

**STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND
THOUGHT OF THE ISMĀʿILĪ STATES IN
MEDIAEVAL YEMEN**

ADEL SALEM AL-ABDULJADER

Thesis presented for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy to the
Department of Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies
The University of Edinburgh
November 1997

Vol. I



بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ

with love and gratitude

ABSTRACT

This study is a study of the history of the establishment of the independent state of the Kingdom of Yemen, which came out of the Persian empire. It also analyses the political, economic and social conditions and the role of the state in particular on two little-known periods of the history of the Kingdom of Yemen. The introduction presents a brief overview of the primary and secondary sources used in this study. The first chapter is devoted to presenting the aspects of Shiism and to protect the development of the state. The second is an historical analysis of the fragmentation of the Sana'a entity into three groups: the Zaidiyyah, the Hanafiyah and the Isma'iliyyah. The second is an historical analysis of the decline of the authority of Abul-Qasim al-Harithi, and of its impact on the state. The third is an historical analysis of the arrival of the Isma'iliyyah, the Hanafiyah and the Zaidiyyah. It also mentions the arrival of the Isma'iliyyah in Yemen, their success in establishing the first Isma'iliyyah state in the Kingdom of Yemen, and the role of the Isma'iliyyah in the Kingdom of Yemen. The third is an historical analysis of the arrival of the Isma'iliyyah in the Kingdom of Yemen, their success in establishing the first Isma'iliyyah state in the Kingdom of Yemen, and the role of the Isma'iliyyah in the Kingdom of Yemen.

To My Parents

with love and gratitude

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of the history of the establishment of the independent Ismāʿīlī states in Yemen, which arose out of the Fatimid empire. It also analyses Ismāʿīlī doctrines and some of their literature and focuses in particular on two little-known manuscripts which are anti-Ismāʿīlī refutations. The Introduction presents a critical survey of the primary and secondary sources used in this study. The first chapter is an attempt to summarise the origins of Shiism and to present the development of Ismāʿīlism as a result of the fragmentation of the Shiite entity into three groups: the Zaydīs, the Twelvers and the Ismāʿīlīs. The second is an historical analysis of the consequences in Yemen of the decline of Abbasid authority, and of its impact on the tribal powers, the Ziyādids, the Manākhids and the Yuʿfirids. It also mentions the arrival of the two Ismāʿīlī *dāʿīs* in Yemen, their success in establishing the first Ismāʿīlī state there, and the end of that state as a result of conflict between these two *dāʿīs*. The third chapter gives an edition of an early Zaydī manuscript with an introductory section concerning the manuscript and its author. This work is an example of the way in which after the downfall of the Ismāʿīlī state in Yemen and the spread of the Ismāʿīlī *daʿwa* in the Islamic regions, the enemies of the Ismāʿīlīs began by the fourth/tenth century to attack the Ismāʿīlīs in their books. The Zaydīs were one such Muslim group. The fourth chapter shows how during the fifth/eleventh century, the Ismāʿīlīs organized themselves and united their forces under the command of ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣulayḥī, who together with his successors ruled Yemen for almost a century. The fifth chapter presents an edition with selected translations of some unknown Sunni texts of the sixth/twelfth century which attack Ismāʿīlī doctrines. Particular attention is given to the work entitled **Mukhtaṣar fī ʿAqāʾid al-Thalāth wa Sabʿin Firqa** by Abū Muḥammad.

DECLARATION

My thanks are due especially to Professor 'Ali 'A. al-Shamlūn, the Director General of Kuwait Foundation for the Advancement of Sciences, who gave me the opportunity to complete my studies at the University of Edinburgh by granting me a scholarship.

I hereby declare that this thesis has been composed by myself alone and that the work which enabled it to be produced was carried out by myself alone.

Adel Salem A. Al-Abdul Jader

Date: November 1997

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks are due especially to Professor 'Alī 'A. al-Shamlān, the Director General of Kuwait Foundation for the Advancement of Sciences, who gave me the opportunity to complete my studies at the University of Edinburgh by granting me a scholarship without which I would not have been able to finish this work. I also thank him for his support, advice and kindness over the years.

I wish to express my profound acknowledgement to my supervisor Dr. Carole Hillenbrand -the Head of the Department of Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies in Edinburgh University- for her invaluable advice and assistance and her encouragement. She patiently supervised the whole of this thesis and made useful and constructive criticism for alteration and addition, also saving me from several errors and inaccuracies.

I would like to thank Professor Madelung of the University of Oxford for his generosity in lending me his own microfilm of al-Bustī's **Min Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya**. In addition, a debt of gratitude should go to Professor Zakkār of the University of Damascus to let me use his private library, and allowed me to have photocopies of some manuscripts and gave me the semi-edited manuscript of Abū Muḥammad's **Mukhtaṣar fī 'Aqā'id al-Thalāth wa Sab'īn Firqa**. Moreover, my gratitude and appreciation should go to Professor M. Ṣālḥiyya of the University of Yarmūk-Jordan, for his kindness during my visit to Jordan, where he provided me with books, microfilms of Yemeni manuscripts, and moreover with his valuable advice.

I would like to record my special indebtedness to the Institute of Ismaili Studies in London for its great help in supporting this study with some Ismā'īlī sources. Special thanks go to Dr. Farhad Daftary, Mr. al-Noor Merchant and Mrs. Khadīja Sharīf, who made many difficulties easy by giving me access to the Library of the Institute and providing me with photocopies of al-Kirmānī's **al-Iṣlāḥ**, al-Sijistānī's **al-Yanābī'** and some of Ivanow's works, without which this thesis might not have been possible.

My appreciation should also go to certain Kuwaiti scientific associations, namely; Kuwait Central Library, Arabic Heritage Centre-National Council of Culture & Art and Letters, the Heritage Manuscripts & Documents Centre, and the Library of Arts Faculty of Kuwait University. I would like also to acknowledge Mr. A. al-Duwaysān, Dr. ‘Ajīl al-Zāhir and the staff of the Kuwaiti Cultural Attaché’s Office in London for their valuable administrative help during my living and studying in the United Kingdom. My thanks should also go to Mr. Maṣṣūr al-‘Awaḍī, the Consul of the Embassy of Kuwait in Ṣan‘ā’-Yemen for his help and kindness.

I am particularly indebted to Professor Y. Sulayman, the previous Head of the Department of Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies-Edinburgh University, Professor Robert Hillenbrand; Dr. Waleed B. Salāma, Dr. W. Donaldson and Dr. A. Shalem for their valuable help and kindness.

I am grateful too for the help and advice of my colleagues in the Kuwait Foundation for the Advancement of Sciences, Mr. M. al-Muṭawwa‘, Mr. K. al-Muḥaylān, Mr. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd Basyūnī, Mr. K. al-Rubay‘ān and the staff of the Directorate of Maintenance & Building Engineering.

Last, but not least, my thanks to Miss Lesley Scobie -the Secretary of the Islamic and Middle Eastern Department-, Miss Crawford -the previous Secretary of the Department-, and my colleagues in the Islamic and Middle Eastern Department, Mr. Ṭalāl Mallūsh, Dr. Daniel Feins and Miss Helene Robertson.

INDEX	103
CONTENTS	105
A LIST OF THE MANUSCRIPTS	107
A LIST OF THE PRINTED BOOKS AND ALBUMS	112
1. Arabic Manuscripts	114
2. Arabic Printed Books	116
3. Arabic Manuscripts	117
4. Arabic Printed Books	119
5. Arabic Manuscripts	122
6. Arabic Printed Books	127
7. Arabic Manuscripts	128
8. Arabic Printed Books	131
9. Arabic Manuscripts	134

CONTENTS

A REVIEW OF THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SOURCES

WORKS OF REFERENCE AND PROBLEMS OF ACCESSIBILITY OF SOURCES.....	1
PRIMARY SOURCES	
1. <i>Non-Isma‘ili Yemeni Sources</i>	9
2. <i>Isma‘ili Yemeni Sources</i>	20
3. <i>Additional Sources by other Muslim historians</i>	25
4. <i>Heresiographical and theological Sources</i>	29
5. <i>Biographical Sources</i>	31
6. <i>Geographical Sources</i>	33
SECONDARY SOURCES.....	35
1. <i>The Contribution of Western Scholars</i>	35
2. <i>The contribution of Eastern Scholars</i>	40

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE SHIITES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ISMA‘ILISM

THE SHIITES.....	46
THE DEVELOPMENT OF ISMA‘ILISM.....	49
<i>The Imāmate</i>	49
<i>The Concealment of the Isma‘ili Imām</i>	52
<i>The Hidden Isma‘ili Imāms</i>	54
<i>The Carmathians' Dilemma</i>	56

