمِيع عِيسِي) (كلمة الله), Jesus Christ (子孙
of Maryam, through whom he created the world.”
This distinctly points to Christian influence, whether directly
(see the quotation from Bagd. in the next note) or through some
gnostic medium, must be left open.
— L. 11. According to Shahr. 134, Muğira b. Sa‘id (p. 79 ff.)
similarly believed that the shadows of Muhammed and Ali
(Bagd. 95b mentions the shadow of Muhammed only) were
created first. Comp. preceding note. This doctrine is called 10
“tafwid” and is quoted alongside of “guluww” (Tusy, very fre-
quently, e. g., Nos. 281, 417, 415, 455 speaks instead of
غُلُووَّ ،” (Tusy: “guluww”)
Ibab., 3tikadat 24a has a special chapter
"tafwid" and "guluww." He defines it as follows:

Bagd. 98b states the matter more accurately: 20
Aماما المفروضة من:

1 On Zurara b. A‘yun (died 150) see Tusy 141 ff. He was a favorite of
Ja‘far aš-Sādiq, Fihr. 220. (See also Index to this treatise sub voce
Zurara.)
2 See p. 19. ولد apparently stands here for “adherent.”
At the bottom of this idea lies the Gnostic discrimination between the "unoriginated, inconceivable Father" and the Word (Logos) emanating from him which is the Demiurge; see preceding note and p. 82 ff. See also later, p. 127.

This doctrine is probably the reflection of the Clementine conception of the True Prophet, see p. 85. It contradicts both Koran and Sunna, which equally insist that Muhammed is the last prophet (p. 76).

The same is reported of the Khaṭṭābiyya, p. 14.

Ibn Fakih (ed. de Goeje) 185 speaks of "Abū Mašūr the Strangler." IKot. 300 says briefly: "to them (the Mašūriyya) belong the Stranglers." Shahr. 136 says distinctly: "his (Abū Mašūr's) adherents thought it permissible to kill their opponents and take away their property." Assassination is designated as a peculiarity of the Muğirīyya and Mašūriyya (see Index sub voce Terrorism). Jāḥīz in his Kitāb al-Ḥayawān gives an account of the manners of these terrorists of the eighth century. He who practised both "strangling" and "skull-breaking" was styled "Jāmi," "Combiner." This extremely curious and interesting passage is reproduced and discussed by van Volten, Wargers in Iraq (in a Dutch article. See List of Cited Works sub voce van Vloten, Wargers). The Thugs in India, whose beginnings date as far back as the first Muhammedan caliphs, also kill their victims by strangling.

The theological substructure for this peculiar tenet is supplied by I. H., Ed. IV, 171: "The command to do right and the prohibition to do wrong must be carried out with the heart and, if possible, with the tongue. It must not be executed by (employing) the hand nor in any way by drawing the sword or using arms ... All the Rawāfiḍ hold to it, though they all be killed (see the reading of L. Br., Text 63, note 1). But they believe in it only as long as the "Speaking" (Imam) does not come forth. When he does come forth, then the drawing of swords becomes obligatory. If not, then it is not (obligatory) ...
Certain sections of the Sunnites, all the Mu'tazilites, all the Khawārij and Zeidiyya (comp. Text p. 75) are of the opinion that with reference to the command to do right and the prohibition to do wrong, the drawing of swords is obligatory, since the repulsion of wrong is impossible without it. See following note.

63, 1. 1 and note 1. The Khashabiyya are connected with the Keisâniyya (ib. note 1) and originated simultaneously with them in the uprising of al-Mukhtar. IKot. 300 thus explains the name: "the Khashabiyya of the Rawâfid: Ibrâhîm b. al-Ashtar encountered 'Obeidallah b. Ziyâd. The majority of Ibrâhîm's followers were carrying with them wooden arms (al-khashab). They were, in consequence, called the Khashabiyya." Masudi V, 226 (anno 67) relates that al-Mukhtar "began to go forth every day to fight Muṣ'ab and those that followed him of the people of Kufa. Al-Mukhtar (on the other hand) had with him many people of the Shi'a. They were called the Khashabiyya (belonging) to the Keisâniyya." Comp. also the notice Agh. VI, 139 (=Tab. II, 1798'): "Othman al-Khashabi belonged to the Khashabiyya who were with al-Mukhtar." When Muhallab, who fought against al-Mukhtar, was besieging the city of Nisibis which was defended by the Khashabiyya, he thus addressed himself to the inhabitants: "O ye people! Let not these men frighten you. They are only slaves and have in their hands (nothing but) sticks." (Agh. V, 155; comp. Tab. II, 68416) These sticks were designated by a Persian word as "the heretic knockers," a name which is characteristic of the...
[63] part played by the Persian element in al-Mukhtār’s rebellion. Thus Tab. II, 694\(^b\) (anno 66) relates that the Khashabiyya who arrived in Mekka to liberate Muhammed b. al-Ijanaḥiyya (comp. 693\(^a\)) entered the Holy Mosque, carrying with them the "heretic knockers" and shouting: "On to the revenge for al-Husein!"\(^1\) The Kāfir-kūbat occur also later in the rebellion of Abū Muslim (see the quotation in de Goeje, *Bibliotheca Geogr. Arabic.* IV, 278) and as late as anno 257 (I Ath. VII, 99\(^b\)).\(^2\)

The name Khashabiyya, it seems, never came into general use. It is often written حبشية and, in consequence of the war cry of this party (revenge for al-Husein!), also حسنية; see the variants in Tab., van Vloten, Worgers, and Ikd (Comm. 93, n. 1).

Originally the name was probably meant to convey a social contrast. It indicated the Mawāli as "men of the sticks," that is, as poor devils who could not afford to equip themselves with proper arms (Wellhausen, *Opp.* 80). But it seems that this social aspect of the name was early forgotten and the name assumed a religious coloring. It is frequently used to designate the Kāsāniyya. Thus *Agh.* XI, 47: "It was Khindif al-Asadi (cf. Comm. 42\(^b\), where "Khandak" is incorrect) who converted Kuthayyir to the Khashabiyya doctrine (مذهب الخشبية)." Kuthayyir was a typical representative of the Kāsāniyya.

This peculiar idea which makes the use of arms dependent on the arrival of the Mahdi stands in a remarkable contrast to the Messianic conception of the Prophets (Is. 2, 4; Micah 4, 3). Perhaps it reflects the Messianic belief of post-biblical Judaism (adopted also by orthodox Islam), according to which the arrival

\(^1\) The same I Ath. IV, 207, where the variant مذهب الكافر كوبات is to be preferred. I Ath. denies that the poor equipment gave rise to the name. He gives a different interpretation to the incident. "They were called Khashabiyya, because on entering Mekka they carried sticks, being reluctant to display swords in the Holy District." Tab., however, (II, 695\(^b\)) reports that they threatened Ibn az-Zubeir with their swords.

\(^2\) De Goeje in the glossary to *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum,* ibidem, maintains that the word is an anachronism at so early a period as al-Mukhtār. But the general rôle of the Persian element in that movement and the passage in Tab. confirm the genuineness of the name.
of the Messiah will be connected with a series of bloody wars. [63]
At any rate, among the parallels between the Jews and the Rawā-
fiḍ put into the mouth of ash-Sha'bī (Ikd 269, Comm. p. 191) appears also the following comparison: "The Jews say, there shall be no fighting for the sake of God until the Messiah, the Expected One, goes forth and a herald from heaven proclaims (his arrival). The Rāfīda say, there is no fighting for the sake of Allah until the Mahādi goes forth and a rope' descends from heaven."

In view of the religious character assigned to the use of wooden weapons, we may, with all due reserve, call attention to the utter-
ance of Ibn Sabā recorded by Jāhiz (Comm. 431) that Ali "would not die till he would drive you with his stick," the more so, as, quite independently of Jāhiz, Zeid. (Comm. 422) reports the same form of the Shiitic belief "that Ali is alive and has not died, but will drive the Arabs and Persians with his stick." Perhaps it is not accidental that Kuthayyir, who was a Khashābī (see before) and had just returned from a visit to the neighbor-
hood of ar-Raḍwa, which in the belief of the Keisāniyya was the hiding place of Muḥammed b. al-Hanafiyya, "appeared before us leaning on a stick" (Agh. VIII, 33).²


— L. 6. Extremely remarkable is the statement that these adepts of Terror did not even spare one another. But the reason given for it and the solemn assurance of Hishām’s trust-
worthiness leave no doubt as to the meaning of the passage.

— L. 8. It is, of course, the fifth of the spoil originally to be delivered to the Prophet, Koran VIII, 42. The Karmatian leader Abū Ṭāhir and his successors still were in the habit of delivering this tax to ‘Ubeidallah, whom they considered their Imam, de Goeje, Čarmathes, p. 82.

64, l. 4. Most sources quoted p. 89¹⁴ f. state that Abū Man-[64] šūr laid claim to the Imamate only when Muḥammed b. Ali (al-Bākīr) had died (in 117).

— L. 6. On Bazīg see Shahr. 137; Iji 346; Makr. 352¹⁰. His name appears among those of other sectarian Kashi 196,

¹ ḏ[…] سبب? "Rope" gives no sense. Perhaps سبب! has here the meaning recorded Dozy s.v.: "Introducteur," the person who introduces one to the Caliph: The herald announcing the arrival of the Mahdi?
² See on this passage p. 25 n. 2.
On some of these heretics see Comm. p. 90¹⁰ and Index.

When Ja‘far was told that Bazig had been killed, he exclaimed: “Praise be unto Allah! There is surely nothing better for these Mügirîyîya (read instead of Mügîrîyîya) than to be killed, for they will never repent.” (Kashi 197.)

On the variants of the name see Text here note 8 and 34 n. 7.

Ed. I, 112 ult. reads يربيع. Shahr. ascribes to him the interesting view that a man who has attained to perfection cannot be said to have died.¹ Probably in connection with this belief he claimed that the best among his adherents had been raised to the dignity of angels, Iji. His profession is mentioned only here and Ed. I, 112 ult. The weaver’s trade was considered highly degrading, see Ferazdak ed. Boucher 211¹⁰ f.; Wellhausen, Opp. 62 n. 3. The same view is held by the Rabbis. Tosefta ‘Eduyoth I, 2 it is designated as the lowest trade in the world.

— Note 10. See p. 55¹⁶.

— L. 9. Mu‘ammar appears again Text 69¹⁴. For this reason the reading of L. Br. (note 11) seems preferable. On Sârî al-Âkîsam (with broken front teeth) I have found nothing except the bare mention of his name Kashi 196, 197 (see this page 251. 1 f.). In his stead the other sources énumerate as one of the sects of the Khaṭṭâbiyya مفصل الصَّبْرِ، Shahr. 137 and others.

— L. 10. ‘Omeir at-Tabban is no doubt identical with عبيِ بن بيان الجَيْلَي. Bagd. 98ᵃ; Isfr. 58ᵃ; Makr. 352¹²; Shahr. 137; Iji 346 (the latter بيان بنان instead of بيان بنان, comp. p. 88ᵃ). Most probably بنان بنان (or بيان بنان) is only another reading for البيان which is confirmed by the alchemistic utterance l. 12–13,

¹ Comp. Text 69¹¹, Comm. 72¹¹, 113²⁰.
not recorded elsewhere. Note the expression "this straw."[64]
That he was an 'Ijlite is significant in view of p. 7934 ff.—
According to Makr., the 'Omeiriyya erected a special tent in
Kufa for the worship of Ja'far as-Sâdiq, see later p. 107.

65, l. 1. This contradicts Shahr.'s and Makr.'s statement 5
that he was killed by Yazid b. 'Omar b. 'Ubeira (Makr. جنید)
the governor of 'Irâk under al-Mansûr.
L. 3. The same number is recorded in the other sources.
There is, however, a difference as regards the sects which con-
stitute this number. I. II. apparently counts as follows: 10
1) Mugîra, 2) Abû Mansûr, 3) Bazîg, 4) Mu'ammar or, perhaps
more correctly, Sari (p. 9623), 5) 'Omeir. The other writers,
including Bagd. and Isfr., count the Muqirîyya and Mansûriyya
apart and enumerate as the five sects of the Khattablîyya:
1) the Khattablîyya proper, then the followers of 2) Bazîg, 15
3) Mu'ammar, 4) Mufaddal (p. 9624) and 5) 'Omeir.
— Note 2. The notice, preserved only in L. Br., refers to
the event related Tab. III, 221713 ff. (anno 289). The Karmat-
ian missionary Zikrweih b. Mihrweih endeavors to win over to
the Kelbites. He sends to them his son Yahya. But no one 20
joined him "except the clan known as the Banû 'l-'Uleîs' b.
Dâmâm2 b. 'Adî b. Janâb3 and their clients. They swore
allegiance towards the end of 289... to Zikrweih’s son whose
name was Yahya and whose Kunya Abû 'l-Kâsim." Comp. de
Goeje, Carmathes, p. 48; Istakhri 232=IHaukal 2915; de Sacy 25
ccii; Führ. 187 n. 10.— Yahya pretended to be a certain well-
known Alide. But it is not settled which Alide he tried to
impersonate.—Tuqî (l. 5 of note 2) was the governor of Damas-
cus. I connect this sentence with the notice Tab. III, 221911:
"The cause of his (Yahya’s) death, according to some reports, 30
was that one of the Berbers struck him with a short spear4 and
a torch bearer5 followed him who threw fire at him and burned

1 I'Ath. VII, 353 reads قلیص; Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen II, 506,
Kaliss.
2 See the variants Tab. ib.
3 I'Ath. حباب, comp. the reading of L.—Janâb, Wüstenfeld,
Tabullen 284.—On 'Adî b. Janâb see Wüstenfeld, Register p. 266, Lubb
al-Lubbâb s.v.
4 See Glossary to Tab. s.v. مَرّاق.
5 See ib. s.v. نَفْط.
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him.” The construction من طَفَّجٌ is rather hard, for it is scarcely probable that it stands here, as it often does in later Arabic, as the exponent of the passive and signifies (burned) by Tuğj. Read مع (in his encounter) with Tuğj?

— Note 2, l. 10. On the Zenj see Tab. III, 1742 ff. (anno 255); Kremer, İdeen 195 f., 386. A graphic account of this movement is given by Nöildeke, Sketches from Eastern History, p. 146 ff. Opinions differ as to the person of the Alide he pretended to represent, comp. Masudi VIII, 31; Tab. 17421, 1743, 174612. IKhald. I, 361 summarily states that he traced back his origin to 'İsa b. Zeid, the son of Zeid b. 'Ali, the founder of the Zeidiyya.

— L. 4. The reading of Ed. Y. (note 3) is correct (Goldziher). 'Then “those” would not refer to the Khattabiyya mentioned immediately before, as they are not connected with the Abbassides, but in general to those “who admit prophecy after the Prophet,” p. 561.

— L. 6. The reading of L. Br. (note 4) stands quite isolated. The correct pronunciation is Khidash; see Tâj al-‘Arâs sub hac voce: وَخِدَاشُ كِتَابٍ أَسْمُ رَجُلٍ وَهُوَ مِنْ قُوْلِهِمْ خَادِشُ الرِّجْلَ.

أَيْ خَادِشُ وَجْهَةَ وَخِدَاشُ هُوْ وَجْهَهُ. Comp. van Vloten, Chitisme, p. 49: “Khidache (de la racine Khadacha ‘déchirer avec les ongles,’ puisqu’il déchira la religion).” Kremer, İdeen p. 11, who quotes I. H., writes incorrectly “Chaddâsch.”—

25 ‘Ammâr was executed in a most barbarous manner by Asad b. ‘Abdallah in the year 118, Tab. II, 1492. This ‘Ammar is not, at least is not meant to be, identical with ‘Ammâr al-‘Ibâdî who was also a missionary of the Abbassides and was similarly killed by Asad in 108, Tab. II, 1492.1


— L. 13 ff. The incident is reported in all sources, see the quotations later. Kashi offers several details which are not recorded elsewhere. They numbered ten persons and were

1 The latter passage strangely contradicts Tab.’s account, p. 1488 (anno 107), according to which ‘Ammâr alone saved himself, while the others perished.
standing at the gate. When they had been let in to Ali, they [65] said to him: "We maintain that thou art our Lord and that thou art he who created us and who gives us sustenance" (Kashi 48, parallel p. 198). According to another version (p. 72), they were seventy gypsies (الرُّطَح). The tendency of all these stories is plain: they are intended as a protest against the later "Exaggerators" by showing that Ali himself rejected them. It can be easily understood why the orthodox Shiites who were often made responsible for the extravagance of the Gulat were so very anxious to circulate these stories condemning the Gulat. 5

66, l. 1 f. "Thou art Allah"; also Makr. 352°; Iji 343 with-[66] out the preliminary "Thou art He" (l. 1); Kashi 70, 72; Shahr. 132 more pointedly "Thou art Thou," which reminds one somewhat of the Hindoo "Tat twam asi."

— L. 5. The same Isfr. 54°: "أَنِّيُّ الْحَقِيْقَةُ إِلَّا إِلَهُ الْمَلِكُ ۚ اَنْبِلِبْ ۚ أَنْتَ الْمَلِكُ إِلَّا مَلِكُ النَّارِ.

— L. 7. The verse is also quoted Kashi 48 and with variants 49.—Bagd. 94° (similarly Isfr. 55°) quotes another locus probans and gives a somewhat different version of this auto-20 da-fé: Le ۚ أَنْبِلِبْ ۚ أَنْتَ الْمَلِكُ إِلَّا مَلِكُ النَّارِ

ابْحَرَقَ قُومَ مِنْهُمْ فِي حُفْرَتِهِمْ حَتَّى قَالَ بَعْضُ الْأَشْعَرَاءِ فِي ذَلِكَ [الوَاقِر]

لِتَرَأَمْ بِهِمْ وَالْخَوَاتِمَ حَتَّى شَاءَ—ۚ إِذَا لم تَرَمْ بِهِ فِي الْحُفْرَتِينَ

According to Kashi 72, Ali killed the seventy gypsies (see. before) in a most ingenious manner by throwing them into a number of pits which were connected through holes. Then the pits were closed and smoke was let in through one of them, so 30 that they were all choked.

— L. 10. Kanbar is designated as a servant (خادم) of Ali, Tahdib 514; Tab. I, 3257 (غلام). He acts as such Kashi 48,
I. Friedlaender, [1908.]

[66] 198. Tâj al-ʻArūs sub voce ۱۸۷، and Suyuti, Tarikh 159, call him a mawla of Ali. He was wounded in the attack on Othman, Tab., ib.; Suyuti, ib.

—L. 11. All the authorities quoted throughout this treatise and a great many other writers equally attest that Ali burned some of those who held "exaggerated" notions about him. Most of them connect these "exaggerators" with Abdallah b. Sabā. In spite of this consensus of opinion, the historical character of this narrative is more than doubtful. The historians proper (Tabari, Masudi, I Ath. and the minor ones) are silent on this point. The fact of an auto-da-fé at so early a period is in itself extremely unlikely. The tendency of the story is unmistakable (see p. 99°), and the way it is connected with Ibn Sabāi is satisfactorily explained when we remember the peculiar rôle assigned to this man and his sect by the Muhammedan theologians. Being a Jew, Ibn Sabā was made the scapegoat for all the subsequent heresies in Islam. The name Sabā'īyya became synonymous with radical heresy and was applied to heretics who lived long after 'Abdallah b. Sabā.² Shahrî's account on Ibn Sabā is almost entirely a projection of later doctrines on the founder of Shiism. It is therefore natural that he should figure in an execution of heretics by Ali.

I regard this story as an anticipation of the frequent executions of Shiitic sectarians by Khâlid al-Kasri and his successor Yûsuf b. 'Omar. Íkd 267 characteristically, though unconsciously, states this relation: "al-Muğira b. Sa'id (read Sa'id, see p. 79°) was one of the Sabā'īyya whom Ali burned at the stake." Muğira, however, was burned by Khâlid as late as 119. Similarly IKot. 300, who mentions Muğira immediately after 'Abdallah b. Sabā and designates him as a Sabā'ī.

A striking parallel to our incident and perhaps its prototype is Tab.'s account (III, 418) on the Râwandîyya who worshipped the Caliph al-Manṣûr. "They came forward shouting to Abû

---

¹ See, e. g., IKot. 300; Íkd 267. According to Kashi 70, Ali burned 'Abdallah himself. This, however, is contradicted by other sources as well as by the facts, see p. 43.

² Thus al-Kelbî (died 146) is designated as an adherent (صاحب) of Ibn Sabā, I Khall. No. 645, p. 26. See Comm. 25°. The same is the case with Muğira (d. 119), see this page l. 30. Cf. Wellhausen, Opp. 12 n. 1.
Ja'far (al-Manṣūr): 'Thou art Thou!' (The narrator) says:[66] he (al-Manṣūr) himself came out against them and fought them. While they were fighting, they came forward crying: 'Thou art Thou!' The origin of the Rāwandīyya which points to Khorasan (see p. 123)' and the time to which the incident is assigned strongly support the historicity of Tab.'s account.

— L. 15 f. The temptation of Jesus consisted in the "guluww" of the Apostles, i.e., in their belief in his divinity (comp. p. 163). The Prophet himself is reported to have compared Ali with Jesus who fell a victim to the love of the Christians and the hatred of the Jews (ZDMG. 38, 391). "As for the Ṣafīda, they strongly exaggerate concerning Ali; some of them follow the doctrines of the Christians concerning Christ. They are the Sabā'īyya, the followers of 'Abdallah b. Sabā, Allah's curse on them." (Ikd 267). More thoughtfully is this relation between the Ultra-Shiitic and the Christian doctrines stated by IKhalid, I, 358: "The Gūlāt have transgressed the limits of reason and religion by assuming the divinity of these Imams. As for Ali, he (read فائنة) is (considered by them) a human being which has assumed the attributes of the Deity and (they believe) that God has embodied himself in his human (corporeal) essence. This is the doctrine of Incarnation which corresponds to the teachings of the Christians concerning Jesus."

— L. 17. The sect named in the following is considered an outgrowth of the Sabā'īyya because it shares with the latter the deification of Ali. The Sabā'īyya is the Alidic sect κατὰ ἐξοχήν. Cf. Text 45 f., 65" f.

— L. 18. Apart from علیائیة, the readings علیائیة and علیائیة are frequently found, see Text n. 7, Masudi III, 265 and the references to be quoted presently. The founder of this sect is called Makr. 353. As-Sayyid composed a poem in which he protests against calling Ali a "son of God," ib.
The 'Ulyaniyya are designated as Dammiyya ("the Blamers," Shahr., Makr.) because they blamed Muhammed for having usurped the dignity to which Ali was entitled. The 'Ulyaniyya, in particular, preferred Ali to Muhammed, claiming that Muhammed was Ali's apostle. See also Bagd. 98°.

— L. 19. This Ishak is most probably identical with Ibn Mahtab al-nuṣṣuri, who frequently figures in Agh. as a narrator of biographical stories from the life of as-Sayyid al-Himyari, e.g., VII, 2 penult., 98, 114, etc.—Shahr. 133 f., Iji 21 and 348 he appears, independently of the 'Ulyaniyya, as the representative of a special sect which is called after him the Ishakiyiya and is closely related to the Nušeiriyya (p. 137°). De Sacy II, 593 quotes besides a sect called Hamrawiyya, which he rightly connects with this Ishāk whose by-name was al-Ahmār. On his book and the following passage in general see later.4

The Muhammadiyya who believe in the divinity of Muhammed are the counterpart of the 'Ulyaniyya who believe in the divinity of Ali. The literary champions of the Muhammadiyya are al-Bhnki and al-Fayyād, while Ishāk b. Muhammed represents the other party. Shahr. and Makr. speak of the two sects but allusively. Thus Shahr., in speaking of the Ilbā'iyiya (= 'Ulyaniyya, see p. 101°), makes the following remark: "Among them are such who believe in the divinity of both (Ali as well as Muhammed), but they give the preference

1 Comp. Goldziher, ZDMG. 50, 120.
2 Like all Rāwis, his name is missing in the index of Agh.
3 Kashi 167° quotes him as authority for an account on a discussion between the Barmekide Vizier Yahya b. Khālid and Hishām b. al-Ḥakam.
4 As he appears in connection with the Keisanite as-Sayyid, we may identify him with Ishāk b. 'Omar who is mentioned Abū 'l-Maāli 158 as the founder of the Ishākīyya, one of the four Keisanite sects.—There is no evidence, however, for his identity with a certain Ishāk who acts in Transoxania as an agitator for Abū Muslim, Fihr. 344°, as is confidently assumed p. 180 ib.
5 Not to be confounded with the Muhammadiyya, as those who believe in the Imamate of Muhammad, 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan, Text 48° and 60°, are designated by Bagd. 17°, 97° and Isfr. 12°.
to Ali in matters divine. They are called the ‘Ainiyya.

There are among them such who believe in the divinity of both but give the preference to Muhammed as regards divinity. They are called the Mimiyiyaa.” ‘Ain and Mim are apparently the initials for Ali and Muhammed respectively. The name Muhammadiyya I find only here and Masudi V, 475, VII, 118 (referring to his Sirr al-Hayat), III, 265. The latter passage has an immediate bearing on our subject and is possibly the source of I. H.’s account. I reproduce the passage in translation: Certain heretics quote a poem by al-‘Abbâs in confirmation of their ġuluwa. “This is mentioned by a number of their writers and their cleverest critics, out of the sects of the Muhammadiyya, the ‘Ilbaniyya (see p. 101?) and others. One of them, Ishâk b. Muhammed an-Nakha’i, known as al-Âhumar, (did it) in his book entitled āş-Sirât.” It is also mentioned by al-Fayyâd b. Ali b. Muhammed b. al-Fayyâd (see Text, p. 67, note 2) in his book known as ‘al-Ḳustâs,’ in his refutation of the book āş-Sirât.’ It is further mentioned by the (man) known under the name of an-Nakînî (? see Text, p. 66, note 9) in his refutation of the book entitled āş-Sirât.’

These (two men) belong to the Muhammadiyya. They refuted this book (of Ishâk) which was (written) according to the doctrine of the ‘Ilbaniyya.”

— L. 6. The name of the Kâtib is Ali b. Muhammed b. al-Fayyâd (note 2). I have found no reference to him elsewhere, except the superscription to al-Buhturi’s poem (see later).— Ishâk b. Kandât died 279. [‘Abdallah Text 67° is oversight.]


