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This dissertation deals with the Arab-Byzantine frontier district, which at some time became known as the thughūr, from the beginning of 'Abbāsid rule until the death of Hārūn al-Rashīd (132-193/750-809). It emphasizes the place of the thughūr within Islamic society and government.

In many of the sources (such as chronicles, geographical works, hadīth, and biography), there is a tendency to idealization of matters having to do with the thughūr and with jihād. But in much of this material we may detect an underlying conflict over the role of the Caliph in Islamic society.

Chapter I provides an introduction to the subject. It also presents the Arab geographers' accounts of the thughūr, and examines the peculiarly fixed, anachronistic picture which prevailed of the region in later generations.

Chapter II deals with the reigns of the first two 'Abbāsid caliphs, Abū 'l-'Abbās (al-Saffah) and Abū Ja'far (al-Manṣūr), and is largely devoted to problems of chronology. It emerges, however, that al-Manṣūr sought to maintain a balance in the area by rotating the great warlords through the thughūr (both in performing the yearly expeditions and in governing the area as it was rebuilt). He succeeded in this partly because of the loyalty of military men who had previously been "companions" of Marwān II in the "Umayyad North."

Chapter III covers the reigns of al-Mahdī, al-Ḥādi, and Hārūn al-Rashīd. Al-Mahdī's interest in jihād resulted in a stronger caliphal presence in the thughūr, and this trend increased during the reign of Hārūn. The central event of this chapter is the creation of the district of al-`Awāsim. An old
numismatic puzzle, that of Hārūnābād and al-Hārūniyya, is solved, and casts some light on this event. The peculiar nature of this new district is examined, after an account of its administrative history.

Chapter IV takes up the problem of ju'l, or substitutes for the jihād. Ju'l breaks down into two varieties, which have become intertwined with one another apparently since the beginning: payments made by individuals to one another, and payments involving groups. This latter sense seems often to cover soldiers' wages paid by the government. This rather difficult question of ju'l is pursued through poetry, tafsīr, law books (the teachings of the early schools), and finally, the ḥadīth.

Chapter V, which is based on biographical sources, deals with the fairly numerous men of piety and learning who went to live in the thughūr at this time. Three men of the first generation of theghī scholars are singled out as exemplifying certain trends. The "schools" of the region are then mapped out, according to locality, from this time until the Byzantine reconquest. We find a tendency among the scholars, at least in the early period, to think of themselves (or to be thought of by others) as holders of genuine religious authority, in an area where the Caliph's power is somewhat limited.

Chapter VI provides a general conclusion.
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The Arab-Byzantine Frontier
c. 750 - 800
(after Kromm, die Grenze)
Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Frontier and the Caliphate

The district of the Caliphate which bordered on the Byzantine Empire, and which at some point became generally known as the thughūr, does not seem to have held a place among the provinces of Islam comparable to that of the frontier district of Byzantium among the lands of that great rival empire. In Byzantium, the system of themes appears to have emerged in response to the need to protect the new frontiers of Asia Minor; a frontier crisis of the seventh century may thus be said to have transformed Byzantine society and government. (1) And in the centuries between the Arab invasions and the Turkish influx, we may identify the frontier district as the breeding ground of a new Byzantine warrior aristocracy (2) and even of several emperors. But in the Islamic world, at least during the period of the independent caliphate, no such thing happened. Conquest and jihād are central values of the Islamic polity. Yet paradoxically, the Islamic frontier district never generated an elite of its own; and its role as a power base in the struggles of high politics was, at most times, correspondingly slight. We may see this contrast between the two rivals at its starkest in the mid fourth/tenth century, if we

(1) See R.-J. Lilie, Die byzantinische Reaktion auf die Ausbreitung der Araber, pp. 281f.

compare the careers of the soldier-emperors Nicephorus Phocas and John Tzimisces with that of their contemporary Sayf al-Dawla, a lord of the marches who failed utterly in his bid for power in Baghdad.

If any period constitutes an exception to this pattern, it is the one examined in this dissertation, the years from the 'Abbāsīd revolution until the death of Hārūn al-Rashīd. For the frontier district seems then to have been of some strategic importance in caliphal politics. That is, holding authority and commanding armies in the thughūr in those years might significantly advance one's position in the struggle for power at the center. Two of the best examples of this are the unsuccessful bid for power by 'Abdallāh ibn 'Ali in 136/754 (see below, 2.4) and events surrounding the accession of Hārūn in 170/786. (3)

At the same time, this period saw the emergence of the system of fortress-towns which became known as al-thughūr and al-‘awāṣim. The most important event in this process was the reorganization of the frontier district which occurred in 170/186-187, the first year of the reign of Hārūn. This system seems afterwards to have remained much the same until the Byzantine reconquests of the fourth/tenth century. (4)

While the later history of the region is somewhat better known, this crucial early period remains obscure. We do not know what sort of district this was (either before or after the reorganization of 170), how it was governed, and often, even by whom. (5) As will be seen, scholars who have touched upon this issue have run the risk of anachronism by taking the Muslim geographers (3) On the latter, see M. Bonnar, "Al-Khilifa al-Marid" (forthcoming).

(4) Haldon and Kennedy, p. 106.

(5) Haldon and Kennedy, p. 111, refer to "the leaders of Muslim activity on the frontiers" without specifying the offices held by these leaders. This vagueness is typical of writing on this subject.
as a principal source. For the earliest of the extant geographers lived several generations after the events in question, and they all present a picture of the frontier district which differs in several important respects from the situation which obtained in the early Abbāsid period (see following section and Chapter III).

In short, the emergence of the thughūr is a complicated question, one which necessarily combines theory with practice, words with deeds. This dissertation will focus upon this question, limiting itself, to the extent possible, to this narrow span of time. The central problem to be kept in mind will be the place of the frontier in Islamic government and society and--unavoidably--in Islamic thought.

1.2 The Geographers and the Thughūr

Muslim geographical tradition on the Arab-Byzantine frontier district is remarkable for its stability and consistency over generations and even centuries. What we may call a "classical" picture of the area prevailed in most medieval Islamic books dealing with geography and related subjects.

We already find this "classical" picture fully developed in the third/ninth century writers Istakhri, Ibn Khurraḍāḥbīhī, Yaʿqūbī, and Baladhurī. Two essential features of this "classical" picture stand out.

The first is the division of the "front line" of the frontier into districts attached (at least by name) to the provinces behind them. We thus have the *thughur al-Shām* (or *al-thughur al-shāmiyya*), comprising al-Maṣṣaḥa, Adana, Tarqa, al-Ḥadath, Ayn Zarba, al-Hārūniyya, al-Kanīsa al-Sawdi, and a number of smaller places; and the *thughur al-Jazīra* (or *al-thughur al-jazīriyya*), whose most important places are Shimal, Kazkh, Malatya, Har'ash, Zibatra, and Hisn Naṣrū.(8) Occasionally we find a third division added to the north, in Armenian territory, called *al-thughur al-bakriyya*. However, the earliest writers on this subject, and most later authors, limit themselves to two divisions, the Syrian and the Jazīran *thughur*.

The second of these two features of the "classical" tradition is the division between the *thughur*, here conceived as a single elongated district facing the enemy directly, and the *'awāsim*, a large area containing supporting positions behind the *thughur*. The *'awāsim* ("the protectors," or "the inviolate ones") are said to owe their name to the fact that the Muslims would fall back on them after their own raids and when under attack.(10) The principal cities of this district are Manbij, Dulūk, Ra'bān, Qurūs, Antioch, and Tīzin.

---

(7) On the vocalization of this toponym, see below, 5.4.2.


(9) Qudāma, pp. 254-255; Canard, H'mandanes, pp. 254-261.

(10) Balādhurī, Futūḥ, pp. 132, 147-152; Ya'qūb, Bālā' al-buldān, III, 741-742; Canard, H'mandanes, p. 226; idem, "al-'Awasim," EI2, I, 760-762; below, 3.2.

(11) Al-Ḥadath and Har'ash are assigned by different authors to the Syrian
Despite disagreement over details, these two organizing principles appear in most accounts, medieval and modern, of the frontier district. However, the fact that they do not fit together has escaped general notice.

According to the first division, the frontier is cut into two pieces each of which bears the name of and is presumably an appendage of the larger province behind it. According to the second division, the thughur as a unit are cut off from other Islamic provinces by the intermediate zone of the 'awāṣim. Here the other provinces (Syria, Jazīra) have become irrelevant. Our geographical sources have thus maintained side by side two basically incompatible versions of the administrative geography of the area.

We may detect some possible reasons for this. The first division, into Syrian and Jaziran thughur, has a basis in topography: that is, the thughur al-Shām occupy the Cilician plain and points immediately adjacent, while the thughur al-Jazīra are scattered in the mountainous country to the north and east. But the origins of this dividing principle are probably to be found in late Umayyad times, when in one year there would typically be a "right" and a "left" ghûfā, or summer expedition. Syria was, of course, the metropolitan province; but equally important is the fact that al-Jazīra was part of the huge, loosely unified area which has now (largely on numismatic grounds) been identified as the "Umayyad North." While the fron-

and to the Jaziran thughūr. Sumaysāt appears in several districts.

Many examples could be given.

(12) Or three; this does not change the point.


(14) See, for instance, Lilie, Die Reaktion, p. 149 (A.D. 732).

(15) On the administrative unity of the provinces al-Jazīra, Arāmaty, Arrān, and Ṣ̲h̲u̲�̲r̲̲b̲̲a̲̲y̲̲ŷ̲̲jn in the Umayyad period, see M. Bates, forthcoming paper; D.A. Spellberg, "The Janza Dirhams: Administrative and Historical Sig-
tier area was not then organized as it was later, it nonetheless reflected this great territorial division within the Umayyad caliphate. Our geographers would seem to have retained a memory of this state of affairs. Much the same sort of thing seems to have happened in the case of the two yearly raids (the ṣa’ifa and the shatiya) prescribed by our authors. The winter expedition (shatiya) seems to have been an Umayyad practice discontinued under the ʿAbbāsid, but kept alive in bookish tradition.\(^{(16)}\)

The second division, into thughur and ʿawāsīm, must be dated to the early ʿAbbāsid period. The crucial date here is 170, when Harūn crested the district of al-ʿAwāṣim. This event and its aftermath will be taken up in Chapter III; it will be shown there that the distinction between thughur and ʿawāsīm did not exist at that time, at least not in the form which we know from the geographers.\(^{(17)}\) But we may already see that our two organizing principles derive from two distinct historical periods.

The apparently stable system which the geographers present is thus an idealized hybrid. We may therefore ask to what extent it ever reflected the administrative and political realities of the region.

This it could only have done at the time of our earliest extant writers on geography, that is, in the mid-to-late third/ninth century. But one of these authors, İstakhri, shows signs of discomfort with a scheme which has already significance," Museum Notes of the American Numismatic Society (forthcoming); M.G. Morony, *Iraq after the Muslim Conquest* (Princeton, 1984), pp. 135-136; below, 6.2.

\(^{(16)}\) See Haldon and Kennedy, "The Arab-Byzantine Frontier," p. 113, where Kennedy finds only two instances of winter raids in the century following the ʿAbbāsid revolution. These occur in 178 (Tabari, III, 637) and 231 (Tabari, III, 1365-1367).

\(^{(17)}\) Only in the earliest of them, İstakhri, do we find evidence of the earlier state of affairs. See p. 62: ḫa-ṣam al-ʿawāṣim faʾam al-ṣa’tiya wa-layna sawāf bi-ʿamnihi yusamm al-ʿawāṣim...
grown rigid.

I have joined the thughūr to al-Shām. Even though part of the thughūr is known as the thughūr al-Shām and part as the thughūr al-Jazīra, both belong to al-Shām, because everything which lies beyond the Euphrates belongs to al-Shām. However, [the district] from Malapya to Mar’ash is called the thughūr al-Jazīra, because the people of al-Jazīra perform garrison duty there,(18) and because they go on raids there, not because it is part of al-Jazīra.(19)

Iṣṭakhrī makes his correction on theoretical grounds (kullu ʿāmar aʿl-Furat min al-Shām). He seems to be trying to find explanations for more or less inherited categories which do not make sense to him.(20)

In geographical writers of succeeding generations, this idealization of the thughūr assumes other forms. Qudāmā's, in a well-known passage, names the dates of departure, length, and other details of the yearly raids.(21) Qudāmā's source for this information is the ahl al-khibra min al-thughriyya ("knowledgeable residents of the thughūr"), and the entire passage may be inspired more by the pen than by the sword.

Mas'ūdī in the Kitāb al-tanbīh is not concerned with the organization of the thughūr district in itself. The thughūr arise only in connection with the bilād al-Rūm, a subject of particular interest to this author. In Mas'ūdī's stately processions of Roman and Byzantine emperors, of Byzantine administrative districts, and of ceremonies of redeeming captives (ṣafāya),

(18) Correct text of Iṣṭakhrī to yurabāṭuna.


(20) The statement that the thughūr al-Shām and the thughūr al-Jazīra were manned respectively by Syrians and Jaziran is in itself something of an idealization. At any rate, this was not the case in the period dealt with by this dissertation; here the Syrians and Jaziran tend to be lumped together, usually in contradistinction to Khurāsānīs.

(21) Qudāmā, p. 259. Qudāmā adds a spring raid (rabiʿiyay) to the usual two. His preference for threes over twos also appears in his adding al-thughūr al-bakriyya to the Syrian and Jaziran thughūr (see above).
the thughûr appear many times as a simple geographical designation. But the need for prêsence at bionséance leads at times to distortions. In his list of sindya, Masûdi lists each time an azir al-thughûr al-sha’miyya, after naming the reigning caliph and emperor. For the first fid’â, that of 189, this title is assigned to Abu Sulaym Faraj; for the second, occurring in 192, to Thabit ibn Naqr. While these men did hold positions of authority in the thughûr, they do not seem to have held the title of amir (below, 3.3.3.1).

Ibn Hawqal, writing after the fall of the region to the Byzantines, echoes Ištakhri’s account more or less verbatim, but then gives in his own words what is probably the fullest account which we have of the region in the fourth/tenth century. But here Ibn Hawqal ignores the traditional division of the region, being mainly concerned with the depredations of the Hamdânids and the decline of Islam. Ibn Hawqal, pp. 179-189; cf. Miquel, La géographie humaine, II, 473-474. This seems to be true also of the Kitâb al-masâlik wa’il-mamâlik by al-Hasayn ibn Ahmad al-Muhallabi, written for the Fâtimid caliph al-‘Aziz billah. See Canard, "Quelques observations sur l’introduction géographique de la Bughyat at’-T’alab," pp. 45-46.

(22) Masûdi, Tanbih, pp. 189-190.


(24) Muqaddasî, p. 148 (Malaya). Some of the old conceptions are still present, despite the changed circumstances: at p. 151, the iqlim of al-Sham is still described as having al-ribâtâr al-fâdila wa’il-thughûr al-jallîa.
These fourth-century writers thus seem to have lost interest in what we have called the "classical" conception of the thughûr, a conception which seems to date from the mid-third century. Nonetheless, they did not openly challenge it; and in later literature, this "classical" picture predominated, even as it became increasingly irrelevant. (25)

For our purposes we may note the tendency to anachronism present even in the earliest extant writers on geographical matters. This tendency seems to arise from a need to idealize anything having to do with the thughûr and with jihâd. And we find such an idealization of the thughûr assuming many forms, in a variety of sources of different kinds.

1.3 Sources

(25) The late fourth/tenth-century Persian Hudûd al-'Slam (ed. and tr. Minorsky, London, 1937) follows Istakhri in describing the "fortified line of Jazira" as "belonging to Syria" (pp. 148-169). In the work of al-Muhallabi (see above, n. 23), as recorded by Ibn al-'Adîm, "On voit que la plus grande partie de la description [of Tarsûs] se rapporte à une èpoque antérieure." See Canard, "Quelques observations," pp. 47f. The same seems to be true of the (apparently no longer extant) Siyar al-thughûr by the fourth-century Ahû 'Amr 'Uthman ibn 'Abdallah al-Tarsûsî, a work which seems to go far in the "idealization" of the thughûr. For the view of the matter in the late Middle Ages, see Yâqût, Mu'jam al-buldûn, III, 741-742, and passim; Qalqashandi, Subh al-a'sbû, IV, 130-135.

(26) For the most part, the early 'Abbâsid thughûr have been discussed only in works devoted to other, broader topics. At the turn of the century, E.W. Brooks collected and translated the sources then available, in a series of two articles entitled "Byzantium and the Arabs in the Time of the Early Abbasids." These articles, which give little by way of critical analysis, are today of limited value, especially in view of the new sources which have become available since 1900.

The three-volume study Al-fudûd al-islâmiyya al-bizanîyya by Fathi Osman covers a wide range of subjects. While it does not discuss the early 'Abbâsid period in critical detail, it is useful for its collection of source materials.

A concise work by 'A.-S. Jamsûrî entitled Al-Thughûr al-bâriyya
Modern scholars writing on the early Islamic *thughūr* (26) have tended to use a narrower range of sources than have Byzantinists writing on comparable subjects. The Islamicists have relied primarily upon chroniclers (Arabic and other) and geographers. The information which these provide, while important and (in some cases) plentiful, results in a somewhat monochrome picture. The Byzantinists, on the other hand, have successfully integrated other sources, most notably numismatic, legal, and hagiographic, into their discussions of these, as of other events. (27) Such materials are available to the Islamicists.

al-islāmiyya 'alā budūd al-dawla al-bīzanṭiyya fī 'l-'usūr al-wastū fī 'l-'usūr al-wastū provides helpful summaries on places and events, but likewise does not deal with this early period in any detail.

P. von Sivers has written an article on the *thughūr* ("Taxes and Trade in the 'Abbasid Thughūr, 750-962/133-351"), which includes some interesting pages on our subject (pp. 74-77). However, the early period receives somewhat short shrift, being subsumed under the first of three periods spanning the entire history of the 'Abbasid *thughūr*. Furthermore, von Sivers' interest in economic and social matters works more or less to the exclusion of administrative history, religion, and ideology, all of which are important. In any case, it is questionable to what extent one may follow von Sivers in speaking of a "ruling class" in the *thughūr* if, as is maintained in this dissertation, the Islamic frontier region failed to produce its own local aristocracy.

The Birmingham dissertation by 'A.-R. Salem, entitled "War and Peace in Caliphate and Empire: Political Relations between the 'Abbasids and Byzantium," uses a wide range of sources, and is frequently helpful. However, Salem's emphasis is different from that of this dissertation, and since he has taken on practically the full gamut of Byzantine-Arab relations, he does not enter into detail on most of the matters which will come up here.

So far there is only one article which deals with the Islamic frontier district of these years in and of itself, in any detail. This is the result of a collaboration between a Byzantinist (J.F. Haldon) and an Islamicist (H. Kennedy). See Haldon and Kennedy, "The Arab-Byzantine Frontier in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries: Military Organisation and Society in the Borderlands." Here the frontier districts of both sides are described with clarity.

(27) See, for example, the articles on the frontier in the *Actes du XVe Congrès Internationale des Études Byzantines* (Bucharest, 1974-1975). The Byzantine historian A. Pertusi in particular wrote interesting pages on the social history of the Islamic frontier: see his "Tra storia e leggende: Akritai e Ghazi sulla frontiera orientale di Bisanzio," espe-
cist in great profusion, and their exploitation for the history of the thughûr is overdue.

This dissertation is an attempt to approach the early 'Abbâsid thughûr through various kinds of sources. Chapters II and III, concerned primarily with the administrative history of the district, are based upon the works of the historians. However, Chapter III also takes up a numismatic problem which casts some light on the problem of the reorganization of the thughûr as a distinct entity. Chapter IV takes up a subject of direct relevance to frontier society, that of ju'âl (substitutes for the jihad), and examines its development in Islamic law and in hadîth. Chapter V uses biographical literature to draw a group portrait of the "scholars and saints" who lived in or were otherwise associated with the region of the thughûr. (28)

However, materials of such different origins cannot be woven together into one seamless narrative. Individual genres of Islamic literature, such as history, hadîth, and biography, have a way of addressing the world only according to their own viewpoints, at times to the apparent exclusion even of one another. Consequently, we shall not find corroboration in the chronicles officially pp. 248f. The above-mentioned article by Haldon and Kennedy also illustrates this point.

for most of the information derived from law, hadith, and biography. Nonethe­
less, this exploration of different genres will, it is hoped, lead to a better understanding of the *thughūr* in relation to the Islamic world than would otherwise have been possible.\(^{(29)}\)

1.4 Themes

The problem of the early 'Abbāsid *thughūr* has several aspects. It involves, first of all, the caliphs and their deputies. But other sorts of people are ultimately no less important. These include the men who went to fight, the soldiers and the volunteers; and the men of learning and piety who are known to have settled there in considerable numbers. Each of these groups (roughly, caliphs, soldiers, scholars) will be taken up in turn.

To be sure, other groups could also be studied, and themes could be identified other than the ones dealt with here. Nonetheless, from these chapters there will emerge an understanding of the contrast made at the beginning of this introduction. In Byzantium, where religion for the most part rejected the idea of holy war, the phenomenon of the frontier came to pervade the entire society. In Islam, the very stress on *jihād* led to the opposite situation. That is, the centrality of the concept made it too important to be left in the hands of marauding frontiersmen. Instead, we find the Islamic center asserting itself, in every instance.

Caliphs worked out different methods of controlling the area, with varying degrees of success; but above all they themselves, as well as the 'Abbāsid family in general, imprinted their own personalities on the area as on few other places. As a result, the region remained stillborn: from an adminis-

\(^{(29)}\) I am indebted to the work of A. Noth, *Heiliger Krieg und heiliger Kampf in Islam und Christentum* (Bonn, 1966) for my understanding of the concept of *jihād*.
trative point of view, the thughūr never became a real province. The con­
trast with the Byzantine kleisourai is instructive.(30)

The problem of ju‘l likewise provides a perfect illustration of this move
from periphery to center. Here we begin with a debate of direct relevance to
the frontier, and seemingly only to the frontier, only to find it taking
place in such places as Kufa, Basra, and Medina. Bits of the debate make
their way to the thughūr (below, 4.5.3.2), but it has to do more with the
major legal and theological issues of the day, than with local conditions.

Finally, the "scholars and saints" pose the issue in the starkest fashion.
One acquired religious merit by traveling to the thughūr, by living there,
and by participating in the jihād. But this merit (faṣl al-jihād) does not
come simply from fighting the enemy: it is related to other religious ideas
then current in the Islamic world.

1.4.1 Chronology

The classic work in the field of Arab-Byzantine relations, Byzance et les
Arabes by A. Vasiliev and his translators/editors, begins with the Amorian
dynasty (820-867).(31) For those interested in Arab-Byzantine relations of
the early ’Abbāsid period, this presents a problem. For while detailed work
on political and military events has been done on some of this period,(32) we

(30) See J. Ferluga, "Le clisure bizantine in Asia Minore." Ferluga empha­
sizes that the kleisourai were independent administrative and military
units. The kleisourarch did not hold a rank subordinate to that of the
strategos of a theme (p. 10). We find a kleisourarch (or the son of a
kleisourarch) patronizing a painter/ascetic/stylite in Cappadocia around
the year 700 (p. 12; see N. Thierry, "Les peintures murales de six
églises du haut moyen âge en Cappadoce." Comptes rendus de l'Acadé­
448; resume in Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzan­
tines (Bucharest, 1974), I, 286-288).

(31) Vasiliev did not explain this choice. See Byzance et les Arabes, I,
xiiif.
still lack the sort of detailed, continuous narrative which, as Vasiliev him­
self noted, is a prerequisite for other sorts of inquiry.(33)

However, an early 'Abbāsid installment of Byzance et les Arabes is beyond
the reach of this dissertation. And in any case, the emphasis here will be
on the Islamic world, rather than on the Byzantine. Accordingly, this dis­
sertation will have to begin by filling gaps in chronology (particularly for
the first two 'Abbāsid caliphs) before proceeding to other matters. This
will be taken up in Chapter II.

(32) S. Moscati, "Studi storici sul califfato di al-Mahdi," "Nuovi studi sto­
rici sul califfato di al-Mahdi," "Le califat d'al-Hādi." M. Canard, "La
prise d'Héraclée et les relations entre Hārūn ar-Rashīd et l'Empereur
Nicephore Ier."

(33) Byzance et les Arabes, I, xiii.
Chapter II

ABU 'L-'ABBAS AND ABU 'JA'FAR

2.1 Introduction

By the year A.D. 720 the Muslims had gained control of most of the area known as the thughur.(34) The situation in the area then became stable, despite minor fluctuations. Byzantine strategy in these years consisted of harassing and, when possible, destroying Muslim outposts, while maintaining a barren region between the Empire and the frontier.(35) The Muslims, for their part, began to dig themselves into the area during this late Umayyad period.(36) Having given up their earlier policy of sending armies to winter in the interior of Anatolia, they now devoted most of their energy to the frontier region itself and to the nearest Byzantine lands. This change in policy accompanied, or was a consequence of, their abandonment of any practical strategy directed at Constantinople.(37)

The rise of the 'Abbāsids to power did not immediately bring about changes in the thughur or in Muslim strategy. Lilie has argued convincingly that the history of the thughur under the early 'Abbāsids may be seen as a direct consequence of the situation inherited from the late Umayyad period. That is,

(34) Lilie, Die byzantinische Reaktion, pp. 138-140, 159-163.
(36) Baladhuri, Futūh, p. 185; Lilie, p. 139.
(37) Lilie, pp. 160, 181-182. According to Lilie, it was only after 700 that the Arab expeditions acquired the character ascribed to them by Wellhausen, that of raids for the purpose of plunder.
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the Byzantine policy of harassing the Arab frontier settlements (without venturing far beyond them) forced the Muslims to improve their own defenses; a half-century of this process resulted in the organized system familiar to us from the geographers. (38)

Nevertheless, this defensive reading of Muslim strategy does not give an adequate account of Muslim policy during the early 'Abbāsid period. Lilie describes the Arab expeditions in Asia Minor as more or less pointless forays with the goal of plunder. (39) The position of Salem, that the early 'Abbāsids were interested in peaceful relations and in maintaining their defenses, likewise comes to grief on the offensive nature of the Muslim expeditions. (40)

This chapter will concentrate on the administrative history of the thughur during the reigns of the first two 'Abbāsid caliphs. This will lead, it is hoped, to a better understanding of what the thughur meant at the time, and of the true nature of the activities which went on there. First, however, must come a brief survey of the main sources.

2.1.1 Sources

The detailed treatment which the preceding (Umayyad) period has received from modern scholars has not been carried over to Arab-Byzantine relations under the early 'Abbāsids. (41)

(40) Salem, "War and Peace in Caliphate and Empire," pp. 65f.
(41) Castani’s *Chronographia islamica* (Paris, 1912) ends with the year 132. His *Cronografia generale del bacino mediterraneo* (Rome, 1923) covers the years A.H. 132-164, but is not of much use, since it covers most of the Old World, while neglecting some of the early Arabic sources (such as Ya’qūbī). Castani does not, in any case, give critical discussions of the rather severe problems of chronology which arise for this period.
2.1.1.1 Muslim

The major Muslim sources are Tabari, Ya'qubi, Khalifa ibn Khayyat, Salamuri (both the Futuh al-buldan and the Ansab al-ashraf), Azdli, and Ibn al-'Adim.

A major divergence exists between Ya'qubi and Tabari. (42) This divergence, which will recur throughout this chapter, is important in the history of the tughur of this period, especially with regard to the role played by Salih ibn 'Ali (below, 2.6.1-2). Other early Muslim sources tend to be close to Tabari, with the major exception of Khalifa ibn Khayyat (d. 240), whose Ta'rikh is usually (though not always) closer to Ya'qubi's version of events.

The Ta'rikh al-Mawsil by al-Azdl gives some details on the tughur not available elsewhere. For the most part, however, Azdli seems to be following Tabari's sources. Much the same may be said of the Kitab al-'unwan by the Christian Arabic writer Agapinus of Hambij, insofar as it relies on Muslim sources.

The all-important Kitab Futuh al-buldan by al-Salamuri (d. 279) follows a different principle of organization from that of the chronicles. Disagreement over details occurs frequently between Salamuri and Tabari, but this is often susceptible to harmonization. We may thus add the Futuh to a "synop-

The collection of "annalistic extracts" by E.W. Brooks is also not very useful, both because of sources which have become available since 1900 (such as Khalifa and the Ansab of Salamuri), and because of Brooks' omission of page references. The works by Weilbacher ("Die Kämpfe der Araber") and Canard ("Les expéditions") both concentrate on the Umayyad period. But this is also largely true of Lilie's Die byzantinische Reaktion. Lilie provides a rather detailed chronology of the Umayyad period (pp. 47-162), but contents himself "mit einem kurzen Überblick" of the first 'Abbasid half-century (pp. 169-182; see p. 169, n. 2). Lilie's 'Abbasid section is useful nonetheless. The most detailed discussion of this earliest 'Abbasid period is that of Salem ("War and Peace," pp. 28-63).

(42) As noted by Brooks, English Historical Review XV (1900), p. 730. Salem, pp. 240-261, only notes that Ya'qubi "often throws much light" on Tabari.
tic" collection, presumably deriving from the same sources. In opposition are Ya'qūbī and Khalīfa, who seem to be in a different tradition.

Baladhuri's *Ansāb al-ashrāf*, a book of a different genre, adds precious, detailed information on politics and 'Abbāsid family gossip. On the other hand, the anonymous *Kitāb al-'uyūn wa'l-ḥadā'iq* is of no help in this chapter.

The *Zubdat al-ḥalab min ta'rīkh Ḥalab* by Ibn al-'Adīm, though a late source, provides the local view from Jund Qinnasrīn, and while its notices of ṣanā‘īf are of secondary importance, the information which it gives on administrative divisions and on governors is indispensable. However, Ibn al-'Adīm was confronted with much the same problems of chronology as confront us now, and it must be kept in mind that his statements may be the result of his own harmonization and reflection.

2.1.1.2 Christian

The chronicle of Theophanes is the principal Byzantine source for this period. Later Byzantine historians depend on him; his contemporary Nicephorus adds little information of use here.

The Syriac chronicle attributed to Dionysius of Tell Maḥrēṣ(45) is our only source for this period which gives extensive information on the lives and sufferings of ordinary inhabitants of al-Jazīra and the thughur (below, 2.9). Other Syriac chronicles, especially Michael the Syrian and the anonymous

(43) Prominent among these sources would be Wāqīdī, frequently cited by Baladhuri and Ṭabarī.


Chronicle of 1234 (which seem to incorporate Syriac sources as old as the ninth-century Chronica Minora) are essential to the enterprise. For Armenian matters, Lewond is indispensable, though unreliable on dates.

The Christian writers (with the exception of Theophanes and Nicephorus) lack precision in matters of chronology. They also tend to present a more or less unified front when contrasted with the Muslim chroniclers. However, it is frequently easier to account for and even to harmonize these discrepancies than to bridge the gap between Ya'qūbī and the Muslim "synoptics."

It will be noticed, in any case, that documentation for this period is relatively plentiful. The chronicles of various traditions, combined with Baladhuri's Futūḥ, provide a fairly full picture of events. The Ansāb provides insight into the inner workings of the 'Abbāsid family and government, while the chronicle of Dionysius allows unique glimpses into "real life."

2.2 Ishaq ibn Muslim at Sumaysāt

Upon their triumph over the Umayyads in 132/750, the 'Abbāsids had immediately to face several military challenges from the residue of the Umayyad armies. Ibn Hubayra, besieged in Wāsiṭ with an important force, became the principal obstacle to 'Abbāsid rule in Iraq. But in no sense did he become a center of local resistance. He had already "played an ambiguous role in the drama," especially by refraining from coming to Marwān's aid in the final crisis, and now held out for favorable terms of surrender. These terms were

(46) See preface by J.-M. Fiey to the translation of Chronicle of 1234, Vol. II (Louvain, 1974), pp. v-xii. This chronicle is independent from that of Michael the Syrian, though they share common sources.

(47) Agapius of Manbij may be included here, except for when he relies on Muslim sources.

(48) H. Kennedy, The Early Abbasid Caliphate, p. 69.
duly granted, and then duly violated, with Ibn Hubayra and his family being put to the sword. (49)

Events in Syria and al-Jazīra, the homeland of the Umayyad armies, were much less orderly. Several more or less distinct anti-Abbasid revolts may be traced there in the years 132 and 133. The revolt which centered in Qinnasrīn, and which was led by Abū 'l-Ward (a former general and "companion" of Marwān II) together with Abū Muḥammad al-Sufyānī (50) was separate from the (southern) Syrian uprising led by Ḥabīb ibn Mūrra al-Murrī (described as min quwwād Marwān wa-fursānīhī). (51) These movements lacked any connection with one another, so that the Abbasid ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAlī was able to come to terms with Ḥabīb as soon as he got word of Abū 'l-Ward's uprising. (52)

At about the same time, a third uprising took place. This one began in al-Jazīra, and like the other two is described in the sources as a tabyīḍ, or pro-Umayyad uprising. It is of interest to us here because it culminated in a long siege at Zumaysāt in the thughur al-Jazīra. Tabari's account is the one usually cited:

When word reached the people of al-Jazīra of the revolt of Abū 'l-Ward and the people of Qinnasrīn, they revolted. At that time Mūsā ibn Ka'b ['Abbasid governor of al-Jazīra] was in Harrān with 3000 soldiers, holding fast to the city. They went there in a state of rebellion (mubayyīḍin) from every direction, and laid siege to [Mūsā] and his fellow defenders. At that time they were not under a unified command. Thereupon Ḥanṭiq ibn Muslim came to them from Armenia (he had departed from there upon hearing of Marwān's defeat), and the men of al-Jazīra made him their chief. He besieged Mūsā ibn Ka'b for around two months. (53)

(49) Tabari, III, 61-72.


(51) Tabari, III, 56.

(52) Tabari, III, 56; Ibn al-Athīr, V, 452.

(53) Tabari, III, 56-57.
Ishaq ibn Muslim al-'UqaylI was a leader of the Qays, and one of Marwan's important officers. In his first appearance in the sources, he conquered the qilâ' Tūmânshāh in 120. In 126, as Marwan prepared to head south to avenge al-Walid, he sent Ishaq to al-Bāb, as head of the Qays. We find him leading the maysara in battle against al-Khaybar al-Khārijī. In 132-133 Ishaq was unquestionably governor of Armenia. His name appears on undated bronze coins of that province.

Tabari then reports that the caliph Abū 'l-'Abbās sent Abū Ja'far to suppress this rebellion, which had spread throughout the province of al-Jazīra. Ishaq was reinforced by Arabs of Rabl'a, under the leadership of "a man of the Baruriyya called Bukayrā." These were routed by Abū Ja'far's forces, apparently in the area of Dārā and Māridīn. These Khārijīs were thus no more of a match for the 'Abbāsid Khurasan armies than the (no doubt similar) forces of Abū 'l-Ward and Ḥabīb were in Syria at about the same time.

---

(54) Tabari, II, 1635.
(56) Tabari, II, 1941; Khalifa, pp. 574-575; Azdī, p. 72.
(57) Baladhuri Futūḥ, p. 209. Khalifa (p. 620) says that when Marwan left Armenia he installed 'Āṣim ibn 'Abdallāh ibn Yazīd al-Khālidī as governor there. Al-Debbāk sent Musafir ibn al-Qassāb who killed 'Āṣim. The governorship was taken by 'Abdallāh ibn Muslim, who died and was replaced by his brother Ishaq. Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, p. 49, cites Ya’qūbī, II, 410, where, however, there is nothing about this.
(59) Tabari, III, 57. Bukayrā's maraudings are lamented by Dionysius of Tell Māhrā, p. 46.
However, still according to Ṭabarî, Ishaq left his brother Bakkâr with a garrison at Edessa, and proceeded with the greater part of his army to Sumaysât.

Abû '1-'Abbâs wrote to 'Abdallâh ibn 'Ali instructing him to proceed with his army to [fight] Ishaq in Sumaysât. Ishaq then had 60,000 men from all of al-Jazîra. 'Abdallâh ibn 'Ali's forces faced them from across the Euphrates.\(^{(60)}\)

This siege lasted seven months, during which (still according to Ṭabarî) Abû '1-'Abbâs sent Abû Ja'far, who entered into negotiations with Ishaq, resulting in an aṣām for the besieged. Ishaq then became a trusted companion of Abû Ja'far.

Ṭabarî's version of these events presents several difficulties. First of all, he describes Abû Ja'far as arriving at Sumaysât when his uncle 'Abdallâh ibn 'Ali was already there. Abû Ja'far is not described as relieving or reinforcing his uncle; instead, 'Abdallâh simply drops out of the picture. Ya'qûbî presents two versions of these events, whereby the siege of Sumaysât was conducted either by Abû Ja'far or by 'Abdallâh, but in any case not by both.\(^{(61)}\) Likewise, we find a certain amount of confusion on precisely when Abû Ja'far became governor of al-Jazîra, Armenia and Azerbaijan.\(^{(62)}\)

This discord in the sources about the roles played by 'Abdallâh and Abû Ja'far—the two main contenders for the succession to Abû '1-'Abbâs—is of interest in the light of later events. However, of more importance to the

\(^{(60)}\) Ṭabarî, III, 57.

\(^{(61)}\) Ya'qûbî, I, 425. Ibn al-'Adîm, Zubdâ, p. 56, has 'Abdallâh operating against Ishaq from a base in Dâbih. Ibn al-Athîr (V, 434-435) who follows Ṭabarî in all this, notes the discrepancy, wa-ṣâila inna 'Abdallâh....

\(^{(62)}\) According to Baladhurî, Futûh, p. 192, and Ibn al-'Adîm, Zubdâ, p. 56, Abû Ja'far already held this governorship when the siege of Sumaysât began. Ṭabarî (III, 57) seems to imply that the appointment followed upon these events.
The history of the thawâr is the fact that only Tabari (and later historians who follow him, such as Ibn al-Athîr) says that Ishâq ibn Muslim became head of the rebellion of al-Jazîra in Edessa and Harrân. In the other sources, Ishâq simply moves from Armenia westward to Sumaysât. (63)

In taking up a position in Sumaysât, Ishâq would have been venturing just beyond the borders of his own province, (64) and, more importantly, doing so with his own forces, rather than with all the fighting men of al-Jazîra. For it seems improbable that such a large force (Tabari says 60,000) could have stayed in a frontier outpost even under peaceful conditions; and what reason was there for all the Jazîrans to retreat to the frontier, when this did not in any case put them beyond the reach of the 'Abbâsid forces?

According to Christian writers, Syriac and Arabic, Edessa was occupied and fortified by one Mansûr bar Ga’unna, a leader of the Qays, while Ishâq ibn Muslim took up his position in Sumaysât. The Jazîran forces besieging Mînâh ibn Ka’b at Harrân dispersed upon hearing of the defeat of Abî ‘I-ward; and after a while, Mansûr bar Ga’unna and Ishâq ibn Muslim both surrendered “of their own accord.” (65) In other words, we have here separate, but coordinated resistance in Edessa and Sumaysât. Baladhûrî largely confirms this picture:

---

(63) Ya’qûbî, II, 425; Baladhûrî, Anṣâb al-âshrîf, III, 154; Agapius of Hamshîr, Kitâb al-umâm, VIII, 530; Ibn al-Adîm, Zubda, p. 56; Michael the Syrian, II, 518.

(64) Those borders were ill-defined. However, the northern part of the thawâr al-Jazîra was (later) considered part of Armenia IV (Arminiya al-rabî’). For Ibn Khurradadhbih (BGA VI, 122) Armenia IV consisted of Shimshat, Khîlât, Ardjih, Bajunays; cf. Baladhûrî Futûh, p. 184; Khalîfîn, p. 627; Dionysius of Tell Mahrâ, pp. 56, 107; Michael the Syrian, II, 518; W. N. Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor, p. 325; A. Ter-Ghewondyan, The Arab Emirates in Baghrâtîd Armenia, p. 32.

(65) Chronicle of 1236, I, 260-261; Agapius, p. 530.
Abū 'Amr al-Bāhili and others told me that Hisn Mansūr was named after Mansūr ibn Ja'wana ibn al-Harith al-'Amir of Qays. He was assigned to build and repair it. He stayed there in the days of Marwān to keep the enemy back, with a large army of Syrians and Jazirans. This Mansūr was in command of the men of Edessa when they resisted at the beginning of the Dawla, and when al-Mansūr, then Abu 'l-'Abbās' governor of al-Jazīra, besieged them. When he conquered the town, Mansūr fled, but was then granted a reprieve (ba-'umina wa-tahara). But when 'Abdallah threw off the rule of Abū Ja'far al-Mansūr, he put [Mansūr ibn Ja'wana] in charge of his šurūṭa. Then, when 'Abdallah fled to al-Basra...[Mansūr ibn Ja'wana was brought to al-Mansūr at al-Raqqa, and executed in the year 141. (66)

With this we might consider the question of who led the revolt in al-Jazīra to be settled for once and for all. However, we find more candidates for this position elsewhere. According to al-Ya'qūbī, the revolt in al-Jazīra was led by Muḥammad ibn Haslama ibn 'Abd al-Malik (Ibn Ja'wana is not mentioned). (67) Ibn al-'Adīm has another Umayyad prince, Abān ibn Mu'āwiya ibn Hišām ibn 'Abd al-Malik holding out at Sumaysāt with 4000 men after the capitulation of Ishaq ibn Muslim. (68) Ibn al-'Adīm then relates that Abān was defeated by Ḫusayd ibn Qaṭḥāba, who took Sumaysāt by force in Ramadan 133.

In the Ansāb al-ashrāf, however we also find a report that when, in 137, 'Abdallah ibn 'All was about to embark on the ṣā'ifa which later turned into a rebellion, he had first to deal with a force of 4000 led by this same Abān. (69) There is no indication here of what Abān had been doing for the previous four years; we can only surmise that he had remained independent.

---

(66) Baladhuri, Futūh, p. 192; cf. Ansāb, III, 106; Ṭabarī, III, 129, where Mansūr's execution occurs in 140.

(67) Ya'qūbī, II, 425.

(68) Zubda, p. 56. There may be an allusion to this at Ṭabarī, III, 57, fa-kharaja Ishaq illā abī Ja'far wa-tamma al-ṣulḫ beynshumā wa-kāna `indahu man ṣīhara aṣhābahu.

(69) Baladhuri, Ansāb, III, 109.
with his force of 4000—which seems unlikely.

Neither of these Umayyad princes would have had much hope of mercy from the 'Abbasids in 133; they had every reason to hold out longer than the other commanders. There may be truth to many, or even all of these versions. Resistance in Syria and al-Jazira was notoriously uncoordinated (see above); and different leaders, Qaysi generals and Umayyad princes, may have operated more or less independently of one another.

The one version which should probably be rejected is that of Ṭabarī. No early source confirms Ṭabarī’s assertion that Ishaq went first to Edessa, and became commander of the Jaziran forces. Aside from the impracticality of moving these forces to Sumaysat, we may argue that the discipline and tenacity of Ishaq’s men shows that they were different from the less stable Jazirans. By all accounts, the siege lasted for seven months; even if this was actually no more than a prolonged bargaining over terms of surrender, it nonetheless represents a far more unified effort than did any of the revolts going on in Syria and al-Jazira at the time. These were probably the men Ishaq had brought with him from Armenia, Syro-Jazirans with experience of fighting in the Caucasus and the Byzantine frontiers, as well, of course, as the long succession of civil wars which had marked the reign of Marwān and the first 'Abbāsid years.

(70) As Kennedy implies, Early Abbasid Caliphate, pp. 49-50. However, see Ṭabarī, III, 57, wa-kānār baynahumā waqā‘ār.

(71) Note that the men described as leaders of the revolt were closely associated with frontier warfare. Mansūr ibn Ja‘wana had been so involved with the thughūr that the fortress of Ḥisn Mansūr was named for him, Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 192, and above. Abān ibn Mu‘āwiya came from a family noted for its activity in the thughūr (his father and uncle conducted frequent expeditions), even though Abān himself is mentioned only as leading forces against the Khārijite Ibn Mu‘āwiya in 129, Ṭabarī, II, 1978-1980; Baladhuri, Ansāb, III, 175. Muhammad ibn Maslama appears in the sources only here, but again his ancestry is enough to qualify him as a thaghri.
2.3 Byzantine attacks, 133

The emperor Constantine V took advantage of the chaos prevailing on the Muslim side of the frontier by directing (or actually leading) attacks on the thughūr. This expedition (or expeditions) presents several problems of chronology. Was it one or several events? Did it coincide with the siege of Sumaysīt? First, however, we must establish the dates. Ţabari, again standing alone, assigns this Byzantine campaign to 137.

And among the events of that year was the forcible entry of the Roman tyrant Constantine into Malatya. He subdued its inhabitants, destroyed its walls, and let its garrison (ṣuqatīlṣahā) go free with their dependents. (72)

Constantine's liberal behavior in allowing the Muslims to return unharmed to al-Jazira is reported in all the sources, and is an identifying mark for this event. However, other Arabic sources assign the fall of Malatya to 133. (73) There is disagreement among the Syriac writers, but they agree in any case in making this campaign prior to 137/754. (74) Theophanes alludes to this campaign in describing the Armenians who were deported to Thrace from Malatya and Qālīqalā, bringing with them their detested Paulicianism. (75)

Also arguing for a date of 133 is the fact that several events of 137 and the years immediately following could easily have been confused with this expedition. Malatya and Qālīqalā were rebuilt in 139. (76) The Muslim expe-

------------------------

(72) Ţabari, III, 121.
(73) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, pp. 186, 199; Andī, p. 142; Yaʾqūbī, II, 435; Khālīfī, p. 626.
(74) Dionysius, pp. 55-56, ascribes it to 1061 (749-750/132-133); the Chronicle of 1234 (I, 263) to the year 1063 (=751-752/133-134), as does Michael the Syrian (II, 518). Cf. Caetani, Cronografica generale, pp. 16-17; Lilie, Die Reaktion, pp. 164-165.
(76) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, pp. 186-187, 199.
ditions of the 130's present severe problems of chronology; in the case of at least one of these expeditions, the Muslims encountered a large Byzantine force, reportedly commanded by Constantine V himself. (77)

Finally, the turmoil on the Muslim side of the frontier in 133 provided an opportunity for the Byzantines which did not recur in 137. This emerges in Baladhuri:

Al-Waqidi said that in the year 133 Constantine the tyrant set out for Malatya. Kassh was then in the hands of the Muslims, under a man of the Banu Sulaym. The people of Kassh called out to the people of Malatya, who then set out against the Romans with 800 horse. They met the Roman cavalry, and were defeated. The Roman (al-hal) then swerved (asa'id) towards Malatya, and besieged it. Al-Jazira was then in a state of rebellion (wa 'l-Jazira safina), and Musa ibn Ka'b was its governor in Harran. (78)

These circumstances (wa 'l-Jazira safina) make it all the more likely that most of our sources (again excluding Tabari) are correct in assigning the fall of Malatya to 133. (79) It therefore appears to be the case that the 'Abbasid forces were so intent on defeating Ishaq ibn Muslim in Sumaysat and the other rebels in al-Jazira, that they permitted the Byzantine armies to attack Muslim fortress towns, whose garrisons were left to fend for themselves. We find that during the same expedition Constantine besieged Shimshat unsuccessfully, (80) and (perhaps) al-Naṣṣa. (81)

(77) Probably in the year 140. Baladhuri, Futuḥ, p. 188; Tabari, III, 125.
(78) Baladhuri, Futuḥ, p. 186.
(79) Agapius (p. 131) is more explicit: "And while the people were occupied by this struggle, the Emperor of the Romans attacked Malatya. He conquered the town, took its people prisoner, and returned." Cf. Michael the Syrian, II, 518.
(80) Baladhuri, Futuḥ, p. 184.
(81) Baladhuri, Futuḥ, p. 166 might be referring to this expedition: fi awal ayyid al-dawl al-mubāra.
There also took place an expedition against Qāliqalā which some of our sources connect closely with the fall of Malatya.

Thereupon [Constantine] went to Harj al-hasā, and sent Kawshān al-Armani to besiege Qāliqalā, whose population was then small, and which was governed by Abū Karima. Two Armenian brothers from the inhabitants of the city of Qāliqalā tunneled through a weak spot in the wall, went out to Kawshān, and let him into the city. He seized it, killed people and took prisoners, and sent the bounty (m3 haw3) to the tyrant. He then divided the prisoners among his companions.(82)

However, Khalīfa and the Syriac writers agree in making Kawshān's expedition later than 133/750-1, and distinct from the siege and fall of Malatya.

[In 134] 'Abdallāh ibn 'All, who was then in Syria, sent al-Harith ibn 'Abdallah al-Harashl. The Romans came out led by Kawshān the Patricius, in Jumādā II, 134. Muqātil ibn Ḥakīm al-'Askī sent his son Nakhlād ibn Muqātil [against them]. He encountered the Romans in Armenia IV, and was defeated. His army surrendered.(83)

Dionysius has separate expeditions of Kawshān for 1065 and 1066 (753-754 and 754-755). In Michael the Syrian, Constantine takes Theodosiopolis (Qāliqalā) in 1066 (754-755).(84)

Agapius similarly puts the Byzantine siege of Qāliqalā in the "year of the Arabs" 136. His use of Muslim chronology shows that here he is using a Muslim source.

(82) Baladhuri, Fustūḥ, p. 199. There is no Marj al-hasā in Yaqūt's Mu'jam al-baladān. There is, however, a Marj al-khaliṭ, described as aṣīn nawāḥi theghr al-Hasṣā. Constantine is said (perhaps) to have besieged al-Hasṣā on this very expedition, see previous note.

(83) Khalīfa, p. 627.

(84) Dionysius, pp. 56-57; Michael the Syrian, II, 516. Confusion may have arisen from the fact that Constantine seems to have campaigned extensively in the north (but not in Qāliqalā) in 133/750. See Michael the Syrian, II, 518: "Constantin[us] vint assiéger Mélițone, et fit établir contre cette ville un retranchement (kharskome). Il fit un brèche dans une partie de son mur. A la fin, il traita avec les Taiyūn qui s'y trouvaient et les laissa partir. Il assiégea et fit captive la population de Claudie et de tous les villages de l'Arménie IV." Cf. Caetani, Cronográfiā generāli, pp. 17, 63; Lilie, Die Reaktion, p. 165, n. 12.
Constantine Emperor of the Romans attacked Qāliqalā, conquered it, and took its inhabitants prisoner. Šāliḥ ibn 'All then attacked the Romans with Arab and Persian soldiers (fi ājāḥd al-'Arab wa'l-'Ajam).(85)

To sum up this section: the attack on Malatya seems to have taken place in 133, while the Muslims were preoccupied with their own civil wars. The date of the fall of Qāliqalā cannot be fixed more precisely than after 133 and before 137. But in any case, these two events were separate.

2.4 Establishment of ʿAbbāsid Authority, 133-136
Tabarī reports that in the year 133, Šāliḥ ibn 'All sent his nephew Ṣaʿīd ibn Ṭābdollah to conduct a summer raid "beyond the pass" (li-ghazw al-qā'īfa wa r s 'a al-darb).(86) Khalifa, however, says that in that year the caliph Abū ʿl-'Abbās sent one Muhammad ibn al-Nadr ibn Yarīm al-Hiyyarī, who raided as far as Ṭuwānā (Tyana).(87) Still other sources state, however, that no ʿāifa occurred at all from 125 until 138.(88) It certainly would seem strange for any raid to be launched in the very year when Ishaq ibn Muslim was besieged at Sumaysat, and when Byzantine forces were ravaging the ṣughur district. These latter events, however, are described in the Muslim chronicles under both the years 132 and 133, which means that they occurred in mid-750.(89) A Muslim expedition such as Ṭabarī or Khalīfa describes could therefore be reasonably ascribed to the summer of 751, when things were calmer.

(85) Agapius, p. 538.
(87) Khalīfa, p. 626.
(89) The year 133 began on 9 August 750.
It would not have been inconsistent with the position of Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥāfiz to command such an expedition, in any case. He had been confirmed, together with his brother 'Abdallāh ibn Ḥāfiz, over the ašrāf al-Shābān in 133,(90) even though he was based in Egypt and Palestine during the reign of Abū ʿl-ʿAbbās (below, 2.6.1). It is also possible that since Ṣāliḥ played a leading role in expeditions which took place in the late 130's, one of these raids may have been misdated to 133.

Otherwise we have little information on the ṭughūr in the last years of the short reign of Abū ʿl-ʿAbbās. It appears that the ʿAbbāsids established their authority in Syria and al-Jazīra with considerable harshness.(91) Some sources report that the ʿAbbāsids razed the walls of the cities of these two provinces. According to the anonymous Syriac chronicle, "Abū Jaʿfar destroyed the wall of Edessa and of all the cities, except Mayyāfārīqūn [and Harrān]."(92) But the frontier fortresses themselves must have been allowed to keep their walls.(93) As the fate of Malatya and Qālīqalā shows, it was the Byzantines who sought to destroy the walls of the frontier towns in these years, and the Muslims who tried to build and maintain them.

Abū Jaʿfar, the future al-Mansūr, became governor of al-Jazīra, Armenia and Azerbaijan as early as 132.(94) He appointed sub-governors of these

------------------

(90) Tabari, III, 73.

(91) Dionysius, pp. 55-56, a tyranny of the Persians over the Arabs and the Arameans.


(93) Theophanes says that Antioch was the only city of Syria allowed to keep its walls intact.

(94) Tabari, III, 57-58; Yaʿqūbī, II, 430.
three provinces, many of whom were to figure prominently in the history of the thughûr in the years of Abû Ja'far's own caliphate, and who already, at this early point, can be seen "rotating" through these governorships for brief terms, as some of them were to do for many years afterwards.

Did the Byzantine frontier district constitute a distinct administrative entity in any sense in these years? The provinces attributed to Abû Ja'far do not expressly include the thughûr, although this might be implied in the designation wa-kâna wâliya ʾalāʾī Jazîra wa-mā yâliha.(96)

2.4.1 Muhammad ibn Ṣâl

During the rebellion of ʾAbdallâh ibn Ṭâlî in 137 (see following section), we find Muhammad ibn Ṣâl ensconced in Shimshät with 5000 troops.(97) ʾAbdallâh tried at that time to win over Muhammad ibn Ṣâl, together with the governors of al-Jazîra, Armenia and Azerbaijan. We might infer from this that during the reign of Abû ʾl-ʿAbbâs the thughûr had become something of an independent district, comparable to those three provinces. Indeed, the forces at Muhammad ibn Ṣâl's disposal in 137 outnumbered those of the governor of al-Jazîra by a thousand.(98) Was Ibn Ṣâl governor of the thughûr?

---


(96) Andî, p. 159.

(97) Balâdhûrî, Ansâb, III, 106.

(98) Ansâb, III, 106, Muqâtil ibn Ṭâlîb al-Ḥakîm al-ʿAbbâsî was besieged in Harrân with 4000 soldiers.
Muhammad ibn Sul, ancestor of the historian Muhammad ibn Yahyā al-Suli, was a nuslā of Turkish origin, and one of the twelve original nuqabā'. (99) He became an important commander for the 'Abbāsids, particularly at the Zābh in 132. He conquered Armenia for them (100) and was afterwards appointed governor of the unruly province of Mosul in 133. (101) The populace of Mosul, who according to the Ansāb consisted of "khwārij, thieves and merchants," (102) rejected him, refusing to have a "nuslā of Khath' am" as their amīr. (103) They were, of course, afraid of being at the mercy of the Khurāsānis. (104) Nonetheless, it was Ibn Sul’s inferior social position which inflamed the Mawsilīs, apparently more than the fact that he had already thrown a number of their fellow-citizens into the river. (105) He then became governor of Azerbaijan, where he apparently had no such problems, since he is reported there for 134 and 135. (106) It should be remembered that Azerbaijan was a border province in its own right. (107) We do not hear of him again until 137, when he appears with his army at Shimshāt. What his

(100) Ya’qūbī, III, 429, where he is described as the first ‘Abbāsid governor of that province. Cf. Vasmer, Chronologe, p. 7.
(101) Tabarī, III, 47; Azdī, pp. 141, 145f.
(102) Ansāb, III, 281.
(104) Crome, Slaves, p. 61, n. 428; Omar, ‘Abbāsid Caliphs, pp. 312-314. Muhammad ibn Sul’s successor in Mosul, Yahyā ibn Muhammad, did massacre the Arab inhabitants.
(105) Ansāb, III, 281. They clamor for an ‘Abbāsid governor, though this turns out to be much worse for them.
(106) Tabarī, III, 81, 84.
(107) Tabarī, III, 383, a thaghr min al-thughūr.
position was then is not clear, but in any case he was not then governor of
Azerbaijan, since this position was then held by Mālik ibn Haytham. (108)
Muhammad ibn Ṣūl's status must not in fact have been very high at that
time, since we find Abū Ja'far using him as a spy.

Al-Mansūr infiltrated (Cossa) Muhammad ibn Ṣūl into 'Abbālāh ibn
'Alī's camp, to assassinate him if possible, and to write to al-
Mansūr concerning him. [Ibn Ṣūl] went to ['Abbālāh] and accom-
panied him. One of 'Abbālāh's spies in al-Mansūr's camp then
wrote to 'Abbālāh: "Attack Ibn Ṣūl before he attacks you!"
(sul bi'bn Sul qabla an yasqola bika). 'Abbālāh then killed him
and two of his sons. (109)

This undignified end to Ibn Ṣūl's career makes it unlikely that he was then
governor of anything. It further seems that the thughūr then most likely did
not have anything like the status of the provinces al-Jazīra, Armenia and
Azerbaijan.

2.5 Revolt of 'Abbālāh ibn 'Alī

2.5.1 Expedition of 136

'Abbālāh ibn 'Alī's bid for the caliphate in 137 was preceded by prepara-
tions for a major expedition in the thughūr which never took place.

In that year [136] 'Abbālāh ibn 'Alī came to Abū l-'Abbās at
al-Anbār. Abū l-'Abbās set him over the ṣaliṣa with an army of
men of Ḫurāsān, Syria, al-Jazīra and Mosul. He set off and
reached Dulūk [where he remained] without entering the pass (wa-
lam yudrib). (110)

(108) Baladhurī, Ansāb, III, 106.
(109) Ansāb, III, 281.
(110) Tabarī, III, 91; Cf. Ya'qūbī, II, 437-38 (where 'Abbālāh is appointed
by letter, and has already entered the pass when news reaches him of
Abū l-'Abbās' death). See also Baladhurī, Ansāb, III, 105; Gaetani,
Cronografías generales, p. 85; Salem, "War and Peace," p. 36.
There had not been a sa'ifa since 133 (and the existence of that one can be disputed). In general the practice had fallen into disuse since the last years of the Umayyad dynasty. Why was such a large army massed under 'Abdallah's command at this point? Naturally, 'Abdallah may already have had it in mind to outmaneuver his nephew Abū Ja'far. Nonetheless, it was the caliph's command which brought the expedition into being.