THE OCCURRENCE OF ISMA‘ILISM IN YEMEN/THE FIRST ISMA‘ILĪ STATE IN YEMEN

THE START OF THE ISMA‘ILĪ DA‘WA IN YEMEN.....	64
<i>Yemen before the arrival of the two dā‘īs</i>	65
THE ISMA‘ILĪ MISSION AND ITS PREPARATION.....	70
IBN ḤAWSHAB IN YEMEN.....	74
‘ALĪ IBN AL-FADL.....	80
THE MEETING BETWEEN THE TWO DĀ‘ĪS.....	85
THE ISMA‘ILĪ IMĀM AND HIS CHANGE OF PLANS.....	87
<i>The Chief Dā‘ī Abandoned his Imām</i>	88
THE CONFLICT BETWEEN IBN ḤAWSHAB AND IBN AL-FADL.....	89
IBN AL-FADL AND HIS RELATIONS WITH THE LOCAL POWERS.....	93
THE END OF THE FIRST ISMA‘ILĪ STATE.....	95

CHAPTER TWO

MIN KASHF ASRAR AL-BAṬĪNIYYA WA GHAWAR MADHHABIHIM

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MANUSCRIPT.....	103
THE MANUSCRIPT'S LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION.....	105
ABŪ AL-QĀSIM ISMA‘ĪL AL-BUSTĪ: HIS LIFE AND HIS WORKS.....	107
A LIST OF ISMA‘ILĪ BOOKS AND AUTHORS.....	112
1. <i>Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādīm</i>	114
2. <i>Al-Jayrānī (?)</i>	116
3. <i>Al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Marwazī</i>	117
4. <i>Al-Nasafī</i>	119
5. <i>Al-Sijistānī</i>	122
6. <i>Al-Murādī al-Naysābūrī</i>	127
7. <i>Mas‘ūd ibn Muḥammad al-Nasafī</i>	128
8. <i>Abū Ayyūb al-Qayrawānī</i>	133
9. <i>Abū Tamīm, al-Mu‘izz li-Dīn Allāh</i>	134

CHAPTER THREE

SOME POLEMICAL TREATISES AGAINST THE ISMĀ'ĪLIS

I. MIN KASHF ASRĀR AL-BĀṬINIYYA WA GHAWĀR MADHHABIHIM.....	140
--	-----

CHAPTER FOUR

THE SECOND ISMĀ'ĪLĪ STATE IN YEMEN

<i>The Rise of the Ṣulayhids</i>	268
--	-----

CHAPTER FIVE

SOME POLEMICAL TREATISES AGAINST THE ISMĀ'ĪLIS

II. ABŪ MUḤAMMAD AND HIS REFUTATION OF ISMĀ'ĪLISM	312
---	-----

THE ISMĀ'ĪLĪ 'AHD.....	322
------------------------	-----

1. <i>The 'Ahd in al-Farq bayn al-Firaq:</i>	324
--	-----

2. <i>The 'Ahd in Faḍā'ih al-Bāṭiniyya:</i>	326
---	-----

3. <i>The 'Ahd in Mukhtaṣar:</i>	328
--	-----

4. <i>The 'Ahd in al-Kashf:</i>	332
---------------------------------------	-----

5. <i>The 'Ahd in al-Dustūr:</i>	334
--	-----

THE RELIGIOUS HIERARCHY OF THE ISMĀ'ĪLĪ DA'WA	343
---	-----

1. <i>Abū MuḤammad's refutation of al-Sijistānī's al-Iftikhār:</i>	389
--	-----

2. <i>Abū MuḤammad's refutation of Abū Tammām's Shajarat al-Yaqīn:</i>	393
--	-----

3. <i>Abū MuḤammad's refutation of al-Nasafī's al-Maḥṣūl:</i>	398
---	-----

3. <i>Al-Ṣulayhī and his work al-Mas'ala wa al-Jawāb:</i>	417
---	-----

MAPS

1. YEMEN BEFORE THE ENTRY OF THE ISMĀ'ĪLĪ DĀ'IS.....	426
--	-----

2. THE IMPORTANT PLACES DURING THE FIRST ISMĀ'ĪLĪ STATE IN YEMEN.....	427
---	-----

3. THE ENTRY OF THE ISMĀ'ĪLĪ DĀ'IS IN YEMEN	428
---	-----

4. THE MILITARY MOVEMENTS OF THE ISMĀ'ĪLĪ DĀ'IS IN YEMEN.....	429
---	-----

5. THE IMPORTANT PLACES DURING THE SECOND ISMĀ'ĪLĪ STATE IN YEMEN.....	430
--	-----

APPENDIX.....	431
---------------	-----

The Ismā'īlīs: A chapter from a book of Abū MuḤammad's <i>Mukhtaṣar fī 'Aqā'id al-Thalāth wa Sab'in Firqa</i>	432
---	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	657
--------------------	-----

NOTE OF THE TEXT

The system of transliteration in this thesis for the Arabic script is essentially that of the new edition of **Encyclopaedia of Islam**, with two modifications, namely, **j** for **dj**, and **q** for **k**. The transliterations shows as follows:

ا	=	a	ي	=	ī	ذ	=	dh
أ	=	a	ك	=	k	ض	=	ḍ
إ	=	i	ل	=	l	ظ	=	ẓ
أ	=	u	م	=	m	غ	=	gh
آ	=	ā	ن	=	n	ء	=	-an
ب	=	b	س	=	s	ة	=	-in
ج	=	j	ع	=	-c-	ة	=	-un
د	=	d	ف	=	f	ؤ	=	aw
هـ	=	h	ص	=	ṣ	يء	=	ay
و	=	w	ق	=	q	يء	=	iyy
ؤ	=	ū	ر	=	r	ؤ	=	uww
ز	=	z	ش	=	sh			
ح	=	ḥ	ت	=	t			
ط	=	ṭ	ث	=	th			
ي	=	y	خ	=	kh			

Common geographical names and certain Islamic terms which have acquired standard usage in the English language have not been transliterated, e.g., Yemen, Mecca and Medina.

The lunar years of the Islamic calendar are generally followed throughout the text and the footnotes by the corresponding Gregorian solar years, e.g., 268/882, Shawwāl 334/May 946, or the fifth/eleventh century.

A few standardised abbreviations have been used in this thesis, notably, *ca.* for **circa**, indicating an approximate date; **d.** for died; **ed.** for edition or editor; **trans.** for translation or translator.

It should be noted that quotations from the Qur'ān have been taken from the English translation by M. M. Pickthall, **The Meaning of the Glorious Koran**, London, 1957. The Prophet's *ḥadīths*, which are mentioned in the thesis, have the numbering of "**Fihris al-Ḥadīth al-Sharīf**", a computer program which is produced by **al-Alamia-Kuwait**, 1993.

- JAOS Journal of the American Oriental Society
- JNES Journal of Near Eastern Studies
- JRAS Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland
- JCS Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society
- MW Muslim World
- NC Numismatic Chronicle
- NEOEH Near East Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History
- NSI Neue Numismatik
- ZDMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft

ABBREVIATIONS

A Review of the Primary and Secondary Sources

BSO(A)S	Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies
EI	Encyclopedia of Islam
EI²	Encyclopedia of Islam, New edition
Glossary	Encyclopedia of Islam, New edition - Glossary and Index of Technical Terms
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland
JRCAS	Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society
MW	Muslim World
NC	Numismatic Chronicle
NENIEH	Near East Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History
RN	Revue Numismatique
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft

A Review of the Primary and Secondary Sources

Works of reference and problems of accessibility of sources

Scholars working in the field of Ismā‘īlī studies generally face difficulties in finding the relevant primary sources which have been scattered all over the world. Some of them are hidden from the public by various Ismā‘īlī communities in certain countries, such as Syria, India and Pakistan. Other sources remain in manuscript form in different libraries around the world. Unfortunately, some of these libraries have been closed by different reasons, such as the Ambrosiana library in Milan, the library of “the Journal of the Institute of Arabic manuscripts-League of Arab States” and the library of the “Arabic heritage Centre-National Council Culture & Art and Letters” in Kuwait. Others, like the library of the “Great Mosque” (*al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr*) in Ṣan‘ā’ and *Dār al-Kutub* in Cairo, create difficulties in providing researchers with access to the books or manuscripts in their collections.

There are a number of important reference works which provide helpful information on Shiite and Ismā‘īlī studies and a bibliographical starting-point. Brockelmann’s *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*¹ and *Supplementbände*,² and Massignon’s *Esquisse d’ une Bibliographie Qarmate*,³ enable scholars to trace the names of authors, titles, and sometimes the places where primary sources may be found. Ivanow edited and translated major Ismā‘īlī manuscripts and his book, *A Guide of Ismā‘īlī literature*⁴ has been a reference work for most

¹ Leiden 1949.

² Leiden 1942.

³ Paris 1922.

⁴ London 1933.