The Kašida is headed وَقَالَ يُسْتَدِحُ عَلَيْهِ بِنِ مُحَمَّدٍ بِنِ الْفِيَأَضَ (وَقَالَ يُسْتَدِحُ بِنِ الْفِيَأَضَ). The verse is the beginning of a naṣîb.

— L. 11. Guweir is a drinking place of the Kelb between ‘Irâk and Syria, Yakut III, 827. Bekri, Geographical Diction-
Abūl-Husein al-Ḳāsim b. ‘Abdallah (or ‘Ubeidal-lah) died during the reign of Muktafi in 291, only over thirty years old. He is described as being very bloodthirsty, IKhall. No. 474.—The fact recorded by I. H.—al-Fayyād’s execution at the hands of al-Ḳāsim—is not found in any other source at my disposal.

Adam” here apparently stands for the “original man,” the Ḥisān Qadim of the Manichæans, the Adam Kadmon, of the Cabbala, see Louis Ginzberg in Jew. Encycl., vol. I, s.v. Adam Kadmon. Shahr. 114 ascribes to Bayān (p. 88) the belief that Adam possessed a “Divine particle” which made him worthy of the worship of the angels. A similar conception—the “Divine Element” inherent in Adam as the immediate creation of God, passing through the pious descendants of Adam to Jacob and through him to the Jewish nation—is the basis of Jehuda Halevi’s (twelfth century) philosophical system in his Kusari (Book I, § 47, 95).—From Adam to Muhammed there were seven prophets (comp. p. 12515). This number of prophets occurs very frequently in connection with Shiitic sects, see p. 89 f.; p. 79 (the Karmatians); p. 127 (the Nuṣairiyah); Blochet 56 (the Ismā’iliyya). The origin of this conception goes back to the Pseudo-Clementines, see p. 8526 ff.

It is possible that here, too, the number seven is intended. Ja’far is the seventh prophet beginning with Muhammed.—Zeid. fol. 104 expresses a Rawafid pure and simple those who pass the Imamate down to Ja’far:

Ja’far as-Sādiq occupies a central position among the Shi‘a. He is called “the Great Ja’far” by the Persian theologians (Blochet 53, note 1) and his name permanently figures in Shiitic literature as authority for everything that bears on religious doctrine. He was also highly esteemed by the Sunna. Typical of this unique position of Ja’far is the anecdote told by Isfr. fol. 16:
The purpose of this Sunnitic invention is plain. It is meant to ridicule the constant references of the Shiites to the authority of Ja'far (see the passages in the Index to this treatise s.v. Ja'far). But it also shows the great esteem in which Ja'far was held even by the orthodox.

The knowledge of mystic lore with which the Shiites credit all their Imams is attributed in even a higher degree to Ja'far. Zeid. 101b defines this belief in the omniscience of the Imams in the following characteristic manner:

It is interesting to note that the more moderate among the Shiites oppose this extravagant belief in Ja'far's omniscience and they quote Ja'far himself as indignantly protesting against it. When Ja'far was told that people believed that he knew

---

1 See page 563 f.
2 See page 563 f.
3 with the by-meaning of "telling a lie," see Goldziher, Muh. St. II, 51.
I. Friedlaender,  

[68] “hidden things” (الغيب), he passionately exclaimed: “Praise unto Allah! Put thy hand on my head! By Allah, there is not a single hair on my body which does not stand on edge!” (Kashi 196).

An outgrowth of this conception is the peculiar belief in the existence of a mystic book called “Jafr” containing a record of all past and future events “from Creation to Resurrection”, the authorship of which was assigned to Ja’far. This mysterious volume with the mysterious name plays an important part in the development of the Shi’a. See on this book, de Goeje, Carmathes 115 f., van Vloten, Chiitisme, 54 f., IKhald. II, 184 f. Bagd’s remarks on the subject (fol. 99a) are worthy of reproduction.

ومن أُثَبِّب الأشياء أن الخطابية زعمت أن جعفرًا الصادق قد أرَّدَعهم جُلَّدًا فيه عُلم كل ما يحتاجون اليه من (Ms. Qar) معلوم الغيب وسَمَّوا ذلك الجلد جَعْفَرًا وزموا أنه لا يقرأ (يقرى) ما فيه إلا من كان منهم وقد ذكر ذلك عارون بن سعد العقاص في شعره وقال: [الطويل]

لا يُسْتَر أن الراضيين تفَرَّقت فكَّلَهُم مَن جعفر قال منكرًا.. ومن جَعْفَر لم أُقَيَّض جَيْلُ جعفر بَرَتِت إلى الرحمان ممَّن جعَفَرًا

1 Comp. Blochet, p. 13. There was a white and a red “Jafr,” ib.
2 IKhald. II, 184 maintains that “Jafr” signifies dialectically “small” and that the book was so called because it was written on the hide of a small (young) ox. According to Taj al-‘Arus, the word signifies sheep in the first few months of life. Neither explanation is in any way satisfactory. The real meaning of the word was evidently early forgotten. Van Vloten, Chiitisme, p. 56, note 6 is inclined to regard it as a foreign word and to connect it with Greek γραφή. I am rather inclined to think that Jafr is merely a variation of Ja‘far to whom it is assigned. [I have since noticed that Goldziher, Shi‘a, p. 456 n. 5, incidentally gives the same explanation.]
3 See Text, p. 68, l. 6.
4 Comp. Makr. 35216.
5 The verses are quoted anonymously IKhall. No. 419. The authorship of Ḥārūn b. Sa‘d (Kashi 151, Sa‘id) is rather precarious, for it is he who is mentioned IKhald. II, 184 as the Rawi of this book. (He is designated in the same passage as the head of the Zeidiyya.)
The episode presupposes the allegorical method of Koran interpretation current in Shiitic circles which explains the religious prohibitions as the names of persons and brings all religious commands in relation to the Imam, see Text, p. 35, and Comm. p. 14 ff. It is obvious that the Hajj precept, if for no other than political reasons, had to succumb to the same allegorical transformation and to become a mere "going to the Imam" (Text, p. 35'). Accordingly, the Gulat of Kufa arrange a regular hajj to Ja'far with all due requisites, including attire and religious exclamations (Labbaika Ja'far, l. 10).—An interesting parallel to this story is the incident related Agh. XV, 121. The Ja'fariyya (as is evident from XIX, 58, identical with the Mu'giriyya, the adherents of Mu'gira b. Sa'id, Comm. p. 80) rebelled against Khâlid b. 'Abdallah al-Ḳasrī, the wali of Kufa (Comm. 79'), "and they came out in short trousers," shouting: 'with thee ('labbaika') o Ja'far! with thee, o Ja'far!' At first sight one might feel inclined to identify the two stories. But chronological considerations stand in the way of this identification. For the rebellion of Mu'gira took place in 119 (Tab. II, 459/1060) quoted by Mirza, fol. 65b:

"How anxious the Shiitic leaders were to abolish the hajj to Mekka, the center of Sunnitic Islam, can be inferred from the pregnant utterance of Abû Ja'far, at-Ṭûsî (the author of List of Shia books, died pl. of تُبَارِكَانّ small breeches "without legs such as to conceal the anterior and posterior pudenda" (Lane), indeed a sort of sans culottes. It was the dress of the Mawâli, van Vloten, Chiittisme, p. 70, note 2.—Prof. Nöldeke is inclined to take it as the plural of تُبَارِكَانّ and to translate في التُبَارِكَانّ (فيسوق النبّان) "on the market of the Strawdealers."
[68] 1619 f.), while the story related in our text plays in the beginning of the Abbasside period. Wellhausen, Opp. 97, note 1 is sceptical with reference to the hajj incident told in Agh. But it is not only supported by I. H.'s account. The general character of the Ultra-Shiitic tenets makes an incident of this sort quite probable.

— L. 11. Abû Bekr Ibn 'Ayâsh died in 193, IAth. VII, 153; Dahabi, Ḥuffâz VI, 20.¹ The words كاذب أنظمر اليهم يومهم I take (with a great deal of reserve) to indicate that he remembers the incident so vividly, as if it were before his eyes. Ibn 'Ayâsh probably narrated the incident long after it passed. He died 193, while 'Îsa b. Mûsa, who fought against the sectarians, died in 167.


— L. 19. Al-Ḥasan b. Bahram was the head of the Kar-matians of Bahrein. He was killed by his servant in 301, IKhall. No. 186, p. 122; Tab. III, 2291.—The reading الجبلي (n. 6) is found elsewhere, see de Goeje, Carmathes 111, note 3.

The name al-Jannâbî comes from Jannaba, a small place on the coast of the Persian Gulf, opposite the island Khârak, Yakut II, 122. IKhall. ibidem and No. 650, p. 40, maintains that Jannâba is a place near Bahrein. Yakut, however, brands this assumption as a gross error.

— Note 7. The form كسم as given in Codd. does not necessarily represent the consonants KSR. The middle letter may stand for a great many combinations of consonants with dia-critical points which it is impossible to make out. The man himself is no doubt identical with "the Iṣbahanian," de Goeje, Carmathes 129 ff. He managed to pass as a saint in the eyes of Abû Tâhir, the son of Abû Sa'îd (see preceding note), who believed in him and paid him Divine honors. He carried him about in a tent so as to hide him from the gaze of the multi-

¹ IAth., who gives the exact pronunciation, has no Tashdîd. Yet, is frequently found, see, e. g., Tab. III, 2508³. Goldziher, Zahiriten, p. 3, writes "'Ajâš." the same ZDMG. 50, 492 "'Ajjâš."
tude (Arib, p. 162). Ultimately, however, he was found out and then killed by Abū Tāhir’s sons. IAth. VIII, 263 f. places these events in 326, de Goeje in 319.—The same man is unquestionably identical with "the Ishbahanian," briefly mentioned by Ibn Adhari, ed. Dozy I, 232: "Abū ʿObeid (read Abū ʿaʿid) al-Jannābī . . . advocated publicly adultery, unnatural vice, lying, wine drinking and the omission of prayer. Similarly to it acted the Ishbahanian (الاصدهائى)." Masudi, Tanbīh, ed. de Goeje, 391 describes him as "the young man known as az-Zakari, one of the descendants of the Persian kings of the lands of Ishbān." The other sources also give his first name, but in so many forms that it is impossible to make out the correct form; comp. de Goeje, ibidem.

—L. 20 and note 8. The man spoken of here is usually designated as Ibn Haushab; comp. IKhald. II, 185. The other names differ widely in the various sources. The nearest to I. H. is Makr.: Abū ʿl-ʿKāsim al-Ḥasan (or al-Ḥusein) b. Faraj b. Haushab al-Kūfī (de Sacy, cclv note). IAth. VIII, 22, Abulfeda and Bibars Mansūri (quoted de Sacy, ib.) call him Rustem b. Ḥusein b. Haushab b. Zadān (IAth. 10 Dalāl) an-Najjar. Nuweiri again (quoted de Sacy, p. cccxlv) has Abū ʿl-Ḥusein Rustem b. Karhin b. Haushab b. Dādān an-Najjar. Dastūr al-Munajjimīn (de Goeje, Carmathes 204) gives Abū ʿl-ʿKāsim al-Faraj b. al-Ḥasan b. Haushab b. Zadān.—The reason for this vacillation lies in the fact recorded, though, it seems, no more understood, by I. H. that he "was called al-Mansūr." Al-Mansūr was the title of the Karmatian Missionary-in-chief which approached in significance that of the Mahdī. There was a Mansūr al-Bahrein as well as a Mansūr al-Yemen who is referred to here; see de Goeje ib., p. 170, n. 1, 204. Ibn Haushab made his public appearance in Yemen in 270, de Goeje ib. 204. Abū ʿAbdallah ash-Shiʿi (p. 7510) was one of the best officers of Ibn Haushab (Blochet, 70), to whom he had been sent by ʿUbeidallah and Muhammed al-Ḥabīb (IKhald. II, 185, in the name of Ibn ar-Raķīk, d. 340/952). On the death of

---

1 Blochet 70 erroneously transcribes Abu'l Kasem ibn Djouhem (sic).
2 On Mansūr as the title of the Mahdī (Messiah) see Goldziher, ZDMG. 56, 411; van Vloten. Chiitisme, p. 61; de Goeje, ib. p. 73.
Halwâni and Abû Suﬁyân, the Karmatian missionaries in Maghrib, Ibn Haushab dispatched him to that country (Makr. II, 104 ff., Blochet ib.).

— Note 8, l. 3–4. ‘Ali b. al-Fadl (al-Janadî from the province Janad in Yemen, Ed. II, 3823, see Comm. p. 17) was the Janâh (a Karmatian technical term designating a sort of aide-de-camp) of Ibn Ḥaushab and accompanied him to Aden La‘a, de Goeje ib. 204. The latter gives his name, similarly to I. H., as Ali. Otherwise he is called Muhammed, e. g., Istakhri 24,6 de Sačy ccxiv. Nuweiri (quoted de Sačy cccclvi) has Abû’l-Kheir Muhammed b. al-Fadl, comp. Weil, Geschicht der Chalifen II, 510, Müller, Islam I, 595. The Banû Ziyâd traced back their origin to Ziyâd, who pretended to be a son of Abû Suﬁyân and was afterwards acknowledged as brother by Mu‘awiyâh, IKot. 176. They were settled in Zebid. The Dû-Manâkh lived in the neighborhood of Aden, Yakut IV, 472.

— Note 8, l. 5. ástuI is most probably identical with المبوني mentioned de Sačy ccx. I quote this passage, as it is of great significance in connection with I. H.’s text. “En année 295 un nouvel imposteur, nommé Abou Khatem, établit une secte particulière parmi certain Karmates du Sawad que l’on nommait Bouranîja, du nom de leur Dai Bourani (الإمبراني). Abou Khatem interdisait à ses disciples l’ail, le poireau et les raves... Cette espèce de Karmates fut nommée Nakalîjja

1 Ibn Adhârî I, 292 is probably identical with Ibn Ḥaushab. Read 249 على التجار الكوفي. — It is possible that, who is mentioned Comm. 17 among the Karmatian missionaries immediately before ‘Ali b. al-Fadl (see next note), is identical with our man. — أبو عبد الله العتاجان (ib.) is perhaps identical with Abû ‘Abdallah ash-Shi‘i.

The variant in note 6 instead of, may be due to the difference in name.

See above page 7616. A certain Mu‘tazîlite بكر بن اخشب (frequent variant prohibited garlick and onions, Isfr. 48. On the prohibition of certain vegetables, see Chwolson, Ssabier, II, 10, 109 ff.
The name Bûrânî does not occur elsewhere, but Nakaliyya is found in various forms. Arib (ed. de Goeje) p. 137 (anno 316) speaks of the Karmatians known (sic) بالنقلية بسواجد القروات. As one of their leaders is mentioned a certain مسعود بن حربيت IAth. VIII, 136 (also anno 316). Interesting is Mas'ūdi’s remark (Tanbih 391): he had already mentioned in former works بسواجد (sic, see note e) أحبار القرامطة البقلية أخبار ال قامتة البقلية وهو اسم دياني عندهم وكان رساسهم مسعود بن حربيت. comp. de Goeje ib. p. 99. I consider the reading Bakliyya the only correct one, as it no doubt stands in some relation to the prohibition of certain vegetables بقلم (البقل) recorded by de Sacy. The connection, assumed in the glossary to Mas'ūdi’s Tanbih (s. v. بقلية البقلية), between this sect and a certain al-Bakli (Agh. XI, 75', see Comm. p. 464) is impossible. Both material and chronological discrepancies (anno 129—anno 316) speak against the identification.

69, l. 1. On 'Ubeidallah and the rise of the Fatimides see the detailed accounts by de Goeje, Carmathes, p. 5 ff. (the larger part of the essay bearing on this subject), Blochet, p. 77 ff.

— L. 4. The Khaṭṭâbiyya and the numerous factions belonging to it are frequently mentioned by I. H. (see Index). The name of the founder as given by I. H. is found Fihr. 186 ult., Shahr. 136, IAth. VIII, 21. Kashi, who devotes a very long article to him (pp. 187–199), calls him Muhammad b. Abī

Perhaps حاتم بن حمد بن حاتم البازاري from Bârân, one of the towns of Merv (Yakut I, 462), may be the same man.—Lubb al-Lubâb explains as referring إلى عمل البورائى من القصص البورائى. In the Appendix sub hac voce the editor remarks: “In separato articulo agit Ibn al-Athîr de البورائى, quae est alia tantum eiusdem nominis forma.” I have not been able to locate the passage in IAth.
Zeinab, but adds that his name was L.LL or Iuo! (p. 187). Makr. 352 gives his name as c5?t ~ O or J?.pv (5 i?; the latter Kunya is declared to be correct by de Sacy cccxl, note 2. Zeid. fol. 104a differs from all other authorities in calling him al-Ḥattāb (with soft under the line and without Abû):

10 The Khattābiyya occupy a commanding position in heterodox Islam. Makr. 352 estimates their subdivisions at no less than fifty. Abû'l-Khattāb is designated as the originator of the allegorical method of Koran interpretation, see p. 14. Ikot. 300, on the other hand, confesses to know nothing about him, except that he permitted perjury against the opponents of his sect as well as murder and adultery. The latter is also attributed to him by other writers.

The central point of the Khattābiyya doctrine is the worship of Ja'far. They claimed to be in possession of his mystic work "Jafr," see p. 106. Führ. 186 ult. ascribes to him the belief in the divinity of Ali. But this appears to be correct only in so far as he regarded all the Imams as higher Divine beings. According to Shahr. and Isfr. (56b), he claimed prophecy only when Ja'far had withdrawn from him. Zeid. (ib.) however maintains that he asserted his claims only after Ja'far's death, pretending to have been designated by him as his successor.

---

1 On Raj'a see p. 33 ff.
2 See Makr. 353. — Comp. Goldziher, ZDMG. 60, 222.
3 Isfr. 56 and Makr. 352 assign to the Khattābiyya the belief in a "speaking" and "silent" Imam (Naṭīk and Sāmit), a conception which is of such incisive importance in the propaganda of the Bāṭiniyya. One might feel reluctant to admit the existence of this belief at so early a period. But Führ., too, assumes a connection between the Khattābiyya and the Meimūniyya, the party of Meimūn al-Kaddāḥ, the originator of the Bāṭiniyya movement. Comp. de Sacy, cccxl.
The orthodox Imamites are anxious to get rid of this unpleas-ant partnership. Hence the numerous utterances put into the mouth of Ja‘far which curse Abūl-Khaṭṭāb (Kashi repeatedly, see esp. p. 195) and declare those who follow him to be worse than “Jews, Christians, Magians and heathens” (p. 192, 194; in the year 138, p. 191 below). They maintain that Abūl-Khaṭṭāb told lies about Ja‘far (ib. 195, 146) and that his adherents “to this very day smuggle these traditions into the books of the adherents of Abū ‘Abdallāh (i.e., Ja‘far)” (ib. 146).

Abūl-Khaṭṭāb was crucified in Kufa by ‘Īsa b Mūsa (d. 167), Shahr. ib., Isfr. 56b.

— L. 7. Comp. Iji 346 (read ابا) وَجَعَفَ الصادقُ إِلَّا لَكُنَّ ابْنِي (ابا) الخَطَابِ افْضَلُ مِنِهِ, similarly Bagd. 99b, Isfr. 56b.

— L. 9 f. is quoted Koran 5, 21 as the pretension of the Jews and Christians. According to Shahr., Abūl-Khaṭṭāb applied this expression to the ancestors of Ja‘far, i.e., to the Huseinids only. Makr. (3526) states that he believed that “the Imams were like Ali and that his (i.e., Ali’s) children were all prophets.” More distinctly Iji ib.:

الدَّعَاهَا ٱلْيَهَةَ، and quite unequivocally Bagd. 99b, Isfr. 56b, واَحْسَنَانِ أَبْنَاءِ الَّذِينَ أَوْلَادُهُمُ الْحَسَنُ وَالْخَسَيْنِ. Our text accordingly cannot be correct. On the basis of the above statements I have inserted the name of al-Ḥusein. I read either

الْحَسَنُ وَالْخَسَيْنِ or, perhaps more acceptably, 

— L. 11. This strange belief was widespread in these circles, see p. 73rs. Thus the Mu‘ammariyya (p. 114rs) believed that “men do not die but their spirits are lifted up into other (men?)” (Makr. 352r). This is evidently the belief in Transmigration. Philosophically tinged is the opinion of the Bazl-ġiyya “that the man who has attained to perfection cannot be said to have died” (p. 96rs).
Instead of the translation offered in the text, which conveys no proper meaning, I would suggest to punctuate the Arabic phrase Ed. IV, 187 in the following manner:

"the most uncertain in the opinion of men regarding this (the claim not to die and to be lifted up to heaven) is the Sheikh whom you see (i. e., Abūl-Khaṭṭāb)." In other words, if anyone, then it is Abūl-Khaṭṭāb who has no chance to get to heaven. L Br (note 5) read

Perhaps in Ed., too, Abū is to be corrected into Abūnāb. The two readings would then coincide.

On the Mu‘ammariyya see Shahr. 137, Makr. 352 (who agrees with him verbatim). This Mu‘ammar is possibly identical with the Mu‘tazilite Makr. 347, Iji 340, who expresses similar opinions, and with Mu‘ammar who advocates the Imamate of ‘Abdallah, the son of Ja‘far as-Sādīk, Makr. 351. The latter view is assigned by Shahr. 126 to the Aftahiyya sect, which derives its name from al-Aftaḥ, the by-name of ‘Abdallah b. Ja‘far. The name of the founder is omitted.

Abū Muqīth (Tab. III, 2289, Abū Muhammed) al-Ḥusein b. Manṣūr al-Ḥallāj, whose grandfather is said to have been a Magian (Zoroastrian), came from the town Beidā in Fāris. He was executed in 309/922 during the reign of al-Muḳṭadīr and his ashes were strewn in the Tigris. His adherents considered this the cause of the rise of the Tigris in that year. Many expected that he would return to life after forty days (comp. p. 237), asserting that it was not Ḥallāj who was executed but an enemy of his on whom he had pressed his own features, IKhall. 186, see Comm. 3012. He exercised a powerful influence not only on his own age but on posterity as well. He had numerous admirers among orthodox Muhammedans (Bagd.

---

1 One thinks of Makr.’s words (352) in his account on the Bazgiyya that Ja‘far was a god that Ja‘far was a god. But I do not know how to bring this meaning into I. H.’s sentence.
and even among non-Muhammedans. See on Hallâj, [69] Fâhir. 190 ff. (with a list of his writings), Arib (ed. de Goeje) 86 ff., Bagd. 101a, Isfr. 60a f. (an extract from the latter, Haarbrücker II, 417), Dozy, Isl. 324 f., Kremer, Ideen 70 f., 130 note 26.

— L. 19. IKhall. No. 186 similarly has Hâmid (not Ibn H., note 9). He died 311.

— L. 22. The by-name of this sectarian is usually given as شلماغان، from Shalmagan, a town in the neighborhood of Wâsit, I Ath. VIII, 216, Yakut III, 314. It is evident that I. H. took the name Shalmagan to be that of a person (see also note 10). Similarly IKhall. No. 186, p. 129 has Ibn ash-Shalmaganî. Interesting in this connection is Yakut's remark (ib.): 'ash-Shalmaganî is the name of a man; possibly this town derives its name from him. But it is a mistake.” He admits, however, that elsewhere this word is found as a personal name, as can be confirmed by a verse of al-Buhturi. Aside from شلماغان، we also find شلم أغانî, Fâhir. 17625, note 13 (this coincides with the reading of A, note 10 of our text) and شلم أغانî, Bagd. 102a.—I. H. is the only one who designates him as Kâtib. Perhaps this is due to a confusion with the Kâtib mentioned soon afterwards (Text, p. 70, note 2, l. 5).

The reading (note 11) is confirmed by the variant فرقان, IKhall. No. 186, p. 129. The vast majority of writers,

---

1 I. H. quotes him repeatedly as the type of a miracle worker, e.g., Ed. I, 109bis, 11011; he ridicules (V, 11712) the “adherents of Incarnation and the extremists among the Râfi’d” who believe that people like Hallâj. ابن أبي العراق (probably abbreviation for ابن أبي العزل) see Comm. 116 n. 1) and others are Divine beings, while they sit in their company, discharge the lowest human functions and exhibit human desires.

2 See a poem of his transcribed in Hebrew characters published by Hirschfeld, Jewish Quarterly Review. 15 (1903), p. 176, 180 f. I myself found in the Oxford Genizah (Ms. Hebr. d 57) a poem of a similar nature in Hebrew characters with the superscription لخلفاج رضي الله عنه. (He plainly says there انا الله انا.)
however, give him the Kunya.\footnote{Abū al-ʿurāfī.} Bagd. 91\textsuperscript{a}, 102\textsuperscript{a} and Isfr. 61\textsuperscript{b} call his adherents al-ʿurāfī. IAth. VIII, 216 reads

Masudi III, 267 has Abū al-ʿurāfī.

The cardinal point of ash-Shalmagāni's doctrine is the theory of the "Addād" (Contrasts), the simultaneous revelation of God in a good and evil principle. Thus, e. g., he revealed himself first in Adam and Iblis, etc.\footnote{He called Moses and Muhammed impostors, because they merely were the apostles of Aron and Ali respectively and usurped a dignity to which they were not entitled. IAth. and Abulfeda II, 382, from whom I have drawn this information, point out the resemblance between this doctrine and that of the Nuṣeirīyya (p. 126 f.), suggesting that they are identical.}

On ash-Shalmagāni see also Fihr. 176\textsuperscript{b}, 147\textsuperscript{b}, 196\textsuperscript{b}, de Slane's English translation of IKallikan I, 439, note 18 (a biography extracted from Dahabi's Ta'rikh al-Islām), de Sacy ccxlxi, Kremer, Ideen 75 ff.

Worthy of note is the relation of the official Shi'a to this heretic. Tusy allots him some space in his work (p. 305, No. 663), but cautiously adds Kan Mustaqīm al-ṭarīq thumma taqīm. Mirza fol. 55\textsuperscript{b} rebukes the Imamites for this ambiguous attitude:

\[\text{وَذَٰلِكَ أُرِئِيُّهُمْ عِنْدَ الْمُقْدَصَةُ لَيْكَ} \]

\[\text{بِنْ عَلِيِّ الْمُقْدَشَةُ لَيْكَ} \]

This idea is clearly identical with the Syzygy doctrine taught in the Pseudo-Clementines, Recognitio III, 59, 61; Homilies, II, 15; Recogn. III, 61 assumes ten such opposite pairs.