With all the confusion concerning the chronology of these years, in particular the fall of Qālīqālā (above, 2.3), it is practically impossible to say if this expedition was intended to avenge any particular Byzantine aggression. But it is most likely that Abū ʻl-ʻAbbās wished to demonstrate the strength and legitimacy of the new dynasty by means of a large expedition, the first of its kind in many years. A passage from the Ansāb demonstrates this: at about the same time, when Abū Musliṣa asked permission to go on the pilgrimage, Abū ʻl-ʻAbbās replied, "jihād is more meritorious than pilgrimage" (Inna 'l-jihāda afdalu min al-hajj).

2.5.2 The Revolt of 137

'Abdallah ibn 'Alī's bid for the caliphate is important in the history of the thughūr because it was made with the large expeditionary force assembled to invade Byzantine territory, and because the tensions and rivalries (especially between Khurāsānīs and Syro-Jazirans) which proved crucial in the conflict remained important for some time afterwards. Other aspects of 'Abdallah's revolt, though important, need not be discussed here.

(111) Ansāb, III, 184.

(112) Lassner, Shaping of 'Abbāsid Rule, pp. 31-35, has discussed the basis of 'Abdallah's claim to the caliphate. See also Omėr, 'Abbāsid Caliphate, pp. 185-192, and Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, pp. 58-61.
\[\text{\'Abdallāh} \text{ decided to claim the caliphate. He harangued the army (\textit{wa-khataba al-nās}) between Dulūk and Ra\'ān} \ldots \text{Humayd ibn Qahtaba swore the bay'a to him. \textit{\'Abdallāh} then stopped at Qinnsārīn, and set Zufar ibn \textit{\'Aqīm} over it as governor... He wrote to al-\textit{\'Aṣām} ibn Qahtaba, who was in Armenia, and to Mālik ibn al-Haytham, who was in Azerbaijan, and to Muḥammad ibn Șūl, who was staying in Sumaysāt with a force of 5000 men. 'Abdallāh called upon them to recognize him, but they refused. He then went to Harrān, which was under the command of Muqāṭīl ibn Ḥākim al-\textit{\'Akkī}, then governor of al-Jazīra, with a garrison of 4000. 'Abdallāh besieged him with catapults, whereupon Muqāṭīl sought a truce (\textit{al-sulb}). 'Abdallāh then made his own brother 'Abd al-\textit{\'Aṣām} ibn \textit{\'Alī} governor of al-Jazīra and heir apparent. (113)

Al-\textit{\'Aṣām} ibn Qahtaba, Mālik ibn al-Haytham and Muqāṭīl ibn Ḥākim al-\textit{\'Akkī} were all at this point technically subgovernors of Abū Ja'far, and remained loyal to him. Muḥammad ibn Șūl has been discussed above (2.4.1). He and his garrison at Shimṣāt were not part of the expeditionary force mustered at Dulūk. This army consisted, of course, of men from other regions, and with other preoccupations. We may see this in the ease with which Abū Muslim played upon the fears of the Syrians, creating mistrust between 'Abdallāh and his army, as well as among the different groups within that army. (114)

The "ethnic mix" of 'Abdallāh's army, characteristic of the early \textit{\'Abbasid} expeditionary forces, (115) proved its undoing. 'Abdallāh turned against


(114) Baladhurī, \textit{Ansāb}, III, 107-108; Ṭabarī, III, 95-96 (a simpler version, where Abū Muslim claims to have been made governor of Syria).

(115) See Dionysius, p. 72, for a colorful description of a Khurāsānī army (this is the one which besieged Kamkh in 149, and may represent scrapings from the barrel):

Cette armée était composée de divers peuples, différents d'aspect, [professant] tous les cultes. Parmi eux, les uns adoraient le feu; d'autres le soleil; le matin ils se tournaient et adoraient au levant, au milieu du jour ils adoraient au midi, et le soir au couchant; d'autres adoraient la lune, d'autres les étoiles, d'autres les chevaux; d'autres s'étaient fabriqué divers simulacres de toute espèce d'idoles, qu'ils portaient avec eux pour les adorer... Cette armée était un mélange de tous les peuples et était appelée pour cela "la Pléniitude
Humayd ibn Qahtaba, his only major Khurasan ally, and then against the Khurasan contingent in general.(116)

'Abdallah's bid for the throne has been described as part of a "Syrian attempt at a come-back."(117) In particular, it is claimed that "old associates of Marwan" such as Zufar ibn 'Asim al-Hilali and Ja'far ibn Hanzala al-Bahrani hoped for a restoration of the old order in some form.(118)

The sources do not, however, inform us of the precise intentions of these men. They say only that they served in 'Abdallah's army, that 'Abdallah made Zufar governor of Qinnasrin (see above), and that afterwards they held high positions under al-Mansur, and were put in charge of the sawā‘if on several occasions. The loyalty of the Syrian soldiers to their former Umayyad commanders is uncontested; as is the importance of the loyalty of these men to

royale."

Il y avait en effet parmi eux des Sindhiens, des Alains, des Khazars, des Mèdes, des Perses, des 'Aqouleens, des Arabes, des Kushanites, des Turcs; en sorte que nous pouvons dire que c'était un essaim de saute-relles de toutes les variétés.

Il se commettait parmi eux des péchés sans nombre et de toute espèce; mais nous les passons sous silence à cause de leur énorimité et de leur abomination, et aussi pour ne pas faire souiller la langue du lecteur ni l'oreille de ceux qui l'entendent; car c'est une souillure pour la bouche de les prononcer.

(116) The degree to which he persecuted the Khurasanis varies according to the various sources, see Lassner, *Shaping of 'Abbasid Rule*, pp. 35-37, especially n. 30. See also Agapius, p. 534: wa-khuṣa ['Abdallah] yuqaddu 'alā-'Arab 'alā abn Khurasan wa-yuthirhun illā 'l-marāṭib wa'1-karāṣāt wa-khala'sa wa-yqul al-'Ajam wa-ra'khudhun awshā'ibum illā '1-'Arab.


(118) Kennedy, *loc. cit.* Both these men were to play important roles in the reigns. Zufar's father 'Asim had been governor of Arisia under Maswih, Ya'qub II, 404; cf. Tabari, III, 94; Annob, III, 183. Tabari, III, 226, says that Ja'far ibn Hanzala was tall and leprous (wa-khuṣa abraa'at ẓu'wā'ala).
the governors and sovereigns whom they chose to support. What is less sure
is the extent to which a Syrian "revival" was possible. The behavior of the
Syrians in 'Abdallah's army shows how uncohesive a group they had become.

Nonetheless, the 'Abbāsids understood that the Syro-Jazirans were both
potentially dangerous to them, and necessary. This realization led to their
quick "rehabilitation."

Abū Muslim wrote to al-Mansūr, informing him that the Jazirans
and Syrians were serving as garrisons in fortified places in the
thughūr against the enemy (bi-'aydā' sīn al-thughūr minshahāna
līl-'edwaw), and that the thughūr could only be held by them
(wa-anakah Ia tawadda illā bikhin). He asked for lenience
towards them, and referred to the fact that their notables had
asked that they be reconciled with the Caliph and returned to his
good graces (wa-ashāra 'alayhi bi'isālāh wa-jāhidim wa'-
stinā'ihin). He went with a number of their nobles (ashrāf) on a
delation to the Caliph.(119)

Abū Ja'far must have known that the thughūr would require more manpower,
as well as the skills in border warfare which many of the Syro-Jazirans had
acquired. His Khurasānī troops were too much in demand elsewhere, in these
years of constant revolts on all sides. This left him no choice but to leave
the Syro-Jazirans to man the Byzantine front. On the other hand, it is per­
haps too much to say, as does Kennedy, that this constituted an "agreement"
with the Syrians.(120)

What is more striking than the integration of the Syro-Jazirans into the
new order of things is the supreme importance of the loyalty of their com­
manders to the various governors and sovereigns. Ishaq ibn Muslim and Yazid

(119) Baladhuri, Ansāb, III, 109.

(120) "They were to be stationed as garrisons on the Byzantine frontier.
They retained their strength and organisation; their leaders remained
unpunished and continued to enjoy real political power....they had
secured for themselves a useful, if secondary, place in the new power
structure. It was a measure of the success of this agreement that not
until the confusion which followed the death of Harun in 193 (809), was
there any serious threat to Abbasid rule in the area." Kennedy, Early
Abbasid Caliphate, pp. 60-61.
ibn Usayd, both Qaysí of Jazíran origin, had served Marwán in the "Umayyad North," and now become equally tenacious in their loyalty to their new liege, Abū Ja’far; while Abū Ja’far’s policy in this northwestern region relied upon them as much as upon men from the East such as al-Hasan ibn Qahtaba and Muhammad ibn Sul.

‘Abdallah ibn ‘Alī may have owed his failure to his shortcomings as a commander (though his previous history would argue against this). But an army assembled primarily for purposes of plunder and show proved too brittle against so determined an opponent as Abū Muslim with his Khurāshīf army.

2.6 Rebuilding the Thughûr

For several years after the defeat of ‘Abdallah ibn ‘Alī the thughûr al-Jazíra, then the principal theater of war with the Byzantines, became the object of renewed activity. Several important fortress towns were rebuilt and provided with garrisons. Most significantly, the sawāfīf were resumed on a more or less regular (annual) basis. These two closely related phenomena will be discussed below in separate sections. First, however, comes the crucial question of how the area was ruled and by whom.

2.6.1 Sālih ibn ‘Alī

The name which we find mentioned most often in connection with this activity is that of Sālih ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abdallāh ibn al-‘Abbas, who, like ‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Alī, was one of the uncles of the first two ‘Abbāsid caliphs (the ‘umāmā). Sālih had pursued Marwán II in Palestine and Egypt, and commanded the forces which killed the last Umayyad caliph. (121) He was rewarded with estates in Palestine formerly belonging to the Umayyads. (122) He became gov-

(121) Ṭabarî, III, 28-30; Ḍalā‘al, Amrîb, III, 100, 104.
ernor of Egypt briefly in 133/750-751, and then, after serving as governor of Palestine from 133 until 135, he resumed the governorship of Egypt (apparently combined with that of Palestine) in 136. (123) During the revolt of his brother 'Abdallah ibn 'Ali, Śāliḥ either remained neutral or inclined to Abū Ja'far. (124) He apparently began the year 137 as governor of Egypt, (125) but during that year became governor of "Aleppo, Qinnasrin and Ḥimṣ," taking up residence in Aleppo. (126)

Śāliḥ thus took his brother's place in northern Syria. There he established a "sub-dynasty," whose members were to play leading roles in the history of the early 'Abbasid caliphate, as well as in that of the ṭughūr. (127)

Upon his arrival in northern Syria, Śāliḥ became involved in the rebuilding of the ṭughūr and the ǧawā'id (below, 2.6.3-4, 2.7). Nevertheless, al-Ya'qūbī is the only one of our sources who attributes a title to Śāliḥ involving the ṭughūr.

Śāliḥ ibn 'Ali remained as governor of al-Sha'm and the ṭughūr, sending commanders on raids against the land of the Romans... (wa-aqama Śāliḥ ibn 'Ali waliyan 'ala '1-Sha'm wa-l-ṭughūr wa-huwa yughzi bilad al-ruūum wa-huwa yughzi bilad al-ruūum wa-huwa yughzi bilad al-ruūum). (128)

(122) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 143; cf. Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, pp. 48-49.

(123) Kindi, Walīt Miṣr, pp. 97-105; Ṭabarī, III, 75, 81, 84; Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, p. 52; A. Grohmann, EI1, IV, 112 (prolonging Śāliḥ's governorship of Egypt at the expense of his governorship of Palestine).


(125) Ṭabarī, III, 121.

(126) Ibn al-'Adim, Zubda, p. 59.

(127) Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, p. 74.

(128) Ya'qūbī, II, 470.
Elsewhere al-Ya'qubi refers to Salih as governor of "Qinnasrin and al-`Awáṣim." (129) Otherwise, the sources describe Salih as governor of "Damascus, Hims and Qinnasrin,"(130) or of "Aleppo, Qinnasrin and Hims,"(131) without mentioning the frontier area, even though all agree in assigning Salih a leading role in that region, at least until the year 142.

2.6.2 WALL AL-JAZIRA WA-THUGHURIHÁ

Elsewhere, however, we find others mentioned as governors of the thughr.

Then [al-Mansur] decided to send 'Abd al-Wahhab ibn Ibrahim al-Imam as governor (wáll) of al-Jazira and its thughur. He set off in the year 140, accompanied by al-Hasan ibn Qahtaba with Khurasan! troops (fl ajnad ahl Khurasan). (132)

According to al-Baladhuri, al-Hasan ibn Qahtaba then showed such generosity to the workers and soldiers as to challenge 'Abd al-Wahhab's supremacy, receiving confirmation in this from the Caliph himself. This does not speak well for 'Abd al-Wahhab's authority as governor of "al-Jazira and its thughr." In any case, we soon find him supplanted in that office.

And in that year [142], according to al-Waqidi, Abu Ja'far appointed his brother al-'Abbas ibn Muhammad as governor of al-Jazira and its thughur, attaching to him a number of officers (qawwád). Al-'Abbas remained there for a while. (133)

This al-'Abbas had already been mentioned in the sources as sharing the command with his uncle Salih ibn 'Ali during the construction of Malatya in 139 and in the gā'iffa which occurred afterwards. (134) It is possible, of

(129) Ya'qubi, II, 461.
(130) Ya'qubi, II, 469; Tabari, III, 138.
(131) Ibn al-'Adim, Zubda, p. 59.
(132) Baladhuri, Futūh, p. 187.
(133) Tabari, III, 141. Note that Tabari does not mention any part played by 'Abd al-Wahhab.
(134) Tabari, III, 125.
course, that 'Abd al-Wahhab preceded his cousin al-'Abbās in the position of wāli al-Jazira wa-thughūrīhā by two years. Arguing against this harmonization of Baladhuri and Ṭabarī is the fact that the sources present rival versions of these events (the rebuilding of Malatya and the subsequent expedition: these will be dealt with in the following sections), ascribing them to the pair 'Abd al-Wahhab and al-Iman (Baladhuri) or al-'Abbās and Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Ali (Ṭabarī).(135)

It thus appears likely that the two cousins have become confused in the sources. It is also not clear who was governor of al-Jazira in the years 140-142. Ḥumayd ibn Qahtaba is the most likely candidate, but at all events not 'Abd al-Wahhab ibn Idrāhim.(136) Al-'Abbās ibn Muḥammad did enjoy a long tenure as governor of al-Jazira, where he stayed from 142 until 155.(137) We may only note that the title wāli al-Jazira wa-thughūrīhā emerges during the years 140-142, together with the practice of associating princes of the blood with the ṣā'īf.

But what about Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Ali, whom Ya'qūbī describes as wāli Qinnasrin wa'l-thughūr? The sources may be reduced to two versions of these events. Ṭabarī, Baladhuri and other sources may be harmonized (though certainly not in every detail) into a "synoptic" version according to which the ṣīlahīs were attached before or around 142 to the authority of the governor of al-Jazira, which office was occupied by al-'Abbās ibn Muḥammad from then until 155. In this "synoptic" version we hear of little or no involvement on Ṣāliḥ's part in the frontier region after 142, even though he remained in

(135) Ṭabarī, III, 125 may be referring to a separate set of events, but confusion is possible at any rate.
(136) Ṭabarī, III, 121; Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 186; Vasmer, Chronologie, pp. 8-9.
(137) Ṭabarī, III, 141, 289, 374; Vasmer, Chronologie, pp. 8-9.
power in Syria until his death in 132. (138) In Ya'qubi, on the other hand, we find not only that Šāliḥ was in charge of Syria and the thughur, but that he was responsible for many sawā'if both before and after 142.

Another solution comes to mind, namely, that Šāliḥ controlled the south-western part of the frontier district only, that is, the thughur al-Shām, while al-'Abbas controlled the thughur al-Jazīra. This would make the Muslim geographers’ division into Syrian and Jaziran thughur valid at least for the first decades of the 1Abbasid period. However, in the sources we find rival versions of events, which seem to reflect competition over authority in the thughur between the governors of these two provinces, and which in any case preclude such a neat solution.

Whatever the exact position may have been, Al-Mansūr clearly wished to avoid a repetition of the events of 137, when his uncle ʿAbdallāh had made a serious bid for the caliphate using Syro-Jaziran forces operating (or about to operate) in the frontier district. Šāliḥ had largely inherited ʿAbdallāh’s position; and so to keep Šāliḥ in his place, al-Mansūr would seem to have placed authority in the thughur with his brother al-ʿAbbās in al-Jazīra.

There is nothing, in any case, to suggest that Šāliḥ ever showed overt disloyalty to al-Mansūr. A close examination of his source does not bear out Kennedy’s suggestion that al-Mansūr bought Šāliḥ’s loyalty during ʿAbdallāh’s

-----------

(138) Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubds, p. 60. Ibn al-ʿAdīm there reports having seen fulūs minted in Aleppo in 146, inscribed mimām amrā bihi ʿl-amīr Šāliḥ ibn ʿAlī akramahu ʿl-lāh. Cf. G. C. Miles, Rare Islamic Coins, #572 (p. 112): S. Lane-Poole, Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, IX, #90k (p. 94). Similar coins were struck in 147 (American Numismatic Society 1917.216.244) and 148 (ANS 1002.1.206, University Museum).

(139) Early Abbasid Caliphate, p. 59. Šāliḥ and his brother Sulaymān in Bas-
revolt. (139) On the other hand, Baladhuri does report (140) that Šāliḥ actu-
ally took the field for Abū Ja'far in 137, against [al-Ḥakam] ibn Ḍa'bān
[al-Judhami].

The problem with this is that al-Kindī, (141) who describes this campaign
(or rather, campaigns) of Šāliḥ against Ibn Ḍa'bān in some detail, seems to
imply that Ibn Ḍa'bān was operating on his own, apparently as a Khārijite
leader. In the Ansāb, however, it is clearly stated that Ibn Ḍa'bān took
'Abdallāh ibn 'Ali's side in 137, and was appointed his governor of Pale-
stine. (142) This version makes more sense, for a Khārijite revolt of this
magnitude (forcing Šāliḥ to send or lead several expeditions, and ending with
a harvest of 3000 Khārijite heads sent to Fustāṭ) would have been unlikely to
occur in Palestine, a province usually immune to this disease. (143)

In any case, Manṣūr's distrust of Šāliḥ ran deep. We see this in
Ya'qūbī's account of Šāliḥ's death, which occurred in 152.

Šāliḥ ibn 'Ali ibn 'Abdallāh ibn 'Abbās acted as Abū Ja'far's
governor in Qinnasrin and al-'Awasim. Word reached [Abū Ja'far]
of [Šāliḥ's] numerous [soldiers] and nawī and he feared him.
He then wrote to him, ordering him to come to him. [Šāliḥ] wrote
back, pleading grave illness. [Abū Ja'far] did not accept this
excuse—although Šāliḥ actually had consumption. Thereupon Šāliḥ
made his way to Baghdad. When Abū Ja'far saw him, he dismissed
ra "remained discreetly neutral—perhaps encouraged by the large subsi-
dies Manṣūr paid them," referring to Ansāb, fol. 578 (=III, 105-107).

(141) Wüste Misr, pp. 103-104.
(142) Baladhuri, Ansāb, III, 105-106.
(143) L. Vechia Vaglieri, "Le vicende del hārijismo in epoca abbaside," Rivi-
ste di Studi Orientali, XXV (1949), p. 38, n. 7, remarks that "la Pale-
stina non figura fra i paesi infectati dai Hārigiti," but notes this
event (involving the 3000 heads) as an exception. However, her sources
(Ibn Taghribirdi, I, 331 and Wüstenfeld, Die Statthalter von Aegypten
zur Zeit der Schiiten, II, 4) apparently follow Kindī and not the
Ansāb. Ibn Ḍa'bān also appears at Ṭabari, III, 47, seizing the prov-
ince and treasury of Palestine during Marwān's retreat to Egypt.
him, and accorded him no honors or welcome. Ṣāliḥ then said, "The Commander of the Faithful has given up on me, and has done this to me. But God will revive the rotting bones" (wa'llāhu yūḥyi 'ī'amma wa-hiya ramīm). When Ṣāliḥ had reached Ḥanāt, a district of the Euphrates, he died. He was Abu Ja'far's contemporary.\(^{(144)}\)

2.6.3 The Rebuilding of Malatya and the Expedition of 139

Malatya, the most important of the ṭughrūr al-Jazīra, had been inhabited in Umayyad times,\(^{(145)}\) and then taken and destroyed by Constantine V in 133.\(^{(146)}\) The Muslims now rebuilt this town, by most accounts in 139 or or 140. However, the sources present three different versions of the rebuilding of Malatya, and of the expedition which was launched from there at almost the same time.

The most commonly held version has it that Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Alī and al-'Abbās ibn Muhammad raised a large force of Syro-Jazirans and Khurāsānis, built Malatya, and then went on campaign in 139.\(^{(147)}\) Another version, usually cited as authoritative,\(^{(148)}\) states that in 139 al-Mansūr assigned the task of restoring Malatya to Ṣāliḥ, but that in the following year (140) he sent ʿAbd al-Wahḥāb ibn Ibrāhīm (then newly appointed wa'all al-Jazīra wa-

\(^{(144)}\) Ya'qūbī, II, 461.
\(^{(145)}\) Baladhurī, Futūḥ, p. 185.
\(^{(146)}\) Futūḥ, pp. 186-187; above, 2.3.
\(^{(147)}\) Ṭabarī, III, 125; Andī 171; Ya'qūbī, II, 469 (where this is ascribed to 138, but where nothing else happens along the frontier in the following two years); Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, p. 59, where Ṣāliḥ and his son al-Ṭeṭl conduct an expedition bi-abl al-Sbām, with no mention either of al-ʿAbbās or of Malatya.

According to Baladhuri (but not Khalifa), ʿAbd al-Wahhāb was accompanied by al-Ḥasan ibn Qaḥṭaba. Baladhuri devotes a great deal of space to the building of Malatya, emphasizing the speed with which this was accomplished and the rivalry between the two leaders.

Elsewhere, we find a third version, according to which Jaʿfar ibn Ḥanzala al-Bahrānī either led an expedition (150) or went to Malatya. (151) Khalifa gives the longest such version:

[In the year 139] Jaʿfar ibn Ḥanzala al-Bahrānī went out to Malatya, which was then in ruins, and camped there (faʾ-ʾaskara). ʿAbd al-Wahid went out to Malatya. He planted seeds and baked lime in great quantities. Then he returned. The tyrant [Constantine] then dispatched forces which burned the crops (fa-wajjaha al-tagbiya fa-haraqa al-zar'). (152)

The name ʿAbd al-Wahīd here is likely to be a copyist's error for ʿAbd al-Wahhāb. (153)

There has probably been a confusion of different events here. Tabari also reports an expedition for 140, led by ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and al-Ḥasan (but not directly related to the building of Malatya). Baladhuri reports an alternative version of the 140 expedition, led by ʿAbd al-Wahhāb. Here al-Ḥasan does not figure, but instead we have Nasr ibn Malik al-Khuzaʿī and Naṣr ibn...

(149) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, pp. 186-187; Khalifa, pp. 640-641; Yāqūt, Buldān, IV, 632.

(150) Tabari, III, 125.

(151) Azdi, p. 171, the caliph sends Jaʿfar ibn Ḥanzala to Malatya, where he plants seeds and bakes lime (fa-zaraʾ wa-ṭabakha kilsan), as occurs in Khalifa's version (see next note).

(152) Khalifa, p. 640.

(153) Yāqūt, Buldān, IV, 634, citing Khalifa, has only ʿAbd al-Wahhāb. There was no ʿAbd al-Wahīd in the ʿAbbasid family at the time, and of other holders of the name, only ʿAbd al-Wahīd ibn Ziyād ibn ʿAmr al-ʿAtkī (Baladhuri, Ansāb, III, 175) is a possibility.
Sa'd al-Kātib, mawla al-ansār. (154)

This 140 expedition meets a large Byzantine force of 100,000 supposedly led by Constantine himself, who withdraws from the Jayhan upon hearing of the Arabs' large numbers. (155)

However, those accounts which assign the building of Malatya and the ṣa'īfa to the pair Ṣāliḥ and al-ʿAbbās agree in placing both events in the year 139 (or 138). (156) They describe no military activity, booty, or prisoners taken. They do, however, give the curious detail that:

Ṣāliḥ's two sisters, Umm 'Isā and Lubāba, daughters of ʿAlī, went on the expedition with him. They had previously vowed that if the rule (mulk) of the Umayyads ended, they would perform jihād in the path of God. (157)

To whose advantage was it to have these pious ladies endure the rigors of the ṣa'īfa? While the ʿAbbāsid cause in general could be considered to profit, Ṣāliḥ appears to be the prime beneficiary of the fanfare attached to this expedition of 139 (according to some sources the first since 125, (158) and in any case since 133). And it is striking that in most accounts, Ṣāliḥ is omitted from the expedition of 140, and thereafter does not play an important role in the thughūr.

We may conclude that the expedition of 139 was probably led by Ṣāliḥ, that of 140 by someone else, most likely by ʿabd al-Wahhāb; and that these two events have become hopelessly confused with the building of Malatya, so that

---------(154) Baladhurī, Futūḥ, p. 188. Cf. Dionysius, p. 67.
(156) Tabarī, III, 125; Azdī, p. 171; Yaʿqūbī, II, 469.
(158) Yaʿqūbī 170; Ibn al-ʿAdim, Zubda, 59.
we can not know with certainty who was actually responsible for it. Underlying all this is the confusion in the sources regarding Şâliḥ, and the corresponding problem of who actually held authority in the thughūr.

We are left, finally, with the third version, involving Ja'far ibn Ḥanṣa­la. This Qaysî, a former companion of Marwān, had been prominent in 'Abdallāh's rebellion, and then had become one of Abū Ja'far's closest advisors(159) and military commanders in times of crisis.(160) But Ja'far, in any case, then returned to Iraq, and did not become part of the picture in the thughūr: a picture in which the position occupied by Şâliḥ ibn 'Alī remains a crucial problem.

2.6.4 Al-Maqṣîṣa, Alhana, Har'ash

The 'Abbāsids also directed their attention to these three towns of the thughūr al-Shām. Al-Maqṣîṣa, on the river Jaybān, lay in ruins, and its surviving population lived outside its walls. In the accounts concerning its restoration in 139-141, we again find versions which describe Şâliḥ as in charge of (at least this section) of the thughūr. In contrast with Malatya, these towns, once restored, did not immediately serve as bases for expeditions. In these accounts Şâliḥ sends Jabrīl ibn Yahyā al-Bajālī to rebuild Malatya. Other versions have the caliph giving orders directly, with no role at all assigned to Şâliḥ.(161)

In the year 139, al-Mansūr gave orders that the city of al-Maqṣîṣa should be restored and repopulated. Its wall had fallen into ruins from earthquakes, and its inhabitants had dwindled, living outside the city. He built the city wall and installed

(159) Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, pp. 59-60.

(160) Ibid., p. 68.

(161) Tabari, III, 135; cf. Ya'qūbī, II, 466; Andī, p. 173, where al-Mansūr writes to Şâliḥ, but (as in the case of Malatya) sends someone else (here Jabrīl ibn Yahyā) to do the job.
settlers in the year 140, calling it "al-Ma'mura." He built there a cathedral mosque in the place of a haykal which had been there, making it several times larger than the mosque of 'Umar. (162)

Adhana was also rebuilt at about this time, according to Baladhuri:

Abū Nu‘mān al-Anṭakī and others said that Adhana was built in the year 141 or 142, as Khurāsānī troops camped there under the command of Maslama ibn Yaḥyā al-Dajālī, together with men commanded by Mālik ibn Adham al-Bāhili. Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Alī sent them. (163)

Events in al-Maṣṣīfa and Adhana are thus closely connected, just as the towns themselves are geographically close. (164) We do not have information on the earlier career of Jabrīl ibn Yaḥyā, but can see that he was a Khurāsānī officer who later led Syro-Jaziran troops in Armenia for al-Maṣṭūr. (165) His brother Maslama makes his first appearance in the sources here. (166)

It is strange that these two Khurāsānī brothers should appear here under the command of Ṣāliḥ. However, Ṣāliḥ's cooperation, if not leadership, was probably necessary, if only for geographical reasons. Furthermore, an "ethnic mix" of soldiers seems to have been deliberately sought. Thus, we have Mālik ibn Adham ibn Muḥrīz al-Bāhili, who previously had surrendered with his Syrian troops at Nihrawān to the 'Abbāsīd armies. (167) As in the case of Malatya, al-Maṣṭūr put Khurāsānī and Syro-Jaziran commanders together. (168)

(162) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 166.
(164) G. Le Strange, Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 131.
(165) Ṭabarī, III, 328; Ya‘qūbī, II, 446f.; Crone, Slaves on Horses, p. 179.
(166) Crone, Slaves, p. 179.
(167) Crone, Slaves, p. 169; Ṭabarī, III, 2, 6f.; Khalīfa, pp. 600f.
(168) This is more evidence against the neat division into Syrian and Jaziran
Khalifa dates the building of Adhana to 144, with Śāliḥ sending Maslama ibn Yahyā. (169)

Mar'ash lies well to the northeast of al-Maṣṣūṣa and Adhana, and is sometimes considered one of the thughūr al-Jazīra. (170) It had been destroyed by Constantine V in 129/746. (171) The restoration of Mar'ash, again attributed to Śāliḥ ibn 'Aflī, also took place at about this time, although Balādhurī's brief notice does not give an exact date. (172)

2.6.5 Qāliqalā

This northern outpost of the Muslim empire, notorious for its harsh climate, had been taken and razed by the Byzantines (or by Kawshan) between 133 and 137 (above, 2.3). The restoration of Qāliqalā, like its destruction, presents problems of chronology.

Al-Maqqīdī said that in the year 139, al-Mansūr ransomed the captives who survived from Qāliqalā. He rebuilt and repopulated Qāliqalā, returning to it the captives whom he had ransomed. He stationed there a garrison (wa-nadaba llayhi jundan) of Jazirans and others. (173)

From the Armenian historian Lewond, we learn that the restored city had a different population from the old one. Lewond says that Yazdū [ibn Usayd] built the town.

--------------

thughūr for this period.

(169) Khalifa, p. 647.


(171) Balādhurī, Futūḥ, p. 189; Theophanes, p. 422.

(172) Futūḥ, p. 189. Theophanes (p. 443) also attributes the rebuilding of Mar'ash to Śāliḥ.

(173) Balādhurī, Futūḥ, p. 199. Tabarī, III, 125 confirms the ṣaddā' or 139. This date should be preferred to that of 137, apparently put forth at Agapius, p. 537. Cf. Caetani, Cronografica generalis, p. 186.
Yazid ibn Usayd prepared the troops which were under his command, reached the city of Kerin [Qālīqalā] and imposed poll tax throughout the country. He also assembled the innumerable multitude and assigned foremen for the construction work of the ruptured walls of the city, and he himself took care of it. He later allowed the Arabs to migrate to the city and live there with their families for the purpose of protecting the city from the enemies. [Yazid] also made arrangements for food to be distributed to them from our land of Armenia. (174)

Previously the town had had an (at least largely) Armenian population, (175) but it now became the seat of an occupying garrison, mainly preoccupied with gathering taxes. (176)

Lewond thus ascribes the building of Qālīqalā to the governor of Armenia, Yazid ibn Usayd. However, Yazid did not become governor of Armenia until 140/758 at the earliest. (177) As elsewhere (below, 3.4), Lewond is not precise about these dates. However, Yazid ibn Usayd may have been governor of al-Jazīra before being replaced there in 142 by al-'Abbas ibn Muḥammad. (178)

There is good reason to believe that in 139, the year in which Qālīqalā was resettled, Yazid was governor not of Armenia, but of al-Jazīra. Baladhurī, in the passage quoted at the beginning of this section, does not mention Yazid, saying only that al-Ḥanūr，“un certain d'origine jazirienne et autres.”


(175) Baladhurī, Futūḥ, p. 199, and above, 2.3.

(176) J. Laurent, L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam depuis la conquête arabe jusqu'en 886, pp. 176-177.

(177) Tabari, III, 99; Vasmer, Chronologie, p. 8. Coins of Armenia from these years do not name the governors.

(178) Tabari, III, 374-375; Vasmer, Chronologie, p. 9. The years 140-142 are a grey area for both al-Jazīra and Arminiya. Vasmer writes: "Wann Yazids Ernennung stattgefunden hat, ist ungewiss, im Jahre 137, nach al-Ḥanūr, sogar im Jahre 138, war noch Ḥusayd ibn Qahtaba Statthalter (Tabari III, 120-121)."
At more or less the same time, the thughūr al-Jazīra to the south were also being rebuilt, largely through the agency of the governor of Syria, Šālih ibn ʿAll. Here we find Qāliqalā associated with the province and the governor of al-Jazīra.

2.6.5.1 ʿAuzaʾī’s letters on Qāliqalā

There is extant a series of letters by al-ʿAuzaʾī, sent to the Caliph and to various high officials on behalf of various individuals and groups. Four of these letters, which seek ransom money for the Muslim population of Qāliqalā, give lurid descriptions of the sufferings of that population, particularly the young girls, and must be dated between 133 or 137 and 139.

2.7 Resumption of the Ṣawā'if

Al-Mansūr and his commanders thus built or rebuilt several important fortress towns in the thughūr. They also lost no time in launching expeditions against the Byzantines from these bases. They were thus able to stabilize, if not reverse, a military situation which had been largely unfavorable to the Muslims for several years.

Unfortunately, the sources present many differences and contradictions concerning these expeditions. Most notably, al-Yaʿqūbī presents a substantially different version of events from that of Ṣabarī and Baladhurī. The latter two, and other writers dependent on them, or using their sources, present a picture which again may be roughly described as "synoptic."

----------------------------------


(180) Ibid., pp. 195-202. These letters are said to be addressed to 1) ʿAbdallāh ibn Muhammad amir al-muʾminīn, 2) Sulaymān ibn Muʿāḍad, 3) ʿIsā ibn ʿAlī, and 4) ʿAbd Balj. See below, 5.5.1.
The expeditions of 139 and 140 have already been discussed in the section on the rebuilding of Malatya (above, 2.6.3). In the expedition of 140 (if it is distinct from that of 139, which seems likely), Şallah took no part. This expedition approached a large Byzantine force encamped on the Jayhân. Upon hearing of their arrival, Constantine retreated (ahjama). A Muslim force was sent to Malatya in the following year (141) to hold it against a Byzantine army operating in the area. Muhammad ibn Ibrâhim al-İnum was in this force. This is during the time when, according to Baladhuri, Muhammad’s brother ‘Abd al-Wahhab had been made wâli al-Jazîra wa-thughurîthâ. It is interesting to see Muhammad, himself a prince with a possible claim to the succession, sent here as a murabit two years after Şallah had gone to war with his two sisters (and their pious vows).

According to Tabari, no ş斐’fa took place between 140 and 146, since al-Mansûr was preoccupied with Ḥasanid rebellions. In Ya’qubi, however, expeditions are listed for 138, and then for every year from 142 until 149, except for 144. Most important, al-Ya’qubi describes all of these expeditions as coming under the control of Şallah ibn ‘Ali.(184)

Most of the commanders whom al-Ya’qubi describes as leading these expeditions were prominent figures: al-‘Abbâs ibn Muhammad (142, 143), al-Ḥusayn ibn Ḥaṭaba (143), Muhammad ibn Ibrâhim (146), al-Sinî ibn ‘Abdallâh

---------------------

(181) Tabari, III, 125.
(182) Tabari, III, 135, wa-râbヘ Moḥammad ibn Ibrâhîm bi-Malâtîya.
Baladhuri, Farhî, p. 188.
(183) Tabari, III, 125.
(185) Confirmed by Theophanes, p. 431.
ibn Ḥārith (147), al-Fadl ibn Śāliḥ (148), Yazīd ibn Usayd (149). These may all have been minor expeditions. Nonetheless, it is difficult to see why this activity should be reported only by al-Yaʿqūbī, unless we take Śāliḥ's role as the key. Perhaps Śāliḥ was operating independently; but it seems more likely that the mainstream historical tradition has downplayed his role.

Khalīfa ibn Khayyat presents yet another version of these expeditions, one which, while different from that of al-Yaʿqūbī, also tends to confirm the continuing importance of Śāliḥ ibn Śalīḥ in the 140's. Thus, for 144 Khalīfa has Śāliḥ direct Maslama ibn Yahyā to build Adhānā.[186] In 145, Khalīfa has Śāliḥ appoint 'Īsā ibn Kathār ibn al-Naqqāsh (it is not clear to what, fīhā wa'llā Śāliḥ ibn Śalīḥ 'Īsā ibn Kathār al-Naqqāsh ḍa-qādār al-Qaṣīya...). 'Īsā then raided as far as Seleucia, Tyana and Qarma.[187] It is strange that so ambitious a raid should not be recorded elsewhere. 'Īsā ibn Kathār is otherwise unknown.

For 148, Ṭabarī reports activities on Śāliḥ's part again:

In that year, it is said, Śāliḥ ibn Śalīḥ mustered his forces ('āskara) in Dabīq, but did not campaign (wā-lām yaghzi).[188]

2.7.1 Expedition of 149

In 149, al-Maṣūr himself went to al-Jazīra. From there he directed a large expedition, about which many details have come down from many sources. According to the principal Muslim sources,[189] this was a major expedition which achieved triumphant results. As will be seen, other sources tend to

---

[187] See below, 5.1. Qarma (Harma, Kharma) is the Greek Koron, in Cappadocia.
[188] Ṭabarī, III, 353.
belie this success; but it appears in any case that this was the largest expedition of its decade.

In 149 al-Mansur traveled from Baghdad until he stopped at Nadlhat al-Mawzil. He then sent al-Hasan ibn Qahtaba on an expedition, and after him Muhammad ibn al-Ash'ath. He set al-Abbas ibn Muhammad over them, with orders to attack Kamkh together with them. Muhammad ibn al-Ash'ath died in Amid. Al-'Abbas and al-Hasan went on until they arrived at Malatya, where they assembled provisions. They then stopped at Kamkh. Al-'Abbas ordered that catapults should be set up against the fortress. [The defenders] put cypress wood (al-'ar'ar) over the fortress, to prevent the stones launched by the catapults from damaging it. They hurled stones at the Muslims, killing 200 of them. The Muslims then took their dabbas, and fought fiercely until they conquered the town. Accompanying al-'Abbâs ibn Muhammad on that expedition was Ma'ar al-Warrâq.

Al-Mansur set his brother al-'Abbas, then governor of al-Jazira, in command over al-Hasan, then no longer governor of Armenia. These officers commanded separate armies.

Dionysius of Tell Mehirî gives a long account of this campaign, which agrees in many respects with that of Ballâdhuri. Here, however, the Muslim forces besiege Kamkh until the onset of winter, and are forced to lift the siege because they themselves are suffering from famine. In the meantime, "Radad" and "Mâlik ibn Tûf" lead a large force (of 40,000!) inland, beyond Caesarea. These raiders are surrounded, with all their prisoners and booty, and nearly annihilated. Radad escapes with a remnant to Malatya, Ibn Tûf to Qalîqâlî with 5000 men.

---

(190) Futûh, p. 186.
(191) Vasmâr, Chronologie, pp. 8-10.
(192) Dionysius, pp. 71f.
Dionysius has probably exaggerated the magnitude of the Muslims’ defeat. However, Khalifa confirms the assertion that the Muslims failed to take Kamkh.

Abū Ja’far sent al-Ḥasan ibn Qahtaba, who went to Kamkh from the land of al-Jazira. However, they held fast, and [al-Ḥasan] returned without having accomplished anything. (194)

2.7.2 Expeditions of 150-158

This was the last large expedition of the reign of al-Mansūr. The following years saw some building activity, in Shimshāt and Mar’ash. (195) For the year 150, Tabari tells us that the saʿifa was entrusted to “Usayd.” (196) This is probably an error for Yazīd ibn Usayd, who then may also have been governor of Armenia. (197) This notice would then correspond to Ya’qūbi’s statement that Yazīd ibn Usayd led the saʿifa in 149. Yazīd did not enter enemy territory, but stayed in his camp at Marj Dabiq. (198)

For 151, Tabari reports a saʿifa led by ʿAbd al-Wahhāb ibn Ibrāhīm. (199)

For 152, Tabari lists three alternative commanders for the raid: Humayd ibn Qahtaba (who became governor of Khurasan in that same year); alternatively, ʿAbd al-Wahhāb ibn Ibrāhīm (again), who did not actually perform it

---------------------
(194) Khalīfa, p. 656.
(195) Bālādhurī, Futūḥ, p. 189. Cf. Theophanes, p. 444. Salem, “War and Peace,” p. 44. Note that ʿṢalih ibn ʿAṭī is associated with this building activity, which occurred in 150 and 151 (Ṣalih died in 152). This is further proof against the Syrian and Jazīran division of the thughūr at this time, since Shimshāt belonged to the thughūr al-Jazīra, by all accounts, while we find Mar’ash assigned to both.
(196) Tabarī, III, 359.
(197) Vasmer, Chronologie, pp. 9, 27. It is also possible that Sulaymān was then governor.
(198) Tabarī, III, 359.
(199) Tabarī, III, 367.
For 153, we have a more ambitious expedition.

In that year, Ma'yūf ibn Yahyā al-Ḥajūrī led the ḥāïfa. He went up by night to a Byzantine fortress (ḥisn min ḥaṣṣān al-Rum) while its inhabitants were asleep. He then took prisoner all the soldiers in the town. He then went to al-Lādhiqīyya al-muṭḥaraqa, bringing out of it the heads of 6000 prisoners, aside from the men who had reached majority.

Ma'yūf, like Zafar ibn 'Asim al-Ḥilālī, was a Syrian who afterwards played a major role in several expeditions on land, and one at sea. This expedition of 153 marks the appearance of the Syrians as leaders of expeditions. It should be noticed that this new advance from Syria began in the year after the death of Șalih ibn ʿAll.

This pattern continued in the following year [154], when the Syrian Zafar ibn 'Asim al-Ḥilālī led a raid which reached the Euphrates.

155 was the year in which al-Mansūr dismissed his brother al-ʿAbbās from the governorship of al-Jazīra and put Mūsā ibn Kalb in his place (see following section). It was also the year in which al-Mansūr founded al-Raḥīqa, presumably with an eye to improved communications with the frontier.

---

(200) Tabarī, III, 367.


(202) Tabarī, III, 385, 568.

(203) Tabarī, III, 711.

(204) Tabarī, III, 373. Khalīfa's account (p. 663) is more complete, with Zafar going out through al-Maṣṣṣaṣa and returning through the darb Wār ʿasāh, after sending his raiders through the area (wa-bāchha 'l-ḥayā fağhanīna wa-khāṣṣaṣa).

(205) Baladhurī, Futūḥ, p. 179; Michael the Syrian, II, 526; Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, pp. 89-90; Salem, "War and Peace," p. 44.
Raids also continued throughout these years. All sources agree in assigning the expedition of 153 to Yazid ibn Usayd. (205)

All this activity apparently had some effect on the Byzantines, since in the following year they asked for a truce, according to Tabari, consenting to pay jizya. (207)

For the year 156, the Arabic sources agree that the qa'ifa was again led by Zufar ibn 'Asim. (208)

For the year 157, the principal sources agree again that Yazid ibn Usayd led the expedition.

Yazid ibn Usayd led the qa'ifa in that year. He sent Sinan, 'awal al-Bezgal to one of the fortresses, and he took prisoners and booty. Muhammad ibn 'Umar said that the one who led the qa'ifa in that year was Zufar ibn 'Asim. (209)

For 158, the final year of al-Mansur's reign, we have only the notice of Khalifa that Ma'yuf ibn Yahya led the expedition in that year. (210)

2.8 Conclusion

(206) Tabari, III, 374; Ya'qubi, II, 470; Khalifa, p. 664, where Yazid leads the expedition against Dhamiya bi-nabiyyat al-Khazer.

(207) Tabari, III, 374.

(208) Tabari, III, 378; Khalifa, p. 665; Andi, p. 225. See below, 5.1.


(210) Khalifa, p. 668.
2.8.1 Al-Mansûr and his Commanders

I have sworn an oath of allegiance, and I shall not cease from it until I know that the one to whom I swore it has died or been killed (fi 'unuqî bay'utun fa-šanā lâ ada'ühū hattâ a'lamâ anna shahihah qad mata aw qutila). (211)

These words of Ishâq ibn Muslim at Sumaysîf are echoed in most of the sources. Abû Ja'far had to go to great lengths to prove to Ishâq that Marwân had indeed been killed. Ishâq had been Marwân’s deputy in the great frontier province of Arûnîya; and loyalty to Marwân survived longest in this frontier outpost.

Abû Ja'far evidently recognized the value of such loyalty, (212) for he made Ishâq one of his closest companions and advisors. Other former “companions of Marwân” who had commanded armies in the Umayyad North had long careers under Abû Ja’far’s rule, both during the latter’s governorship of these northwestern provinces and during his own caliphate. Yazîd ibn Usayd is the outstanding example of these.

Having been governor of al-Jazîra, Armenia and Azerbaijan under Abû 'l-'Abbâs, and having faced a serious challenge (that of 'Abdallah ibn 'All) from the northwestern area early in his own caliphate, al-Mansûr was anxious that no prince or warlord should ever create a power base for himself out of the considerable military resources massed along the frontiers and their hinterlands. He developed a network of men outstanding for their loyalty to him (as well, of course, for their military prowess), including .bû-muhammad ibn 'alî, al-Mansûr's own uncles, brothers and cousins. He rotated these men

---

(211) Tabari, III, 58.
(212) See Mas‘ûdi, Khuṣî, VI, 158-160, 167-168, for "literary" variations on this theme.
through the governorships of the provinces al-Jazira and Arzniya, and most of all, the sava'if.

For these yearly raids, 'Abbasid princes and (usually Khorasan!) warlords alternated in such fashion that none ever led the expedition more than twice in succession (and as a rule, not even that).(213) On larger expeditions, such as that of 149, several of these commanders might be sent with separate forces.

Beginning in 153, Syrian generals (Ma'Yûf ibn Yahya and Zufar ibn 'Alîm) begin to enter the picture. But it is probably no accident that this incorporation of the Syrians into the regular sava'if, coinciding with the extension of the Byzantine war front southward to the Mediterranean coast, occurred in the year following the death of 'Alih ibn 'All. For 'Alih was not part of al-Mansûr's rotation scheme; rather, that scheme existed in large part as a counterbalance to the threat which 'Alih, and Syria in general, posed to al-Mansûr.

Al-Mansûr's rotation policy stands in contrast with that of the later Umayyads.(214) His commanders usually (though not always) went on expedition when they were otherwise out of office.(215) Al-'Abbâs ibn Muḥammad was the notable exception to this pattern, since he remained as governor of al-Jazira

-----------

(213) This pattern holds true if we include the sava'if of the 140's which are reported only by al-Ya'qûbî. See above, 2.7.

(214) E.g., Mu'ayyad ibn Mihârum conducted the raids every year from 114 to 118; his brother Sulaymân conducted them in 120 and 121. Tabari, II, 1563, 1564, 1573, 1588.

(213) Al-'Hasan ibn Qahtâba and Yazid ibn Usayd conducted their expeditions at times other than their respective governorships of Armenia, except perhaps for the expedition of 140, when al-'Hasan may still have been governor; but Vasmer remarks (Chronologie, p. 10), "Daraus lassen sich aber keinerlei Schlûde inbetreff der Statthalterschaft von Armenien machen." Yazid ibn Usayd in 150 may be another exception, see above, 2.7.2.
from 142 until 155, during which time he participated in as many as three expeditions. (216)

This system, whereby the potentially dangerous provinces of the northwestern frontier were controlled by men of whose loyalty al-Mansur could be sure, and whose different backgrounds (and loyalties) counterbalanced one another, was in reality quite precarious, because of the jealousy which inevitably arose among these competing warlords.

In 155, al-Mansur became angry at his brother al-`Abbās, fined him and imprisoned him. No reason is stated for this. However, Tabari tells us of a quarrel between al-`Abbās and Yazīd ibn Usayd, steming from Yazīd's dismissal from the governorship of al-Jazīra.

When Yazīd ibn Usayd had been dismissed from al-Jazīra by al-`Abbās, he complained to Aḥū Jafār, saying, "Commander of the Faithful, your brother has dismissed me wrongfully and insulted my honor (isas'a asli wa-shatama `irdi)." Al-Mansur said to him, "Let the kindness which I have shown you balance my brother's bad treatment of you." Yazīd ibn Usayd then said, "Commander of the Faithful, if your [al-Mansur's] kindness toward us were by way of compensation for your [the `Abbāsid family's] bad treatment of us, then our obedience to you would constitute merely a favor to you on our part" (iddhā kāna ḥṣānuka jamā' an bi-l-su′ārīkum kānat fā'atūn na-tṣaffaqūlah inmā 'alaykum). (217)

Al-`Abbās had replaced Yazīd as governor of al-Jazīra in 142, 13 lunar years before the events reported here. (218) Why should Yazīd's anger have smoldered for so long, only to emerge at this time? And how could this result in al-`Abbās' dismissal (though not, in any case, in Yazīd's reinstatement)?

(216) In 142 and 143, according to Ya'qūbī, II, 470, which, as noted, conflicts with the main historical tradition; and in 149, see above, 2.7.

(217) Tabari, III, 375.

(218) Tabari, III, 99; Vasmer, Chronologie, p. 8; above, 2.6.5. However, in Khilāfa (p. 679), Humayd ibn Qahtaba precedes al-`Abbās as governor of al-Jazīra.
This is difficult to explain; perhaps the story of Yazid complaining to al-Mansur (which has a thoroughly "literary" character, and the point of which is the elegant statement of a theme concerning loyalty) does not really belong here, but rather arose from events in 142 (or was embroidered on the basis of them), and then presented itself to the historians as the only available explanation for the otherwise inexplicable dismissal of al-Abbās in 155. Another explanation might be that something did occur then, of which we know nothing, to bring these two powerful men to loggerheads. However, Yazid in 155 was not in a position from which al-Abbās could depose him.

In any case, the fall of al-Abbās in 155 marks the breakdown of the system which al-Mansur had been employing in the northwestern provinces and the thughūr. The increasing role of the Syrians and the extension of the war southward are other indications of change.

2.8.2 Thughūr al-Shām, Thughūr al-Jazīra
To what extent did the administrative situation in these years correspond to the picture which we have from Baladhuri and the geographers? That is, were the thughūr al-Shām and the thughūr al-Jazīra distinct from one another, and attached to the provinces Syria and Jazīra? Supporting such an assertion are statements such as that of Baladhuri, that al-Mansur "settled in Malatya 4000 soldiers from al-Jazīra, because [Malatya] is one of its thughūr." (219) Here, however, the interpretation is Baladhuri's own; and we have already seen that his presentation of the frontier district adheres to the "classical picture" (above, 1.2). Stronger evidence is to be found in Dionysius, who tells of a call to arms sent out by 'Abbās, the governor of al-Jazīra, to the Arab inhabitants of that province, some 600 of whom are sent to perform gar-

(219) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 187; below, 4.1.
rison duty in the fortresses. (220)

However, the Arabic sources tend in a different direction. The most salient fact about them in this regard is their lack of harmony, especially with regard to the role played by Şâliḥ ibn 'All. It is impossible to say if this confusion derives from the sources themselves, or from a particularly fluid administrative situation. We may note, in any case, that the sources reveal considerable tension around this issue. Most often the caliph gives the orders for buildings and expeditions; but the provincial governors probably held more power, in a longer succession of years, than most of the historians (with the notable exception of Ya'qūbī) were prepared to admit.

From many indications in the sources, it also appears that the jurisdiction (for lack of a better word) of the two great governors did not apply neatly to the thughūr regions named after their respective provinces. Again, this applies especially in the case of Şâliḥ, whose activities extended as far to the northeast as Malatya and Shimshāt (above, 2.6.3, 2.7.2).

2.9 Appendix: Life in the Thughūr

The classical Arab geographers are of limited value for this early period. However, as if to compensate for this lack, we have the precise details (especially concerning buildings and land) of Baladhuri's Futūḥ. There are also other sources which afford us glimpses into life in this region in the earliest 'Abbāsid period. Foremost of these is the Chronicle of Dionysius of Tell Mahrū, the value of which as a document for the social history of al-Jazīra, especially for the last years of the reign of al-Mansūr, has been shown by Claude Cahen. (221)

---

(220) Dionysius, pp. 89-90; below, 4.6.2.

(221) "Fiscalité, propriété, antagonismes sociaux en Haute-Mésopotamie au
2.9.1 Al-Ṣaʿālīk

The end of Umayyad rule and the ensuing period of struggle led to a breakdown of authority (such as it was) in the plateau of al-Jazīra and the adjoining mountainous regions. Dionysius' picture is vivid:

L'an 1062 [749-750], les Arabes de Maipherkat se répandèrent dans la région et commencèrent à faire beaucoup de mal aux habitants de la montagne et de toute la contrée. Qūra ibn Thābit monta dans le canton de Qoulab, s'empara de ses notables et en tua sept. (222)

The local Christians take to armed resistance, uniting around a man named John son of Dadai. So far has the anarchy spread that they form an alliance with their own local Arabs, against this local governor/bandit chief Qurra ibn Thābit.

Les Arabes et les Chrétiens voulurent, d'un commun accord, faire descendre le gouverneur qui, depuis deux ans, était établi dans la forteresse de Qoulab. Ils refusèrent de lui obéir et se révoltèrent contre lui. Les Arabes voulaient le faire descendre de peur qu'il ne se joignît aux habitants de la montagne; les Syriens aussi demandaient son départ dans la crainte qu'il ne les trahit. Celui-ci, résistant aux deux partis, s'établit solidement dans la forteresse: il réunit des hommes pervers dont il devint le chef et descendit à la tête de sa troupe pour ravager les villages et emporter le butin dans la forteresse. Il tomba à l'improviste en Eloul et Paspassat, où il commit toutes sortes d'atrocités, lui et son armée. Il jeta les habitants dans les fers et s'empara de tout ce qu'ils possédaient. (223)

This Qurra ibn Thābit is not known to the Arabic sources. His activities as a robber baron, however, together with the band which forms around him, find many echoes throughout the history of the frontier region, on both sides. In Arabic, these adventurers and unfortunate are often called the ṣaʿālīk. (224) Who these ṣaʿālīk were exactly is difficult to say. We

-----------------------------

temps des premiers 'Abbāsides d'après Denys de Tell-Mahre.'

(222) Dionysius, p. 47.
(223) Dionysius, p. 47.
(224) A. Partusi, "Tra Storia e leggenda: Akritai e Ghāzi sulla frontiera
encounter a group of them at this same time, in Armenia during the revolt of
the 'abī al-Baylaqān against Muhammad ibn 'Ṣul in 750:

They gathered a crowd of qa'allk and others at Qil'at al-Kilāb. Muhammad ibn 'Ṣul sent Ṣāliḥ ibn Ṣubayh al-Kindi against them. He besieged them, and killed a great number of them.\(^{(225)}\)

Strange to say, this same Ṣāliḥ ibn Ṣubayh appears in Dionysius\(^{(226)}\) as a kind of independent warlord, very much like Qurra ibn Thābit. In 752-753, he holds Christian hostages at Mayyafariqlī, while the same John bar Dadai seeks (and is granted) help against him from Ābū Ja'far at Ḩarrān. Chabot thought that this was the 'Abbasid Ṣāliḥ ibn Ṣul, but Ṣāliḥ ibn Ṣubayh is well attested in the Ansāb,\(^{(227)}\) where "Ṣāliḥ ibn Ṣubayh qa'allā Kinda" is sent (with other officers) to al-Jazīra against Mulabbad the Kharījite.

We may (loosely) call Qurra and Ṣāliḥ leaders of the qa'allk, representing the dark side of this world of loyalties binding sovereigns, commanders and soldiers. In an atmosphere of anarchy, they pass into the service of the 'Abbasid government, when it suits them, and then operate against the "authorities" from their strongholds in the hills.\(^{(228)}\) They prey without interruption on the local Christian population, and even on the local Arabs. The identity and condition of the latter is a complex matter, which must be

\(^{(225)}\) Ya'qūbī, II, 429.

\(^{(226)}\) Dionysius, p. 55.

\(^{(227)}\) Baladhurī, Ansāb, III, 248-249.

\(^{(228)}\) Cf. Azdī, p. 279 (s.a. 177), where urban qa'allk in Mosul join a rebel who collects the kharāj and imprisons the tax officers (ummā). See also Osman, ʿAduūd, I, 391.
2.9.2 Al-Rhadrij

Who were these "Arabs of Mayyâfâriqîn" who "se répandèrent dans la région et commençaient à faire beaucoup de mal aux habitants de la montagne?" They are not, in any case, synonymous with the qa‘ātîlîk led by Qurra, whom Dionysius portrays as their enemies (above, 2.9.1). But what was their relation to the Jazîran Arabs who fought in the garrisons and the expeditionary armies of the thughûr? The scholars who have noted this passage of Dionysius have not explained it.(229)

The plateau of the Jazîra is potentially fertile, especially in the zone at the foot of the Taurus, where it receives fairly ample rainfall. However, because al-Jazîra lies open to the desert, its agricultural life has always been precarious.(230) In modern times, the Jazîra was largely abandoned to the Beduins, until a reconquest of the land for agriculture began under the French Mandate.(231)

Arabs had been present in the Jazîra in large numbers before the Islamic conquests, and in the period of Arab dominance many tribesmen had poured into the province. The passage from Dionysius about the Arabs of Mayyâfâriqîn proves the existence of some kind of balance between the Christians, in large part mountain folk, and the Arabs who, as usual, live in the plain. The balance is disturbed here, but apparently not fatally, as happened two centuries later, when the Banû Habîb devastated this very same area.(232)

(230) X. de Planhol, Les fondements géographiques de l'histoire de l'Islam, pp. 74-75, 77-78.
(231) Ibid., pp. 112-114.
Some Christian peasants had Arab landlords. These Arabs presumably paid 'ushr on this land to the treasury. Certainly not all the Arabs of al-Jazira were landowners. But the large Jaziran armies which fought in the wars of this period received military pay, no matter what side they were on. The Arabs' primary occupation was arms, and not the nomadic life as such. Naturally, there must have been a large number of Beduin present. But if nomads had predominated, then the peasantry would not have survived as long as it did: whereas Dionysius speaks of periods of great prosperity for the Syrian peasants. The tax collector, not the Beduin, was their greatest enemy.