Ismā‘īlī studies since it was published. Methodologically, Ismā‘īl Poonawala, a modern Ismā‘īlī scholar, followed Brockelmann and Massignon. He catalogued most of the Ismā‘īlī source material and published it in his guidebook, **Biobibliography of Ismā‘īlī Literature**.¹

5 Nevertheless, there were still difficulties in obtaining references for this study. In the Dār al-Kutub in Cairo, most of the Yemeni manuscripts have been photocopied and made into microfilms. What has been published from them in Egypt has been put in a special section in the Dār al-Kutub and there is an index of the Yemeni manuscripts. In Yemen, one is confronted with the same problem. Fortunately,
10 manuscripts in *al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr* are listed in the four volumes of **the Index of al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr**.² Scholars may be allowed to photocopy some manuscripts from *al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr* with the permission of the Minister of Endowments and Guidance. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥibshī has published some books on the sources for the history of Yemen, *Marāji‘ Tārīkh al-Yaman*,³ *Maṣādir al-Fikr al-‘Arabī al-Islāmī fī al-*
15 *Yaman*⁴ and he was one of the team that catalogued **the Index of al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr**.⁵

It should be noted that new progress in Ismā‘īlī studies has been achieved in the last five decades, during which some scholars have had access to some Ismā‘īlī manuscripts. This has contributed to the appearance of more manuscripts and scholarly monographs, especially by modern Ismā‘īlī scholars who have written about
20 the history and doctrines of the Ismā‘īlīs. There is no doubt that most of the Ismā‘īlī books have remained unidentified and hidden from the public by the Ismā‘īlīs themselves. When modern Ismā‘īlī scholars started to publish some of the hidden manuscripts, certain Ismā‘īlīs protested. However, Ḥ. Hamdānī with his son ‘Abbās,

¹ Malibu 1977.

² Published under the supervision of **Ministry of Endowments and Guidance-Ṣan‘ā’** 1984.

³ Published under the supervision of **Ministry of Culture**, Damascus, 1972.

⁴ Published under the supervision of **The Centre of Yemeni Studies**, Beirut, (no date).

⁵ Ṣan‘ā’, 1984.

as well as Muṣṭafā Ghālib and ‘Ārif Tāmir¹ insisted that some of the Ismā‘īlī heritage from the hidden manuscripts should be published, especially after the spread of anti-Ismā‘īlī books and the way in which Ismā‘īlīs have been humiliated socially and religiously in Muslim countries. The Institute of Ismā‘īlī Studies in London plays an important part in supporting scholars with new publications.

Primary Sources

1. Non-Ismā‘īlī Yemeni Sources

This study depends on Yemeni sources as evidence for the history of the Ismā‘īlīs in Yemen. It begins in what has been called by L. Massignon “the Ismā‘īlī century in the history of Islam”, around the end of the third/ninth century and the beginning of the fourth/tenth century, when the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* entered the country and established the first Ismā‘īlī state in Yemen. This study finishes with the collapse of the Ṣulayḥid state on the death of Queen Arwā in the sixth/twelfth century.

Some Yemeni historians,² most of whom are anti-Ismā‘īlīs, wrote the history of Yemen within the confrontation between the Ismā‘īlī and Zaydī *da‘was*. The earliest such work is *Sīrat al-Hādī*³ which tells the history of Yemen from 283/895-6 until 327/939 and gives the biography of Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, the first Zaydī Imām and the founder of Zaydism in Yemen. The book plays an important role in the history of Zaydism in Yemen. More especially, it depicts the Ismā‘īlī movement in Yemen at the beginning of the fourth/tenth century and the confrontation between the Zaydīs and the Ismā‘īlīs. According to the introduction of the manuscript on which Zakkār depended when he edited *Sīrat al-Hādī*, the information in this book is narrated by

¹ See below, 43.

² Historians who were not originally from Yemen but lived there are included. It should be noted that the Ismā‘īlī Yemeni sources are listed in “the Ismā‘īlī Sources”, see below, 20-5.

³ Ed. S. Zakkār, Beirut 1972.

Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān al-Kūfī¹ and ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh al-‘Abbāsī.² It seems that the work was written by ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-‘Abbāsī, who was also one of al-Hādī’s adherents and contemporaries, although some parts of the work appear to have been written by another person. As it emerges several times in the book, al-‘Abbāsī recounts what he was told by his father and Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān, and he refers to them when he writes about events of which he was not an eyewitness. Zakkār concludes from the evidence that some additions were appended after the death of the author, especially concerning the Zaydī Imāms following al-Hādī in Yemen.³

Less than two hundred years after the entry of the Ismā‘īlīs into Yemen, Muḥammad ibn Mālik al-Ḥammādī (d. 470/1077) alleged that he had converted to Ismā‘īlism and then returned to Sunnism. Subsequently, he wrote **Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya**.⁴ It is likely that al-Ḥammādī had read some anti-Ismā‘īlī refutations, such as those of al-Baghdādī, or perhaps al-Bustī.⁵ Indeed, there is more than one similarity between some chapters in **Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya** with those written by al-Baghdādī in his **al-Farq bayn al-Firaq** and by al-Bustī in **Min Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya wa Ghawār Madhhabihim**.⁶ Moreover, al-Ḥammādī had access to some Ismā‘īlī books, which were apparently available at that time in the Ismā‘īlī community in Yemen, such as those of Ja‘far ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman and al-Qāḍī al-

¹ Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān al-Kūfī lived at the end of the third/ninth century and the beginning of the fourth/tenth century, and was one of al-Hādī’s companions. Kaḥḥāla, **Mu‘jam al-Mu‘alifin**, x, 54. Brockelmann, **GAL**, i, 209 - S., i, 346.

² ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn al-Faḍl al-‘Abbās ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. Cf. the introduction of **Sīrat al-Hādī ilā al-Ḥaqq**, S. Zakkār, 15.

³ ‘Abbāsī, **Sīrat**, 8.

⁴ The book has been edited twice; M. al-Khusht, Cairo 1985. M. ‘Azab, Cairo 1986.

⁵ See below, 108.

⁶ Cf. Bustī, **Min Kashf**, fol. 18 v.-19 v. Baghdādī, **Farq**, ed. M. M. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, 282-285. See also, Ḥammādī, **Kashf**, ed. M. Khusht, 31-37.

Nu‘mān. Al-Ḥammādī’s book has been a reference work for most Yemeni and anti-
Ismā‘īlī scholars for centuries. Subsequent Yemeni sources never mention the
Ismā‘īlīs in Yemen without referring to al-Ḥammādī.

After **Sīrat al-Hādī**, writing the biographies of their Imāms became a feature of
5 Zaydī historiography. In 544/1149-50, Musallam al-Laḥjī, a Zaydī scholar, wrote **The
Sīra of Imām Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā, al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh**.¹ The book, as Madelung has
pointed out, is extracted from **Kitāb Akhbār al-Zaydiyya min Ahl al-Bayt ‘alayhim
al-salām wa-shī‘atihim bi-al-Yaman** by the same author.² The author gives important
information about the conflict between the supporters of the Imām Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā
10 and the Ismā‘īlīs. One of al-Laḥjī’s contemporaries, Mufarriḥ (or Mufarrij) ibn
Aḥmad al-Raba‘ī wrote his **Sīrat al-Amīrayn al-Jalīlayn al-Sharīfayn al-Fāḍilayn**³
during the fifth/eleventh century. The **Sīrat al-Amīrayn** is a chronicle describing the
history of the Zaydīs during the Ṣulayḥid state in Yemen. It seems that the **Sīrat al-
Amīrayn** focuses on the struggle between the Zaydīs and the Ṣulayḥids in Yemen.
15 Nashwān al-Ḥimyarī (d. 573/1178), a Zaydī-Mu‘tazilite scholar and another of al-
Laḥjī’s contemporaries, wrote **al-Ḥūr al-‘In**.⁴ In his book, Nashwān classifies the
Muslim sects and mentions their origins, indicating their tribes and locations in
Yemen. In addition, he narrates some of their history.⁵

After the work of al-Ḥammādī mentioned above, some Yemeni scholars started
20 to attack Ismā‘īlī doctrines in their books. Most of the works of this kind written in the
sixth/twelfth century and the first half of the seventh/thirteenth century have been lost.

¹ Ed. W. Madelung, Exeter 1990.

² M. Laḥjī, **The Sīra of Imām Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā**, ed. Madelung, cf. the introduction, v.

³ Ed. R. al-Sayyid and ‘A. M. ‘Abd al-‘Āṭī, Beirut, 1993.

⁴ Nashwān ibn Sa‘īd ibn Nashwān al-Yamanī al-Ḥimyarī, **Risālat al-Ḥūr al-‘In**, ed. K. Muṣṭafā, Beirut 1949.

⁵ The book contains other chapters which are less important about the Arabic language and poetics, and the religions and customs of non-Arab nations. *Ibid.*, see for example, 270-82.