\footnote{This idea is clearly identical with the Syzygy doctrine taught in the Pseudo-Clementines, Recognitio III, 59, 61; Homilies, II, 15; Recogn. III, 61 assumes ten such opposite pairs.}

\footnote{Died 726\textsuperscript{b}, Ḥaji Khalfa II, 194.}

\footnote{Abū al-ʿurāfī stands for Abū ʿurāfī, then this would be the original form of the name and the difference between I. H. (note 11) and the other writers could be easily explained. IAth. VIII, 372 calls him Ibn Ṭibīʿ-Karākir.}
He believed that the union in spirit is possible only through the union in flesh, de Sacy II, 572.

Note 2, l. 2–4. Al-Husein b. ‘Ubeidallah was Vizier under al-Muktadir. I. H.’s assertion that he was killed conflicts with the statement of all other authorities that he renounced ash-Shalmagâni in time and thus saved his life. Bagd. reports that the Shafiite and Malekite judges were of different opinion regarding the admissibility of his repentance, the former voting for, the latter against its acceptance.

Note 2, l. 5. Ibrâhim b. Ahmad b. Muhammed b. Abî ‘Aun (so Yakut III, 314; Ikhallikan ib. omits Muhammed) was a writer of note, celebrated for the elegance of his style, Yakut, Ikhall. Contrary to the vizier al-Husein (see preceding note), he refused to renounce ash-Shalmagâni and was crucified and then burned in the year 322.

L. 5. The same man is mentioned by I. H. as a typical sorcerer Milal V, fol. 62a (Ed. I, 10920 ff. as well as Cod. L leave the name out and differ considerably): ومن هذا النوع كان جَعْرَةٌ جِوْفِعَونَ وَشَنَاسٌ البصريِّ وَسائر الكردّابيين فقط. See the variants in our text note 3. There is no means to decide which is the correct form.—This person seems to be identical with a man merely designated as البصري and dealt with by Iath. VIII, 372 (anno 340). He pretended that Ibn Abî’l Karâkir (see p. 116 n. 1) had embodied himself in him and he had then become the legitimate head of the Karakiriyâ. The

1 Comp. Brockelmann I, 406.
2 The same form of the name also Ikhal. 186, p. 139 (=de Slane’s edition 224b), Iath. VIII, 217, Abulfeda II, 382, Bagd. 102a, Isfr. 61b; only Tab. III, 2162 has Abû’l-Husein.
identification suggests itself the more readily, as in I. H.'s account he also follows immediately after ash-Shalmâghânî. — The clause "in our time" is scarcely correct, as I. H. was born 384h (died 456). The mistake, however, is excusable when we think of the distance between Cordova and Basra.

— L. 7. Abû Muslim, usually styled Sâhib ad-Daula, was born about 100h and was assassinated at the command of Manṣûr about 140, IKhall. No. 382; IKot. 191 gives the year 137. The by-name (as-Sirâj "Lamp" or, better, as-Sarrâj "Saddler"?) I found only in I. H. (Text here, 361, 451).

Abû Muslim was dealt with Text 45. Here I. H. records the additional belief in his divinity. According to Shahr. 114, it was the Rizâmiyya who advocated this belief. The founder of this sect, Rizâm b. Sâbîk, rose in Khurâsân during the lifetime of Abû Muslim. He maintained that Ali transferred the Imamate to Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya, who passed it over to Abû Hâshim, who, in turn, bequeathed it in writing to the Abbassides. At the same time he believed that Abû Muslim was an associate in the Imamate and an incarnation of the Divinity. Similarly Iji 347. Bagd. 100 (and alike Isfr. 59) confine these doctrines to a fraction of the Rizâmiyya:

١٠ "لا عزموا أن" تتم زعموا ان
الإمامنة بعد السقاوح صارت (صارت) إبى المسلم وأقرروا مع ذلك بقتل إبى المسلم ومرته ألا فروطة منهم يقال لها إبى مسلمية أقرروا فيه إبى المسلم غناوة الإفرط وزعموا أن صار إلّاما يحمل روح الاله فيه وزمعوا ان ابا المسلم خير من جبريل وميكليل وسائر الملاكاة وزعموا أيضا ان ابا مسلم حي لم يمت وهم على

١ Makr. reads السروح سابيق, see Text ib. note 6.

٢ Instead of Sâhib Cureton's edition has a blank. It was apparently missing in his Ms. I have supplied the name from Makr. 353. Haarbrücker, p. 173, curiously translates: "Die Anhänger von Rizám, dem Sohne eines unbekannten Vaters"!

٣ Hence their classification among the Keisâniyya.

٤ The Bazîgîyya (p. 95) believed "that some among them were better than Gabriel, Michael and Muhammed," Makr. 352.
Masudi VI, 186, on the whole, agrees with this presentation: “When the (news of) the assassination of Abū Muslim reached Khorásan and the other mountainous regions, the Khurramiyya (comp. the variants) became agitated. They are the party called Musiliyya, which believed in Abū Muslim and in his Imamate * * * Some among them were of the opinion that he has not died nor would he ever die until he has appeared and filled the earth with justice.” Fihr. 344 ff. similarly describes the Musiliyya as the sect which believed that Abū Muslim was alive (الله حي يُبَرَّرُهُ), comp. Comm. 38 ff. He mentions particularly a certain Ishāk who acted in Transoxania as Abū Muslim’s missionary, claiming that the latter was imprisoned in the mountains of ar-Rayy and that he would come forth at a certain time which was known to him only. Makr. 353 is not correct when he describes the Rizāmiyya as the party which passes the Imamate down to as-Saffāh and quite separately enumerates among the Rāwandiyya (p. 121 ff.) the “سلمة صاحب دولة بنية العباس” (see footnote below) which transfers the Imamate from as-Saffāh to Abū Muslim.

1 See p. 30 ff.
2 Makr. 354 is to be read instead of 353 ff.—de Sacy LIX connects the “سلمة” with Abū Salma, Abū Muslim’s general. But then it would be most surprising that Makr. mentions nothing about the worship of Abū Muslim and that the other sources again mention nothing about Abū Salma. Besides, Abū Salma would scarcely be styled “Sāhib ad-Daula.” The proposed emendation removes these difficulties. The name of the sect (as Masudi and Fihrist have) or to be explained as a contracted Nisba for Abū Muslim (as Bagd. gives), e. g., عبقيسيّ (comp. Wright, Grammar of the Arabic Language (3d ed.) I, § 264 Rem. b. True, this contraction does not exactly correspond with the examples given, I, p. 162 A. But one knows that the abstractions of the Arabic grammarians are of little avail, especially in the case of the Nisba endings.
On Abû Muslim and his connection with Mazdaism, see Blochet 43 ff.

— L. 9. See also Text 36°. The first name of al-Mukanna’ is not certain. IKhall. No. 431 gives ‘Atâ and Ḥakîm respectively. The latter name is recorded Tab. III, 484\textsuperscript{a} and IAth. VI, 25. Ḥâşim (reading of L. Br, note 6) is also found Makr. 354\textsuperscript{a}, while Bagd. 100\textsuperscript{a}, perhaps correctly, calls him Ḥâşim b. Ḥâkim. He was from Merv (note 7), according to Bagd.

He was a fuller by profession. I. H., Bagd. Abulfeda II, 44, IAth. VI, 25 (read instead of قصيرًا). He belonged to the Rizâmiyya (Shahr. 115, Bagd.) and believed in the divinity of Abû Muslim, regarding himself as his incarnation (IAth.). He committed suicide while besieged in his stronghold in 163. According to one version, he died through poison, Tab. III, 490\textsuperscript{a}, IKhall. ib., Abulfeda ib., Dozy, Isl. 245 f. According to another (recorded by Bagd. and Isfr.), he threw himself into a burning furnace so that his adherents were unable to find his body and were therefore induced to believe that he had been lifted up to heaven. IAth. VI, 34 f. gives room to both versions. Bagd. 100\textsuperscript{b} (shorter Isfr. 60\textsuperscript{a}) adds the following interesting notice about the adherents of Mukanna’ at the time of this writer:

Very important is Bagd’s statement (100\textsuperscript{a}) concerning his doctrine:
The Heterodoxies of the Shiites, etc. 121

See on this doctrine p. 85 ff.

— L. 13. Read Ṭāwandiyya (with long ā in the first syllable).

The name Ṭāwandiyya is generally applied to the people who came in 141 or, according to another version, in 136 or 137, to Hāshimiyya, then the capital of the Caliphate, to pay divine homage to the Caliph al-Mansūr, Tab. III, 129 = IAth. V, 383; Dozy, Isl. 242; Kremer, Ideen 12; Müller, Islam I, 494; Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen II, 37 f.; van Vloten, Chiitisme 48.

This application, however, is correct only in part. Originally, it seems, the Ṭāwandiyya were but a political party which assigned the Imamate to the Abbassides, just as other parties assigned it to the Omeyyads or Alides. Masudi repeatedly describes them as the "Sheīta ʿlāl, the people who justified the transfer of the Imamate to the Abbassides on the basis of Koran 8, 76 and who hired the corruptible al-Jāḥiz (d. 255/869) to write for them to order the book "Kitāb Ḥamāmat al-ʿAbbas." (Masudi VIII, 56.) The latter fact alone, which brings the Ṭāwandiyya down to the third century H., suffices to show that the Ṭāwandiyya, at least, chronologically, extend far beyond the ill-fated "guluww" attempt in 141. It was only at a later time that the Ṭāwandiyya claimed that the Imamate had been transferred to the Abbassides by a written will of Abū Hāshim, the son of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya (Masudi VIII, 58), thus appearing as a branch of the Keisāniyya.

Bagd. apparently holds the same view on this matter when, in formulating the orthodox doctrine of the Imamate, he adds (fol. 133a):
Another party says: the Caliphate is only permissible in the children of al-
'sic' Abbás b. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib. This is the opinion of the Rāwan-
diyya."

It was only a small group out of this large party which cherished extravagant ideas and, as the Muhammedan theologians would say, exaggerated concerning the 'Abbassides. This is
still evident from Tab.'s statement III, 418所说的, that it was a cer-
tain man called Ablak who arranged the attempt at the deifica-
tion of Mansûr and "called upon the Rāwandiyya to join him," in other words, used an already existing party for his special purposes.

The name of the sect is written راوندیية Tab. ib., I. H. and
others; یاوندیية Bagd. and Isfr., and راوندیية Suyūṭī, Ta'rīkh, 263, which the English translator, p. 266 note, unjustifiably, as will presently be seen, regards as incorrect. For it is the
latter variant, reflected as well in the reading of Ed. Y.

(our text, note 9) and this page, note 2, which gives us
the clue to the origin of the sect. As a matter of fact, the
Rāwandiyya are unanimously connected by the Arabic authors
with the province of Khorāsān, which was, as is well known,
the centre of the Abbasside propaganda (Masudi VI, 54, Tab.
locality by the name of Rāwand, however, is unknown in that
province. A place of that name is mentioned by Yakut II, 741
as being in the vicinity of یسیبان. Accordingly, Dozy, Isl.
242 and Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen II, 38 (the latter quotes

may refer to the Prophet or to Ali. The latter is more prob-
able, for Masudi, too, tells us that they made an exception in the case of
Ali.

Cod. L. یاوندیية, see later. Masudi VI, 26 says rather vaguely :
"The Rāwandiyya (maintain) that the Imamate is permissible in the
Kureish only."

The view set forth in the text is in the main anticipated by de Sacy
LVI f. who similarly takes Masʿūdī's statement as the point of departure.

It is to be regretted that the editor omitted the variations of this
name, which he declares (III, 82, note b) to be numerous.
also other views, note 1) seek the origin of this sect in that \([70]\) region. But this view contradicts the express statements of the Arabic sources. Considering the variations of the name of this sect, I am inclined to place its origin in رَبْوَنْد a region near Nisabûr, the capital of Khorâsân, Yakut II, 891, comp. *Lubb* 5 al-*Lubâb* s. v., رَبْوَنْد. This conjecture is raised to certainty by the fact that IKhall. calls the very same region رَبْوَنْد (No. 34, in the biography of aḥmad b. Ḥabīb al-راوند) إِلَى إِبْنِ عَبَّاسِ بَرْصِيّةَ بِن (الراوند). In other words, رَبْوَنْدarat and رَبْوَنْد are two various pronunciations of the same name which in Persian sounded Râvend.\(^1\)

Aside from this geographical explanation of the name, another derivation is found which must be discussed here. Isf. 10, speaking of the succession of the Imamate after Abû Hâshim, remarks as follows: 

"ثم قال قوم رجعت (يعني الإمامة) بعد أبي حاشم إلى عماد بن علي بن عبد الله بن عباس برصية بن ابي حاشم له بها وهذا قول ابن (strike out) ‹بِن› الرَبْوَنْدِيّ واتباعه. I combine this statement with the notice *Makr.* 351 (in his enumeration of the sects of the Ṣawâfīd)

وَقَد اخْتَلَفَ النَّاسُ فِي الإِمَامِ بَعْدِ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمُ فَذُهَبَ الجَمِيعُ إِلَى اِبْنَ اَبِى بَكْرٍ . . . وَقَالَ الْعَبْسَٰيْبَةُ والرَّبْوَنْدِيَةُ اختِبَا رَبُّتِهِ عَبْسَةُ هَبْبَتْهُ الرَّبْوَنْدِيَةُ وَقَبِلَ اِتِّبَاعُ ابِنَ الْعَبْسَةُ الرَّبْوَنْدِيَةُ هوَ الْعَبْسَةُ بِنْ عَبَّاسٍ الْمَطْلُبُ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ لَأَنَّهُ الْعَمّ والْوَارِثُ وَهُوَ أَحْقَقَ مِنْ ابِنَ الْعَمّ الرَّبْوَنْدِيَةَ (instead of the الرَّبْوَنْدِيَة and) and, taking into account their identity in doctrine, to regard them as one.

Examining our material as a whole, we are led to believe that there were two sects of this name: the one, properly so called, from Rîwand in Khorâsân, appeared in the time of Abû\\

\(^{1}\) De Sacy LVII recognized in part this relation.
Muslim and professed the extravagant doctrines set forth above; the other, called so after their founder or leader ar-Râwandî, was a political party for which al-Jâhîz as late as in the third century composed his treatise in favor of the Abbasside claims to the Imamate.

Finally, attention may be called to another sect which stands in a peculiar relation to the Râwandiyya. It is a remarkable fact that our sect which, as can be inferred from the above, is by no means insignificant, is mentioned neither by Shahr. nor Iji nor Makr. In its stead we find the Rizâmiyya, credited with exactly the same views, as have been set forth above as those of the Râwandiyya. And what is even more significant, the Baslamiyya (or Muslimiyya, see p. 119 n. 2), which worshipped Abû Muslim as a Divine incarnation and is counted among the Râwandiyya (Makr. 353 ult.,—the only passage in which the name occurs—, Tab. III, 129* =IAth. V, 383; Bagd. 103b:

وَكَذَلِكَ دَفْرَتُ قُومٍ مِنَ الرَّونِدِيَّةِ فِي ابْنِ مَسْلِمِ

figures in the other sources among the Rizâmiyya (p. 118 f.). It is clear that the two sects are intimately connected with one another. One feels naturally inclined to take them for one. The difference in the names and their derivations seem to speak against their identity.

— L. 15. See p. 100 ff.

A great deal of confusion prevails with regard to the name of this sectarian. The extant forms may be classified as follows: 

عبد الله بن عمرو بن الحرب

Text 37, Makr. 362* (quotation), Shahr. 112, Bagd. 12* (promiscue and Gümç), Isfr. 10*; Kashi 195*; Text 71, note 1 (reading of L Br), Kashi 188* (parallel to 195*), Makr. quoted by van Vloten, Worgers p. 61, note 8; عبد الله بن عمرو بن الحرب (or حرب) Bagd. 97*; Shahr. 112 ult., Text 37* (reading of Y); Text 71, n. 1 (reading of Ed. Y). The name of the sect is written عبد الله بن حرب الخريبة Bagd. 97*, Abu'l Maali 158; الخريبة ib. as a variant, Makr. quoted van Vloten, Worgers, p.
61, n. 8, 'Text 71'' (see note 12). Very interesting in this connection is Makr.'s notice quoted from a manuscript by van Vloten, Worgers ib.: ومنهم المُخَرَّبية أُذْبَاع عبد الله بن الخرث واسم الخرث سلم بن مسعود بن خالد بن أشرم وهو من بنى الطمح بن الخرث بن معاوية بن الخرث بن معاوية بن ثور بن مرتع. The notice is not quite clear, but this much can be inferred from it that there is both 'Abdallah's ancestors who may be responsible for the variations and that the name of the sect does not, at least in this case, necessarily conform with the immediate ancestor of the founder.2

Very peculiar is the notice Shahr. 113 that after 'Abdallah b. Muʿāwiya's death (comp. Text 71") his adherents believed that his spirit was transferred to "Iṣḥāḳ b. Zeid b. al-Ḫārith al-_ANSARI. These are the Ḥārithiyya who permit forbidden things and live the life of one who has no duties imposed on him" (comp. de Sacy, II, 593). It would thus seem that the Ḥārithiyya are not identical with the Ḥarbiyya and represent but a later development of the Ḥarbiyya (or Kharbiyya).4

1 Van Vloten is inclined to pronounce the name al-Kharibiyya to suit the metre. This is scarcely permissible considering that the word itself stands in the verse by emendation.

2 The genealogical chain Marta′—Thaur—Muʿāwiya—al-Ḫārith—Muʿāwiya is found Wüstenfeld, Tabellen, 421.

3 Comp. Goldziher, ZDMG. 61, 75 n. 2.

4 I have no means to ascertain whether the following passages have any bearing on this sect, although several points seem to suggest it:

Belâdorî, Futuḥ al-Buldân, ed. de Goeje, 295 penult.: إلى حرب بن عبد الله البلخي (see variants): 'Abu'l-Maḥāsîn, Leyden 1855, I, 397 (anno 147): حرب بن عبد الله الرِّبْوَنْدَى الذي تَنْسَب اليه الخَرْبِيَّة ببغداد; IKhall.

وُدُفِّن بمقبرة باب حرب وباب حرب منسوب إلى حرب بن عبد الله أحد احتماب ابي جعفر المنصور ولي حرب هذا تنسب الكحلاة المعروفة بالخربة. 30
According to Bagd. 97\textsuperscript{a}, 'Abdallah adhered to the doctrine of Bayán that God embodies himself in the prophets and the Imams, claiming that the Divine spirit went over from Abû Hâšhim to him; comp. Shahr. 112 penult.

---

On the number of prayers see the variants here and Text 37, n. 3. 17 is attested by most manuscripts, Makr. 362\textsuperscript{a} (quotation from I. H.), also in the notice quoted by van Vloten, Worger\textsuperscript{b} ib. Is 17 (7+10) a holy number? The "Greatest Name" is said to consist of 17 letters, p. 87\textsuperscript{a}.

---

The Şufriyya (or Şifriyya, see Haarbrücker, II, 406) is a very moderate Khârijite sect.

---


---

The words Shahr. 1131 are impossible, both as regards contents and grammatical form (subject before verb, ... $O$ for a single action). What Shahr. meant to say is most probably, judging by the statements of I. H. and Makr., the exact reverse of it: that 'Abdallah did return to (true) knowledge and religion, and was consequently deserted by his followers.

---

On 'Abdallah b. Muʿawiya see Text 45\textsuperscript{a}, Comm. 44\textsuperscript{a} ff. and Wellhausen, Opp. 98 ff.

---

The name of this sect alternates between $\text{نصرية}$ and $\text{نصرية}$ (see the readings note 15). The former is also found Abulfeda II, 388 (IAth. VIII, 220, which is his source, reads $\text{نصيرية}$), Dictionary of Technical Terms, p. 1385 (quotation from Iji; ed. Sörenson has $\text{نصيرية}$). This difference is of importance for the understanding of the origin of the sect, which is controversial; see de Sacy clxxxiii, II 559 ff., Wolff, Drusen 214 ff. Abulfeda derives the name from the citadel Nasariyya and places the origin of the sect in the year 270/891. Nuseiriyya again is interpreted as a term of contempt: "little Christians," ZDMG. III, 308 note. On the other hand, Guayard, "Un grand maître des Assassins," Journal

The cardinal point of the Nuṣeiriyya doctrine is the deification of Ali. This accounts for the fact that they are considered by I. H. an outgrowth of the Sabāʿiyya.—Ali, they believed, existed before the world was created, Shahr. 144. To the question “who has created us?” the modern Nuṣeiriyya catechism gives the reply: “Ali”, ZDMG. III, 302. In other words, Ali is the Demiurge, see p. 91. They believed in the simultaneous incarnation of God in a good and evil being (Shahr. 144, Iji 348), more exactly, in seven such successive incarnations; see the list of the seven incarnations, ZDMG. III, 303; on the number seven see Index s.v. Seven. This theory strikingly resembles ash-Shalmağanî’s doctrine of the Addād, p. 1165. Muhammed was Ali’s apostle and was sent to bring mankind to his recognition, ZDMG. III, 302.

The Nuṣeiriyya are closely related to the Ishākiyya (p. 10212). They are mentioned together, Shahr. 143, Iji 21, 348. Yakut III, 275, appears to identify them. He says briefly of ash-Shorta, a district near Wāsīt, 72, l. 1. Instead of “army” read “district.” 

أجنباد, originally “army district,” became afterwards a pure geographical designation. The Jordan district with Tiberias as capital corresponds to the Roman province Palestina Secunda (Prof. Nöldeke in a private communication).—I have found no reference to this occupation of Palestine by the Nuṣeiriyya outside of I. H.

— L. 2 ff. Yakut probably refers to the same fact when he says, referring to them (II, 338, sub voce أصلهم الإمامية (عصر يرسون السلف. —The reason for their hatred of Fāṭima and her children lies probably in their conception of Ali as Divine being, who, as such, can have neither wife nor children. Abu’l Maali 158 enumerates among the ḇāliya a sect Azdariyya: “They say that he who was the father of Ḥasan and Ḥusein was
not the (real) Ali. He was rather a man called Ali al-Azdari. But the Ali who is an Imam has no children, as he is the Creator.” I. H.’s statement contradicts the assertion of Shahr. 144\(^{5}\) (comp. Haarbrücker II, 413), Iji 21, 348, see de Sacy II, 559, that the Nuseiriyya (and Ishakiyya) worshipped the children of Ali as well. The modern Nuseiriyya catechism (ZDMG. III, 305) also recognizes this relationship of Ali in his capacity as man.

— L. 8. This is a reflex of the belief in Docetism, p. 30.

— L. 13. In his polemic against the Sabá‘iyya, who believe that a devil was killed in Ali’s stead, Isfr. 56\(^{a}\) uses the same argument:

ویرعوم ان الذى قتلته ابن ملكم كان شيطانًا وتم

قتل شيطانًا كان يصردًا فكيف يفنيه.

— L. 3. See Text p. 34\(^{13}\) and Comm. p. 13\(^{13}\) ff.

— L. 4. The words enclosed in quotation marks make the impression of a citation from some Şüfi author. Perhaps it would have been more correct to translate بعض as “one”:

“one of them adds.”

— L. 6 f. The name of this Şüfi is Abû Sa‘id Abû’l-Kheir, as I. H. expressly states, with two kunyas joined together; de Sacy, Journal des Savants 1821, p. 725 gives the same form of the name. Browne, A Literary History of Persia, New York 1906, writes consistently Abû Sa‘id bnu Abi’l-Kheir (see passages in his index). The same Dozy, Ist. 320, Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie I, 186, note 3 (from Ibn Abî Usheibi‘a, ed. Müller II, 9\(^{17}\)).

Abû Sa‘id was born December 7, 967 and died January 12, 301049. He was a contemporary of Avicenna (980-1037)—he is said to have been his friend, Goldziher, ibidem—and consequently of I. H. (Text 73\(^{6}\)). According to Dozy, however, ib. (=Kremer, Ideen, p. 66), he founded a monastery (Khánkah) in Khorásán as early as in the year 200/815. But the date is no doubt incorrect.

The Şüfis regard him as the originator of their doctrine. De Sacy ib. thinks that this is unhistorical.

\(^{1}\) He is buried by his side, in Hamadan. See the picture of their tombs in Jackson, Persia Past and Present (New York 1906), p. 167.
Abû Saʿīd was a famous Rubāʿī poet, Browne, ib. 261 ff. [73]
Even now his Rubāʿīs are believed to have a magic power.
They are recited a certain definite number of times as prayers
for forgiveness of sins, for rain, etc.¹

On his spiritual conception of the religious obligations comp. 5
Browne, ib. p. 268.
— L. 9. On the prohibition of silk see Hughes, Dictionary
of Islam, sub voce Dress.

— L. 21 ff. The belief in a written will (نَصْ) of the Prophet
bequeathing the Imamate to Ali is the cardinal tenet of the 10
Imamites in contradistinction from the Zeidites; see Introduction
On the reflex of this struggle in the Ḥadīth see Goldziher, Muh.
St. II, 115 ff.

74, l. 4. On the name Rawāfīd see Appendix A.
— L. 9. On Zeid see Shahr. 116. He was a pupil of Wāsīl [74]
b. ʿĀṭā, the founder of the Muʿtazila.
— L. 15. Ali’s voluntary concession of the Imamate to the
three first Caliphs is taught, according to Shahr. 121⁵, by the 20
Ṣāliḥīyya, the adherents of al-Ḥasan b. Ṣāliḥ (p. 130 f.), and the
Butriyya, the followers of a certain al-Abtar. Bagd. 10⁶ applies
the name Butriyya to both sects. They accordingly considered
136⁷ ff.) agreed with them on this point, but differed from them 25
regarding ‘Othman. Suleimān declared him an infidel, while
the others reserved their opinion concerning him (Shahr.,
Bagd).—Kashi 152 applies the appellation Butriyya to the
adherents of several men who held the same views on the Imamate.
Al-Abtar, however, is not mentioned by him⁸:

كثير النوا والحسن بن صالح بن بين (sic) يحيى (sic) وسلم

¹ Zhukovski in the Memoires (Zapiski) of the Oriental Department of
the Russian Archeological Society, XIII (1900), p. 145.
² See following note.
³ Cf. p. 130⁰.—Makr. 352⁹ curiously connects the two men
البتريّة

أتباع الحسن بن صالح بن كثير الأبتر
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calls him *promiscue* al-Hasan b.-Sâlih (b. Hayy), Text 307, 7419 [74] (note 10), 75 n. 1, and al-Hasan b. Hayy, 7423.6, 753, 7919. This peculiar circumstance is rendered intelligible by the fact that Hayy or, more exactly, Hayyân is identical with Sâlih; see Tab. III, 2516, 2517 (and notes), Wüstenfeld, *Tabellen* 93. Fiihr. 5 17820, however, calls his father Sâlih bnu Hayy.