In the beginning of this period (in 133), we find the fortress of Kamkh commanded by a "man of the Banu Sulaym." This tribe predominated in Diyâr Bâkr, and had settled in Armenia along the frontier northwards to Qâlîqâlî. The Banû Sulaym supplied many leaders in the history of the northwest frontier provinces of the late Umayyads and early 'Abbâsids (such as Yazid ibn Usayd and Yûsuf ibn Râshid), and, no doubt, much of the rank and file of the armies. Although we do not know much about these armies, we may say that these men fought in organized formations, and were skilled in siege warfare both offensive and defensive. Indeed, to the degree to which they were successful, the Banû Sulaym and other tribes living in the interior of Anatolia had abandoned the Beduin way of life and of combat. For it is well known that traditional Arab nomadism, based on the dromedary, cannot function

(233) Dionysius, p. 82; Cahen, *art. cit.*, p. 151; below, 4.6.2.
in the harsh winters and high, mountainous terrain of Anatolia. The Turkish nomads, with their Bactrian camels (and skill in crossbreeding), and their love of high ground, were to accomplish the nomadization of these regions in later centuries.

How the Arab armies did as well as they did in Armenia and the northern frontier region remains something of a mystery. But many of the Arabs of al-Jazira found a more congenial activity in kharijism, a creed which in effect turned its back on the Byzantine frontier with its alien landscape.

L. Veccia Vaglieri counted 16 major Kharijite revolts in Diyar Bakr and Diyar Rabi'a for the period of the independent 'Abbasid caliphate. She omitted, however, the revolt of Mulabbad ibn Ḥarama al-Shaybâni, which began in 137. Tabari's account gives an interesting list of Mulabbad's enemies.

In that year, Mulabbad ibn Ḥarama al-Shaybâni revolted as a Kharijite (kharaja...fa-hakkama) in the region of al-Jazira. The rawîbî al-Jazîra who, it is said, then numbered a thousand fighters, set out against him. Mulabbad fought them and defeated them, and killed a number of them. Then the rawîbî al-Maṣūfî set out against him, and he defeated them. Then Yazid ibn Ḥāsim al-Muhallabî set out against him and he defeated him also, etc. (239)

The verb ṭabâta and its cognates can denote, in this period, garrison duty on the frontiers performed by regular soldiers who receive 'atâ'.

When al-Mansur became caliph, he appointed Yazid ibn Usayd al-Sulâni governor of Armenia. [Yazid] conquered the ʿabab al-Lân and stationed regular troops (receiving pensions) there. (wa-rattaba fihi rawîbî ahl al-di̇wān). (240)

(236) De Planhol, op. cit., p. 208.


(238) "Le vicende del harigismo," p. 39.

(239) Ṭabarî, III, 120.
The word ḥātha occurs fairly frequently in this period referring specifically to the Byzantine frontier. However, as the above passage from Ṭabarī (concerning Mulabbad) shows, the ṣawāḥ of al-Jazīra and Mosul (then separate provinces) are engaged in the struggle against the Ḥawārij. The term ṣawāḥ al-Mawṣil in particular recurs constantly, as in the case of a commander of the garrison: wa-kāna murābiṭan bi’l-Mawṣil fī al-fayn.(242)

These Ḥawārij, whatever their degree of nomadization, were themselves Jaziran Arabs. The ṣawāḥ who fought them may have been Khurāsānī in their majority; but the essential thing about them is that they were organized and settled. The garrisons of the thughūr seem to have been largely Jazīran in this period. The rivalry between Khurāsānīs and Jazīrans within the expeditionary armies and garrisons of this period may thus have counted for less than did the more basic division of armed men into ṣawāḥ and Ḥawārij.

The gulf between these two kinds of fighters is apparent in the case of an alliance between them, that of ʿIṣḥāq ibn Muslim, in command of a Syro-Jazīran army, and Bukayra the Ḥarūrī (above, 2.2). Bukayra fought and lost to Abū Jaʿfar, while the "regular" forces sat in their fortified positions. Dionysius seems unaware of any connection between the two, noting only that Bukayra "embraced the sect of the Ḥarūrites."(243)

(241) E.g., Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 188, wa-rāba Muḥammad ibn ʿIbrāhīm bi-Malatya. Ibn al-ʿAdim, Zubda, p. 46.
(242) Awd, pp. 177, 217.
(243) Dionysius, p. 40.
Chapter III

HARUN

3.1 Introduction

The thughūr are blocked by Hārūn, and through him the ropes of the Muslim state are firmly plaited.

His banner is forever tied with [divine] victory; he has an army before which armies scatter.

Every king of the Rūm gives him jīzya, unwillingly, perforce, out of hand in humiliation.

We-suddat bi-hārūna ‘l-thughūru fa-ubkmat
bīhi min ‘umūri ‘l-muslimīna ‘l-mawā’ira

We-ma ‘nsakka ma’qūda bī-maṣrīn liya’ubu
lābū ‘ansarun ‘anbul rūḥānu ‘l-‘asā’ikira

We-kalīna wulīkī ‘l-Rūm a’līhū jīzyatān
‘ālā ‘l-rasīliq gisran ‘an yadin wahma ṣāḥbihu(244)

For the reigns of al-Mahdi, al-Hādi, and al-Rashid, it is the last-named of these three who predominates in the history of the thughūr. Hārūn remained involved with the jihād and the thughūr, from his adolescence until the end of his life. Partly as a result of this predilection of his, this period differs significantly from the one preceding.

(244) Ṭabarī, III, 741. Panegyric by Marwān ibn Abī Ḥafṣa, declaimed in the year 181. The first verse might be translated, less literally, as "The thughūr are blocked (defended) by Hārūn, and through him the resolve of the Muslim state is strengthened." Underlying this metaphor is Qur'ān 3:108, wo‘ẓaqūn bi-ḥabī ‘lilb, and the notion, familiar from panegyric, of the Caliph as God's rope to mankind. See Crone and Hinds, God's Caliph, pp. 39-40.
We have seen that al-Mansūr had little personal inclination for jihād, and governed the Ṭūḥār region from a distance. He maintained control by rotating the great princes and warlords through the sawād'il and the governorships of the adjoining provinces. We have found the complexity of this balancing act reflected in the sources, which have proved difficult to harmonize. But in this following period, the matter is simpler: Hārūn (following the example of his father Muḥammad al-Mahdī) made frequent trips to the Ṭūḥār, and seems to have maintained an interest in the area even when absent. A result of this stronger caliphal presence is a decrease in confusion in our sources over who was in charge of what and when (see following section). (245)

However, this "age of Hārūn" in the Ṭūḥār has its own complexities. During this period there took place the administrative changes which, according to the Muslim geographers and historians, resulted in the organization of the frontier area into al-ʾawāsima waʾl-Ṭūḥār. How and why this happened is far from clear. Furthermore, residence in or near the Ṭūḥār and involvement in the jihād seem to have had an almost sacral meaning for this ruler, whom we only imagine to be a familiar figure.

3.1.1 Sources

The historical sources for this period are somewhat poorer than for the preceding. The two sources which lent most color to the picture of the reign of al-Mansūr, Rājdūhari's Ansāb and the pseudo-Dionysius, both peter out here, as does the Kitāb al-ʾuswān of Agapius of Manbij. We find some compensation in the anonymous Kitāb al-ʾuyūn waʾl-ḥadīq. Other sources remain much the same.

(245) The chronology of the reigns of al-Mahdī and al-Hādī (including the Byzantine wars) has been discussed in detail by Moscati. Canard has dealt with the wars of the latter part of the reign of al-Rashīd. This chapter will therefore focus (to a greater extent than was possible in the preceding chapter) on the Ṭūḥār as a province, how it was governed and by whom.
same as before.

While disagreement remains among the Arabic sources, it is at once milder than for the preceding period (see previous section), and seemingly less patterned. Thus, while Ya'qubi still differs from Tabari, there does not seem to be any political difference motivating these historians or their sources. The chorus of approval for Harun, however little deserved, seems to have begun quite early to drown out dissenting voices.

There is, of course, an enormous amount of more "literary" historical material on this period, much of it devoted to the Barmakids. But this is of little use to the administrative history of the thughur. An old numismatic problem turns out to be of direct relevance (below, 3.4).

3.2 The Reigns of al-Mahdi and al-Hadi

Since Moscati has provided critical descriptions of these reigns, there is no need for a chronology. Only a few points will be made here.

Al-Mahdi took a stronger personal interest in the jihad than his father had done. News of the defeat of the expedition of 161 provoked his anger; and when he learned of the Byzantine successes of 164, he gave

(246) Most relevant is Moscati, "Studi," pp. 309-318, 325-329. Moscati integrated all relevant sources; the only major Arabic source lacking to him was Khalifa. This is not a serious lack, since (unlike the preceding period) the reign of Harun imposed a sort of peace among its chroniclers. Khalifa's statements will be brought up in what follows. See also E.W. Brooks, "Byzantines and Arabs in the Time of the Early Abbasids," *English Historical Review* XV (1900), pp. 734-740; XVI (1901), pp. 84-92; M. Canard, "Les expéditions des Arabes contre Constantinople dans l'histoire et dans la légende," pp. 102-104; H. Kennedy, *The Early Abbasid Caliphate*, pp. 96-114; Lilie, *Die Reaktion*, pp. 166-167; Salem, "War and Peace," pp. 66-80; Bonner, "Al-Khalifa al-Hadi.

(247) See also below, 3.3, 3.4.

orders to behead the Muslim commander 'Abd al-Kabir ibn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd. (249) Furthermore, while al-Mansūr in his time gave orders to found and rebuild fortress towns, and to keep their garrisons paid and equipped, al-Mahdī went further in this respect: not only did he visit some of the sites which he restored, but he even had one of them (al-Ḥadath) renamed after himself (al-Muḥammadīyya or al-Mahdiyya). (250)

But most important is the fact that al-Mahdī put his son Hārūn in charge of the great expeditions of 163 and 165. The caliph accompanied these expeditions on their way (in 163 going as far as the river Jayḥūn), (251) and received them with pomp when they returned to Baghdad. Members of the 'Abbāsid family had led expeditions before, but never on such a scale. (252)

Hārūn’s rise in the 160’s began with these expeditions: it was upon Hārūn’s return to Baghdad in 163 that al-Mahdī appointed his governor of "Armenia, Azerbaijan, and the Maghrib," while to celebrate Hārūn’s victory of 165, al-Mahdī granted him the title "al-Rashīd" and named him successor to his brother Mūsā al-Muḥādi. (253) Accordingly, in the ṭuḥūr in 165 we find Hārūn giving orders (on the site) for repairing al-Maṣṣīṣa, its mosque, and a nearby bridge. (254)

---

(249) Ṭabarī, III, 501; Moscati, "Studi," p. 315. After intercession had been made, al-Mahdī was content with imprisoning him.

(250) Balādhdhi, Futūḥ, p. 190; Moscati, "Studi," pp. 312-313; below, 3.4.

(251) Ṭabarī, III, 599.

(252) See above, 2.6-7. The revolt of 'Abdallāh ibn 'Alī (above, 2.5) might be considered an exception. Al-Mahdī himself did not conduct jihād as heir apparent: Moscati, "Studi," p. 327, n. 1 refers to his activities in Khurāsān (Ṭabarī, III, 133-137).

In contrast with the previous reign, we thus find in the reign of al-Mahdi a new energy in matters of jihad, personified by the young Harun. We may therefore take issue with Moscati's characterization of this period as one of decline in terms of military action.\(^{(255)}\)

3.3 The Reorganization of 170

Tabari tells us that in 170 Harun, in the first year of his reign, "took all the thughur away from al-Jazira and Qinnasrin, and made them one district called al-'awasim (wa-fihā 'azala al-Rashid al-thughur kullahā 'an al-Jazira wa-Qinnasrin wa-ja'ālahā hayyian wāhidon wa-summiyat al-'awāsim)."\(^{(256)}\) This dry little notice requires some commentary.

In their discussions of this region, the Muslim geographers use the word thughur to refer to frontier strongholds, and the word 'awasim to refer to strongholds situated further to the rear.\(^{(257)}\) If Tabari is correct, then this division did not yet exist in 170.

The only other early Arabic sources which address the issue are Azdi and Baladhuri. Azdi in his Ta'rikh al-Mansil has a version of this statement which conforms to what we may call the "orthodox" view of the matter: "The thughur were separated from al-Jazira and Qinnasrin, while the area behind them was called al-'awāsim."\(^{(258)}\) However, this version makes little sense:

\(^{(255)}\) "Studi," p. 326.

\(^{(256)}\) Tabari, III, 604.

\(^{(257)}\) Above, 1.2. Canard (H'andénidos, p. 225) sums this up: "Le jund ou territoire des 'Awāsim dont les places principales sont...Mambij, Reihān, Qūrus, Dulk, Tizin, Antioche, est ainsi nommé parce que ces villes servent d'appui aux places avancées, appelées thughur, ou places frontières."

\(^{(258)}\) Azdi, p. 262. Wa-ufridat al-thughur 'an al-Jazira wa-Qinnasrin wa-summiya mā dūnahā al-'awāsim.
how could the 'awāṣim be given the new name, if it was another area, the thughur, which had been made separate? This version may be the product of a later attempt to resolve this inconsistency.

For Baladhuri, the phrase al-mudūn al-lātī sammāhā al-Rashid 'awāṣim ("the towns which al-Rashid called 'awāṣim") refers to Antioch and its neighbors—that is, to al-'Awasim in the "orthodox" sense. For according to Baladhuri's understanding of the matter, the changes of 170 resulted immediately in the situation familiar to him and to the geographers.

Tabari is to preferred over Baladhuri in this instance, for the following reasons. Baladhuri was the most meticulous writer of his time in describing the frontier district according to the idealized, "classical" scheme (above, 1.2). He also tended generally to anachronism in technical matters, as will appear in his description of ju‘l (below, 4.1). Tabari, on the other hand, frequently gives what appear to be transcriptions of official pronouncements and state documents. We cannot know if this particular statement is such a transcription; but speaking for its authenticity is the fact that Tabari here uses the terms thughur and 'awāṣim differently from the way later tradition understood them.

While a few later historians have transmitted this line from Tabari,(261) Muslim geographical and historical tradition has mostly ignored the problem.

(259) Futūḥ, p. 163.

(260) Ibid., p. 132. Upon succeeding to the caliphate Harun made Qinnasrin separate from the new al-'Awaṣim. The latter included Manbij, Dalūk, Ra‘bān, Qūrus, Antākya, and Tīzin. He called them al-'Awaṣim because the Muslims defend themselves (ya’taṣṣūma) in them when they return from their raids.

(261) E.g., Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, VI, 75; Abū ‘1-Fidā’, Al-Hukḥtasa fī akhbār al-bashar, II, 12.
it poses, with the possible exceptions of Yaqūt (262) and Qalqashandi (263).

Modern scholarship has followed suit (264).

We may also ask what is meant by ḥayyizan wahidān. The word ḥayyiz means "a quarter, tract, region, or place...syn. nāḥiyah" (Lane). Accordingly, the translation "he made them into one district" makes perfect sense. However, the word ḥayyiz does not belong to the ʿAbbāsid administrative vocabulary (265).

3.3.1 Al-Jazira and Qinnasrin before 170

This change which occurred in 170 has been misunderstood by later tradition. To reconstruct what happened, we must first find out what state of affairs preceded the change.

(262) At Muʿjam al-buldān, III, 741, Yaqūt considers the possibility that the thughur of al-Ḥassāṣa, ʿArsūs, etc., may have been part of the ʿawāṣim. He can only conceive of one answer, true for all time.

(263) Qalqashandi (Ṣubḥ al-ʿaṣḥāb, IV, 131) cites this passage (with the variant wa-sammahā for wa-summīyat) from ʿImād al-Dīn (that is, Abū ʿl-Fīdā, see Mukhtasar akhbar al-bashar, II, 12—the change in phrasing seems to be Qalqashandi's), and goes on to say: "This indicates that the phrase al-thughur waʾl-ʿawāṣim is a name for one thing" (Qultu wa-muqtatfī dhalika an takSna al-thughur waʾl-ʿawāṣim ismanʿala musamman wahid). Like Yaqūt, Qalqashandi can only conceive of one correct answer.

(264) E.g., Canard, Ṣamdanides, pp. 226f.; idem, "Al-ʿAwāṣim," EI2, I, 760-762; Salem, "War and Peace," pp. 82-84.

(265) It appears once in an obscure ʿUthmān toponym, Yaʾqūbī, Buldān (BGA VII), p. 339. But the root ḥwz (hold, possess) also had its associations with the thughur, as we see in this line from a poem of Abū ʿl-Maʾrūf al-Kīlābī, declaimed in celebration of Ḥarūn's capture of Heracleia in the year 190 (Ṭabarī, III, 710):

Wa-mā hāza ṭ-thonghūra šīwāka khalqun mīn al-murakhkalifīna ʿala ṭ-usahaan

No one of those who have succeeded to the rule, other than you, has ever held the thughur.
It seems from this passage of Tabari that responsibility for the *thughur* prior to 170 was divided between the governors of al-Janīra and Qinnasrin. For the reign of al-Mansūr, we have seen the title *wali al-Janīra wa-thughurība* applied to *Abbasid* princes in the years 140-142 (above, 2.6.2). We have also seen ʿAlī ibn ʿAbbās designated as *wali Qinnasrin waʾl-thughūr* (above, 2.6.1). Otherwise, activity in the *thughūr*—building, restoring, and commanding fortress towns, and leading expeditions—was not the sole prerogative of the governors of these two provinces during the reign of al-Mansūr. Moreover, even when these governors do become involved in the frontier area, the extent of territory controlled by each is not clear (above, 2.8.2).

Ibn al-ʿAdim says that when al-Mahdī became caliph, Mūsā ibn Sulaymān al-Khurasānī was governor of Qinnasrin. When al-Mahdī visited Aleppo in 163, he appointed ʿAlī ibn Sulaymān (ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn al-ʿAbbās) governor of "Qinnasrin, Aleppo, and al-Janīra."(266) In older sources we find a more complicated situation, but Tabari and Baladhuri finally confirm, and Khalīfa does not contradict, the statement that by 168 ʿAlī ibn Sulaymān was governor of both Qinnasrin and al-Janīra.(267)

These governors of al-Janīra named by Tabari and Khalīfa are notable for their absence from the *thughur* and the Byzantine campaigns in the reign of

(266) Zubda, pp. 60-61, ḥarabān wa-kharājan wa-ṣalātan.
(267) Tabari lists *Abbasid* princes (al-ʿAṣīr ibn ʿAbdallāh, ʿAbd al-Samad ibn ʿAlī, ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAlī) as governors of al-Janīra for the years 159, 160, 162, 163; ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAṣim is also listed for 163 (III, 470, 484, 494, 500). After a gap we find ʿAlī ibn Sulaymān ʿalī al-Janīra wa-Qinnasrin in 168 (III, 521). Khalīfa (Taʾṣikh, p. 697) names no governor of Qinnasrin; he lists eight governors of al-Janīra in the reign of al-Mahdī, including these same *Abbasid* princes. ʿAlī ibn Sulaymān appears twice. See also Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 190, and below. No coins are extant from Qinnasrin or al-Janīra in these years.
al-Mahdi. (268) Al-Mahdi, Harun, and the Barmakids controlled the area directly in this decade, assigning commands to men of their own choice. (269)

By the end of the caliphate of al-Mahdi, and during that of al-Hadi, (270) al-Jazira and Qinnasrin were joined under the rule of one governor, an 'Abbāsid prince who did not take part in the Byzantine wars, at least until the end of his tenure in that office. Al-Mahdi, Harun, and the Barmakids seem to have been anxious to keep the prestige of the jihad, as well as the loyalty of the frontier armies, entirely for themselves.

In 168, 'Ali ibn Sulaymān did find himself in command of a conglomeration of forces, meeting a military emergency. He failed, and was quickly sacked; this disruption of the normal order of things may have been a cause for the creation of the new district of al-'Awāsīm in 170. These events will be discussed in the following section.

3.4 Harunābād and al-Haruniyya

It is here that a numismatic problem enters the picture, one which has remained largely unsolved ever since scholars became aware of it early in the nineteenth century, and one whose solution may cast new light on the problem of the formation of the thughūr.

This reorganization of the thughūr district does not, at first glance, appear to be reflected in the numismatic history of the region. However, the coinage of Harunābād and al-Haruniyya, which begins in 168/785 and ends in

(268) According to Ya'qūbī (II, 466), al-Fadl ibn Šāliḥ led a raid in 167. The truce was still in effect in that year, but al-Fadl was then out of office in any case.

(269) See "Al-Khalīfa al-Narţī." We have the name of a commander of al-Maṣṣūla in the reign of al-Mahdi, Šāliḥ al-Barallūsī (Balādhūrī, Futḥ, p. 166), but he is otherwise unknown.

(270) Balādhūrī, Futḥ, p. 190, and below.
171/788, presents several puzzles. Do these two names indicate a single mint? Does the mint name al-Haruniyya correspond to the fortress town of that name, described by the Arab geographers as lying in the Syrian thughur? If so, why is this series of coins clearly identified as belonging to the province of Armenia? And finally, what is the meaning of the title al-khalifa al-mardi, which appears on coins of al-Haruniyya, and of no other place, upon the accession of Harun al-Rashid to the caliphate?(271)

Numismatists have long been aware of these problems.(272) Since the 1840's, however, no one has attempted to consider all these problems together, and to place this unusual coinage in its historical context.(273) The Armenia/Harunabad/al-Haruniyya puzzles must be solved as part of the series of shifts and changes which took place around 170.

Throughout the reign of al-Mahdi, coins of Armenia (Arminiya) were struck by the Muslim authorities of that province (see following chart) with no indication of the mint location (except, for the copper fulûs, which often indicate the town as well as the province). However, it is generally assumed that the coins of the province Arminiya were struck at Dabll (Dwin), while

(271) On this last question, see Bonner, "Al-Khalifa al-Mardi" (forthcoming).

(272) The most important discussions of this coinage are to be found in: Fraehn, Recension, Nos. *115, *116, *125; Stickel, Handbuch, pp. 66-67, 80-84, 86-90; Tiesenhausen, Monety vostochnavo Khalifat a, Nos. 1051, 1077, 1090, 1093, 1099, 1117, 1142, 1143 (Tiesenhausen incorporates writings of Fraehn which are otherwise inaccessible); Anderson, Kochtel, pp. 20-25, Vasmer’s contribution; Vasmer, Chronologie, pp. 19f.; Zambaur, Münzprägungen, p. 263; Miles, Rare Islamic Coins, No. 233 (pp. 60-61); Artuk, Denizbaci Definexi, pp. 79-81, 89-90; the lists of Armenian coins in Mushegian, "Vypusk abbasidskikh monet;" and Nicol, "Abbâsid Provincial Administration," pp. 97-101, 306-324.

(273) Vasmer, after setting forth his penetrating arguments concerning the Harunabad/al-Haruniyya problem in Kochtel, pp. 20-25, then devoted only a few descriptive lines to the al-khalifa al-mardi coin mentioned in that same work, pp. 27-28. Stickel's comments of 1845 (Handbuch, pp. 86-90), remain the last attempt at a comprehensive view.
those of the sub-province Arrān (which was always under the rule of the Arab governor of Armenia) were struck at Bardhā'ā (Partaw).
Armenia, Arran and Azerbaijan in the Reign of al-Mahdi, 158-169 (775-785)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Sovereign</th>
<th>Governor or Official(*)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AE 158</td>
<td>Bardha'a</td>
<td>al-Hasan</td>
<td>T. 2766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AE 159</td>
<td>Da'bil</td>
<td>Yazid b. Usayd</td>
<td>Mesh. 30-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. AE 159</td>
<td>Bardha'a</td>
<td>Yazid b. Usayd</td>
<td>T. 887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. AE 159</td>
<td>al-Bab</td>
<td>Yazid b. Usayd</td>
<td>Pakh. p. 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. AR 161</td>
<td>Arminiya</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>T. 910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. AR 162</td>
<td>Arminiya</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>T. 925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. AE 163</td>
<td>Bardha'a</td>
<td>Yazid b. Usayd</td>
<td>T. 2769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. AR 165</td>
<td>Arminiya</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Pakh. p. 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. AR 166</td>
<td>Arran</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>B. 783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. AR 166</td>
<td>Arminiya</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>B. 787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. AR 166</td>
<td>Adharbayjan</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Nuṣayr*</td>
<td>T. 925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. AR 167</td>
<td>Arminiya</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Nuṣayr*</td>
<td>M. 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. AR 167</td>
<td>Arminiya</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Ibn Khuraym</td>
<td>T. 1027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. AR 167</td>
<td>Adharbayjan</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Nuṣayr*</td>
<td>T. 1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. AR 168</td>
<td>Arran</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Ibn Khuraym</td>
<td>T. 2774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. AR 168</td>
<td>Arminiya</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Ibn Khuraym</td>
<td>T. 1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. AR 168</td>
<td>Arminiya</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Hasan*</td>
<td>T. 1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. AR 169</td>
<td>Adharbayjan</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Nuṣayr*</td>
<td>T. 1063, 1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. AR 169</td>
<td>Arran</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Rawḥ</td>
<td>T. 1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. AR 169</td>
<td>Arminiya</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Hasan*</td>
<td>T. 1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. AR 169</td>
<td>Arminiya</td>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>Harunabad</td>
<td>Khusayma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mint of Harunabad leaps abruptly into history with Issue 1 (see Catalogue at end of this chapter). Three good nineteenth-century authorities attest to this rare coin, which appears from their descriptions to be identical to the far more abundant Issue 2 in all respects, except the date (168 instead of 169).

No place called Harunabad is mentioned in any medieval written source. The Persian ending of the name would argue for a location in Iran or (as some have thought) in Kurdistan. However, the word Arminiya is clearly stamped on the reverse field. This double indication of the mint (Harunabad and Arminiya) is in itself something of a rarity.

Several numismatists have identified the Hasan of Issues 1 and 2 as the famous al-Hasan ibn Qahtaba, who was governor of Armenia in the last years of the reign of al-Mansur (154-158). However, this al-Hasan is never mentioned by any source, Arabic or Armenian, as governor around 168-169. Furthermore, the absence of the definite article in the name "Hasan" must be accounted for.

---

(274) E.g., Fraehn, Recensio, p. 6; Codrington, Manual of Musulman Numismatics, p. 195, where the author lists: "Harunabad. In Kurdistan, 340 10'N; 46 45' E. Abbasid," with no indication of how he found these coordinates. Zambaur, Münzschriften, p. 263, wrongly gives the impression that Yaqût has a section on Harunabad.


(277) As noted at Tiesenhausen, Money, no. 1051 and Lane-Poole, Khed. No. 393 (p. 639). The coins struck in al-Hasan ibn Qahtaba's name from the years 154 until 158 are clearly marked 'al-Hasan.
A more probable connection can be made with a Hasan (again without the definite article) who appears on dirhems of Madīnat al-Salām issued in the beginning of the reign of Hārūn (170). Fraehn thought that this Baghdad Hasan was a mintmaster ("praefecti rei monetariae nomen esse").(278) Whatever Hasan's function was, we may easily imagine a bureaucrat in a place named after Hārūn taking a position in the central government when that prince assumes the supreme rule.

The mint name Hārūnābād stops in 169, and is apparently replaced in that same year by the name al-Hārūniyya (Issue 3). A glance at the Catalogue should nearly suffice to convince the reader that the one name merely replaces the other. The peculiarity of the double indication of the mint in Issues 1-3 makes this conclusion nearly unavoidable. Nonetheless, many numismatists have thought that these were two separate places.(279)

Issue 2a would provide a smooth transition from Hārūnābād to al-Hārūniyya, because it is purportedly a Hārūnābād coin with the name of the governor Khuzayma, which also appears on al-Hārūniyya coins (Issues 3-6). However, Issue 2a seems to be a bibliographical hybrid created by the great Tiesenhausen (see Catalogue), which subsequent scholarship (especially Soviet) has incorporated into the series of Armenian coinage for this period.(280) It must be ruled out as a link between the two mint-names.

[Footnotes]


(280) E.g., Vasmer, *Chronologie*, p. 28, n. 28; Mushegian, No. 34 in list.
We must also rule out die-links as a means of proving that Harunabād and al-Hārūniyya were one and the same place. Different obverses and reverse dies were used for each of these issues: note that the annulet patterns on the obverses change from Issues 2 to 3.\textsuperscript{(281)}

Nonetheless, it is difficult to maintain that Harunabād and al-Hārūniyya were different places. As already stated, Issues 1-3 all bear the province name Arminiya. Of even greater importance is the fact that no mint other than Harunabād and al-Hārūniyya issued coins of Armenia from 169 until 172.\textsuperscript{(282)} The available specimens of Issues 2 and 3 are also remarkably similar in epigraphical style. We must now tentatively assume that the names Harunabād and al-Hārūniyya do refer to one place, and proceed to ask where al-Hārūniyya was located. We cannot hope to find the location of Harunabād by any other means, since there is no record of it in any source, other than these coins.

A place called al-Hārūniyya was well known to the medieval Arab geographers. T. H. Weir summarized the geographical tradition concerning its history and location. Al-Hārūniyya is located in the Syrian thughūr between Mar'ash and 'Ayn Zarba, to the east of the middle Jayhān (Pyramos). "It owes its name to Harūn al-Rashid who founded it in 183/799 when he was organizing the defence of the frontier." In the fourth/tenth century it was taken by the Byzantines, then retaken and rebuilt by Sayf al-Dawla. Afterwards the Crusaders captured it, and it became annexed to Little Armenia.\textsuperscript{(283)}

\textsuperscript{(281)} There are three die-linked coins of Issue 2 in the ANS collection, all from the Yacouriyya hoard.


\textsuperscript{(283)} EI2, III, 234-235.
Cilicia at the end of the second/eighth century is, of course, never described as Little Armenia, and it is startling to find the silver mint (and therefore the administrative capital?) of Armenia situated so far to the south. This has led many numismatists to declare the Arab geographers irrelevant to the problem or simply wrong, and to place al-Haruniyya far to the north and to the east of the Syrian thughūr. (284) In addition, the foundation date of 183 (found in Baladhuri, Hamadhani and Yaqūt) is too late for our coinage.

This latter problem can be disposed of fairly easily. Baladhuri’s Futūḥ gives an alternative tradition, without isnād:

It is also said that [Harun] built [al-Haruniyya] during the caliphate of al-Mahdi, and that it was completed afterwards during his own caliphate. (285)

This alternative tradition provides a plausible, though long, period in which to place the foundation of al-Haruniyya (or Harunabad?). (286) It is well attested that Harūn, then an adolescent, played an important part in the wars with Byzantium during the reign of his father al-Mahdi. He led campaigns in 163 and 165, both of which took place partly in the Syrian

(284) This has more or less been the consensus in this century, ever since Vasmer declared al-Haruniyya to be synonymous with Dabīl or some other Armenian locales, Anderson, Kocher, pp. 24-25. E.g., Zambuir, Münzprägungen, p. 263; S. Album, “Price List No. 15,” August 1979, No. 230. Scholars in the nineteenth century were more inclined to cede al-Haruniyya to the Syrian thughūr, e.g., Fraenh, Recensio, p. 6; Stickel, Handbuch, p. 80; Torneberg, ZDMG XXII (1868), p. 287; Blau, NZ VI-VII (1874-1875), p. 19.

(285) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 171, aw-yuqūlu, whereas the tradition which gives the foundation date of 183 is armed with the isnād of al-Waqidi—ibn Su’d—al-Wāṣiti. This same tradition is repeated in Hamadhani, p. 113, on the authority of al-Waqidi.

(286) Note the two dates (162 and 171) given for the founding of Ṭarsūs, Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 169.

(287) Ṭabarī, III, 457-498, 504-505.
thughür. His activities in this area are mentioned in some detail in Baladhuri's Futūḥ.

The early 'Abbāsids were fond of naming towns after themselves and their relatives. The mint name al-Muhammadīyya first appears on coins of al-Rayy in 148, with al-Mahdi as heir apparent. Al-Mahdiyya of North Africa begins to issue coins in 152. It is also reported that al-Mahdi, after restoring al-Hadath in 162 or 163, intended to rename that town as al-Muhammadīyya or al-Mahdiyya. The name al-Haruniyya (though not, of course, Hārūnābād) would fit easily into this pattern. It is tempting to think that it was founded during Hārūn’s campaigns in 163 or 165; but it might also be the case that it first arose late in al-Mahdi’s reign, somehow marking an advance in Hārūn’s position in his competition over the succession with his older brother Muṣa.

What happened in 168 which might have forced the mint of Armenia to move southward? We may detect two distinct sources of trouble in that year for the 'Abbāsid authorities in that large, ill-defined province.

(288) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, pp. 168, 192.

(289) Miles, A Numismatic History of Rayy, p. 31.

(290) Zambaur, Miinzpragungen, p. 251: "Die arabischen Annalisten und Geographen behaupten, daß diese Stadt nach dem Fatimiden-khalifen 'Abdallah al-Mahdi benannt worden sei, der sie i.J. 303 mit Mauern versehen ließ; doch die Münzen beweisen klar, daß sie nach dem Abbasiden al-Mahdi gennant wurde." There is, however, a gap in the coinage from 189 until 310.

(291) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 190; Tabarī, III, 499, under the year 163, where al-Mahdi accompanies Hārūn to the frontier: wa-shayya’a al-Mahdi shabha Hārūn ḥattā qaṣa’s el-derb wa-balagh aJayhan wa’rtāda al-medina allati tusaammu al-Mahdiyya wa-wadda’s Hārūn ‘alā nahr Jayhan. This account is not incompatible with Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 190 (pace Moscati, "Studii," p. 313), because the date which Baladhuri first cites (161) does not apply to all of the long series of events which he describes at that point, ending with the death of al-Mahdi (in 169).
First of all, the Arabic sources tell us that in Ramadān 168 (March 17 - April 15, 785), the Byzantines violated the truce, which at that point had been in effect for three years. Caught unawares, the Arabs responded in that year with a small expedition (sariyya). (292) Fighting continued into 169 (that is, into the summer, the usual campaigning season); Tabarî tells us little about it; but clearly states that al-Ḥadath was taken by the enemy. (293)

The Muslim year has three months after Ramadān. Accordingly, there were three months in 168 in which a new mint might have begun to operate in the Syrian thughūr, presumably in order to supply the needs of this new concentration of soldiers. The fact that Issue 1 is scarce, whereas Issue 2 is relatively plentiful (the two being identical except for the date) would indicate that the new mint did not open until the very end of 168, and then continued its production into the following year. (294)

In Baladhurī we find a fuller picture of the events surrounding the Byzantine attacks of 168-169 in the Syro-Jazīran thughūr. The frontier fortress town of al-Ḥadath (a day's march from al-Ḥārūniyya) was restored and fortified by ʿAlī ibn Sulaymān, who directed operations against the Byzantines in 168. Ālāʾ, the son of Sulaymān, died when work on al-Ḥadath had neared completion.

Al-Mahdi's son Mūsá al-Ḥadi succeeded to the caliphate. Mūsá dismissed ʿAlī ibn Sulaymān, and appointed Muḥammad ibn Ṣulaymān ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī governor of al-Jazīra and Qinnasrin. ʿAlī ibn Sulaymān had completed the construction of the town of al-

(292) ʿAlī ibn Sulaymān was then then governor of al-Jazīra and Qinnasrin. Tabarî, III, 521; Yaʿqūbī, II, 486; Moscati, "Studi," p. 318. He sent Yazid ibn Badr ibn al-Ṣaṭṭāl on this expedition.


(294) If the mint did in fact move from Dabīl, then three months seems like a very short time. However, the staff of such a mint was not large, while its hardware was simple and easy to transport.
Hadath, and Muhammad assigned to it a levy of soldiers (wa-farada
lahā Muḥammad farādan) from al-Shām, al-Jazīra and Khorāsān,
granting them stipends (al-‘aṭṣ) of 40 dinars. He also granted
ten houses (wa-qatfa‘ahum al-masākīn) and gave each man 300 din-
ars. Al-Ḥadath was completed in 169.

Abū '1-Khattāb said that 'All ibn Sulaymān assigned 4000 sol-
diers to al-Ḥadath, and settled them in the town. He transferred
2000 men there from Malayta, Shimshāt, Sunaysāt, Kaysūm, Dalūk
and Ra‘bān. Al-Waqīdī said that when the town of al-Ḥadath was
built, the winter was severe, with heavy snowfall and rainfall.
The town’s buildings had not been constructed sturdily enough,
and did not provide protection. The town therefore became filled
with cracks, and fell apart. The Romans then descended upon the
town, while the garrison and the other inhabitants scattered.

News of this reached Mīnā, and he sent a contingent (wa-qatfa‘ahum
ba‘tham) with al-Musayyib ibn Zuhayr, a contingent with Rawḥ ibn
Mātim, and a contingent with Rāma ibn Mālik. However, he died
before they were sent out. Thitherupon al-Rashīd assumed the Cal-
iphate, and gave orders that the city should be rebuilt, fortifi-
ced and supplied, and that its troops should be granted dwelling
places and tracts of land (wa-iqta‘ muqatilatiba al-
masākīn). (295)

The new army’s financial requirements were thus quite considerable, and
are described for us in some detail. It seems possible that the mint of
Hārūnābād would have been set up in 168 to meet those requirements. The date
of these events (168–169) fits the Hārūnābād coins perfectly.

Perhaps the most important piece of information which Baladhuri provides
us here is the presence of Rawḥ ibn Mātim at al-Ḥadath with a contingent of
soldiers. Rawḥ is known to have been governor of Armenia at this time, and
is described as such both by Arabic and by Armenian sources. His name
appears on coins of Arrān and Azerbaijan in this period (168–169). (296)

(295) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, pp. 190–191. It has been stated that farq here
refers to mercenaries. The word can mean "paid soldiers," Baladhuri is
perhaps referring to regular murtaqīs. See E. Kubbel', "0 nekotorykh
chertakh voennoi sistemy khilifata Omaysidov," Palestinskii Sbornik, IV
(1959), p. 120.

For the coins see the chart (above). Rawḥ could not have been in all
these provinces at once; coins must have been minted in his name
during his absence.
soon afterward became governor of Ifriqiya, replacing his own brother who had
died there. Rawḥ's own replacement in Armenia in 169 was Khuzayma ibn
Khāsim, well known from our coins (see Catalogue) and from written sources.
But Rawḥ's presence in the Syro-Jaziran thughūr at this critical time
(168-169) makes the transfer of the Armenian mint to Cilicia seem more proba-
bile.

However, even though Rawḥ was present in the region of al-Ḥadath and
(Cilician) al-Ḫūrūṭiya during these military operations, we are still told
that 'Ali ibn Sulaymān, the governor of al-Jazīra and Qinnasrīn, was in
charge of operations in 168, as well as of the defense of al-Ḥadath (see
above). How could such a governor strike coins in the name of a province not
his own (that is, Armenia)? Furthermore, it might seem strange that a major
provincial mint should be set up so near a marauding enemy. Richard Vasmer
found these arguments overwhelming, and proceeded to locate al-Ḫūrūṭiya in
the north, suggesting that it might be identical with Dabīl itself. (297)

However, Vasmer did not take into account the presence of Rawḥ ibn Ḥātim
in the Syro-Jaziran frontier region during this time. And from this passage
in Baladhūrī, we might infer that 'Ali fell into disgrace; and that Rawḥ may
even have replaced him for a while, in some fashion.

Furthermore, 'Ali did not hold a position superior to that of Rawḥ; and
even if he had done so, he would still have been unable to strike coins in
his own name and in the name of his own provinces. For the fact is that al-
Jazīra and Qinnasrīn, the provinces under 'Ali's control, produced no or next
to no coinage during the early 'Abbāsid years. Armenia, on the other hand,
had been a productive mint for decades (though with some interruptions). The
silver mines which al-Mahdī had opened in 162 must have added greatly to this

We are therefore in a position to explain how coins of Armenia could have been struck in the *thughur al-Shām* starting late in 168. Troops were brought from the entire Syro-Jaziran border region to man the new fortifications and to meet the military emergency. Al-Ḥadath fell, and Ṭālī ibn Sulaymān was dismissed as governor and commander. New troops were sent to the area, under new commanders, including Rawḥ ibn Ḥātim. Coinage was needed; and since Armenia then had an active mint, whereas al-Jazira and Qinnasrin had none, the Armenian mint took over these duties. The governor of Armenia, Rawḥ ibn Ḥātim, was present at this site of Hārūnābād, which for a short time may have become his "moveable capital." Rawḥ's name does not appear on the coins of Hārūnābād, but then neither does the name of any governor.

The ‘Abbasid authorities faced a second problem in the northwestern provinces in 168-169, this one in Armenia itself. The Armenian historian Lewond tells of a persecution occurring in 785 (A.H. 168-169). In that year al-Ḥādī sent a governor named Khazm (this is the Khuzayma ibn Khazim of our coins) who proceeded to persecute the Armenian faithful, including three Armenian princes, one of whom apostatized, while the others were tortured and killed. Our coins prove beyond any doubt that Khuzayma (Issues 3-6) began his governorship under al-Mahdī, and not al-Ḥādī. Lewond's chronology is all slightly wrong for these years.

---


(299) As shown above, the Hasan of Issues 1 and 2 was almost certainly not a governor. Khuzayma's name does not appear until Issue 3.

(300) Lewond, pp. 144-145; Moscati, "La califat," pp. 16-17.

However, al-Ya’qūbī, our best Arabic source for Armenia in this period, confirms a picture of large-scale turbulence beginning in 168.

And when al-Rashīd appointed Khuzayma ibn Khāzim al-Ya‘qūbī over Armenia, Khuzayma stayed there for a year and two months, subduing the country, setting it in order, and reducing it to obedience. (302)

Like Lewond, Ya’qūbī appears to have his chronology wrong. The coins show that Khuzayma took office in the reign of al-Mahdī. However, it should be remembered that since 163 Hārūn had been (at least in name) governor or viceroy of "the Maghrib, Azerbaijan and Armenia."(303) Hārūn (or perhaps more likely, Yahyā ibn Khālid ibn Barmaq) may possibly have chosen Khuzayma for this post during the caliphate of al-Mahdī.

Lewond describes Khuzayma as residing in Dībī (Dabil); and we have no indication from any source that Khuzayma governed from, or resided in, the area of (Cilician) al-Hārūniyya. However, Lewond was much more interested in gory details about this monster, whose name in Armenian (Kazam) means "war, battle."(304) than in matters of chronology and the precise whereabouts of governors. In any case, even if Khuzayma did reside in the north (at Dībī or Bardha‘a’), these disturbances in Armenia coincided with the renewal of hostilities on the Byzantine frontier, precisely at the time of the Hārūnābād and al-Hārūniyya coinage. The combination of these two pressures may have forced the mint (if not the provincial government) to remain in the south for three years, once it had moved there.

-------------
(302) Ya‘qūbī, II, 513-516; Marquart, Streitwüge, pp. 453-454.
(303) Tabarī, III, 500. At Lewond, pp. 143-144, Hārūn makes decisions and gives orders (concerning the persecution of Armenians) by himself, and then together with his father al-Mahdī.
(304) Lewond, ed. Chahnazarian, p. 156 (translator's note).
We may then finally ask why these coins were first struck with the Persian name Hārūnābdād. There seems to be only one available explanation. Baladhuri describes a great deal of activity in the thughūr during the reigns of al-Mahdī and al-Rashīd. Towns were restored, fortifications built, and garrisons brought in. Among the various kinds of troops brought in for this purpose, Khurāsānīs seem to have been the most important and the most numerous. (305) Indeed, the arrival of Khurāsānīs coming to take part in the jihād remained a constantly recurring event in the thughūr, right until the days of the Byzantine reconquest, when such an arrival was celebrated in the ringing words of Ibn Nubāta. (306)

As virtual foreigners, and with their special consciousness of being the mainstay of the 'Abbāsid dynasty, these Khurāsānīs may have used their own language in naming their new castles and citadels. Furthermore, the example of al-Muḥammadiyya/al-Rayy shows that the name on a coin might refer only to a part of a town. (307) Al-Hārūnīyya may even have been the name by which the town was generally known from its founding.

We may conclude that the al-Hārūnīyya of the coins was indeed the site known to the geographers. This does not mean that Ṭarsus, al-Hadath, al-Māssāla, or even al-Hārūnīyya itself were considered part of Armenia prior to 170. We have seen that the frontier-towns were under the command of the governor of al-Jazīra and Qinnasrin in 168. But it does seem, however, that the


(307) Miles, Numismatic History of Rayy, p. 31. "In the strict sense al-Muḥammadiyya applied only to the inner city situated at the base of the citadel hill."
3.4.1 Armenia and the Thughur

The Ḥarūnīyya coinage must be examined in the context of Arab Armenia in the years immediately preceding 168. The chart (above) sketches the numismatic history of [Greater] Armenia in the decade immediately preceding the coinage of Ḥarūnābād and al-Ḥarūnīyya.

Armenia, Arran, the Caucasus and Azerbaijan do seem to form some sort of administrative unity in this period. However, we cannot even be sure that the dirhams with the mint name Arminiya were struck at Dabil, or at any other particular place. It might even be the case that the Armenian mint was in operation at Ḥarūnābād (in Cilicia) before 168. Nonetheless, the southward move of the mint of Armenia, and the reorganization of the Syro-Jaziran thughūr which came soon afterwards, together mark a shift in the entire northwestern region.

Under the Umayyads, the Arab dominion in Armenia, though of course unwelcome to the Armenians, nonetheless had something of the character of an alliance against the common enemy, the Khazars. Muḥāwiya's treaty with Theodore reflects something of this state of affairs, despite the fact that it was honored mostly in the breach. Marwān ibn Muḥammad owed much of his success in that part of the world to his skill in handling the Armenian magnates; so much so that when he himself was fighting the 'Abbāsid armies in al-Jazīra, ...

(308) Laurent, L'Arménie, pp. 9-34. Note that the (bureaucrat's) name Nusayr (formerly read as Bakkar, but see Pakhomov, Moneyy Azerbaidzhana, I, 78) appears on coins of both Armenia and Azerbaijan in 167.

(309) Though Rawḥ ibn Ḥātim's expedition, which gives us a reason why the government and the mint should have moved in 168, makes this unlikely.
Ashot Bagratuni brought him assistance, reportedly in the form of 15,000 horsemen. (310)

When the 'Abbasids came to power, this situation changed in several respects. Qālīqāla fell to the Byzantines in 750. When the Arabs retook it, they resettled it themselves (instead of with Armenians). (311) The Muslim authorities then cut off the stipends paid to the Armenian barons for their military service: (312) stipends which are described as having amounted to 100,000 gold pieces per annum under Hishām. (313) The revolt of 771, which resulted in a bloodbath of the Armenian nobility, had for the Arabs an unexpected, and ultimately unfavorable result: with so many of the barons knocked off the board, two great families were able to control much more of the country than they had had before.

All of this meant that the Arabs became a mere occupying power, concerned chiefly with gathering taxes. (314) Muslim soldiers (who included many Khurāsānis) were cooped up in garrisons, which during the reign of al-Rashīd became increasingly restive and rebellious. Ya'qūbī (315) gives a list of


(311) Lewond, p. 124; Laurent, *L'Arménie*, pp. 176-177; above, 2.6.5.

(312) Lewond, p. 123: "...for the flow of silver pouring yearly from the royal treasury for the benefit of the Armenian army was henceforth to be halted. Furthermore, the princes were ordered to furnish cavalry in specified numbers and were required to maintain their forces at their own expense...."

(313) Lewond, p. 114.

(314) The early 'Abbasid governors appeared to the Armenian historians as financial officers: see Laurent, *L'Arménie*, p. 163. In al-Jazīra, the local population had a similar view, G. Cohen, "Fiscalité, propriété, antagonismes sociaux en Haute-Mésopotamie au temps des premiers 'Abbasides."

these disturbances, which include a Kharijite revolt led by one Abu Muslim al-Shari, as well as revolts by garrisons in Bardha'a and Derbend (al-Bah). Indeed, it is possible that the disturbances which Khuzayma ibn Khazim repressed so successfully in 169 were not started by the Armenian natives, who do not seem to have had much fight left in them at this point, but rather by Arab tribesmen moving north from al-Jazira, or even by Arab and Khurassani soldiers already stationed there.

It is in this context that the thughur al-Jazira wa'l-Sham finally emerge as a distinctive entity.

3.5 The Province of al-‘Awāṣīm in the Reign of Harun

The precise boundaries of this new unit are not clear, but they seem to have included the areas known later to the geographers as al-thughur and al-‘awāṣīm. This section will investigate the question of how this area was governed and by whom.

3.5.1 170-177

There are few clues for the first three years of Harun’s reign. One phrase in Yaqubi may supply a hint:

[In] 171 [the campaign was led by] Yazid ibn ‘Anbasa al-Harashi, acting on behalf of (‘amilan min qibal) Ishaq ibn Sulayman.(317)

(316) Tribal conflict became a principal feature of Arab Armenia in the reign of al-Rashid. Yaqubī, loc. cit., says that Yusuf ibn Rashid al-Sulami (see Catalogue, Issue 9) brought a large number of Nizarī Arabs to Armenia, but that their influence was offset by an immigration of Rabi’ under Yazid ibn Harashī. Marquart, Streifzüge, pp. 454f.; Laurent, L’Arménie, pp. 155-156; Grousset, Histoire de l’Arménie, pp. 337-338; Ter-Servonyan, Arab Emirates, pp. 29-33.

(317) Yaqubī, II, 522.
The 'Abbāsid Ishāq ibn Sulaymān ibn ʿAlī may thus have been Ḥārūn's first
wāli al-ʿAwasim. We find support for this hypothesis in Ṭabarī's report that
Ishāq led the expedition in 172. However, it is difficult to reconcile
this slender evidence with Baladhurī's account of the restoration of Ṭarṣūs
in 171.

In the year 171, word reached al-Rashīd that the Rūm had arranged
among themselves to attack Ṭarṣūs, to fortify it, and to station
a garrison there. He therefore sent Harthama ibn A'yān on the
sa'īfa in 171, and ordered him to repopulate Ṭarṣūs, to rebuild
it and to fortify it. [Harthama] did this, and entrusted the
command [over Ṭarṣūs] to Faraj ibn Sulaym al-Khādim, on the
orders of al-Rashīd. (319)

All other sources call this subgovernor of Ṭarsūs Abū Sulaym, not Ibn Sulaym.
He is also known variously as al-Turkā, al-Khādīm, and al-Khaṣī (both words
indicating "the eunuch"). (320) Baladhurī then goes on to describe how large
contingents were brought to Ṭarsūs, and how the city was rebuilt. Faraj, a
person of lowly status who took orders from Harthama, could not have been
governor of al-ʿAwasim—but it also seems unlikely that Harthama held this
office. (321)

It therefore appears that in the first two or three years of the caliphate
of Ḥārūn there was no single governor of al-ʿAwasim.

(318) Ṭabarī, III, 607.
(319) Baladhurī, Futūḥ, p. 169. On the restoration of Ṭarsūs, see Salem,
"War and Peace," pp. 81-82.
(320) Baladhurī (Futūḥ, p. 170) also calls him Abū Sula'yim. See Ṭabarī, III,
604 (dating this event to 170); KhaĪfī, p. 711; Azdī, p. 262 (both
dating it to 171). On this early use of the word Khādīm in the sense
of "eunuch," see D. Ayalon, "On the Term Khādīm in the Sense of 'Eu-
(321) Harthama acts here on direct orders from the caliph. No source other
than Baladhurī confirms Harthama for the sa'īfa in or around 172.
3.5.1.1 'Abd al-Malik ibn Šalih

For the year 173, we find a more likely candidate for this office.

'Abd al-Malik ibn Šalih had appointed Yazid ibn Makhlaž al-Fazārī over Tarsūs. The Khurāsānīs who were installed there chased him away, being afraid of the Hubayrīyya. [Yazid] made Abū 'l-Fawāris his successor. 'Abd al-Malik confirmed him. This took place in the year 173.\(^{(322)}\)

Abū Sulaym Faraj al-Turkī has apparently left the scene between 171 and 173. But most important is the fact that here 'Abd al-Malik ibn Šalih makes and confirms the local appointees, even if he has limited control over what goes on in Tarsūs. 'Abd al-Malik ibn Šalih is therefore the first governor of al-'Awasīm whom we can identify with any confidence.\(^{(323)}\)

In 171 'Abd al-Malik was dismissed from the governorship of Mosul.\(^{(324)}\)

According to Baladhurī, he became governor of al-'Awasīm in 173.\(^{(325)}\) Syrian tradition describes him as active in the thughūr at this time.\(^{(326)}\) We then find him behaving like a governor, that is, giving orders and delegating

\(^{(322)}\) Baladhurī, Futūh, p. 170. At p. 132, 'Abd al-Malik is described as governor of al-'Awasīm in 173.

\(^{(323)}\) This does not necessarily mean that 'Abd al-Malik was the first to hold this position: see above on Ishāq ibn Sūlaymān. In 174 Ishāq was appointed governor of Sind and Makrān, see Tabarī, III, 609. See the note on 'Abd al-Malik in Canard, "La prise d’Héraclée," p. 373, n. 4.

\(^{(324)}\) Azdī, p. 257.

\(^{(325)}\) Baladhurī, Futūh, pp. 132, 170; above.

\(^{(326)}\) Michael the Syrian, III, 8. "Quand Haroun roi des Taiyaye, commença à régner, il envoya 'Abd al-Malik rebâtir Hadeth."

\(^{(327)}\) Khalīfa, p. 716. "'Abd al-Malik wrote to Makhlaž ibn Yazid ibn 'Umar ibn Hurayra, ordering him to go to Dibsa, to meet there 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn 'Abd al-Malik ibn Šalih. 'Abd al-Rahmān then went [to Dibsa], and conquered it."

\(^{(328)}\) Baladhurī, Futūh, p. 185. "Muḥammad ibn 'Abdallah ibn 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn 'Abd 'Umar al-Anṣārī, who was then 'Abd al-Malik ibn Šalih’s 'Amīl over Shimshāt, went on a ghazw. He entered [Kamkh]...." See also
authority, in 176, (327) in 177, (328) and in 178. (329) Furthermore, while there is disagreement on the details, the early sources agree that 'Abd al-Malik and his son 'Abd al-Rahmān led expeditions from 173 or 174 until 177. They also agree in characterizing the expedition of 175 as a major affair, involving the suh al-thughūr jam'ān. (330)

It thus seems reasonable to assume that 'Abd al-Malik ibn Ṣāliḥ was governor of al-'Awasim from 173 at least until 177. Ibn al-'Adīm provides confirmation for this theory, but with a new twist.

When the rule came to al-Rashīd, he appointed 'Abd al-Malik ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Ali ibn 'Abdallāh as governor of Qinnasrīn. ['Abd al-Malik] resided in Manbij, and built for himself a palace with an orchard next to it...his appointment as governor was in 175. Then [al-Rashīd] dismissed him because of some matter which had angered him against him. (331)

Ibn al-'Adīm does not mention al-'Awasim here at all; 'Abd al-Malik is governor of Qinnasrīn. But then, Ibn al-'Adīm also does not report the creation of the new district of al-'Awasim in 170. From this local history of Aleppo (chief city of Jund Qinnasrīn by the early 'Abbāsid period), we thus gain the impression that nothing changed in 170, that is, that Jund Qinnasrīn remained a frontier province.

We should not be surprised if this local historical tradition (of Qinnasrīn) retained only a fuzzy memory of the existence of an adjoining province, especially if that province included territory lopped off from its own

Ya'qūbī, II, 522, where the raid for the year 177 is led by Dāwūd ibn al-Nu'mān 'on the part of' (mīz qibāl) 'Abd al-Malik.'

(329) Khalīfa, p. 718. "'Abd al-Malik ibn Ṣāliḥ entrusted the command to al-Bakhtārī ibn Shurayk ibn al-'Alī' al-'Absī. He plundered without suffering loss. His booty amounted to 153,000 dinars."


(331) Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, p. 62.
bailiwick. It does seem reasonable to assume, however, that this tradition would have preserved a fairly accurate version of the identities, dates, and sequence of its own governors.

We therefore cannot assume automatically that the men whom Ibn al-'Adīm lists as governors of Qinnasrīn during the reign of Hārūn were also governors of al-'Awāṣim. But if any of these same men are otherwise attested to have held the office of wāli al-'Awāṣim, then we have good evidence that the provinces of Qinnasrīn and al-'Awāṣim were joined administratively, for at least part of the reign of al-Rashīd. In the governorship of ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Ṣāliḥ this appears to be the case.

In Ibn al-'Adīm's account, ʿAbd al-Malik moved his residence and capital (that is, the capital of Qinnasrīn) to Manbij. According to Bālādhurī and the geographers, Manbij belonged to Jund Qinnasrīn before 170, at which time it became capital of al-'Awāṣim (understood in the later, "orthodox" sense). (332) Modern scholars seem to have accepted this version, and describe Manbij as the capital of al-'Awāṣim during the reign of Hārūn. (333)

We may conclude that in 173, the frontier province called al-'Awāṣim was assigned to ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Ṣāliḥ, who was also governor of Qinnasrīn. ʿAbd al-Malik then moved to Manbij, a town whose location permitted him to oversee both provinces. (334) It is impossible, however, to determine if Man-

(332) See Yāqūt, Buldūn, IV, 654. "Al-Rashīd was the first to make al-'Awāṣim separate (annel an al-firda al-'Awāṣim), and he made Manbij its [chief] city. ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn ʿAlī ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbbās went to live there." Here Yāqūt has no problem with the definition of al-'Awāṣim, since Manbij belongs to the province of al-'Awāṣim in the later, "orthodox" definition.

(333) E.g., Canard, E'andnizados, pp. 233-234.

(334) Canard, E'andnizados, p. 233. Manbij enjoyed a location "proche de la région où se faisaient la jonction des places frontières mésopotamiennes et syriennes, et voisine de l'Euphrate et d'Alep."
bij then belonged to the old province of Qinnasrin or to the new one called al-'Awasim.

These events mark a partial return to the situation which prevailed before 170, when the frontier area was under the nominal control of the governor of Qinnasrin and al-Jazira. (335) If Harun intended in 170 to make the frontier district independent of the neighboring provinces, then his attempt had met with failure by 173. Furthermore, we have seen that it is not clear if between 170 and 173 the frontier district actually constituted such an independent province—if anything, the evidence points to a degree of chaos.

The length of 'Abd al-Malik's tenure in office presents different problems. According to Ibn al-'Adim, 'Abd al-Malik remained governor of Qinnasrin until the year 176, when Harun "removed him because of some matter which angered him against him." (336) However, the examples already cited to show that 'Abd al-Malik held gubernatorial authority in al-'Awasim cluster in the years 173-177. In each of those same years, we find 'Abd al-Malik or his son 'Abd al-Rahman leading expeditions (see above). It therefore seems more reasonable to date 'Abd al-Malik's dismissal to 177 than to 176.