On the other hand, Muslim societies outside Yemen were informed to a lesser or greater extent about Ismā‘īlī ideas through the writings of scholars from the eastern Islamic world. Their books were widely spread throughout the Muslim regions. Some of them are still used as references, such as the works of al-Qādī ‘Abd al-Jabbār ibn 5 Aḥmad al-Hamadhānī (d. 415/1024), ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037), al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī (d. 543/1148) and al-Shahrastānī (d. 548/1153).

Another relevant work, **Qawā‘id ‘Aqā‘id Āl Muḥammad**¹ was written in 707/1308 by Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Daylamī al-Yamānī. In addition to reading 10 some of the Ismā‘īlī works, which are mentioned in his book, such as **Da‘ā‘im al-Islām**² by al-Qādī al-Nu‘mān, **al-Maḥṣūl** by al-Nasafī³ and **al-‘Ilm al-Maknūn wa al-Sirr al-Makhzūn**⁴ by al-Sijistānī, al-Daylamī refers to the following works: **al-Ḥusām al-Battār**⁵ by Ḥumayd (or Ḥamīd) al-Maḥallī, **Tahāfut al-Falāsifa**⁶ and **Shifā’ al-Ghalīl** by al-Ghazālī,⁷ and **Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya** by al-Ḥammādī, in 15 order to attack the Ismā‘īlīs. In addition to Ismā‘īlī books mentioned by early Yemeni scholars, al-Daylamī mentions other later Ismā‘īlī books.⁸

¹ Edited twice, the first time by Strothmann, Leipzig-Berlin 1939, the second by ‘I. al-‘Attār, Cairo 1951.

² Ed. A. Fayzee, Beirut 1963.

³ See below, 120-1.

⁴ This book has not yet been found; cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 88. Al-Daylamī mentions the following Ismā‘īlī books:

Al-Balāgh al-Akbar, **Ta‘wīl al-Sharī‘a**, **al-Maḥṣūl**, **al-Jāmi‘ fī al-Fiqh**, **al-Taqiyya wa al-Muttaqī**, **al-Riḍā‘ fī al-Bāṭin**, **al-Mabda’ wa al-Muntahā**, **Yaqaḏat (or Mūqiz) al-Ghāfil** and **Kashf al-Ḥujub wa al-Astār**.

⁵ This work, **al-Ḥusām al-Battār fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Qarāmiṭa al-Kuffār**, seems to be no longer extant. Cf. A. Sayyid, *Sources de l' Histoire du Yémen*, 128, Institut Français d' Archéologie du Caire, Cairo 1974.

⁶ Ed. S. Dunya 1957.

⁷ Daylamī, **Qawā‘id**, 114. This book has not yet been found and is not listed as one of al-Ghazālī's works. Cf. ‘A. Badawī, **Marajī‘ al-Ghazālī**, Kuwait, 1974.

⁸ Cf. Daylamī, **Qawā‘id**, 55 & 109.

Idrīs al-Ḥamzī (d.714/1314), a descendant of al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and one of the candidates for the Zaydī Imāmate in his time, wrote a book of general history called **Kanz al-Akhyār fī Ma‘rifat al-Siyar wa al-Akhhbār**, in which the history of Yemen is treated separately under the rubric **Tārīkh al-Yaman**.¹

During the eighth/fourteenth century two celebrated historians appeared. Firstly, ‘Abd al-Bāqī ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd (d. 743/1342-3) quoted from al-Ḥamzī for his account of most of the historical events, especially the history of the two Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs*. Nevertheless, Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd’s book **Bahjat al-Zaman fī Tārīkh al-Yaman**² became one of the important works of reference for Yemeni historians. Secondly, ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan al-Khazrajī (d. 812/1409-10), who wrote **al-‘Uqūd al-Lu’lu’iyya fī Akhhbār al-Dawla al-Rasūliyya**³ and **al-‘Asjad al-Masbūk fī man Wulliya al-Yaman min al-Mulūk**,⁴ adds some information about the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī*, Ibn al-Faḍl and the end of the first Ismā‘īlī state in Yemen.

There are some Yemeni historians who wrote books about specific regions or cities in Yemen, such as **Tārīkh Madīnat Ṣan‘ā’**⁵ by Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Rāzī (d. 460/1068) and **al-Mufīd fī Akhhbār Ṣan‘ā’ wa Zabīd**⁶ by Najm al-Dīn ‘Umāra ibn ‘Alī. ‘Umāra was a Shāfi‘ī scholar, who rebelled against Saladin in favour of the Fatimids and was hanged in 569/1174. His work **al-Mufīd** sheds interesting light on the history of the Ismā‘īlīs in Yemen. ‘Umāra derives most of his book, as Kay

¹ Ed. A. Mad‘aj, Kuwait 1992.

² Ed. A. Hībshī & M. Sanbānī, Ṣan‘ā’ 1988.

³ Ed. M. Akwa‘, Published under the supervision of **The Centre of Yemeni Studies**, Beirut 1983.

⁴ The second volume was edited by Sh. ‘Abd al-Mun‘im, Baghdād 1975, whilst the first volume is still in manuscript form. S. Zakkār edited part of the first volume in **Akhhbār al-Qarāmiṭa**, Beirut 1982 (the part on the Carmathians in Yemen, fols. 35-43 from MS. of **al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr** in Ṣan‘ā’ and fols. 36-48 from MS. of al-Ḥaram Library in Mecca).

⁵ Ed. H. al-‘Amrī, Damascus 1974.

⁶ Ed. H. Kay, London 1892. M. Akwa‘, Ṣan‘ā’ 1965.

mentions,¹ from **al-Mufid fī Akhbār Zabīd**² by the third Najāhid³ ruler of Zabīd, Abū al-Ṭāmī Jayyāsh (d. 498/1105).⁴ Nevertheless, ‘Umāra’s book has value, especially considering the loss of Jayyāsh’s book. Another useful work is that of Wajīh al-Dīn al-Ḥubayshī al-Waṣābī (d. 782/1380) **Tārīkh Waṣāb**, also called **al-I‘tibār fī al-Tawārīkh wa al-Āthār**.⁵ These books add information to this study.

In spite of the quantity of the books written about Yemen during the ninth/fifteenth century and thereafter, one can find nothing but quotations from earlier works in them. For example, **al-Muniya wa al-Amal fī Sharḥ al-Milal wa al-Niḥal**⁶ by Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā ibn al-Murtaḍā (d. 840/1436-7), is an admixture from **al-Maqālāt** by Abū al-Qāsim al-Balkhī (d. 319/931), **al-Farq bayn al-Firaq**⁷ by al-Baghdādī, **Ṭabaqāt al-Mu‘tazila**⁸ by al-Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār, **Sharḥ al-‘Uyūn** by al-Ḥākim al-Jushmī (d. 494/1101),⁹ **al-Milal wa al-Niḥal** by al-Shahrastānī and **al-Ḥūr al-‘In** by Nashwān al-Ḥimyarī. Nevertheless, the extensive use of quotations is useful

¹ H. Kay, *Yaman, Its Early Medieval History*, xii.

² The book has not yet found. ‘Umāra mentions the book as one of his references, ‘Umāra, **al-Mufid**, ed. M. Akwa‘, 46. F. Sayyid mentions that there is a manuscript of a book called **al-Tārīkh al-Mufid** in the library of ‘Alī Amīrī-Turkey, no. 2376, which might be the same book of Jayyāsh, but he has not seen it. A. Sayyid, *Sources de l’ Histoire du Yémen*, 97. Cf. Ziriklī, *A‘lām*, 2, 147. Kaḥḥāla, **Mu‘jam**, 3, 172.

³ The Najāhids or the Banū Najāh, the descendants of Najḥ ibn Najāh, an Abyssinian slave of the Ziyādids. The Najāhids ruled Zabīd from 412/1021 until 554/1159. ‘Umāra, **Mufid**, ed. Akwa‘, 188.

⁴ Naṣīr al-Dīn Abū al-Ṭāmī Jayyāsh ibn Najāh, an educated ruler and poet. *Ibid.*, 46-7.

⁵ Ed. A. Hibshī, *Ṣan‘ā* 1979.

⁶ Ed. T. W. Arnold, Hyderabad 1902; ed. M. Mashkūr, Beirut 1979. See also, S. Diwald-Wilzar, *Die Klassen der Mu‘taziliten*, Beirut 1960.

⁷ Ed. M. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, Beirut 1965.

⁸ Ed. F. Sayyid, Tunis 1972.