Al-Hasan, with the Kunya Abf 'Abdallah, was a member of the Thaur Hamdan (Bagd. 10a, comp. Isfr. 9a, l. 8). His daughter was married to 'Iâsa, the son of Zeid b. Ali, the founder of the Zeidiyya. Together with his son-in-law, who was pursued by the Caliph Mahdi, he was compelled to hide in Kufa for seven years. He died in the same city; the year of his death is variously given as 167, 168 and 169; see Wüstenfeld, *Register*, sub voce, Tab. ib., Fiihr. ib., Dahabi, *Huffâz* V, 45. He was famous for his piety, see especially Dahabi.

15 Muslim in his *Sahâh* quotes him as Râwi, while Bukhârî mentions him honorably, Bagd. 10a (comp. Isfr. 9a): 

وَقَدْ اٰخْرَجَ مُسْلِمُ بِنَّ الْخُلَّاجَ حَدِيثَ الْمُهَـسَّنِ بِنَّ صَالِحِ بَنِ حَئ فِي مُسْتَنَدِهِ الصَّحِيحِ عَلَى أُخْرِجَ حَمَدُ بْنِ إِسْمَاعِيلِ البِخَارِيْ حَدِيثَهُ فِى الصَّحِيحِ وَلَكِنَّهُ تَالُ فِى كِتَابِ التَّأْرِيبِ الكِبَرُ المَهْسُونُ بِنَّ صَالِحِ بَنِ حَئ الْكَوْنِيّ سِعْمُ سَمَالُ بَنِ حَرِيبُ وَمَا سَنَةُ سَبِيعٌ وَسَتِينُ وَمَا ثَمَانُ وَمَا مِنْ ثَلَاثِ هَمِدَانِ كَنُونَةٌ آبُو عَمَرِ الْلَّهُ.

I. H.'s account on al-Hasan's views flagrantly contradicts the statements of the other sources. The latter generally count him among the Zeidiyya, who confine the Imamate to the descendants of Ali or, still narrower, to those of Fâṭîma (see later p. 132 ff.), Shahr. 121, Bagd., Isfr.; IKot. 301 counts him, more vaguely, among the Shi'a. Fiihr. 17820, who mentions him among the Buteiriyya, registers a book of his entitled "A book on the Imamate of the descendants of Ali by Fâṭîma." 30

---

1 The South-Arabic tribe Hamdân in 'Irâk adhered to the Alides, Kremer, *Culturgeschichte unter den Chalifen*, II, 144.

In contradiction to all these authors, I. H. insists that al-Hasan shared the orthodox view which admits the Imamate "in all the descendants of Fiihr b. Mālik," i.e., the Kureish (comp. Wüstenfeld, Tabellen O'). One might feel inclined to charge I. H. with the attempt to claim this famous theologian for the Sunna. But it must be remembered that I. H. quotes as his authority an Imamite.—Quite isolated is Masudi’s statement (VI, 25) that he went as far as to admit the Imamate even outside the Kureish.

This is intended to show that al-Hasan considered even these men legitimate Imams. Al-Hasan was also very mild in his opinion about ‘Othmān, see p. 129^27.

According to all other authorities, including Masudi V, 474, IKhald. I, 357, comp. Kremer. Ideen 375, the Zeidiyya restrict the Imamate to the descendants of Fātimā. The Keisāniyya are thus excluded. See Introduction, p. 23 and Comm. p. 35.

Note 6. Instead of the enigmatic words of Ed. I would suggest (although with some hesitation) to read "and the love of unsheathing the sword is in him."

According to IKhald. I, 356, the Imamiyya claim a written will of Ali in favor of Fātimā’s sons.

Similarly Shahr. 134^18: "They (the Imāmiyya) agree as to the transfer of the Imamate down to Ja‘far b. Muhammed as-Ṣādik. They disagree as to the person he appointed (Imam) by a written will after him." See Text 76^ and Comm. p. 104^25 ff.

On Hishām b. al-Ḥakam see p. 65^11 ff.

— L. 23. On Dâwûd al-Ḥawârî see p. 67\textsuperscript{32} ff.
— Ibidem. On Dâwûd b. Kathîr ar-Rakî from Rakka in Babylonia, see Kashi 256 f. Tusy No. 281, p. 131 designates him as “weak,” because the “Gulât” quote him as authority for their traditions. Kashi 257 defends him against this charge. 5 He is said to have died about 200\textsuperscript{b}, Tusy \textit{ib.}, comp. Kashi \textit{ib}.
— Ibidem. ‘Ali b. Maṅsûr is enumerated Shahr. 145 among the writers of the Shi’a. Masudi VI, 369 calls him an Imamite and a follower of Hishâm b. al-Ḥakam. He is mentioned in connection with the latter, Kashi 165 ult. See also below l. 22. 10
— Ibidem. ‘Ali b. Mîtham see p. 60\textsuperscript{f} ff.
— L. 24. On ash-Shakkâk see p. 66\textsuperscript{4} ff.
— L. 26. Abû Mâlîk al-Ḥadramî is mentioned Bagd. 21\textsuperscript{b} in connection with Ali b. Mîtham, both being styled 15

\textbf{Fīhr.} 177\textsuperscript{25} counts him among the dogmatists of the Shi’a (من متكلّبي الشيعة).\textsuperscript{1} Contrary to this, and no doubt incorrectly, Masudi VI, 369 designates him as a radical Khârîjite.—He took part, together with most of the other men mentioned in our text, in the famous discussion before the Barmekide\textsuperscript{20} Vizier Yahya, Masudi \textit{ib.}; comp. on this discussion Kashi 167 ff.—Abû Mâlîk is mentioned, together with Ali b. Maṅsûr (see above l. 7), Kashi 179 ult. They both belonged to Ja‘far’s circle. They outlived Ja‘far, \textit{ib.}

\textbf{76}, l. 3 and note 1. According to most authorities (quoted 25 Comm. p. 19\textsuperscript{27} f.), Ismâ‘îl died before his father (five years, [76] Blochet 51). The Ismâ‘iliyya remove this difficulty by the assumption that Ja‘far purposely spread the rumor about his death so as to save his life. See the story told Shahr. 146.
— L. 4. These are the Karmatians. See on these Comm. 30 p. 19\textsuperscript{29} and p. 79\textsuperscript{b}.
— L. 7. These are the Ithnâ‘ashariyya, see p. 78\textsuperscript{35}
— L. 10 ff. See on this passage Text p. 48 and Comm. 52 ff.

\textsuperscript{1} which follows immediately is most probably a dittography from the next line. The editors identify this name with Abû Mâlîk. The difference in the Kunya (Abû Mâlîk and Abû 'Abdallah) as well as in the Nisba (al-Ḥaḍramî and al-Īsfaḥānî) speak decidedly against this conjecture.
I. Friedlaender,

[76] — L. 20. On the contest about the inheritance see the allusive statement Shahr. 129 and a more elaborate account IBab., Ithbat 41 penult. It is natural that Ja‘far gets the worst of it.

5 77, note 3. I prefer the reading of L. Br غَيِّرَ بِهَا “People sneered at her.” See on this expression Goldziher, Muh. St. II, 143 ult. and note 7. The nature of the accusation is not quite clear. Did she become the concubine of al-淮安 b. Ja‘far?

10 — L. 5. I have not been able to find any reference to this Kātib.—The details set forth here are not found elsewhere.

— L. 8. In the time of Abu‘l Ma‘ali (wrote about 485h) people made pilgrimages to the cellar (sardāb) in which he was said to have disappeared, Blochet 155. Even as late as Ibn Khaldūn a peculiar ceremony connected with this cellar was still in vogue. Comp. the interesting passage, IKhald. I, 359.

— Ibidem (comp. note 7). The same number of years (180) also Ed. IV, 96°.


— L. 13. Muḥammed b. Ismā‘īl as-Sayyid al-Ḥimyari was born 105/723 and died 173/789, Brockelmann I, 83. To the sources quoted by Brockelmann add the biography in Dahabi’s Ta‘rikh al-Islām (Ms. of Strassburg University Library, not paginated), which is in part closely related to that given in Fawāt al-Wafāyāt I, 24.—On as-Sayyid comp. also the index to this treatise.

— L. 14. Kuthayyir ‘Azza, so called because of his love to ‘Azza, a girl of the Khuzā‘a tribe, died in 105, the year in which as-Sayyid was born, Brockelmann I, 48.‴

[78] 78, note 2. The drift of this anecdote is probably this, that, as no decent man shared the views of as-Sayyid, he could only point to a cobbler in Ray as his associate in doctrine.

1 The remark in Agh. Tables p. 395‴ s.v. السِّتَّة الدْحَمِيِّي: “loué par Kuthayyir” is, of course, a misunderstanding. The passage referred to (Agh. VIII, 32) merely states that the verses quoted there in the name of Kuthayyir are ascribed by others to as-Sayyid. Comp. Agh. VII, 7.
— L. 4. The accusation of forgery, which is certainly more [78] justified than the reciprocal charge of "tabdiil" (see p. 61 f.), is often made against the Shiites, see Goldziher, Muh. St. II, 111. IAth. (VIII, 21) puts it forcibly as well as briefly: "When the enemies of Islam gave up the hope to uproot it by force they took to inventing false traditions." The Rawafid are on this score brought in comparison with the Jews and this comparison is put into the mouth of ash-Sha'bi (d. 103), Ikd 269 (in a briefer form, also in the name of ash-Sha'bi, Isfr. 15a), see p. 19. Ash-Sha'bi, of course, is not responsible for this invidious comparison. The Sunnites in protesting against the Shiitic forgeries found no better spokesman than ash-Sha'bi, who was revered by the Sunna and at the same time known as a Shiite. It must be noted, however, that, according to Isfr. 70b penult., the tertium comparationis in the analogy between the Rawafid and the Jews is not the forgery of traditions but "tashbih," the anthropomorphistic conception of God. The Shiites incline towards "tashbih" (see, e. g., p. 66) and the latter is regarded as characteristic of Judaism by the Muhammadan theologians. [Cf. Kauffmann, Attributenlehre 81.]

The Sunnites answer the Shiitic forgeries with forgeries of their own which are directed against their opponents (Goldziher, Muh. St. II, 117 ff. A few instances can be found Isfr. 15b f. Some of them are rather clumsy. Thus the Prophet is reported to have ordered Ali to kill the Rawafid. [See p. 143 ult.]

— L. 6. In the expositions following in Ed., I. H. endeavors to refute the Shiitic view that the Imamate is admissible only in the descendants of Ali. His expositions, however, are of a theological nature and do not offer any historical material.

The author very cleverly points out that the hadith 30 which is a standing argument of the Shiites—it is at the same time binding for the Sunnites as being recorded in the two Sahihas (Nawawi, Tahdib 438)—proves nothing in favor of Ali, as Joshua, and not Aron, was the successor of Moses.

[78] — L. 10. ُتَّبَشِّيِل here and in the passages quoted Comm. p. 729 and 928 obviously means “Synopsis.” This meaning of the word is not recorded in the dictionaries.

— L. 17. Read كُفَّار (misprint).

5 79, l. 3. Read المُسَبِّب “who caused” (Nöldeke); correct accordingly Text 80a.

— L. 12. This is the opinion of Suleimán b. Jarîr (see l. 21). Comp. Shahr. 119: “The nation committed . . . a sin which does not reach the degree of impiety.” See Iji 353, Makr. 352a (سلیمان instead of سلیمان), Masudi V, 474. His party is called Jarirîyya; Isfr. 7a calls it Suleimâniyya.


— L. 18. This is the view of the Jârûdiyya, see p. 232f ff.

— L. 20. Comp. a similar utterance Ed. I, 412 (directed against the Apostles): “It is not permitted to believe an apostate nor to receive (true) religion from an apostate.”

— L. 21. On at-Tammar see p. 60f f.

[80] 80, l. 2. On Abû Kâmil see p. 7642 f.

— L. 7. See Text 562 ff.

1 Comp. Goldziher, ZDMG. 61, 75 n. 2.

CORRECTIONS.

Introduction, p. 13 l. 3 from below: Joseph is oversight for Samuel. Comm. p. 15, n. 3. Al-Warrâk is probably identical with Abû ʿĪsa Muhammed b. Hárûn al-Warrâk, of Bagdad, quoted by Maṣʿūdî, Murâj VII, 236.

—Page 78 l. 15. Comp. also IKot. p. 106: عظيم البطن.
APPENDIX A.

The term "Rawāfīd."¹

The term Rawāfīd which figures so conspicuously in the literature bearing on Shiism as well as in the texts of Ibn Ḥazm can lay claim to a long and eventful history. The word has undergone numerous changes and modifications which are sometimes of such fluctuating a nature as to defy all exact definitions. In the following an attempt is made—for it cannot be more than an attempt—to trace the principal stages in this development and to classify the various, sometimes contradictory applications of this word.

Rawāfīd, in the collective singular Rāfīda,² occasionally Arfād³ and Rāfīdan,⁴ in the singular Rāfīd,⁵ originally signifies "an army, or a military force ... which has deserted its leader" (Lane), in other words "deserters," or "traitors." It is obviously meant as a nickname, more exactly, an abusive nickname, a nomen odiosum.⁶ Its application, in consequence,

¹ The abbreviations under which the sources are quoted in this appendix are the same as in the body of the article.
² The form which may only represent a different spelling of is quoted by Goldziher, ZDMG, 36, 281, n. 1, and Shi'a, p. 511⁶. Another example is recorded by Dozy sub voce (from Nuweiri).
³ Comp. Tāj-al-'Arfis (see Lane s.v.), Dozy s.v. and Goldziher, ZDMG. 36, 280, n. 1.
⁴ See p. 140, n. 3, and Comm. p. 106¹⁸, Goldziher, Shi'a 460⁶. The first two examples occur in poetry, the third in rhymed prose.
⁵ Whether the variant (Text 63, n. 2) represents an actual usage or is merely a scribal error is difficult to determine.
⁶ Mukaddasī (p. 36¹⁸) counts the Rawāfīd among the sects which are designated by a nickname: "فَامَا الْمَلْقَبَةُ فَالْرَّوَافِضُ وَالْمُجَّبَّرةُ والْمُرْجَحَةُ وَالْشُّكَالْ". The abusive nature of the name is evident from the remark immediately following: "وَأَمَا الْفِتْحَةُ فَأَحْلُ السَّنَةُ فَإِجَالَةُ الْبَعْضَةُ وَالْجَمَاعَةُ وَأَحْلَ العَدُولُ وَالْتَوْحِيدُ الْحَرَّ."
largely depends on the mental attitude of the person using it. Hence its preeminently polemical character.¹

Historically the name is connected with Zeid, the great-grandson of Ali, the originator of the Zeidiyya. Tabari² has preserved an elaborate account of the incident to which the word owes its origin.

Zeid b. Ali b. al-Ḥusein b. Ali b. Abī Ṭālib had been encouraged by the people of Kufa to assert his claims to the throne of the Omeyyads. Relying on their promises of assistance, he organizes in the year 1221 an open rebellion which is to take place on a prearranged day in Kufa. The governor Yūsuf b. ‘Omar receives timely information and takes energetic measures to nip the rebellion in the bud by getting hold of its organizer. In this moment of danger the leaders of the rebellious Kufiotes, who had always been noted for their fickleness of character, gather around Zeid to cross-examine him as to the legitimacy of the first two Caliphs, Abī Bekr and ‘Omar. "Zeid³ said: 'May Allah have mercy on them both and grant them forgiveness! I have never heard anyone of my family repudiating them or speaking of them otherwise than favor-

¹ The Shiites never designate themselves as Rawāfiḍ. According to Mukaddasi (p. 142, n. 6), they apply this word to their opponents. As-Sayyid protests against the affront implied in it (p. 140, n. 3). The expression has, it seems, always (see, however, p. 151, n. 5) carried with it a derogatory meaning. The term Muʿtazila, "secessionists" or "schismatics", affords, both as regards origin (see Shahr. 3311 and the other sources) and subsequent development, an interesting parallel to Rawāfiḍ. The Muʿtazila themselves prefer the designation Aṣḥāb (or ahl) al-ʿadl wa’t-tauḥid (Shahr. 29 bottom, cf. preceding note, and Zeid. Muʿtaz. p. 2). Bagd. 40°, 137° uses the word polemically: 

² II, 1698 ff.

³ Tab. II, 1699. We quote the passage verbatim, as it strikingly illustrates the fundamental points of difference between the two most important sections of the Shi'a.

⁴ The expression is the technical term in this connection. The opposite attitude is designated as . See Goldziher, ZDMG. 36, 380 n. 2, Snouck-Hurgronje, Mekka 1, 33 n. 2, and the references quoted in the course of this appendix.
bly.' They said: 'Why, then, do you seek the blood of this family (the Omeyyads), if they have not (illegally) seized upon your throne and wrenched it from your hands?' He replied to them: 'The most I can admit in the question you are discussing is that we (the family of Ali) were the worthiest among men of the Prophet's throne and that the people appropriated it in preference to us and pushed us away from it. Yet, this, in our opinion, does not constitute apostasy on their part. They were Caliphs, they were just in their dealings with the people and acted in accordance with the Book and Tradition.' They said: 'If those did not wrong you, then these (the Omeyyads) have not wronged you either. Why, then, should you call (us) to fight people who are not doing you any wrong?' He answered: 'These here are not the same as those. These here do wrong me and you and themselves. For we only call you to Allah's Book and the Prophet's Tradition (so that) the traditions be revived and the innovations extinguished. If you follow us, you will be blessed. If not,—I am not responsible for you!' Thereupon they withdrew from him, violating their oath of allegiance, and declared: 'the Imam has died!'; hence-forward maintaining that Abū Ja'far Muhammed b. Ali, the brother of Zeid b. Ali, was the (legitimate) Imam. The latter, however, had died in the meantime, but his son Ja'far b. Muhammed was alive. So they declared: 'Ja'far is now our Imam after his father. He is the worthiest of the Imamate after his father. We will not follow Zeid b. Ali, for he is no Imam.' Zeid thereupon called them Rāfiḍa. At present, however, they maintain that it was al-Muğira who called them Rāfiḍa at the time when they had withdrawn from him.'

The last sentence is highly significant. The partisans of Zeid apparently repented their faithless action which resulted

---

1 Abū Bekr and 'Omar. It is not clear whether 'Othman is included. The attitude of the Zeidiyya toward the latter is vacillating. See Comm. p. 12926.

2 On this meaning of سباق الإمام see Tabari glossary sub voce and compare the next sentence.

3 Codex B omits it. The narrator was a contemporary of Zeid. See later p. 141.
in his pitiful death. They felt the scathing shame of having been branded as "deserters" or "traitors" by so distinguished and pious a descendant of Ali. Shrewd as they were, they pretended that this name was hung on them by al-Muʿğira b. Saʿīd under whom they had risen shortly before and from whom they had betimes withdrawn. To have been thus nicknamed by so rank a heretic constituted, in their opinion, a title of honor.

Tabari's derivation of the word from the unfortunate uprising of Zeid b. Ali in 122 is almost universally confirmed by the Arabic authorities. So all the national lexicographers (see the quotations in Lane sub voce); Bagd. 10b f.*; Isfr. 9a; Shahr.

1 The text merely gives al-Muʿğira. But if this is to have any meaning, it can only be taken as referring to al-Muʿğira b. Saʿīd, Text 59 f., Comm. 79. This identification is also assumed in the index to Tabari. Wellhausen, Opp. 96 n. 1, substitutes, without justification, the name of al-Muʿğira b. Shuʿba. It is difficult to account for his name in this connection.

2 Cf. Text 6014.

3 The derogatory character of the word (comp. p. 137 n. 6) is aptly illustrated by a verse of as-Sayyid, Agh. VII, 17. The latter had been accused by the poet Sawwār, in the presence of the Caliph Mansūr, of being a fanatical Shiite. As-Sayyid replies to Sawwār in a scathing poem in which he says:

"We, however, are—whether you like it or not—men who 'desert' people of error and ungodly works." This apparently means: You may nickname us "deserters." But we are such only because we "desert" Abū Bekr and 'Omar who disregarded the Prophet's will and usurped the Caliphate rightly belonging to Ali. See later p. 142 f. Barbier de Meynard, Journal Asiatique 1874, p. 210 misunderstood the verse.

4 A few (see later p. 142, n. 6) add another explanation which is no doubt secondary.

5 Comp. also Nawawi on Muslim's Sahih I, 51.

6 Comp. fol. 11s: Faffar trope: ʿnd zdld ᵃt nhl lhm Ṧrfṣṭmwn ʿn lmtk l'l ṣblṭl lʾmmtk. Bagd. winds up his lengthly account with the interesting observation: ṣnl ʿnd bn ʿqhd rʾfṣ t-kwṭf ʾmṣʾfr b-l ʿqhd rʾjūl ʾʾnd ṣr mmtlk fihhmn ᵃh ṣb mmtlk ʾmṣʾfr t-kwṭf ᵃʾgždʾʾmṣʾfr t-kwṭf.
17, 116; IKhald. I, 357; Makr. 351 ( = de Sacy XLVIII, II, 588)\(^1\), and others. Mukaddasi, who records various applications of our term, distinctly states:\(^2\) "with the Zeidiyya (it signifies) those who denied the Caliphate of Zeid b. Ali, and this is the original meaning."

It is well known that historical incidents quoted by Muhammadan authorities for the purposes of philological interpretation cannot always be relied upon, as they are not infrequently manufactured for the occasion. But no such scepticism is justified in our case. Tabari's report is derived from Abū Mikhnaf, who was a contemporary of Zeid, lived in the same city and is the best authority for the early history of Islam, especially in ‘Irāk.\(^3\) Besides, the incident has every internal evidence in its favor. Zeid b. Ali was the pupil of Wāsıl b. ‘Atā, the founder of the Mu’tazila.\(^4\) Like the latter, he looked at the problem of the Imamate from a rational point of view.\(^5\) To Zeid and his followers the Zeidiyya the Imamate was essentially a question of personal qualification.\(^6\) They denied the existence of a written will\(^7\) and, while maintaining the superiority of Ali, they justly enough admitted that the first two eminently successful Caliphs were legitimate rulers.\(^8\) To Zeid’s opponents the Imamate was exclusively a question of birth. It was hereditary in its very nature and bequeathed to Ali by the Prophet. Accordingly, Abū Bekr and ‘Omar were usurpers and, disregarding, as they did, the express will of Allah’s Prophet,\(^9\)

\(^1\) Who also quotes the other explanation, p. 142, n. 6.
\(^2\) See p. 142, n. 6.
\(^3\) See on this historian Wellhausen, Das arabische Reich, Preface.
\(^4\) See Comm. 11\(^{38}\).
\(^5\) Comp. Iji 297.
\(^6\) Comp. Text 75\(^9\) and Comm.
\(^7\) Comp. Introd. p. 22 and Text 74\(^{4}\).
\(^8\) Makr. 352\(^{23}\) sums up Zeid’s standpoint in the words: يفضِّل على إبٍي بكر رضي الله عنهما "the Imamate of the Inferior." See on this important point Shahr. 116 and Ibn Ḥazm, Ed. IV, 163 ff.

\(^9\) This view is based on the belief in the legitimacy of إمامَة المفضول: Bā’adā will ابْن هازم on this important point Shahr. 116 and Ibn Ḥazm, Ed. IV, 163 ff.
they are to be looked upon as apostates. Thus the “repudiation of the two Elders” became the equivalent and complement of the recognition of the claims of the Alids. It was the propelling force of all Shiitic uprisings and it is but natural that the same question formed the point of issue between the legitimists of Kufa and the rationalistic and fair-minded Zeid at the moment when they were both about to take up arms against the ruling dynasty.