(335) These two governorships were united, as we have seen, in the reign of al-Mahdi. 'Abd al-Malik, by contrast, never held both offices: see the list of Harun's governors of al-Jazira at Khalifa, p. 747.

(336) Zubda, p. 62. Ibn al-'Adim seems to be misplacing in 176 events which appear in Tabari under the year 187, when "al-Rashid became angry at 'Abd al-Malik ibn Qalib and imprisoned him" (III, 688f.). Ibn al-'Adim repeats an anecdote associated in Tabari with that dismissal.
Our sources do not give a clear picture of events in al-'Awasim and its neighboring provinces during these years. Ibn al-'Adim offers a summary, again from the viewpoint of Jund Qinnasrin.

Al-Rashid then appointed Mūsā ibn 'Isa [over Qinnasrin] in 176. The fitna was raging in al-Sham between the Nizāriyya and the Yamāniyya. Al-Rashid then appointed Mūsā ibn Yaḥyā ibn Khālid in that year over all of al-Sham. He stayed there until he had made peace among them. Al-Rashid then appointed Ja'far ibn Yaḥyā ibn Khālid ibn Bārakah in the year 178; he went there in the year 180, and appointed as deputy 'Īsā ibn al-‘Ākki. Al-Rashid then appointed Ismā'īl ibn Sālih ibn 'Alī when he removed him from Egypt in the year 182. ...Then al-Rashid appointed 'Abd al-Malik ibn Sālih for the second time. (337)

Ṭabarī largely confirms this version of events in Syria. (338) However, the rest of this passage does not harmonize with the few indications which we have from other sources. Several questions arise, of direct relevance to the history of al-'Awasim. Did the frontier region continue to depend administratively on Jund Qinnasrin? For how long was Jund Qinnasrin subject, in its turn, to Damascus? And what was 'Abd al-Malik ibn Sālih doing all the while?

3.5.2 Al-'Awasim, Qinnasrin and al-Sham

The fitna and the temporary unification of al-Sham under one governor need not have resulted immediately in the sacking of 'Abd al-Malik ibn Sālih in Qinnasrin and the 'Awasim: as we have seen, there is evidence that he remained in power there at least until 177. But in any case, the administrative link between Qinnasrin and the 'Awasim does seem to have been broken upon 'Abd al-Malik's dismissal. For none of the men mentioned by Ibn

---


(338) Ṭabarī, III, 624-625, 639-641. The fitna and the appointment of Mūsā ibn 'Isā took place in 176. Mūsā was killed on the job, whereupon Harūn replaced him with Mūsā ibn Yaḥyā ibn Khālid. Ja'far went to Syria in 180 to suppress another outbreak, and then returned to Baghdad, leaving 'Īsā ibn al-‘Ākki as his deputy.
al-\'Adim as governors (of Syria, perhaps with control over Qinnasrin) between the two governorships of \'Abd al-Malik played any role whatsoever in the Byzantine wars or the frontier area during those years.

The more difficult question of the link between Damascus and Jund Qinnasrin must next be taken up, for the following reason. \'Abd al-Malik ibn Sāliḥ continued to play a major role in the thughūr, especially in the mid-180's. According to Kennedy, \'Abd al-Malik was not only, like his father Sāliḥ and his brother al-Faḍl, leader of a major "sub-dynasty,"(339) but also represented a Syrian regional interest.(340) He thus enjoyed a broad base of support in Syria; Kennedy seems to assume that \'Abd al-Malik was governor of that province until his fall in 187. In the discussion which is to follow of the frontier province in these years, much will depend on whether we assign \'Abd al-Malik a power base encompassing all of bilād al-Shām together with al-\'Awasim, or a smaller one in northern Syria.

Between his governorships of Qinnasrin, \'Abd al-Malik does not seem to have fallen into disfavor, since he is reported as active in several places (too many, in fact).

According to Ṭabarī, Ḥārūn appointed \'Abd al-Malik ibn Sāliḥ governor of Egypt in 178, to succeed Harthama ibn A'yūn.(341) However, we may disregard this statement, since neither Kindī nor Khālid mention \'Abd al-Malik as a governor of Egypt. Ṭabarī's version may have confused \'Abd al-Malik with his brothers Ibrāhīm and Ismā'īl, both of whom did serve as governors of Egypt under Ḥārūn.(342)

(339) Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, pp. 74-75, 118.
(340) Ibid., p. 125.
(341) Ṭabarī, III, 630.
(342) According to Kindī (ed. Guest), p. 137, Ḥārūn's brother 'Ubaydallāh ibn
Ya'qubi says that when al-Walid ibn Tarif revolted (kharaja) in al-Jazira in the year 179, 'Abd al-Malik was then governor of that province, as well as of part of Syria (ba'q al-Shām). Ya'qubi in discussing these same events does not mention 'Abd al-Malik or anyone else as governor of al-Jazira during al-Walid's revolt. Furthermore, Khalifa does not list 'Abd al-Malik among Harūn's governors of al-Jazira. Ya'qubi's version therefore seems doubtful; but it raises the possibility that 'Abd al-Malik was still present in Qinnasrin in 179. 'Abd al-Malik led a ṣaffa in 181.

'Abd al-Malik thus seems to have spent part, or even all of the years 178-184 in northern Syria, though it is not clear with what position. Was he also then governor of Syria itself, as Kennedy implies? Zambaur lists him as governor of Damascus from 177 to 180. However, this attribution appears neither in the sources which Zambaur cites, nor in the sources used here. Kennedy's theory would in any case require 'Abd al-Malik to be governor there after 180.

In 180 Ja'far the Barmakid came to Syria as governor. When he left for Baghdad, he made 'Isa ibn al-'Akkî his deputy in Damascus. Barmakid rule in Syria, exercised through such deputies, would have remained much the same, even if others took the place of 'Isa. Our sources neglect the history of Damascus in these years; but Damascus dirhams of 185 and 186, bearing the

--------------

al-Mahdi succeeded Harthama in Egypt in 178. Ibrāhīm was governor there in 175-176 (p. 135); Ismā'il ibn Ṣāliḥ in 181-182 (p. 138). Khalifa, p. 747, confirms all this, but omits Ismā'il.

(343) Ya'qubi, II, 495-496.
(344) Ṭabarî, III, 631, 638; Khalifa, p. 747.
(345) Ṭabarî, III, 647.
(346) Zambaur, Manuel, p. 27.
(347) Ṭabarî, III, 639, 641.
name Ja'far, (348) indicate that the Barmakids retained control over Syria until their downfall in 187.

We may conclude that: 1) Beginning in 176, Syria was shaken by the fitna, and subsequently found itself subjected to direct rule from Baghdad, administered by the Barmakids until 187. But if Jund Qinnasrin was ever ruled as part of this united province, this rule probably did not last long. 2) The administrative link between al-'Awasim and Jund Qinnasrin was broken. 3) 'Abd al-Malik never held power in Damascus. We cannot say precisely what position, if any, he did hold from 178 until 184. He may have retained his governorship of Qinnasrin for some or even all of that time. His recorded activity in the wars for these years was limited to one expedition. (349)

3.5.2.2 Hārūn and al-'Awasim

In these years Hārūn himself managed affairs in the frontier district to a large extent. In 180 he selected al-Raqqa as his residence. (350) This choice may be partly explained by al-Raqqa's "proximity to the Byzantine frontier." (351) In that same year, Hārūn ordered the construction and fortification of 'Ayn Zarbā. (352) In 181 he led the expedition which took the fortress of Safsaf, to the delight of punning poets. (353) The year usually given for the foundation of al-Haruniyah, 183, may perhaps have been the date

---------------------

(348) ANS 72.79.660 (A.H. 185); Fraiha, Recensio, p. 28*, no. *212 (A.H. 186).

(349) The 5 īf of 181. Ṭabarī, III, 646.

(350) Ṭabarī, III, 645.

(351) Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, p. 120.

(352) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 170.

(353) Ṭabarī, III, 646; Azdi, p. 290. Safsaf means "barren, empty."
of a restoration. (354) The fortress of al-Kanīsa al-Sawdā' may also have been built in these years. (355) In short, Harūn gave the orders, and if 'Abd al-Malik ibn ʿĀlīṣīh had any role to play, it was that of subordinate.

3.5.3 186-187

By 180, 'Abd al-Malik had either been sacked or relegated to a subordinate position in al-ʿAwaṣīm. He later received either a second governorship (if we follow Ibn ʿAdīm) or a renewal of his strength in the district. In either case, to when can we date this? In 181, the year of Harūn's own expedition against Ṣafṣūf, ʿAbd al-Malik led an expedition which reached Ankara, and conquered al-muṣṭaʿūrā. (356) In the following year, his son ʿAbd al-Rahmān conducted a raid which went all the way to Ephesus. (357) This in itself does not mean that ʿAbd al-Malik was reinstated in or by 181; but he must at least have regained the caliph's favor (if he had ever lost it). In the Kitāb al-ʿuyūn, under the year 181, we find the title wālī ʿalī ʿl-ṭughūr applied to one ʿAbd al-Razzāq (ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd). (358) In 184, at any rate, we find a surer indication of ʿAbd al-Malik's governorship. Khalīfa says that in that year, ʿAbd al-Malik ibn ʿĀlīṣīh sent (wajīha) ʿAbd al-Malik ibn ʿAbd al-Shaybānī on a raid. (359) Michael the Syrian says that ʿAbd al-Malik was "chargé de faire la guerre aux Romains" when Nicephorus became

(354) Baladhurī, Futūḥ, p. 171; above, 3.4.
(355) Ibid., p. 171.
(356) Ṭabarī, III, 647. Al-muṣṭaʿūrā ("the underground granaries") was a district in Cappadocia. See Honigmann, Die Ostgrenze, p. 46, and Lilie, Die Reaktion, p. 151, n. 33.
(357) Ṭabarī, III, 647; Azdi, p. 293.
This latter event occurred in A.H. 187; 'Abd al-Malik would thus have kept his position in al-‘Awasim until his downfall in 187 or 188.

However, according to Tabari, Harun’s son al-Qasim received in 186 the bay’a (as third in succession), the regnal title al-Hu’taman, and the governorship of "al-Jazira, al-Thughur, and al-‘Awasim."(361) While all agree that al-Qasim was governor in the last part of Harun's reign, this date of 186 presents several problems.

Al-Qasim was said to be 'Abd al-Malik's protégé.(362) But if al-Qasim replaced 'Abd al-Malik in 186, this would have been a year before the latter's fall and imprisonment. How could this relationship have worked so much to the disadvantage of the patron? Kennedy offers an explanation: al-Qasim was 'Abd al-Malik’s candidate for the succession, just as al-Ma’mun was the candidate of the Barmakids. Harun’s move against the Barmakids in 187 was quickly followed by a similar move against 'Abd al-Malik; foremost among Harun’s motives in all this was a desire to strengthen his son Muhammad al-Amin. Thus, in 186 al-Qasim would have remained 'Abd al-Malik’s puppet, while holding authority in several northwestern provinces.(363)

Objections may be raised. Kennedy assumes here that 'Abd al-Malik had a broader power base in Syria than seems to have been the case (above, 3.5.2.1). 'Abd al-Malik might have exerted control over al-Qasim even after that prince had replaced his in whatever governorship[s] he did hold; but

(360) Michael the Syrian, III, 15.
(362) Tabari, III, 652. This statement serves to explain three lines of verse in support of al-Qasim. Khilifa, p. 734, has al-Qasim perform the qā‘ī‘a with 'Abd al-Malik in 187, and assigns the fall of 'Abd al-Malik and the appointment of al-Qasim to 188 (p. 735).
(363) Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, pp. 25, 29.
this seems unlikely. Unlike the Barmakids, 'Abd al-Malik did not owe his position to skill in finance and administration.

Furthermore, all sources agree that when 'Abd al-Malik fell from power in 187, Harun sacked him ('azalahu). For some reason they do not say from what; but all indications are that before going to prison he held the job of governor of Qinnasrin and al-'Awāṣim.

Finally, Tabari and Azdi are our only sources which state that al-Qāsim received the governorship of the frontier province in 186. Elsewhere Tabari gives a different version, according to which Harun made al-Qāsim governor of al-'Awāṣim in 187. (364) This harmonizes with Michael the Syrian (above). Since Tabari offers two dates for one event, we are free to reject one of them, namely the first (with the date of 186). Also supporting the authenticity of the second version is its use of the term 'awāṣim ("frontier district"), whereas the first version uses an expression intelligible to later generations (al-thughur wa'l-'awāṣim).

It therefore seems most likely that al-Qāsim received the bay'a and the regnal title in 186, while 'Abd al-Malik remained governor of al-'Awāṣim and Qinnasrin until his downfall in 187, at which time al-Qāsim replaced him. 'Abd al-Malik does seem to have involved himself in succession politics (see following section). Nonetheless, Kennedy's understanding of his position must be modified.

(364) Tabari, III, 688; below, 3.5.5.1.
3.5.3.1 The Fall of 'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Ali

Ṭabarī reports the fall and imprisonment of 'Abd al-Malik for 187, the year in which the Barmakids fell, and in which al-Qāsim ibn Hārūn became governor of al-'Awāṣim. (365) 'Abd al-Malik was denounced by his own son 'Abd al-Raḥmān for plotting to make himself caliph; in spite of pleas made on 'Abd al-Malik's behalf, and 'Abd al-Malik's own denials, Hārūn refused to release him from prison. The story has a thoroughly "literary" character, like much of the historical material concerning the Barmakids. There is no reason why Ṭabarī's version should be preferred to that of Mas'ūdī, which is similar in character, but which gives different details. (366)

It is difficult to say what relation the fall of 'Abd al-Malik had to that of the Barmakids, which occurred in the same year. (367) But these accounts also neglect to inform us what position 'Abd al-Malik held at the time of his fall (we only know from elsewhere that he was governor of Qinnasrin and al-'Awāṣim). 'Abd al-Malik may have been meddling in succession politics, and did, in any case, strike fear into Hārūn's heart. (368)

But most remarkable is the similarity of this fear on Hārūn's part to the fear which Hārūn's grandfather al-Mansūr seems to have had of 'Abd al-Malik's father Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Ali. (369)

-----------------------

(365) Ṭabarī, III, 688-694.

(366) Mas'ūdī omits the accusation by 'Abd al-Raḥmān, but describes an attempt by Yahyā the Barmakid to entrap 'Abd al-Malik. Muruj (ed. Barbier), VI, 302-305.

(367) At Ṭabarī, III, 692, Yahyā (in prison) denies any connection.

(368) At Ṭabarī, III, 692, Hārūn says: balaghānī 'ambu sā maḥamnātī wa-lam sa'ūn an yaḍrībta bwaya ilmāyya ḥāḍhayni.

(369) See Ya'qūbī's account of Ṣāliḥ's death, above, 2.6.2.
3.5.4 187-193

During the last years of Harun's reign, the Byzantine wars grew hotter, while the caliph devoted himself to the jihad perhaps more than at any time since his adolescence. These years present problems of chronology, which Canard has already discussed. (370)

3.5.4.1 Al-Qāsim

Al-Qāsim became governor immediately after 'Abd al-Malik's fall. Khalifa dates both events to 188, Tabari to 187. (371) Tabari's is the most interesting version.

And in that year (187), al-Rashid sent his son al-Qāsim on the ḍā'ifah. He dedicated him to God, made him a sacrifice and a means [of approaching God], and made him governor of al-'Awāsim (fa-waḥdahu lillah wa-ja'alahu qurbanan wa-wasilatan wa-wallahu al-'Awāsim).

We may take this statement to be authentic—that is, as a quote from official pronouncements of the time—for two reasons. First, its use of the word 'awāsim matches that of this period, rather than that of later generations (including the geographers). Second, it is too strange for anyone to have thought of it afterwards.

Al-Qāsim's appointment seems to have taken place soon after or during Harun's famous exchange of letters with Nicephorus. (372) However, this does

(370) "La prise d'Héraclée et les relations entre Harun ar-Rashid et l'Empereur Nicephore Ier." See also Lille, Die Reaktion, pp. 177-178; Saloum, "War and Peace," pp. 91-97.

(371) Khalifa, p. 735; Tabari, III, 685. Ya'qūbī, II, 512, is aware of the expedition, which he assigns to 188, but mentions neither the governorship nor the dedication (see below).

(372) Tabari, III, 695f. Canard, "La prise d'Héraclée," p. 375, says: "La lettre de Nicephore semble être postérieure à la campagne de Qāsim...puisque Tabari mentionne celle-ci avant." However, the order of events within one year in Tabari does not constitute proof of their relative chronology. Furthermore, Canard himself says that the exchange of letters cannot be historical in its details ("La prise
not explain the extraordinary vocabulary used for this appointment.

It might be argued that Harūn gave al-Qāsim the assignment of being a sacrifice so as to put him out of the way in the succession. However, the field of serious contenders had long since narrowed down to two. Moreover, Harūn's experience during his own struggle over the succession with his brother Mūsā al-Ḥādi would have taught him the opposite, namely that the frontier district could be a source of strength in such a crisis. (373)

For now we may merely note that Harūn used language of an almost sacral nature in appointing al-Qāsim over al-'Awasim.

Our principal sources agree on the outlines of al-Qāsim's campaign of 187 (or 188). (374) The raiders besieged Qurra and Sinān; their efforts were rewarded by the release of 320 Muslim prisoners. This low number suggests that the expedition was less than a success, though Ya'qūbī is the only source to speak of its hardships. Several commanders are named beside al-Qāsim, who thus may have had only a ceremonial part to play.

In the following year, Ibrāhīm ibn Jibrīl led a major expedition through the Darb al-Ṣafāf, while al-Qāsim remained (rābata) in Dabīq. (375) In the year after that (189 according to Ṭabarī), al-Qāsim again remained as a murābiṭ in Dabīq. (376) But we are also told that in the same year he accompanied al-Rašīd and al-Ma'mūn from Mecca to Rayy. (377)

---

Tabari thus gives the impression that al-Qasim's ribat was an unimportant matter. In Baladhuri, however, al-Qasim in Dabiq has more to do.

'Azzun ibn Said, one of the inhabitants of the frontier (be'd ash al-thaghur) related to me that the Rum captured [al-Kanisa al-Sawda'] while al-Qasim ibn al-Rashid was staying in Dabiq. They drove away the inhabitants' cattle, and took a number of people prisoner. Soldiers and volunteers from al-Mas'isa (ahl al-Mas'isa wa-suwta'atam al-thughur) set out toward them, and got back everything which [the Rum] had taken. They killed a number of them, and the survivors returned in distress and defeat. (Al-Qasim then sent men to fortify and restore the town, and increased its supplies.)

These events correspond to the Byzantine expedition of 190. Baladhuri thus describes al-Qasim as active in al-'Awasim a year later than does Tabari.

In that same year (190), Harun conducted an expedition himself, and sent out a number of other expeditions from his base at Manbij. And upon leaving al-Raqqa for Manbij, he had left his son al-Ma'mun in charge. This shows that al-Qasim was then governor of al-'Awasim, and not of al-Jazira.

Al-Qasim appears nowhere in the sources for 191. Instead we find Harun delegating authority in the frontier district to several men.

---

(381) Tabari, III, 708.
(382) This constitutes more proof against Tabari, III, 652, making al-Qasim governor of "al-Jazira, the thughur and the 'Awasim" in 186, see above, 3.5.3.
(383) Tabari, III, 712: Harthama ibn A'yan in charge of the sā'īfā, with 30,000 Khurasanī regulars (jund), and Harūr al-Khadim in charge of expenditures and everything else except al-rīyāṣā. 'Abdallāh ibn Mālik was given the command of al-Hadath; Sa'id ibn Sim [?] ibn Qutayba assigned to Mar'ash; Muḥammad ibn Yazīd ibn Ḥasyūd to Tarsūs.
In the year 192, when al-Rashid headed eastward from al-Raqqa, he left al-Qasim as his deputy, under the tutelage of Khuzayma ibn Khazim.(384) In that same year, Thabit ibn Naṣr ibn Malik became governor of the thughūr, and led the Muslims both on an expedition and in a ransom of prisoners.(385)

It thus appears most likely that al-Qasim remained governor of the frontier district from 187 until 192, at which time he was transferred to al-Jazīra.(386) However, this matter is not entirely clear in the sources, as we see in the following:

[Upon Harun's death] Muhammad ibn Harun confirmed his brother al-Qasim [in 193] in the governorship of al-Jazīra, which his father had assigned to him. He put Khuzayma ibn Khazim in charge of it, and confirmed al-Qasim over Qinnasrin and al-'Awāṣim.(387)

This passage confirms Ibn al-'Adim's statement that in 193 al-Rashid appointed Khuzayma ibn Khazim over Aleppo and Qinnasrin, on behalf of (min qibāl) al-Qasim.(388) But it is still not clear if al-Qasim remained governor of al-'Awāṣim from 187 right until Harun's death in 193. In any case, al-Amin dismissed al-Qasim from his governorship[s] in 194, and summoned him to Bagh-daš.(389)

(384) Tabari, III, 730. Khalifa, p. 747, lists Khuzayma twice as governor of al-Jazira during the reign of Harun, but does not list al-Qasim.

(385) Tabari, III, 730, 732.


(387) Tabari, III, 775.

(388) Zubda, pp. 63-64. The question of who was governor during the years 187-193 in Qinnasrin is so confused that Ibn al-'Adim settles for wa'llahu 'ala'ha.

(389) Tabari, III, 776.
In sum, Al-Qāsim's career as wāli al-‘Awāsim began with one (apparently unsuccessful) ṣāffa, which he may not even have commanded. He then stayed behind as a murābiḥ in Dabiq, while his father directed operations. He was then appointed (nominal) governor of al-Jazīra, while Thābit ibn Nashr, a real soldier, commanded the thughūr.

During the years 187-193, the administration (such as it was) of the frontier district took on two aspects, in a clearer fashion than before. When Tahārī says that Thābit ibn Nashr was made governor (wulūya al-thughūr), the phrase seems to mean "he was given command of the army, of the ghazw." Thus, while we know of the existence of a financial administrator in the thughūr at the end of Hārūn's reign,(390) we do not know if he was chosen by, or answerable to Thābit, who appears in the sources only as a general.

We might think of Al-Qāsim's role as merely ceremonial. However, his attribute of murābiḥ may be the key to his activity. The reign of Hārūn saw development in the notion of ribāṭ, together with a growth in the number of scholars in the thughūr (below, Chapter V). Hadith proclaimed the merit achieved from ribāṭ to be equivalent to that of (active) jihād, and associated ribāṭ with other religious acts of a non-military nature. Accordingly, while Al-Qāsim does seem to have performed military tasks from his stronghold in Dabiq, his importance as a qurbān ma-wasila may derive from this other aspect of ribāṭ, that is, religious merit not always, or even primarily associated with actual fighting.

Thābit and Al-Qāsim may thus be said to embody two trends or aspects of the thughūr, which we might crudely characterize as the active and the contemplative. But neither of these has to do primarily with administration and

(390) Baladhurī, Futūḥ, p. 168, Abū Sulaym Faraj (see above, 3.5) in charge of the a’shār al-thughūr.
government; just as al-‘Awasim, though forming "one district" (ḥiyyūs wāḥid), was not a province like other provinces.

3.5.4.2 The destruction of the churches

Tabari reports that in 191 Hārūn "ordered the destruction of the churches of the thughūr." (391) We find confirmation of this statement where we should expect to find it, that is, in Syrian sources. However, problems of chronology arise once again.

Michael the Syrian and the anonymous Chronicle of 1234 are usually cited:

Quand Haroun, roi des faïye, commença à régner, il envoya 'Abd al-Malik rebâtir Hadeth. Celui-ci rassembla deux mille chariots; les églises qui se trouvaient à l'occident du Sauga furent démolies, et avec leurs pierres on rebâtit le mur. La grande église de Kaisoum fut détruite avec les 15 temples qui se trouvaient là. (392)

This event is placed in the beginning, not the end of Hārūn's reign.

According to Baladhuri, al-Ḥadath was built in the reign of al-Mahdi. (393)

The event described here could have happened in the early 170's, but is confirmed nowhere else.

However, the anonymous Syriac chronicle shows that such a destruction of churches did take place in or around 191.

Les Arabes de Harran, d'Edesse et de Samosate s'assemblèrent et demandèrent à 'Abd Allâh d'ordonner que les églises qui étaient nouvellement bâties depuis dix ans soient détruites et que les cloches cessent de sonner. Mais le bon prince 'Abd Allâh leur répondit: "Les pauvres chrétiens n'ont même pas reconstruit un dixième des églises détruites et incendiées par eux." (394)

(391) Tabarî, III, 713.


(393) Baladhuri, Futūh, p. 169; above.

(394) Chronicle of 1234, II, 11 (tr. Abouna); Tritton, Caliphs, p. 49, citing CSCO III, 14-15 (correct to 16).
'Abdallah ibn Tahir became governor in al-Raqqa in 205, or 14 years after Harun is supposed to have destroyed the churches. This might imply that the area affected, known (in 191) as the thughur, extended back from the frontier area (Samosata) into al-Jazira itself.

Finally, and most convincingly, Michael the Syrian notes for the Seleucid year 1118 (which overlaps with A.H. 191) that Harun ordered the devastation of churches in Tagra, in the district of Antioch, and in Jerusalem.

Why did Harun enact this measure? The usual explanation given is that "the Christians were thought to be acting as a fifth column for the enemy." Evidence exists for this theory, in the following passage:

En l'an 1108, Haroun, roi des Taiyaye, se porta vers le Beit Roumâyé. Lorsqu'il passa par Édessa, des trahisons se présentèrent pour accuser les chrétiens (disant): "Ils sont des espions; l'empereur des Romains vient chaque année prier dans leur église," et ils lui demandèrent de faire démolir la grande église, et d'empêcher de sonner la cloche. Le roi dit à Yahyah, son conseiller: "Qu'en semble-t-il de cette accusation?" Celui-ci répondit avec sagesse: "Il ne convient pas de le recevoir." Et aussitôt les trahisons furent chassées et même punies.

This story, which seems intended as an illustration of Yahyah's wisdom and justice, occurs some ten years before Harun ordered the destruction of the churches. It also results in no destruction at all; whereas we have seen that damage was actually done, if not in Edessa itself.

(395) Tabarî, III, 1044-1045.
(396) There is nothing about churches actually being destroyed at this time in Edessa itself, however, in Segal's Edessa.
(398) Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, p. 131; Tritton, Caliphs, p. 48; Canard, "La prise d'Héraclée," p. 351, "en représailles peut-être."
We find better evidence for the theory of a "fifth column" in the story behind the destruction of the churches as found in Michael the Syrian (above). The monks of Gubba Barraya, in a quarrel over succession to a bishopric, opposed the Jacobite patriarch Cyriacus.

Tous les rebelles et les évêques qui avaient été déposés de l'épiscopat se réunirent et allèrent trouver Haroun, roi des Taïyaye, dans la prairie de Dabeq, au moment où il se disposait à envahir le pays des Romains. "Nous faisons savoir à l'émir protégé (de Dieu) que ce Cyriacus, qui s'intitule patriarche, a été établi notre chef sans notre consentement...il est l'ennemi du roi et de tous les musulmans. Il se hâtit des églises dans le pays des Romains: il fait passer des lettres aux Romains, et il ne consent pas à demeurer dans le lieu où tu es; mais quand tu viens en Orient, il s'en va en Occident." Quand la lettre eut été lue, un édit parut, ordonnant de détruire les églises de la région de Tagra, et toute église nouvelle....

Matar, qui avait été envoyé pour dévaster les églises, commet des choses horribles non seulement à Tagra, mais encore dans les villages (du district) d'Antioche et à Jérusalem. Il démolit des églises anciennes, et notre église à Jérusalem. Il en retira un grand profit. Tout le monde maudissait les Goubbaye qui furent la cause de cette ruine.(400)

These events occur at the right time. However, several problems arise. Harun's response does not seem directly connected to these events, even in this text ("Quand la lettre eut été lue, un édit parut...."). Furthermore, demolition of a church in Jerusalem does not make sense in reprisals supposedly taken against the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch.

Theophanes also reports demolition of churches in Jerusalem.(401) He dates this to the civil war between al-Amin and al-Ma'mun. However, the date which he gives for this, A.H. 650 (≈A.D. 840-860, A.H. 192-194) is too early for the fourth fitna (which began in 195/810). Muslim sources also seem to

(400) Michael the Syrian, III, 19-21. The Chronicle of 813, pp. 194-196, reports this schism, without mentioning the Caliph's edict. Here Harun takes the side of Cyriacus. Brooks notes on p. 183 that the unknown author of this chronicle used the same source as Michael.

(401) Theophanes, p. 484.
Canard thought that this passage in Theophanes should be dated back to A.H. 191. If this is correct, then we have evidence from Syriac and from Greek sources of destruction of churches in Jerusalem, at the very same time that churches were being demolished in al-'Awasim (as attested by Arabic and Syriac sources):

The Syriac chronicler has interpreted all this as measures taken against the Jacobites, resulting from a Jacobite quarrel and a Jacobite betrayal. The Muslim sources, however, give a different impression.

Hārūn's order to destroy the churches of al-'Awasim appears in Ṭabarī together with an edict forbidding dhimmis of Baghdad to dress and to ride in the manner of Muslims. In this same year (191), Hārūn imposed jizya on Nicephorus and his son, in addition to tribute amounting to 30,000 dinars. Hārūn's panegyricists made much of this jizya at the time. The imposing of jizya on the Emperor and the edict against dhimmis of Baghdad happened in the same year as the destruction of churches in the thughūr and in Jerusalem. All these events must be considered together.

---

(402) "La prise d'Héraclée," p. 347.

(403) Ṭabarī III, 713; Azdī, p. 311. "Hārūn wrote to al-Sindic ibn Shēhīk ordering him to make the shī al-dhimma in Madīnat al-Salām dress and ride differently...."


(405) See the poem of Marvān ibn Ābi Ḥafṣa, beginning of this chapter; Abū 'l-'Āṣhīya, at Ṭabarī, III, 698.

(406) Several of these themes appear in a letter which Nicephorus is said to have sent to Hārūn in the third year of his reign (444. A.H. 190-191), recorded by Georgius Monachus, pp. 772-773 (cf. Canard, "La prise d'Héraclée," p. 346).

Why do you rejoice in wrongdoing and in shedding human blood? Why do you not remain content with what you have,
Hārūn's order to destroy churches did not come as a response to a "fifth column," real or imagined. The closest parallel in early Islamic history is to be found in the Umayyad period, when 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān is said to have ordered the seizing of the pillars of the church of Gethsemane, to incorporate into the new "temple of Mecca." He also "removed the gilded cupola of brass from a Christian church in Baalbek and placed it on the mosque of Jerusalem, over the holy rock." His son al-Walīd pulled down the church of St. John the Baptist in Damascus to erect the great mosque. Other examples can be cited.

---

Instead of violating the ancient frontiers which you inherited from your ancestors (horous arkhēious kai patrōous)? Which prophet or divine teacher taught you to do these things? Hasn't your own prophet Moukhoumed commanded you to take the Christian as your brother, and to proclaim him (as much)? The Creator of all, who has both sides in His care, does not rejoice at the wrongful shedding of innocent blood--no! Have you come to inflict wrongs on people who have done you no wrong, because of a lack of silver or gold or anything else? Yet you possess to satiety that which is finest and most difficult to acquire, the object of our desire, in the Holy Land, the wealthiest land (ek tās hieras kai plousiotates).

---


(409) Tabari, II, 1275; Balādhurī, Futūh, p. 125; N. Elisséeff, tr., La description de Damas d'Ibn 'Asākir (Damascus 1959), pp. 27-38; H. Lammens, Études sur le siècle des Omayyades (Beirut, 1930), pp. 287-304.

(410) E.g., Hims (Balādhurī, Futūh, p. 131; al-Ramla, where Sulaymān ibn 'Abd al-Malik forced the Christians of Lydda to yield marble columns (hidden in the sand) for his "white mosque." This must be Sulaymān rather than Kishām, as reported by Nuqaddāsī, p. 119; cf. F. Gabrieli, II califato di Hisham (Alexandria 1935), p. 130, where this is the only reference to a mosque in a list of "public works" executed during the reign of Kishām. Balādhurī (Futūh, p. 145) and Yāqūt (Buldān, II, 818) report Sulaymān (who resided in al-Ramla) for this event.
stealing, a "fifth column" (of Orthodox clergy) has also been suggested.(411)

3.6 Conclusion

3.6.1 The District of al-'Awasîm

An apparently simple event, the creation of a new district in the frontier area, has proved quite complicated. Prior to 170, the thughûr were formally subject to the governor[s] of Qinnasrin and al-Jazira. In the reign of al-Mahdî, the caliph himself, and increasingly his son Hârûn, ran things themselves to a great extent. Administrative and military confusion became evident in the crisis of 168-169, during which the 'Abbâsid governor of Qinnasrin and al-Jazira actually directed military operations, apparently for the first time and with disastrous results. He was sacked, and to meet the emergency the mint and (for a short time) the governor of Armenia moved to al-Hârûniyya in the thughûr. There is no evidence (apart from the coins) that the thughûr were incorporated into the province of Armenia; but in any case, they were certainly cut off from Qinnasrin and al-Jazira, before the accession of Hârûn in 170.

At the same time, another crisis was brewing over the succession. During the period of tension which ended with the death of Mûsâ al-Hâdî, the thughûr seem to have remained loyal to Hârûn.(412)

-----------------------------


(412) See "Al-Khilîfa al-Mardî."
Upon succeeding to the rule in 170, Harun ordered the creation of the new district of al-'Awasim. We may interpret this move both as an attempt to restore administrative order, and as a means of keeping the thugsūr bound closely to himself.

However, the early years of Harun's reign show no signs of a new administrative order in al-'Awasim. Al-Haruniyya remained the mint of Armenia well into 171, and it is not until 173 that a governor of the district ('Abd al-Malik ibn Ṣāliḥ) can be identified with any certainty. But 'Abd al-Malik was also governor of Qinnasrin. We might therefore conclude either that Harun's attempt to make the district independent (and specifically of Qinnasrin and al-Jazira) failed quite early on; or else that al-'Awasim was never intended to be a regular province at all.

It is not clear if 'Abd al-Malik was dismissed in or around 177. In any case, the fitna in Syria at that time resulted in the unification of that province, under Barmakid control. Jund Qinnasrin seems to have been added temporarily to that union, but minus al-'Awasim. Into the gap stepped Harun himself, managing affairs from his new capital in al-Raqqa (beginning in 180).

'Abd al-Malik reemerged as governor of the combined provinces of Qinnasrin and al-'Awasim by 184 at the latest. He remained there until his fall in 187, while the Barmakids retained control over Damascus. 'Abd al-Malik had a smaller power base than the one which Kennedy has assigned him, but there is reason nonetheless to see continuity in his position with that of his father Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Alī, who had been walī al-Sham wa'l-thugsūr.

Harun then spent much of the time which remained to him on jihād. Al-Qāsim receded into the background soon after his appointment as governor.
of al-'Awasim in 187. A number of military men, none of them members of the 'Abbasid family, received commands from Harun in the frontier region; one of them, Thabit ibn Nasr, became wali al-thughur. But Harun himself dominated in the region in the last part of his life.

Harun thus vacillated throughout his reign between two methods of governing al-'Awasim. The first was to allow things to fall into the pattern they had followed before the reorganization, that is, to allow an 'Abbasid prince to control the frontier area from a base in northern Syria. It was dangerous, however, to allow such a potential rival to become too well entrenched in this region of armies and fortresses. (The example of 'Abdallah ibn Ali may have remained vivid.)

The second method was for Harun to take control himself. He did this periodically, and with great zest. Harun's preoccupation with jihad may have been the reason for these shifts, but the consequences were enormous for the administration of all the affected provinces. And during these periods al-'Awasim, the place of jihad, became the object of the caliph's attention, even his private preserve.

We may ask what it meant to be governor of such a district, or hayyiz. Harun's last governor of the thughur, Thabit ibn Nasr, never held any other governorships—whereas we normally find 'Abbasid governors at a number of posts during their careers. Thabit was, of course, a soldier; and the phrase used of him, waslhu (Harun) al-thughur, seems actually to mean "he gave him command of the expeditionary force."(413)

A Syriac chronicler's view of 'Abd al-Malik reinforces this impression:

(413) Šaberi, III, 732. The fact that Thabit conducted a fida' in the same year (192) does not change this.
Quand 'Abd al-Malik, qui était chargé de faire la guerre aux Romains, apprit que Nicephorus régnait....(414)

'Abd al-Razzaq, who in appears in one source as wilāya of the thughūr in 181, is described as "brave and noble."(415) And even al-Qāsim received his appointment together with command of the ṭā'īfa of 187.

Not surprisingly, a governorship of al-‘Awāṣim meant that one led the jihād, that one acted as warrior or murābit, rather than as administrator. Al-‘Awāṣim was not and could not be a real province. At the same time, it did have real administrative needs; but these could only be supplied from the outside. This is why real power was wielded in al-‘Awāṣim either by someone who simultaneously held another governorship, or else by the Caliph himself.

3.6.2 Ḥarūn and the Jihād

The energy which Ḥarūn devoted to his apparently futile Byzantine wars has puzzled some modern historians. The disparity between effort and results has been attributed to "difficulties of supply and the harshness of the weather."(416) Alternatively, the war effort has been described as "propaganda for internal consumption."(417)

Such things are difficult to gauge; but real activity in the thughūr, as measured in buildings, fortifications, the raising of armies, and the organization of supply networks, does not seem to have increased much in the 23 (lunar) years of Ḥarūn’s reign, in comparison with the preceding years of the ʿAbbāsid caliphate. The single greatest difference was the caliph’s personal involvement in the jihād. The following call to arms, issued in 190, seems... (414) Michael the Syrian, III, 15.

(415) Kitāb al-ʿuyūn, p. 301; above, 3.5.3.

(416) F. Omar, EI2, III, 234.

(417) Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, p. 131.
[Harun] wrote to the horizons [calling for] hearkening and obedience. The ring of al-Mansur was brought for him to wear on his right hand. This was the "khatam al-khassa, inscribed "my trust and faith are in God.""(418)

Here the caliph's own person and the prestige of his family predominate: al-sams wa'l-ta'a must be made to him. And in the event, Harun's call for ta'a was answered by, among others, mu'tawwi'a.(419) Similarly, the poets who sing the praises of this warrior-caliph frequently mention the thughur, but in doing so omit the other ghazis and the community in general.(420)

It has also been noticed that Harun devoted himself to hajj as well as to jihād.(421) While directing operations in 190, Harun wore a qalansuwa bearing the inscription ḤAjjU n GHAZIN.(422) His panegyrists quickly picked up the theme.(423)

---

(418) Tabari, III, 708-709.
(419) Tabari, III, 709.
(420) See the lines of Marwan ibn Abi Hafṣa quoted at the beginning of this chapter, and Tabari, III, 696-698.
(421) D. Sourdel (La civilisation de l'Islam classique [Paris 1954], p. 71) says that Harun's conception of his duty as head of the community "lui faisait diriger alternativement le Pelerinage à la Mekke et les expéditions guerrières saisons à les environs de la Mekke et les expéditions guerrières saisons." The notion that Harun alternated pilgrimage and jihād is not strictly accurate. Harun made the pilgrimage in 170, 173, 174, 175, 177, 179, 181, 186, and 188; cf. Canard, "La prise d'Héraclée," pp. 357-358.
(422) Tabari, III, 710.
(423) E.g., Abu 'l-Ma'ālī al-Kīlābī (Tabari III, 709), who recited:

fa-man yatlim liqā‘aka aw yuridhu fa-bi‘i-ḥaramayni aw agar ‘i-thughūri

fa-fī ardī ‘l-‘aduwwi ‘alā ṭimīrin wa-fī ardī ‘l-taqaffūbi fawqā kāri

Whoever seeks to meet you, or sets out for this Must go to the two sanctuaries, or else to the farthest of the thughūr.
This ostentatious practice of both pilgrimage and jihad might be called "propaganda for internal consumption," or else a reflection of "la fidélité rigoriste du calife à ses devoirs de la Communaute." But it is important to remember that Harun sought and received professional advice in these matters. He performed hajj accompanied by one hundred fuqaha'. (424) We do not know if a similar detachment of scholars escorted him to the frontier whenever he went on jihad. But this was not necessary in any case, since by this time the scholars were already there in force (below, Chapter V).

In general Harun seems to have respected the views of the fuqaha'. He commissioned the Kitab al-kharaj from Abu Yusuf. In 181, soon after moving to al-Raqqa, he changed chancery practice, so that henceforth official letters began with the name of the Prophet. (425) Scholarly advisors are likely to have been involved in this decision. Harun also appears in the biographies of scholars who were associated with jihad and the thughur, in particular Abu Ishaq al-Fazari and Abdallah ibn al-Mubarak. (426) At times we may detect a note of rivalry between Harun and the scholars. (427) But the scholars of the thughur were certainly well pleased with Harun.

In the land of the enemy [you are mounted] on a noble horse;
In the land of ease, on a camel saddle.


(425) Tabari, III, 646.

(426) E.g., Ibn Majer, Tahdhib al-tahdhib, I, 152, where Harun mentions both these scholars in a conversation with a zindiq; Ibn 'Adakir, Tahdhib al-ta'rikh al-kabir, II, 153f.; al-Tabari, al-Baghdadi, Ta'rikh Baghdad, X, 156-157.

(427) When Harun first arrived in al-Raqqa, people were so intent on hearing and following Abdallah ibn al-Mubarak that an umm wa'lid of the caliph exclaimed that Ibn al-Mubarak, not Harun, was king. Khatib, Ta'rikh Baghdad, X, 156-157.
Mulwa'ya ibn 'Amr (428) said: In diligence for ghazw and perspicuity in jihād, we saw a magnificent thing in the Commander of the Faithful Harun. He employed more skill (ṣinā'a) than had ever been employed before, he divided up property (al-sawāl) in the thughūr and the sawābīl, and he caused anxiety to the enemy and subdued him.(429)

It will be seen below (5.3) that a debate took place at this same time among the scholars on the relative merits of pilgrimage and jihād. At issue was the degree of personal merit which one acquired in each of these two activities, and not their benefit (or necessity) to the community. Harun hedged his bets, by practicing both. But to a large extent, he must have shared his advisors' views on these matters. Accordingly, we might attribute Harun's enthusiasm for the jihād simply to a desire to save his own soul, by following the advice of the doctors of the law. But beyond this, we may have here some clues to the puzzles which the history of al-'Awāsim has presented.

3.6.3 Al-'Awāsim as Sacred Territory

Prominent in both jihād and ḥajj is a journey, usually long and difficult. The journey of pilgrimage has as its goal a shrine, that is, a place; one's activities upon arrival focus upon that place. By contrast, the journey of jihād ends with an activity. Theoretically, one must travel to any place where there are still unsubjected infidels, in order to perform this activity of jihād.

Harun upset this distinction, by creating a separate, official place of jihād, called al-'Awāsim. The mujāhidūn could now make this their goal, just as the pilgrims made the holy places theirs. Naturally, this place called

(428) On him see below, 5.5.2.2. He transmitted the Kitāb al-siyar from Abū Issāq al-Fazārī, and died in Baghdad in 213, 214, or 215.

(429) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 163.
al-'Awasim did not simply become a fourth haraṣ. Its governor was supervisor of an activity, rather than administrator of a place. Nevertheless, al-'Awasim in the reign of Hārūn did acquire some of the characteristics of a shrine.

3.6.3.1 Qurbān wa-wasila

Al-Qasim in his appointment over al-'Awasim was dedicated to God as a qurbān wa-wasila. This is as sharp an example as any of Hārūn's desire to monopolize the merit of the jihād for himself and his dynasty. But in addition, Hārūn's offering his son as sacrifice may have been intended to recall the similar action of Ibrāhīm.(430) The Qur'ān does not name Ibrāhīm's son here. But if (as is most likely), Ismā'īl was understood to be involved, then we have a strong connection with the Meccan shrine.(431)

In another passage about Ismā'īl, the word mardī makes its only appearance in the Qur'ān.(432) This word appears as epithet and Isqab of Hārūn in 170, the year in which he succeeded to the rule and created the district of al-'Awasim.(433) It is curious that the Qur'ānic Ismā'īl should be lurking in the background in both cases.

(430) Qur'ān 37:102-108. The verb dhābaha and its maṣdar, dhibū, appear here, not qurbān. However, in two of its three Qur'ānic appearances, qurbān does refer to sacrifice: 3:183, 5:27 (the sacrifices of Cain and Abel). At 46:28, qurbān is perhaps to be understood as synonymous with qurba.

(431) The alternative leads to a similar connection, since the episode with Isaac took place on Mount Moriah.

(432) 19:55, wa-kānā 'inda rabbīthi mardīyyan.

(433) Bonner, "Al-Khalīfa al-Mardī."
3.6.3.2  The destruction of the churches

Churches were destroyed in only two places: the frontier area and Jerusalem. The insult and propaganda value of such moves against Christian Jerusalem is clear enough. But why al-'Awasim? The "fifth column" theory does not work. It seems that Hārūn was concerned not only to make a gesture at his Christian enemies, but also to purify the land, to make it Islamic. Not only did many Christians live in the large area encompassed by al-'Awasim, but the land had changed hands so many times, that its status according to Islamic law had become problematic.

Abū Sāliḥ al-Antakl told me that Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī used to disapprove of buying land in the thughūr. He would say that at first a group of warriors (qaum) had taken possession of [this land], and debarred the Rūm from it. However, they did not divide it up among themselves, and it [later] fell into the possession of others. As a result, an intelligent person must retain a measure of doubt which it would be best for him to avoid.(434)

We have seen that the scholars applauded Hārūn for his attitude toward precisely this issue, that of qasm al-umāl.(435)

--------

(434) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 171.

(435) Baladhuri, Futūḥ, p. 163; above, 3.6.2.
3.7 Catalogue of the Coins of Harunabad and al-Faruniyya

George Miles noted the "bewildering number of issues at this mint during the three years of its existence."(436) Sixteen distinct issues have been identified here.

All these coins are silver dirhams, with the exception of Issue 5 (copper fals). All coins have the obverse legend لَا إِلَٰهَ إِلَّا هُوَ وَلَدَيْهٖ / لَا شَرِيكَ لَهُ ("There is no god but / God alone / with no associate"). The reverse margin inscription of all the dirhams is derived from Qur'ān 9:33, as is usual for coins of this period. The catalogue therefore includes only the following, for each issue:

1) Date and mint.
2) Illustration (if available).
3) Reverse field legend, with translation.
4) Obverse margin (giving mint and date), with translation.
5) Annulet pattern.

6) Sources, in approximate chronological order, but beginning with Tiesenhausen's Money vostochnovo Khalifata (when applicable), this still being the principal reference work for early 'Abbāsid coins, and ending with the collection of the American Numismatic Society.

--------

(436) Miles, Rare Islamic Coins, p. 60.
Abbreviations for the Catalogue (See also Bibliography)


ANS: Collection of the American Numismatic Society.


CNS: Corpus nummorum saeculorum IX-XI qui in Suecia reperti sunt. Stockholm 1975-.


Lane-Poole, Khed.: Lane-Poole, S. Catalogue of the Collection of Arabic Coins Preserved in the Khedivial Library at Cairo. London, 1897.

Lane-Poole, SPC: Some Private Collections of Muhammadan Coins and Other Essays in Oriental Numismatics. London, 1892.


Miles, RIC: Rare Islamic Coins. New York, 1950.

NC: Numismatic Chronicle.

Numismatic Zeitschrift.


Revue de la Numismatique Belge.


Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
1. 168 Harunabad

Armenia

The Caliph al-Mahdi

At the Command of Harun

Son of the Commander of the Faithful

Hasan

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in Harunabad in the year 168.

Annulets: 000 000 000

T. 1051; Stickel, ZDMG IX (1855), p. 251; Tornberg, ZDMG XXII (1868), p. 286; BMC IX, No. 132m. Stickel described the lettering as "sehr klein und fein, etwas nach links geneigt."
2. 169 Hārūnābād

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in Hārūnābād in the year 169.

Annelets: 000 000 000


Nicol, "Abbasid Provincial Administration," p. 320, refers to a Hārūnābād coin of 167, listed in I.L. Dzhalagania, Monetnie kladý Gruzii (Tiflis, 1974). This coin is likely to belong to this issue (with the date of 169) because: 1) there is no indication anywhere else of Hārūnābād coins for 167; 2) Issue 1 probably began late in 168 (see above, 3.4); 3) its can easily be confused with ash in Kufic.
2a. 169 Hārūnābād (with Khuzayma ibn Khāzīm named as governor)

T. 1077 lists a "dirhem of Hārūnābād" ("Garunabadskii dirgens tovo zhe goda" [=169]). Tiesenhausen gives three references.

1) Stickel, Handbuch, pp. 81-82, which clearly refers to our Issue 4 (see below).

2) Fraehn, Numi kufici ex variis museis selecti (St. Petersburg, 1823), p. 51, where Fraehn discusses a coin issued during Khuzayma's second governorship of Armenia, in 189, and gives no confirmation of the existence of the coin which we have identified here as Issue 2a. Tiesenhausen's sources are therefore reduced to:

3) Fraehn, Ms. X, fol. 71, recto, and XI, 62-63, now utterly inaccessible. Tiesenhausen understands Fraehn as referring precisely to this Issue 2a ("zaklyuchayetsya slyeduyushchaya zamenka po povodu etoi monety"), and quotes at length from these unedited manuscripts. However, nothing in the sections quoted refers to Hārūnābād as a mint name. Fraehn discussed Khuzayma's career in Armenia, Baghdad, etc., saying, "Choseimam nostrum a. 169 Ciliciae praefuisse ex hoc numo intelligimus" ("From this coin we learn that our Khuzayma was governor of Cilicia in 169"). This could equally well be said of Issue 3 (see below). It therefore appears to be the case that either Fraehn or Tiesenhausen mistakenly attributed the mint name Hārūnābād to a coin belonging to Issue 3 (al-Harūnīyya). Confirmation of this may be found in the fact that Issue 3 is lacking altogether in the Monety vostochnovo Khali­fata.
3. 169 al-Haruniyya

Armlniya
The Caliph al-Mahdi
At the Command of Harun
Son of the Commander of the Faithful
Khuzayma

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 169.

Annulets: 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

BMC I, No. 133; P. No. 737; Anderson, Kochtel, p. 20; S. Album, unpublished notes on collection of Ashmolean Museum; ANS 1972.79.589 (illustrated above).
4. 169 al-Haruniyya

Khuzayma
The Caliph al-Hadi
At the Command of Harun
Son of the Commander of the Faithful
Ibn Khazim

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 169.

Annulata: 00 00 000 00 000 00

T. 1088, citing Fraehn, Ms. XI, p. 64 (unavailable); Fraehn, Nova supplementa. I, 119, a (p. 12); Stickel, Handbuch, No. XCIV (pp. 81-82); BMC I, No. 138; Lane-Poole, Khed., No. 396 = Nicol, Eg. Lib., No. 823; Lane-Poole, SPC, p. 112 (40), No. 319; B. No. 926; Ostrup, No. 292; Ahmed Ziya Bey, No. 2223; Artuk, Cat., No. 214; Qazzaz, Syrer XX (1964), p. 282, No. 9042; Artuk, Denizbaci Defteri, No. 343; CNS 1.2 Butte 36; Scora Velinga I, No. 243 (p. 233); ANS 1917.215.392; 1972.79.590 (illustrated above); 1972.170.692.
5. AE Fals. 169 al-Haruniyya

The Caliph
At the Command of the Amir
Khuzayma ibn Khazim
God Strengthen his Victory
Al-Hadi

In the name of God. This fals was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 169.

T. 1093, citing Frasen, Ms. XI; Bartholomaei, "Seconde lettre à M. Soret," RNB 3e série, V (1861), p. 27; ANS 1959.165.2.

Engraver's error, 'azza for a'zza. This line is not legible in the ANS specimen.
6. 169 al-Haruniyya

Khuzayma

Muhammad is the Messenger of God, God's Blessing upon him and Peace

The Caliph Musa

Ibn Khazim

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 169.

T. 1089 gives only two references for this coin.

1) Nesselmann, *Neue Preussische Provinzial-Blätter* (1854), p. 404. This appears to be a mistake for p. 429, where Nesselmann reports a newly found coin, whose reverse inscription he translates: "Der Khalif Musa. Von denen, welche angeordnet hat Harun, der Gehilfe des Bundes der Moslimen." The mint name Haruniyya is not mentioned here; and the phrase *wall 'ahd al-Muslimin* appears on no coins of al-Haruniyya. This coin must therefore be excluded from the Haruniyya corpus.

2) Nesselmann, *Die orientalischen Münzen*, No. 104, is therefore the sole reported specimen of this issue. It bears a different inscription from Issue #4. Nesselmann recognized how unusual this coin was: "Alle mir bekannten Münzen al-Hādi’s aus Haruniya vom Jahre 169...weichen wesentlich von der Vorliegenden ab."
7. 169 al-Haruniyya

At the Command of Yazid

Muṣṣammad is the Messenger

of God, God's Blessing upon him

and Peace. The Caliph al-Hādī

Ibn Mazyad

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 169.

Annulets as at Issue #4. (437)

T. 1090, citing Fraehn, Ms. XI, p. 60 (unavailable); Stickel, Handbuch, p. 80 (XCIII), with illustration; Qazzāz, Sumer XX (1964), p. 282 (No. 8455).

(437) I owe this information to Dr. N.D. Nicol.
8. 170 al-Haruniyya

At the Command of Yazid
Muhammad is the Messenger
of God, God's Blessing upon him
and Peace. The Caliph al-Hadi
Ibn Mazyad

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 170.

Annulets: 0 000 0 000 0 000

BMC I, No. 142; Ahmed Ziya Bey, No. 224; Album, notes on Ashmolean.
9. 170 al-Haruniyya

Yūsuf

Muhammad is the Messenger
of God, God's Blessing upon him
and Peace. The Caliph al-Hādī

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 170.

P. no. 744; M. No. 321; CNS 1.2 Storo Velinge, I, 233, no. 233; ANS 1972.170.693 (illustrated above).
10. 170 al-Haruniyya

Ibrahim
Muhammad is the Messenger of God
The Caliph al-Hadi
At the Command of Harun
Son of the Commander of the Faithful
Jarir

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 170.

Annulets: 0 0 0 0 0 0

T. 1999; Frenkel, Recensio, p. 83, No. 123; Stickel, Handbuch, p. 86 (C); BMC I, No. 139; P. No. 743; S. Nos. 928, 929; Tornberg, Numi Cufici, No. 129; Östrup, No. 291; H. No. 322; Artuk, Cat., No. 215; Artuk, Denizbaci, "Definesi", No. 344; Qazzaz, Sumer XX (1964), p. 282 (No. 8832); S. Album, "Price List #15" (August 1979), No. 230; ANS 1917.215.393; 1959.165.38; 1972.79.592 (illustrated above); 1972.79.592.
11. 170 al-Haruniyya

Jarir

Muhammad is the Messenger of God

The Caliph al-Mardî

At the Command of Harûn

Commander of the Faithful

In the name of God. This dirhem was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 170.

Annulets: 0 oo 0 oo 0 oo

T. 1118; B. No. 1240; Artuk, Cat., No. 252 = Artuk, Denizbaci: Definesi, No. 380; Miles,RIC No. 233 (pp. 60-61) = ANS (Wood Collection); ANS 17.216.217 (illustrated above).
12. 170 al-Haruniyya

Rajā'

Muhammad is the Messenger of God, God's Blessing upon him and Peace.

The Caliph al-Mardi

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 170.

Annulets: 0 oo 0 oo 0 oo

T. 1117, quoting Fraehn, Sammlung kleiner Abhandlungen and Ms. 38, fol. 65, both unavailable. Fraehn, Recensio, p. *111, No. *133; BMC I, no. 230 (illustrated above); Lane-Poole, Khed., No. 397 = Nicol, Eg. Lib., No. 1084; B. Nos. 1241, 1242; D. No. 183; CNS 1.2 Bjorke, No. 8 (p. 82); Qazzaz, Sumer XX (1964), pp. 78-79 (No. 8510); Artuk, Denizbaci Definesi, No. 381.
13. 171 al-Haruniyya

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 171.

Annulets: 0 0 0 0 0

T. 1142, quoting Fraehn, Bull. scient., I, 100 (unavailable); Fraehn, Messa- zig, No. 133 (p. 111); Stickel, Handbuch, pp. 86-87 (CI); BMC I, no. 231; E. No. 1243; D. No. 193; Tornberg, Numi cufici No. 136.
14. 171 al-Hārūniyya

Rajā'
Muhammad is the Messenger
of God, God's Blessing
upon him and Peace
The Caliph al-Rashīd

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in al-Hārūniyya in the year 171.

Annumlets: 0 0 0 0 0

Only one specimen reported, Stickel, Handbuch, p. 90, No. CII (with drawn illustration, unavailable for reproduction). Stickel noted that this was "eine unedirte und merkwürdige und seltene Silbermünze."

Fraehn, Mon. suppl. 133a (p. 12) is a Hārūniyya coin dated 170, with a reverse legend corresponding exactly to this Issue #14. Fraehn wrote, "isdem ac No. 133 [Recensionis sc.] titulis, nisi quod hic pro distincte al-Rashīd legitur." That is, this coin bears the same legend as Recensio No. 133, which belongs to Issue #13 (see above), except that it has the title al-Rashīd instead of al-Mardi. It is therefore likely to be a coin of Issue #14 struck with an old obverse die.
15. 171 al-Haruniyya

Yazid

Muhammad is the Messenger
of God, God's Blessing
upont him and Peace
The Caliph al-Rashid
Ibn Mazyad

In the name of God. This dirham was struck in al-Haruniyya in the year 171.

Annulets: 0 0 0 0

Only one specimen: ANS 1972.79.593 (illustrated above).
16. 171 al-Haruniyya

In the name of God. This dirhem was struck in al-Haruniyya in the yar 171.

Annulets: 0 0 0 0 0 0

P. No. 851; ANS 1966.126.30 (illustrated above). Lavoix read جم instead of حارث; but it is likely that he misread this name, being aware of issues 12-14. P. 851 resembles the ANS coin in all other respects. (438)

The name Harith and the letter سد also appear on coins of al-Muhammediyya dated 172 (Miles, MBR, p. 53; BMC I, No. 191; Lane-Poole, Khoöf, No. 467).

Muhammad ibn amir al-mu'minin, the future al-Amin, appears here as heir apparent.

(438) This surmise has been confirmed by Dr. Nicol, who has seen the coin in Paris.
169 al-Haruniyya

ANS 1972.170.691 (illustrated above). The obverse of this coin corresponds to Issue 4, while the reverse belongs to Issue 11. It is therefore likely to be a mule, struck between dies belonging to different issues and different years.