⁹ Al-Ḥākim Abū Sa‘d al-Muḥassin ibn Muḥammad ibn Karāma al-Jushmī al-Bayhaqī was a Hanafite scholar; he then converted to Zaydism and was killed in Mecca as a result of writing one of his books. Ziriklī, *A‘lām*, 6, 176. Brockelmann, *GAL*, i, 524 & *S.*, i, 731.

since it safeguards information in earlier non-extant books. For example, Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Kindī, known as al-Bahā' al-Janadī (d. 732/1331-2), admits that he quotes from al-Ḥammādī for part of the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* in his book **al-Sulūk fī Ṭabaqāt al-‘Ulamā’ wa al-Mulūk**.¹ Even so, **al-Sulūk** became an important source for some historians, such as Badr al-Dīn al-Ḥusayn al-Ahdal (d.855/1451) in his book **Tuḥfat al-Zaman fī Tārīkh al-Yaman**² and Ibn al-Dayba‘ (d. 944/1537),³ the author of **Qurrat al-‘Uyūn**.⁴

Another writer whose information has been used in this study is a scholar of the eleventh/seventeenth century, Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn (d. 1100/1689). His book **Ghāyat al-Amānī fī Akhbār al-Quṭr al-Yamānī**,⁵ is one of the most important reference works on the history of Yemen. In it he mentions that he has referred to numerous books and has quoted from them, but with modifications. In this work he begins his narrative at the time of the Prophet and brings it up until the events of the year 1045/1635.

15 2. Non-Yemeni Ismā‘īlī Sources

These will be listed in chronological order. There is more information available about these authors than their Zaydī counterparts.

Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nu‘mān ibn Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥayyūn al-Tamīmī, known as al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān, lived between 293/906 and 363/974.⁶ He was

¹ Ed. H. Kay, London 1892. M. Akwa‘, San‘ā’ 1983.

² Ed. A. Ḥibshī, Beirut 1986.

³ Wajīh al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Shaybānī al-Shāfi‘ī al-Zabīdī, known as Ibn al-Dayba‘. Brockelmann, **GAL**, ii, 527 & **S.**, ii, 548. Ziriklī, **A‘lām**, iv, 91. Kaḥḥāla, **Mu‘jam**, v, 195.

⁴ Akwa‘, Cairo 1977.

⁵ Ed. Sa‘īd A. ‘Āshūr, Cairo 1968.

⁶ Cf. A. Fayzee, the introduction of **Da‘ā’im al-Islām**, 9 & **JRAS**, 1934. Gottheil, **JAOS**, 1906. Ghālib, **A‘lām al-Ismā‘īliyya**, 589.

appointed judge by the third Fatimid Caliph, al-Manṣūr bi-Allāh.¹ In the reign of al-Mu‘izz li-Dīn Allāh,² he reached one of the highest ranks in the Fatimid state as the chief *qāḍī* (*qāḍī al-quḍāt*) and the chief *dā‘ī* (*dā‘ī al-du‘āt*). Al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān never wrote a book without permission from the Fatimid Caliph and sometimes the Caliph allegedly dictated the book to him. Thus, his writings became the official books of the Fatimid state.³ A thorough reading of all his published works, such as **Da‘ā’im al-Islām**,⁴ **Ta’wīl al-Da‘ā’im**⁵ and some of the manuscripts of his unpublished writings, such as **al-Qānūn**,⁶ indicates that they are of great importance in this study.

In **Iftitāḥ al-Da‘wa**,⁷ al-Nu‘mān reports the beginning of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* and the sending of the first *dā‘īs* to North Africa, and how they succeeded, after a long struggle with the Aghlabids, in establishing the first Ismā‘īlī state. He mentions the Ismā‘īlī mission to Yemen, which aimed to pave the way for the Imām’s arrival.

Sharḥ al-Akḥbār fī Faḍā’il al-A’imma al-Akhyār,⁸ which was written in sixteen parts, mentions the Ismā‘īlī Imāms from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib until the Imām of his time. Part 14 mentions the Shiite sects during the Imāmate of Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad (d. 148/765), moving forward to the disagreement between Ja‘far’s followers in the Imāmate and explaining the emergence of al-Mahdī. In part 15, al-

¹ Abū Ṭāhir Ismā‘īl ibn Muḥammad (al-Qā’im bi-Amr Allāh) ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī, d. 334/953. Bosworth, **The New Islamic dynasties**, 63.

² Abū Tamīm Ma‘ad ibn Ismā‘īl, d. 365/975. **Ibid.**

³ A. Fayzee, the introduction of **Da‘ā’im al-Islām**, 10, where he says:

ويقول رواية الفاطميين إنه لم يؤلف شيئاً دون الرجوع إلى أئمة عصره. ويعتبر أقوم كتبه "كتاب دعائم الإسلام" أنه من عمل المعز نفسه وليس من عمل القاضي الأكبر. ولهذا كان هذا الكتاب هو القانون الرسمي منذ عهد المعز حتى نهاية الدولة الفاطمية.

⁴ Ed. A. Fayzee, Cairo 1952.

⁵ It is an unfinished book by al-Nu‘mān. The book is known also as **Kitāb Tarbiyat al-Mu’minīn ‘alā Ḥudūd Bāṭin ‘ilm al-Dīn** (ed. M. Ḥ. al-A‘zamī, Cairo 1968-72), which is an interpretation of **Da‘ā’im al-Islām**.

⁶ See below.

⁷ Ed. Widād al-Qāḍī, Beirut 1970. And also edited by Farahāt al-Dishrāwī, Tunis 1975.

⁸ Ed. M. al-Jalālī, Beirut 1994.

Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān reports the signs of the emergence of al-Mahdī, moving forward to the spreading of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in *al-Maghrib* and ending with the appearance of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī (d. 322/934) as the true Imām.

Al-Majālis wa al-Musāyarāt,¹ is a work in which the author reports what he allegedly heard directly from al-Mu‘izz on different subjects, such as history, doctrines and literature. In this book, al-Nu‘mān expatiates on most important dogmas and elucidates them; for example, the Imāmate, the Fatimid genealogy and the Mahdī. The author holds opinions against the extremists (*ghulāt*) in favour of the Imāms. He also wrote a book on the etiquette of following the Imāms called **Ādāb Ittibā‘ al-A‘imma**.²

Al-Nu‘mān wrote **al-Urjūza al-Mukhtāra**³ during the reign of the second Fatimid Caliph, al-Qā‘im bi-Amr Allāh (d. 334/946). It is a poem about the lives of the Imāms until al-Qā‘im. At the end of **Urjūza**,⁴ the author reviews the Shiite sects, such as the Zaydiyya, the Bayāniyya, the Khattābiyya and the other *ghulāt* groups, and he refutes their proofs.

There is also a work entitled **al-Risāla al-Mudhhiba**,⁵ edited in 1956 by ‘Ārif Tāmīr from three manuscripts which are not introduced with the name of the author by the copyists. When Tāmīr could not find the name of the author of the manuscripts in his possession, he asked the advice of some specialists in Ismā‘īlī studies, namely Fayzee, Ḥusayn and Ivanow.⁶ They suggested that the book was probably written by al-Nu‘mān, especially when the author mentions in different places that he is a

¹ Ed. Ḥ al-Faqqī, I. Shabbūh and M. Ya‘lāwī, Tunis 1978.

² Ed. M. Ghālib, Beirut 1978.

³ Ed. I. Poonawala, Montreal 1970.

⁴ *Urjūza* (pl. *Arājiz*), has mostly the same meaning as *Malḥama* (pl. *Malāḥim*), which literally means an epic.

⁵ Ed. ‘A. Tāmīr in *Khams Rasā’il Ismā‘īliyya*, 27-87, Beirut 1956 & 1988, he published **al-Risāla al-Mudhhiba** allegedly by Ya‘qūb ibn Killis.

⁶ See, 6. Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 67.

contemporary of al-Mu‘izz.¹ Some time later, in 1968, Tāmīr discovered another manuscript of the same book that showed the name of the author to be Ya‘qūb ibn Killis, the Fatimid vizier (d. 380/990). Tāmīr’s arguments that the book was written by Ibn Killis are not acceptable since this book interprets the esoteric meaning (*bāṭin*) behind the literal wording of sacred texts and religious prescriptions. Such works were usually written by high ranking *dā‘īs* who were the closest associates of the Imām. In this case, it is inappropriate to attribute this work to Ibn Killis. Later on, a fifth manuscript came into the discussion: this mentions al-Nu‘mān as the writer of the same work.² Therefore, one may accept that the book is more likely to have been written by al-Nu‘mān than Ibn Killis.

Ja‘far ibn Maṣṣūr al-Yaman al-Ḥasan ibn Ḥawshab (d. 380/990) was the first Ismā‘īlī author who includes in his books some interpretations (*ta‘wīl*) of the *bāṭin*. He was very close to al-Manṣūr bi-Allāh (d. 341/953), the third Fatimid Caliph.³ He then reached the rank of “the Proof” (*ḥujja*) and “the Gate of the Gates” (*bāb al-abwāb*) in the time of al-Mu‘izz li-Dīn Allāh (d. 365/975). According to the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* hierarchy, the *bāb al-abwāb* had authority to disclose interpretation (*ta‘wīl*) or as they called it *faṣl al-khiṭāb*.⁴ Ja‘far’s books served as guides for the Fatimid missionaries for a long time.