Thus we may consider it certain that the word Rawāfid originated in Kufa in the year of the Hijra 122, in connection with the rebellion of Zeid b. Ali.3

The specific characteristic of the Rawāfīd, of those who deserted Zeid and were termed by him “deserters,” was the negative attitude towards Abū Bekr and ‘Omar, and, in a lesser degree, of ‘Othman and the other Companions,’—an attitude which was not a mere theoretic notion but soon grew into violent hatred and vented itself in the action—believed to be meritorious—of “‘the public denunciation of the Companions.” Hence Rafād or Taraffud, i. e. “to act as Rāfīda” became the designation for this hostile attitude toward the “two Elders” and the Companions, Rawāfid and its parallel forms the name of those who maintain this attitude.6 Thus

---

1 See Introd. 22 and Text 7918.
2 Ash-Sha’bī’s (died 103) reference to the Rāfīda (Comm. p. 1916) is no doubt apocryphal. This scathing criticism of the Rāfīda is attributed to him purposely because he was known to be favorably inclined towards Shiism. The sentence quoted ibidem 1920 is attributed Isfr. 15a to the Prophet himself, whilst according to ash-Sha’bī (see p. 1443), the Rawāfid were even worse than the Jews. Again, according to Shahr. 9, the Prophet compared the Rawāfid with the Christians.
3 Whether Zeid gave his opponents that name or it was given to them by others in connection with that event is quite immaterial to us.
4 Cf. p. 139, n. 1.
5 On “Sabb” see Goldziher, Shi’a 455 ff. and ZDMG. 36, 280. For some very characteristic instances see Comm. 28, n. 1 (quotation from Mirza), 424 ff., 651 ff. and Goldziher, Shi’a 456 middle.
6 This, in our opinion, accounts for the additional explanation of “Rawāfīd” as, as those who deserted Abū Bekr and ‘Omar, so Ikā (cf. p. 148). Makrizi 3518, who defines (ib.) the
Bagd 12b introduces with the words وَقَالَ الْمَهْدُورُ بِفِنْضَةٍ the following two verses as characteristic of "Rafid":

Rawāfiḍ as quotes both explanations: 1) those who "deserted the opinion" of Zeid; 2) those who "deserted the opinion" of the Companions in electing Abū Bekr, cf. de Sacy XLVIII, II, 588.—Very significant—although not unmistakable—is the remark Mukaddasi's (385):

والرُّافِضُ عند الشيعة مـَنْ أَخْرَ خُلَافَةٍ عَلَىٰ وَعَندَ غَيْرِهِمْ مـَنْ نِسَا خُلَافَةَ العَمْرَيْنَ for which Codex C reads more elaborately: 

We are thus presented with three derivations of the name: 1) according to the Shiites, the name applies to those who gave the precedence to someone else over Ali in the Caliphate, i.e. who elected Abū Bekr (and 'Omar) instead of Ali. 2) According to the Zeidiyya, it applies to those who rejected Zeid's Caliphate (in 122), 3) According to the others (i.e. the Sunnites), Rawāfiḍ are those who rejected the Caliphate of Abū Bekr and 'Omar. Historically, the first and third explanation are identical: they both assign an earlier origin to the name, deriving it from the events following Muhammed's death. They are substantially identical with the second explanation quoted by Makrizi. The second derivation of Muḥaddasi assigns the name to the year 122. This explanation is, according to Muḥaddasi, the original one, while the third, although the ordinary one, is apocryphal. From the expositions in the text it will have become obvious why the latter explanation had become so favorite. From the remark above quoted we also learn the fact—otherwise unknown—that the Shi'a,—in this case the Imāmiyya, see later p. 158,—applied the same nickname to their adversaries. This apparently means that the Rawāfiḍ, smarting under the offence implied in that term (comp. p. 140), endeavor to explain it differently: i.e. as those who deserted Ali, the opposition to Ali being objectionable even in the eyes of many Sunnites.—Another example of a polemical explanation of Rawāfiḍ is found in a ḥadith (apocryphal, of course) quoted Isfr. 15b penult: (sic)
In a dictum quoted Isfr. 15 in the name of ash-Sha‘bî (d. 103) the Rawāfiḍ are characterized thus: 15d 1

"These here are Rāfida, those opposite them are Sunnites . . . . the Sunnites are pleased with ‘Abî Bekr and ‘Omar, the

The same hadith with a different isnād and a few variations is quoted Goldziher, Shi'a 444.

Thus, according to al-Asma‘î (died 215, quoted Lisân sub voce Zeid was told (O . . . .) , Zeid was told (Rāfida) says instead (Rāfida)

2 Arwa was ‘Othman’s mother.

3 Ms. ; corrected according to Agh. VII, 24 (see n. 6).

4 i. e. Abû Bekr.

5 sic !—“ was proclaimed.”

6 Agh. VII, 24 ascribes these two verses to as-Sayyid, who is said to have uttered them with his last breath. The second verse appears here in a considerably different form:

The elimination of Abû Bekr’s and ‘Omar’s name is certainly not accidental. See on Abûl-Faraj al-Iṣfahâni’s attitude towards Shiism, and especially towards as-Sayyid, Goldziher, Shi’a 441 f.

7 See p. 142, n. 2. Although apocryphal, the utterance illustrates the meaning attached to “Rawāfiḍ” by those who invented it.

Cf. p. 188, n. 4.
Rafida denounce them” (Dozy sub voce رفضة from Naurir).

Characteristic is the anecdote Agh. XVIII, 59: the poet Di‘bil (died 246h), who is an enthusiastic Shiite,1 denounces a descendant of Zubeir, the son of Safiyya bint ‘Abd al-Muttalib, the Prophet’s aunt. The Kadi ‘Amr b. Humeid interposes on the plea that this is equal to insulting a close relative of the Prophet. Di‘bil retorts: “I have never seen anyone more stupid than thyself, except the one who hath appointed thee . . . Thy mind can conceive that I am a Rafidi because of calumniating Safiyya the daughter of ‘Abd al-Muttalib . . . Is calumniating Safiyya a religious tenet of the Rafida?” Di‘bil shrewdly implies that other personalities, far more important than Safiyya, are the target of the Rawafid’s hatred.

Because of this “denunciation of the Companions” the Rawafid are nicknamed “Sabbabun,” “denouncers.”

To realize the full significance of this usage, we must bear in mind the fact so lucidly expounded by Goldziher,2 that the Shi’a

1 Cf. Agh. XVIII, 29.
ZDMG. 36, 290, n. 1.—This general aspect of our term is to be thought of, whenever it is found difficult to assign it to any of the more definitely circumscribed categories to be mentioned in the course of this article.—Mu‘addasi affords us two interesting examples derived from his personal experience. While travelling in ‘Irak, where there are “Galiya, exaggerating their love for Mu‘awiya” (p. 126, 1. 14 and note n; cf. Comm. 129), our author hears in the principal mosque of Wasit a man reciting a hadith (forged, of course) in favor of Mu‘awiya. He remonstrates. The man shouts

هذا رجل هذا الرافضي

and the mob advances to attack him (p. 126). Similarly, in Isphahan, which is equally distinguished by its “Guluww for Mu‘awiya” (cf. also Goldziher, Shi’a 495, n. 3) the author protests against a man who denounces Ali and is angrily pointed at as

هذا رجل

(p. 39913). This does not necessarily imply that “orthodoxi fanatīci vocant quoque orthodoxos moderatos” (Glossary to Mu‘addasi s.v. رفضي), but simply means that the people seeing that he objects to Mu‘awiya or that he defends Ali, think that he is a “repudiator” of the Companions. In point of fact, Mu‘addasi is very favorably inclined toward the Zaidiyya (see p. 158).

but slowly and gradually developed into an independent religious organism and at first represented rather a different current within Islam than a separate sect. Shiism (Tashayyu') in itself, i.e. attachment to Ali and the Alidic family, is, from the Sunnitic point of view, by no means objectionable, nay, is even commendable; the word Shi'a in itself does not imply any heresy. It does become objectionable when the attachment to Ali is coupled with the denunciation of the Companions, in the first place of Abū Bekr and 'Omar. Hence, even in later times, Rawādīd is frequently used side by side with and at the same time as distinguished from Shi'a, the former denoting the radical and improper expression of Alidic sympathy, the latter the moderate and permissible one. Thus Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Askalānī (died 852/1449) characteristically says:

كان أبوه فاضلاً متشيعًا من غير شيبة ولا غلو فنشأ ولده غالبًا في الرفض.

This differentiation has even found expression in a hadith, quoted Isf. 16:

외리 بن عم رسول الله عليه أن رسول الله صلّى علّى تعود في الجنة وشيعت كبونون في الجنة وسكون بعدك قوم رأينون ولاينون يذعون الروافض فائتهم إن وجدتهم فاقتتلنهم فانتهم مشركون فقال علي وعما علامتهم يا رسول الله فقال لا يكون لهم جمعة ولا جماعة: يشتينون ابنا بكر وعم.

1 Shi'a 443, n. 3. Cf. Snouck-Hurgronje ib. 32, n. 1.
2 Comp. the characteristic utterance Damiri's (quoted Shi'a ib.) يتشيع تشييعا حسنا يقول بتفضيل اهل البيت من غير تقيص لأحد من الخلافة. See other examples quoted ib.
3 ZDMG. 36, 280 n. 2.
4 Similarly the well-known Shiite Zurara b. A'yun is said to have been

أحد الغلالة في الرفض (Makr. 353).
5 Ms. ولايمك.
6 Comp. the hadith quoted at the end of p. 142, n. 6.
7 Comp. the hadith quoted Goldziher, Shi'a 447: في خرجون من الجماعات ويتفرقون الجماعات.
are sent to Paradise, while those partisans who cannot refrain from denouncing Abū Bekr and 'Omar desire extermination. In consequence, for the moderate and radical wing of Alidic sympathizers is an expression often to be met with. Several examples can be gleaned from the abundant polemical material collected by Goldziher in his Shi‘a: 453 ult., 486 l. 6, 511 l. 6, 512 l. 17 and penult. A further instance may be added from IKhald. III, 74. Speaking of the later Šūfís, Ibn

---

1 The hadith is shrewdly enough transmitted through the son of 'Omar. Goldziher, Shi‘a 444, quotes a hadith which is obviously identical with ours. But it is undoubtedly expurgated and almost entirely shorn of its pro-Alidic—one might almost say, Zeiditic—tendency. The words are left out and the Prophet's reply is more in keeping with strict orthodoxy: In the latter form the Prophet also protests against those who, like the Zeidiyya, acknowledge Abū Bekr and ‘Omar but reject the other Companions.

2 In this passage the author (a Persian Shiite of the eleventh century of the Hijra) incidentally explains the origin of the word رافضة (or, as he spells it, رفضة, cf. 137 n. 2) in a manner different from the explanations previously quoted. He says, Shi‘a 511 ff.: وخم وتمَّ لا يكابر عقله ووجداته نعلم علمًا يقبلنّ قطعًا بآن هؤلاء الجواري والموالي والمجتهدين في مذعه أهله البيت عليهم السلام كانوا أخص بهم وأعلم بأصولهم وفرعهم لأنّ أهله البيت ابصر بما في البيت وانّهم سمو بهذا السبب شيعة رفضة. “He and those who do not defy their reason or senses are truly and positively aware that these maid servants and male servants (of the Alids) and the students of the doctrine of the Prophet's family were nearer to the latter (cf. Goldziher ib. 508, n. 6) and better acquainted with their fundamental and derivative principles. For the Prophet's family is best aware of what is in the Family. It was for this reason that they (apparently referring to the people mentioned at the beginning of the quotation) were called Shi‘a and Rāfida.” Shi‘a—partisans of Ali. Rāfida seems to convey to the author's mind an essentially positive meaning: intense devotion to the Alidic family, while originally this meaning was merely the complement of the negative idea: the repudiation of the Companions.
I. Friedlaender,

Khalldn says: They exalt Ali above all other Companions "in accordance with the beliefs of Shiism," shortly afterwards remarking: "This (the system of the Sufis) is merely borrowed from the religious philosophy of the Shi'a and Rafida and their doctrines in their writings." All these examples are of rather late origin. For an earlier instance see the curious quotation from an ancient poet, Makkaré I, 799: "Thou sayest: 'Shiism consists in the love of the Bald one of Hashim.' Be then, I pray, a Rafidi, if thou wishest it, or become thou a Shiite!" As clearly differentiated the two terms appear in the definition Ikd 267: "They were called Rafida, because they 'deserted' Abû Bekr and 'Omar" (cf. p. 142, n. 6). The Shi'a, however, are outside of them (the Rafida). They are those who prefer Ali to Othman but follow Abû Bekr and 'Omar." Compare also above, Comm., p. 19.

With the consolidation of the Shi'a the "deserters" of Zeid b. Ali in 1221 developed into the Imamyya sect which out of the belief in the hereditary nature of the Imamate and the repudia-

1 In this case, however, and possibly in some other cases Rafida may be taken in the more limited meaning of Imamyya, see later in the text, p. 149 f.
2 For a few more equally late examples see Ahlwardt's Berlin Catalogue No. 2152.
3 Ali was bald, cf. Text 57.
4 The pun contained in these words is as clever as it is frivolous.
5 See later p. 158 middle.
ation of the Prophet's Companions evolved an independent system of religious doctrine and practice. Their antipodes within the Shi'a were the Zeidiyya, the followers of Zeid b. Ali. Hence Rawḍāfīd very aptly became the equivalent for Imāmiyya.¹ In this application our term is consistently used by Zeiditic and very frequently by Sunnitic writers. Thus a Zeidite writes كتاب

الرَّحْمَة عَلَى الرَّافضِة.

The early Zeidite al-Ḳāsim b. Ibrāhīm (died 246²) applies the word in the same manner, e. g., Comm. 104²⁸, similarly Zeid. Mutaz., p. 48. The Zeidite Suleimān b. Jarīr (see Comm. p. 7²) criticized the Rāfīda, i. e. the Imāmiyya (Shahr. 119). Jāḥiz begins his "Epistle on the Doctrines of the Shi'a" (Majmāʿat ar-Rasā'il, Cairo 1324ʰ, p. 178) with the characteristic words: "Know . . . that the Shi'a of Ali is Zeidite and Rāfīdite (زَيْدِيّة وَرَافِضٍ). The rest of them are isolated and not classified. The description of these two (Zeidites and Rāfīdites) makes (the description of) those outside of them unnecessary." Masudi VI, 23 designates as the sects of Islam الخوارج والمرجئة والرافضة والريديّة والمشروّبة; the same meaning apparently attaches to the word ibidem, V, 442.³ So, also, Tab. III, 168⁴¹³ رافضة . . وزيدية.

In the same sense our word is constantly applied by Ibn Ḥazm. He consciously defines it as contradictory to Zeidiyya Text 7⁴ ff. and very often applies it in this meaning in his Milāl. Thus Ed. IV, 17⁶⁰ الخوارج والزبدية والرافضة وجمهور المعتزلة: وجمع الرافضة من الشيعة . . ومعجم الزبدية من الشيعة⁴¹² similarly IV, 17⁶¹¹, ¹². Famous Imamites are designated as

¹ Comp. Snouck-Hurgronje, Mekka I, 33 ult.: "Ursprünglich bildeten die Zeiditen einen Gegensatz zu den Rāfīditen."
² Fihrist 193 ult. For another example see Brockelmann I, 186.—"Die imamitische Sekte der Zaiditen," ibidem, p. 185, is a contradictio in adiecto.
³ Elsewhere (V, 473) he allusively refers to the origin of the name of the Zeidiyya, for which he claims to have several explanations.
⁴ In this passage I. H. exactly defines the position of the Imāmiyya in the question of the "Imamate of the Inferior" (cf. p. 141, n. 8).
Rafidis, e.g., Ali b. Mitam (Comm. 601), Hisham b. al-Ḥakam (Comm. 651), Text 632, 742; Ed. II, 121; Muḥammad b. Ja'far (Sheitān at-Tāk, Comm. 599), Text 5015. As synonymous with Imāmiyya the word also appears Text 6216; Comm. 144, 155; Ed. IV, 100 f. and elsewhere.

It is only a slight variation of this usage when I. H. employs Rawāfid as an opposition of Imāmiyya. Thus Text 4415 (= Ed. IV, 179 penult.)

وقال بعض الروافض الإمامية وهى الفرقة التي
وقالت الفقاهة من (ib.)
الأمامية الرافضة كلهم وهم جمهور الشيعة 5
كلهم شيعة رافضة شعبة,
for which Br. and V. (see ib. n. 4) read 

On the other hand, the original meaning of Rawāfid as "repudiators," without the restriction of an organized sect, seems to be unconsciously present in Ibn Ḥazm's mind when he speaks ofроавафуд ал-ạамиyya, see this page note 5 and Text 4218=Ed. IV, 1798.

As an equivalent of Imāmiyya our word shares in all the modifications of that term, embracing all those who believe in the hereditary nature of the Imamate and in a written will of the Prophet (comp. Text 74). Thus the Zeidite al-Kāsim consciously defines Rawāfid as those who carry the Imamate

1 Bagd., too, counts him among the شيوخ الراوية
2 In the Arabic text (Ed. IV, 181 penult.) is to be read instead of روأكل.
3 Comp. Masudi VII, 231.
4 L. and Br. merely read (ib. note 8) وقالت فرقة من الراوية.
5 L. Br. instead (ib. n. 13) وقالت الفقاهة كلهما وهم من الإمامة من الراوية اليوم,
see later.
6 Comp. Burton, Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to al-Medinah and Meccah (ed. 1898), I, 206: "The Maghrabis, too, hearing that the Persians were Rafaz (heretics) crowded fiercely round to do a little Jihad, or Fighting for the Faith." The Persians were no doubt "Twelvers."
In the same sense probably, I Khalid. counts (II. 165, III, 72, 74) the Ismāʿiliyya, who transfer the Imamate from Jaʿfar to his son Ismāʿīl, and for a similar reason the Fatimides (III, 8) among the Rawāfiḍ. Jaʿfar’s son Mūsa is termed “Imām ar-Rāfīḍa,” and so is al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, the Mahdi’s father. With the spread of the Ithnāʿashāriyya, Rawāfiḍ just as Imāmiyya became a designation of the “Twelvers.” Thus Mirza 49 unmistakably says الأئتني عشرية التي يعترف بها بنروافض والروافض. His treatise entitled رسالة الروافض في رده الروافض is directed against the same sect. I. H. applies the word similarly, Ed. I, 1397 and Text 767, 777.

The further development of our term seems to have been influenced by the relation of the Sunnites to the Imāmiyya. However bitterly the former resented the Imāmiyya’s attitude towards the Companions, they still regarded them as being within the fold of Islam. Excluded from the Muhammedan community were only the Gulāt or Gāliya, who were considered

---

1 See Comm. p. 10425.
2 Another explanation is possible, see p. 152, n. 4.
3 One must, however, bear in mind that under the Fatimides the “repudiation” of the first Caliphs became obligatory as a state law, cf. Goldziher, Shi‘a 456.
4 I Bab., Ithbat 38.
5 Ib. 41. It is worthy of notice that al-Ḥasan is so designated by one of his admirers (although not a Shiite). This would indicate that, in Shiitic countries at least, our appellation lost much of its derogatory character.
7 See following note.
8 Wajjum farq al-qalala minhum (ayi min al-shi‘a). Xajorn ʿan farq al-islam fama farq al-zindīya wa al-imāmiyya, see ib. 99a and Makr. 345. Comp. also Introduction, p. 21.
an outgrowth of the Imāmiyya, but not identified with them. The nature of our term as a nomen odiosum sufficiently accounts for its occasional application as Ġulāt in distinction from the Imāmiyya. Thus IKhald. II, 164, in speaking of the Sufis who believe in the Divine nature of the Imams, observes: "they share this belief with the Imāmiyya and Rāfiḍa (i. e. Ġulāt), because they maintain the divinity of the Imam or the incarnation of the Deity in them." Ibidem l. 1: "the tenets of the Imāmiyya and Rāfiḍa of the Shi‘a as to the recognition of Ali’s superiority and the belief in his Imamate, owing to a written will of the Prophet, as well as the repudiation of the two Elders." As Ġulāt our word is probably to be explained Masudi VI, 26: and the most zealous and fervent believers of the Shi‘a and Rawa‘idiyya, who repudiate the authority of the two Elders, and the expression (p. 151) the latter might designate Ġulāt, as the Ismā‘iliyya hold ġuluww doctrines. Ib. III, 74 IKhald., alongside of the expression just quoted, says".

1 IKhald. I, 359 speaks of غلالة الإمامية, see the following note.
2 Comp. the sharp distinction drawn by Ibn Ḥazm, Text 5521 ff. The Imamites themselves energetically deny any connection with the Ġulāt, comp. Goldziher, Shi‘a 466, n. 2 and Comm. 9113.
3 Comp. IKhald. I, 358: "The Ġulāt have transgressed the limits of Reason and Faith by believing in the divinity of these Imams." See Ibn Ḥazm, Text 5519.
4 Outside the Imāmiyya, it is only the Ġulāt who hold these beliefs. The Zeidiyya reject them.—On the other hand, if we take Imamiyya in its restricted sense as Ithnā‘ashariyya (comp. p. 151 n. 6), Rāfiḍa here might possibly stand for the Ismā‘iliyya. Again, in the expression الإساعليّة من الرافضة, the latter might designate Ġulāt, as the Ismā‘iliyya hold ġuluww doctrines. Ib. III, 74 IKhald., alongside of the expression just quoted, says الإساعليّة من الشيعة.

5 I take من البيان as من البيان.
22) and other sects\(^1\) and the remaining sects of the Shi'a\(^2\) and the Râfiḍa\(^3\) as well as the Râwendiyya (Comm. p. 121 ff.) hold that the Imamate is permissible only in the Kureish tribe." A clear case of this usage is found IAthir VII, 341 l. 4, where instead of وَكَانَ مَغَالِّي (مَغَالِّي in the text) three codices read يُترّفَض. A curious as well as instructive example is afforded by the anecdote told Kâmil, ed. Wright 547 and Agh. III, 24. Wâsil b. 'Atâ, the founder of the Mu'tazila (Comm. p. 1138), was suffering from a linguistic defect and was consequently unable to pronounce the letter Râ. He bears a deadly hatred towards the ultra-Shiitic poet Bashshâr b. Burd, who had derogated him in one of his poems. Wâsil pithingly retorts: he would hire assassins to dispose of him لَوْلَا اِنَّ الْغَيْلَة

خُلِقَ مِنْ أَخْلَاقِ الْعَالِيَة

"were not assassination a specific quality of the Gâliya." Here the narrator remarks: Wâsil said Gâliya (Kâmil, ib.) "but he did not say al-Mânsûriyya nor al-Muğirîyya,"—two ultra-Shiitic sects known for their terroristic practices\(^5\)—because of the Râ contained in their names. This remark of the narrator is reproduced Agh. with a significant variant: ولم يقل الرافضة Wâsil said Gâliya, but not Râfiḍa. To the narrator in Agh. then the two expressions seemed synonymous.\(^6\)

---


\(^2\) Probably referring to the various sections of the Imâmîyya.

\(^3\) It is not clear whether والرافضة or والرافضة is to be read.

\(^4\) To whom Bashshâr (Comm. 24) belonged.

\(^5\) See Comm. 92 ff.

\(^6\) It is possible that this meaning of the word is unconsciously present in I. H.'s mind when he declares (Comm. 628=Ed. II, 784): "the Rawâfiḍ do not belong to the Muslims." For the Imamites are not excluded by I. H. from the community of Islam (cf. p. 153, n. 2). On the other hand, the belief in "Tabdîl" with which the Rawâfiḍ are charged in the above-mentioned passage is characteristic of the Imamites (cf. Text 51)
This application, however, cannot be said to be more than incidental. Often enough it is impossible to distinguish it from the usages enumerated before, the "Exaggerators" being at the same time "Repudiators." Besides, the Gāliya never became an independent organism as did the Imāmiyya. The constituency of the Gāliya is as fluctuating as is the name, which only later and even then not uncontestedly became the technical term for Ultra Shiites. At any rate, the cases in which Rawāfīd appears as a synonym of Gāliya are counterbalanced by the examples in which they are distinctly kept asunder. Thus Ḥādī al-Tirmīdī (van Vloten, Worgers, p. 58 ult.) expressly says that the Rawafīd became an independent organism as did the Imāmiyya. The constituency of the Gāliya is as fluctuating as is the name, which only later and even then not uncontestedly became the technical term for Ultra Shiites. At any rate, the cases in which Rawāfīd appears as a synonym of Gāliya are counterbalanced by the examples in which they are distinctly kept asunder. Thus Ḥādī al-Tirmīdī (van Vloten, Worgers, p. 58 ult.) expressly says that the Rawafīd became an independent organism as did the Imāmiyya. The constituency of the Gāliya is as fluctuating as is the name, which only later and even then not uncontestedly became the technical term for Ultra Shiites. At any rate, the cases in which Rawāfīd appears as a synonym of Gāliya are counterbalanced by the examples in which they are distinctly kept asunder. Thus Ḥādī al-Tirmīdī (van Vloten, Worgers, p. 58 ult.) expressly says that the Rawafīd became an independent organism as did the Imāmiyya. The constituency of the Gāliya is as fluctuating as is the name, which only later and even then not uncontestedly became the technical term for Ultra Shiites. At any rate, the cases in which Rawāfīd appears as a synonym of Gāliya are counterbalanced by the examples in which they are distinctly kept asunder. Thus Ḥādī al-Tirmīdī (van Vloten, Worgers, p. 58 ult.) expressly says that the Rawafīd became an independent organism as did the Imāmiyya. The constituency of the Gāliya is as fluctuating as is the name, which only later and even then not uncontestedly became the technical term for Ultra Shiites. At any rate, the cases in which Rawāfīd appears as a synonym of Gāliya are counterbalanced by the examples in which they are distinctly kept asunder. Thus Ḥādī al-Tirmīdī (van Vloten, Worgers, p. 58 ult.) expressly says that the Rawafīd became an independent organism as did the Imāmiyya. The constituency of the Gāliya is as fluctuating as is the name, which only later and even then not uncontestedly became the technical term for Ultra Shiites. At any rate, the cases in which Rawāfīd appears as a synonym of Gāliya are counterbalanced by the examples in which they are distinctly kept asunder. Thus Ḥādī al-Tirmīdī (van Vloten, Worgers, p. 58 ult.) expressly says that the Rawafīd became an independent organism as did the Imāmiyya. The constituency of the Gāliya is as fluctuating as is the name, which only later and even then not uncontestedly became the technical term for Ultra Shiites. At any rate, the cases in which Rawāfīd appears as a synonym of Gāliya are counterbalanced by the examples in which they are distinctly kept asunder. Thus Ḥādī al-Tirmīdī (van Vloten, Worgers, p. 58 ult.) expressly says that the Rawafīd became an independent organism as did the Imāmiyya. The constituency of the Gāliya is as fluctuating as is the name, which only later and even then not uncontestedly became the technical term for Ultra Shiites. At any rate, the cases in which Rawāfīd appears as a synonym of Gāliya are counterbalanced by the examples in which they are distinctly kept asunder. Thus Ḥādī al-Tirmīdī (van Vloten, Worgers, p. 58 ult.) expressly says that the Rawafīd became an independent organism as did the Imāmiyya. The constituency of the Gāliya is as fluctuating as is the name, which only later and even then not uncontestedly became the technical term for Ultra Shiites. At any rate, the cases in which Rawāfīd appears as a synonym of Gāliya are counterbalanced by the examples in which they are distinctly kept asunder. Thus Ḥādī al-Tirmīdī (van Vloten, Worgers, p. 58 ult.) expressly says that the Rawafīd became an independent organism as did the Imāmiyya. The constituency of the Gāliya is as fluctuating as is the name, which only later and even then not uncontestedly became the technical term for Ultra Shiites. At any rate, the cases in which Rawāfīd appears as a synonym of Gāliya are counterbalanced by the examples in which they are distinctly kept asunder. Thus Ḥādī al-Tirmīdī (van Vloten, Worgers, p. 58 ult.) expressly says that the Rawafīd became an independent organism as did the Imāmiyya. The constituency of the Gāliya is as fluctuating as is the name, which only later and even then not uncontestedly became the technical term for Ultra Shiites. At any rate, the cases in which Rawāfīd appears as a synonym of Gāliya are counterbalance.
the outcome of a more hostile attitude toward the Shiites, particularly towards the Zeidiyya, on the part of the Sunnites, who now indiscriminately brand by this derogatory term all those who swerve from the Sunna. Thus the Dictionary of Technical Terms, ed. Sprenger, bluntly declares: 

الروافض من كُرّ الفرق الإسلامیة وَتُستَّی سَبِيل‌الشیعة أيضًا. Bagd. and Isfr., who elaborately derive the origin of the word from Zeid b. Ali, consistently apply Rawafid to all the sects of the Shi‘a without exception. To quote a few examples out of many: Bagd. 6b

As the Zeidiyya and Imamiyya, so are the Gulat and their various sections counted among the Rawafid: fol. 103a

the Zeidiyya themselves,—for it is only with reference to the Zeidiyya that this usage of our word differs from the one preceding it. Thus Shahrastani, having narrated the incident with Zeid b. Ali anno 122b, observes (p. 118):

Wellhausen's statement (Opp. 96, n. 1): "Sabaijja ist ein älterer, Rāfida ein späterer Name für dieselbe Sache" is not in accordance with the facts set forth above.
with that of Bagd.: Isfr. 8b. Makrizi in his account on Muhammedan sects employs the word in the same general sense, including among the Rawâfîd the Imâmîyya as well as the Zeidiyya. This usage is also found much earlier. IKot. 300 presupposes it when he remarks: The same meaning is apparently assumed Tab. III, 1465 (anno 247): a man recites before Mutawakkil a poem against the Râfîda in which it is argued that a daughter has no hereditary claims, and receives from the overjoyed Caliph 10,000 Dirhems and the governorship of Bahrein and Yamama. This argument, which is directed against the descendants of Fâtîma, affects the Zeidiyya as well as the Imâmîyya.