Cf. Lane-Poole, SPC, p. 112 (40), No. 320, a Haruniyya coin of 170 with a reverse corresponding to coins of Armenia dated 161 (al-Mahdi).
Chapter IV

AL-JU'L

4.1 Introduction

Al-Mansūr settled in Malatya 4000 soldiers from al-Jazīra, because [Malatya] is one of its thughūr. He granted each man ten dinars as a supplement to his stipend and a ma'ūna of one hundred dinars, aside from the ju'l which the tribes arrange among themselves. He supplied [the town] with a store of weapons, and granted plots of farmland to the soldiers.

Wā-askanā 'l-Mansūru Malatya 'arba'ata alfi muqātilatin min ahli 'l-Jazīra' li-annahā min thughūrihā 'als ziyādati 'asharati damāra'ī fī 'ṣaḥāli kulli rajulān wa-ma'ūnati mi'āti dinārin siwā 'l-ju'l 'alādi yatajā'aluhi 'l-qabā'ilu baynahā wa-wada' a fihā shihātahā min al-silsilā wassāta' ī-r-junda 'l-mazārī'.

(439) Baladhurī, Futūḥ al-buldān, pp. 187-188.

(440) Hitti translated ma'ūna as "bounty," a sense which seems plausible here (although one hundred dinars seems impossibly high for this), but which is not to be found in the dictionaries. It may refer to some sort of general fund, since the soldiers have already been granted a supplement, ziyāda (ṣkhāṣṣa, see de Goeje, glossary to Futūḥ, s.v.).

This chapter will seek to establish the meaning of this rather obscure term, the relevance of which to the early 'Abbāsid thughūr should be clear enough. The emphasis in what follows will be on the origins and early development of the practice of ju'l. But it will also soon become clear that this practice cannot be separated from the theory.

A brief discussion of the lexicographical tradition on ju'l will be followed by an examination of some references in old poetry. A section devoted to Qur'ān and tafsir will then take up some underlying issues. Next follows a discussion of the early jurists. The subject of ju'l will be analyzed into components, and the positions of the four madhāhib will be examined on each point, if applicable. Finally, the hadith will be discussed according to the categories set out in the preceding section on the jurists. The hadith will be presented in the order: traditions of tabī'īs, of saḥābīs, and finally of the Prophet. This laborious groundwork cannot be avoided, since ju'l, as it turns out, ia a fairly complicated subject which has not received the attention of modern scholars. (442)

4.1.1 Lexicography

The word ju'l has the general sense of "wages." But the Arabic lexicographical tradition recognizes a special meaning: "wages or pay, which one gives to a man that he may aid himself thereby to serve in the war." (443) It occurs "when a man is obligated to go to war, and has another man take his place in exchange for a stipulated wage." (444)

(442) The comments of Aghnides, Mohammedan Theories of Finance, pp. 348-353, are of little help.

(443) Lane, Lexicon, quoting the Tāj al-'arūs.

(444) Ibn al-Athir, Nikāya, I, 276; Lisan al-'Arab, s.v. ʿan-dhālikā 'idhā wajaba ʿallā al-insān ghawr fa-ja'alaṣṣa makānahu rajulan ʿikbar bi-ju'l yahštakifūbu.
The lexicographers claim that the word ji'ala (or ja'la, or ju'la), pl. ja'la'il, is the most correct term for this procedure. However, the plural ja'la'il is the only one of these forms which occurs with any great frequency in the texts.

The dictionaries say that this situation occurs when a man has been called up (‘inda al-ba'ith). It is first (and most often) described as a transaction taking place between two individuals, a ja'il (payor) and a mujta'il (payee). But ju'l also takes place within a larger group: "The people stipulated among themselves to give wages, or pay, to such of them as should serve as substitutes, on the occasion of being ordered forth to war" (tajal'ala al-nas baynahum 'inda al-ba'ith). This phrase resembles the one in Baladhuri (al-ju'l alladhî yataja'aluhu al-qaba'il baynahâ), but has al-nas instead of al-qaba'il.

A further refinement occurs in some of the lexicographical works, in what amounts to another, somewhat different practice: when a group (qawm) has been summoned to war, one man of every four or five sets out, receiving ju'l from the three or four who remain at home. But even when they discuss this practice, the lexicographers make no mention of the tribes (qaba'il) making arrangements among one another, as seems to be the case in

---

(445) In the Lisan in particular, there is an attempt to fix precisely the meanings of all these variants.

(446) Zamakhshari, Fâ'iq, I, 198, and Tâj al-'arûs, s.v., both speak of ju'l yada'ahu al-madrûb 'alsâyhi al-ba'îth ila man yaghru 'anhu ("ju'l paid by the man who has been called up to the man who goes to war in his stead").

(447) Azharl, Tahdhib al-lugha, I, 374; Lane, Lexicon, and Tâj al-'arûs, s.v. Here this practice is called ju'I.

(448) With the exception of the Tahdhib al-lugha of al-Azhari (d. 370), the
Two final points must be mentioned. First, the lexicographers understand *ju‘l* as a phenomenon which occurs mostly (though not uniquely) in the hadith. Second, the *ju‘l* described by the lexicographers, in all its variations, does not correspond to the situation described in the *Futūḥ al-buldān*. The soldiers in Malatya are more or less permanently stationed there, and receive other (apparently permanent) forms of income, aside from their *ju‘l*. It seems strange, if not impossible, that soldiers who are paid *ṣa‘b* should also receive *ju‘l* as we have seen it defined—that is, if the lexicographers’ definitions have anything to do with what actually went on in the early ‘Abbāsid period.

4.1.2 Individual and Community

From the dictionaries we may now identify a theme which will remain important throughout this chapter.

In the various kinds of sources which deal with this question, we may detect a constant tension between two rival views of *ju‘l*. The first of these may be called the "individual" view. Here *ju‘l* is understood as a one-to-one procedure: I am called up, and pay you to take my place. Discussion comes to focus on questions of individual conduct and merit, and in particular the theological question of which of us will receive the reward which God has promised to fighters and martyrs.

---

Lexicographical works cited here are late. The subject of *ju‘l* does not occur in the *Gharīb al-hadīth* of Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallān (d. 224). The similarly-titled books of Dāraquṭnī (d. 385, see Sezgin, *GAS*, I, 298) and Khaṭṭābī (d. 288, see *GAS*, I 211) are not available.

(450) *Ibn al-ʿAṭhir, Ǧīhāda*, I, 276; *Zamakhshārī, Futūḥ*, I, 198; *Lisān* and *Tafsīr al-ʿarūs*, s.v.
The second, "communal" view involves groups such as tribes or even the entire umma. A group may be held jointly responsible for furnishing a certain number of soldiers equipped for battle. Ju'll is somehow distributed among or within such groups. Elsewhere we find a more extreme version of this "communal" view. In some authors (notably al-Shafi'I) the Imam enters the picture. Considerations of a different sort arise, involving the raising and maintenance of armies and the guarding of the frontiers (sadd atrāf al-Muslimin bi'l-rijāl). Here attention focuses on the welfare of the entire Muslim community, rather than on the religious merit achieved by individuals. Ju'll comes to mean wages which the government pays to soldiers.

These do not represent separate schools of thought, but rather poles of opinion. Most of the views which we shall see expressed in this chapter represent combinations of views which may be derived from these two extreme positions. Some of these "hybrids" are constructed with artful equivocation. But this theme of tension between the individual and the communal views of ju'll provides us with our first and most useful means of organizing this somewhat bewildering material.

4.2 Poetry

4.2.1 Shaqiq al-Asadi

In their sections on ju'll, the Lisan al-'Arab and the Taj al-'arūs both cite a line of verse ascribed by the former to "al-Asadi," by the latter to "al-Sulayk ibn Shaqiq al-Asadi."

fa-a'ptu 'l-jā'ala mustamītan
khāfīfa 'l-hādhi mīn tīyānī jarū[n]

So I gave the jī'āla to one who bravely sought death, an ardent warrior, one not weighed down [by property and family].
This line occurs in the following poem in the *Bamasa* of Abu Tammâm, where it is ascribed (by the commentator al-Tibrizi) to one "Shaqlq ibn Sulayk al-Asadi."

\[
\text{Atâni 'an Abî Anasin wa'idun fa-sulla li-ghayzi '1-Dahhaki jismi}
\text{wa-lam a'çi '1-amira wa-lam arîba
wa-lam asbiq Abî Anasî bi-waghaîni}
\text{wa-lâkuna '1-bu'ûtha jarat 'alaynî fa-sîrâna bayne tâbâhin wa-ghurami}
\text{wa-khâfat min jibâli '1-Sughdî nafaî
wa-khâfat min jibâli Khuwarazmî}
\text{wa-qûra'tu '1-bu'ûtha wa-qûra'ûnî
fa-fâra bi-da'jâtin fi '1-hayyi sahi}
\text{fa-e'aytu '1-ji'âla mustamltan
khafîja '1-ßâdhi min fîryûni jarîn}
\]

I received a threat from Abû Anas, and my flesh was consumed by the anger of al-Dahhâk.\(^{(451)}\)

I did not disobey the emîr, I gave him no cause to doubt, and I began no strife with Abû Anas.

But the call to arms had reached us, and we found ourselves caught between far-away [destruction] and the payment of fines.

And my soul was afraid of the mountains of Soghd and of Khuwarazm.

So I cast lots with those who had been called up, and won as my lot [the right] to lie about at home.

And I gave the *ji'âla* to one who bravely sought death, an ardent warrior, one not weighed down.\(^{(452)}\)

\(^{(451)}\) Abû Anas is the same person as al-Dahhâq (ibn Qays al-Fihri).


\(^{(453)}\) The references at Fischer and Braunlich, *Schawabid-Indices*, pp. 50, 239, do not help to identify him. Tibrizi is the only source who gives
Shaqqīq ibn Sulayk al-ʿAsadī is an obscure figure. However, this short poem dates and places itself: we know that al-ʿDahhak ibn Qays al-ʿFihrī, one of Muʿāwiya’s most trusted commanders, served as governor in Kufa from 55 until 58.

We seem therefore to have here an authentic reference to jaʿaʾil in the early Umayyad period. However, what this means here is far from clear. Nowhere else have I found reference to casting lots in connection with jaʿaʾil. In addition, there is ambiguity around the term jiʿala itself.

This seems like a one-to-one procedure, much as we found in the dictionaries. However, Tibrizī in his commentary described jiʿala as (the poet’s) military pay, received from the Umayyad government (al-ʿatāʾ allāhī yaqtadīḥī min al-sulṭān). If this were so, then the poet would merely have turned over his "pay" to the man who replaced him. However, jiʿala could very well have the more specialized sense of "substitute money" here. In any case, the tone of this piece is light, and its inclusion at the end of the ḏūb al-ḥamāsā seems intended as a joke.

Ibn Manṣūr in the Līsuʿn cites a variant of the first hemistich of this verse:

ṣa-yakūflka rājiʿa laʾīlasa wustamlītun...

One who seeks death bravely, etc., will take your

-----------------------------

us this name: Marzūqī says merely wa-qāla ʾakharū, while Yāqūt has only "al-ʿAsadī," as does the Līsuʿn al-ʿArab.

(454) Tabarī, II, 170, 172, 177, 180, 181; Wellhausen, The Arab Kingdom, p. 130. The commentators are unanimous in saying that this is the ʿDahhak in question. Al-ʿDahhak ibn Qays was later killed at Marj Rāḥiṭ, where he led forces loyal to Ibn Zubayr.


(456) This is the opinion of Marzūqī. See the Amlīn-Hārūn edition of ʿanāsīs, II, 777.
place [in exchange for] the ji'ala.

His authority for this variant reading is Ibn Barri ('Abdallāh ibn Barri ibn 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Naṣrī al-Qudsī, d. 582), an Egyptian chancery official who moved to Jerusalem, and who was responsible for the correctness of the Arabic of state documents. (457) Ibn Barri's glosses on the Qānasī were one of Ibn Manṣūr's sources for the Līsān. (458) This version may seem clearer. (459) However, we know that Ibn Barri, who wrote commentaries on grammatical and adab works, also liked to compose verses to illustrate the meanings of obscure words. (460) In this case, he may perhaps have "corrected" an older verse to demonstrate the meaning and usage of ji'ala—centuries after this word had gone out of use.

The identity of Shaqlq ibn Sulayk al-Asadi remains something of a mystery. Confusion with the jāhili poet al-Sulayk ibn al-Sulaka seems unlikely. (461) However, Shaqlq does seem to appear in one other place. In the Muṣannaf of 'Abd al-Razzāq, (462) questions concerning ja'a'il are put to Ibn 'Umar and

(457) Brockelmann, GAL, I, 365 [301-302], SI, 529; Sezgin, GAS, IX, 317; Zirikli, al-Gur, IV, 73-74.
(459) It must have appeared so to Marsafi, who cited only this version of the line, Rawḍa, VII, 194.
(460) Brockelmann (GAL, I, 362 [302]) cites a Berlin manuscript (7068) containing "verses on the various meanings of the word al-kbal.

(461) Al-Sulayk ibn 'Umayr al-Sa'di, called Ibn al-Sulaka (or Ibn al-Salaka) after his mother, was well-known as one of the 'al-shu'arā' al-aspālīk. Abū al-'Aqāf, Abū Aqāf, IV, 101; VII, 158; XIV, 28; XVIII, 133-138; Ibn Qutayba, Al-Shīr wa-l-shu'arā', pp. 213-217; Ibn Ḥaṭib, Kitāb al-al-shu'arā' (Hyderabad 1966, repr. Beirut 1967), pp. 307-308; Marzubani, Rawḍa, V (Cairo 1965), p. 120; Anādi, Al-Mu'talif wa-l-mukhtalif (Cairo 1961), pp. 202-203; Buhṭurī, Fāwāda (ed. Cheikho, Beirut 1910), pp. 127-128, 3641; Sezgin, GAS, II, 139-140.
(462) V, 130, 9946; also at Ibn Abī Shayba, Muṣannaf, V, 346; Bayhaqi, Sunan, IX, 27. See below, 4.5.2.1.
Ibn Zubayr by a man named Shaqlq ibn 'Izar al-Asadi. No dates are known for this man; Ibn Abi Hatim apparently knows of him only from this tradition. Here we have nothing more than an obscure figure of the tabi'i generation, associated with ja'ā'il. But this person would have been alive during the reign of Mu'awiya. This fact, together with the association with this rather unusual subject, makes it likely that we have here one and the same Shaqlq.

4.2.2 'Isa ibn Fāṭik

The word ja'ā'il appears in another poem dating from the days of Mu'awiya. This one describes how forty Kharijīs led by Mirdas ibn Udayya routed a force of 2000 horsemen sent against them by Mu'awiya's governor in Iraq, 'Ubaydallah ibn Ziyād (successor of al-Dahhak) in or after the year 58, in a place in Fars called Ṭamak. Authorship is attributed to one 'Isa ibn Fāṭik of the Banū Taym ibn Thālabā. Mubārrad elsewhere quotes a Kharijī poet named 'Isa ibn Fāṭik al-Ṭabāṭī. This must be the same man. Despite the confusion over his nisba, it appears most likely that the correct form was "al-Khaṭṭī," from al-Khaṭṭ in Oman, famous for its spears.

----------

(463) Al-Jarḥ wa'l-ta'dil, II, 1, 372, #1616.

(464) Nöldeke, Delectus, p. 90; Mubārrad, Kāmil, p. 588, Ṭabarī, II, 187 (omitting the beginning of the text given by Mubārrad); Yāqūt, Muḥammad al-Buldān, I, 62; Dinawari, Al-Akhbār al-Ťawal, p. 279 (where the date of 80 is impossible).

(465) Mubārrad, p. 588. Ṭabarī only says fa-qāla rajul min Banī Taym Allāh ibn Thālabā. Dinawari is even less helpful, saying fa-ansha rajul min al-Kindī. Yāqūt (ed. Wüstenfeld) gives the nisba "al-Ḥazzā" (see below).

(466) Mubārrad, p. 590.

(467) Yāqūt, Muḥammad al-Buldān, II, 433-434, says that 'Isa ibn Fāṭik the Kharijī took his nisba from that place. "Al-Ḥazzā" (Yāqūt, I, 62, see
There were two important tribal groups known as Taym Allah ibn Tha'labah or (more authentically) Taym al-Lat ibn Tha'labah. The better known of these two was northern, part of the Rabi'a grouping (Bakr ibn W3'il).(468) The lesser-known one, Taym Allah ibn Tha'labah ibn 'Amr, was southern, with partly Himyarite origins.(469) 'Isa ibn Fatik, with his Omani nisba, may have belonged to this latter group.

The relevant lines of this poem are as follows:

fa-lamnā aṣbahū qašaw wa-qānīl
ila 'l-farūdī 'l-ṣināqi masawwaqīnū

fa-lamnā 'stajna'ū ḥamālū 'alabīn
fa-qallā bāwā 'l-ja'dīllī yuqta'llūnū

laqiyyata yawmibah baţūn baţūn,
subūḍu 'l-layli fihi yurāwhūnū

And in the morning they prayed, and turned to
The short-haired fine [steeds], marked [for battle];

And when they had gathered, they charged against them,
And the owners of ja'd'il were killed

All through the rest of the day, until the black of night
Came to them, allowing them [deceitfully] to slip away.

Mubarrad does not comment on the word ja'd'il here.(470) It is, however, clearly a term of contempt, as Noldeke wrote: "[The poet] contemptuously applies the term 'mercenaries' to soldiers who, unlike [the Kharijis] themselves, do not fight solely to serve God."(471)

above) is easily explained by the misplacing of a point. See Fischer and Brünlich, Schwäbisch-Indices, pp. 155, 156, 303; Marsafi, Rawda, VII, 195-196.

(468) Caskel, I, #141; Levi della Vida, EI, IV, 623.
(469) Caskel, I, #185; II, 543.
(470) Tabari does not include this part of the poem.
We know nothing about the 2000 Basran horsemen who were put to flight by the forty Khārijīs, except that their commander was Ma‘bad ibn Aslam al-Kilābī. However, the Khārijī leader Mirdās did stress correct Islamic behavior in fiscal matters during his revolt. We see this in the incident which triggered off the battle at Ḡasāk, which went as follows:

Money which was being transported to Ibn Ziyād fell into [Mirdās’] possession. He brought together his forty companions and divided up the money, taking his own ‘afa’ and the a’tiyāt of his companions. He then returned the remaining amount to the messengers, saying, “Tell your master that we have taken our a’tiyāt.” One of his companions then said, “Why are we letting the rest of the money go?” He answered, “They divide up the fay’, just as they perform prayer. Don’t fight them.”

Ibn Ziyād did not appreciate this gesture, and sent out the ill-fated 2000 horsemen. But we again see Mirdās’ idea of correct behavior (sunna) in the matter of the fay’ (that is, not to allow a government or a governor to control it) in his speech to his fellow-Khārijīs before the battle. Ma‘bad, he said, was a libertine, a subverter (fasid) who, among other things, had arrogated the fay’ to himself.

In our poem, ‘Īsā ibn Fāṭik taunts Ibn Ziyād’s soldiers by calling them receivers of ja‘ā’il. This seems to imply that they are mercenaries—though this would not necessarily be the way anyone other than the Khārijīs would describe them. The word ja‘ā’il here corresponds to the way it was usually (later) understood (that is, as a one-to-one transaction) only in the broadest sense; it seems in fact to connote soldiers’ wages paid by the govern-

---

(471) Delectus, p. 90, n. 1.
(472) Taḥāri has Ibn Ḥisn al-Tamīmī.
(473) Mubarrad, p. 588. Yāqūt’s version (I, 62) is somewhat clearer: “His companions asked, ‘Why are you letting them have the rest?’” (‘alahu tufrīju ‘an al-bāqī’) He answered, “They pray, and I do not cause distress to those who pray to the qibla.”
(474) Mubarrad, p. 588, ll. 1-2, wa-yakhussu bi‘l-fay’.
But here, in any case, ja'a'il are not for soldiers who are paid in the correct Islamic fashion, that is, for those who receive atâ‘.

From these two poems, dating from the reign of Mu'awiya, we may already detect both an "individual" and a "communal" or "governmental" sense of the terms ja'l and ja'a'il. The one-to-one procedure is already in existence (though its workings are obscure); but the needs of the government are also making themselves felt.

4.3 Qur'ân

The words ja'll, ja'lla, ja'a'il do not occur in the Qur'ân. Accordingly, the jurists who discussed this subject had to base their arguments upon sunna and whatever other sources they recognized. There are, however, several passages in the Qur'ân (most of them in the Surat al-tawbah) which express, or have been thought to express, some of the most basic principles.

4.3.1 Al-Jihād bi'l-Mal

The believers are repeatedly enjoined to strive in the path of God with both their wealth (amāl) and their lives (an'as). This is often considered the most fundamental of Qur'ānic principles pertaining to ja'l. God has bought their wealth and their lives from them in exchange for Paradise: this transaction is effected by their fighting, killing, and being killed in the path of God, and is a binding pledge made in the Torah, the Gospel, and the

(475) 4:49, 8:72, 9:20, 41, 44, 81, 85, 49:15.

(476) Shâfi'i, Umm, IV, 85. For Sarakhsi, the Qur'ānic prooftext for ja'll is 22:78, wa-jihādī fi 'llahi haqqa jihādīhi, which means, says Sarakhsi, "performing jihād with one's wealth and one's life." Sharh al-siyar al-kabîr, I, 138.
Qur’an. (477) It is not difficult to see what this means in terms of the believers’ lives, which they exchange for Paradise when they die in battle. But what precisely does it mean for them to exchange their amrūl for a divine reward? The tafsir on these passages does not clarify this point.

4.3.1.1 fi sabll Allāh

Elsewhere in the Sūrat al-tawba, God inveighs against certain persons who heap up treasure without spending it fi sabll Allāh.(478) The ahl al-ts’wil differ on the meaning of “treasure” (kans), but all agree that the fault in question consists of the failure to pay zakāt.(479) But does the phrase fi sabll Allāh here necessarily refer to war? In the passages already mentioned, which command the believers to fight with their wealth and their lives, the phrase clearly has this meaning. But in this instance (9:34), where the verb jahada does not appear, does paying zakāt mean making a contribution to the war effort?

In Ṭabarī’a Jāmi’ al-bayūn and elsewhere, the phrase fi sabll Allāh is understood as referring to the jihād in every case. However, not all the muftassirūn interpret the phrase this way every time. Bayḍāwi, in his commentary on this same passage, glosses fi sabll Allāh as [fi] dinhi.(480) In another passage, contributions made fi sabll Allāh can mean, according to Bayḍāwi, either 1) money, weapons, and mounts for the mu’tawwi’a, or 2) “for building bridges and reservoirs” (masānī’). (481) We thus have variant opin-

---

(477) 9:111.
(478) 9:34.
(480) Bayḍāwi, I, 485, 1. 6.
(481) Bayḍāwi, I, 391, 11. 9-10, commenting on Qur’ān 9:60. Ṭabarī (Jāmi’,
ions on the meaning of this phrase at a late stage. But in some of the ear-
liest tafsir, the interpretation of this phrase does not necessarily refer to
holy war. In early tafsir works in the tradition of Ibn 'Abbas, fi sabil
Allāh is interpreted consistently and throughout with the equally ambiguous
phrase fi ḫaṣṣ Allāh. On the other hand, in the 'ahd al-umma, the
phrase fi sabīl Allāh refers clearly and unambiguously to warfare.

We find an analogous situation with regard to the obscure verse 9:122,
where the verb nafara has always been understood as a reference to warfare.
R. Paret has shown, however, that nafara should be understood in a more neu-
tral sense, and that the verse does not refer to setting out for war.

A similar problem occurs in two consecutive verses of the Surat al-
baqara. The first of these, "He that gives his wealth for the cause of
Allāh (fi sabīl Allāh) is like a grain of corn which brings forth seven ears
each bearing a hundred grains," is interpreted by Tabari (following the isnad
of Yunus--Ibn Wahb--Ibn Zayd) as referring to "those who spend their wealth
in the path of Allāh."

X, 165) does not make this distinction: here fi sabīl Allāh refers to
warfare.

(482) Muṣṭafī, Tafsīr al-khamṣī'at ʿayn, p. 52 (on 9:34), and passim.
Fīrūzabādi, Tanwīr al-ʿqīṭābīs an tafsīr Ibn ʿAbbas (known as the
tafsīr of al-Kalbī, d. 146, GAS, I, 34-35), p. 142 (Qurʾān 9:34,
yasuddūna ʿan sabīl Allāh, is interpreted as ʿan din Allāh wa-taʿātī)
wa-ṭāstībī).

(483) Wa-lā yusallu wuʾnān dīnā muʾminin fi qīṭābīs fi sabīl ʿllāh. Abū
ʿUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām, Kitāb al-amālī, p. 292; Ibn Hishām, Sīra,
p. 342. Serjeant renders this as "No Muʾmin will make peace to the
exclusion of [or separately from] a Muʾmin fighting in the path of
Allāh."

Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period, ed. Beeston
et al., p. 136. See also Serjeant, "The Constitution of Medina,"

232-236.

(485) 2:261-262.
on themselves in fighting God's enemies with their lives and their wealth." (486) Note that it is only the tafsir, and its understanding of the phrase *fi sabā'il Allāh*, which makes this verse a basis for *al-jihād bi'l-mal*.

The following verse (2:262), "Those that give their wealth for the cause of God and do not follow their almsgiving with taunts and insults shall be rewarded by their Lord" (*thumma lā yuthi`ūna mā sanaqū mana`man wa-lā adhān lahum ajrūhum 'inda rabblühm*), has been interpreted as nearly providing a basis for *jā'a'il*. For Ṭabarī (again following Yūnus—Ibn Wāhib—Ibn Zayd), this verse refers to "the one who gives his money to those who strive in the path of God, as help to them (*ma`ṣnātan lahum*) in the path of God." Such a giver provides money, mounts, and other forms of aid (*ma`nas*). The point of the verse, says Ṭabarī (and the *ahl al-ta`wil* whom he follows here) is that the giver receives his reward (*ajr*), regardless of what actually becomes of his contribution. Ṭabarī here does not use the word *ju`l* or its derivatives, but nonetheless makes a pronouncement on the issue which resembles that of Shāfi`ī (below, 4.4.4.3). Here we have Ṭabarī speaking as the founder of a *madhhab*, as much as the author of tafsir.

It is not a (personal) obligation between them, which would oblige the giver to ensure that it was correctly carried out. He spends the money out of a desire for a reward from God, and so as to please God; God must reward him regardless of the one on whom he spent it. (487)

---

(486) Ṭabarī, *Ja`f*, III, 61. The giver gets back his gift seven hundred times.

(487) *Ja`f*, III, 62-63.
4.3.1.2 Sadaqa

These two verses are part of a long section (2:261-281) on the sadaqa. God's instructions in this section are not by any means limited to providing for the warriors—and we have seen that it is only the interpretation which insists on this point at all. Thus, something in the Qurʾān which the tafsir describes as juʿl in everything but the name, occurs in a section on sadaqa. We have already seen a similar situation in the case of zekār. Whether purely voluntary almsgiving (ṣadaqat al-tawawwul) or the involuntary poor-rate is the subject of these Qurʾānic verses, is beyond the scope of this chapter. In the Qurʾānic verse which lists the recipients of alms, a portion is reserved fi sabll Allāh. Thus, in all the Qurʾānic passages which have been interpreted as calling for something like jaʿāil, there are grounds to identify the practice either as a voluntary (charitable) donation from one individual to another, or as money or supplies originating in the state treasury. The individual and communal views of juʿl (above, 4.1.2) both have Qurʾānic counterparts.

4.3.1.3 Al-Jassāṣ

In his Ḥanafī jurist al-Jassāṣ discusses the requirement of performing jihād with one’s wealth and one’s life. A man who is healthy but poor should perform jihād "after he has found sufficient means."

---

(488) 9:34; above, 4.3.1.1.

(489) The same ambiguity exists for the term zekāt: Schacht, "Zakāt," EI1, IV, 1202-1204. At 9:34 (see previous section), Ṭabari and the Abī al-taʾwīl whom he cites do not qualify what they mean by zekāt. However, it must be the second (government-sponsored) variety, since no one can be obligated to make a voluntary payment.

(490) 9:60. The phrase remains ambiguous.

(491) Jassāṣ, Ḥanāfī al-Qurʾān, III, 117, 1. 13.
One who is sick should perform al-jihād bi’l-māl by giving money to another man who will go to war (Jaṣṣāṣ does not specifically say "in his place").(492) Elsewhere, Jaṣṣāṣ names two varieties of al-jihād bi’l-māl. The first is spending money on weapons, mounts, provisions, and the like for one’s self. The second is spending one’s money on others who perform jihād.(493)

Jaṣṣāṣ’ two categories correspond to those made by Ṭabarī in his interpretation of Qur’ān 2:261-262 (see above, 4.3.1.1). Like Ṭabarī, Jaṣṣāṣ does not use the words ju’il and ja’a’il, and cites none of the relevant ḥadīth. In addition, he does not mention whether this money given as al-jihād bi’l-māl comes under the heading of ṣadaqah or zakāt.

4.3.1.4 Ḥdā ‘1-ḥusnayaynī

The question of what is the reward for al-jihād bi’l-māl remains unresolved. We find some of this ambiguity reflected in the tafsīr on the phrase Ḥdā ‘1-ḥusnayaynī ("one of the two best things," 9:52), which is generally interpreted as referring to 1) victory in war and 2) Paradise.(494) The first of these is the difficult one: Ṭabarī(495) defined it as al-ṣjr wa’l-ghanīm wa’l-sīlah—plunder plus some undefined reward which implies divine favor (and is therefore more than worldly). Similarly, Ṭabarī does not say what the return is to be from one’s contribution to the war effort—he only says, following Qur’ān 2:261, that the giver receives it back 700 times.(496) Here

(492) III, 117, 1. 12.

(493) III, 118, 11. 27-28. We’l-thānī infaq al-māl ʿalā ghayrihi mimāl (read mimman) yuṣḥādī wa-maʿunatubu bi’l-rāʾid wa’l-wwdd.

(494) See Shāfiʿī, Umm, IV, 92.

(495) Jāmaʿ, X, 150.

(496) Jāmaʿ, III, 61.
we have the ambiguity of the word *ajr* which figures prominently in much of the hadith (see below, 4.5.3.2-3).

### 4.3.2 Takhalluf

Much of the *Surat al-tawba* is devoted to invective against members of the community who dodge their obligation to fight the enemies of God. They are called *qa'idun* and *mukhallafun*, and are subjected to snide remarks in this life(497) and to more lasting forms of punishment in the next.(498) The nomads have the same obligations in this respect as do the townsfolk.(499)

However, some people have legitimate excuses.

> It shall be no offence for the weak, the sick, and those who lack the means to contribute to the war, to stay behind, if they are true to Allah and His apostle....Nor shall those be blamed who, when they came to you demanding conveyances to the battle-front and you could find none to carry them, went away in tears grieving that they could take no part.(500)

There are thus three classes of *mukhallafun*,(501) the weak (usually glossed as the old), the sick, and those who are too poor. From this we may infer that an able-bodied warrior must pay his own way to the battlefield; if he cannot do this, and if no one else will pay for him, then he is free of blame. The Prophet, furthermore, was under no obligation to help such people.

---

(497) 9:46.

(498) 9:35, 39.

(499) 9:90, 120-121.

(500) 9:91-92 (Dawood translation, with minor changes). *laya* 'alā 'I*-g'arā* 'l wa-'lā *la* 'l-samā 'wa-llā *la* 'lladhina la yajidūn mā yun-fiqūna hār'ahūn idhā nasā'ah ḫīrā wa-rasūlahu...*la* 'lladhina idhā mā ṣamakā li-taḥmilluhum qulū bi la ahdū mā ahmiṣūn *alayhi ṭawal-laq wa-e*yunūnu rafidu 'alā 'l-*da*m ī ḥazānūn allā yajidūn mā yun-fiqūna.*

The peculiar use of the verbs *wajada* and *ḥamala* in these verses becomes a constant feature in legal discussions of *juʿl* and related matters. See Shāfi’i, *Usm*, IV, 85f.; below, 4.4.4.1-4.

At the same time, the practice of providing mounts seems to be known in the Qur'an, and considered acceptable, though not obligatory. This practice, known as *humāran*, appears both in law books and in ḥadīth (see following section).

The only addition to our understanding of these two verses which we gain from the tafsīr is in the area of *asbāb al-nuzūl*. This particular piece of divine guidance is said originally to have been required a propos of several different would-be warriors. There are different traditions on who these men were. These details seem insignificant; what stands out is that Ibn 'Abbās and his followers show the greatest interest in the matter, and that their views prevail. It is again Ibn 'Abbās who, more than any other figure, shows an interest in this issue of *takhalluf* when it appears in the ḥadīth.

### 4.4 The Jurists

The Qur'ān thus provides little more than general principles affecting *ja'fīr*, and the lawyers have had to rely on the ḥadīth. Unfortunately, this ḥadīth became entangled in its own branches and offshoots. If we are to find a path through this small forest, we must begin by mapping out the positions of the various *madhābhīh*. The following pages will set out the positions

---

*(502) All this is clearly stated by Shāfi‘ī, *Umm*, IV, 85, 90.

*(503) An *taḥmīlahum*. These would be needed in the war itself, as well as in traveling to it (Dawood's translation is therefore incomplete).

*(504) "And when God saw their zeal in their love of him and of His Messenger, he revealed their *'udhr* ('excuse') in His Book." Ţabarî, *Jāmi‘*, X, 211.

ascribed to the founding figures of the various schools.

Several different aspects of the problem must be kept in mind.

1) *Ju‘l*—as defined so far, especially in the dictionaries (above, 4.1.1).

This is most often construed as a transaction between two individuals, but also occurs between two groups, or else between an individual (the Imam) and a group.

2) Donations and *ṣamām*. The early jurists discuss gifts or donations given to those setting out *fi sabīl Allāh*. These differ from *ju‘l* in that they involve no *quid pro quo* (no *ajr* in exchange for *manfa‘a*). Furthermore, the early legal discussions of this issue show no awareness or concern with that of *ju‘l*. The jurists discuss problems such as when these gifts become the property of the recipient, and how he may dispose of them. The jurists discuss problems such as when these gifts become the property of the recipient, and how he may dispose of them. The jurists discuss problems such as when these gifts become the property of the recipient, and how he may dispose of them. (506) Closely related to these donations is the subject of *ṣamām* (see Qur’ān 9:92, and above, 4.3.2). This consists of horses or camels which one gives to the *ghāzi* as he sets out. Again, there is no *quid pro quo*.

3) The *ajr*. In much of the hadīth (and in particular the prophetic hadīth) on this subject, a man who receives *ju‘l* is called an *ajr* ("hireling"). Traditions seem to be used as weapons by both sides in a debate over whether or not such a person receives an *ajr* ("reward, compensation") in addition to, or taking the place of, the *ju‘l* which he has been paid. Statements on the validity of the practice of *ju‘l* thus tend to focus on the status of the *ajr* ("recipient of *ju‘l*") in this life and/or the afterlife.

However, in many of the earliest legal texts, the word *ajr* refers to another kind of person. When the jurists discuss the division of spoils (*qass al-ghanima*), they name the categories of persons who, after participating in a battle, a) are entitled to full shares of the spoils, or b) receive

only radkh ("discretionary payments"), or c) receive nothing at all. The categories of persons discussed include women, minors, slaves, merchants, dhimmis, and ajirs. Here the word ajir means a person hired by an individual to act as a personal servant—but not specifically to fight—or a camp follower performing similar service for the army. (507)

The word ajir has thus acquired two distinct uses, both of which can be found in the jurista's writings and in the hadith itself. (508) This fact has contributed to the general confusion. To make matters worse, some of the early jurists also refer to the possibility of a group (qawm) of non-Muslims fighting with the Muslims in exchange for pay, and call such persons musta'jarūn. (509) This practice actually belongs under the rubric of ju'ī, even if it is not described as such.

4) Takhalluf. The Qur'anic principle of legitimate excuses for not performing jihad (above, 4.3.2) was thought to provide a basis for the practice of takhalluf. In the hadith, this comes to mean that a group is held responsible for providing fully equipped warriors (this group may consist of the entire umma). This large group is then subdivided into many small groups of four, five, ten, or whatever, each of which must provide out of its own number one or more soldiers fully equipped. Those who remain at home are called qā'dūn or mukhallafūn or mutakhallifūn. (510) In this particular strand of

(507) This will become clear in the following sections, particularly the ones devoted to Awzā'ī, Malik, and the Hanafis. At Waqidi, III, 1012, ajir appears in the sense of "hireling."

(508) It need not be the case that one of these preceded the other, though there might be reason to believe that the sense of "hireling, camp follower" is the older of the two. Both uses occur (and overlap) in the hadith.

(509) For Awzā'ī, musta'jar has the same meaning as ajir ("hired servant").

(510) In the Sūrat al-tauhûb, those who avoid military service and remain at home are called mukhallafūn, see above, 4.3.2.
tradition, we never see the word *ju‘l*, and the two notions do not quite fit together. Nonetheless, *takhalluf* must logically be included in a discussion of *ju‘l*—and was usually so understood by the jurists.

4.4.1 Awza‘ī

It would seem reasonable to suppose that from al-Awza‘ī, the imām of the *thughr*, we might learn what was meant by *ju‘l* in the *thaghr* of Malatya, during Awza‘ī’s own lifetime. However, Awza‘ī tells us nothing of the sort, at least in the meagre fragments available to us. We have no statement from him on the subject of *ju‘l*, not even in Abu Yusuf’s *Kitāb al-radd ‘alā siyar al-Awza‘ī*.

4.4.1.1 The *ajir*

In the *Kitāb al-radd*, Awza‘ī’s views on whether shares are allotted to women, *dhimms*, minors who fight with the Muslims, and *mushriks* who convert and join the Muslims in the *dār al-harb*, are set out for us,(511) if only to be refuted by the Hanafis. For some reason, the *ajir* does not appear in this list. In later sources, however, we find a maxim attributed to Awza‘ī: *al-musta‘jaru ‘alā khidmati ‘l-qawmi lā sabma lāhu* ("One who has been hired to serve the army receives no share").(512) This position is well attested, and its formulation as a maxim speaks well for its antiquity.(513) *Musta‘jar* here means *ajir* in the "archaic" sense in which it appears in other early jurists.(514)

(511) They all receive shares. *Al-Radd*, pp. 37-45; *Umm*, VII, 311-315.


Awzā'i’s opinions, according to Schacht, "represent the oldest solutions adopted by Muhammadan jurisprudence." (515) Here we have a simple principle—camp followers receive no share of the booty—without the qualifications made by Mālik and the Iraqis.

4.4.2 Mālik

4.4.2.1 Donations

In the Ḥuwatta' we have a tradition stating that whenever 'Abdallāh ibn 'Umar gave something fi sabil Allāh, he would say to the recipient: "It is yours once you reach Wādi '1-Qurā." (516) Another tradition of Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyib has the same text, substituting ra's maghāthihi for Wādi '1-Qurā. (517) Zurqānī explains that this was out of fear that the giver would come out to reclaim the gift. Both traditions also occur in the Ḥuwatta' of Shaybānī. (518)

4.4.2.2 Ju'āl

In the Mudawwana, (519) Mālik states his strong opposition to the practice of a man "fighting on condition that he receive ju'āl." One should not "shed his own blood in exchange for such a thing." Mālik recognizes two forms of remuneration for warriors: 1) shares of the spoils, which the Prophet used to distribute only after the fighting had subsided, and 2) the armor, etc.,

(517) Zurqānī, loc. cit.
(518) Shaybānī, Nawāṭṭa', p. 308, where Abū Ḥanīfa rules that the gift belongs to the recipient once he has received it. This point is made in the hadith (see below, 4.5.3.4).
(519) III, 31.
of an enemy soldier whom one has killed, if one's claim is clear and un­tested (in kāna lahu bayyinatun). For this we have, says Mālik, "an excellent model (uswa ḥasanah) in the Messenger of God; how could anyone con­tradict what he stated and enacted as sunna" (ma qāla wa-sanna)? As for the practice of ju’l, Mālik has nothing to cause him to believe that the Prophet ever established it as customary after Ḥunayn. And if in fact he did so, then this "was an established matter mentioned by no one."(521) Furthermore, Mālik states that he has no indication that Abū Bakr or ʿUmar ever estab­lished this practice or made use of it.

What is most surprising about this passage is Mālik’s assertion that the Prophet set down no rules regarding ja’ā’il. As will be seen in the following sections, we have a number of traditions in al-kutub al-sūtta and other sources which trace this practice back to the Prophet.

4.4.2.3 The ajir

Concerning al-ajir fi ’l-ghazu, Mālik’s position is:

If he has witnessed (shahida) the fighting, and was with [the army] as they fought, and if he is free, then he receives his share. Otherwise, he receives none. And I [Yahyā] heard Mālik say: It is my opinion (wa-arṣ) that shares should be allotted only to free persons who witness the fighting.(522)

Ajir here means a person hired for some purpose other than fighting. For if it meant a recipient of ju’l, then the question of whether or not he took part in the fighting would hardly arise.(523) Furthermore, in this passage

-----------------------------


(521) Kāna dhulika surān thabita laysa fihī qawlu.

(522) Zurqānī, Shaḥr, III, 297.

(523) Zurqānī seems to fall between the two senses of ajir, with his gloss nahwa ’l-birās ("for something like guard duty").
of the Ḥuwāṭṭa', it is implicitly possible for the ajīr to be a slave; whereas according to Mālik, the duty to perform jihād is not incumbent upon a slave, and no share of the spoils is allotted to him.\(^\text{(524)}\)

Some later jurists were aware of Mālik's condemnation of ju'ūl.\(^\text{(525)}\) However, this passage in the Ḥuwāṭṭa' was apparently better known.\(^\text{(526)}\)

4.4.3 The Ḥanafīs

It is not until Sarakhsi (d. 483) that we find a comprehensive Ḥanafī theory of ju'ūl.\(^\text{(527)}\) For reconstructing the early doctrine of the school, the material is somewhat meagre.\(^\text{(528)}\)

4.4.3.1 Ju'ūl

According to Sarakhsi, Abū Ḥanīfa's position was as follows. He disapproved of ja'ā'il so long as the Muslims are strong. If they are weak, then it is all right for them to fortify one another in this manner. A man who has enough money of his own should therefore not accept ju'ūl, but may do so if he has none.\(^\text{(529)}\)

\(^\text{(524)}\) Women, children, merchants, and slaves receive neither shares nor ṭadīkh ('discretionary payments'). \text{Mudawwana, III, 32} (correct Schacht's edition of Ṭabarî, \text{Ikhṭilāf al-fuqahā'}, p. 21, n.1, which gives III, 23).

\(^\text{(525)}\) Ibn Ḥajār, \text{Fatḥ al-bārī}, XII, 87-88.

\(^\text{(526)}\) Ḥaṭṭāḥī, \text{Ma'ālim as-sunan}, quoted by Ḥāṣmābādī, \text{`Awq al-ma'ābud}, VII, 201; Ibn Ḥazm, \text{Muhāllā}, VII, 333, l. 13.

\(^\text{(527)}\) Sarakhsi, \text{Kitāb al-ṣabaḥ}, X, 19-21; \text{Sharḥ al-ṣiyār al-kabīr}, I, 139-144. This \text{Sharḥ} is not a real commentary on Shaybānī's \text{Ṣiyār}: it omits, rearranges, and paraphrases, and adds much of Sarakhsi's own rationalizing. See Goldziher, \text{Muslim Studies}, II, 13.

\(^\text{(528)}\) This subject does not come up in the \text{Āthār Abī Yūsuf} and the \text{Āthār al-Shaybānī}. The \text{Ḥuwāṭṭa'} of Shaybānī deals only with the related issue of donations.

\(^\text{(529)}\) Sarakhsi, \text{Sharḥ}, I, 138; echoed by Ibn Ḥajār, \text{Fatḥ al-bārī}, XII, 87-88.
I have not been able to find such a statement attributed to Abu Hanifa in the works of the early Hanafi jurists. Perhaps Sarakhsi is giving a summary of the Hanafi position—according to his own understanding.

What we do have is a section of Shaybani's Kitab al-siyar al-kabir which deals with ju'l. Here Shaybani only reports traditions, most of them with Kufan isnads. The tabi'i Ibrahim al-Nakhawi makes the simple assertion that ju'l is acceptable. Shaybani is also said to have paid ju'l to someone to perform active service in the thughur for him. Another tabi'i, Maymun ibn Mirwan (d. 116 or 117) also leads support to ja'ili, though with a qualification. The practice of ju'l is also attributed to the sabibi Jarir ibn 'Abdul rashid (d. 51).

From all this we may detect a Kufan/early Hanafi position generally in favor of ja'ili. However, we do find a few dissenting voices among the early Iraqis.

4.4.3.2 The ajir

In Tabari's Ikhtilaf al-fuqaha', a section is devoted to the question of "whether or not shares should be allotted to the minor, the ajir, the slave, the female, and the ahl al-dhimma." Here we have a statement which,

---


(531) Shaybani, Siyar, pp. 96-97; Islamic Law of Nations, p. 84.

(532) Shaybani, Siyar, p. 97; Islamic Law of Nations, pp. 85-86. Ju'l is all right, but one who accepts it should not then "hire another person [to fight] for an amount less than that contribution."

(533) Shaybani, Siyar, p. 97; Islamic Law of Nations, p. 86; Sarakhsi, Sharh, 1, 139; Habsi, X, 20-21. See below, 4.5.2.2.

(534) See Ibn Abi Shayba, V, 346-348; below, 4.5.1.

(535) Tabari, ed. Schacht, Ikhtilaf al-fuqaha', pp. 20-21. This title of the section is found in the fihrist. Unfortunately, the opening words of
according to Schacht, represents the views of Abū Ḥanīfa and his followers. (536)

An ajīr who accompanies a man in the Muslim army in enemy territory, serving him in return for an ajīr, without fighting, receives no share in the spoils, whether he is slave or free. But if the ajīr is a free man, and if he fights together with the Muslims so that they get the spoils (ḥattā yaghnamū), then he is allotted a share, as are the Muslims.

This stands in contrast to the "school" position on women, minors, helpful musbrikūn, and slaves, all of whom may receive ṭalqū but no shares. (537)

4.4.3.3 Takballuf

Shaybānī mentions two ḥadīth traditions. 1) 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb used to send the bachelors off to war, in place of the married men. He would give the warrior the married man's horse. (538) 2) Ibn 'Abbas made a pronouncement in favor of ḫa'sīl, after being asked what was the proper contribution for those who remained behind to make to the fighters, in a situation in which five, six, or seven of every ten men were required to go and fight. (539)

In Shaybānī's Siyar, these two traditions are interspersed among the others. However, they stand out, not only because of their subject-matter, but because of their isnāds. 'Umar does occasionally appear as an authority for the section are lacking in the ms.

(536) See p. 20, n. 1, wa-qalū jami'allu.

(537) Ṭabarī, Ikhtilāf, p. 20; Abū Yūsuf, Kitāb al-radd, pp. 37-45, 120.


(539) Shaybānī, Siyar, p. 97; Islamic Law of Nations, pp. 84-85; Sarakhsi, Sharḥ, I, 139-139; Mabsūṭ, X, 20; 'Abd al-Razzāq, Ḥusaynī, V, 230, 9946; Ibn Abī Shayba, V, 346. Ibn 'Abbas' reply did not quite fit the question: he said that only contributions for mounts and weapons were permissible; household goods (mats' al-bayt) were not. Sarakhsi adds fine points on whether or not the recipient may use the money however he likes (cf. Qur'ān 2:262).
the Kufans,(540) but less frequently than do the Companions 'Ali and Ibn Mas'ūd. This tradition, associating 'Umar with takbahluf, is relayed by Abū 'Uthmān al-Nahdā (d. 95) and 'Ashūr ibn Sulaymān al-Āpjāl (d. 142 or 143), both of whom were associated at least as much with Basra as with Kūfā.(541)

The tradition about Ibn 'Abbās, not a Kufan figure at all,(542) is handed down by Abū Šāliḥ [Dhakwān] al-Samān (d. 101), a Madīnī, and the Kufan Abū Ishāq al-Sabī'I (d. 116, 117, or 118), and two unnamed persons. In other words, this tradition appears to have been "adopted" by the Kufans at some point.(543)

4.4.3.4 Sarakhsī

Sarakhsī discusses this practice attributed to 'Umar, and states that some people say that he ['Umar] did this by mutual consent (bi'l-tārāḍī). If such consent is lacking, says Sarakhsī, then the Imam should equip the ghāzī out of the bayt al-māl, or state treasury, since the money kept there is intended for this purpose. But if the bayt al-māl is depleted, at a time when it is necessary to ward off the enemy, then the Imam, by virtue of his responsibility for the umma, may constrain people to pay (fa-lahu an yahkuma 'ala al-nas), in particular the wealthy ones (arbāb al-māl).

It is this power and responsibility of the Imam, says Sarakhsī, which underly the practice of ju'l. For giving ju'l is not simply a matter of hiring someone for wages, but rather of providing aid to the expeditionary.

------------------------

(540) Schacht, Origins, p. 32.

(541) Ibn Hajar, Tahdhlīb, V, 42-43, VI, 277-278.

(542) Schacht assigns him to the Meccans, Origins, pp. 249-252.

(543) Note that it is stitched together, and that Ibn 'Abbās' answer is not entirely relevant to the question. In Sarakhsī, we find this same statement from Ibn 'Abbās appended to an entirely different question.
armies. (544) Sarakhsi takes this so far as to interpret the phrase َقَرَابَة ِبَعْتُهُمْ (in the tradition about Jarir ibn 'Abdallah, see above, 4.4.3.1) as "constraining people to pay their money, according to the extent to which it is necessary to equip the army." (545)

In much of this, Sarakhsi seems to be echoing Shafi'i (see following section) instead of the rather fragmentary views of the early Hanafi jurists. For Shafi'i was the first to make the role of the Imam the essential ingredient of a theory of ُجَلَلْ.

The early Hanafis seem, in fact, to have consistently interpreted ُجَلَلْ as a transaction between individuals; and here, where an Imam (Umar) and the entire community become involved, the element of ِتَكْحِلْلَع has the effect of breaking the situation down to individuals again.

Finally, another noteworthy fact about the early Hanafi material is the total absence in it of prophetic hadith. (546)

4.4.4 Shafi'i

Shafi'i's treatment of ُجَلَلْ, at least as it appears in ِكِيْتَاب ِالْعَم, is interspersed with other matters, and not clearly ordered. The following section will extract a "theory of ُجَلَلْ."

(544) Habsi, X, 19, َفَنَقَّطْ اَلْإِسْتِجْرَى َلَى َالْجَهَدِ َلَا َيَجْزَى َوَلَا َتَقْلِبُ َالْبَعْث َلِلْعِبَادِ َلَا َيَصْبُحُ َالْبَيْنَةَ ِعَلَى َالْعَمَّ.

(545) Habsi, X, 20-21, َبَعْدَ َالْجَهَدِ َفَتَقْلِبُ ِالْجَهَدِ َلِلْعِبَادِ َلَا َيَصْبُحُ َالْبَيْنَةَ ِعَلَى َالْعَمَّ.

(546) Sarakhsi, Habsi, X, 19, quotes a prophetic tradition against shares for the َجُرْ ("recipient of ُجَلَلْ"). This is countered by Ibn 'Abbas, using the same words as above.
4.4.4.1 *Fard al-jihād*

We must begin with the most basic purpose of the jihād, which is twofold: 1) to prevent the enemy from entering Muslim territory, and only then, 2) to send enough Muslims on campaign as will succeed in converting the idolaters to Islam, or in imposing *jīzā* on the *ahl al-kitāb*. Shāfi‘ī adduces Qur‘ān and the *sunna* of the Prophet to show that the *fard al-jihād* is an obligation incumbent on the entire community of the Muslims, but of which the community may acquit itself through the activity of a certain number only, if that number is sufficient to accomplish these two purposes (*an yaqūma bihi man fihi kifāya*). If a sufficient number of mujāhidūn perform the jihād, then those who do not fight are not held to blame. This is, of course, what later generations called a *fard kifāya*, although Shāfi‘ī does not call it this. It should be noted that in the *Risāla* Shāfi‘ī again clearly states the principle of *fard kifāya*, without using the phrase.

What stands out in this discussion of the *fard al-jihād* is the ceaseless need for manpower. Shāfi‘ī gives a (second) definition of the basic purpose of the jihād, in a formula which starkly expresses this need: *and sūfā al-muslimin bi‘l-rijāl* ("to keep the outposts [weak spots] of the Muslims supplied with men [literally, blocked, dammed up]").

How is this need filled? Aside from the attraction of earthly and heavenly rewards, a Muslim must be aware of the obligation upon the community. But not all who wish to fight may do so. The mujāhid must bring his own provi-
sions (mu'ād), weapons, equipment, and mount, all out of his own wealth. (551)
He must also provide money for his dependents during his absence. (552) Only one who can provide (waqāda) these things enters the category of those upon whom the performance of the farāḍ al-jihād is incumbent. All others are exempt. (553) Shāfi'i cites the Qur'ān (9:91-92, see above, 4.3.2), as the basis for the principle that not only those who are physically weakened, but also those who do not have enough money to equip themselves, are exempt from the jihād.

A healthy man who lacks (lān yajid) a mount, weapons, or sufficient money for his dependents, should estimate the time he will be absent on campaign. If he comes up with (waqāda) only part of what he requires, he must be considered as belonging to the class of those who are unable to equip themselves. (554) If he arrives at the frontier, and then runs out of the prerequisites, or falls sick, he has a legitimate excuse (ṣara min ahl al-'udhr), and may return home. (555)

This system presents obvious difficulties. The initial investment lies beyond the means of most potential soldiers, however great the promise of earthly spoils and heavenly reward. It should be mentioned that in all of this, Shāfi'i mentions neither fay' nor 'atā'.
4.4.4.2 Tatawwu' Shafi'i outlines a first solution to this problem. If a man goes on campaign, and then runs out of the prerequisites (qāra minna la yajidu), he is allowed to return home. However, Shafi'i recommends (wa-kāna ababba ilayya) that such a person remain with the army as a volunteer.\footnote{Umm, IV, 84. Wa-yatawwa'u li-an-nahu idhā lam yajid fa-huwa mutatawwi' bi'l-ghaww.}

It is usually understood that the mutatawwi'un (or, better, muttawwi's) were men who took part in the campaigns either for less pay than the regular troops received\footnote{Cl. Cahen, "Djaysh," EI2, II, 505.} or for none at all.\footnote{Haldon and Kennedy, "The Arab-Byzantine Frontier in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries," p. 110.} Because of a well-known passage in Ibn Hawqal, we know that in the fourth/tenth century muttawwi's lived in Tarāsūs in barracks funded by awqāf maintained by their province of origin.\footnote{Ibn Hawqal, pp. 183-184; Haldon and Kennedy, loc. cit.} But the situation in the Umayyad and early Abbasid periods is less clear. In Baladhuri's Futūḥ, we find muttawwi's in al-Massīgra. Here they are considered distinct from the regular soldiers, the jund. And when al-Mahdī assumed the caliphate, he provided for pay for two thousand men in al-Massīgra, but he did not grant them qata'i', since it [al-Massīgra] was already garrisoned by regular soldiers and volunteers.\footnote{Futūḥ, p. 166. Wa-ismā' 'istakhbara al-mahdī faraqa bi'il-Massīgra li-sayraj wal-lam yuqti'hi li-an-nahā qad kānat shḥinat min al-jund wa'il-muttawwi'ā.}

We find a similar situation in nearby al-Mūrūnīyya.\footnote{Ibid., p. 171, using similar language. The date 183 should be changed to the early 160's (above, 3.4). This earlier date harmonizes with the events in al-Massīgra just mentioned.}
4.4.4.3 *Ju'l* paid by the Sultan

The topic of *ju'l* for the soldiers appears in several places in Shafi'i's discussion. It amounts to a second solution to the problem described above. Shafi'i never explicitly connects *ju'l* with his suggestion that the indigent fighter should become a *mutawwi'*a. The relation between the *mutawwi'*as and the ghurāt remains somewhat hazy.(562)

According to Shafi'i, one may never accept *ju'l* from an individual. If a man goes on campaign in exchange for such a *ju'l*, he must return home and reimburse the one who paid it.(563) However, Shafi'i does permit fighters to accept *ju'l* from the government (min al-sultan), and only from the government.(564)

A man who goes to perform jihad must return home if he is summoned by a parent (if that parent is Muslim) or a creditor (of any religion).(565) However, this principle does not apply if he has made a contract of *ju'l* with the sultan.(566) The sultan, on its part, may not reclaim its *ju'l*, even if the soldier becomes incapacitated during the campaign. This is because of the nature of the obligation incurred: *wa-laysa inahu al-rajū* fī *'i-ju'l iš-an-nahu ḥaqiq in ḥaqihi akhabahu wa-khuwa yasta'ubuhu* ("The sultan] may not renge on the *ju'l* because it is a right of his which he has assumed, and which obligates him [the sultan]").(567)

(562) As it is in Cahen, *loc. cit.*

(563) *Umm*, IV, 87.

(564) *Umm*, IV, 87. *Inmaš ašatū inahu bādhā min al-sūlṭān annahu yağhūwa bi-shay' in min šālihi.*


(566) *Umm*, IV, 87. The sultan must let him return if he becomes incapacitated on campaign.

(567) *Umm*, IV, 87.
4.4.4.4 Qillat al-wujūd

Elsewhere, Shāfī'I describes what amounts to a third solution. Here the word *ju'll* does not appear. Shāfī'I says that the sultan may detain soldiers on campaign (against their will) only in one case: that of a soldier who sets out *bi-qillat al-wujūd*. This could mean either 1) with insufficient supplies and weapons (*ma'jada* is the term which Shāfī'I uses for this throughout), or 2) in exchange for sustenance (as in *istaqalla* = "having enough money to make the journey on one's own"). In either case, the result is the same: the sultan must keep these men supplied and equipped (*fa-'iṣlaḥū an yuʿṭiyahum ḥattā yakūna wājīdan*).(568)

A soldier who has accepted this help must remain on the jihād until the end of the campaign; that is, the sultan has the right to detain him. However, a soldier who has declined this help from the sultan may leave the campaign.(569)

It seems fairly clear that both in the passage on *ju'll* paid by the sultan and in the passage on *qillat al-wujūd*, Shāfī'I is alluding to the same thing, even though he does not use the word *ju'll* in the latter. It is tempting to assimilate the poor *muttaqawī* to this system: that is, when Shāfī'I says that the indigent mujāhid should become (or indeed, already is) a *muttaqawī*,(570) he means that he should accept *ju'll* from the sultan.

---

(568) *Umm*, IV, 87. It is difficult to see how this could refer to giving *ṣūq*, since this subject has not come up anywhere in the discussion, and the words *an yuʿṭiyahum* could simply mean "that he give to them."