¹ *Al-Risāla al-Mudhhiba*, ed. Tāmīr, 38, 46, 64 and 170.

² On the first folio of *al-Risāla al-Mudhhiba*, a photocopy that was generously given to me by Prof. Zakkār, it is mentioned that:

هذا كتاب الرسالة المذهبية في فنون الحكمة وغرائب التأويل، جواباً عن مسائل وردت عن بعض الحدود، أجاب عنها القاضي النعمان بن محمد، قدس الله روحه، بعد أن عرضها على مولانا وسيدنا الإمام المعز لدين الله أمر المؤمنين.

³ Abū ‘Alī Maṣṣūr al-‘Azīzī al-Jawdhārī, *Sīrat al-Ustādh Jawdhar*, ed. M. K. Ḥusayn & M. A. Shu‘ayrah, 126.

⁴ M. Ghālib, *al-Ḥarakāt al-Bāṭiniyya fī al-Islām*, 121. This phrase denotes the interpretation of the *bāṭin* for a specific cycle (*dawr*) by deciding the divine discourse. S. Makarem, *The Doctrine of the Ismailis*, 30.

Ja'far's works, **Sarā'ir wa Asrār al-Nuṭaqā'**¹ deals with the *ta'wīl* of the stories of the speaker Prophets (*Nuṭaqā'*);² i.e., Adam, Noah (*Nūḥ*), Abraham (*Ibrāhīm*), Moses (*Mūsā*), Jesus (*Īsā*), Muḥammad and the *Qā'im*,³ Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl. It ends with a refutation of those who reject the Imāmate of Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far.

5 **Al-Kashf**⁴ is one of several books which were written by Ja'far to explain the inner connotations of some Quranic verses to reveal the real meaning of *ta'wīl*. Ja'far divides his book into six chapters corresponding to the six cycles (*adwār*)⁵ of time in Ismā'īlī doctrines. In this book, Ja'far enumerates the seven speaker Prophets (*nātiq*) and their Legatees (*awṣiyā'*)⁶ who are also called "Foundations" (*'usus* pl. of *'asās*),
10 and then he mentions the Imāms and their Legatees. He explains how the truth (*ḥaqīqa*) in the *bātin* remains unchangeable while the *sharī'a* is altered by every *nātiq*. At the end of the book, he explains why it is important for the Ismā'īlīs to assume an obligation under pledge of secrecy, and how the *dā'īs* should exact a promise (*'ahd*) from the followers.

15 In 1958, Ḥ. Hamdānī disclosed the existence of a confidential letter sent by 'Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī himself to his *dā'īs* in Yemen. The letter was included in one of Ja'far's books called **al-Farā'id wa Ḥudūd al-Dīn**.⁷ Hamdānī published this letter,

¹ It is also titled "Asrār al-Nuṭaqā'" or "Sarā'ir al-Nuṭaqā'", cf. Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 72. A part of it was edited and translated in Calcutta 1942 by W. Ivanow in **The Rise of the Fatimids**, 275-304. The full text was edited by M. Ghālib in Beirut 1984.

² *Nuṭaqā'* (pl. of *nātiq*): a law-announcing prophet who brings a new religious law (*sharī'a*), abrogating the previous law and, hence initiating a new cycle of time (*dawr*) in the hierohistory of mankind. See below, 343.

³ *Qā'im*: lit. means "riser" or the expected messianic Imām who announces the Resurrection.

⁴ Published by R. Strothmann, **Islamic Research Association**, Series no. 13, London, 1952; ed. Ghālib, Beirut, 1984.

⁵ *Adwār* (pl. of *dawr*): periods, eras, cycles of history: according to the Ismā'īlī belief the history of mankind consisted of seven *adwār*, each inaugurated by a *nātiq*. **Glossary and Index of Technical Terms of E.I.**², 61-2. See below, **Abū Muḥammad and his Refutation of Ismā'īlism**, 342.

⁶ *Awṣiyā'* (pl. of *waṣī*) who interpreted and explained the new religious law which was brought by the *nātiq*. More details about the hierarchy of the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* will be found below, **The Ismā'īlī Da'wa and its Hierarchy**, 342-4.

⁷ A manuscript in the Hamdānī collection. Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 73.

editing it and providing a translation under the title "On The Genealogy of Fatimid Caliphs".¹ This letter from 'Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī dates from a time, after he had established himself in al-Mahdiyya,² i.e. after the year 308/920 and before his death in 322/934;³ it is addressed to the Ismā'īlīs of Yemen and deals with the apparent (zāhir) and esoteric (bātin) names of his secret predecessors. The value of this text lies in the fact that it lists the real names of the hidden Ismā'īlī Imāms. It also presents an unexpected new idea: it appears that the seventh Ismā'īlī Imām after Ja'far ibn Muḥammad (*al-Ṣādiq*) was his son 'Abd Allāh, and not Ismā'īl.⁴

On the genealogy of the Ismā'īlī Imāms one may also cite the unedited manuscript of a book called *al-Tarātib*.⁵ Ivanow mentions that a book called *al-Tarātib* was written by Muḥammad ibn al-Faḍl ibn 'Alī al-Buzā'ī with no further details,⁶ whilst Zakkār who edited a section from the book which he included in *Akhbār al-Qarāmiṭa*,⁷ says that he could not find the name of the author on the manuscript.⁸ Unfortunately, nothing is known about Muḥammad ibn al-Faḍl ibn 'Alī al-Buzā'ī.⁹ Zakkār assumes that the author was an Ismā'īlī *dā'ī*,¹⁰ and that the book was written before the establishment of the Fatimid state in the Maghrib or is

¹ Publications of the American University at Cairo School of Oriental Studies, Occasional Paper No. 1, English trans., 1-21, Cairo 1958.

² *Ibid.*, 9.

³ 'Abbās Hamdanī & François de Blois, "A re-examination of al-Mahdī's letter to the Yemenites on the genealogy of the Fatimid caliphs", *JRAS*, 1983, 174.

⁴ About the succession of al-Ṣādiq's Imāmate, see below, 48-9.

⁵ A photocopy of the manuscript was generously given to me by Prof. Zakkār.

⁶ Ivanow, *Ismā'īlī Literature*, Tehran, 1963, 173.

⁷ Zakkār, *Akhbār al-Qarāmiṭa*, 135-141.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 55-6.

⁹ Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 297.

¹⁰ Zakkār, *Akhbār al-Qarāmiṭa*, 55.

contemporaneous with it,¹ around 305/217-334/946. The subject of the book is the genealogy of the Ismā‘īlī Imāms and the classification of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘wa* with a cosmological interpretation. It seems to be the genesis of early Ismā‘īlī philosophy. It also shows the conflict among the Ismā‘īlīs in Salamiyya about the rightful Imām and it mentions the confrontation between the Imām and the Carmathians.

Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm (or Muḥammad) al-Nīsābūrī was a Persian *dā‘ī* who came to Cairo during the reign of al-‘Azīz bi-Allāh (365-386/975-996) to learn from the chief *dā‘īs* more knowledge about the philosophy of the *dā‘wa*.² According to Ghālib, al-Nīsābūrī wrote five books, most of them in Cairo.³ Unfortunately, not more than two of them appear to be extant. The first is **Ithbāt al-Imāma**⁴ which depends on the Qur’ān and *ḥadīth* to confirm that the Imāmate is one of the Islamic pillars such as alms (*zakāt*) and prayers (*ṣalāt*). The author then tries to prove the necessity of the Imāms’ presence in every era to guide people to the truth. As an Ismā‘īlī, al-Nīsābūrī disputes any claimant to the Imāmate who is not from the Prophet’s family through the lineage of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and Fāṭima. The second book is **Istitār al-Imām**⁵ which narrates the story of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī when he hid from the Carmathians and fled to the west where he established the first Ismā‘īlī state.

Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Yamānī wrote his book **Sīrat Ja‘far al-Ḥājib**⁶ during the reign of al-‘Azīz bi-Allāh. Al-Yamānī served in the Fatimid court and it seems that he had a connection with others who were in the close entourage of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī. Al-Yamānī did not witness the events himself but he cites what he heard from Ja‘far al-Ḥājib “the chamberlain” (d. ca. 341/953). The latter was

¹ Ibid.

² Ghālib (ed.), **Ithbāt al-Imāma**, the introduction, 22.

³ These books are; **Istitār al-Imām**, **Ithbāt al-Imāma**, **al-Risāla al-Mūjaza al-Kāfiya fī Adāb al-Da‘wa**, **al-Risāla al-Zāhira fī Ma‘rifat al-‘Ākhira** and **al-Tawḥīd**. Ibid.

⁴ Ed. M. Ghālib, Beirut 1984.

⁵ Ed. & trans., W. Ivanow in **Ismā‘īlī Tradition**, 157-183, Calcutta 1942.