Ibn Ḥazm seems to refrain from this unrestricted use of the word. The only exception—and this perhaps a deceptive one—is found Text 4011 (=Ed. IV, 178) , where, instead of the

---

1 The Gulât are excluded from Islam. Bağdâdî, who counts four sections (p. 155), is inconsistent, cf. p. 151, n. 8.

2 Makrizi’s statement (Comm. 12) may apply to the Shi‘a in general or to the Imâmîyya of whom he speaks in the quoted passage. On the relation of the Mu‘tazila to the Imâmîyya, see also Goldziher, Shi‘a, p. 494.

3 This is apparently the source for Ikd 269: and this usage is somewhat inconsistent with the statement p. 148. Elsewhere (cf. Comm. 26) Ikd designates as Rawâfîd those who believe in the “return” of Muhammed b. al-Hanaâfiyya, i.e., the Keisâniyya.


5 For the author speaks of the “depravities” of these sects, cf. Introduction, p. 21.
Those who have perused the material presented in this appendix with some measure of attention will have observed that the word Shi'a—not unlike Rawâfd—is not a sharply and definitely circumscribed term but is subject to not inconsiderable modifications. In distinction from Rawâfd, the term Shi'a has nothing objectionable or derogatory about it: the Shiites themselves unhesitatingly assume this appellation. To the Sunnites as well, owing to the ever increasing prevalence of pro-Alidic sentiments among the masses, Shi'a even in the sense of "Shi'at 'Ali" conveys no objectionable meaning,—this, as it were, respectable character of the word being, in our opinion, the main reason for the gradual spread of Rawâfd at its expense. The application of Shi'a by the Sunnites, just as that of Rawâfd, is largely conditioned by their attitude towards the Zeidiyya. The disagreement between the Sunna and Zeidiyya is not one of deep-seated antagonism. In point of fact, the whole difference reduces itself to the question as to the candidacy for the Imamate. According to the Zeidiyya, the Imamate is confined to the descendants of Fâtima; the Sunnites extend it to the whole of Kureish. Since, however, the Sunnites for the most part agree with the Zeidiyya as to the excellence of

1 Cf. also Comm. 215.
2 The former superscription however is the original one, see the reference quoted Text 40, n. 3.
3 Cf. p. 146, n. 1.
4 Cf. Shahr. 1438 (in a quotation from Ibn an-Nu'mán, Comm. 595), also Goldziher, Shi'a 470, n. 2.
5 Cf. ZDMG. 50, 111.
6 i. e., Hasanides as well as Huseinides,—provided, of course, their personal fitness (cf. Text 755 ff. and Comm.).—Wellhausen's assumption (Opp. 98): "Sie (die Zeidijja) unterscheiden sich von der Râfida durch ihr Eintreten für das Haus Husains" contradicts one of the fundamental tenets of the Zeidiyya. That Zeid b. Ali was a descendant of Husein was mere chance and wholly indifferent to the Zeidiyya or to Zeid himself. Cf. Comm. 235 ff.
Ali and his family, and the Zeidiyya, on the other hand, agree with the Sunnites as to the legitimacy of the two Elders, the gap between them seems practically to close. "The Zeidiyya," says Makr. 354', "are the best among the Shi'a, for they admit the Imamate of Abû Bekr and deny the existence of a written will concerning the Imamate of Ali." This stands to reason why Mukaddasi, e. g., places the Zeidiyya outside the Shi'a, applying the latter term to the Imâmiyya and other radical sections of the Shi'a. Thus p. 38 n. d (see above p. 142 n. 6): "الشيعة والذين على الزيدية: "the Shi'a prevailed upon the Zeidiyya," or p. 128.; "الغلفاء الأربعة وقد علمت ما يقول فيه الحوارج وجمهور الشيعة."

The "stupid Shiites" can only refer to the Imâmiyya and other radical sections, as the Zeidiyya, on the whole, refrain from attacking the four Caliphs.

It is nothing but a different consequence of the same attitude of mind when, on the contrary, we find that the term Shi'a, without any objectionable by-meaning, is applied to the Zeidiyya, to the exclusion of the Imâmiyya who are designated as Rafid. This is clearly the case with the utterance of Ikd, p. 148 and the hadith p. 146 (cf. p. 147 n. 2). It may also be applicable in the phrase الشيعة والرافضة, of which several examples were quoted p. 147 f., notably so in the case of IKhald, p. 148.

With the rise within the Zeidiyya of sections which, unfaithful to their founder, did not refrain from the "denunciation of the Companions," the attitude of the Sunna became one of hostility and the term Shi'a, gradually assuming a distinct

1 This is clearly shown by the variant (note a) f.
2 As different from Zeidiyya, Shi'a is also applied by Masudi, see p. 152.
3 Cf. p. 146, n. 1.
4 This is in contradiction with Ikd, p. 156, n. 3. But the latter passage is borrowed from Ibn Koteiba, see ib.
5 Ibn Khaldûn speaks of their writings, which would point to a dogmatically consolidated sect.
6 Cf. p. 155, n. 1. The sect mentioned Comm. 75 limits the Imamate to the Hasanides, yet indulges in the denunciation of the Companions.
heterodox character, was now applied to all sects of Shiism, from the Zeidiyya to its farthest ramifications, the "Gulât."

Lastly, mention must be made of a term used by the Shiites for the same polemical purposes as was Rawāfīd by the Sunnites. We refer to the expression Nawāṣib, which seems to have been patterned after Rawāfīd. Ample information about the meaning and history of this designation can be drawn from Goldziher's writings. Originally Nawāṣib stood for the exact reverse of Rawāfīd: the "enemies" or "haters" (of Ali), and was confined to the extreme Khārijites. Gradually its meaning expanded so that it finally embraced all Sunnites, however far they were from hating Ali.

In addition we may remark that the Imāmiyya polemically apply the same term even to the Zeidiyya, with whom the superiority of Ali is a cardinal doctrine. Kashi 149 quotes Ja'far as-Ṣādiq as saying: Further utterances of a similar tendency can be found in the same passage.

---

1 So nearly all writers.—On the relation of the Gulât to the Shi'ā comp. Introduction, p. 21 and Index s.v. Shi'ā.

2 Cf. Muḥaddīsī 387: Wāma ariša lُقْب بِهَا اهْلُ chances Fāl al-hādiyya Fād al-nawṣaš al-bāb al-bāb. Thus the Hashwīyya correspond with the Murji'ā and the Nawāṣib with the Rawāfīd.

3 Shi'ā 491 ff., ZDMG. 36, 281, Muh. St. II, 120.

4 Muḥīṭ al-Muḥīṭ explains it in this way: Nuṣṣāb, which occurs several times in Kashi, is not recorded in the dictionaries.
### APPENDIX B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Ali (k. 40)</th>
<th>2. al-Hasan (d. 49)</th>
<th>3. al-Husein (k. 61)</th>
<th>4. Ali (Zein al-'Abidin, d. 94)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by Khaulah al-Hanaфиyya</td>
<td>by Fatiha</td>
<td>by Fatima</td>
<td>by Khaulah al-Hanaфиyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammed (k. 145)</td>
<td>Muhammed (II. 35 n. 3)</td>
<td>Muhammed (k. 219)</td>
<td>'Omar Zeid (k. 122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idris</td>
<td>Idris</td>
<td>Muhammed (at-Tāmm)</td>
<td>Idris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahya</td>
<td>Yahya</td>
<td>Muhammed (at-Dalīl, d. 164)</td>
<td>Muhammed (at-Dalīl, d. 164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammed (k. 145)</td>
<td>Muhammed (II. 35 n. 3)</td>
<td>Muhammed (at-Dalīl, d. 146)</td>
<td>Muhammed (at-Dalīl, d. 146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idris</td>
<td>Idris</td>
<td>Idris</td>
<td>Idris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammed (at-Dalīl, d. 146)</td>
<td>Muhammed (at-Dalīl, d. 146)</td>
<td>Muhammed (at-Dalīl, d. 146)</td>
<td>Muhammed (at-Dalīl, d. 146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idris</td>
<td>Idris</td>
<td>Idris</td>
<td>Idris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ubeidallah (Mahdi of Fatimid)</td>
<td>'Ubeidallah (Mahdi of Fatimid)</td>
<td>'Ubeidallah (Mahdi of Fatimid)</td>
<td>'Ubeidallah (Mahdi of Fatimid)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This list is primarily based on *Gen. Leyd*. For the twelve Imams the data of IKot. 108 ff. and Diyārbekrī (cf. Comm. 7826) have been utilized. The persons whose names appear in italics are mentioned in this treatise and are registered in the Index; the others are mere links in the genealogical chain. The dates of death differ considerably in the various sources. I have frequently followed IKot.-d. = died; k. = killed. According to the Imamiyya, all Imams, except the twelfth (the Mahdi), were killed (see Comm. 3015 ff. and the list quoted 7826). I merely followed the historical data. The Imams of the Ithna'ashariyya and Sab'iyya have been marked by figures. The titles of the Imams are numerous. Only one has been given in each case. The children of a single man are arranged according to age, as they are given in *Gen. Leyd*. Wüstenfeld, *Tabellen* (list Y and Z) frequently differs in this respect.


3 Comm. 87 n. 2. Not found in *Gen. Leyd.* nor in any other source. IKot. 110 registers 'Abdallah as the only brother of Ja'far.

4 I. 51" omitted through oversight. Cf. II. 639.
INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS.\(^1\)

**Abatur**, deity of Mandaeans, II. 84\(^{23}\).

al-'Abbàs, II. 20\(^{11}\), 108\(^{10}\).

'Abbasids, see Imamate.

‘Abdallah b. al-'Abbàs, II. 25\(^{15}\).

``

b. ‘Abdallah b. Shuneif, II. 74\(^{16}\).
``

b. Aḥmad b. Abî Zeid, II. 41 n. 2.

``

b. ‘Amr b. al-Ḥarb (II. 124\(^{26}\)), see ‘A. b. al-Ḥārîth.
``

b. ‘A. b. al-Ḥârîth (II. 124\(^{26}\)), see ‘A. b. al-Ḥârîth.

``

b. al-Ḥârîth (II. 124\(^{26}\)), see ‘A. b. al-Ḥârîth.
``

Harbiyya, II. 124 f.

``

b. al-Ḥârîth, I. 37\(^{5}\), 71, II. 90\(^{11}\), 124 ff.
``

b. Ja’far b. Abî Ṭâlib, II. 45 n. 2.

``

b. al- Aftâh, II. 114\(^{10}\) ff.

Aftahiyya, ib.

``

b. al-Kharb (II. 124\(^{26}\)), see ‘A. b. al-Ḥârîth.
``

Kharbiyya, I. 71\(^{15}\), II. 124 f.

``

b. Lahi’a, II. 43\(^{3}\).
``

b. Mu‘āwiya, I. 45\(^{15}\), 71\(^{14}\), II. 24 n. 1, 44 ff., 125\(^{11}\).

Janâhiyya, see Mu‘āwiya b. ‘Abdallah.

``

b. Muğîra b. Sa‘īd, I. 60\(^{3}\).
``

b. Nauf, II. 73\(^{18}\) f.
``

b. Sabā, called Ibn as-Saudā, accounts on, I. 3. n. 1,

II. 19, 100; Jew, embraced Islam to injure it,

I. 37\(^{7}\), 45\(^{2}\), II. 17; against ‘Othmān, I. 37\(^{10}\),

II. 19\(^{4}\); originates Raj’a and Gāîba, II. 27\(^{3}\);

Raj’a of Muhammed, II. 24\(^{19}\), 25 n. 1; Raj’a of

---

\(^1\) The authorities quoted as such throughout the treatise have been excluded from this index. On account of lack of space only the most important items have been specified. Unless otherwise stated, the names are those of persons. The words ending in -iyya designate sects. The latter appear under the heading of the person to which they belong, a cross-reference always indicating that person. The words printed in italics will be found as special items. The quotations refer to line and page. Where the line is left out, the whole page or most of it deals with that item. I. refers to the first part of this treatise (vol. xxviii. of this Journal); II. to the second (vol. xxix). In the alphabetical arrangement the article in its various forms and b. (=bnu) have not been counted. s. v. refers to the preceding item in italics; ib. to the preceding figure. Fatḥa is rendered by a, occasionally by e, ḍamma by u and o: the diphthong fatḥa + yà by ai and ei. A list of Arabic words is appended to this index.
'Ali denying that he died, I. 45, II. 25, 30, 43 f., 95, cf. 39, 128, and maintaining that in clouds, I. 45, II. 42 ff.; belief in divinity of 'Ali, I. 65 ult. ff., II. 17, 99; cf. II. 91; banished by 'Ali, II. 42 n. 1, 48 n. 6, or burned, II. 100 n. 1; his adherents burned by 'Ali, II. 99 f.

Sabæi, in I. 45, 65 n. 7, II. 17, 101 n., 155 penult.; called Sababiyya, II. 41 f.; principal Alidic sect, II. 108 n.; synonymous with radical heresy, II. 100 n., cf. 88 n. 1, 100 ff.; and Rawḍiyya, II. 155 n.

'Abdallah b. Sabbāb, II. 42 n. 1.

b. Yāsīn, I. 55 n. 1, II. 76.


Abdarrāhmān b. Muljam, I. 72 n., II. 128.

Abīa, II. 123.

Abnā', appellation for Persians, I. 35 ult., II. 186.

al-Abtar, II. 128 ff. See Kathir al-Abtar.

Abū 'l-Abbās ar-Rubūbādī, II. 128 ff.

Rubūbādīyya, ib. See ar-Rawandi and Rawandiyya.

Abdallah al-'Ājānī, II. 17, 110 n. 1.

'ash-Shākiyya, II. 75, 109, 110 n. 1.

'Ali (ash-Shakkāk), I. 52 penult., 75, II. 66.

Bashshār al-Ash'ari, II. 96.

Bekr and 'Omar, legitimate Imams, II. 21, 74, 129, 180, 188 f., 141, 158, or illegitimate, I. 79, 141 penult.; hated and denounced by the Shi'a, I. 85, 52, II. 143, 28 n. 1, 42, 64, 65, 142–148, 151 n. 3, 153. See Companions.

b 'Ayash, see Ibn 'Ayash.

'Abdallah al-Isfahānī, author of Ḥagānī, II. 144 n. 6.

'Abdullāh b. Muḥammad, II. 89, 126. See Imamate.

Ḥāshimiyya, II. 35 ff., 89.

Hudeil, I. 30, 53, II. 14 ff., 16, 58, 59, 60 f., 66 f., 74.

Hureira ar-Rubūbādī, see Abū 'l-Abbās.

'Īsa al-Isfahānī, II. 90.

Ismā'īl al-Bittikhi, I. 30 ult., II. 114, 124.

Bittikhiyya, I. 30 ult.

Jārūd, called Surbūb, II. 22.

Jārūdiyya, I. 42, 43 ff., 74, II. 22, 136, 153 n. 1.

Surbūbiyya, II. 22.

Kāmil, I. 55, 80, II. 76.
Abû Karb, II. 35\textsuperscript{24}, 36 n. 1.

Karbiyya, \textit{ib}.

" 'l Kâsim 'Ali al-Murtaḍâ, I. 51\textsuperscript{17}, II. 63.

" 'l an-Najjâr, \textit{see} Ibn Ḥaushab.

" 'l ar-Râzî, I. 52\textsuperscript{1}, II. 63\textsuperscript{23}.

Khâtîm, \textit{sec} al-Bawârî.

" 'l Khâṭṭâb, II. 112 ff., divinity of, I. 34\textsuperscript{19}, 69\textsuperscript{4}, 17\textsuperscript{3}; attacked by \textit{Jayfar as-Ṣâdiḳ}, II. 14\textsuperscript{25}, 90\textsuperscript{12}, 96\textsuperscript{2}.

Khâtâbiyya, II. 112; factions of, I. 7, 64 f., 69\textsuperscript{14}, II. 96 f.; worship \textit{Jayfar as-Ṣâdiḳ}, I. 68, 69\textsuperscript{2}, II. 106\textsuperscript{12}; allegorize Koran, II. 14; claim to avoid death. I. 69\textsuperscript{10}, II. 24 n. 1, 72\textsuperscript{20}.

" Khirâsh (I. 65 n. 4), \textit{see} Khidâsh.

" Kubeis, mountain, II. 67\textsuperscript{17}.

" 'l Kurûs, II. 36 n. 1.

" Lahab, II. 90\textsuperscript{6}.

" Mâlik al-Ḥaḍrami, I. 75 ult., II. 133\textsuperscript{14}.

" Mansûr al-'Ijîl, called al-Kisf, I. 34\textsuperscript{19}, 62 ff., II. 89 ff., 92\textsuperscript{12} ff., 95\textsuperscript{31}.

Mansûriyya, or Kisfiyya (cf. I. 63 n. 4), I. 63, II. 92\textsuperscript{14}, 18, 97\textsuperscript{12}, 153\textsuperscript{17}.

" 'l Muẓaffar b. Aḍrash, II. 71.

" 'l Mikdâm Thâ'it (?) al-Ḥaddâd, II. 130\textsuperscript{4}.

" Mîkhnâf, II. 141\textsuperscript{9}.

" Muslim, I. '36\textsuperscript{3}, 45, 70\textsuperscript{1}, II. 30\textsuperscript{10}, 44\textsuperscript{18}, 21, 64\textsuperscript{10}, 94\textsuperscript{7}, 118 f., 120\textsuperscript{12}, 124\textsuperscript{14}, 17.

Abû-Muslimiyya, II. 118\textsuperscript{23}, 119 n. 2, or Muslimiyya, II. 119\textsuperscript{5}, \textsuperscript{11}, \textit{See} Abû Salma; Iṣḥâḳ.

" Sa'id Abû 'l Kheir, I. 73\textsuperscript{3}, II. 128 f.

" 'al-Ḥasan b. Bahrâm al-Jannâbî, I. 68\textsuperscript{19}, II. 108\textsuperscript{17}, 109\textsuperscript{2}.

" Salma, II. 119 n. 2.

Baslamiyya \textit{ib}., 124\textsuperscript{19}.

" Sufyân, father of Mu'âwiyâ, I. 68 n. 8, II, 14\textsuperscript{29}, 110\textsuperscript{14}.

" ' . \textit{Karmatian}, II. 110\textsuperscript{5}.

" Tâhir, II. 95\textsuperscript{29}, 108\textsuperscript{22} ff.

" Ya'la, I. 51 ult., II. 63\textsuperscript{14}.

" Zakariyya al-Khayyât, II. 17\textsuperscript{3}.

Achamoth, Gnostic hypostasis, II. 83\textsuperscript{28}.

Adam, I. 68\textsuperscript{1}, II, 45 n. 3, 104, 116\textsuperscript{1}, 121\textsuperscript{1} ff.

Aḍdâd, \textit{see} Clementines.

Aden, in Yemen, II. 110\textsuperscript{5}, \textsuperscript{16}.

Afsfîn, II. 101, n. 1.

Aftahiyya, \textit{see} 'Abdallah b. Ja'far al-Aftâh.

Ahmad b. Hâbiṭ (II. 10\textsuperscript{41}), \textit{see} next.

" b. Ḥâ'it, I. 30\textsuperscript{17}, II. 10\textsuperscript{7} ff., 11\textsuperscript{5}, 11\textsuperscript{7}, 64\textsuperscript{9} f., 90\textsuperscript{23}, 91\textsuperscript{23}.

" b. Idrîs, I. 54 penult.

" b. Nânûs (II. 10\textsuperscript{22}), \textit{see} A. b. Yânûsh.
Ahmad b. Salih, II. 704.

b. Yanush, I. 3013, II. 1017 ff., 6410, 8828, 9028, 9124.

Ahrar, appellation for Persians, I. 35 ult., II. 1813.

al-Ahwal, II. 65 n. 2.

*Aminiyâ, II. 1031.

*A'isha, I. 351, 5216, II. 2011, 1304.

*Ajarida, Khârijite sect, I. 311, II. 1128, 121.

'Ali b. Abi Talib, name, I. 53 penult., II. 73; age, I. 5624, II. 7724; appearance, I. 57, II. 78; grave unknown, II. 439 ff., or buried in Kufa, II. 43 n. 3; worthiest of Imamate, I. 3224, 41, 798, II. 1391, 15915; acknowledged even by Râwanidiyya, II. 122 n. 1; loved by Sunna, II. 143 n. 6, 146; exalted by Sûfa, II. 1481; conceded Imamate to three first Caliphs, I. 7415, II. 12919, hence declared apostate. I. 5519, 7924; denounced, II. 145 n. 2; hated by Khawârij, II. 6424; Imamate of: and eleven descendants, see Twelvers, and three sons, see Keisâniyya, and two sons, II. 11315 ff., he alone Imam, I. 5523, II. 7828, 154 n. 1; possessed and bequeathed Mystic lore, II. 2011, 32, 33; stops sun, I. 532, II. 121, 88 f.; resuscitates dead, II. 83 n. 1; was not killed and will return, I. 34 ult., see 'Abdallah b. Sabâ; in the clouds, s. v.; diversity of, s. v., I. 7215, II. 6215, 22, 102 f., 1121, 127; Demiurge (Creator), I. 6219, II. 91, 99 f., 127, 1281; as such had neither wife nor children, II. 1271 ff.; punishes 'Abdallah b. Sabâ, s. v., and other exaggerators, I. 3710, 66, II. 99 f.; designated as al-Kisf, II. 8923, as "dâbbat al-ard, " II. 8617; compared with Aaron, II. 4829, 13511, with Jesus, s. v., with Joshua, II. 68, 70 f., 13526; warned by Prophet against Râwâfiqd, II. 146; objects to religious discussions, II. 1521; see also Imamate, Imâmiyya, Muhammed, Naqsh, Zeidiyya.

al-Azdari', II. 12736 ff.

Azdariyya, ib.

b. al-Faql, I. 68 n. 8, II. 171, 1101 ff.

b. Haitham, see 'A. b. Mitham.

b. al-Hasan b. al-Faql, II. 4 n. 2.

b. al-Husein b. 'Ali, I. 582, 682, 7515.

b. b. Mûsa, see Abû 'l-Kâsim 'Ali.

b. Ismâ'il b. Mitham, see 'A. b. Mitham.

b. Mansûr, I. 7522, II. 1381, 52.

b. Mitham, I. 511, 7522, II. 4013, 60, 13813, 1501.


b. b. al-Fayyâd, II. 10824, 31, cf. I. 672.


an-Nâjîr, II. 172, 110 n. 1.

b. al-Warşand (I. 54 n. 7), see Ibn Warşand.

Almoravides, II. 4929, 7619.

'Amîr b. Shurâhil, see ash-Sha'bî.
Vol. xxix.] The Heterodoxies of the Shiites, etc.

'Āmir b. aṭ-Tufeil, I. 54, II. 73.
'Amr b. al-Ṭuḥayy, I. 54, II. 73.
'Amr b. al-Ṭuḥayy, I. 54, II. 73.
'Amr b. al-Ṭuḥayy, I. 54, II. 73.
Aristotle, II. 57.
Arms, use of, see Khashabiyya.
Asad b. Hoṣayn, I. 54, II. 73.
Asad b. Ḥumayd, I. 54, II. 73.
Aristotle, II. 57.
Ash'ari, I. 29 ff., II. 73, 81.
'Ammar al-'Ibadi, II. 98 ff.
Asad b. Šam'a, I. 34, II. 90.
Asad b. Šam'a, I. 34, II. 90.
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Asad b. Šam'a, I. 34, II. 90.
Aristotle, II. 57.
Biṭṭikhiyya, see Abū Ismā‘īl.
Bunān (II. 88), see Bayān b. Sam‘ān.
al- Būrāni, see al-Bawārī.

Būrāniyya, II. 110ff.

Burhūt, well, II. 85ff.
Butriyya, or Buteiriyya, see al-Abtar.

Cabbage, see Dietary regulations.
Cabbala, II. 81ff., 104ff.
Carmathians, see Karmatians.
Christ, see Jesus.
Christians and Christianity, I. 3 n. 1, II. 10ff, 119, 47ff, 61ff, 87ff, 91, 101. See Jesus.

Clementines (Pseudo-), the True Prophet (or Successive Incarnation),
II. 45ff, 85ff., 92ff, 104ff., 121ff., cf. I. 60ff, 62ff.; Syzygy (Aḍḍād),
II. 116, 127ff.; origin of evil, II. 85 n. 3.

Communism, of wives (and property), I. 87ff, 70ff, II. 19ff, 120ff.
Companions, of Prophet, hide Naṣṣ, I. 22, 74ff, II. 22ff, 61ff; declared
apostates, I. 74ff, 79ff, II. 22ff, 142ff; hated and denounced by
Shī‘a, I. 35ff, II. 41ff, 69ff, 61ff, 75ff, 130ff, 142-147, 155, 158. Cf.
Abū Bekr and ‘Omar.