(569) *Umm*, IV, 87-88.

(570) *Umm*, IV, 86; above, 4.4.4.2.
4.4.6.5 Raďkh

What is the source of the money and supplies which the sultan gives by way of ju'li? Shâfi'i mentions in several places that the Prophet made discretionary payments (raďkhâ) or gave presents (ahdâh) to women, slaves, and minors who took part in the battle. (571) These people were not allotted regular shares from the booty; and if the Imam gives such raďkh or āhdâh, he should make the amount of the gift less than that of a regular share.

We come closer to an answer in another of Shâfi'i's cases: that of a mushrik who helps the Muslims by acting as a guide or showing them the enemy's weak spots. Shâfi'i recommends that such a person not receive anything from the fay'. Instead, he should receive a wage (wa-yusta'jaru ijaratan). This money must come from māl lā sālik lahu bi-'aynīhi wa-huwa ghafr sahr al-nabî. This seems to mean "money which has no determinate owner, [and which is] not the Prophet's share"—that is, from the other four fifths of the spoils, before they have been divided up and assigned to owners. This raďkh should in any case be less than the amount of a regular share. (572)

The helpful mushrik receives a wage (wa-yusta'jaru ijaratan). This is like the recipient of ju'li, who in the ḥadîth (though not in these pages of Shâfi'i) is constantly referred to as an ājîr. If the analogy is correct, then the ājîr, who receives raďkh, is given a discretionary "gift" out of the spoils—but in any case, not out of the fay'.

(571) Umm, IV, 86, 88-89.

(572) Umm, IV, 89-90. At IV, 88, it is stated that raďkh comes from the ghanîma.
4.4.4.6 The ajīr

Elsewhere, in a chapter on division of the spoils, Shāfi‘ī discusses the ajīr. He notes three opinions concerning the ajīr who sets out intending to perform jihād: 1) He is awarded a share; 2) he must choose between receiving a share, while relinquishing his wage, or receiving the wage, while relinquishing the share; or 3) he receives only ṭāfkh. Shāfi‘ī expresses no preference among these three views, and then goes on to discuss other cases such as women and dhimma (for whom Shāfi‘ī recommends ṭāfkh but no share).

Shāfi‘ī’s discussion of the ajīr parallels that of Mālik and the Ḥanafīs (particularly in that the ajīr is considered together with women, slaves, dhimma, etc.). However, Shāfi‘ī’s ajīr could very well be taken to mean a recipient of ju‘l—which could not happen in the case of Mālik and the Ḥanafīs (see above, 4.4.2.3, 4.4.3.2). In any case, it would be difficult to reconcile what Shāfi‘ī says here about the ajīr with his teachings on ju‘l, which are in a different place.

4.4.4.7 Takhalluf

Shāfi‘ī outlines what we may call a theory of takhalluf. As stated above (4.4.4.1), one who remains behind does not incur blame for neglecting the jihād, if a sufficient number of Muslims perform it. When the Prophet went on his expeditions, he used to leave behind a certain number of trustworthy men (rija‘l as-rūfūn). He often stayed at home himself. Furthermore, the amīr in charge of a frontier zone may not send all the inhabitants of an encampment (dār) on expedition, without leaving behind enough soldiers to protect the encampment from the enemy. Therefore, if the Muslims in that

(573) Umm, IV, 70; cf. IV, 85.
(574) Umm, IV, 90.
encampment are few in number, none of them should go out on campaign. They
should stay in the *ribāṭ al-jihād*, with their provisions.\(^{(575)}\)

Thus, duty in a frontier fortress, a *thaghri*\(^{(576)}\) may constitute perform­
ance of *jihād*, even if one does not actively attack the *mushrikūn*. And from
this we may derive a justification for supplying the garrison of Malatya with
*ju’il*: even though they are settled in the town, they nonetheless retain the
status of *mujāhidūn*.

Shāfi‘ī goes on to say that if the *ribāṭ al-jihād* are secure (*mustātan‘a‘a*),
under no immediate threat from the enemy, then the most the amīr may do is to
send one of every two men on expedition. The one who stays behind takes
responsibility for the family and property of the one who goes away.\(^{(577)}\)

Shāfi‘ī bases this one-out-of-two rule on a tradition according to which
the Prophet applied this rule to the Muslims while preparing for the expedi­tion
against Tabuk.\(^{(578)}\) This is in fact the only prophetic tradition
bearing upon the (larger) question of *ju’il* of which Shāfi‘ī shows any knowl­
edge.

Shāfi‘ī’s writings on *ju’il* and related subjects constitute the first
approach to an integrated theory on these matters. He seems to have been the
first to state openly that the *sultan* must play the most important role. He
also brought into his thinking on this subject the vital principle that in
frontier posts (*ribāṭ al-jihād*), all are *mujāhidūn*.

\(^{(575)}\) *Umm*, IV, 91. *Wa-kāna hā’ulā‘i fi ribāṭ al-jihād wa-nuzulihim.*

\(^{(576)}\) *Umm*, IV, 91-92.

\(^{(577)}\) *Umm*, IV, 91. *Fa-yakhlufu ‘l-muqlmu ‘l-za‘ina fi ahlihi wa-malihi.*

\(^{(578)}\) *Umm*, IV, 91.
4.4.5 The Ḥanbalīs

In the scanty references to this subject which have survived in early Ḥanbalī literature,(579) the word ḥumlān does not appear. However, the Musnad of Ḥānumad contains much of the hadith on this subject.(580) It appears that the early position of the school resembled that of Shāfī'ī, in permitting some sort of payment to fighters from the community, but not from individuals.

4.4.5.1 Ḥumlān

Ṭuhmād declares himself opposed to ḥumlān (involving mounts), and to any donation "unless it is given disinterestedly" (illā an yu'tā 'an ghayri tahrīf nafsin Hay hī). Failing this, it is better to perform ghāzī without a horse; or else (as last choice) to perform ribāt.(583) This resembles the position of Shāfī'ī, that it is all right to take from the sultan, but not from a private individual.

4.4.5.2 Ju'l

There is a passage in Khiraqi's Mukhtasar which served Ibn Qudāma as a basis for constructing a full theory; but here, Ibn Qudāma in effect performed his own ijtihād, in order to extract "the intent (ma'na) of Ṭuhmād and Khiraqi." This passage is as follows.

(579) Nothing appears on this in the books of Maṣā'il al-Imam Ṭuhmād by his son Abdallāh and by Abū D āwūd.
(580) III, 34-35, 49, 55, 91; IV, 150, 179-180, 243-244, 344, 386; V, 413.
(582) Ibid., #1635. Qala [Ṭuhmād] na'm qad kāna 'l-nāsu yujāhhi'ina wa-ya'khudhūna wa-yaghdhūna lā ba'se.
(583) Ibid., #1633.
If the amîr hires a group (qawm) to go on campaign with the Mus­lims because of the benefit [accruing to the latter from their presence], no share should be allotted to them. They should be given [the wage] for which they were hired. (584)

This situation has already appeared in the early jurists. (585) Khiraqi does not use the words ajîr and ju'îl, but the situation resembles the one described with ju'îl.

Ahmad's position, says Ibn Qudâma, (586) was that an imâm who hires a qawm to accompany him on campaign should give them no share of the spoils. Such a qawm consists of people who are under no obligation to perform jihâd, such as slaves and kuffâr. But may free Muslim males accept wages for performing jihâd? This statement of Ahmad and Khiraqi, says Ibn Qudâma, may be understood as applying to those for whom the jihâd is not a personal obligation (li-sâm lam yata'ayyin 'alayhi)--a category which extends to free Muslim males, since jihâd "is not limited to those seeking to draw near to God" (wa-li-annhu waq idh yakhitsqu fâ'ilahu an yekûna min ahl al-qurba). One may hire people to perform it just as one may hire them to build a mosque. Ibn Qudâma then reverts to more conventional language, by stating that jihâd, unlike the pilgrimage, is not a farâd 'ayn, and that the constant need for soldiers justifies the payment of ju'îl.

Ibn Qudâma then takes on the hadîth, where he manages to find support for this position.

(584) Khiraqi, Mukhtasar, p. 204. Wa-iddâ 'sta'jara al-amir qawman yaghdiruna wa'a al-Muslimin li-manafsii'ihim lam yusham liham wa-n'zii sii 'sta'jiru bihi.

(585) Tabarî, Ikhtilaf al-fuqaha', p. 21, ll. 10-12; Shâfi'I, Umm, IV, 70; VII, 177.

(586) The following passage occurs in Mughânî, IX, 303-304.
4.4.5.3 The ajir

Ibn Qudama declares, on the basis of the sunna of the prophet, that the recipient of ju'1 should receive no share of the spoils. He then acknowledges an opposing position, that of the Ḥanbali al-Khallāl (d. 311), whom Ibn Qudama cites as stating (587) that Ahmad's position was that the ajir receives a share of the spoils (the underlying principle being that all those who take part in the fighting receive shares). Here we have a clear example of the ambiguity of the word ajir. Ibn Qudama's argument up to this point has clearly been about the recipient of ju'1 (ajir in the sense in which it usually appears in the prophetic hadith). Ahmad, as cited here by Khallāl, refers to ajir in the sense of personal servant or camp follower.

However, Ibn Qudama seems aware of this shift. His solution is that the ajir should be allotted a share if he was among the mujāhidūn, and went with the intention of fighting. (588) But as for those who receive something out of the fay' or the ṣadaqa, Ibn Qudama says that they receive shares in any case, because their ju'1 (Ibn Qudama here does not use this word) is not paid in exchange for their jihād, but is rather a ṣaqqu ja'ālahu 'llāhu lāhum li-yaghzū, (589) that is, "a right [of theirs] which God has made for them, in order for them to go to war."

(587) Probably in his Kitāb al-jāmi' li-ʿulūm Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal (see Sezgin, OAS, 1, 512).

(588) According to the old Ḥanafī understanding of the ajir (Ṭabarī, Ikhtilāf, p. 21; see above, 4.4.3.2), he would not be an ajir at all if he set out with the intention of fighting.

(589) The edition omits the quiescent alif of ṣaqqu, but the sentence makes no sense without it.
4.4.6 Ijāra and Ju’l

The early Hanafi school construed ju’l as a transaction between two individuals. The reason for this may be that, in their search for legal analogies, the old ahl al-ra’y assimilated a certain form of payment to the Islamic law of hire as they understood it. This is where we must next look for clues.

The Islamic law of hire bears a strong resemblance to the Roman. In both systems, ijāra (locatio conductio operarum, the hire of services) is a purely consensual contract which has as its object the benefits (manāfi’) which derive from a piece of work. The prerequisites of ijāra are that the stipulated work 1) must represent a service capable of being assigned a concrete value, 2) it must be determinate, 3) possible, and 4) licit. These same prerequisites also apply to kira’, the hire of a thing (locatio conductio rei). Ijāra is not valid in the case of an aleatory or undetermined transaction, which depends on the result of the work in question. This is likely to have been a sticking point for the early Islamic jurists. For while hired soldiers produce benefits for the community, the results of their efforts can never be known in advance.

---


(591) Roman law recognizes two broad categories of contract, the consensual and the formal. The former arises from agreement among the parties rather than from abiding by specific forms. Hire (locatio conductio) is one of four consensual contracts ordinarily recognized by Roman law. I would like to thank Mr. David Eisenberg for his help on this.


(595) Khiraqī, Mukhtasar, p. 209, *idhā ’sta’jara al-umr qawmān...ls-manāfi’ alhm...*. See above, 4.4.5.1.
The special form of hire known in Roman law as *locatio conductio operis* has in Islamic law the technical name of *ju'l* or *ju'ala*. This form of hire has as its object the completed piece of work or finished product. *Ju'l* is the contract formed if someone hires a builder to build him a house in return for a specified sum to be paid upon completion of the task, or when someone promises a reward to whoever will return to him an object which he has lost. (596) It is not a purely consensual contract: until the work has begun, the one who has undertaken to perform it may withdraw his offer. (597)

This form apparently allowed more room for an indeterminate element. (598) Nonetheless, the jurists would soon have encountered problems in applying this form to soldiers' pay. For while a contract of *ju'l* (in this more general sense) has a certain aleatory character, it still requires that the task ("\'amal") in question be exactly determined, according to its nature. Furthermore, the *musta'jir* (*conductor operis*) must himself have an interest in the work. The compensation may not be uncertain or aleatory. (599)

The problem remains that the outcome of war is always uncertain; and that in any case the value of victory cannot be precisely determined. (Spoils of war are a separate issue, one which does not involve the law of hire with its *quid pro quo*).

-------------------


(597) Ibid., II, 271.

(598) Ibid., II, 270: "The more or less aleatory nature of this contract did not escape the notice of the Muslim jurists, who nonetheless found justification for it in the Qur'an [12:72], in tradition," and in consen­sus.

(599) Ibid., II, 270-271.
The jurists encountered another difficulty, which we may easily see in the hadith. In their discussions of the law of hire, the jurists use the words *ajr* and *ajra* more or less interchangeably. (600) But in matters of jihad the word *ajr* had, or came to acquire, the theologically loaded meaning which it has in the Qur'ān. (601) One might describe Qur'ān 9:111 (God has bought the believers' wealth and lives in exchange for Paradise, see above, 4.3.1) as a contract, but it remains impossible to interpret such a "contract" in terms of services and remuneration, in particular with the precision required by Islamic law.

This attack on theological grounds appears in the hadith on (military) *ja‘ā’il*. The words *ajr* and *ajlr* thus acquired the equivocal meanings which we see in some of the jurists' writings and in the hadith.

4.5 The Hadith

It is impossible to say precisely how the hadith developed, and in what order. The following presentation gives only a rough (though plausible) chronology.

4.5.1 Ṭabī‘is

ʿAbd al-Razāq ibn Ḥammān (d. 211) reports in his *Husannaf* that he learned from Ma‘mar ibn Ṣāhid (d. 154) that he [Ma‘mar] once asked al-Zuhri (d. 124) about *ja‘ā’il*. Zuhri replied, "If a man accepts it so as to fortify himself there is nothing wrong" (*idha‘ akbadhahu ‘l-rajulu yataqawwa bī bi fa-la ba‘sa*). (602)

(600) E. Tyan, "Idjār, idjāra," E12, III, 1017.

(601) 4:95 is likely to have been important here: *wa-faddala ‘llahu ‘l-mujāhidīna ‘alā ‘l-qā‘idīna ajfan ‘aslam*.

(602) ʿAbd al-Razāq, *Husannaf*, V, 239, #9458. The editor, H.R. al-A‘zamī,
Zuhri's reply, which has something of the character of a maxim, provides us with a starting point. For here, beyond Zuhri, we have no isnād at all; rather, we may have an instance of what Schacht called Umayyad administrative practice as the starting-point of Muslim jurisprudence. (603) Zuhri was, of course, closely associated with the Umayyads. (604)

We have another ṭabā'ī tradition in support of ja‘īl from Maymūn ibn Mihrān (d. 116 or 117). (605) However much Maymūn may have inclined to ṭashâyyu‘, he was put in charge of both the kharāf and the qāḍī of al-Jazīra during the reign of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. Like Zuhri, he enjoyed the admiration of that caliph. (606) If ju‘l became a legal problem under the Umayyads, then the qāḍī of the frontier province of al-Jazīra would have been precisely the man called upon to pronounce upon it. (607)

reports that in one of his ms. (q), the word bi-daynīhi is inserted after akhādhabu. It is not clear which ms. he means by this: at I, 8, we are promised a discussion of manuscripts in some future volume (unspecified), but no such discussion seems ever to have been included. According to A‘zāmī’s own rumūs, s does not indicate sahih, and in any case, no such phrase occurs on Bukhārī or Muslim. If q means asl, it is again not clear what this means. In any case, this bi-daynīhi stands in only one ms.; and in the echoes of this phrase which we find in the hadith, it never reappears. However, the possibility exists that the bi-daynīhi version was the earliest form, subsequently altered.

(603) Origins, pp. 190f., esp. 198, 204-205.


(605) Shāybānī, Siyār, p. 97; tr. Khadduri, Islamic Law of Nations, pp. 85-86; above, 4.4.1. The isnād is Maymūn–Abū ‘Uṣuf—‘a shaykh.

(606) Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, X, 391. For ‘Umar’s admiration of Zuhri, see Ḍhahābī, Ta‘rīkh al-Islām, V, 391; Ibn Ḥajar, IX, 449, “There is no one more learned than he in sunna madiya.”

We thus have two traditions which we might call fragments of Umayyad administrative law. The other tabi'I traditions which we have seem mostly to represent the tradition of Kufa. Ibrahim al-Nakha'i allows je'a'il in principle and himself gives ju'l to a man who takes his place in an expedition. We also find Ibrahim stating more guarded approval, "It is better to give [ji'ala] than to receive." Ibrahim al-Nakha'i allows ja'sil in principle and himself gives ju'l to a man who takes his place in an expedition. We also find Ibrahim stating more guarded approval, "It is better to give [ji'ala] than to receive." (611)

Masруq is also said to have paid ju'l to someone who took his place. But elsewhere Masруq is associated with disapproval of je'a'il, together with the Kufan al-Aswad (ibn Yazid al-Nakha'i, d. 74 or 75) and the Medinese 'Ikrima (d. 105). (613) This would indicate that the early jurists (including the Iraqis) were not all in agreement on this matter. (614) However, the opinions expressed by tabi'Is are mostly in favor of ja'a'il.

(608) See above, 4.4.3.1-3. Maymun ibn Mihran was a Kufan who went to live in al-Raqqa.

(609) Shaybani, Siyar, p. 97; Islamic Law of Nations, p. 85.

(610) Shaybani, Siyar, pp. 96-97; Islamic Law of Nations, p. 84.

(611) 'Abd al-Razzag, Nuṣannaf, V, 231, #9463. Ibrahim--Mansur ibn al-Nu'man (Kufan, d. 132)--al-Thawri (d. 161)--Abu Ishaq--Abu Yusuf--Shaybani.

(612) Shaybani, Siyar, pp. 96-97; Islamic Law of Nations, p. 84.

(613) Ibn Abi Shayba, Muṣannaf, V, 347.

(614) Contradiction occurs yet again: al-Aswad, asked by Ibrahim (al-Nakha'i), states approval of the practice of accepting ju'l and then paying someone else in turn (a smaller amount). Ibn Abi Shayba, V, 346.

(615) These also include (Muhammad) Ibn Sirin (Kufan, d. 110), al-Nu'man ibn Abi 'Ayash (Medinese, n.d.), and 'Abd al-Nasir ibn Yazid al-Nakha'i (Kufan, brother of al-Aswad, d. 73 or 83). Ibn Abi Shayba, V, 347-348.
Most interesting for our purposes is the statement attributed to Makhūl (Syrian, d. between 112 and 118), (616) "that he saw nothing wrong with ju'l in the tribe" (annahā la yarā bi'l-ju'l fi 'l-qabila ba'se'n). (617) This brings to mind the phrase from Baladhurī with which this chapter began. The meaning of al-ju'l fi 'l-qabila remains obscure, and seems to imply a transaction within one tribe. In any case, the association of ju'l with tribes may here be assigned to (Umayyad) Syria. From the isnād of this tradition, we may also detect a connection with the thughūr themselves. (618)

The thughūr traditions provide evidence of disagreement among the early authorities of all the important centers. For the most part, however, they may be said to embody a Kufan position in favor of ju'l, which is understood as a one-to-one procedure. This position seems to coincide with Umayyad practice.

4.5.2 Ṣaḥābīs

4.5.2.1 Attack

Opposition to ja'ā'il is expressed by 'Abdallāh ibn 'Umar.

The man who stays [at home] used to give a donation to the warrior. But as for a man's selling his own ghazw, I don't know what that is.

Rāba 'l-qā'īdu yamnālīt 'l-ghāziya [following Aʿzami's emendation yamnātu for yamnāʿ] fa-sannā an yabi'a 'l-raji'lu ghazwahu fa-lā adār lu 'humā. (619)

(616) That the Syrian Makhūl is meant here seems borne out by the transmission from the Damascene Saʿīd ibn Ḥab al-ʿAzīz (d. 127 or 128) to ʿĪsā ibn Abī ʿIshāq (d. 187 or 191 in al-Ḥadath).

(617) Ibn Abī Shayba, V, 346-347.

(618) Saʿīd ibn Ḥab al-ʿAzīz (Damascene, d. 127 or 128)→ ʿĪsā ibn Abī ʿIshāq (d. 187 or 191 in al-Ḥadath). ʿĪsā [ibn Yunus] ibn Abī ʿIshāq was a Kufan who settled in the thughūr. See below, 5.4.4.

(619) 'Abd al-Razzāq, Muṣannaf, V, 230, #9495. The isnād is Basran: Ibn
Surprisingly, this tradition does not reappear in the hadith. A possible reason for this is Ibn 'Umar's phrase "selling his ghazw." Military *ju'f* was considered a form of hire and not of sale; and the attack on it came to focus on the concept of *ajr*, or reward/wage. (620)

But while Ibn 'Umar condemns what appears to be a new practice, a *bid'a*, he does state approval here for the established practice of giving donations. It will be remembered that in the *nuwass* Ibn 'Umar set the precedent for such donations (see above, 4.4.2.1). In fact, the pattern in this tradition of approval of the *sunnah* of donations, together with rejection of the *bid'a* of *ju'f*, reflects the position of Mālik (above, 4.4.2.1-2).

In another tradition of Ibn 'Umar we find the opposition coming nearer to the line of attack which later became standard. The obscure figure Shaqīq ibn 'Izar al-Asadi (above, 4.2.1) asks Ibn 'Umar about *ja'ā'il*. He replies, "I don't accept bribes, except for the bribe which God offers me" (*īaam akun la-artsīb ilīa ma rashāni 'illa hu*). (621) Here we have wordplay on yet another meaning of *ju'f* (="bribe", see Lane s.v. *ristaw*).

In later hadith this equivocation was always expressed through the word *ajr*. This may explain why this tradition, like the one previously discussed, had no *forties*. Its Kufan isnād (Shaqīq [n.d.]--Al-Zubayr ibn 'Adi [Kufan, d. 131]--Al-Thawrī—'Abd al-Razzaq) indicates opposition within the very

---

(620) Ibn al-Athir, *Aṣlīhāyā*, I, 276, is an exception. But Ibn al-Athir cites this tradition in a curiously altered version which reflects later developments in the hadith. Qāla [Ibn 'Umar] la aghṣī 'alī 'ajr wa-la abi 'u ajru min al-jihād. The quibbling over *ajr* is characteristic of the prophetic hadith (see below, 4.5.3.2).

group which supposedly advocated *ju'ila* as a "school" position. Note that the attack is now on theological grounds.

Later we find Ibn 'Umar supplanted by his father as the authority for the practice of donations (now becoming combined with *qualān*).

Mujahid said, "I said to Ibn 'Umar, '[Let's go] to war!' He said, 'I wish to help you with some of my money.' I said, 'God has been bountiful to me.' He said, 'Keep your money. I wish for my own money to be on this expedition' (*wa*īf). 'Umar said, "There are people who take from [other people's] money so as to perform jihad, and who then don't do this. If someone acts in this manner, we have a greater right to his money, and may take back what he took." Tawus and Mujahid said, "If something is given to you for you to set out *fi sabīl Allāh*, do whatever you like with it, or keep it in your family." (622)

This composite tradition preserves an argument over how the recipient of these gifts may dispose of them. 'Umar elsewhere takes over the regulation of these matters, which become expressed as *qualān*. 'Umar runs off to the Prophet, who gives him a ruling which substantially agrees with the principle stated here by Tawus and Mujahid. (623)

The important point, however, is that in these *saḥābī* traditions we have defense of *sunna* (donations to warriors) combined with condemnation of *bid'a* (*ju'ila*). This corresponds to the position of Mālik.

---

(622) Bukhārī, *Saḥābī*, II, 241, (Jihad 119). "'Umar" does not seem to be a mistake for "Ibn 'Umar" here. Or rather, the confusion is more widespread: see Ibn Abī Shayba, V, 345, where Ibn Sirīn writes to 'Umar, and receives an answer resembling that of Ibn 'Umar quoted at the beginning of this section, *la ašī'u nasīhi min al-jihād*.

(623) Ibid.
4.5.2.2 Defense

The attack on ju`l did not come only from the Medinese: we have seen evidence of opposition from Iraq as well. To fend off these attacks coming both from within and without, the pro-ju`l Kufans had recourse to sahābi traditions of their own. They came up with the following:

Mu`awiya b. Abi Sufyān ordered the inhabitants of Kūfa to raise an army but he exempted Jarir [ibn `Abdallah, d. 51] and his son. Jarir said, "We would not accept [the exemption] but would give to the warrior a contribution from our property" (wa-lakinn3 naj`alu min amwilin lil-g8al). (624)

However, this tradition is exceptional, because the other sahābi traditions which we may connect with the Kufans are all concerned with the practice of takhalluf. These traditions go back either to Ibn `Abbas or to `Umar; it has already been shown that these traditions show Medinese (Ibn `Abbas) and Basran (`Umar) origins (above, 4.4.3.3). The Ibn `Abbas traditions in particular appear to have been stitched together from originally separate pieces.

[Ubayd ibn al-A`jam said:] I asked Ibn `Abbas about ja`l, when one of every four or three [Shaybānī: ten, five, six, or seven] of us was required to go. He answered, "If you make contributions of mounts or weapons, that is all right, but if you contribute a slave or a slavegirl, or small cattle [Shaybānī: household provisions], that is not permissible." (625)

(624) Shaybānī, Siyar, p. 97; Islamic Law of Nations, p. 86; Saraḵhāl, Sharh, I, 139; Nabūt, X, 20-21; above, 4.4.3.1.

It is not entirely clear what all this means: Ibn 'Abbas' reply does not quite fit the question. In Sarakhsi we find this statement from Ibn 'Abbas tacked onto a different question altogether. (626) One gets the impression that the element of takballuf has been added here to material having originally to do with donations or (less likely) ju`l.

We have seen that Shaybání in his Siyar mixed together traditions about (simple) ju`l and takballuf (above, 4.4.3.1, 4.4.3.3). The Kufans/early Hanafís also approved of donations. (627) They thus seem to have responded to the attack on ju`fi`l with a defense in depth, using everything they could find. As a result, the distinctions among these things became blurred. The Medinans/early Mälîkî position, on the other hand, emphasized the distinction between donations (including (humlan) and outright ju`l. We do not have here a debate between the Kufans and the Medinans, however, so much as two scholastic solutions to a problem, based to some extent upon the same material.

4.5.3 The Prophet

The traditions going back to the Prophet are demonstrably late. Mälîk has heard of none, apart from his mysterious reference to "after ḥumaynu" (above, 4.4.2.2). Shaybání in his Siyar lists traditions from Companions and Followers, but none from the Prophet. Even Shafi`I, who would be eager to base his teaching about ju`l on the sunna of the Prophet, knows only of one tradition (in two versions) about the Prophet practicing takballuf before the expedition to Tabuk (above, 4.4.4.7). On the other hand, Ahmad ibn Hanbal incorporated much of the prophetic material concerning ju`l into his Mausd (see above, 4.4.5), as did the compilers of al-kutub al-sitta. These traditions


(627) Shaybání, Muwatta`, p. 308; above, 4.4.2.1.
must therefore have entered circulation in the (very) late second and early third centuries.

The prophetic hadith on this subject has its own characteristics, which make it easier to classify than the earlier material.

4.5.3.1  

In only one instance do we find the Prophet openly declaring support for ju'lı.

Those of my umma who go on expedition and accept ju'lı with which to fortify themselves against their enemy are like the mother of Moses as she suckled her child while accepting her wage.

Mathalu 'lladhina yaghzūna 'ain ummatī wa-ya'khudāna '1-ju'lı yataqawwana 'alū 'aduwwihim mathalu ummatī ḥārā turqī'ū waladāhā wa-te'khudhū ajrahā.(628)

This tradition, which is mursal, probably originates in a relatively early stage of the debate. Ajr is used here as a parallel to ju'lı: the sense of "wage" still predominates.

This tradition echoes Qur'ān 2:261, mathalu 'lladhina yunflqūna amwilshum fi sabīlī 'ilāhī ka-mathalī ḥabbatin... (above, 4.3.1.1). It also incorporates the word yataqawwā from the maxim ascribed to Zuhrī (above, 4.5.1). Its (incomplete) isnad is Himsi.(629)
The sense of "hireling, camp follower" for this word has now all but disappeared. *Ajlr* now usually means recipient of *ju'lı*, usually with negative connotations. *Ajlr* refers both to the martyr’s reward and to the fighter’s (material) wage: these are now the terms of the debate. We accordingly no longer find *ju'lı* mentioned unless *ajlr* also appears. At times the words *ju'lı* and *ja'əb'il* do not appear at all, even where the argument is about *ju'lı*.

There is an important tradition reported in Abū Dāwūd’s *Sunan* and elsewhere, (630) where the word *qabā'il* appears prominently. This may have been one of Balādhurī’s sources. It will therefore be examined in some detail.

[From Abū Ayyūb. The Prophet said:] The *anṣār* will be opened for you, and armies will be mustered, to which you will be summoned [for military service]. And there will be someone among you who will not wish to answer the call to the armies, and so he will withdraw from his own people, and will search through the tribes, presenting himself to them, saying: “Who will accept compensation [from me for answering] this call?” Indeed, this man will remain a hireling to the last drop of his blood.


---------------------


(632) Some versions of this text have *man akfihī* instead of *man akfihī*. They are Bayhaqī, loc. cit., and Muttaqi, loc. cit.. In addition, Ḱa‘īlābādī (‘Ām al-‘asr bā‘d, VII, 200) notes the variant, *kadhā* fī ba‘d al-mā‘ṣa‘al. The jussive might make sense as shart of a conditional sentence having as its jauab the entire phrase beginning with *alā*. However, the absence of the particle *fa* makes the syntax of such a sentence impossible. This must simply be a question, in the imperfect (as translated above).
This text is somewhat obscure. One difficulty is that we incline at first to understand *wa-dhalika al-ajir* as noun plus demonstrative, "that hireling." However, the modern commentator 'Aṣimābādı stated that *wa-dhalika* is subject, *al-ajir* is predicate. If this is the case, then the man who leaves his tribe, and who asks the question *man akfihi ba'tha kadhā*, is not the one referred to as *wa-dhalika*. The latter must be the *ajir* hired by the former.

The early commentators do not seem to have dealt with this problem, but we may take this as the best solution: even if this (second) man fights (and dies), he remains a mere hireling, with a hireling's reward.

Our soldier thus remains an *ajir* to the last drop of his blood. A number of other traditions speak of the last drop of the martyr's blood. Tha'alibi's version is typical:

There is no drop dearer to God than a drop of blood [shed] in His way, or a teardrop [shed] in fear of Him in the middle of the night.

(633) 'Awn al-ma'būd VII, 200-201.

(634) Khaṭṭāḇi (d. 388), whose *Ma'ālim al-sunan* is quoted in *Awn al-ma'būd* and by Da'īs in his edition of ibn Dāwūd, does not seem to have considered this question. Mundhirī (d. 656) in his *Ash al-mawūd al-mawādūd* did not comment on this hadith (see *Awn al-ma'būd*, VII, 211), nor did al-Qāṣīyām al-Jawziyya (d. 751) in his *Tabāh两边 Suṣan Abī Dāwūd*. The extensive commentary by Mahsūd Muḥammad Khaṭṭāḇ al-Subkī, *Al-Manhal al-ṣadr al-mawūd* (Cairo, 1932-35) and its *takmila* by Amin Maṣṣūf Khaṭṭāḇ, *Fath al-malik al-ma'būd* (Cairo, 1955-) did not reach *Kitāb al-jihād*.

(635) For Khaṭṭāḇi this hadith constitutes proof of [the Prophet's] disapproval of *ja'ā'il*. The meaning of this tradition, says Khaṭṭāḇi, seems to be that if an agreement has been made for a man to perform jihād on behalf of one who pays a wage, and if the man then performs the *fard* by fighting in person, then the principle of the hiring (*ma'na al-ijara*) becomes void. The hireling becomes one of the group of fighters, and is granted a share of the spoils (with certain qualifications). Khaṭṭāḇi here bases his arguments on the reasoning of the jurists, to such an extent that he neglects the hadith itself. Unfortunately, he takes no notice of the word *qabā'il*.
The first drop of the martyr's blood effaces his sins. It also brings him to the hůrūs, or, better, it lets him see his place in heaven, marries him to the hůrūs, frees him from "the greatest fear" and from "the torture of the grave," and lets his taste of the sweetness of the faith.

The drop of blood provides a thematic connection to our ajīr. Its inclusion here apparently drives home the point that these delights will be denied him.

Like the tradition about the mother of Moses, this ḥadīth has a Himsī isnād. It is particularly interesting in its beginning (the Companion Abu Ayyūb, appropriate because of his status as hero and martyr in the war against Byzantium) and its end (Ībrāhīm ibn Mahdī al-Usuulī, proof for the diffusion of this tradition in the ṭughūr). But while this ḥadīth seems to have been made in Hims, it does not permit us to identify a Himsī "school position" on this issue, since one Himsī tradition is clearly in favor of juʿl, while the other implies disapproval.

(636) Thimār al-qulūb, p. 34, §24. Cf. Tirmidhī, Sunan, V, 377, #1669 (Jihad 26); Muttaqī, Kanz, IV, 410, §1155.


(638) Ibn Abī Shayba, V, 301.

(639) Ahmad, Musnad, IV, 200; Kanz, IV, 410, §11152.

(640) The full chain is: Abu Ayyūb (d. 52)—Ibn Abī Ayyūb (=Abū Sawra, n.d., see Ibn Ḥajar, Tahāsib, XII, 124. He was damned by all the rījāl authorities except Ibn Hībbān. Ibn Dā'ī in said that he transmitted from some other Abu Ayyūb)—Yahyā ibn Jābir al-Ṭāʾī (Himsī, d. 126)—Sulaymān ibn Sulaym al-Khūlī al-Kalbī (Himsī, d. 147)—Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd (Himsī, d. 192 or 194). At this point the chain bifurcates, but it is remarkable that the next link in both versions is Himsī. Ahmad’s last link is Yazīd ibn Ṭabābatābī (Himsī, d. 224, Ibn ʿAbd, XI, 344-345). In Abu Dāwūd and Bayḥaqī, we have ʿAmr ibn ʿUthmān ibn ʿAbd al-Qurashi, who died in the 220's and was a descendant of a mawla of the Umayyads; he transmits to Ibrāhīm ibn Mahdī al-Usuulī (d. 224 or 225).
We may note also that it is once again Syrians who associate ju'f with tribes, and theghris who keep this association alive through their transmission of hadith (above, 4.5.1).

'Abdallâh ibn 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ is the reporter of another Prophetic tradition on ju'f. (641) It has a primarily Egyptian isnâd, ending with two traditions bearing the niṣâb "al-Masšisi." (642)

The warrior gets his reward, and the giver of ju'f gets his reward, plus that of the warrior.

\[\text{Līl-ghāzi ajrū hu wa-jā'il ajrū hu wa-ajrū '1-ghāzi.}\]

This tradition is usually understood as permitting ja'ā'il. (643) However, it has a certain ambiguity. At first glance, it seems that the ghāzi receives only his wage (money), while the jā'īl receives his reward (Paradise) plus that of the ghāzi (money?). (644) One way to solve the puzzle is to say that both receive the ajr of Paradise, with a double reward for the jā'īl. Supporting this hypothesis are several traditions from the Prophet concerning double rewards: for instance, someone killed by the Râs receives

(641) Abû Dawûd, Sunan, III, 36-37 (Jihad 31); Bayhaqi, Sunan, IX, 28; Ibn Qudâma, Rughání, IX, 303, ii. 6-9.

(642) 'Abdallâh ibn 'Amr (d. 65 or 67; said variously to have died in Egypt, Palestine, Mecca, and Ta'if)— Shufayy ibn Mâti' (Egyptian, d. 105)—Husayn ibn Shufayy ibn Mâti' (Egyptian, n.d., described as "gā'if", Ibn Mâsîr, II, 340-341)— Bayhaqi, Sunan, IX, 28; Ibn Qudâma, Rughání, IX, 303, ii. 6-9.

(643) In Abû Dawûd it comes under the heading Râb al-rukhsa fi akhdh al-ju'f. Khâṭṭâbî understood it that way (Abû Dawûd, III, 35, n. 1.).

(644) Taṣâfi confronts a similar conundrum in Jāmî', X, 130. See above, 4.3.1.4.
the ajr of two martyrs. (645) Again, we do not know what this means. (646)

Another prophetic tradition has the effect of permitting ja'ā'il, while limiting the ajr of the warrior to the money he has received. (647)

Ya'la ibn Munya [also called ibn Qayyā] said: "The Messenger of God called for an expedition (ḥadās bi'l-ghazw) when I was an old man, and had no servant. I therefore sought an ajir to take my place (yakfini, cf. above, man aṣfih be'tha kadhā) who would receive his share from me as his wage (wa-ajri lāhu sahmahu). I found a man; and when the time for departure drew near, he came to me and asked if I knew what the shares were, and [said] 'what would be the amount of my share? Specify an amount, whether or not it is the [actual] amount of a share.' (648) And so I named three dinars. And when the time came for dividing the spoils, I named the [three] dinars. I went to the Prophet and mentioned his case to him. The Prophet said, 'All that I find for him for this campaign of his, both in this world and in the next, are the dinars which he specified'" (ma ajidu [lahu] fl ghazatihi hadhihi fl '1-dunya w a '1-akhirati ilia dananirahu 'llatl samma).

Here we have the question of whether the ajir (=servant) gets a share of the spoils, fused with the question of whether the ajr (=recipient of ju'l) receives a heavenly reward.

---------------------

(643) Abu Dawūd, Sunan, III, 13, §2488 (Jihad 8). See following section.

(646) To make matters worse, we have Ibn Qudāma (Hughā, IX, 303, 11. 8-9) citing a different version: ili-ghazi ajruhu wā-ili-ja'ā ilajruhu. This has the merit of making sense: the rewards are divided, to the apparent disadvantage of the ghazi. Ibn Qudāma understood this as a tradition favorable to ja'ā'il, in any case. However, this variant does not appear in any of the hadith collections or commentaries.

(647) Abu Dawūd, Sunan, III, 37, §2527 (Jihad 32); al-Ḫākin, Mustadrak, II, 112; Bayhaqī, Sunan, VI, 351; Muttaqī, Raws, IV, 516, §10781; Ibn Qudāma, Hughā, IV, 305, 11. 17-21.

(648) Following Da'īs, who prints al-sahm without vowels (making it possible to read al-sahm), rather than the Cairo 1935 edition, which vocalizes al-sahm.

(649) Ya'la ibn Munya--`Abdallāh ibn Firūz al-Daylamī (n.d., lived in Jerusalem, included among the "tābī'īs of the Syrians." Ibn Majār, V, 358-359)--Yahyā ibn Aḥm al-Saybānī (Hīmēl, a nephew of Awzā`ī, d. 148)--`Aṣīm ibn Ḥākim (Egyptian, d. 144 or 156 or 157)--`Abdallāh ibn Wahb (Egyptian, d. 197)--Aḥmad ibn Sālīh [known as Ibn al-Tābarī] (Egyptian, d. 248)--Abū Dawūd.
The isnād of this tradition brings together Egypt and Hims. The Egyptian Ibn Wahb is a link both in this chain and in that of the preceding tradition. Ibn Wahb was a follower of Mālik, who reportedly called him faqih Miṣr. However, one cannot describe this hadith as consonant with the Mālikī position, which condemns ju‘l outright.

What these five traditions do show is that the debate on ju‘l and the ajr continues only in Syria and, to some extent, Egypt. The Iraqi and Hijazi traditionists have no interest in prophetic hadith of this sort, being preoccupied with traditions about takhalluf. Conversely, Syrians do not figure in the isnāds of takhalluf traditions. Furthermore, it is only these (Syrian) traditions about ju‘l which find their way to the thughrūr (as we can see from these three traditions with the nisba “al-Massīṣī”).

4.5.3.3 Ajr al-shahīd

A number of traditions, not directly concerned with ja‘3‘l, give more details on the ajr of the martyr.

One who dies murābiṣan fi sabil Allāh receives the same ajr as a martyr. This is consonant with the position of Shāfi‘ī (above, 4.4.4.7).

We have seen that a warrior who dies fighting the Rūm receives a double reward (previous section). In similar fashion, a sea fighter prostrate from seasickness receives a martyr's reward; if he drowns, he receives double.

(650) Ibn Hajar, VI, 74; Sezgin, GAS, I, 446.

(651) Muttaqī, Kanz, IV, 324-327, nos. 10723, 10726, 10734, 10736. One of these (#10736), stresses the financial metaphor: wa-yuqta‘u lahu bi-rizqin min al-jannati.

(652) Abu Dawūd, Sunan, III, 15-16, #2693 (Jihād 10); Kanz, IV, 400, #11114. The isnād is Syrian.
Is God required to give this *ajr* to those who perish on an expedition? In a ḥadīth with a Syrian isnād, the Prophet answers affirmatively.\(^{(653)}\) In the case of a Muslim fighter who dies a non-combatant death, Paradise is also required (*wajibat labu al-janna*).\(^{(654)}\) However, this tradition (which has a mixed, partly Syrian isnād) adds the element of intention. It continues:

And whoever truthfully asks God for death [in battle], and then dies or is killed, receives the martyr's reward.

\[\text{Wa-man sa'ala 'llSba 'l-qatla min 'indi wāf'da gaddan thumma mata wuqtia fa-lahu ajru shahidin.}\]

The element of intention prevails in other traditions of this sort. 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb is asked about the *ajr* of those who perish on an expedition (is it incumbent on God?). 'Umar gives a long, careful answer, dividing the mujāhidūn according to their intentions. The true *shuhdā* are those who fight *ibtighå'a wahī 'llShi* ("for the sake of God").\(^{(655)}\) We then find the Prophet making a clear pronouncement:

If someone goes on expedition only with the intention [of obtaining] *'iqal*, then he receives what he intended.

\[\text{Hun baza wa'-huwa 13 yanwi ilia 'l-'iqalata fa-lahu m3 nawa.}\]

---

\(^{(653)}\) Al-Ḥakim, *Mustadrak*, II, 74. Abū ʿUmbāra al-Bāhili [Ṣudayy ibn ḤIJān] (d. 173)--Sulaymān ibn Ḥabīb al-Dimashqi al-Qādī (d. 218)--Sulaymān ibn Ḥabīb al-Dimashqi al-Qādī (d. 218)--Sulaymān ibn Ḥabīb al-Dimashqi al-Qādī (d. 218)--Sulaymān ibn Ḥabīb al-Dimashqi al-Qādī (d. 218). This tradition also occurs in the Husnad of Ahmad (V, 243-244), where the text adds: "even if he dies on his bed."

\(^{(654)}\) Mustadrak, II, 77. Maʿādh ibn Jabal ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʾAnsārī (d. 177)--Mālik ibn Yakhānīr (Mīṣā, d. 70 or 72)--Sulaymān ibn Ḥabīb al-Dimashqi al-Qādī (d. 115)--Ibn Jurayj (Mecan, d. 150)--Bakr ibn ʿUbāda [not ʿUbād, see Ibn ʿAjār, III, 293-296] (Baṣra, d. 205 or 207)--Qābūn [Abd al-Malik ibn Muḥammad al-Raqīṣ, see Ibn ʿAjār, VI, 419-421] (Baghdād, d. 276!!--Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥamūd. This tradition also occurs in the Musnad of Ahmad (V, 243-244), where the text adds: "even if he dies on his bed."


\(^{(656)}\) Mustadrak, II, 109.
If 'iqal here means the poor-rate, the ṣadaqa, then we may have here an indirect reference to the practice of ju'l. In any case, this principle applies not only to worldly goods, but also to worldly honor: a man who fights out of a desire for 'ird al-dunya receives no ajr. (657)

4.5.3.4 Ḫumlān

This is the practice of providing mounts to mujāhidūn who cannot afford them. In Qur'ān 9:91-92 (above, 4.3.2) it is closely associated with takhlluf— that is, involuntary mukhallafun may be helped in this way. Ḫumlān amounts to much the same thing as donations, and while these two things are distinct in their origins, they fuse together in the hadith.

'Umar ibn al-Khattāb is associated with this practice (above, 4.5.2.1). He once found that a horse which he had donated was being sold on the market. He wished to buy it, but the Prophet instructed him not to do so. The tradition is Medinese. (658)

Another (prophetic) tradition names no Companions at all, while deliberately evoking the circumstances of Qur'ān 9:92.

A man came to the Prophet and said: "My camel has become jaded. Give me a fresh one!" (innā ubdi's bī fa'ṣalīhu). He answered, "I have none." A man then said, "Messager of God, I will show him someone who can give him a mount." Whereupon the Messenger of God said, "Whoever shows [the way to] a good deed receives the same reward as the one who performs it" (man dalla 'alā khayrīn fa-lahu mithlu ajri fa'ilihi. (659)

(657) Mustadrak, II, 85.

(658) Bukhārī, Ṣeḥīḥ, II, 241 (Jihād 119); Tāhā Hājar, Fatḥ al-bārī, XII, 87. Ibn 'Umar (reporting about his father)—Nāfi‘ (d. 117)—Mālik—Imām al-Būyayyān (Abū Umāma). Another version, substantially the same, has 'Umar (reporting for himself)—Abū Usama (d. 80)—Zayd ibn Aslam (Medinese, d. 136)—Mālik—Suhaylī—Umayyī.

(659) Muslim, Ṣeḥīḥ, III, 1506 (Imāra 123); Bayhaqī, Sunan, IX, 28 (two versions).
Ajr did not appear in earlier material on donations and *humâla*. But equally strange is the fact that the isnâd of this hadith is Kufan. (660)

4.5.3.5 Takhalluf

This notion continues to grow in complexity. In its Qur'anic origins, it refers to (or derives from) the practice of staying home instead of going to war. Under certain circumstances, it is possible to have a legitimate excuse (*udhr*) for doing this. Among those who claimed such an excuse was the Prophet himself, who frequently stayed in Medina while the expeditions went out. He gives his reasons in a hadith which seems intended as a justification for takhalluf in general.

Were it not for my anxiety over my umma, I would never stay behind from any raid; however, [*Path al-barâl*: I cannot find a mount and] I cannot find mounts for them [Qur'an 9:92], and they are grieved if they have to lag behind me. And I wish I could fight in the way of God, be killed and then resurrected, and then fight, be killed, and resurrected. (661)

In earlier hadith, the practice of sending one of every two, four, or whatever, with those remaining being made responsible for keeping the fighter equipped and supplied, was grafted onto this general notion of takhalluf. This practice was first associated with Ibn 'Abbas and with 'Umar (above, 4.4.3.3; 4.5.2.2). Now we find the Prophet taking responsibility for it.

[The Prophet] sent a levy of soldiers from Hudhayl against the Banû Liyân, and said: "Let one of every two men join the expedition. They will share the ajr between them" (Li-yanba'th min

---


The various isnâds are predominantly Basran. (663) Does ajr here indicate (worldly) wage? We find interpolations made, with the usual quibbling on this word.

[As above] Then the Messenger of God said, "O God, bless us according to our measure, and make the blessing twofold" (Allâhu hamma bârîk la-nâ âl-ajrû baynabuma). (664)

Elsewhere we find yet another interpolation.

[The Prophet said] to the one who stayed behind: "Whoever of the two of you takes the place of the one who leaves, taking care of his family and possessions, will receive half the ajr of the one who leaves.

Wa-qala illâ qâ'idî sâyukûnâ khalâfa 'î-khârijâ fi âhîhî wa-nâlîhî bi-khâyrihâ kûn lâhu mishlih nisfî 'î-ajrî 'î-khârijî. (665)
Here we have yet another sense of the root *khalafa* grafted onto this already quite entangled outgrowth of the hadith. *Khalaftuhu* means, according to Lane, "I was, after him, a substitute for him, I supplied his place." Similarly, *khalafa fulān fi al-hālihi* means "he became his *khalifa* among, or in respect of, his family." This phrase occurs once in the Qur'ān, when Moses asks Aaron to perform this office for him. It is applied in the case of someone who has died: *khalafa ilāhi laka bi-khayrīn*, "may God give thee good in the place of that which has gone from thee."

This sense of the verb *khalafa* becomes mixed in the hadith with the other one, *takhalluf* (the simple form *khalafa* is also allowed) *'an al-qawm*, "he remained behind, or after, the people, or party, not going with them." The Prophet expressed this "enlarged" notion of *takhalluf* in a hadith which circulated widely.

> Whoever equips a warrior has [in effect] gone to war himself, and whoever takes his place [acts as guardian] for his family, has gone to war himself.

> Han jahhaza ghaziyan [fi sabili 'llahi] fa-qad ghaza wa-am hāla shūlafahubu [fi sabili 'llahi] [bi-khayrīn] fa-qad ghaza.(667)

The isnāds are both Basran and Medinese.(668)

---


(667) Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, III, 1506, 1507 (Masāra 135); Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, III, 35-36 (Jihād 21), #2309; further at Wensinck, Concordances, I, 391.

(668) Muslim, III, 1507: Zayd ibn Khālid al-Juḥanī (Medinese, some say Euṣṭ, d. 78, Ibn Majar, III, 410-411)—Busr ibn Sa'īd (Medinese, d. 100)—Abū Sa‘īda [Ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān] (Medinese, d. 94 or 104, Ibn Majar, XI, 115-118)—Yaḥyā ibn Abī Kathīr (as above)—Munayn al-Mu‘allim—Yasīd ibn Zayrīy (Basran, d. 182)—Abū ‘l-Rahī al-Zahrānī [Sulaymān ibn Dāwūd] (Basran, d. 234). Muslim III, 1506: Zayd—Busr—Bukayr ibn al-Asbajj (Medinese, d. 117 or 120)—‘Amr ibn al-Wārith (Medinese, went to Egypt, d. 147 or 148)—'Abdallah ibn Wahb (Egyptian, d. 197)—Sa‘īd ibn Manṣūr.
Elsewhere we find further refinements. In a Medinese tradition of 'Umar, the Prophet says:

Whoever shades the head of a warrior will be shaded by God on the Judgement Day; and whoever equips a warrior so that he has enough (ḥatsa yastaqilla bi-jahāzī, cf. Shafi'i, above, 4.4.4.4), will receive a similar reward (to the warrior's).(669)

The presence of 'Umar indicates an assimilation to ḥumlān (above, 4.5.3.3). This assimilation becomes more apparent in a story according to which a man came to the Prophet seeking help. The Prophet sent him off to someone else who had the outfit, but had fallen sick.(670)

Takhalluf and ḥumlān thus tend to become one thing; between them they account for a much larger number of prophetic traditions than does ju'ī. From the isnads we may detect interest in this issue in Kufa and Basra, as well as in Medina. But while takhalluf (understood to include ḥumlān) became the usual subject of debate, everywhere except Syria, the issue of ajr entered that debate, just as it became crucial to the (Syrian) discussions of ja'ā'il.

The rules for takhalluf became more detailed:

The wives of the mujāhidūn are forbidden to the qā'idūn, just as their own mothers are forbidden to them. If any one of the qā'idūn who has undertaken to act as guardian (khalīfa...fi ahl-ihi) for one of the mujāhidūn, then deceives him with respect to them [the wives], he will be made to stand on the Judgement Day, and he will receive for his deed...(671)

(669) Al-Hākim, Mustadrak, II, 89.
(670) Bayhaqi, Sunan, IX, 28. The phrasing has been altered to wa-layṣa ma'lā ma atajahhu bīhi from the Qur'ānic ḥmilnī.
(671) Muslim, III, 1508 (Imāra 139). The end seems corrupt, yaqifīs labu yawma 'l-qiyāmati fa-yākhubu sin 'amalīhi ma ahl-a fa-mā yamukudī? Cf. Waqīdī, III, 1021, wa-laqad tuḥfīla nisā' al-mujāhidīna 'alā 'l-qā'idīna.
4.5.4 Tabûk: the Literary Origins of Takhalluf

It will be recalled that when the Kufans added the one-of-several principle to their defenses against the attacks then being mounted against ja'a'il, they built this notion onto traditions of 'Umar and of Ibn 'Abbâs concerning takhalluf (above, 4.4.3.3, 4.5.2.2). Where did this combination of ideas come from? We have seen that Ibn 'Abbâs in the tafsîr shows an interest in the matter of takhalluf (in the simplest sense of staying at home when there is a battle going on, above, 4.3.2). But we also know that takhalluf is a theme of the sîra and meghâzi literature in its treatment of the expedition to Tabûk. We must next look here for the sources of this material.

Mâlik, in stating his opposition to ju'î, said that there were no grounds for believing that the Prophet ever established such a custom after Hunayn; and if he did so, this was "an established matter mentioned by no one."(672) We may detect a defensive attitude here: someone seems to be saying that some such thing did happen; and while Mâlik does not refute him outright, he remains suspicious.

There is nothing in the accounts of the battle of Hunayn in Wâqidi or Ibn Hishâm relating to such events.(673) However, the accounts of the next (and last) of the Prophet's expeditions, that of Tabûk, are replete with references to takhalluf.(674) This may explain Mâlik's discomfort.

Shâfi'i developed a theory of takhalluf, according to which every other man in the ribât al-jihâd may be sent on expedition (above, 4.4.4.7). Shâfi'i based this one-of-two rule on a tradition according to which the

(672) Mudawwana, III, 31; above, 4.4.2.2.
Prophet applied this rule to the Muslims while preparing for the expedition against Tabuk. This is the only prophetic tradition bearing upon the question of *ju'lat* (in a large sense) of which Shafi'i shows any knowledge (above, 4.4.4.7, 4.5.4.1).

*Takhalluf* is indeed a main preoccupation of Waqidi and Ibn Hisham in their accounts of Tabuk. This expedition provides asbāb al-nuzūl for practically all of Sūrat al-tawbah. (675) The Prophet here shows a strong interest in the matter: he distributes permissions for staying home; (676) while on campaign, he laments the fact that "muhājirūn from Quraysh and the Ansar and Ghifar and Aslam should stay behind." (677) The fortunes of various *mukhallafūn* are described in detail and at length.

However, Shafi'i's understanding of these events does not correspond to that of Waqidi and Ibn Hisham. For Shafi'i, it was the Prophet himself who applied the one-of-two rule before Tabuk. In Waqidi and Ibn Hisham, there is pressure on all able-bodied males to join this expedition; those who fail to do so later become social outcasts. (678) Moreover, in Waqidi and Ibn Hisham the Prophet does not exert this pressure by himself. We find wealthy members of the community taking it upon themselves to equip and supply the army.

Those who had wealth desired to perform good deeds (al-khayr wa'l-ma'ruf), and they considered this to be a good deed. Accordingly, a man would bring a camel to a man or two men, and say, "This camel is for the two of you, to take turns riding it" (ḥādhā 'l-ba'll ru'ayyānī tata'aqabānīḥ). And a man would bring *nafaqā* and would give it to someone who was setting

---

(676) Waqidi, III, 992-994.
(678) See especially the story of Ka'b ibn Malik, Waqidi, III, 1050-1056; Ibn Hisham, 908-914.
This amounts to ʿhumām and donations. We also find this procedure followed by al-ʿAbbās and ʿUthmān, who give mounts to two and three men, respectively. (680)

Elsewhere, the Prophet enters the picture, by ordering people to bring ʿṣadqā, apparently to equip the army. Ābū Bakr, ʿUmar, and al-ʿAbbās vie with one another in their contributions; ʿUthmān wins the contest by equipping (jaahāza) a third of the army. (681) It will be noticed that this large-scale receiving and distributing of ʿṣadqā is difficult to reconcile with the one-to-several arrangements described in the preceding paragraph.

Shāfiʿī thus differs from Wāqīdī and Ibn Hishām in his understanding of the Prophet’s tākhalluf. But we may also detect discrepancies between the latter two authors. When the Prophet laments the fact that certain men of Quraysh, the ʿAnṣār, etc., have stayed behind (see above), he says, in Ibn Hishām’s version, “What prevented one of these when he fell out from mounting a zealous man in the way of God on one of his camels?” (682) Wāqīdī reports the same phrase, but adds: “so that he would receive a reward similar to that of the one who set out” (ṣu-yakūnu lahu mithlu ajrī ʿI-khāriji). (683) Here a new element has been added, the ajrī so familiar from the hadīth.

Elsewhere we read the following passage in Ibn Hishām.

The apostle left ʿAlī behind to look after his family, and ordered him to stay with them (khabīla...wa-amara...hi’il-ʿiqāms fihim). The hypocrites spoke evil of him, saying that he had

(679) Wāqīdī, III, 991.
(682) Ibn Hishām, II, 906 (tr. Guillaume, p. 609).
(683) Wāqīdī, III, 1002.
been left behind because he was a burden to the apostle and he wanted to get rid of him. On hearing this ‘Ali seized his weapons and caught up with the apostle when he was halting in al-Jurf and repeated to him what the hypocrites were saying. He replied, “They lie. I left you behind because of what I had left behind, so go back and represent me in my family and yours. Are you not content, ‘Ali, to stand to me as Aaron stood to Moses, except that there will be no prophet after me?”

This is a clear reference to Qur’an 7:14 (see above, 4.3.4.1). It seems that this sense of khallafa occurs nowhere else in Wāqīḍī or Ibn Hishām. But more important is the fact that this passage is lacking altogether in Wāqīḍī. We may perhaps ascribe the discrepancy to Ibn Ishaq’s tashayyu’.(685) But at the same time, the partisan character of this passage gives a clue to the nature of the takhalluf material in the sira and maghazi literature. We have already seen Abu Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān donating large sums as sadaqa, with ‘Uthmān giving most; we have also seen humla practiced by both ‘Uthmān and al-‘Abbās, with the latter winning out.

In short, we have the endless debate of the partisans of ‘Alids, Umayyads, and ‘Abbāsids, expressed here in terms of their participation in the expedition to Tabuk.(686) Takhalluf is thematically associated with that campaign, very likely because it was the first Muslim attack on a Byzantine position. This theme and the traditions woven around it grow in complexity both in sira and in hadith. From Mālik’s suspicious comments, we may surmise that this material was taking shape during his lifetime.(687) But in any case, the sira and maghazi literature seems no more stable in this instance


(685) Goldziher, Muslim Studies, II, 120.

(686) Ibid., II, 89-125.

(687) Ibn Ishaq died in 150, Mālik in 179.
than does the ḥadīth.

4.5.4.1 Banū Lihyān and Tabūk

The prophetic hadith does not make matters simpler. For the traditions of the Prophet which describe a one-of-two rule are not set in the campaign against Tabūk at all, but rather in the (earlier) campaign against the Banū Lihyān (above, 4.5.3.5). There is nothing in the accounts of this campaign in Wāqīḍī and Ibn Hishām to indicate such a connection,(688) unless it is the detail that the Prophet tried to disguise his move against the Bāna Lihyān as an attack on Byzantine Syria.(689)

On the other hand, there are traditions about takhalluf and ḥudhr which did not find their way into Wāqīḍī or Ibn Hishām under any guise.(690)

4.6 Conclusion

4.6.1 Development of Ju’l: Summary

Sarakhsī ends one of his discussions of ja’a’il with a lament.