⁶ Ibid., 184-223.

born in 260/874, and he lived with ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī in Salamiyya. When the Carmathians assaulted Salamiyya, Ja‘far was one of ‘Ubayd Allāh’s companions who fled with him. **Sīrat Ja‘far al-Ḥājib** narrates the story of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī from when he was in Salamiyya until he established his rule in the Maghrib in 297/910.

5 It is important to refer to some early Fatimid books to understand the relations between the Ismā‘īlī headquarters and their *dā‘īs* who lived outside the borders of the Fatimid state. Some of these books are biographies of Fatimid Caliphs, whilst others depict intellectual life in early Fatimid times. **Sīrat al-Ustādh Jawdhar**¹ was written by Abū ‘Alī Manṣūr al-‘Azīzī al-Jawdhari.² He was named after his master Jawdhar
10 al-Ṣiqillī (d. ca. 362/973)³ who was a slave of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī some time before 308/920 and later served the first four Fatimid caliphs.⁴ In the reign of the third Fatimid Caliph, Jawdhar was freed by the Caliph al-Manṣūr bi-Allāh (d. 341/953) as a reward for his faithfulness. Jawdhar was entrusted by the Caliphs with their treasuries when they went out to fight their enemies. He then became the chamberlain of al-
15 Mu‘izz. After the death of his master Jawdhar, Abū ‘Alī Manṣūr was promoted to be the successor in the office held by his master during the Caliphate of al-‘Azīz bi-Allāh and al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh (d. 411/1021).⁵

Al-Mu‘ayyad fī al-Dīn, Hibat Allāh al-Shīrāzī (d. 470/1078),⁶ was one of the distinguished Fatimid *dā‘īs* as well a celebrated Ismā‘īlī author. He became the chief
20 *dā‘ī* in 451/1059 when he was appointed to this position by al-Mustanṣir bi-Allāh (d. 487/1094). **Al-Majālis al-Mu‘ayyadiyya**⁷ were probably some kind of lectures that

¹ Ed. M. K. Ḥusayn & M. A. Shu‘ayrah, Cairo 1954. French translation by M. Canard, “*Vie de l’Ustadh*”, RA, 99 (1955), 434-7. Cf. Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 91.

² Ghālib, A‘lām, 546-7. M. Ḥusayn, **Fī Adab Miṣr al-Fāṭimiyya**, 143-5. Ivanow, **Guide**, 41.

³ Cf. M. Ḥusayn, **op. cit.**, 144. Daftary, **The Ismā‘īlīs**, 618 (f.n. 25).

⁴ Poonawala, **op. cit.**, 91 (f.n. 1).

⁵ Maqrīzī, **Khīṭaṭ**, ii, 5. Poonawala, **op. cit.**, 90-1. M. Ḥusayn, **op. cit.**, 143-5.

⁶ Hibat Allāh ibn Abī ‘Imrān Mūsā ibn Dā‘ūd al-Shīrāzī. Ivanow, **op. cit.**, 47-8. Ḥ. Hamdānī, “*The History of the Ismā‘īlī Da‘wa*”, JRAS, 1932. Ghālib, A‘lām, 596-604.

⁷ MS. in the Hamdānī collection, it contains eight hundred symposia (*Majālis*), the first hundred and the third hundred *Majālis* are edited by Ghālib, Beirut 1974 and 1984.

al-Mu'ayyad taught to the *dā'īs* who wanted to be trained at the Fatimid headquarters. This book became a primary source for most of the Yemeni *dā'īs*. In view of its importance, Ḥātim al-Ḥāmidī¹ arranged the contents of the book according to subject and entitled it **Jāmi' al-Ḥaqā'iq**.² The other book attributed to al-Mu'ayyad seems to be an autobiography of the author himself. It was entitled **Mudhakarāt Da'ī al-Du'āt**³ and in it al-Mu'ayyad reported some of the important events in the fifth/eleventh century. He mentions in detail the military revolution against the Abbasid Caliph in 450/1058 in Baghdād, and how the Abbasid Caliph signed a statement to confirm the Fatimid Caliph as the legitimate caliph.

For our knowledge of the earliest Ismā'īlī doctrines the researcher depends on works which were written by the first Ismā'īlī thinkers and *da'īs*. It should be noted that the early Ismā'īlī doctrines were different from Ismā'īlī beliefs nowadays, but the aim here to examine their doctrines during the period of the hidden Imāms from the time when the Carmathians arose until the rise of the Persian Ismā'īlī state in Alamut. Considering this study focuses especially on the Ismā'īlīs in Yemen, the researcher will concentrate his attention on those Ismā'īlī works which somehow had a connection with the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* in Yemen.

In the fourth/tenth century the Ismā'īlī community in Yemen started to receive some books from Egypt and these were circulated in secrecy by them. Books such as **Da'ā'im al-Islām** were recommended by the Fatimid Imām himself to the Yemeni Ismā'īlīs.⁴ Nevertheless, other books found their way to Yemen, such as the rest of al-Nu'mān's books and those of Ja'far ibn Maṣṣūr al-Yaman. It is important in this study to refer to some of the early Ismā'īlī philosophical books in order to compare the Ismā'īlī doctrines in different regions and to comprehend the influence of **Da'ā'im al-**

¹ See below, 23.

² Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 106.

³ Ed. M. Ḥusayn, Cairo 1949 and by Tāmir as **Mudhakarāt Da'ī Du'āt al-Dawla al-Fāṭimiyya**, Beirut 1983.

⁴ Qurashī, *Uyūn*, vi, 301.

Islām on the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen. Books such as **Rasā’il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā’** “the Epistles of the Sincere Brethren”¹ and **Jāmi‘at al-Jāmi‘a**² were secretly written in Baṣra in the fourth/tenth century. It is also possible that the **Rasā’il** spread to Yemen.

Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Nasafī (d. 332/943) seems to have been the first who adopted Neoplatonism into Ismā‘īlī thought. He was probably the founder of Ismā‘īlī philosophy which became later the mainspring of thought for the Persian Ismā‘īlī philosophers. His book **al-Maḥsūl** has not survived, but some parts of it were quoted by other authors.³

When Abū Ḥātim Aḥmad ibn Ḥamdān al-Rāzī (d. 322/934) wrote **al-Isḫāḥ** to rectify some errors which were mentioned by al-Nasafī in **Maḥsūl**, he quoted some parts of al-Nasafī’s book, now no longer extant. Hardly anything is known of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī’s life except that he was a chief *dā‘ī* of Rayy;⁴ moreover, his name is mentioned in different forms in the sources, which means that there is a disagreement even on his origin.⁵ In this study, the researcher refers to one of al-Rāzī’s books, which is called **al-Zīna**.⁶ In this book, Abū Ḥātim tries to define linguistically the difference between the names of the religious groups, such as the Sunnīs, the Shiites, the

¹ Ed. Ziriklī, Cairo 1928. Tāmīr edited it with **Jāmi‘at al-Jāmi‘a** in five volumes, Beirut 1995.

² Ed. ‘A. Tāmīr, Beirut (n. d.).

³ See below, 120-1. Cf. Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 42.

⁴ Nizām al-Mulk, **Siyāsat-nāma**, English trans. by H. Darke, 216; Arabic trans. by Y. Bakkār, 260. Baghdādī, **Farq**, 283. Ivanow, **Guide**, 32. Brockelmann, **S.**, i, 573. Ziriklī, **A‘lām**, i, 116. Ghālib, **A‘lām**, 97.

⁵ The editor of the book **al-Zīna** is Ḥ. Hamdānī, who depends on what is mentioned in **Lisān al-Mizān** (i, 523). He gives the full name of Abū Ḥātim as Aḥmad ibn Ḥamdān ibn Aḥmad al-Warsāmī (or al-Warsanānī) al-Laythī (i, 26). Ḥ. Hamdānī cannot explain why Abū Ḥātim is described as “Warsāmī” and “Laythī”. M. Ghālib in **A‘lām al-Ismā‘īliyya** (97) mentions the name of Abū Ḥātim as Aḥmad ibn Ḥamdān al-Laythī al-Warsanānī. Moreover, he does not give any explanation for the meaning of “Laythī” and “Warsanānī”, or why he puts “Laythī” before “Warsanānī”. Ḥ. Hamdānī, referring to al-Baghdādī’s **al-Farq bayn al-Firaq** (cf. 283) writes that Abū Ḥātim was one of the people of the Maghrib who responded to ‘Ubayd Allāh’s *da‘wa* and then went to Daylam. Abū Ḥātim was given the *nisba* “al-Rāzī” because of his stay in Rayy. Cf. Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 83.

⁶ The book is in three parts, the first two were edited by Ḥ. Hamdānī, Cairo 1957, the third was edited by A. al-Sāmarrā’ī, Baghdād 1972.