Concealment, of Imam, see Ǧaibā.

Dahriyya, I. 45 ult., II. 46ff, 54ff.
Dammiyya, II. 102ff.
Dāwud al-Ḥawārī (or al-Jawārī, or al-Jawāribī), I. 31ff, 53ff, 75ff, II.
67ff.

b. Kathir ar-Rakki, I. 75ff, II. 133ff.

Death, claim to avoid, II. 96ff, 113ff ff. See Abūl-Khaṭṭāb.
Deilam, province, II. 32ff.
Di‘bil, poet, II. 145ff.

Dietary, regulations, entirely abolished, see Precepts; swine partly
permitted, I. 34ff, II. 13ff; cabbage forbidden, I. 53ff, II. 73ff,
other vegetables, II. 76ff, 110ff.; all fruits or vegetables raised
in dung, I. 55ff, II. 76ff.

Dikrweih, see Zikrweih.

Dirār b. ‘Amr, I. 30, II. 94ff.

Discussions, religious, forbidden, I. 35ff, 49ff ff., II. 15ff.


Druzes, sect, II. 124ff.
Du Manakh, tribe, I. 68 n. 8, II. 110ff.

Eli’zēr, servant of Abraham, still alive, I. 46ff, II. 46ff, 47ff.

Exaggerators, or

Extremists, see Gūlāt.

al- Faḍl, of Baṣra, I. 30ff, II. 11ff.
Faith, nature of, II. 8ff, 9ff.
Fakhr ad-Din ar-Rażí, II. 67\textsuperscript{16}, 72 n. 2.

al-Faraj b. al-Ḥasan b. Ḥaushab, see Ibn Ḥaushab.

Fāris, province, I. 45\textsuperscript{a}, II. 32\textsuperscript{b}, 44\textsuperscript{34}, 114\textsuperscript{23}.

Fāṭima, I. 73\textsuperscript{2}, II. 20\textsuperscript{1}, 127\textsuperscript{a} ff.; descendants of, see Imamate.

Fatimids, II. 151\textsuperscript{1}, n. 3. See ‘Ubeidallah.

al-Fayyāḍ b. ṬAli, I. 66 f., II. 102 f., 104\textsuperscript{4}.

Fifth, tax to Imām, I. 63\textsuperscript{8}, II. 95\textsuperscript{17}.

Gabriel (Jibril), I. 56, 80\textsuperscript{2}, II. 77, 84 n. 2.

Gaiba, II. 27\textsuperscript{9}, 28, 46\textsuperscript{1}, 47\textsuperscript{27}.

Gâliya, see Ǧulāt.

Ǧīfār, see Abū Ǧīfār.

Gnosticism, II. 80 ff., 91\textsuperscript{4}, 92\textsuperscript{1}.

God, attributes, I. 81\textsuperscript{14}, 61\textsuperscript{14}, II. 88\textsuperscript{22}; his knowledge, I. 52 penult., II. 66\textsuperscript{22}; his will, I. 53\textsuperscript{10}, II. 72\textsuperscript{9}; anthropomorphistic conception of (Tāshbih), I. 53\textsuperscript{1} ff., 59, 61\textsuperscript{1}, II. 67 f., 135\textsuperscript{15}; alphabet used for description of, I. 59\textsuperscript{6}, II. 81\textsuperscript{12}; crown on his head, I. 59\textsuperscript{6}, 13, II. 81, 83; the Greatest Name (and names) of, I. 59\textsuperscript{6}, II. 13\textsuperscript{7}, II. 82 f., 87\textsuperscript{20}; more than one God, II. 88\textsuperscript{20}, 90\textsuperscript{27} ff. See Imams, Incarnation.

Ǧulāt and Ǧuluww, I. 42 ult., 55 ff., 65 ff., II. 17\textsuperscript{2}, 154; original meaning of, II. 12\textsuperscript{4}, 145 n. 2; relation to Shi‘a, I. 21, II. 76\textsuperscript{8}, 116\textsuperscript{14}, 152; excluded from Islam, I. 55 n. 7, II. 151 n. 8, 156 n. 1; smuggled into Islam by Persians, II. 16 ff., by Jews, 17, into Christianity by Paul, 16\textsuperscript{28} ff., 17; compared with Christians, II. 101. See also Imāmiyya, Rawâfi‘īdī, Shi‘a, Zeidiyya.

Gurābiyya, I. 56, II. 77.

Ǧuweir, drinking place, I. 67\textsuperscript{11}, II. 103\textsuperscript{84}.

Ḫabashiyya (II. 94\textsuperscript{11}), see Khashabiyya.

Ḫabīb b. Aus, II. 68\textsuperscript{16}.

Ḫadīth, see Traditions.

Ḫadramaut, II. 85\textsuperscript{19}.

Ḫājir, mountain, I. 43 n. 7, II. 23\textsuperscript{8}.

Ḫajj (Pilgrimage), I. 68, II. 107 f.

al-Ḫakam b. ‘Uteiba, II. 130\textsuperscript{1}.

Ḫakamiyya, see Ḥishām b. al-Ḫakam.

Ḫakima, see Ḥukeima.

al-Ḫallāj, I. 34\textsuperscript{15}, 69\textsuperscript{7}, II. 13\textsuperscript{19}, 14\textsuperscript{1}, 17\textsuperscript{1}, 24 n. 2, 30\textsuperscript{4}, 114 f.

Ḫallājiyya, II. 13\textsuperscript{19}.

al-Ḫalwānī, II. 110\textsuperscript{5}.

Ḫamadan, city, II. 128 n. 1.

Ḫandān, tribe, I. 68 penult., II. 131 n. 1.

Ḫāmid b. al-‘Abbās, I. 69\textsuperscript{9}, II. 115\textsuperscript{6}.

Ḫanrawiyya, see Iṣhāk b. Muhammed.

Ḫamza b. ‘Omar, II. 90\textsuperscript{12}, 96\textsuperscript{3}.

Ḫarāt, province, II. 44\textsuperscript{11}, 119\textsuperscript{1}.

Ḫarb b. Abdallah, II. 135 n. 4.

Ḫarbiyya, see ‘Abdallah b. Ḥarb.
al-Ḥārith (=Suleim b. Masʿūd), II. 1251.
   " ash-Shaʿmī, II. 9011.
Hārithiyya, see Ḯāṭḥ b. Zeid.
Harranians, II. 733, 8028.
Hārūn b. Saʿd, II. 10614, n. 5.

al-Ḥasan b. Abī Mansūr, I. 63 n. 10.
   " b. Muhammad al-ʿAskari, I. 48, 581, 76, II. 52 ff., 12715, 1514, n. 5.
   " b. Warṣand, see Ibn Warṣand.
   " b. Bahram. see Abū Saʿīd al-Ḥasan.
   " b. Faraq b. Haushab, see Ibn Haushab.
   " b. Ḥayy (II. 1314), see al-H. b. Ṣāliḥ.
   " b. Ismāʿil b. al-Husein, I. 43 n. 11, II. 32 n. 2.
   " b. Jaʿfar an-Nūbakhti, I. 771, II. 1344.
   " b. Ṣāliḥ b. Ḥayy (II. 13026), I. 30, 74 f., 7912, II. 129, 130 ff. Ṣāliḥiyya, II. 12931, 131 n. 2.
   " Butriyya (or Buteiriyya), see al-Abtar.

Hāshim b. Ḥakīm, (II. 1204), see al-Muṣḥana1.
Hāshimiyya, sect, see Abū Hāshim.
Hāshimiyya, city, II. 12111.
Ḥātim b. Muḥammad, II. 111 n. 1.
al-Ḥaṭṭāb and Haṭṭābiyya (II. 1124), see Abū Ḵaṭṭāb.
 Ḥayy and Ḥayyān (abytes Ṣāliḥ), II. 1814.
Hell, see Paradise.
al-Ḥilli, II. 11624.
Hindoo, II. 7624, 9914.
Hishām b. al-Ḥakam, I. 634, 744, II. 5925, 65, 13210; called Ṛaḍī, II. 1501; associates with a Khārijīte, II. 106, with Māṣa b. Jaʿfar, II. 5117, with al-Ḥasan b. Ṣāliḥ, I. 74; disputes with Abū Ḥudayl, I. 534, II. 162, 67, with Yahya b. Khālid, 102 n. 3; views on nature of God, I. 534, II. 67, on Kālām, I. 3118, 5215, II. 6625, cf. 74 n. 1, on Imāmate, I. 7523, II. 6525 ff., cf. 1339.
Hishāmiyya (also referred to Hishām b. Šālīm), II. 664.
 Ḥakamiyya, II. 66 n. 2.
   " b. Šālim al-Juwālīkī, I. 7522, II. 15 n. 3, 668, 13226.
Hishāmiyya, see preceding name.
Ḥukeima, I. 4810, II. 5377.
 Ḥulūl, see Incarnation.
 Hulūliyya, II. 1311.
 Ḥumeima, in Palestine, II. 891.
 Ḥureith b. Masʿūd, see Masʿūd b. Ḥureith.
al-Ḥusein
  b. Abī Mansūr, I. 636.
  " b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, I. 5310, II. 397, 727; revenge for, II.
      93 n. 1, 94512: pilgrimage to, II. 107 n. 1; descendants of, I. 7518, II. 11818. See al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. A. T.
  " b. Faraj b. Ḥaṭšab, see Ibn Ḥaṭšab.
  " b. Ismā'il b. Ibrāhīm, I. 4323, II. 3124, 329.
  " b. al-Jarāḥ, I. 70 n. 2.
  " b. Mansūr, see al-Ḥallāj.
  " b. Muḥammad an-Najjār, I. 2923, II. 918.
  " b. 'Ubeidallah, I. 70 n. 2, II. 117.

Ḥuseiniyya (II. 93 n. 1, 9412), see Khashabiyya.

Ibādiyya, Khārijite sect, II. 98.
Iblīs, I. 341, II. 185, 116.
 Ibn 'Abbād Kāfīl-Kufāt, II. 7123.
 " Abī Aun, I. 70 n. 2, II. 11714.
 " al-'Arabī, I. 12, II. 4724.
 " 'Ayash, I. 68, II. 108.
 " Bābūye (cf. II, 3), II. 2623, n. 1. 3018.
 " Dāwūd, II, 1171.
 " al-Farrākid (I. 69 n. 11, II. 11528), see ash-Shalmağānī.
 " Ḥāmid (I. 69 n. 9), see Ḥāmid b. 'Abdās.
 " al-Ḥanafīyya, see Muḥammad b. al-Ḥ.
 " Ḥaṭšab, I. 6810, n. 8, II. 109.
 Ḥazm, life, I. 9 ff.; writings, I. 11 f.; truthfulness, I. 15, 40 f., II. 2116; Zāhirīte, I. 38 f., II. 1110, 207, 26, 12815; view on origin of Shi'a, I. 35 f., II. 16 f., on division of its sects, I. 21 ff., on attributes of God, II. 8824; pamphlet against heterodox sects, I. 16 f., 391: misrepresents al-‘Ash'arī, II. 9, quotes al-Jāḥiz, II. 43 n. 5; plagiarized by al-Makrizī, II. 8 n. 3, 1624.
 " Mītham (II. 60 n. 2), see 'Alī b. M.
 " Muḥaffa', II. 5618.
 " Mumlik al-Īṣfahānī, II. 138 n. 1.
 " Nāwūs (I. 44 n. 9), see Nāwūs.
 " an-Nū'ūmān (II. 157 n. 4), see Muḥammad b. Ja'far b. an-N.
 " ar-Rāwandi, see ar-Rāwandi.
 " Sabā, see 'Abdallāh b. S.
 " as-Saudā (II. 1882), see 'Abdallāh b. Sabā.
 " Shādān, II. 5915.
 " ash-Shalmağānī, see ash-Shalmağānī.
 " at-Tammār (I. 79 n. 4), see at-Tammār.
 " Wākī al-Būnā, II. 88 n. 2.
 " Wārṣand al-Bajali, I. 54 f., II. 75.
 Bajaliyya. ib.
 " Zubeir, I. 753, II. 94 n. 1.
Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad, see Ibn Abī Aun.
 " b. al-Ashtar, II. 9810, n. 1 [add b.].
Idris b. Muhammed, II. 75³.

Idrisids, II. 75⁴.

‘Ijī, tribe, II. 79, 80 n. 4, 88, 97.

Ījā`, I. 31, II. 11², 16³.

Īlāk, mountains, II. 120⁵.

al-‘Ilbā b. Dirā` (II. 101⁶), see ‘Ulyān.

‘Ilbā’iyya, or ‘Ilbāniyya, II. 101⁹.

Ilhām, see Inspiration.

Ilhāmiyya, II. 54⁸.

Imams, divinity of, I. 34¹⁶, 68⁸, II. 13³⁸, 101⁹, 112³², 113⁴⁰, 152; supernatural knowledge of, II. 33¹⁹, 34²⁵, 54 f., 105 f.; “speaking” and “silent,” II. 93³⁵, 112 n. 3; twelve (II. 78⁵), see Ithnā’ashariyya; seven (II. 79), see Sab‘iyya.

Imamate, fundamental doctrine of Shi‘a, I. 31⁸, of Khawārij, I. 32³; book on, by Muhammed b. Ja‘far b. an-Nu‘mān, I. 50¹, II. 58⁵⁰; theory of, see Hishām b. al-Ḥakam; depends on personal qualification, according to Zeidiyya (and Keisāniyya, II. 34²³), or hereditary and depends on Naṣṣ, according to Imāmiyya, I. 22, 74 f., II. 22, 129⁹, 182¹, 138–142; of Inferior, II. 141 n. 8, 149 n. 4, 155 n. 1; of Kurēish, I. 74⁴¹, II. 18², 153⁵, 157 penult., outside of Kurēish I. 3⁸, II. 18²; of descendants of Ja‘far b. Abī Ṭalīb, II. 4⁵; of Abū Bekr, II. 6⁰; of ‘Alī only, s.v., refuted by Ibn Ḥazm, II. 13⁵⁰ ff.; of all descendants of ‘Alī, I. 75³, II. 35⁵, 13⁰, cf. I. 61 ult., or those of Pāṭima (both according to Zeidiyya), I. 23, II. 29³², 13¹, 13², 156¹, 157 n. 6; of descendants of al-Ḥusein only (Imāmiyya), s.v. al-Ḥusein b. ‘Alī; of those of al-Ḥasan only, s. v.; of Muhammed b. al-Ḥanafīyya (Keisāniyya), I. 58¹¹, 16, 77¹², II. 34³⁰, 79¹³, and his son Abū Ḥāšim, I. 6¹, II. 35¹, 4⁴, who bequeathed it to ‘Abbasids, II. 8⁹, 118¹⁷, 13¹²; See also ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalīb, Ja‘far b. Muhammed, Keisāniyya, Zeidiyya.

Imāmiyya, I. 44–55, 5⁷; founder of, II. 6⁰; reject Abū Bekr and ‘Omar, s.v., and denounce Companions, s.v., cf. I. 127²⁸, hence called Rawāfiḍ, s.v.; = Ithnā‘ashariyya, II. 15¹, n. 6; believe in Mahdī, s.v.; in interpolation of Korān, s.v., in Badd, II. 7²; claim Inspiration, s.v.; and Sunna, II. 15¹; and Muτazila, s.v.; and Shi‘a, I. 3⁰, II. 15⁸; and Keisāniyya, I. 23, II. 3⁴; and Zeidiyya, II. 14⁹, see Imamate; and Ġulāt, I. 5³⁰, II. 1⁸, 7⁶, 15¹ f.; against Ġulāt, II. 8⁰, 9¹, 1³, 1⁸³, 13³, see, however, II. 8⁶, 11⁶²; against Docetism, II. 3⁰, 4³, 3 n. 3; men designated as, II. 4¹ n. 2, 6⁶⁹. See Rawāfiḍ, Shi‘a, Zeidiyya.

Incarnation, I. 3⁴, 3⁷, II. 1³, 1²⁶, 15²; borrowed from Christianity, I. 3 n. 1, II. 101²; of Abū Muslim, II. 11⁸, al-Baṣrī, 1¹⁷, al-Ḥallāj, 1⁸, 1¹⁵ n. 1, al-Muḥamma‘, 1²⁰: successive, see Clementines.

Inspiration, claim of, I. 3⁵, 4⁹, II. 1⁸, 5⁴ f.

‘Irāk, I. 4 f., II. 4³, 8⁰, 1⁴¹, 1⁴⁵ n. 2. See Babylonia.

Iṣbahān, I. 4516, II. 4418, 45 n. 2, 4612, 12215 ff., 145 n. 2.

al-Iṣbahānī, I. 68 n. 7, II. 108 f.

Iṣḥāq, agitator for Abū Muslim, II. 103 n. 4, 11947.

" b. Ibrāhīm b. Muṣʿab, I. 4316, II. 3238.

" b. Kandāj, I. 676 [Abdallah is oversight], II. 10377.

" b. Muhammed al-ʿĀḥmar, I. 6619, II. 102 f.

Iṣḥākiyya, II. 10212, n. 4, 12720 ff., 1284.

Hamrawiyya, II. 10214.

" b. ʿOmar, II. 102 n. 4.

Iṣḥākiyya, ib.

" b. Suweid, II. 436.


Ḥarāthiyya, ib.

Iṣḥākiyya, 1) see Iṣḥāq b. Muḥammed; 2) see Iṣḥāq b. ʿOmar.

Ismāʿīl b. ʿAbdallah al-Ruʿainī, II. 133.

" al-Bīṭṭikhi (II. 1126), see Abū Iṣmāʿīl.


Ismāʿiliyya, I. 3712, II. 1927, 201, 5125, 13327, 1501.

Ithnāʿashariyya, I. 58, II. 40 n. 2, 52, 7815 ff., 13324, 150 n. 6, 151, 152 n. 4.

Iyyāl, Kāḍī, II. 6925.

al-Jābīa, in Syria, II. 8526.


Jaʿfar b. ʿAlī, uncle of the Mahdi, I. 7611 ff., II. 13412.

" b. Muḥammed Abū ʿAbdallah as-Sādiq, II. 4110; and his son ʿIṣmāʿīl, II. 13318; commanding position in Shiʿa, II. 104 ff.; esteemed also by Sunna, II. 798, 10513; one of the twelve ʿImāms, I. 581; ʿImām instead of Zeid b. ʿAlī, II. 139; his ʿImāmate unanimously acknowledged, I. 683, 7522 ff., II. 5110, 10428, 13221, 1511; dissension after his death, I. 762 ff., II. 899; is still alive and will return, I. 44 penult., 764, 1122; divinity of, I. 691; II. 974, 112, 114 n. 1; omniscient, II. 106: ḥajj in his honor, s.v.; apocryphal utterances (cf. II. 105) against: allegorical interpretation of Koran, II. 1427, 32, religious discussions, II. 1512 ff., Budā, 7226, Taṣfīd, 9112, supernatural knowledge of ʿImāms, 10524, Mūsawiyya, 40 n. 2, ʿOmar, 651, Zeidiyya, 15916, Muḥiyya b. Saʿdīūd, 8016, Abū ʿl-Khaṭṭāb, 113, ash-Shalmaʿa, 1171, and other ġulāt, 901, 961 ff.; men belonging to his circle, II. 41 n. 2, 5919, 60 n. 3, 65, 66 n. 1, 91 n. 1, 13313.

Jaʿfariyya, II. 801, 10712.

Jafr, book attributed to Jaʿfar, II. 106, 11226.

al-Jāḥiṣ, I. 50, II. 56 ff., 10425, 12121, 1241, 14819.

Jāḥiṣiyya, II. 5610, 30.

Jahm b. Ṣafwān, I. 2915 ff., 8116, II. 732, 815, 1419, 152, 741.

Jahmiyya, II. 81.
Janad, in Yemen, II. 110.
Janâhiyya, see Mu‘awiyah b. ‘Abdallah.
Jannâba, town, II. 108 ff.
Jarîr b. Keis, II. 43.
Jarirîyya, see Suleimân b. Jarîr.
Jârudîyya, see Abû ‘l-Jârud.
al-Jauzî, Jamâl ad-Din, II. 69 n. 1.
Jehuda Halevi, II. 1046.
Jesus, return at end of Time, I. 47, II. 37, 49; divinity of, I. 62, II. 11, 18, 17, 90 f. ; unreal (Docetism), II. 29 ; miracles, II. 82 n. 2 ; compared with ‘Abb, I. 66, II. 101, with the Mahdi, II. 52, 53 f., with Muhammed, II. 24, 24. Cf. Christianity.
Jews, Jewish, and Judaism, believe in miracles of Jesus, s. v.; bribed Paul II. 16, 17, n. 4; and Shi‘a, I. 19, 95, 137, 14; and Šulaymân, s. v.; and Badda, II. 72; and Tashbih, II. 135; believe in Immortals, I. 46, II. 46 ff.: sects, II. 90; Jewish illustrations, II. 85, 96ff. See ‘Abdallah b. Sabâ, Cabbala, Messiah.
Joshua, see ‘Ali.
al-Jubbâ‘î, II. 58, 66; cf. 108.
al-Ka‘bî, II. 57.
Kâdar (Free Will), II. 9, 36.
Ka‘fî, district and town, I. 54, II. 75.
Kalâm, doctrine, II. 13, 65, 75.
Kanbar, I. 66, II. 99 ff.
Karâkirîyya, sect, see ash-Shalmağânî.
Karbiyya, see Abû Karb.
Karmatas, I. 37, 58, 68, II. 19, 54, 54, 133; emissaries of, II. 17 ff., 93, 97, 108 ff. ; seven Imams of, II. 79, 90 ; believe in Transmigration, II. 64 ff.; dietary restrictions of, II. 73; fifty prayers of, s. v.
Karrâmîyya, see Muhammed b. Karrâm.
al-Kashshî, II. 4 n. 2.
Kaşîliya, province in North Africa, I. 54, II. 75, 76.
Kâthir an-Nawwâb, II. 129. See al-Abtar.
Kaṭî‘iya, see Kitâ‘iya.
Kâze keîmân dât, town, II. 120.
Keisân, II. 33.
Abû ‘Omra, I. 44, 77, II. 34.
Keisânîyya, origin, II. 33 f. ; position within Shi‘a, I. 23, II. 34 f., 155, 156 n. 3; accept Imamate of ‘Abb, al-Hasan, al-Husein and Muhammed b. al-Hasanîyya, I. 58, 77, II. 79 ff.; the latter hidden in Ra‘îqva, I. 44 ff., 77 ult., II. 25 ff., 35 ff., 95; use wooden arms only, hence called Khassabiyya, I. 63 n. 1, II. 93 ff.; believe in Badda, I. 53, II. 72, in Transmigration, I. 34, 52, II. 63, 64, in eternity of world, I. 54; factions among, I. 45, II. 35, 44, 102 n. 4, 118 n. 3, 121. See Imamate, Zeidîyya.
Kelb, tribe, II. 97f.
al-Kelbi, II. 251, 100 n. 2.
al-Khaḍir, prophet, I. 46 f., II. 47f., 48, 49f.
Khālid b. ‘Abdallāh al-Kaṣrī, I. 591, 60, 65f. (cf. II. 97f.), II. 79 f., 86 f.,
100f., 107f.
Khanṣ, mother of Mahdī, II. 54f.
Kharbīyya, see Abū ‘l-Kharb.
Khashabiyya, see Keisānīyya.
Kaṭṭābiyya, see Abū ‘l-Khaṭṭāb.
Khawārīj, I. 30f., 31 penult., 331, 34, II. 92f., 761, 93f., 159f.
Khidāsh, I. 36, 65f., II. 98.
Khīndif al-Asādi, II. 4, 12f. [Khandāk is oversight], 94f.
Khorāsān, I. 44 n. 1, 65 n. 5, II. 101f., 118ff., 119f., 122f., 123f., 1284.
Khurrāmiyya, II. 19ff., 116f.
Kisfīyya, see Abū Mansūr.
Kīṭṭīyya, I. 47ff., II. 26f., 40f., 49 ff.
Korān, interpolated (Tabdīl), I. 50f., 51 f., II. 60f., 61 ff., 158 n. 6, cf.
also I. 33f., II. 121f.; allegorical interpretation of, I. 35, 73 n. 2,
II. 14ff., 45ff., 107; in Berberic language, II. 49f.
KSR (?) (I. 68 n. 7), see al-Iṣbahānī.
Kufa, ‘Alī in, II. 39f., 43 n. 3, 78f., 99f., al-Mukhātār in, II. 98, Muham-
med b. al-Kaṣīm, II. 33f.; Yaḥyā b. ‘Omar, I. 43ff., Zeīd b. ‘Alī, II.
138f., Zenjī, I. 65 n. 2; ‘Alī b. Mithām, II. 60f., al-Ḥasan b.
Ṣāliḥ, I. 74 ult., II. 131ff., Ḥīshām b. al-Ḥakam, I. 63f., 74 ult., II.
65f., n. 4, 67f., Ibn Ḥaushab, I. 68 n. 8; people of, known as stingy
and treacherous, II. 140 n. 6; Gūlāt in, I. 62f., 64, 68 f., 71f., II.
79f., 89ff., 91f., 107; Persian spoken in, II. 78f.
Kūreish, II. 39f., 89f., 90f. See Imamate.
Kūthayyir, II. 134f.; Keisānīte, I. 77ff., II. 251, 35f., 79f.; Keisānīte
poem ascribed to him (or as-Sayyid), II. 38 f.; Khashabī, II. 94f.,
95f.; believes in his own return, II. 24f., 27 n. 2, in Transmigration,
II. 26f., 37 n. 4, 45f.; aids Khīndif, II. 42f.; denounces Companions,
II. 143 f.
Lamās, tribe, II. 75f.
Logic, elimination of, from religion, II. 15.
Luminaries, creation of, I. 59f., II. 84ff.