It is best for a man to share with the people of his own locality in giving [money] to the recipients (i’ta’ al-na’iba). But such a practice, whereby [ju’il] was intended as aid for pious purposes (i’ana ‘ala ‘1-ta’a), used to exist in those former days; whereas in our times, most of the contributions are extortionate. [yujadu aktbar al-nawa’ib bi-ṭarīq al-gul]. [Therefore,] if a person is able to keep this oppression [extortion, gula] at bay,


(689) Wāqīḍī, II, 536, wa-huwa yuzbiru annahu yurdu al-Shām.

(690) In one of these, reported by Jābir and A纳斯, the Prophet speaks of a group in Medina who avoid taking part in the war; the reason is ḥabā-zahwa al-‘udhr. Bukhārī, Sahīh, II, 210-211 (Jihād 35); III, 183 (Maghāzī 81); Abu Dāwūd, Sunan, III, 25, 29508 (Jihād 20); Ahmad, Musnad, III, 103; cf. Mutaqī, Kanz, IV, 337, 10784, 10785; Wensinck, Concordance, I, 412. In only a few instances is the detail added that the Prophet said this as he was returning from the Tabūk expedition: Bukhārī, III, 1183 (Maghāzī 81) and the first of the three versions at Bukhārī, III, 210-211 (Jihād 35).
it is better for him. But if he wishes to make a donation, he should make it to someone who is incapable of keeping this oppression at bay, and who is incapable of providing the money because of his poverty. In this way, he [the giver] will help in warding off the oppression, and will obtain his reward (zhawāb). (691)

We see here that 'ju'l eventually became a pretext for extortion. It may also have become a largely theoretical subject fairly early on. But in its origins it reflects a real problem.

The Umayyads and 'Abbāsids both made use of soldiers who, for whatever reasons (see following section) were not inscribed on the dwān and did not receive 'ṣaṣ'. These men had to be paid; and at some point the need arose for legal justification for these payments. The poem by the Khārijī 'Īsā ibn Fātilk shows that the word 'āṣ'ā' could be used in the reign of Mu'āwiya as a derogatory term referring to wages of mercenaries. (The Basran soldiers were, of course, not necessarily mercenaries in the eyes of anyone but the Khārijīs.)

At the same time, the concept of 'jī'la, a one-to-one payment which a man made to another who took his place in the army, also seems to have been current in the early Umayyad period. Attesting to this are the poem attributed to Shaqiq ibn Sulayk, and the preoccupation of the tābi'Is with this issue in much of the hadith.

At some point, under circumstances which remain obscure, these two notions, separate in their origins, combined into one. This new hybrid posed problems which the jurists took on gladly. But while discussion centered on the "individual" sense of 'ju'l, the "communal" or "governmental" sense was also present and, in fact, likely to have been the true cause of the debate. The early system, whereby Arab warriors had their names inscribed on the

(691) Sarakhsi, Mabsūr, X, 21, 11. 6-10.
Certain early jurists seem to have connected the practice of (non-'ṣāfā') payments with the law of hire, according to which the word ḥa'l had a distinct, technical sense (above, 4.4.6). The fact that the word ḥa'il was already in use, referring to payments made by individuals to other individuals to take their place in the army, would have made the connection that much easier. The assimilation to the law of hire, itself the result of a legal analogy, is likely to have been the work of the ahl al-ra'y: supporting this hypothesis is the consistent Kufan/early Hanafi position in favor of ḥa'il.

And so we find pronouncements on military ḥa'il, mostly in favor, from jurists of the tābi'ī generation. Traditions also appear attributing the practice and the teaching to Companions. Hire is a procedure which takes place between individuals; and accordingly, these tābi'īs and saḥābiyyīs speak of ḥa'il as a one-to-one arrangement, whereby a man would hire another to take his place in the army. The Kufans constructed a bulwark of such traditions in favor of ḥa'il.

This structure proved vulnerable. Mālik, who condoned the practice of giving donations to the mujāhidūn, rejected ḥa'il on the basis of sunna (or lack thereof). For the early Mālikīs the idea of takhallus came to absorb those of donations and ḥualān. They thus found a way to advocate payments made to the mujāhidūn. But for those who retained an interest in ḥa'il, it was theological objections, which we find reflected in the ḥadīth, which proved more devastating. God's promise of heaven to the martyrs is not a payment or a commodity. In the ḥadīth we find much quibbling over the word ajr, as a reflection of this tension.
Meanwhile, there arose another solution to more or less the same problem. It is impossible to say when the concept of *takhalluf* entered the picture (probably quite early). *Takhalluf* has the advantage of being mentioned many times in the Qur'an (even if its meaning is not always clear); whereas *ju'il* never appears there at all. It is also a notoriously elastic concept. The Kufans seem simply to have borrowed traditions of *takhalluf*, which for them included a one-of-several principle, and to have incorporated these traditions into their own defense of *ja'a'il*, without bothering over the inconsistencies which arose. As a result of all this, Medina and Iraq, following different paths, found different solutions to the problem.

With the prophetic hadith, the situation changes again. By the time this material enters circulation, *ju'il* seem to have lost much of its appeal, in every province except Syria (and to some extent, Egypt). In Syria a debate continues over *ja'a'il*, with the Prophet made to express positions both for and against. But here the issues of *ajr* and the *ajir* predominate. The word *ajir*, which usually refers to a hired servant or camp follower, now becomes a (usually derogatory) term for the recipient of *ju'il*. We thus have, in Syria, a debate over the theological consequences of what may have remained a real issue.

It should also be noted that the association of *ju'il* with *qabā'il*, as we see reflected in Baladhuri, appears only in Syrian traditions, which then come to hold a particular interest for scholars in the *thughār*.

Elsewhere, however, *ju'il* dropped out of the hadith in favor of *takhalluf*, which became a growth industry both in hadith and in *mughāl*. The issue of *ajr* also entered these traditions. Prophetic traditions with Iraqi, Medinene, and (sometimes) Egyptian isnāds dealt with *takhalluf* in its nuances.
The close connection with *Surat al-tawba* and the *sira* and *maghāzī* literature made this a subject of research in religious scholarship, while the connection with actual warfare must have broken off completely. For *takhalluf* has little to do with the historical conditions of warfare in the 'Abbāsid period. Its importance is theological: it emerges together with, and is inseparable from, the idea of *fard kifāya*.

But at the same time, nothing is lost, especially to the compilers of dictionaries. *Ja'a'il* and *takhalluf* finally coalesce into one hybrid notion: hence the phrase *ṣajā'ila al-nās baynahum 'inda al-ha'īth*, which echoes Balādhurī’s phrase about the *qaḥš'il*. Here the notion of *ju'l* has come to involve the entire community, while dividing it into small groups.

While this ḥadīth continued to proliferate, the jurists continued to record and disseminate the older teachings. Shāfi‘ī was the first to attempt anything like a theory of *ju'l*, and his comments form the basis of subsequent discussions, such as that of Sarakhsi. In rejecting one-to-one payments, and recognizing only *ju'l* paid by the *sulṭān*, Shāfi‘ī confirmed the true reason for this practice: to provide for all those who wish to take part in the jihād. This insight on Shāfi‘ī’s part is inseparable from the idea of *fard kifāya*, which seems to have been developing at the very same time.

However, the teachings of the various schools, together with the hadīth itself, have kept in place many of the remnants of earlier attempts and solutions, in complicated patterns which, it is hoped, this chapter will have begun to unravel.
4.6.2 Appendix: The Soldiers of al-Jazira

Throughout this discussion of ju`l, it has been maintained that ju`l and `ṣṭā` were not only different, but incompatible. But if we return to our passage from Baladhuri, we find a problem: for here it appears that the garrison of Malatya received both forms of payment. It is conceivable, however, that these payments were intended for different groups of soldiers. Baladhuri himself provides backing for this theory, when he informs us that the garrisons of al-Maṣṣasa and al-Haruniyya (dating from about the same time as that of Malatya) contained separate groupings of jund and mutawwi`a. (692)

Furthermore, Baladhuri's phrasing, with its use of the imperfect (yataj`aluhu) seems like a gloss. Ju`l may already have become an abstruse subject; and a more practical point such as its compatibility with `ṣṭā` would easily have been lost in the maze.

The other historical sources provide little information on the practice of ju`l. We do know, however, that the Umayyads used large numbers of non-Muslim troops (notably Armenians), whom they paid in silver. These payments are said to have ended under al-Mansūr (above, 3.4.1). Furthermore, under the first 'Abbāsid caliphs, there was disagreement and competition over who would be included on the diwan (and thereby receive `ṣṭā`). Malatya, Mar`aṣh, Adhana and Qaliqala were garrisoned, wholly or partly, by Jaziran Arabs (above, 2.6.3-5); these would have been included on the diwan, as they had been under the previous regime. Dionysius of Tell Māhrū allows a glimpse into some of the changes in the fortunes of the Arabs of al-Jazira which took place during the reign of al-Mansūr.

'Abbās [the governor of al-Jazira] envoya des lettres dans toutes les villes pour ordonner aux Arabes de la Mésopotamie de descendre tous, grands et petits, à Harran.

(692) Futūḥ, pp. 166, 171; above, 4.4.4.2.
Ils se réunirent donc et descendaient, en abandonnant leurs récoltes sans les moissonner, car ils étaient pressés de gagner des zouz... Ils attendirent longtemps, jusqu'à ce que leur récolte fût perdue et détruite; il assigna environ six cents hommes d'entre eux aux forteresses et envoya le reste. Ils ne remportèrent chez eux que des pertes. (693)

We have no indication here if the 600 men who did go to the fortresses were settled there permanently; although this seems to have been the case. (694) But what is most striking about this passage is that it presents the Arabs of Mesopotamia as peasants settled on the land. They are eager to abandon this status by becoming soldiers ("Ils étaient pressés de gagner des zouz"), and evidently retain enough military skills to be of use to the authorities. We may therefore surmise that their conversion to the status of peasants is of fairly recent date. But peasants they are, and for the most part, peasants they remain.

Elsewhere we find an explanation of how this came about.

A cette époque, une cruelle épreuve pesait sur le peuple des Syriens. Ils n'avaient point à travailler, parce que leurs terres étaient vendues par les Arabes, car ceux-ci ne recevaient plus la tribut qu'on avait coutume de leur donner, vendirent les terres et les grains et travaillèrent pour eux-mêmes, de sorte que tout trafic cessa pour les paysans. (695)

The Jaziran Arabs were losing their military subsidies, and were having to sell their land and work (part of it) themselves, thereby pushing their Syrian (Christian) tenants off the land. (696) But this also means that recipi-

(693) Dionysius, pp. 89-90.
(696) The stream of unemployed or migrant workers which this process created must have swollen the ranks of the sa'adiq (above, 2.9.2). Indeed, in one instance we find such refugees welcomed by a Byzantine fortress commander, and invited to stay, no doubt as some sort of auxiliary force. Dionysius, p. 73.
ents of 'ṣṭār' were now being denied this privilege. Unfortunately, Dionysius does not locate these events any more precisely than to the (long) reign of al-Mansūr. But the issue of ju'j may have arisen here (and later been recalled by Balādhurī) to meet an emergency which these changes had created.
Chapter V

SCHOLARS AND SAINTS

5.1 Introduction

In the year 156, a raiding expedition (ṣā'ifa) led by Zufar ibn 'Āṣim al-
Hilālī entered Byzantine territory through the Darb al-Ṣafāfī, and reached a
place which our Arabic sources call Kharma or Harma. The Muslim raiders
discovered there "a cave in a desert region where ten men were preserved
whose bodies have not decayed" (ṣaṭṭumāra fi barriyya lihā 'ashṣarat nasr lam
tabīs ajsādhum). Fortunately, this expedition included a scholar, the well-
known Abu Ishaq al-Fazarī. Abu Ishaq certified that these were indeed none
other than the ashab al-raqīm, or Sleepers of the Cave.


(698) Azī, loc. cit. They are usually known as ashāb al-kahf, but both names occur because of Qurʾān 18:9, am hasibta anna ashāb al-kahf waʾl-raqīmi... Different opinions on this matter are collected by Yāqūt, Muʿjam al-baladān, II, 804-807; see also R. Paret, EI2, 1, 691, with bibliography. Abu Ishaq’s opinion on this matter was later echoed by Ibn Khurramādīn (SGA VI, 106-108), who wrote that while Ephesus is known as the madinat ashāb al-kahf, the ashāb al-raqīm (as he calls them) are to be found in this same place, Kharma, a rustaq located between Amorium and Nicaea, four days journey from Qurra. (Qurra is Koron in Cappadocia, see Honigmann, Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches, pp. 45, 47, 48. These geographical indications do not work out in detail.) Ibn Khurramādīn is unaware of Abu Ishaq and the expedition of 156. What he gives is the account of Muḥammad ibn Miṣḥān, a munaẓẓim sent by al-Wāthiq (ruled 227-232), with permission of the Emperor, to visit this site. Apparently the Emperor had been duped into believing that these were the genuine Sleepers; at any rate, this is what Ibn Miṣḥān thought, especially after his guide had attempted to poison him and his followers. "We thought," complained Ibn Miṣḥān, "that you would show us corpses which resemble living people. But these are not like that."
Al-Azdi (d. 334) is our only source for Abū Ishāq’s participation in this expedition of 156, and later opinions about the Sleepers (whose undecayed remains were claimed by many localities in both the Muslim and Christian worlds) may have influenced his report. However, the fact that this detail occurs only in al-Azdi’s book does not force us to consider the entire account an invention.

Here we have the beginning of a fairly long line of scholars and ascetics who are known to have inhabited the region of the thughbūr, from this time until the Byzantine reconquest of the fourth/tenth century. This chapter will attempt to reconstruct their history, relying principally upon biographical sources. The second half of the chapter will list these scholars and saints, according to locality and in chronological order (insofar as this can be determined). But first, several themes which recur in many of these biographies will be presented, through discussions of three men who belonged to the first generation of thaghris, and whose lives, as presented in the sources, may be said to embody these themes.

(699) Considered a reliable source by F. Rosenthal, EI2, I, 813.

(700) The chroniclers’ descriptions of the sawā‘if of this period are mostly brief notices of dates, leaders, and, only occasionally, destinations. As will be seen below, Abū Ishāq’s activity in the thughbūr is well attested in the biographical sources. We find another example of scholars accompanying an expedition at Baladhurī, Futūh, p. 169, where al-Ḥasan ibn Ḫaṭaba performs the ghazw in 162 accompanied by Mandal ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Al-‘Anṣārī al-Kufī (d. 167 or 168, see Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, X, 298-299) and Mu’tasim ibn Sulaymān al-Tanmī al-Baṣrī (d. 187, see Ibn Hajar, X, 227-228). Neither of these two scholars seems to have figured otherwise in the life of the thughbūr.

(701) A. Noth, Heiliger Krieg und heiliger Kampf, p. 25, n. 47, notes that the biographical literature has not yet been investigated with reference to jihād. For a recent example of such a study in a different geographical area, see B. Radtke, “Theologen und Mystiker in Bursa und Transoxanien,” Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, CXXXVI (1986), pp. 536-569.
Underlying all these themes is the issue of religious authority. We have seen (in Chapters II and III) how the early 'Abbāsid caliphs asserted their control over the area; and despite all their efforts, the area seems frequently to have been a source of trouble for them, and, we may imagine, not subject to their rule to the degree which they would have liked. For the scholars, whose relation to the caliphate was often far from harmonious, the ṣuḥūr seem to have provided a sort of testing ground. Here they could actually exert certain forms of authority, with less opposition than they would have encountered elsewhere. And, perhaps most important, this was a place where they could apply their own notions of religious merit, particularly with regard to the jiḥād.

5.2 Ābu ʿIshaq al-Fazarī: ʿāhib sunna wa-ʿghaww

It is well attested that Ābu ʿIshaq, who by most accounts was born in Kufa,(702) went to live in al-Maṣṣūṣa and became a ghāzi. Two of the earliest sources, Bukhārī and Ibn ʿAbbās Ḥātim,(703) do not mention these activities in their notices on Ābu ʿIshaq: such matters were irrelevant to the more technical concerns of these two authors. However, Ibn Saʿd (d. 230) states that Ābu ʿIshaq was a ʿāhib sunna wa-ʿghaww.(704) Ibn Qutayba (d. 276) reports that Ābu ʿIshaq died in al-Maṣṣūṣa.(705) In Ibn Hibbān (d. 353) we read that Ābu ʿIshaq lived in the frontier garrisons (wa-rābaṣṭa biʿl-thaghr ilā an

(702) Though some say Wāṣīṭ, Ibn Hibbān, Maṣḥāḥir, p. 182; Ibn Ḥajar, Tahāḥīb, I, 153.

(703) Bukhārī, Al-Taʿrīkh al-kabīr, I, i, 321, #1005; Ibn ʿAbbās Ḥātim, Al-Jarḥ waʿl-taʿdīl, I, i, 128-129.


(705) Ibn Qutayba, Naʿāẓif, p. 514.
We do not know how old Abu Ishaq was in the year 156, since no source gives a date for his birth. His death is reported variously for 185, 186, and 188. But it appears that by 156, late in the reign of al-Mansur, Abu Ishaq had already moved to the thughur, and possibly to al-Massisa, a town which had been restored in 140. We cannot fix the dates any more precisely.

Abu Ishaq's shuyukh included al-`Awza`i, who held such a high opinion of Abu Ishaq that he himself transmitted hadith from him, and even told a scribe to whom he was dictating a letter to "begin with him [with his name], for by God, he is better than I am" (uktub wa`abda` bhi fa-ltanabu wa'ilahi khayrun minnii). Abu Ishaq seems similarly to have enjoyed a special position among the pupils of al-`Awza`i: in his biographies, at any rate, it was said that if you asked a Syrian, he would name al-`Awza`i and al-Fazari as "the two imams of Syria."

---

(706) Hashähr, p. 182.
(708) Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, I, 152.
(709) Baladhúrî, Futuh, p. 166. Above, 2.6.4.
(710) Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, I, 151, na-humna min shuyukhdhi. Abu Nu`aym, Ilýa, VIII, 256.
(712) Abu Nu`aym, Ilýa, VIII, 254; Ibn `Asákir, Tahdhib, II, 254, where `Abd al-Rahmán ibn Mahdî (d. 198, see Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, VI, 261) says that people split up into competing groups in matters of religious learning, with the Banu Asad following Hamzah ibn Zayd, while the Kufans prefer Zayd ibn Harb and Malik ibn Anas. "And if you see a Syrian, he will prefer al-`Awza`i and al-
Abū Ishaq was, like his master al-Awza‘ī, an imām fi ‘l-sunna. (713) In Awza‘ī’s case, this high level of expertise in sunna was not matched by an equally high level in the science of tradition. (714) Abū Ishaq al-Fazārī seems to have resembled his master in this respect; at any rate, the early authorities were divided on his reliability as a transmitter of hadith. (715)

We have seen that Ibn Sa‘d called Abū Ishaq a gāhib sunna wa-ghazw. This must be how Abū Ishaq earned his fame, rather than as a traditionist. But what does this phrase mean?

Abū Ishaq took a hard line in dealing with the (no doubt uncouth) inhabitants of the frontier district. According to ‘Abdallah ibn Sāliḥ al-Ijli (d. 210 or 211), Abū Ishaq “was the one who taught the inhabitants of the thughur how to behave. He instructed them in the sunna, and used to give commands and prohibitions. Whenever a man inclined to heresy entered the thughur region, Abū Ishaq threw him out.” (716) Abū Ishaq’s opposition to Fazārī, and will put his trust in them. [All] these are imāms of the sunna” (fa-inna ha’ula‘i a‘imma fi ‘l-sunna).

(713) See end of previous note.

(714) In another statement attributed to ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Mahīl, Awza‘ī was characterized as an “imām in the sunna, but not an imām in the hadith.” Sufyān al-Thawrī had the opposite qualifications, while Malik was an imām in both areas. Götziger, Muslim Studies (ed. Stern), II, 25, citing Zurqānī, Sharh ‘alā sahih al-Muwatta’, I, 4; cf. Ibn Abī Hātim, Taqdim, p. 203.

(715) Ibn Qutayba (Ma‘ārif, p. 514) damned him as kathīr al-ghalat fi ‘l-hadith. Ibn Sa‘d (Tabaqāt, VII, ii, 185) gave a mixed review, concluding with kathīr al-khata‘ fi ḥadithihi. Perhaps this tendency to error resulted from Abū Ishaq’s late start (at the age of 28) in the business of kitābāt al-hadith (see Ibn Hājar, Tahdhib, I, 153). On the other hand, other early authorities, namely, Ibn Ma‘īn, Abū Hātim, al-Ijli, and al-Nasa‘ī, praised his hadith: see Ibn Abī Hātim, Jarḥ, I, 1, 128-129; Ibn Hājar, Tahdhib, I, 152-153.

Qadarites was just as energetic: once when a man arrived in al-Maṣṣīṣa and began to speak favorably of qadar, Abū Ishaq sent word to him, saying, "Get away from us!" (717) Similarly, the Damascene Abū Mushir al-Ghassānī (d. 218) reported that when Abū Ishaq visited Damascus, people gathered to hear him, and that he told Abū Mushir to dismiss all Qadarites from the room. (718)

This may give us an idea of Abū Ishaq’s role as ǧāḥib ʿsunna. But the other part of his epithet, namely, ǧāḥib ʿghazw, proves more difficult to understand. First, and no doubt most important, is the fact that he wrote a book on siyar which won highest praise from al-Shāfī’ī. (719) This book of siyar was probably like that of al-Awzāʿī, and included a section on ʿghazwānāt.

Did a ǧāḥib ʿsunna wa-ʿghazw teach by example, as well as by imparting his knowledge? More specifically, was Abū Ishaq actually a ʿghazī? The only reference we have to an actual campaign in which Abū Ishaq took part is the ǧaʿīfa of 156, referred to above. None of the biographical notices on Abū Ishaq (some of which are fairly long) mention this episode. Instead, they usually present him as settled in al-Maṣṣīṣa, or else travelling to Iraq and Damascus. (720) Thus, while Abū Ishaq may actually have taken part in the


(719) Ibn Mājah, Tahdhib, I, 152. Shāfī’ī said, "No one has composed a book on siyar like this one" (fī ṣiyar ʿaṣhāri). See Sezgin, GAS, I, 292; Abū Bekr ibn Khayr, Fihrist mā rāmu tu nakš ʿalā šuyūkhātī, p. 236; Balādūrī, Futūḥ, pp. 162-163, includes information apparently taken from this Kitāb ʿaṣhār al-ṣiyar.

(720) In one story, told apparently to illustrate his ʿwarāʾ, he is not on the expedition. The narrator, Makhlud ibn Ḥusayn (see below) says, "We were on campaign with Abū al-Makhl al-Ḥashimī, and as we were approaching home, al-Ṣamārūṣ passed us by in a hurry, without greeting
jihad, this aspect of his life did not greatly interest the compilers of biographies; and when they say of him that he is a model, an example to be followed (yuqtada bihi), (721) they must have something else in mind.

5.3 'Abdallâh ibn al-Mubârik: jihad vs. ḥajj

The following passage (from late sources) strengthens the impression that Abû Ishaq was thought of as a scholar and a holy man, rather than as a warrior.

Al-Fudayl ibn 'Iyâd said, "Perhaps the reason why I longed [to go to] al-Massîsa was not so that I could acquire the merit of ribât, but rather so that I could see Abû Ishaq al-Fâzârî. (722)

Al-Fudayl ibn 'Iyâd ibn Mas'ūd ibn Bishr al-Tamîmî was famous both as a zâhid and as a muhaddith. He had success at the court of Harûn al-Rashîd, and afterwards went to live in Mecca, where he died in 187. (723) None of the biographical notices on al-Fudayl mention any journeys on his part to the thughîr, and al-Fudayl in this passage as much as says that performing jihad itself did not interest him. Furthermore, al-Fudayl and Abû Ishaq did not even transmit hadîth from one another, and have nothing to say about one another in the sources, apart from this one instance. Why, then, do we have this passage connecting al-Fudayl with Abû Ishaq and the thughîr?

---

(721) Ibn Ḥaţâr, Tahdîlîb, I, 152.


(723) Sezgin, GAS, I, 636, and sources listed there; A.-M. Schimmel, Mystical Dimensions of Islam, pp. 35-37.
Al-Fudayl, who made many pilgrimages in his life, and finally went to live in Mecca, figures in our sources as a Meccan representative in a debate, waged both in poetry and in hadith, on the relative merits of *hajj* and of *jihād*. We find him as the addressee of verses vaunting the superiority of the *jihād*. The author of these verses was reported to be the famous 'Abdallāh ibn al-Mubārak, a man who, like both Abū Ishaq and al-Fudayl, was known, among other things, both for his *zuhd* and for his activity as a transmitter of hadith.(724)

"'Abdallāh ibn Muḥammad, the qādi of Naṣībīn, said that Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Abī Sukayna told me, Ibn al-Mubārak dictated the following verses to me at Taṣrūs as I was taking my leave of him. He sent the sheet [containing the verses] in my care to al-Fudayl ibn 'Iyād in the year 177.

Worshipper of the two sanctuaries, if you could only see us,
You would know that in your worship you are merely playing games.

For some it may be fine to tinge their necks with tears;
But our breasts are dyed in our own life's blood.

They tire out their horses in some vain enterprise;
While our steeds grow tired on the very Day of Brightness.

For you the scent of perfume, but the scent which we prefer
Is the hooves' burning and the most delicious dust.

A true and trusted sentence has reached us from our Prophet,
Out of his sayings, one which cannot be called a lie.

"The dust of God's cavalry, as it covers a man's face,
Will never be found together with the hell-smoke of the Fire."

This is the Book of God pronouncing thus between us
That the Martyr does not die: here can be no falsehood.

Ya 'Abīda 'l-haramayni lūf abārtašā
la 'ališta anmaka fi 'l-'ibādati taš'ābu

--------------------------------------

man kāna yakhdibū jirahū bi-dumāʾiḥi
fa-nuḥārunā bi-dimāʾinā tatekhdīḥebu

sw kāna yut'ibū khaylabu fi bāṣṭilin
fa-khayilūnā yuma 'l-ṣabīḥati tat'abu

riḥū 'l-'abīrī lekum wa-ṣabū 'l-ābirūnā
wa-habu 'l-ṣambīkī wa-'l-ghubāru 'l-syābu

wa-laṣaq adhkā mū naqšli nashīryinā
qalun ṣabīkun qādiqun la yakhdabu

la yastaqam ghubāru khaylī 'l-lāhī fi
ansī 'nī' in wa-dukhānu nārin talhabu

ḥiḥdā kitābu 'l-lāhī yantīṣu bayna mū
layse 'l-sabīḥa bi-māyṣītin la yakhdabu

[Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm] said: And so, I reached al-Fudayl in Mecca at the sanctuary, and when he had read [the letter], his eyes flowed [with tears], and he said, Abu 'Abd al-Rahman has told the truth and has advised me faithfully (ṣadaqa...wa-nasaha). (725)

While the authenticity of these verses may be questioned, we see, at any rate, that their author was familiar with the prophetic hadith on jihad, where the wordplay on dumīʿ and dīmāʿ recurs frequently. The poet has also paraphrased a well-known hadith, la yastamī'u ghubārun fi sabīlī 'l-lāhī wa-
dukhānu Jahannāma. (726) Finally, arguing (though only in the most general way) for Ibn al-Mubarak's authorship is Ibn Sa'd's statement that Ibn al-
Mubarak composed poetry inciting to the jihad.

But whoever wrote these verses, and under whatever circumstances, they illustrate a topos which occurs in various places in the early 'Abbāsid period. We see it in the words of the caliph Abū 'l-'Abbas to Abū Muslim, when the latter was seeking permission to go on pilgrimage: inna 'l-jīhādī afdalu

--------------------

(725) Dhahabi, Siyar al-ṣālim al-nubalā', VIII, 364-365; Ibn Taghrībirdī, Al-
Nujūm al-zabira, II, 103-104.

(726) Al-Muttaqī al-Hindi, Kanz al-ʾummāl, II, 261; Wensinck, Concordance,
IV, 438.
min al-hajji ("Jihad is better than pilgrimage").(727) Abu Ishāq al-Fazārī transmitted the following hadith:

[Abū Ishāq from al-A'mash from Abū Wā'il from 'Abdallāh ibn Mas'ūd. The Prophet said:] Of the ayyam al-'amal there is none better than the tenth of Dhu 'l-Hijja. He was asked, not even jihād in the path of God? He answered, not even jihād in the path of God, except for one whose charger has stumbled and whose blood has gushed forth (zilē min ayyām al-'amal, wa-ubūqi dam-hu).(728)

The putative author of these verses, Abū 'Abd al-Rahman 'Abdallah ibn al-Hubārak ibn Wāḍīh al-Naṣṣāli al-Tamīmī al-Mawāzī, was one of the best-known scholars of his generation.(729) Abu Ishāq al-Fazārī knew him, and called him imam al-muslimin.(730) Abu Ishāq and Ibn al-Mubārak would sit together asking questions of one another.(731) But then, Ibn al-Mubārak was also familiar with Fudayl ibn 'Iyāḍ and his companions.(732) Ibn al-Mubārak made many pilgrimages during his life, and thus had associations with both sides in the jihād vs. ḥajj quarrel.

-------------------------

(727) Baladhurī, Ansāb, III, 184; above, 2.5.1.

(728) Abū Nu‘aym, Ḥilya, VIII, 259. Different versions indicated at Wen-sinc, Concordance, IV, 380 (zilē min ayyām al-'amal).


(731) Khaṭīb, X, 163.

(732) Khaṭīb, X, 158; Ibn Khayrāb, Tadhib, V, 383; Ibn Al-Jawzī, Sīfa, IV, 115, where al-Fudayl transmits a saying from Ibn al-Mubārak against those who "eat from their religion."
5.3.1 Ibn al-Mubarak as Ghāzī

He was, as should already be apparent, a man of many accomplishments. What, then, was the nature of his involvement with the *thughur*? We have, to begin with, the fact that he wrote a *Kitāb al-jihād*, a book of hadith which has now been edited. (733) Here his connection to the *thughur* is much like that of Abu Ishaq, author of the *Kitāb al-siyar*. But (as in the case of Abu Ishaq) this involvement was deeper than that of an author of books; or so it would seem from Sufyān ibn 'Uyayna's statement that the only advantage which the Companions had over Ibn al-Mubarak was "their companionship with the Prophet and their taking part with him in campaigns." (734)

In some (later) sources, Ibn al-Mubarak's activities as ghāzī assume heroic proportions.

["Ubda ibn Sulaymān said:] We were on an expedition (sariyya) with 'Abdallah ibn al-Mubarak in *bilād al-Rūm*. We encountered the enemy, and when the two armies faced each other, one of their men stepped forth and challenged us to single combat. A man stepped forth [from our ranks] and killed him. Another of them then [issued a challenge] and he killed him also. Then he issued [his own] challenge to the Rūm. [One of them] stepped forth; he attacked [this man] for an hour, then stabbed him and killed him. [The Muslims] then crowded around him, and I was one of those who did so. He was concealing his face in his sleeve. I took hold of the edge of his sleeve and pulled it away, and lo! it was 'Abdallah ibn al-Mubarak. He then said to me, Abu 'Amr, you too are one of those who say evil things against me (wa-anta ya Abū 'Amr an yushanni'u 'alayna) (735)

Here we have entered the world of al-Malik al-Nu'mān and Dhat al-Himma. But later generations also associated Ibn al-Mubarak closely with the jihād.

After his death, he appeared in a dream to Muḥammad, the son of al-Fudayl ibn

(733) By N. Ḥammad, Beirut 1971. According to Abū Bakr ibn Khayr (Fihrist al-maṣāriḥu, p. 495), the title of this book was *Kitāb fadl al-jihād*. This is an accurate description of the contents.


Iyād, and informed him that "that which I used to do" (al-lādihī kuntu 'alayhi) was the "best of deeds" (al-ṣād al-a'māl). When Ibn Fudayl pressed him on this point, Ibn al-Mubarak affirmed that this was indeed none other than al-rībat wa'l-jihād. (736)

Our early sources give far fewer details of Ibn al-Mubarak's exploits in the thughūr. One item of general agreement is that he died in Hit in the year 181; some sources say that he was then returning from Tarsūs, others that he was returning from a campaign (munsarifan min al-ghazw). (737) But what sort of ghazw would he have been performing at the age of 63 (lunar) years? Elsewhere the sources say that he made frequent trips to Tarsūs (wa-kāna kathīr al-ikhtilāf ilā Tarsūs). (738) But the activity ascribed to him there is of a civilian nature. As in the case of Abū Ishaq al-Fazārī, we have a picture of a scholar residing in a frontier town (though in this case not permanently).

5.3.2 The Man Without Qualities

But even these references to Ibn al-Mubarak in Tarsūs are from later sources. From the earliest ones we know only that he traveled to the thughūr, and died on his way home (to Marw) from there. And indeed, what stands out about Ibn al-Mubarak is his constant traveling. "He went to Iraq, the Hijaz, Syria, Egypt, and the Yemen, and he heard a great deal of learning." (739) In the


(737) Ibn Sa'd, VII, i, 105, quoted by Ibn Ḥajar, V, 235, min al-ghazw. Ibn Qurayha, Ma'rif, p. 511 (ghazw). Bukhārī, Al-Ṭabarī al-Kabīr, III, i, 212, only gives the date; likewise Ibn Abī Hātim, Jarb, II, ii, 180; Ibn Ḥibbān, Nashṣāhīr, pp. 194-195 (Tarsūs); Sam'ānī, I, 285 (Tarsūs).

(738) Khaṭīb, X, 159.

(739) Ibn Sa'd, VII, i, 205.
opinion of Ahmad ibn Hanbal, "There was no one in Ibn al-Mubarak's time who was more zealous in seeking knowledge (azlab il-'ilm) than he. He traveled to the Yemen, to Syria, and to Basra and Kufa...he wrote down learning from the great and the small...[including from] Abu Ishaq al-Fazari, and he collected a great stock" (wa-jasa'a ansan 'aslan). (740)

Ibn al-Mubarak traveled everywhere; he made frequent pilgrimages, and engaged in trade as he went along. (741) Unlike Abu Ishaq and the other thaghris who will be discussed in this chapter, Ibn al-Mubarak spent only a fraction of his life in the thughur. Why, then, does he appear in the sources in the role of mujahid?

No doubt he actually was one, in some sense, if only on occasion. But what obscures all this for us is his superabundance of virtues. Ibn Hibban said of him that "there were in him virtues (khisal) such as were never united in any man of learning in our time in all the world." (742) Ibn al-Mubarak's friends and pupils were fond of making lists of these khisal, and it is worth noting that the qualities of physical courage (shaja'a) and jihad are not on the earliest versions of these lists, but enter gradually as the lists expand.

A consequence of having so many khisal is that various groups claim the holder, neglecting those khisal that do not serve their purpose, while at the same time amplifying or inventing khisal which fit into their scheme. (743)


(741) Ibn Hajar, V, 386. In late sources his wealth is described as a ra's sāl of 400,000 [dirhams]: Ibn Kathir, Eidsya, X, 177.

(742) Ibn Hajar, V, 386.

(743) Thus in Ibn Abi 'l-Wafa', Jawahir, II, 326, Ibn al-Mubarak becomes a respectful disciple of Abu Hanifa, asking the master questions about zakār, and then citing Abu Hanifa as his own authority when he himself is asked about such matters as the times for prayer, and the permissi-
But in the end, a man who has so many ḥabīb begins to seem like a man without qualities. What matters most is that he is a model to be imitated (yuqṭadā bīḥi).

[Al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad said:] We were traveling with Ibn al-Mubārak, and it would often occur to me, so that I said to myself, How is it that this man’s merit is so far superior to ours, so that it has become so widely known? If he prays, then we pray; if he fasts, then we fast; if he goes to war (in kāma yaghzū), then we go to war; if he goes on pilgrimage, then we go on pilgrimage. We were then on a leg of our journey on the Syrian road, having our supper at night in a house, when the lamp went out. One of our group stood up, took the lamp, and went out to light it. He stayed outside for a while, and then brought the lamp back. Then I looked at Ibn al-Mubārak’s face, and his beard was wet from his tears. I then said to myself, This is why this man’s merit is superior to ours. While the lamp was gone, he was probably sitting in the dark, recalling the Judgement Day.(744)

In this passage, Ibn al-Mubārak’s excellence as a qudwa outweighs his and his followers’ activities in both jihad and ḥajj. Furthermore, in some of the stories told about him, these two activities tend to become blurred. Thus, a story about his generosity on the ḥajj recurs in a setting of jihad, in almost all of its details; the only major difference is that the action takes place on a journey from Baghdad to al-Masṣīfa, instead of one from Marw to Mecca.(745)

(744) Ibn al-Jawzī, Ṣifā, IV, 145.

(745) Khaṭīb, X, 157-158.
The qudwa, the model or exemplar, has this fear of God to such an extent that it gives him enormous strength. (746) He may also continue to exert some form of power over his fellow-men after his death. (747) But in the case of Ibn al-Nuburak, this preeminence leads at times to startling results.

[Abu Nu'aym from Ibrahim ibn 'Abdallah from Muhammad ibn Ishaq from Ahmad ibn al-Walid from 'Ubayd ibn Janad(?). Al-'Umari said:] Ibn al-Nuburak is fit [to rule] (yasluhu li-hadha '1-amr).

A man asked him, for what? He answered, the imamate. (748)

Here we have the convention whereby epithets normally reserved for caliphs are applied to religious scholars: as when Abu Ishaq al-Fazari says that Ibn al-Nuburak was the imam al-muslimin. (749) But an expanded version of this same story takes this theme farther.

[Al-'Umari said:] I have never seen anyone better suited [to rule] in this age of ours than a man who came to my house and stayed with me for three days, asking me about things concerning which the people of this age (ahl hadha '1-dahc) do not ask... We said to him, that was 'Abdallah ibn al-Nuburak. He said, it is fitting that one who is fit to rule should be this way (hakadha yanbagbi an yahlakta hadha '1-amr fa-dhaka).

'Ubayd said, That means, as a model for learning (yas'na al-iqtida' bi' l-ilm). (750)

''Ubayd's attempt at toning down the claim made here seems empty: yasluhu li-hadha '1-amr can only refer to the Caliphate.

(746) When Ibn al-Nuburak read from his Kitab al-zuhd wa'1-raqa'iq (see Szeggin, GAS, I, 95; Abu Bakr ibn Khayr, Fihrist al rawabu, pp. 293, 509), he would bellow like a cow or a bull being slaughtered. Khatib, X, 167; Ibn al-Jawzi, Siwa, IV. Nu'aym ibn Hamad is the informant.

(747) Ibn al-Nuburak's tomb in Hit became a shrine, mashhur yuzar (Ibn Hibban, Kashshaf, p. 195). A strange prayer of his is recorded in connection with this: "Ibn al-Nuburak said, 'God, do not make me die in Hit!' So he died in Hit, may God have mercy on him" (Abu Nu'aym, Hilya, VIII, 164).

(748) Abu Nu'aym, Hilya, VIII, 162.


(750) Abu Nu'aym, Hilya, VIII, 162.
Ibn al-Mubarak is thus proposed for the imamate. The biographers, here and elsewhere, will occasionally refer to a great scholar as amīr al-su'a'ilīn fī 'l-hadīth, iμām al-muslimīn, and so on. It appears that what underlies this convention can be more than a harmless metaphor.

5.4 Ibrahim ibn Adham: al-halāl al-mahd

The third of these "founding fathers" was the famous ascetic Ibrahim ibn Adham, who represents another trend or theme which persists in the thughūr throughout the period dealt with in this chapter. Ibrahim came from Balkh, but by all accounts spent most of his life in bilād al-Shām, an area so defined as to include Tarsus and its environs.(751) While the earliest sources note his piety, generosity, and learning, they seldom call him a murābit or mujāhid. However, there are good grounds for ascribing these qualities to him. It is generally agreed that he died in bilād al-Rūm in 161 or 162.(752) Furthermore, important thaghris of the following generation learned ḥadīth (and no doubt other subjects) from him.(753) Finally, and most important, we have the following passage in Ibn Hībbān:

[Ibrahim] was born in Balkh. Then he moved to Baghdad. Then he went out to al-Shām seeking al-halāl al-mahd. He stayed there as a ghāmil and a murābit, practicing the strictest piety by dint of great efforts, and practicing asceticism by means of devotion, until he died in bilād al-Rūm in the year 161.(754)


(752) Ibn Abī Hātim, Jarḥ, I, i, 87; Ibn Hājar, I, 103.

(753) See below, 5.5.2.1, on 'Ali ibn Bakkar, Makhlad ibn Husayn.

(754) Nashāhīr, p. 183, 1655.
This suffices to identify Ibrahim as a genuine thaghrl. (755) But what was
this al-halal al-mahdl? Much has been written about the conversion which
Ibrahim is supposed to have undergone as a wealthy young man in Khurasan, but
the immediate sequel to that conversion remains equally mysterious.

[Ibrahim set out, he said] until I reached Iraq. I worked there
for a number of days, but found no trace of pure halal (fa-lam
yasfu la fiha shay' min al-halal). Then I asked some shaykhs
about halal, and they said to me: "If you desire halal, then you
must go to bilad al-Sham." So I made my way to bilad al-Sham, to
a town called al-Mansura, that is, al-Massila, (756) but I still
found no trace of halal. I then asked some shaykhs, and they
said to me, "If you desire al-halal al-safl, then you must go to
Tarsus, for it has permissible things and much work (al-zubdhar
wa'l-'amal al-kathir). So I headed for Tarsus, and worked there
for a number of days, watching over orchards and reaping the har­
vest. (757)

It is not stated here if Ibrahim found his pure halal in Tarsus. What he
did practice there was abstinence from food, so much so that after many days
of sitting in an orchard he remained unable to tell a sweet from a sour
pomegranate, never having tasted the fruit. This made people recognize him
(his reputation as an ascetic had apparently preceded him); a crowd came
after him, and he ran away.

Ibrahim seems to have spent much of his time traveling as a migrant labor-
er. And Sulami, who never mentions the word halal with regard to Ibrahim,
says that Ibrahim "went to Syria, and used to work there, eating [what he

(755) As in the case of Ibn al-Mubarak, this does not mean that he restricted
his activities to the thughdr. The numerous stories about him in Hili-
yun el-suliyah have him traveling all over bilad al-Sham, but a large
proportion of these describe him living in the thughdr, and participat­
ing in campaigns. We need not accept all these stories as true, but
the connection with the thughdr may be taken as thematic.

(756) This is a mistake for al-Ma'amura, a name which al-Mansur gave to al-
Massila when he restored it in 139-140. See Baladhuri, Futuh, p. 166;
above, 2.6.4.

(757) Aba Ma'yna, ffilya, VII, 366; Ibn 'Asakir, Tahdhib, II, 169; cf. II,
173.
earned from] the work of his own hand." (758)

However, abstaining from food seems to have been Ibrāhīm's most noticeable trait. He fasted both when traveling and when staying in one place. (759) When Ibrāhīm was working in the orchard of a Christian in Ashkalon, the owner's wife realized who he was when she found his previous meal untouched every time she brought him food. (760) And his notion of *halāl* seems to involve more than mere abstinence. Once while traveling through the desert, Ibrāhīm grew hungry; he therefore stayed where he was for several days, eating sand mixed with water. (761) But his favorite food was clay. He once dined on this delicacy for twenty days, and expressed the wish that "I could take no food other than clay until I meet God, so that I might have pure *halāl* wherever it might be" (ḥattā ḳaṣfūna ʾl-*halāl* min ʾyna huwa). (762)

Ibrāhīm's *halāl* thus involves at the very least an attempt to go beyond what ordinary Islamic dietary law prescribes. When he went on a *ghazw*, Ibrāhīm would refuse to eat provisions captured from the enemy, and would say, "It is *halāl*, but nonetheless I refrain from it." He would eat what he had brought with him, or (of course) would fast. (763)

-------------


(760) *Ibid.*, VII, 372. Compare the story of the pomegranates (above) with a similar one about grapes (VII, 371-372), where Ibrāhīm's identity is again revealed through his abstaining from the fruit.


(763) *Ibid.*, VII, 388. This shows that Nicholson's explanation ("Like many of the ancient Sūfis, he took every precaution that his food should be 'lawful' in the religious sense of the word," EI1, II, 433) is inaccurate.
Ibrāhīm recommended abstaining from women,(764) and praised supererogatory actions in general.(765) Elsewhere we find a rationalized theory of zuhd attributed to Ibrāhīm, opposing al-zuhd fī 'a-harām to al-zuhd fī 'a-halāl.(766) However, it seems safe to say that al-halāl al-mahd or al-halāl al-safi has to do primarily with dietary practices.(767)

Ibrāhīm did not expect his followers to reach his own high standard in matters of fasting.(768) He would, however, reprimand them for greed.(769) He would often give his food and money away to the poor, these being often indistinguishable from his own ashāb.(770) He advocated charity (mu'asah) and poverty (faqr).(771)

But the point about many of the stories involving Ibrāhīm and his companions seems to be, first, that these must recognize him for what he is;(772) second, that they must place their absolute trust in him.(773) To follow ———

(764) Abū Nuʿaym, Ṣīlya, VIII, 11.

(765) Ibid., VIII, 34, "You are under no obligation not to stay up at night and to fast during the day." However, Ibn 'Asakir, Tahdhib, II, 169, has this same saying, minus the "not."

(766) Ibid., VIII, 26. There are three kinds of zuhd, namely, zuhd fard, which is refraining from what is forbidden (al-zuhd min al-harrām), zuhd fadl, or refraining from what is permissible (al-zuhd fī 'a-halāl), and zuhd salām, which is refraining from doubtful cases (al-zuhd min al-shubhāt).

(767) Cf. Ṣīlya, VIII, 34, turidu ta'fī? Rul al-halāl wa'd'u bi-mā shi'ta.

(768) Ibid., VII, 385, he feeds them while fasting himself; VIII, 10, when invited to a meal he would partake of it, without pleading his fast as an excuse.

(769) Ibid., VII, 393, the "fat and thick-necked" Ishaq ibn Najih al-Malāṣī (on him see below, 5.5.5).

(770) Ibid., VII, 373, 385-386.


(772) See above, the stories about pomegranates, grapes, etc.
Ibrâhîm meant to follow him in deed ('amal) rather than in precept; this remained true after his death.(774)

Ibrâhîm's search for al-šalâl al-mâhû was basic to his ascetic style. We may ask where this idea came from. Ibrâhîm does not state vegetarianism as a principle.(775) His al-šalâl al-mâhû does not correspond to the beliefs of sectarian groups such as the 'Abdakiyya.(776) Elsewhere, however, we may find a glimpse of how Ibrâhîm and like-minded Muslims learned these ideas and practices.

[Baqiyya ibn al-Walid (d. 197 or 198) said:] I heard Ibrâhîm ibn Adham say, I learned wisdom (ma'tîfî) from a monk named Abû Sim'ân. I went into his ġawwâs's and asked, "Abû Sim'ân, how long have you been in this ġawwâs's of yours?" He answered, "for seventy years." I asked, "What do you eat?" He said, "One chickpea every night." I asked, "What is it that moves your heart so that this one chickpea suffices?" He said, "Do you see the monastery (dayr) over there?" I asked, "Yes." He said, "One day every year, they come to me, and decorate my ġawwâs's and march around it, and honor me thereby. And so, whenever my soul grows weary of ḥâdîd, I remind her of that hour; fortified by that one hour's glory, I can endure a year's striving (ahtâmîlu jahd sâna li-'izz sâ'â)." Wisdom then settled in my heart (fa-'aqrâbî fl qalbî al-mârîfâ).

(773) Once he told a new traveling companion to give away his last 18 dirhams. The companion resisted this idea at first. Ibrâhîm later earned back this money through miraculously quick harvesting work, gave it to the man, and sent him on his way. Hilya, VII, 375.

(774) A prospective ghâlib of the dead ascetic was told that he would be unable to follow Ibrâhîm's ġariqa because, he was told, "Ibrâhîm acted and did not talk, whereas you have been talking without acting [working]." 'Amal may refer to the custom of eating only what one has earned with one's own hands, as well as to deeds (as opposed to talk).

(775) Although once when he was told that the price of meat had gone up, he said, "Then don't buy it." Abû Nu'aym, Hilya, VIII, 52; Ibn 'Asâkir, Tahdhib, II, 169.

(776) This group maintained that until the appearance of the just îmâm, the world is harâm, as is interaction with its inhabitants. The only permissible thing is food, which you may take from anywhere. Malâtî, Tanbih (Baghdad 1968), p. 93. This antinomian position with regard to food is the opposite of Ibrâhîm's exaggerated "restrictive tendency."
He then said, "Is that enough, or shall I give you more?" I said, "Please!" He said, "Come down from the saumā's," and so I went down. He then handed me a vessel containing twenty chick-peas, and said to me, "Go into the monastery, for they have seen what I handed over to you." When I entered the monastery, the Christians gathered and said, "Ya ḥanīfī, what did the shaykh hand over to you?" I said, "Some of his power" (ṣin quwwatihi). They said, "What are you going to do with it? We have a better claim to it. Name a price." I said, "Twenty dinars," and they gave me twenty dinars. I then returned to the shaykh, and he said, "Ya ḥanīfī, what have you done?" I said, "I sold it." He said, "For how much?" I said, "For twenty dinars." He said, "You made a mistake. If you had stated 20,000 dinars, they would have given it to you. That is the glory (ʿizz) of one who does not worship Him; see how it would be for one who does worship Him. Ya ḥanīfī, approach your Lord, and stop all your coming and going."(777)

Another version of the story adds interesting details: the saumā's is located on top of a pillar, and bends with every gust of wind; and Ibrāhīm ends by inquiring after his host's religion.(778)

The asrifa (gušša) which Abū Simān transmits to Ibrāhīm provides a kind of power over one's fellows. This may seem strange in a Christian ascetic; but for a Muslim seeking religious merit (in Ibrāhīm's case, purity) in the thughūr, it is not strange at all. We have seen that Abū Ishaq al-Fazārī, the ṣaḥīḥ sunna wa-ghaww, took an active (and leading) role in applying the sunna in the thughūr and in suppressing those who violated it. Abū Ishaq was considered a model in this respect (yaqtada bihi). We have also seen that 'Abdallāh ibn al-Mubārak was considered a quduwa, a model, in matters of jihād, as well as in ḥajj and other areas. Ibn al-Mubārak was even called fit to rule, entitled, that is, to real power. Ibrāhīm ibn Adham, known afterwards as the founder of a ṣarīqa, was also a quduwa in his own fashion.


(778) Ibid., VIII, 29-30. The monk replies, "I know of no religion other than Islam; however, the Messiah, peace be upon him, has enjoined upon us and has described the end of your time to us; and your religion is new." The text here seems hopelessly corrupt.
In the thughur region, one could acquire religious merit in a number of ways, only one of which entailed actual performance of jihād. The authority of the caliph did not lie as heavily there as it did in other places; and for the scholars and the saints, this region served as a place where they could, to a greater extent than elsewhere, exercise that authority which, it seems, they thought was theirs by right.

5.5 The Local Schools

A large number of scholars lived in the thughur, either having been born there or as immigrants. The rest of this chapter will discuss these thaghris, dividing them up according to locality. (779)

5.5.1 Awzā'ī and the Thughur

First, however, we must ask why it is that in Ibn Sa'd's Kitāb al-tabaqāt al-kabīr it is al-Awzā'ī who heads the list of the traditionists of al-'awāsim wa'l-thughur. (780) This seems peculiar because, while Awzā'ī attained recognition as the imām of Syria, he is not known ever to have traveled, let alone lived, in the thughur region. (781) Several reasons may be adduced.

The first, and most obvious, is that the city where Awzā'ī did settle, Beirut, was itself considered a "frontier post" because it lay on the coast, exposed to maritime attacks. Ibn Sa'd's list of traditionists of al-'awāsim

(779) Only men who are known to have lived in the thughur region itself are included; the inhabitants of the 'awāsim are left out, except for those who interacted with and influenced the thaghris. The schools of Aleppo and Antioch in particular would require chapters of their own.


contains no other residents of Beirut; it does, however, include Adam ibn Abī Iyās al-'Asqalānī (d. 220 or 221). And in general, the coastal cities of Syria and Palestine seem to have had a "front-line" character. An ascetic named Ḥabīd ibn Abī Qīmālī (also called al-Sāḥili) was once asked why he hadn't laughed in forty years. He replied, "How can I laugh, so long as a single Muslim remains [captive] in the hands of the mushrikiūn?" 

A second reason for Awzā'ī's heading the list of theghrīs may be found in the letters which he wrote to the caliph al-Mansūr, the heir apparent al-Mahdī, and other important figures in the 'Abbāsid government. In one of these letters, Awzā'ī intercedes on behalf of the ahl al-sahil, whose 'aṭṭ has just been reduced. In four other letters, Awzā'ī uses similar language in pleading for ransom money (fīdā') for the captives taken by the Byzantines after the fall of Qāhila. Here Awzā'ī writes with as much eloquence and urgency as he did on behalf of the ahl al-Sīrāq. He thus seems to have taken it upon himself to intercede on behalf of the people.

(782) Ibn Sa'd, VII, ii, 186. Adam was born in Khurāsān, grew up in Baghdad, and settled in Ashkalon after much traveling. See also Khatīb, VII, 27-30; Dhahabi, Tadhkira, I, 409; Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, I, 196. Adam does not seem to have had much to do with the (northern) theghrīs discussed in this chapter. However, his attitude to sunna resembles that of Abū Iṣḥāq al-Fāparī: wa-kāna Adam mushhūran bi'l-sunna shadī al-tamaṣuk bihā wa'il-ḥadd 'alā 'l-taqādīim (Khatīb, VII, 28). He refused to return greetings to Abdallāh ibn Shālī because the latter believed in a created Qur'ān (Khatīb, loc. cit.).


(785) Ibn Abī Hātim, Taqdim, pp. 193-195. The reduction was from 15 dinars to 10.

of the entire thughür region.

Finally, we have already seen the extent to which Abu Ishaq al-Fazari followed the teachings and example of his master al-Awza'i, and was considered, together with him, as "one of the two imāms of Syria" (above, 5.2). Both were authors of books on siyār. Most of the other scholars of the thughūr of Abu Ishaq’s generation were likewise disciples of Awza‘i, or at the very least acquired some of their stock of hadith from him. Succeeding generations of thughrīs thus found themselves in direct intellectual descent from Awza‘i.

5.5.2 Al-Massîṣa

This was the most important academic center of the thughūr. (788)

5.5.2.1 The companions of Abu Ishaq al-Fazari

From some sources we gain the impression that a small group formed in these early days, consisting of Abu Ishaq al-Fazari, Ibrahim ibn Adham, Makhlood ibn al-Musayn, and ‘Ali ibn Bakkar. (789) However, the connection between al-Fazari and Ibrahim ibn Adham is tenuous, particularly in that there is no

(787) Compare Abu Ishaq’s condemnation of the Qadariyya with Taqdi’a, p. 206. See also the speech by Awza‘i transmitted by Abu Ishaq at Abu Nu’aym, Hilya, VIII, 254-255. Awza‘i here inveighs against those who ask people “are you a believer?” (a-mu’mi‘u anut?).

(788) Sam‘anI, Ansāb, XII, 297-298, makes a strong case for his assertion that the correct form of the nisba is “Maṣṣiṣi”. Support for this position may be found at ‘Izā al-Dīn ibn al-Athir, Al-Lubāb fī tahdhīb al-ansāb, III, 221; Iṣṭakhrī, pp. 55, 63. However, the form “Maṣṣiṣi” will be retained here. In favor of this more familiar vocalization are the following: 1) By Sayyid’s own admission, the nisba “Maṣṣiṣi” (Sam‘anI says that this was pronounced without rashdīd) was current in his own day, together with the (supposedly more correct) “Maṣṣiṣi.” 2) Yaqtūn, No‘jam al-balāḏūr, IV, 557; Muqaddasi, RGA, III, 22. 3) The vocalization “Maṣṣiṣi” prevails in most modern works. In any case, Sam‘anI is correct in saying that the same vocalization must be used both for the nisba and for the toponym itself.

(789) E.g., Abu Nu’aym, Hilya, IX, 317; Ibn al-Jazari, Ṣifa, IV, 268.
exchange of ḥadīth recorded between them. (790)

However, we may consider Makhlad ibn al-Ḥusayn (d. 191) as a member of the group surrounding Ḥabīb Isḥāq al-Faṣārī. Makhlad belonged to the generation of Ḥabīb Isḥāq and of Ibnu ʿAbd al-Mubārak, both of whom transmitted ḥadīth from him. (791) Makhlad left his native Bassra at some unknown date, and settled in al-Maṣṣaqa, no doubt after the usual ṭaḥārīj. His own sources of ḥadīth included Awzāʾī and Ibn Jurayj. But at the same time, he appears in early sources as an ascetic, following the same practices as Ibrahīm ibn Adham. (792) In one instance he is mentioned as participating in a ghazw. (793)

Best known of this "pioneer" group was ʿAll ibn Bakkar, who, like Makhlad, came from Bassra. ʿAll is said to have "settled as a murābiṭ in al-Maṣṣaqa," where he died in 207 or 208. (794) We do not know the date of ʿAll's birth, nor that of his move to the ṭaḥārīj. He transmitted ḥadīth directly from al-Awzāʾī, (795) but his role in our sources is most often that of loyal disciple of Abu Ishaq al-Fāzārī. (796)

(790) It stands to reason that relations would have been frosty between the ṣāḥib sunna and the ascetic obsessed with purity. In Ṣīlṣa, however, the two occasionally appear together.


(793) Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, II, 255; cf. above, 5.2.


(795) Ibn Ḥajar, VII, 286.

(796) E.g., Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, II, 253; Ibn Ḥajar, I, 152. In many of the ḥadīths of Abu Ishaq recorded at Ṣīlṣa, VIII, 256-265, Abu Ishaq
'Ali’s activities as a warrior present the problems which we have already encountered, particularly in the case of 'Abdallāh ibn al-Muhārak. Later sources ascribe martial exploits to him. For instance, 'Ali was once wounded in battle, so that his entrails came pouring out onto his saddle. He stuffed them back into place, used his turban to wind around his belly, and proceeded to kill thirteen of the enemy.(797) However, another story creates a different impression about 'Ali.

[Abū Bakr al-Maqārizī said:] I went to see 'Ali ibn Bakhrā as he was sifting barley for his horse. I said to him, 'Abū '1-Hasan, isn’t there anyone who can do this for you?' He answered me, "I was on one of the maghāzi when the enemy attacked us, and the Muslims took to flight, with me among them. My horse then began to lag behind, and so I said, 'We are God’s, and to God we return.' My horse then said, 'Yes, we are God’s, and to God we return. [We have got into this mess] because you malign me, and don’t sift my feed (haythu tatakallamu 'alayya fa-la tunaqqi 'alaff). So I promised that I wouldn’t entrust this task to anyone else."(798)

This ability to communicate with animals appears elsewhere: 'Ali and Abū Ishāq once went to gather wood in the mountains. Abū Ishāq then found 'Ali sitting cross-legged; a lion was sleeping with his head on the fold of 'Ali’s garment.(799) This makes a considerably less warlike impression, as does the statement that 'Ali wept so much that he went blind.(800) And of the many pithy (often obscure) sayings attributed to 'Ali, none refer to jihad.
In short, warlike deeds constitute only one of the types of marvelous activity which the sources ascribe to a holy man of the thughūr. In the case of 'Ali ibn Bakkār, we may affirm only that he was a disciple of Abū Ishaq, probably a sāḥid of some sort (though not following the pattern of Ibrāhīm ibn Adham), and a model for later generations.

Al-Hārith ibn 'Açıyya (d. 199), another Basran who settled in al-Maṣṣīṣa, is an obscure figure. He was a disciple of al- Awsā'ī, from whom he had a book of awsā'ī (response) in addition to ḥadīth. Al-Hārith also transmitted ḥadīth from Makhlad, but, strangely, has no recorded connection with Abū Ishaq or with 'Ali ibn Bakkār. One possible explanation for this is jealousy over the inheritance of al-Awsā'ī (and therefore over academic preeminence in the thughūr). Otherwise we know nothing of his activities, except that he was accounted one of the zuhḥād.

5.5.2.2 The second generation

Abū Ishaq al-Fazārī remained dominant in al-Maṣṣīṣa in the generation after his own death. We see this in Muḥammad ibn 'Uyayna al-Fazārī al-Thughrī (d. 217), who was nephew and son-in-law of old Abū Ishaq, from whom he also transmitted ḥadīth. He also transmitted from Ibn al-Mubārak and Makhlad, but

---


(802) Ibn Hajar, II, 151, citing Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal.

(803) We do not know when al-Hārith went to al-Maṣṣīṣa. However, since he transmitted ḥadīth from al-Awsā'ī (d. 157), he must have belonged to Abū Ishaq's generation, and since he lived in al-Maṣṣīṣa long enough to acquire the nisba "al-Maṣṣīṣī," his time must have overlapped with that of Abū Ishaq. The lack of exchange between al-Hārith and Abū Ishaq's devoted disciple 'Ali ibn Bakkār is equally telling.

(804) Ibn Hajar, II, 151. This in itself is not enough to assign him to the Ibrāhīm ibn Adham club.
not from al-Harith or Majjaj al-a'war. (805)

The Kufan Ma'awiyah ibn 'Amr (128-214) seems to have gone to al-Masqisa in order to become a disciple of Abu Isbaq, from whom he transmitted the Kirab al-siyar. (806)

Another Kufan, Khalaf ibn Tamim ibn Abu 'Attab (d. 206 or 213), settled in al-Masqisa, where Abu Isbaq did him the honor of transmitting hadith from him. Khalaf also had a reputation as an ascetic. (807)

Muhammad ibn Kathir al-Masqisi (d. 216), a more important personage, is said to have come either from Syria or the Yemen. (808) He transmitted both from al-Awza'i and from Abu Isbaq, as well as from Ma'mar ibn Rashid and others. Authorities were divided on his reliability as a transmitter; the quarrel revolves largely around his traditions from al-Awza'i. (809) Muhammad ibn Kathir was active as a traditionist. One of his pupils was 'Ali ibn 'Ali ibn Abu '1-Mada' al-Masqisi (n.d.), known to have been qadi of al-Masqisa. (810)

(805) Ibn Sa'd, VII, ii, 187; Ibn Abi Hatim, Jarh, IV, i, 42; Ibn Hajar, IX, 394-395.

(806) Khatib, XIII, 197-198; Ibn Hajar, X, 315-316. Ma'awiyah came from Kufa, went to live in Baghdad, and then at some unknown time went to the mughir. He returned to Baghdad at the end of his life. See Baladhuri, Futuh, p. 163; above, 3.6.2.

(807) Ibn Sa'd, VII, ii, 187; Ibn Hajar, Ill, 148-149. In the long vita of Ibrahim ibn Adham in al-Masmadi, Khalaf appears frequently as a transmitter of the stories.

(808) Ibn Sa'd, VII, ii, 185; Ibn Abi Hatim, Jarh, IV, i, 69-70; Ibn Hajar, IX, 415-417.

(809) Dhahabi, Tadhkira, I, 169; Ibn Hajar, IX, 416.

(810) Ibn Hajar, VII, 380. No dates are given. His teachers also included al-Haytham ibn Jamil al-Ansaki (d. 213 or 214). Al-Nasawi (d. 203) learned hadith from him.
5.5.2.3 The eastern influx

Hajjaj ibn Muhammad al-Maṣṣīṣa al-a'war (d. 206) was the first major figure in al-Maṣṣīṣa (aside from al-Ḥarīth ibn ʿAtiyya) who did not belong to the circle of ʿAbd ʿIṣḥāq al-Fazārī or to that of his followers. (811) He moved to the ṭūḥūr in 190, too late to hear ʿAbū ʿIṣḥāq. But in any case, Ḥajjaj’s master was Ibn Jurayj (d. 150 or 151), from whom he had his ẓafīr. (812) Being elderly and one-eyed when he lived in the ṭūḥūr, Ḥajjaj was noted neither for jihād nor for zuhd, but rather for his fine Arabic and his great store of learning. (813)

In the 210’s and 220’s, al-Maṣṣīṣa seems to have been swarming with traditionists, many of whom came from Iraq and Khurāsān. We know little more than the names of some of these. A man named ʿAbū ʿl-Mundhir, who died in 222, is said to have been qāḍī of al-Maṣṣīṣa. (814) Ashʿath ibn Shuʿba al-Maṣṣīṣa came originally from Khurāsān, and traveled widely. (815) ʿAbū Saʿīd ʿUthmān al-Qārī al-Sayyār also came from Khurāsān. He was known for his learning and his asceticism, and died in al-Maṣṣīṣa in 221. (816) We may situate


(812) Sezgin, GAS, I, 91. People were reluctant to believe this. Once when Ḥajjaj was asked if he had really heard the ẓafīr from Ibn Jurayj, his eye rolled (he was a'war, one-eyed), and he said: “I heard the ẓafīr from Ibn Jurayj, and these long ḥadīths, and everything of which I say ḥaddathāna Ibn Jurayj I did in fact hear from him.” Khaṭīb, VIII, 236-237; cf. Ibn Ḥajar, II, 205.

(813) Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarḥ, I, ii, 166.

(814) Ibn Saʿd, VII, ii, 187; Ibn ʿAṣār, IX, 309 names an ʿAbū ʿl-Mundhir Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Qārī, who cannot be the same person.

(815) Ibn ʿAṣār, I, 354. No dates are given for Ashʿath, but he transmits from ʿArāb ibn al-Muḥammad (d. 152 or 163) and to ʿAbū Tāhir (Abu al-ʿAmr) ibn al-Saḥr (d. 249 or 255). At Ibn al-Jawzi, Ṣifā, IV, 137, he tells a story about Mārūn al-Raḥmān and Ibn al-Nabīr at al-Raqqā.
this period Abu Zakariyya' al-Tahhan, who died in al-Maṣṣṣa in 225, (817) and 'Abdallâh ibn al-Hasan al-Maṣṣṣi. (818) Ibn Sa'd also mentions the otherwise unknown Mansûr ibn Hârûn (d. 222), (819) and Abu 'l-Muwaqqaf (d. 220). (820)

The greatest achievement of Sunayd [al-Husayn] ibn Dâwûd al-Maṣṣi al-muhtaṣib (d. 221) (821) seems to have been that he received (by dictation) and transmitted the tafsîr of Ibn Jurayj from Hajjâj al-a'war. (822) Sunayd seems to have been devoted to Hajjâj, (823) and while he transmitted to and from a number of muhaddithûn, (his sources include Ibn al-Mubârak), Hajjâj seems to have been his master in this science as well. However, some considered Sunayd irresponsible in his treatment of isnâds. (824)

Also belonging to this generation was Ibrâhîm ibn al-Hasan al-Maṣṣî, who transmitted hadith from Hajjâj, Makhlad, and al-Hârîth. Little else is known about him. (825) It will be noted, however, that he did not transmit from Abû

(816) Ibn Sa'd, VII, ii, 187.
(817) Ibn Sa'd, VII, ii, 188.
(818) Ibn Hajîr, VII, 77. He transmits from 'Amr ibn 'Uthmân al-Ḫansa (d. 218 or 219).
(819) Ibn Sa'd, VII, ii, 187.
(821) Khatîb, VIII, 42-44; Ibn Hajîr, IV, 244-245. "Sunayd" was a āqāb.
(822) Sezgin, GAS, I, 31, 91, referring to him as al-Ḫusayn.
(823) Ibn Hajîr, IV, 244, where Ahmad says, kâna Sunayd lazi'ma Ḥajjâja qadîman.
(824) Some scholars, most notably Ahmad, tried to rescue Ḥajjâj's hadith from the pernicious influence of Sunayd, by stating that Sunayd asked ten­
dentious questions about the isnâds of Ibn Jurayj's Kitâb al-jâmi' in reading the text back to Ḥajjâj (who, after all, had only one eye). The same results could be achieved by saying that Ḥajjâj transmitted hadith to Sunayd when he [Ḥajjâj] was already in his dotage (zaghavya-ya). Ḥajjâj's other hadith was presumed to be sound. Ibn Hajîr, IV, 244.
Ishāq or from 'Alī ibn Bakkār. This provides some support for the theory of a "quarrel of schools" in al-Maṣṣīša. (826)

Ibrāhīm ibn Mahdī al-Maṣṣīši (d. 224 or 225) came originally from Baghdad, and was also called al-Ṭasūṣi. (827) His known tradents include no thaghris: this may indicate that he came to the thughūr late in life. Abū Ḥanīfah Abī ʿAbdullāh ibn al-Mughira (d. 230) also came from Baghdad, and was called al-Ḥadathī as well as al-Maṣṣīšī. He also has no known thaghri tradents. (828)

We may have a native son in 'Ali ibn Bakkār ibn Ḥārūn al-Maṣṣīši (d. 240), frequently confused with the older, more famous 'Alī ibn Bakkār. (829)

Luwayn (Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān ibn Ḥabīb ibn Jubayr al-Asadī al-Maṣṣīši, d. 245) was one of the most famous of the scholars of the thughūr. (830) He was born in Isfahan, and lived in Baghdad where he became a disciple of Ibn ʿUyayna (d. 196). At some point, he settled in the thughūr (kāna niṣṣaṣn yurrabītu biʾl-thughūr). (831) He may then have already reached old age, (832) and in any case he never acquired a reputation as a warrior or

(825) Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarḥ, I, 3, 93; Ibn Ḥajar, I, 114-115. See above, 4.3.3.2, where he transmits a ḥadīth from Ḥajjāj on ajr al-ghażl (Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, III, 16, #2326.) Al-Nasāʾī (215-303) transmitted from him.

(826) See above, 5.5.2.1, on al-Ḥārith ibn ʿAtiyya.

(827) Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarḥ, I, 1, 139-139; Khaṭīb, VI, 178; Semʿānī, Ansāb, XII, 299; Ibn Ḥajar, I, 169.

(828) Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarḥ, I, 1, 45; Khaṭīb, IV, 77-78; Ibn Ḥajar, I, 21-22.

(829) Ibn Ḥajar, VII, 286-287, refuting the statement that this ʿAlī transmitted from Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī.

(830) Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarḥ, III, 11, 268; Khaṭīb, V, 292-296; Semʿānī, XII, 299-300; Ibn Ḥajar, IX, 193. "Luwayn" was a liṣāb, explained at Khaṭīb, V, 294-295; Ibn Ḥajar, IX, 199.

(831) Ibn Ḥajar, IX, 198.

(832) No thaghris appear in the lists of his teachers and disciples, except
as an ascetic. In the last year of his life, he quarreled with his sons in
al-Maṣṣīṣa, and moved to Adhana, where he died.\textsuperscript{833}

Another Maṣṣīṣa who had a long life was Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Salām
al-Juhrānī (d. 250), whose 
\textit{abūyūkī} included Ibn al-Mubārak.\textsuperscript{834}

Yūsuf ibn Saʿīd ibn Mūsāllām (d. 271) appears to have been a local prod-
uct. He bore the nīshāt "Maṣṣīṣa" and "Antākī," and counted among his teach-
ers ʿAlī ibn Bakkār (probably the elder) and Ḥājjāj al-ʿaʿwar.\textsuperscript{835} According
to Saʿnānī, Yūsuf "traveled to the two Iraqs."

ʿAbdallāh ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Jābīr al-Maṣṣīṣ al-Iṣām al-baṣrānī went to
Damascus in 267. He was known for "stealing ḥadīths."\textsuperscript{836} Abū ʿl-Ḥasan
Rashīq ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Maṣṣīṣī is an even more obscure figure. We know only
that he came to Damascus at some point, and may be situated in time between
his teacher Abū ʿl-Qāsim al-Baghawī (214-317) and his pupil Tammām ibn Muḥām-
dad [al-Rāzī] (330-414).\textsuperscript{837}

From this time until the fall of al-Maṣṣīṣa to the Byzantines in 354, we
have evidence of continuous comings and goings of muḥaddithūn, but in most
cases only a few facts. Typical is the case of Abūwāṣim ibn Muḥammad ibu
ʿUbaydallāh ibn Abī Ṣaḥīḥ al-Thaghrī al-Tarsūsī al-Maṣṣīṣī al-majjār, who

\begin{itemize}
\item for the ubiquitous Ibn al-Mubārak. On a trip to Baghdad in 240, he is
said to have claimed to be 113 years old (Khatīb, V, 293).
\item (Khatīb, V, 296. Again we have a parallel with Ḥājjāj al-ʿaʿwar, who
took his family with him from Baghdad to al-Maṣṣīṣa.
\item (Ibn Abī Ḥātim, \textit{Jārīḥ}, III, ii, 209; Saʿnānī, XII, 301; Ibn Ḥajar, IX,
36-35.
\item (Ibn Abī Ḥātim, \textit{Jārīḥ}, IV, ii, 224; Saʿnānī, XII, 298-299; Dāhābī,
\textit{Tadhkīrī}, II, 583-584; Ibn Ḥajar, XI, 414-415. Yūsuf also transmits
from Abū Ṣaḥīḥ al-Ḥarrānī and Muḥammad ibn Muṣʿab al-Qarqūsānī.
\item (Ibn ʿAsākir, \textit{Tahdīb}, VII, 366-367.
\item (Khatīb, VIII, 438; Ibn ʿAsākir, \textit{Tahdīb}, V, 322. On Tammām ibn
Muḥammad, see Sengan, GAS, I, 226.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{833} Khatīb, V, 296. Again we have a parallel with Ḥājjāj al-ʿaʿwar, who
took his family with him from Baghdad to al-Maṣṣīṣa.
\textsuperscript{834} Ibn Abī Ḥātim, \textit{Jārīḥ}, III, ii, 209; Saʿnānī, XII, 301; Ibn Ḥajar, IX,
36-35.
\textsuperscript{835} Ibn Abī Ḥātim, \textit{Jārīḥ}, IV, ii, 224; Saʿnānī, XII, 298-299; Dāhābī,
\textit{Tadhkīrī}, II, 583-584; Ibn Ḥajar, XI, 414-415. Yūsuf also transmitted
from Abū Ṣaḥīḥ al-Ḥarrānī and Muḥammad ibn Muṣʿab al-Qarqūsānī.
\textsuperscript{836} Ibn ʿAsākir, \textit{Tahdīb}, VII, 366-367.
\textsuperscript{837} Khatīb, VIII, 438; Ibn ʿAsākir, \textit{Tahdīb}, V, 322. On Tammām ibn
Muḥammad, see Sengan, GAS, I, 226.
transmitted ḥadīth from Ḥajjāj al-s̱awwār and to al-Nasā'I, and so may only be
assigned to the mid-third century.(838) Similarly, Abū 'Abdallāh Ahmed ibn
Nāṣīḥ transmitted ṣuṣūrīyaḥ to al-Nasā'I and to Muḥammad ibn Sufyān
d. after 310).(839) We would like to know more about Muḥammad ibn Abī Mahrūl al-Maṣṣīl, since he was inām jāmi' al-Maṣṣīl, but must be con­
tent with the fact that Ibn Jumay' al-Ghassānī (305-402) numbered him among
his abuʾābkh.(840) Ibn Jumay'y has also recorded the name of 'Ubayd ibn 'Abd
al-Qādir ibn 'Ubayd al-Maṣṣīl, and told us that his shaykh was Abū Umayya,
al-Taṣṣūsī (d. 273).(841) Muḥammad ibn Sufyān ibn Mūsā al-Maṣṣīl was active
around 310, and transmitted from Muḥammad ibn Ādam.(842)

From the final period of al-Maṣṣīl we have Abū 'Abdallāh al-Ḥusayn ibn
Abūn Ahmed al-Maṣṣīl al-Ṣ̱aʿī al-Tayyān, who went to Damascus in 344, where he
died in that year. He is said to have followed the ṣūrīyaḥ of Hudhayfa al-
Marashī (see below, 5.5.4).(843) We have a somewhat better-known figure in
Shākir ibn 'Abdallāh al-Maṣṣīl (d. 354), a native of al-Maṣṣīl who settled
in Baghdad.(844) Abū Ishaq Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Faṭṭ was another
native of al-Maṣṣīl who went to Baghdad, where he died in 385. In Baghdad
he related traditions from his fellow Maṣṣīl Muḥammad ibn Sufyān, and from

(838) Ibn Hajar, I, 76.
(839) Ibn Hajar, I, 85.
(840) Sam'ānī, Ansâb, XII, 300. On Ibn Jumay'y, see Ziriklī, 'A'lām, V, 313,
citing the 22nd ṭaḥqīqa of Dhahabi's Siyar a'lam al-nubalā'.
(841) Sam'ānī, XII, 301.
(842) Sam'ānī, XII, 301. Ibn Hajar, I, 85, names him as transmitting from
Abūn Ahmed al-Naṣīḥ al-Maṣṣīl. He was mentioned by [Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn
Ibrāhīm] Ibn al-Muqri' (285-381, see Sezgin, GAS, I, 205) in his
Mu'jam.
(843) Ibn 'Asākir, Tahdīb, IV, 287. This passage, however, is garbled.
(844) Sam'ānī, XII, 300; Khatīb, XII, 300.
the (otherwise unknown) Abu 'Abdallah Muhammad ibn Ibrâhim ibn al-Hasâl al- Sahâli shumâ al-Maṣṣila.(845)

Abū 'l-Fâth Naṣr Allâh ibn Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Qawi al-Maṣṣila (d. 540) does not belong to this period, and in any case spent his life in Tyre and Damascus.(846)

5.5.3 Tarsus

Tarsûs and al-Maṣṣila appear to have been fairly closely tied in terms of legal administration, at least at times: we find, for instance, one man (Mūsâ ibn Dâwûd al-Dâhibi, d. 216 or 217) described both as qâdi Tarsûs(847) and as qâdi al-Maṣṣila,(848) and even as qâdi al-thughûr.(849) The academic communities of these two towns were also closely tied to one another. Nevertheless, the "school of Tarsûs" does have a history distinct from that of al-Maṣṣila.

We have seen that 'Abdallah ibn al-Mubârak was known to be kathîr al-Ikhtilâf ilâ Tarsûs, but that it is doubtful if he could be called a true resident or the founder of a school there.(850) People from other places came together there, perhaps only briefly. For instance, Muhammad ibn Ibrâhim ibn Abî Sukayna, who carried Ibn al-Mubârak's letter from Tarsûs to

(845) Khatûb, VI, 171.
(846) Sam'ânî, XII, 299; Dâhâbî, Tadhkîrât, IV, 129.
(847) Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Jarîf, IV, 1, 141; Khatûb, XIII, 33-34; Ibn Hâjar, X, 342.
(848) By Ibn 'Ammâr al-Наwâqîî, Khatûb, XIII, 34; Ibn Hâjar, X, 343.
(849) By al-Dâqaqînî, Khatûb, XII, 34, Ibn Hâjar, X, 343. The title qâdi al-thughûr was later held by al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Abdallah al-Asâkir (d. 319), see Ibn 'Asâkir, Tahdîb, IV, 291.
(850) Khatûb, X, 159; above, 5.3.1. Ibn al-Mubârak used to go to al-Maṣṣila to visit Abû Ishaq al-Ṭâsûrî. Ibn 'Asâkir, Tahdîb, II, 543.
Mecca (above, 5.3), was an Aleppan who transmitted hadith from, among others, Abū Yūsauf (d. 182).(851)

We have no record of scholars settling in Ṭarsūs until Abū Ya’qūb Išāq ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥunaynī al-Madani (d. 216 or 217), who, even though he acquired hadith from Mālik and Suḥyān al-Thawrī, was condemned for his hadith.(852) Abū ʿAbdallāh Mūsā ibn Dāwūd al-Ṭabbā al-Ṭarsūsī (d. 216 or 217) came originally from Kufa, and lived in Baghdad before coming to Ṭarsūs as qādi at some unknown date (see above). Like Išāq ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥunaynī, he had his hadith from such great masters as Mālik and al-Thawrī. We know of two Ṭarsūsīs who transmitted from him. The first of these, ʿAbdullāh ibn al-Haytham ibn Ḥas, also became qādi of Ṭarsūs, very likely as successor to Mūsā ibn Dāwūd;(853) whereas the other, Ḥāsi ibn Yūnus al-Ṭarsūsī, served as muftī in Ṭarsūs, and transmitted hadith from Ḥajjāj al-ʿawar al-Musīṣī (d. 206).(854)

The academic life of Ṭarsūs thus began to flourish in the early third century, after a slow beginning. Abū Tawba al-Rabīʿ ibn Nāfiʿ al-Ḥalabi (d. 241), who settled in Ṭarsūs at some unknown time, was a lifelong resident of the region, and numbered Abū Ishaq al-Ḥazārī among his shuyukh. He traveled widely, and became known as an ascetic.(855) ʿAbdallāh ibn Muḥammad ibn...
Yahyā al-Ṭarsusi, known as al-da'if, was also active in the early-to-mid third century. (856) Little is known about 'Imrân ibn Mūsā al-Ṭarsusi, except that he seems to have been a pupil of Ibn al-Mubarak. (857) Ḥāmid ibn Yahyā ibn Ḥāni' al-Salkhī, a disciple of Ibn 'Uyayna, settled in Ţarsús, and died in 242. (858) Ahmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ja'far al-Ṭarsusi is even more obscure. (859)

With Abū Umayya Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Masallam al-Thaghri al-Ṭarsusi (d. 273), we come to perhaps the best known of the scholars of Ţarsús. (860) Abū Umayya grew up in Baghdad, (861) and traveled widely, being described as min ahl al-riḥla. The authorities were divided on his hadith, some of which he had from Hajjaj al-a'rār. (862) But Abū Umayya appears to have struck roots in Ţarsús, where both his son Ibrāhīm and his grandson Muḥammad figure among his pupils. (863)

(856) Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarḥ, II, ii, 163; Ibn Ḥajar, VI, 19. He transmitted from Ibn 'Uyayna (d. 196) and to Abu Dawūd (d. 275). The nickname ḍa'if here refers to his physical condition, not to his status as a traditionist.


(858) Ibn Ḥajar, II, 169-170.

(859) Ibn Ḥajar, I, 71-72. He transmitted from Yahyā ibn Ma'in (d. 233) and 'Āsim ibn al-Nadr (n.d.), and to al-Nasā'i. Ibn Ḥajar, V, 58, confirms the line of transmission 'Āsim--Abū al-Nabī--Ma'in.

(860) Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarḥ, III, ii, 187; Ibn Ḥibbān, Nashābīr, p. 147; Sam'ānī, IX, 65; III, 137; Khaṭṭīb, I, 394–396; Dḥāhibī, Tadhkira, II, 581; Ibn Ḥajar, IX, 15-16.

(861) Ibn Ḥibbān says he came from a Meccan family; Khaṭṭīb (I, 396) mentions Sijistānī origins.

(862) However, he relates from Ibn Jurayj through Abū 'Āsim al-Nabī [=al-Ḍaḥḥāk ibn Makhālid al-Shaybānī al-Maṣṣī] (d. 212 or 213, see Khaṭṭīb, I, 294-295), and not through Hajjāj.
As in the case of al-Maṣṣīḥ, our information on the scholars of Ṭarsūs grows thin in the late third and the fourth centuries. Al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥānām settled in Ṭarsūs and died there in 291. (864) ʿAbū ʿl-Ḥāris Fayd ibn al-Ḥāḍir al-Muḥāsibī (d. 297) was a native thaghribī who seems to have become an ascetic. He died in Ṭarsūs. (865) ʿAbū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Ṭarsūsī went to Baghdad, where he died some time after 315. (866) Al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥānām (not Ṣaḥaibī) ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥānām ibn Hālib al-Kirmani was the son of an immigrant scholar (see above), who went to Damascus in 354, the year of the fall of Ṭarsūs, and died in that year. (867) ʿAbū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Ṭarsūsī al-Ṣūfī made his way to Bukhara, and died there in 382. (868) ʿAbū Bakr Ahmad ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Ṣaḥaibī al-Ṣabbāḥ died (apparently in Damascus) in 387. (869) ʿAbū Bakr Ahmad ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Bandār ibn Abū Bakr Ṣaḥaibī al-Ṣabbāḥ included among his teachers one ʿAbdallāh ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ṭarsūsī, who is otherwise unknown. He went to Nishapur at the time of the fall of Ṭarsūs, and died in 370. (870) Finally, ʿAbū ʿl-Fath Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Hālib ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn al-Hakam ibn Habib al-Kirmani.

(863) Ibn Ḥajar, IX, 15. On the grandson, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAlāʾ Ṣaḥaibī, see Samʿānī, IX, 65; nothing is said about him except that he transmitted from his grandfather and to Ibn Qudama al-Ṣahabī. Of the son ʿAbdallāh, even less is known.

(864) Ibn Ḥajar, II, 253-254.


(866) Qaṭṭāḥ, I, 408.

(867) Ibn ʿAsākir, Tahdhib, IV, 290; correct text to qadīm al-mutārjim min Ṭarsūs.

(868) Samʿānī, IX, 66-67.

(869) Ibn ʿAsākir, Tahdhib, II, 251-252. No tradents listed.

(870) Samʿānī, IX, 65-66. It is not clear if the term "al-qāḍī al-Ṭarsūsī" means that he was qāḍī of Ṭarsūs.
al-bazzāz [or al-bazzār] al-ghāzi al-Ţarsūsī (d. 409 or 410) was a pupil of
Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Abī Umayya, and died in Jerusalem. (871) Abū 1-
Barākāt Šāfiʿ ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥasan al-Ţarsūsī is too late for this peri-
dod. (872)

5.5.4 Al-Ţadath, Marʿash, Adhanna

These towns never developed schools of their own. (873) Their geographical
proximity to ̨Ţarsūs and al-Maṣṣaṣa is the most likely reason for this.

We know of only one scholar who settled in al-Ţadath, ʿIsā ibn Yūnus ibn
Abī Ishaq al-Šabiʿī al-Kūfī (d. 187 or 191). (874) ʿIsā does not seem to have
acquired his hadith from his famous grandfather Abū Ishaq al-Šabiʿī. He was,
however, an expert on the tradition of al-Awzāʾī. (875)

The strange figure Ḥudhayfa ibn Qatada al-Marʿashī (d. 207) also belongs
to this early period of the thughūr. Ḥudhayfa does not appear in the bio-
graphical dictionaries of hadith scholars. This is because he was too preoc-
cupied with his religious observances (riʿaya) to take time with scholarship
(riwaya), even though he had been a companion of al-Thawrī. (876) He was

(871) Khatib, I, 415-416; Samʿānī, I, 66.
(872) Ibn ᾬAsākir, Tahdhib, VI, 361.
(873) In Samʿānī's Ansāb, the nisba "al-Ţadathi" refers to the residents of
al-Ţaditha in Iraq.
(874) Ibn Saʿd, VII, ii, 185; Ibn Abī Hatim, Jarh, III, 1, 291-292; Ibn
(875) At Ibn Hajar, VIII, 238, al-Walīd ibn Muslim (d. 195) says, "I don't
care if anyone differs from me concerning al-Awzāʾī, unless it is ʿIsā
ibn Yūnus, for I believe that he transmits correctly [from him]" (say bi raʿaytu akhdhahu akhdhan mutykaman). See also the garbled passage
at VIII, 238, where Ahmad calls ʿIsā sunna fi ʾ1-ghazw wa-sunna fi ʾ1-
ḥajj. Ahmad then compares ʿIsā with Abū Ishaq al-Ẓazı, and finally
sides with Abū Ishaq because of nakhdahu min al-Islām.
known later as the founder of a ṭariqa. (877) We also know that his ascetism took the form of al-ḥalāl al-mahd. Some of his sayings help to define that practice: he declares himself opposed to accepting any gifts, and says, "Watch where you get the bread which you eat." (878)

In a later generation, two Mar'ashi traditionists appear concerning whom little can be said, other than that they seem to have lived in the mid fourth century. (879)

Three Adhanis are known to Sam'ānī through Abū Bakr Ibn al-Muqri'. Two of these transmitted from Luwayn al-Maṣṣīṣī: Ḥadhā ibn ʿAbd al-Ḍāqī al-Andī al-Adhání, a native of Adhana, and Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn ʿAbd al-Dāwūd al-Kattānī, who settled there (wa-kīna mimman sakana Adhana murābitān). (880)

5.5.5 Ḥalāṭyā

This town, isolated in the thughur al-Jazīra, developed what we may call a school of its own. However, this school had a disastrous reputation. "There is no such thing as a trustworthy traditionist among the Malāṭīs," said ʿAbd al-Ghānī ibn Saʿīd (d. 409). (881) "I have heard," said Sam'ānī, "that most

----------------------


(878) Ibn al-Jawzī, Ǧīfa, IV, 270. ʿUnqur khabaraka [not khabaraka, as printed] aṣṣina tāʾkulu.

(879) Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥajjāj ibn Muḥammad al-Marʿāshī transmitted from his father (unknown), and is mentioned by Ibn Jumay' (Sam'ānī, XII, 192). ʿAbdallāh ibn Yazīd al-Dhikālī al-Marʿashī was a native of Mar'ash who went to Egypt, perhaps at the time of the Byzantine conquests (Sam'ānī, XII, 192).

(880) Sam'ānī, I, 146-147. The third of these was Abū 'l-Mujāhid Muḥammad ibn Yūnus ibn Khālid.

(881) Khaṭṭīb, XII, 446; Ibn ʿAbd al-Nasir, XII, 423.
of those traditionists who came out of [Malatya] were weak" (daru'afū').

Malatya's abysmal standard in the science of tradition was first set by
Ishaq ibn Najib al-Malatī, who appears to have been active in the middle and
late second century. (882) In good thaghrī fashion, he learned his traditions
from, among others, al-Awza'I and Ibn Jurayj. At some point he went to live
in Baghdad; but this only helped to spread his reputation as a fabricator or
falsifier of hadīth. (884) The jarīḥ experts heaped their abuse on him. Ibn
Hibbān called him an Antichrist (dajjāl min al-dajjālīn). (885) Yahyā ibn
Ma'īn called him "a liar, an enemy of God, a foul, evil man." (886) Among his
fabrications are a hadīth stating that God forgives adulterers but not
pimps, (887) and one which states, "If anyone pronounces on matters pertaining
to our religion according to his own opinion, then kill him." (888)

The fledgling school of Malatya then fell silent for around a century,
perhaps understandably. We hear from it again with the appearance of
al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm ibn ʿAbd al-Malatī al-Sūfī, who learned hadīth from

(882) Samʿānī, Ansāb, XII, 421-422.

(883) Khaṭīb, VI, 321-324; Samʿānī, XII, 422; Ibn Ḥajar, I, 252-253.
Samʿānī (XII, 422) says that Tammām ibn Najīb lived in Malatya, but
this is unlikely to be the case. Tammām lived too early (he heard tra­
dictions from al-Ḥasan al-Halabī), and in other sources is called al-
Dimashqī or al-Malabī. See Ibn ʿAbī Ḥātim, Jarīḥ, I, 1, 445; Ibn
ʿAsākīr, Tahdīl, X, 441-444; Ibn Ḥajar, I, 510-511.

(884) See Ibn Ḥajar, I, 252: Ibn ʿAbī Shayba said, "There were people in
Baghdad, of whom Ishaq was one, who used to fabricate (yadā'una)

(885) Ibn Ḥajar, I, 253.

(886) Khaṭīb, VI, 323; Ibn Ḥajar, I, 252.

(887) Yatūbu ʾalā ʾl-ṣāḥi ʿalā-l-zamiyya ʿalā yaṭūbu ʾalā ʾl-qawwād. Khaṭīb,
VI, 322.

(888) ʾAṣa qalī fi dinīn bi-reʾyiḥi faʿqtulūbu. Khaṭīb, VI, 322. Cf.
Dārimī, Sunan, I, 60, 9207.
Luwayn (d. 245), and who was still alive in 323. (889) Like his predecessor Ishāq ibn Ḥajjāḥ, al-Qāsim was damned as a fabricator of ḥadīth. He was accused in particular of ascribing ʿajbīb min al-abtalīn to Luwayn (ʿan Mālik). (890) Al-Qāsim may, like his fellow-Ṣūfī Ḥudhayfah ibn Qatāda, have been more interested in ṭabīya than in ṭawāhib.

The obscure figure Abū Ayyūb Sulaymān ibn Abī Maʿṣum ibn Yaḥyā ibn Sulaymān al-Malāṭī al-Ḥāfiz also lived in the mid-to-late third century. He is mentioned as having met Dhu 'l-Nun al-Miṣrī (d. 246), answering his questions in verse. (891)

The remaining Malāṭīs whose names have come down to us seem to belong to the fourth century. With a few exceptions, we cannot say much about them; they are not even identified as Ṣūfīs.

Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdullāḥ ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Musālim al-Malāṭī was of Ḥimyarī origin, a grammarian, and imām of the "old mosque" of Malatya. (892) Abū Nishām Muḥammad ibn ʻAbdullāḥ ibn al-ʻAbbās al-Malāṭī was active as a muḥaddithī in 'Ukbara, but it is impossible to say when. (893) Ishāq ibn Mahṣūd ibn al-Jarrāḥ al-Malāṭī settled in Nishapur when he had already reached maturity. (894) Sulaymān ibn Abī Maʿṣum ibn Yaḥyā ibn ʻUthmān ibn Abī Salāḥa was a native of Malatyra who must have lived in the mid-fourth century, since both

(889) Khaṭīb, XII, 446; Samʿānī, XII, 423. Transmission from Luwayn confirmed, Khaṭīb, V, 295; Khaṭīb says that al-Qāsim learned from Luwayn in Baghdad.

(890) Khaṭīb, XII, 446.

(891) Ibn ʿAsākir, Tāḥdīḥ, VI, 243.

(892) Samʿānī, XII, 423. The two men from whom he transmits are unknown; Samʿānī knows of him from Abū Saʿīd ibn Yūnus al-Miṣrī.

(893) Khaṭīb, I, 409 (not 494, as in fihrist). Samʿānī, XII, 423.

(894) Samʿānī, XII, 422-423, citing the Taʾrīkh Naysābūr of al-Ḥākīm (321-423).
Abū Bakr Ibn al-Muqri' and Ibn Junayd al-Chassānī heard him speak. The latter, however, disclaimed responsibility for what he heard on that occasion. Ibn al-Muqri' also heard Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Abī 'l-Shaykh al-Paqīh al-Malātī, and Ghiyāth ibn Ṭahmāb ibn 'Uqba al-Tamīmī, who acted as imām of the masjid jāmi' of Malatya, and transmitted from (the otherwise unknown) Fudayl ibn Muḥammad al-Malātī. Not even a rough date can be assigned to Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Suṭūn al-Malātī, who transmitted ḥadīth from his (equally unknown) grandfather, who was also a Malātī. Dirūr ibn Ṭamīr al-Malātī transmitted from (the unknown) Yazīd al- Raghaḍ and the ahl al-Baṣra, and was condemned for his ḥadīth. Abū 'l-'Alā' Abī al-Majīd ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṭahār al-Malātī was the grandson of a Malātī who had fled the town. He grew up in Šam. Finally, the best-known scholar to bear the nisba "Malātī" was the Shafiʿite Abū 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn Ṭahmāb ibn Abī al-Ḥamīd al-Malātī, who wrote the Kitāb al-ṭanbih wa'l-radd 'alā ahl al-ahwā' wa'l-bīda', and who died in Ashkelon in 377. He has no recorded connection with the other known scholars of Malatya, and in any case spent most or all of his life away from Malatya, which had already become uninhabitable for the Muslims by the 320's. The fada'il of Malatya thus include not only the worst ḥadīth, but also the worst heresiography.

---

(895) Bara' atī min 'udattihī. Samā'ī, XII, 424.
(896) Samā'ī, XII, 423.
(897) Samā'ī, XII, 474.
(898) Samā'ī, XII, 422.
(899) Samā'ī, XII, 422.
(900) Samā'ī, XII, 422.
(901) Brockelmann, GAL, SI, 348; Sexgim, GAS, I, 607.
5.6 Conclusion

Although we have a fair amount of information on these thaghris, we cannot draw for them the sort of group portrait which has been attempted, for example, for the inhabitants of Qazvin and Nishapur.

The first two generations of Massis form, for the most part, a distinct group whose common interests—and conflicts—can to some extent be identified. This period of greatest conformity and unity among the Massis coincides with the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd, who maintained a close connection with the thughūr all his life (see above, Chapter III). It is probably no accident that of all the caliphs who ruled in the period dealt with in this chapter, Hārūn is the only one who makes personal appearances (and frequent ones) in the biographies of thaghrib scholars.

Afterwards, however, the thughūr became less of a distinctive entity, from the academic point of view. Naturally, we have many examples of thaghrib transmitting ḥadīth to other thaghrib, imitating one other's ascetic practices, and so on. Nonetheless, the fact remains that most of the scholars about whom we have much information seem to have come to the thughūr when they were already formed intellectually, and had already accumulated most of their learning. The lists of their šuyūkh—and, more surprisingly, the lists of those to whom they transmitted ḥadīth—tend to identify them as scholars in touch, to the extent of their abilities, with what was then current in the Islamic world of scholarship, and in some cases only marginally involved with the place from which they derived their nisba. It may be that our documentation for most of these thaghrib scholars is simply too thin. And it is certainly true that scholars from every part of the Islamic world traveled constantly in the pursuit of learning. Nonetheless, it can be argued
that the nisbas "TarsusI" and "Naṣṣīl" had a different force from, say, "Naṣrī" and "Dimashqī."

The sources repeatedly describe immigration to the thughur as ribāṭ. (902) Ribāṭ can mean performing garrison duty, without going on expeditions. (903) In the hadith, the murābiṭ— one who performs garrison duty or some form of noncombatant duty—is guaranteed the same (heavenly) reward as the ghāzī, who actually fights. To say ʿala murābiṭan therefore means "he received a martyr's reward," that is, Paradise, even if he did not actually die in battle. Thus Awwālī, the great shaykh of the thughur, died as a murābiṭ (mata murabitan), even though his death resulted from an accident in the bath. (904)

Some, even many of the thaghrib scholars may actually have gone to war. (905) This does not change the fact that ribāṭ for them means a kind of merit which one acquires through traveling, learning, and teaching, and through imitation of a qudwa, that is, another scholar, who has achieved preeminence in the district of the thughur and in the academic subjects of jihād and ghazwāt.

-----------------------------

(902) Wa-kana mimman ṭabbēs biʾl-thaghur thus identifies a settler, while wa-kana mim al Šarāf identifies a native.

(903) Shāfiʿ, Umm, IV, 91; above, 4.4.4.7.


(905) Though some of them could scarcely have done so in any case, such as Ḥajjīj ibn Muḥammad, who had only one eye, and ʿAbdallāh ibn Muḥammad, who was known as "the weak" (al-daʿīf). ʿAlī ibn Bakkār is described as a warrior, but he also wept until he went blind, see above, 5.5.2.1.
Hudhayfa ibn Qatada al-Mar'ashl once sent greetings to 'Ali ibn Bakkar in al-Massa. 'Ali replied:

"Peace upon you and upon him [Hudhayfa]. I know that he has been eating 
halal
for thirty years, and I would rather meet the devil face to face than meet him." (906)

This passage shows that there may have been some hostility on the part of some thaghrs toward the seekers of halal. (907) We have noted the rather surprising lack of exchange of learning between Abu Ishaq al-Fazarl and Ibrahim ibn Adham; (908) some such hostility may also be in evidence here.

The men who concerned themselves with al-hašl al-mahd constituted a distinct group among the thaghrs.

[Al-Mu'afā ibn 'Imran said:] There were ten scholars in the old days who used to occupy themselves strenuously with hašl. They would only eat that which they recognized as hašl. Otherwise they would ingest dust (al-turab). Hudhayfa al-Mar'ashl was one of them. (909)

Al-Mu'afā does not give the names of the other nine, but we may assume that Ibrahim ibn Adham was one of them. Makhlad ibn al-Husayn must also be included, (910) as should (probably) Khalaf ibn Tamīm, because of his associa-

---

(906) Abu Nu'aym, Shi'la, IX, 318-319; Ibn al-Jawzi, Shi'la, IV, 267; above, 5.5.4. Inša'ar or fi Cara yakūn al-hašl  준huhu thalithin sana, wa-lar-i la Ald al-shaytān 'tyūnus ahbabu ilayya min an yalqīn wa-alqūh. The following sentence, which seems to have been tacked on, explains away this apparently hostile statement: here 'Ali says that he is afraid that he would honor Hudhayfa too highly, and thus become devoted to something other than God.

(907) If the text is correct, then it may imply something different (see previous note). However, the plain meaning of the passage quoted clearly implies some such hostility.

(908) Above, 5.5.2.1.

(909) Ibn al-Jawzi, Shi'la, IV, 269.

tion with Ibrāhīm and his asceticism. (911) This group of ten may also have included ’Abd Allāh ibn al-Sarī al-Anṭākī al-Zāhīd, who is identified in the sources as an ascetic and as a companion of Khalaf (though not explicitly as a seeker of ḫalāl). (912)

But we may be sure that this list of ten included Yūsuf ibn Asbāṭ ibn Wāsī al-Shaybānī al-Kufī (d. 195), who lived in or near Antioch. (913) Yūsuf practiced extreme poverty, (914) and "would only eat ḫalāl. If he couldn't find any, he would eat dust" (turāb). (915) One of Yūsuf's sayings seems to incorporate Ibrāhīm ibn Aḥmad's teaching on 'amal into a paradox:

Perform works like a man who will only be saved through works, and trust [in God] like a man who will only be destroyed by that which is preordained for him. (I'mal 'amala rajuli la yunjihī illā 'amaluhu, wa-tawakkal tawakkula rajuli la ḫusibuhu illā nā kutihā lahu.) (916)

It is probably impossible to identify the remaining five seekers of ḫalāl with any certainty. Many of the the thaghfr scholars earned the epithet zāhīd, but not all zuhhrī followed this practice. (917) However, there may be some connection between these seekers of ḫalāl (who belong to the first two

(911) Ibn Ḥajar, III, 149. Ya’qūb ibn Shayba described Khalaf as ahad al-mussāk ḡebāb Ibrāhīm ibn Aḥmad. Ibn Ma’īn said that Khalaf was miskīn, and Abu Ḥātim considered him one of al-ḥubbād al-khushn.

(912) Ibn Aḥī Ḥātim, Ṣaḥīḥ, I, ii, 78; Khāṭīb, IX, 471-472; Sa’ānī, IX, 67. Ibn Ḥajar, V, 233-234. ’Abd Allāh ibn al-Sarī’s ḥadīth was condemned; the ajā’ib which he attempted to transmit included a long ḥadīth on the merits of Antioch.


(914) "For forty years now I haven't owned two shirts" (qamīṣāzayn). Ibn al-Jawzī, Ṣīfa, IV, 263.

(915) Ibn Ḥajar, XI, 408.


(917) For instance, Ibrāhīm al-Fazārī and ʿAlī ibn Bakkar were both considered sin al-ṣubbād, while neither of them belonged to this club (they may even have been hostile to it).
generations of thaghris) and those ascetics (of later generations) who were
noted for their harsh practices (al-'ubbād al-khusha).

These included such devotees as Ābu Tawba al-Rahfī ibn Nāfi' al-Ṭarsūsī al-Ḥalabī (d. 241),
who used to walk around barefoot with a tawlā on his head.(919) 'Ābdallāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Yāḥyā al-Ṭarsūsī was known as al-qa'īf ("the weak") because
of the effects of his holy exertions (li-kāthrat 'ibādatihi).(920)

In some of the otherwise unknown 'ubbād mentioned by Ibn al-Jawzī,(921) we
may see some of these trends continued. For instance, (the unknown) Ābū
Yūsuf al-Ghansūlī would take part in the ghaww, and while the others were eat­
ing the enemy's provisions (min dhabā'īh al-Rūm wa-mīn fawā'ikīm), he would
abstain. They would tell him that this food was ḥalāl, but he would reply,
"[True] abstinence is abstinence from ḥalāl" (innama al-zuhd fi 'ī-
ḥalāl).(922) And in one case, the obsession with diet may be traced to the
fourth century. Ābū 'l-Khayr al-Tīmānī (d. 340) went to live in the moun­
tains near al-Masṣisa after vowing that he would eat only what the wind blew
in his direction. This extreme tawakkul seems to be the opposite of Ibrāhīm
ibn Adham's concept of 'amal. In any case, Ābū 'l-Khayr was mistaken for a
highway robber, and had his hand cut off.(923)

--------------------

(918) Makhlad and Khalaf were already min al-'ubbād al-khusha, see above.
(920) Ibn Ḥajar, VI, 19; above, 5.5.3.
(921) Ṣifā, IV, 273-288. These have no dates and, for the most part, no
individual traits.
(922) Ṣifā, IV, 277. This echoes precisely the practice of Ibrāhīm ibn
Adham, above, 5.4.
(923) Ibid., IV, 282-284. He was known thereafter as "al-aqta'."
Chapter VI
GENERAL CONCLUSION

6.1 The Idea of the Thughūr

I said to her, "How did you find your way here, when between us there lie Dulūk, and the mountain heights, overpowering [human strength],

And Jayhān, Jayhān of the armies, and Ālīs, and the rugged hill of Khazāzā, and the harsh ravines?"

Wa-qultu lahā kayfa 'ihtadayti wa-dūnanā Dulūku wa-ashāfu 'ī-jibāli 'ī-qawāhiru

wa-Jayhānu Jayhānu 'ī-juyūshī wa-Ālīsun

wa-ḥażmā Khazāzā wāl-shuʿūbī 'ī- ṣaḥāsiru (924)

O who has seen the mountain passes,
the highest of which close in the way of meeting the beloved.

Ya man raʾā lī 'l-durūbā shāmikhatan
dūna liqāʾī ṣaḥābī atwalūha (925)

Arabic literature tended to treat the thughūr according to set themes which lasted, in some cases, from the Umayyad period until the Byzantine reconquest and beyond. The thughūr often figure as they do here, as an obstacle (sadd).

Remoteness is another of their frequently-mentioned characteristics. But at

-------------------------


the same time, the thughur are accessible: from the entire Dār al-Islām, volunteers (muṭṭammīʿīs) pour into them constantly. The expeditions and raids proceed from there with ritual regularity. And this place of martyrdom, where placenames may recall those of Paradise,(926) is itself something of a holy place (above, 3.6.3). By taking up residence there, one acquires religious merit. And above all, the thughur are part of the immutable order of things. We even find the Byzantine emperor Nicephorus I expressing such a view. (927)

However, it is often difficult to say when the dominant themes and patterns first emerged in our texts. We may now ask if the picture which our sources present of the early 'Abbāsid thughur was colored, or even created, according to notions current at a later time; or if (as may be the case in these two specimens of verse) the earliest formation, the first vision of things imposed itself on succeeding generations.

In the geographical literature, the former appears to be the case. The geographers describe a system at once neat and complex, one which maintains side by side frozen images of systems which in reality succeeded one another (above, 1.2). As a result, this literature is of limited value for strictly historical purposes; we may note instead the geographers' love of an imagined order of things.

In biography we have identified the crucial issue of imitating a model or exemplar (al-iqtīdāʾ). The great models (qudwās) of the thughur belonged to the first generation of scholars. These men have therefore received far more

---------------------

(926) The Jayhān, like its Central Asian counterpart the Jayhūn, seems to derive its name from the Biblical river of Paradise Gihūm (Genesis 2:13). See Nöldeke, *art. cit.*

attention in the sources than have the thughrīs of later generations. But
the information which we have concerning them tends to be highly stylized,
even when not obviously exaggerated. The needs and habits of later times
have imposed themselves retrospectively on this early 'Abbasid material.

The question of juˈl takes this process of projecting onto the past several
degrees farther. Practices which seem to date from the reign of Muˈawiya
are approved and condemned according to the precept and practice first of
Followers, then of Companions, and finally of the Prophet himself, according
to the familiar Schachtian scheme. But one particularly nagging problem
remains. Something called juˈl did actually exist at some time, and its
existence did create problems, both practical and theoretical. But as we
read our texts, we cannot say if the debates which they report reflect conflicts
between, say, the government and the military administration on the
one hand, and the Islamic purists on the other; or if they represent discussions
among the jurists on questions which actually have to do with other
matters. Both kinds of debate probably took place. We, however, cannot
identify the moment of transition from one to the other.

Finally, we must ask about history itself. The information which the
chronicles present on the thughūr seems least susceptible to stylization or
Tendenz. Nonetheless, problems arise similar to those encountered in the
other genres. It would appear from the historical sources that 'Abbasid
administration in the thughūr and adjoining areas was notoriously fluid, with
overlapping jurisdictions and imprecise designations of office and length of
tenure. While this may well have been the case to a large extent, the sourc-
es have also added their own measure of confusion. Harmonization of these
sources has proved possible in many cases. However, two separate kinds of
confusion remain, arising from the fluid nature of administration itself, and from the desire of certain writers to portray events according to their own notions. Again, we do not know where the boundary lies.

6.2 End of the "Umayyad North"

However, the historical sources, combined with numismatic evidence, will permit the following sketch of events.

In the later Umayyad period, the provinces of al-Jazira, Armenia, Arran, and Azerbaijan fell under the control of a single governor. This governor came usually, though not always, from the ruling house: Muhammad ibn Marwan, Haslama ibn 'Abd al-Malik, and Marwan ibn Muhammad derived their military strength from this huge area. These great lords waged war on two fronts, against the Byzantines and the Khazars, of whom the latter were often the more formidable opponent.(928) The administrative unity of these northwestern provinces remained intact during the reign of Abd al-'Abbās, when Abū Ja'far held this super-governorship, in a sense as heir to Marwân.

However, matters changed during Abū Ja'far's own caliphate. This reign began with the revolt of the caliph's uncle Abdallah ibn 'Ali, who tried to gather under his control the military might of the entire northwestern section of the Islamic empire from his strongpoint in the ṭughūr (above, 2.5). Abū Ja'far then proceeded with his "rotation policy" (above, 2.8.1). While Šālīh ibn 'Alī remained entrenched in Syria throughout most of this reign, and al-'Abbās ibn Muhammad in al-Jazira, the caliph sent other commanders to the ṭughūr in regular succession. Armenia and its governor no longer con-

---

tributed to the Byzantine wars, as the Armenians became demoted to the status of a subject people (above, 3.4.1).

Under these circumstances the *thughur* took shape. This narrow line of fixed points no longer depended on the Armenian hinterland. Al-Mansur at the same time tried to avoid entrusting affairs entirely to the governors of Syria and al-Jazira. He therefore broke up the once-unified "Umayyad North" and created the *thughur* in one and the same process.

However, we find a restoration of the old unity in a new form during the caliphate of al-Mahdi. Hārūn led great expeditions in 163 and 165; after the first of these he was made governor of "the Maghrib, Armenia, and Azerbaijan," with Yāḥyā the Barmaķid in charge of his chancery. (929) The *thughur* seem to have belonged to this great division of the Caliphate, and to have served Hārūn and the Barmaķids as a power base in their struggle with Mūsā al-Hādī and his allies. (930)

Furthermore, the Hārūnābād/al-Hārūniyya coinage indicates that at least for the years 168-171 the *thughur* were connected administratively with the province Armenia (above, 3.4). This amounted to a restoration of the old unity of the northwestern provinces.

The lesson seems to have been that the northwestern provinces, especially if made to include Syria, might constitute a formidable base for opponents and rebels, but only if these gained control of the military resources massed for the Byzantine wars: which during the reign of al-Mansūr had come to mean the *thughur*.

(929) Tabari, III, 545.

(930) Bonner, "Al-Khalīfa al-Mardī."
No doubt with this in mind, Harūn created the new district of al-'Awasim upon succeeding to the rule in 170. During much of his reign, Harūn managed affairs there in situ. But even at other times, governors and warlords (such as 'Abd al-Malik ibn Șāliḥ) were not allowed to grow in strength past a certain point. Thus, even if Harūn failed in his attempt to make an independent province of al-'Awasim, he did succeed in breaking up, for once and for all, the old "Umayyad North." What he left in its place, however, proved less stable.

6.3 The Caliph and his Rivals

The conflicts which we have identified in the sources (above, 6.1) will now help us to understand the emergence of the ṭughūr. For they all point to a dispute which assumed different forms in the early 'Abbasid period, but which never quieted down: the debate over the role of the Imām in Islamic society.

The historical sources are frequently at odds with one another over the issue of jurisdiction. This most often boils down to the question of whether a certain governor or governors controlled the frontier area, or whether the Caliph did this, either directly or through other agents. This pattern holds true for the reign of al-Mansūr, less so for his successors. In the "Muslim synoptics," especially Baladhurī, the Caliph usually wins out. In Ya'qūbī and Khallīfa, however, the governor (especially Șāliḥ ibn 'Alī) has more scope; this may well be the more accurate version. At any rate, this tension is central and palpable.

Al-Mansūr's rivals in the ṭughūr, who were his own relatives, did not seek simply to grab power. Șāliḥ ibn 'Alī in particular tried to monopolize the ṭaḍl al-ḥijād for his own branch of the family.(931) This may have

---

(931) See the account of Șāliḥ’s two sisters fulfilling their vow to perform
amounted to a claim to at least certain attributes of the imâmāt.

From the 150's onward, this threat from provincial governors became less acute. But a new and more enduring challenge then arose from the thughûr. From this same decade dates the first recorded activity of Muslim men of learning in the region. At least some of these scholars became independent foci of religious authority, in a place partly beyond the caliph's reach (above, 5.2-4). Furthermore, as the caliphs al-Mahdî and Hârûn developed an interest in jihâd, they had naturally to turn to these academic specialists for instruction in the subject.

A kind of rivalry seems to have arisen. In panegyric Hârûn appears as a super-ghâzi, with the other fighters and the community pushed out of the picture. (932) But in biographical works, which naturally favor the scholars, we find ambiguity over Hârûn and the role of the caliph in general; and where there is overt rivalry, the scholars always come out on top (above, 3.6.2). But while Hârûn played the game according to the scholars' rules, he still found ways of raising the stakes to his own advantage. His attempts at "sacralization" of al-'Awasîm (above, 3.5.5.1-2, 3.6.3.1-2) are perhaps to be understood this way, as is his tendency to arrogate the faḍl al-jihâd to himself and his heirs.

At the same time, this was not simply a quarrel of caliphs against scholars. Al-Shâfi‘î, alone among the early scholars,(933) emphasizes the responsibility of the Imâm for supervising the community in its conduct of jihâd (above, 4.4.4.1). For Shâfi‘î, this responsibility includes, first of all, defense of the frontiers of Islam (sâd al-aṭrâf al-Muslimîn bi'l-rijâl). We

jihâd, Tabârî, III, 125; above, 2.6.3.

(932) E.g., Tabârî, III, 696-698; above, 3.6.2.

(933) A. Noth, Heiliger Krieg und heiliger Kämpf, p. 45.
find a similar emphasis on defense of the frontiers in panegyric of Hārūn (wa-suddet bi-Ḥārūn 'l-thughūr, above, 3.1), and in ḥadith. (934)

The person of the caliph has become closely associated with the defensive aspect of jihād. We may see this in Hārūn's "official" name for the frontier district, al-ʿawāṣim, "the protectors" or "the inviolate ones." (935) But this does not simply mean that the Muslims had gone on the defensive, after suffering a decline in military strength. The jihād continued unabated in its offensive aspect during these years (above, 2.1); and there was nothing new in the early ʿAbbasid period about the need for defensive measures. Rather, we have here the expression of a certain view of jihād which accorded pride of place to the Imam of the Muslims, and which at the same time made a virtue of these defensive measures, and in general of measures taken for the good of the entire community.

We now may be in a better position to understand why the fixed, stationary conception of the thughūr lived as long as it did in the Islamic view of the world. This conception was originally inseparable from the Caliph himself. (936) But in the early ʿAbbasid period, the thughūr were not at first

(934) Ahmad, Husnād, II, 168, ʿawal man yaddkhulu al-janna min khalq Allāh al-fuqara' wa'l-ṭubājiḍīn alladhina tusaddu biḥīm al-thughūr.

(935) ʿawāṣim would normally be considered plural of the feminine ḥṭima, which calls to mind the epithet of Medina al-ṣadīna al-aḥrār, equivalent in meaning to al-ṣadīna al-aḥrār, "the inviolate," "the chaste." See dictionaries.

(936) This association of Caliph and thughūr continued for centuries afterward. We see this in the following account, taken by Ibn al-'Adīm from al-Tarsī, of the last khūṭba delivered in Tarsūs at the time of the city's fall in 354/965 (Canard, "Quelques observations," p. 52): "Celui qui avait été sollicité pour la prononcer, et qui venait de rentrer d'une ambassade infructueuse en Égypte, refusa d'être le dernier à prêcher au mīrāb de Tarse (les habitants devaient en effet quitter la ville le mercredi suivant). Il fut remplacé au pied levé par un cheikh qui, chose curieuse, prit pour Mu'tadīd, comme s'il était le calife régnant, ou plutôt comme s'il n'y avait plus de califé digne de ce nom depuis sa mort."
so completely stationary. They assumed their peculiar form because of shifts in high politics, and because of tensions in Islamic thought, particularly with regard to the central problem of jihad.
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