Maddān, city, I. 42f., n. 6.
al-Madā‘īnī, II. 57ff.
Maḡrīb, Karmatians in, II. 109 ff.
Māḡūs, tribe, II. 75f.
Mahdī, Caliph, II. 39f., 131f.
Messiah, s. v., cf. I. 36f.: of the Ithnā‘asharīyya, see
Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī; traditions about, II.
30f., 53ff.
Malchizedek, I. 463, II. 46 f.
Mālikiyya, II. 7614, 11711.

al-Mamṭūra, sect (= Mūsawiyya), I. 4416, II. 40, 5114, 6031.
al-Maʿmūn, Caliph, II. 5937.
Mandaean, influence, I. 4, II. 80 ff., 8418, 8729.
Mani, II. 8035.
Manichaeans, influence, I. 4, II. 29 f., 80, 871, 1048.
al-Manṣūr, Caliph, I. 70 penult., II. 100 f., 1185, 1192, 12112 ff., 125 n. 4, 140 n. 3.

' an-Namari, poet, II. 153 n. 6.
" title of Karmatian missionary-in-chief, II. 109.
Manṣūriyya, see Abū Manṣūr.

Marcus, Gnostic, II. 821.
Marriage, with forbidden relations, I. 3325, II. 1216; with nine wives, I. 5813, cf. II. 731.
Mašāmida (or Mašmūda), tribe, I. 5416, II. 7610.

Masʿūd b. ʿHureith, II. 1115, 10.
Mawāli, II. 34, 9416, 107 n. 2.
Mazdak, I. 9715, II. 1985, 1209.

Mazdakiyya, II. 1037, 209.
Medina, I. 481, II. 39 n. 2.
Meimūn al-ʿKaddāḥ, II. 112 n. 3.

Meimūniyya, ʿib.

Meimūniyya, Khārijite sect, II. 1216, 19.
Mekka, I. 53 n. 1, II. 426, 67, 943, n. 1.
Merv, city, I. 70 n. 7, II. 1195, 1209.
Messiah, and Messianism, I. 3 n. 1, 4514, II. 36 ff., 4314, 9427 ff.
Metempsychosis, see Transmigration of Souls.
Methusalem, I. 46 n. 1, II. 4621, n. 8.
Mīklaš b. Abī ʿl-Khāṭṭāb, see Abū ʿl-Khāṭṭāb.
Milāl waʿn-Nīḥal, literature on. I. 5; by Ibn Hazm, literary character of, I. 12 ff., manuscripts of, 17 ff., compared with work of ash-Shahrastānī, 16.

Mīmiyya, II. 1081.
Mitham at-Tammar, II. 6019.
Moses, II. 7016, 1167, 13531.
Muʿammar, I. 649, 6914, II. 968, 91, 11412 ff.

Muʿammariyya, II. 7419, 11327, 11411.

b. ʿAbbād, II. 11413.

Muʿāwiya, Caliph, I. 755, II. 145 n. 2, 14818.

b. ʿAbdallah Dūʾ-ʿl-Janāḥeīn, II. 27 n. 4, 4435, 454, n. 2.
Janāḥiyya, II. 4424.

Mufaḍḍal- ʿaṣ-Šeirafi, II. 9618.
Mufawwīdā, sect, see Tafwiq.
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Muğiriyya, II. 87², n. 2, 96, 153; terrorists, 
I. 62¹, II. 93; haqiq in honor of Ja'far as-Sādiq, II. 107; 
relation to Khattabiyya, II. 97;

al-Muğira b. Shu'ba, II. 140 n. 1.

Muhallab, II. 93⁹⁰.

Muhammed, the Prophet, resembled ‘Ali, I. 56, II. 77 f., hence mis-
taken for him, ib.; apostle of ‘Ali, but usurped prophecy, I. 66 
ult. (cf. I. 56), II. 102, 116, 127; responsible for strife about 
Imamate, I. 55, 80, cf. II. 76⁹⁵; divinity of, I. 67, 68, II. 102 f., 
Demiurge, 91; return of, II. 24¹⁴, 25 n. 1; stops sun, II. 69, 71⁷². 
See ‘Ali b. Abi Ṭalib, Mystic lore.

Muhammadiyah, believe in his divinity, I. 67, 
II. 102 f.

Muhammed b. ‘Abdallah, Kâtib, I. 47⁶, II. 48²³.

b. “ “ “ 

b. al-Hasan, I. 43 ff., 60, n. 5, 64, II. 
23⁸, 30¹¹, 3¹, 86⁴, 87.

Muhammadiyah, II. 86, 102 n. 5.

b. “ “ “ 

b. Ṭahir, I. 43, II. 31⁴.

b. ‘Abd-as-Salâm, called Shu’k al-Leil, I. 47² [see II. 
48¹⁵], II. 48¹⁶, n. 1.

b. Abi Zeinab, see Abû’l-Khattâb.


b. “ “ “ 

b. Abi Ṭalib, see M. b. al-Ḥanafiyah.

b. “ “ “ 

b. al-Ḥusein al-Bâkir, I. 58⁵, 6⁴, 6⁸, 7⁵⁷⁵, II. 
2², 8⁰, 9⁵³, 13⁹.

b. “ “ “ 

b. Mūsâ, I. 48⁴⁰, 5⁸, 7⁶.

b. “ “ “ 

b. an-Nu’man (II. 5⁹⁶), see M. b. Ja’far.

b. “ “ “ 

b. ash-Shalmağan, see ash-Shalmağani.

b. al-Faḍl, see ‘Ali b. al-F.

b. Ḥabib, II. 10⁹²⁴.

b. al-Ḥanafiyah, significance of name, II. 5³ n. 3; wor-
shiped by Keisâniyah, s.v.; defended by Khasha-
biyya, II. 9⁴; supernatural knowledge of, II. 3⁸, 
cf. 1².

b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Ali, Mahdi of Ithnâ‘ashariyya, I. 4⁷ f., 
5⁸, 7⁶, II. 5² ff., 6¹¹; “man of the cellar,” II. 
2⁷¹, 1³⁴² ff., cf. I. 7⁷ n. 7.

b. Iṣḥâq b. ʿĪbrâhîm, II. 3²³.

b. Ismâ‘îl b. Ja’far b. Muhammed, Mahdi of Sab‘iyah 
(and Karmaṭians), I. 5³, 6⁸¹⁶, II. 7⁹, 1⁰⁸¹⁴.

b. Ja’far b. Muhammed, I. 7⁶.

b. “ “ “ 

b. an-Nu’mân, called Sheiṭân at-Ṭâk, I. 3¹⁹, 
5⁰ f., 7⁵ penult., II. 1⁵ n. 3, 5⁹, 6⁵ n. 2, 1⁵⁰, 1⁵⁷ 
n. 4.

Nu’mânīyya, II. 5⁹¹²

Sheiṭâniyya, II. 5⁹¹³, 6⁶⁴.

b. Karrâm, I. 2⁹² ff., II. 8², 9⁶.

Karrâmiyya, II. 8⁷.

Muhammad b. an-Nu'mán, see M. b. Ja'far b. an-N.

b. Nuṣeir, II. 127f.

b. Sāliḥ b. Muʿawiya, II. 45 n. 2.

b. Wṣrd, see Ibn Warṣand.

Ya'kūb, II. 42ff.

Ya'kūbiyya, ib.

b. Zākariyya ar-Rāżi, II. 64f.

Muhammediyya: 1) see Muhammad, the Prophet; see Muhammad b. 'Abdallah b. al-Ḥasan.

Mujabbira (or Mujbara), sect, II. 93, 113, 88 n. 2.

al-Muḳaddasi, on number of sects, I. 6; and Shīʿa, II. 145 n. 2.

al-Muḳanna', I. 36f., 70f., II. 120 f.

Muḳāṭil b. Suleimān, I. 31f., II. 113, 67f.

al-Mukhtār b. Ḥaṭīb, I. 44f., 58f., 76f., II. 17f., 33 f., 72, 79f., 93 f.

Mukhtāriyya, II. 33f., 79f.

Muʿmin at-Ṭāʿī (II. 59f.), see Muhammad b. Jaʿfar b. an-Nuʿmān.


Mūsawīyya. II. 40, 50 ff., 60f., 75ff.

Mūṣa, II. 93f.


Muslimiyya, see Abū Muslim.

al-Muʿtālid, Caliph, I. 67f., 77f.

al-Muʿtaṣim, II. 93f.

al-Muʿtāwakkil, II. 156ff.

Muʿtazila, I. 29f., 31f., 32f., 32 penult., II. 9, 2131; origin of name, II. 138 n. 1; Transmigration, II. 63ff., other doctrines. II. 66ff., 93f; and Shīʿa, II. 113ff., and Ḥadīth, II. 63ff., and Zaidīyya, II. 113ff.

Mūẓaffar b. Ardshir, see Abū Maṣṣūr Muẓaffar.

Mystic lore (supernatural knowledge), of Muḥammed, I. 38, II. 20f., of 'Alī, II. 33, of Muḥammed b. al-Ḥanafīyya, II. 33 f. See Imams.

Nafaliyya, see Baḳliyya.

Nafta, city in district of Kaḥṣa. s.v.

an-Nahkīnī (II. 103f.), see al-Bhnkī.

Naḥlīyya (= Baḥlīliyya, I. 54 n. 6, n. 8), see Ibn Warṣand.

an-Najjār. 1) see al-Ḥusein b. Muḥammed; 2) see Ibn Ḥaushab.

Naḵaliyya, see Baḳliyya.

Name, of God, s.v.; of 'Alī, I. 53 penult., II. 73; identical with that of Prophet, II. 53, 87ff.; allusions to, found in Koran, I. 61ff., 62f., II. 88ff., cf. I. 35, II. 14.

Narjis, mother of Mahdi, I. 48f., 76f., II. 54f.

Naṣāriyya, citadel, I. 126ff.

Naskh ("abrogation"), II. 72f., 23f.

Naṣṣāriyya (II. 126ff.), see Nuṣeiriyya.
Naṣṣ, written bequest, of Muhammed to ‘Alī, I. 22, 73 ff., II. 66\(^n\), 158\(^n\); of or through ‘Alī to al-Hasan and al-Husein, I. 75\(^n\), II. 132\(^n\); to Muhammed b. al-Ḥanafīyya, II. 34 n. 3; of Jaʿfar as-Ṣādiq to one of his sons, II. 132\(^n\); hidden by Companions, s.v.; point of issue between Imāmiyya and Zeidiyya, see Imamate.

Nawāṣib, nickname for opponents of Shiʿa, II. 159.

Nāwus, I. 44\(^n\), II. 41.

Nāwusiyya, ib.

an-Nazzām, I. 50\(^n\), 51\(^n\), II. 11\(^n\), 56\(^n\), 57\(^n\), 58, 60\(^n\), 64\(^n\), 74 n. 1.

Nisābūr, I. 73\(^n\), II. 123\(^n\).

Nisba, influence of, on enumeration of sects, I. 7 f.; artificial formation of, II. 119 n. 2.

Nisibis, II. 93\(^n\).

Nuʿmāniyya, see Muhammed b. Jaʿfar b. an-Nuʿmān.

Nuṣairī, II. 127\(^n\).

Nuṣairīyya, I. 71 f., II. 18\(^n\), 102\(^n\), 116\(^n\), 126 ff.

ʿOmar, see Abū Bekr.

Omaya b. Abi Ṣalt, II. 28 n. 1.

ʿOmeir at-Ṭabbān, I. 64\(^n\), II. 96\(^n\).

ʿOmeirīyya, II. 97\(^n\).

Oshushna, province, II. 101 n. 1.

ʿOthmān, Caliph, interpolated Koran, II. 61\(^n\) ff.; uprising against, I. 37\(^n\), II. 19\(^n\); hated by Imāmiyya, I. 52 n. 5, and Khawārīj, II. 64\(^n\), while Zeidiyya vacillating, see I. 74\(^n\), II. 129\(^n\), 132\(^n\) and 129\(^n\), 130\(^n\), 139 n. 1.

ʿal- Khashābi, II. 93\(^n\).

Paradise, nine enter while alive, II. 47\(^n\); and Hell will decay, I. 54\(^n\), II. 15\(^n\), 73 f., cf. 75\(^n\).

Paul, apostle, see Gūlat.

Persians, and Shiʿa, I. 35 f., II. 16 ; and al-Mukhtār, II. 94\(^n\); absorb ʿIṣl, II. 80 n. 4; derogate ʿAlī, II. 78\(^n\); call themselves “sons” and “nobles,” I. 35 ult., II. 18\(^n\); Persian language, II. 90\(^n\), 93\(^n\), cf. 78\(^n\).

Phinehas, still alive, I. 46\(^n\), II. 46\(^n\), 47\(^n\).

Pilgrimage, see Ḥajj.

Prayers, two a day, I. 33\(^n\); seventeen (or nineteen), I. 37\(^n\), n. 3, 71\(^n\), n. 4, II. 126\(^n\); fifty, I. 37\(^n\), II. 18\(^n\).

Precepts, religious, saints exempt from, I. 34\(^n\), 37\(^n\), 73\(^n\), II. 13\(^n\), 14\(^n\), 14\(^n\); have inner meaning, I. 35, II. 14, 107, 129\(^n\); abolished by Abū Manṣūr, I. 92\(^n\), by Ḥārīthīyya, II. 125\(^n\), by Imāmiyya, 61\(^n\), by Karīmātans, 109\(^n\), by Khaṭṭābiyya, 14, 112\(^n\), by al-Mukanma, 120\(^n\)

Prophecy, can be acquired, I. 34\(^n\), II. 13\(^n\); inadmissible after Muhammed, I. 47\(^n\), 55 n. 7, 56\(^n\), II. 49, 76\(^n\), 92\(^n\); True Prophet, see Clementines.

Ptahil, deity of Mandaean, II. 84\(^n\).
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ar- Rādī, Caliph, I. 70 n. 2.
Rādwa, mountain, I. 48 n. 7, 4415, 77 ult., II. 35 ff., 3918, 9518.
Raj’a, see Return; miscellaneous uses of word, II. 28 n. 1.

ar- Rashīd, Caliph, II. 3919, 5826.
Ray, city, I. 78 n. 2, II. 13413; mountains, II. 11919.

Rawāfīd, term, see Appendix A; different forms of word, II. 137, origin, 188 ff., supposed to have been coined by al-Muğīra b. Sa‘īd, 139 f., coined by Zeid b. ‘Alī, 139, 1414, 142 n. 6, derogatory meaning of, 138 n. 1, 140 n. 3; “repudiators” (of Abū Bekr and ‘Omār and Companions), II. 64 f., 142 ff.; and Shi‘a, II. 146 ff.; applied to Keisāniyya, II. 156 n. 3, to Imāmiyya (excluding Zeidiyya), I. 4413, 4713, II. 148 ff., to Ithnā‘ashariyya, 151, to Gulāt 151 ff., to all Shi‘ītic sects (including Zeidiyya), 154 ff.; acknowledge Imamate of Ja‘far as-Sadīq, II. 10418, 150 ult.; are no Muslims, II. 6218, 1536; compared with Jews, II. 1918, with Christians, 142 n. 2, worse than Jews and Christians, 14418, cf. 7713.
See Shi‘a.

Rāwand, near Isḥābān, II. 12219; = Riwand (in Khurāsān), II. 123.

ar-Rawandiyya, II. 123 f.
Rāwandīyya, I. 7013, II. 10012, 121 ff., 1531.
Reappearance, see Return.
Resurrection, denied, II. 4512, 7414.
Return, after death (Raj’a), I. 34 ult., II. 23–28, 50 f., 8613, 11418.
Raj‘iyya, II. 2413, 251.

Riwand, see Rāwand.

ar-Riwandi (II. 13314), see Rāwandīyya.

Rizām b. Sābīk, II. 11814.

Rizāmiyya, II. 118 f., 12011, 12410, 18.

Rubūbādiyya, see Abū-l-‘Abbās.

Rustem b. Ḥusein b. Ḥaushab, see Ibn Ḥaushab.

Sabā‘iyya, see ‘Abdallah b. Sabā.

Sabbāb, II. 42 n. 1.

Sabbābiyya, ïb.

Sabbābiyya, or Sabbābiyya (II. 17 n. 1, 41 f.), see Sabbā‘iyya.
Sab‘iyya, II. 7913, 10815.

aš-Ṣādīk, see Ja‘far b. Muhammed aš-S.
as-Saffāh, Caliph, II. 11813, 11918.

Ṣāḥiyya bint ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, aunt of Prophet, II. 145.
Saḥābiyya, II. 4218.
Sa‘īd an-Nahdi, II. 9011, 9613.

Saints, superior to prophets, I. 3413, II. 1313, 14; exempt from religious precepts, s.v.

Ṣaḥil, mother of Mahdi, I. 4813, 76, II. 5414.
Ṣalāt, see Prayers.
Ṣāliḥ b. Ṭarīf, I. 4717, II. 4915, 26.
Sāliḥīyya: 1) see al-Ḥasan b. Sāliḥ; 2) sect of Mu'ṭazila, II. 131 n. 2.

Sālim b. Abī Ḥafṣa, II. 1291.

b. Mas'ūd (=al-Ḥārith), II. 1254.

Salma b. Kuheil, II. 1301.

Samāk b. Ḥarb, II. 1311.

Samuel b. Nagdela, I. 13 (l. 3 from below). [Joseph is oversight.]

Sāḥib b. Mas'ūd (--al-Hdrith), II. 1254.

Salma b. Kuheil, II. 1301.

Saturninus, Gnostic, II. 851.

Sausan, mother of Mahdi, I. 4816, 7618, II. 5414.

Sawād, province, I. 68 n. 8, II. 11014, 1114,12.

Sawwār, poet, II. 140 n. 3.

as-Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī, II. 134, cf. 39 n. 3; argues with Muḥammad b. Ja'far b. an-Nu'mān. II. 5916; his rāwī Iṣḥāq b. Muḥammad, II. 1028; believes in return of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanaḍyya, I. 7713, 78 n. 2, II. 2315, 3316, 36 ff., cf. 27 n. 4. in Transmigration, I. 3418, 526, II. 3617, 63 n. 2; on name of Mahdi, II. 53 n. 2; on sun miracle, II. 6811; against divinity of 'Alī, II. 101 n. 2; against Rawāfīd, II. 140 n. 3; denounces Companions, II. 144 n. 6.

Sects, number of, I. 6 f.; classification of, I. 20 ff., 291, 4011, II. 211.

Sefer Yegirah, II. 821.

Semitic, identical with Malchizedek, II. 471.

Seven, Imams, see Sab'īyya; angels, II. 8419; prophets, II. 861, 89 f., 10418,54; incarnations, II. 12715.

Seveners, see Sab'īyya.

ash-Sha'īb, I. 608, II. 8620; on 'Abdallah b. Sabā, II. 4818,26; utterances against Shi'a, II. 1918, 7710, 852, 135, 142 n. 2, 144.

Shāfīyya, II. 11713.

ash-Shalmağâni, Ibn Abī l-'Azākir (also written Ḳārākir), I. 69 ult. ff., 70 n. 2, II. 115 ff., 12715.

'Azākīra, II. 1161.

Ḳārākirīyya, II. 11719.

Sheiṭān at-Ṭāk and Sheiṭāniyya, see Muḥammad b. Ja'far b. an-Nu'mān.

Shī'īa, name, II. 157 f., applied to Imāmiyya, 158, to Zaidiyya, ib., to both, 1591; origin I. 3 n. 1; character, I. 4 f.; division of sects, I. 21 ff., 4215, II. 15511, 1561, cf. I. 301; fundamental beliefs of, I. 3118, 3214, 78 ff.; “exaggerations” of, I. 34 f.; anthropomorphic, II. 13517; relation to Muṭazila, I. 3119, II. 1138 ff., to Šulūt, s.v.; compared with Jews, see ash-Sha'ībi; Traditions against, s.v.; of illegitimate birth, I. 49 f., II. 5524. See Imāmiyya, Rawāfīd, Zaidiyya.

Shibāsh, see al-Baṣrī.

Shinās, see al-Baṣrī.

ash-Shorṭah, district near Wāsīt, II. 12722.

Shuḳḳ al-Leil, see Muḥammad b. 'Abd as-Salām.

Simeon, tribe, II. 4929.

Simon Magus, II. 8537.
Sufis, originated by Abū Saʿīd Abū Ḥ-Kheir, s.v.; in Ḥbahān, II. 45, n. 2; believe that Elījah and al-Khaḍīr alive, I. 467, II. 4739, that saints superior to prophets, s.v., and exempt from religious precepts, s.v.; follow Shī'a, II. 148, and Ḥulūl, I. 731, II. 152; are no Muslims, I. 80 ult., n. 11, II. 1150.

Ṣūfriyya, Khārijite sect, I. 376, 716, II. 909, 914, 12610, 136.

Ṣufṣiyya, Khhrijite sect, I. 376, 716, II. 920, 34, 12610, 136.

Ṣufyan ath-Thauri, II. 4213.

Ṣulaymān b. Jarir, I. 7921, II. 7220, 12924, 136, 149g.

Ṣulaymiyya, II. 136.

Ṣa贯ririyya, s.v.

Sunbād (or Sinbād), I. 369, II. 1819.

Sunna, I. 294, 3311, 348.

Supernatural knowledge, see Mystic lore.

Surūḥūbiyya, see Abūl-Jārūd.

Surr-man-raʾā (Samara), city, I. 76 n. 10, II. 1826.

as-Sūs, city, I. 5416, 551, II. 763.

Syzygy, see Clementines.

Ṭabaristān, province, II. 33.

Tabdil, see Koran, interpolated.

Tafsīr, doctrine, II. 91.

Ṭāḥāwī, II. 70.

Ṭāḥīr b. al-Ḥusein, I. 43 n. 11.

Ṭakhlīt, doctrine, II. 9113.

Ṭākiyya ("compulsion"), II. 910.

Ṭalabīra, city in Spain, I. 474, II. 4839.

Ṭāliḳan, city in Khorāsān, I. 443.

at-Tammār, I. 7921, II. 606; see 'All b. Mitham.

Tanāsukh, see Transmigrating of Souls.

Ṭarīf, II. 4932.

Tashbih, see God.

Ṭawwūs, II. 41 n. 2.

at-Ṭayyār, (II. 6014), see 'Ali b. Mitham.

Terrorism, among Shiitic sects, I. 3512, 62 f., II. 92 f., 9514, 153.

Thugs, in India, II. 9235.

Tiberias, I. 732, II. 12726.

Tidis, II. 135 n. 4.

Tigris, rise of, II. 11425.

Traditions, forged or interpolated by Shī'a, I. 7814, II. 135; by Khafṭūbīyya, II. 1188; by Sunna against Shī'a, II. 4837, 13531, 146, against Zeidīyya, II. 147 n. 2.

Transmigrating, of Souls (Tanāsukh), belief of Muʿtazila, I. 33 ult., II. 1325; of Kaysāniyya, s.v., of other heretics, I. 712, II. 1111, 45125, 11832; relation to Return, II. 36 f.; consequences, I. 52, II. 74.

Tanāsukhiyya, II. 1331, 2632, 6339.

Trinity, II. 9113.

Tugj, I. 65, n. 2, II. 9724.
at-Ṭūṣī, II. (5), 5923, 107 n. 1.
Twelvers, see Ithnā‘ashariyya.

‘Ubeidallah [b. Muḥammad al-Ḥabīb], divinity of, I. 691, II. 203, 9530
10919, 11119.

‘ b. Ziyād, II. 9311.
al-‘Uleṣ, tribe, I. 65 n. 2, II. 9711.
‘Ulyān b. Dirā‘, II. 10132.

‘Ulyāniyya, I. 6618, II. 101 f.

Urdunn, district in Palestine, I. 721, II. 12726.
Ustādīsīs, I. 302, II. 1811.

Vice, unnatural, I. 703, II. 1096, 1173.

Wākīfā, or Wāķīfīyya, II. 263, 40, 50 ff.
al- WaRRāk, II. 15 n. 3, 136 (Corrections).
Wāṣil b. ‘Aṭā‘, II. 1138, 43 n. 1, 1294, 14114, 153.
Wāṣīt, city, II. 41 n. 2, 6513, 8036, 11530, 12732, 145 n. 2.
Water, sanctity of, I. 6013, II. 8718; “dark” and “white” waters of
Mandeans, II. 8417 ff.

Weaver’s trade, despicable, II. 963.

World, creation of, I. 59, II. 81 ff.; eternity of, I. 5411, II. 7419.

Yaḥya b. Dīkhrweih (or Zikrweih), II. 793, 97.

‘ b. Khālid, Vizier, II. 6023, 102 n. 3, 13311.
‘ b. ‘Omar b. Yaḥya, I. 4310 ff., II. 31 f.

Yaḵūbiyya, see Muḥammed b. Yaḵūb.

Yazīd b. ‘Omar b. ‘Aṭā‘, II. 976.

Yemen, I. 68, II. 183, 109 f.

Yūnus b. ‘Abdarrāḥmān, II. 4030, 5130.

Yūsuf b. ‘Omar, I. 626, II. 8631, 10025, 1383.

Zāhirism, I. 88 f., II. 834, 1283.

az-Zakari (II. 10930), see al-Iṣbahānī.


Zeidiyya, on Imamate, s. v. (twice); on Imamate in Kureish, II. 153 ult.; acknowledge Abū Bekr and ‘Omar,
I. 22, 7416, 7913, II. 223 (see also s. v.), and doubtful about ‘Othmān,
s. v., but change their attitude, II. 155 n. 1, cf. 158; believe in Muḥammed b. al-Kāsim, II. 333; and Sunna,
II. 155, 157 f.; and Mu'tazila, s. v.; and Keisānīyya, I. 23, 34 f., 443; and Jāriḍiyya, I. 4231, 7415, II. 153 n. 1; and Imāmiyya, s. v.; and Gulāt, II. 7639;
designated as Shi'a, II. 158; nicknamed Nuṣḥāb, II. 1593; traditions against, s. v.; men belonging to, II. 1131, 7330 (cf. 12936), 106
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أبناء 18⁶ ff.

أحرار 18¹³ ff.

رفاض see رفع

بعد 21¹⁴.

جري see تمررا.

تبرأ عن الشيخين 138 n. 4, 144 n. 1.

تختيط 91¹³.

ترفع see رفع.

ترضى عن الشيخين 138 n. 4, 144 n. 8.

تشيع 146, see شيعة.

جناح 110⁴.

جند 127²⁴.

دبابات 130²⁸.

رجة 28 ff. 28 n. 1.

رافض، رافضون، رافضي، رافضة، رفضة 137. See شيعة and

ترفع، رفع 142.

زعم 105 n. 2.

ساق 50¹¹, 5¹¹.

¹ Quotations exclusively refer to the second part of this treatise.