Kharijites and the Murjites. He then classifies Muslim "divisions" (*firaq*) into seventy three groups. It is clear that Abū Ḥātim at the time of writing his book was practising *taqiyya*, in other words, he hid his belief as an Ismā'īlī to protect himself from danger. Despite his assertion that he was himself a Sunnī, he fails to hide his predilection for the Prophet's household.

In response to Abū Ḥātim's attacks on al-Nasafī with pungent criticism in **al-Iṣlāḥ**, Abū Ya'qūb Ishāq ibn Aḥmad al-Sijistānī replies with **al-Nuṣra** in which he upholds the views of his friend, i.e., al-Nasafī, as expressed in **Maḥṣūl**.¹ Al-Sijistānī succeeded Abū Ḥātim as a chief *da'ī* of Rayy and he remained in that post until his death, apparently between 386-393/996-1002.² Some of his surviving books, such as **al-Yanābī'**³ and **al-Iftikhār**,⁴ show clearly his adoption of Neoplatonism into Ismā'īlī doctrines. In **al-Yanābī'**, for example, he discusses the metaphysics of God as the Originator of the cosmos and some philosophical concepts, such as soul (*nafs*) and intellect (*'aql*).

Rāḥat al-'Aql⁵ was to become one of the important Ismā'īlī books on the "unchangeable truths" (*ḥaqā'iq*). It was written in 411/1020 by the celebrated *da'ī*, Ḥamīd al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Kirmānī,⁶ who probably died shortly after he wrote this book. Al-Kirmānī was a chief *dā'ī* of Irāq,⁷ who then became the *ḥujja* of

¹ More details about the Persian Ismā'īlī *dā'īs* will be found below; see below, 114-33.

² Cf. Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 83.

³ Ed. M. Ghālib, Beirut 1965. Ed. & trans., P. Walker, **The Wellsprings of Wisdom**, Salt Lake 1994.

⁴ Ed. I. Poonawala, Cairo 1967. Ed. M. Ghālib, Beirut 1980.

⁵ Ed. M. K. Ḥusayn & M. Ḥilmī, Cairo 1949. M. Ghālib, Beirut 1984.

⁶ Qurashī, **'Uyūn**, vi, 283 & 306.

⁷ **Ibid.**, 286.

the Imām in the reign of al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh.¹ Al-Kirmānī's classification of the system of the Ten Intelligences (*ḥudūd*) into Ismā'īlī doctrine came to be utilised in Yemen by the Ṭayyibī *da'wa* from the time of the Ṣulayhids.² This means that it replaced the old Fatimid doctrine based on the works of the Fatimid philosophers, such as al-Nasafī, Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and Abū Ya'qūb al-Sijistānī, especially when al-Kirmānī tried to solve the dispute between al-Rāzī and al-Sijistānī³ in his book *al-Riyād fī al-Iṣlāḥ bayn al-Shaykhayn*.⁴

3. The Ismā'īlī Yemeni Sources

It was during the second half of the fifth/eleventh century that Ismā'īlī literary output increased in Yemen, especially after the copying of the most important Fatimid books and their transferral to Yemen by a group of Yemeni *da'īs*.⁵ In the sixth/twelfth century weakness in the body of the Fatimid state had manifested itself long before its fall in 567/1171. This weakness emerged especially after the death of al-Mustaṣir bi-Allāh when the well-known conflict arose between the supporters of his sons, i.e., Nizār (d. 488/1095) and al-Musta'li bi-Allāh (d. 495/1101). The Ṣulayhids supported the Imāmate of al-Musta'li bi-Allāh rather than that of his elder brother Nizār. They then proclaimed the Imāmate of al-Āmir bi-Aḥkām Allāh (d. 524/1130) and his progeny. The disagreement in the Ismā'īlī Imāmate had its impact on Yemen, especially after the appearance of *al-Hidāya al-Āmiriyya fī Ibtāl Da'wa al-*

¹ *Ibid.*, 306.

² Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 261.

³ Qurashī, *Uyūn*, vi, 285.

⁴ The full title of this book is *Kitāb al-Riyād fī al-Iṣlāḥ bayna al-Ṣādayn Ṣāhibay al-Iṣlāḥ wa al-Nuṣra* or *Kitāb al-Riyād fī al-Iṣlāḥ bayn al-Shaykhayn, Abī Ya'qūb wa Abī Ḥātim, fīmā awrad Abū Ḥātim fī Kitāb al-Iṣlāḥ wa Abū Ya'qūb fī Kitāb al-Nuṣra fī Sharḥ mā qālahu al-Shaykh al-Ḥamid fī Kitāb al-Maḥṣūl*, ed. 'A. Tāmir, Beirut 1960. Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 97.

⁵ Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 175 & 178.

Nizāriyya,¹ which was an epistle (*sijill*) belonging to the genre of official instructive *dīwān* correspondence. This epistle was followed by **Īqā‘ Ṣawā‘iq al-Irghām.**²

In the sixth/twelfth century, the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* in Yemen supported the Musta‘lī-Ṭayyibī Imāmate when the great *dā‘īs* in Yemen started to disseminate the *da‘wa* by writing books. Al-Khaṭṭāb ibn al-Ḥasan³ wrote several books, one of which was **Ghāyat al-Mawālīd**⁴ where he tried to prove the genuineness of the Imāmate of al-Ṭayyib, the hidden son of al-Āmir. After this book, many works were written by the Yemeni *dā‘īs* on this subject as a matter of faith; these include **al-Qaṣīda al-Tis‘ūniyya**⁵ a poem by ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn⁶ (554/1159) and **Risālat al-Bishāra** which is an official letter sent by al-Āmir to the Ṣulayḥid queen, Arwā bint Aḥmad (d. 532/1138), informing her of the birth of his successor in 524/1130.⁷

The Yemeni *da‘wa* became independent of the Fatimid state in Egypt when ‘Abd al-Majīd ibn Muḥammad (d. 544/1149), who was the guardian (*waṣī*) for al-Ṭayyib, proclaimed himself as the Caliph-Imām of the Fatimids. A meeting was held for the high ranking *dā‘īs* in Yemen by the Ṣulayḥid queen to discuss the problem and to show them the letter which had been sent to her by al-Āmir about the newborn Imām. The agreement refuted ‘Abd al-Majīd’s Imāmate and guardianship. She

¹ Ed. A. Fayzee, Bombay 1938. Cf. S. Stern, “*The Epistle of the Fatimid Caliph al-Āmir*”, *JRAS*, 1950, 20-31.

² *Ibid.*

³ The Sultan al-Khaṭṭāb ibn Ḥasan (Ḥusayn) ibn Abī al-Ḥifāz al-Ḥujūrī al-Hamdānī. ‘Umārah, *al-Mufīd*, ed. Akwa‘, 204-215 & footnote 2 page 204. Ḥāmidī, *Kanz al-Walad*, 100.

⁴ See, B. Lewis, *The origins of Ismā‘īlism*, 109. Cf. Poonawala, *al-Ṣultān al-Khaṭṭāb*, 73-80. Ivanow, *Rise of the Fatimids*, 20-23 & Arabic text; 35-39. S. Stern, “*Succession to al-Āmir*”, *Oriens*, (4) 1951, 193-255.

⁵ See, Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 140.

⁶ ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Ja‘far ibn Ibrāhīm ibn al-Walīd al-Anf al-Qurashī. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 140. Cf. Ivanow, *Ismā‘īlī Literature*, 257, where he ascribes the poem wrongly to Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Walīd (d. 667/1268).

⁷ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 192. ‘Umārah, *Tārīkh*, Kay, 100.

therefore appointed the first "absolute *dā'ir*" (*dā'ir muṭlaq*) to be the representative of the absent Imām. Al-Dhu'ayb ibn Mūsā al-Wādi'ī (d. 546/1151) became this *dā'ir muṭlaq* with the responsibility for looking after the affairs of the *da'wa* and the community in Yemen.¹ Al-Dhu'ayb wrote numerous works dealing with philosophical aspects of Ismā'īlī doctrines.²

Al-Dhu'ayb was succeeded by Ibrāhīm ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥāmidī,³ the second *dā'ir muṭlaq* (d. 557/1162).⁴ Al-Ḥāmidī collected many Ismā'īlī books when he was in office and he also wrote important works of his own which had an important influence on the literature of the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* in Yemen. One of them, **Kanz al-Walad**⁵ contains fourteen chapters about the unchangeable truths (*ḥaqā'iq*) in the knowledge of the inner meaning (*'ilm al-bāṭin*). He mentioned for the first time the **Epistles of the Sincere Brethren** and **Jāmi'at al-Jāmi'a** as forming part of the literature of the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* in Yemen. Henceforward, these works became the main sources or "holy books" in Ṭayyibī doctrine, or as Ḥ. Hamdānī said:

"they considered it (the Epistles) like a Qur'ān after the Qur'ān."⁶

¹ Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 268.

² About Dhu'ayb's works, see; Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 138-9.

³ Ibrāhīm ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Abī al-Su'ūd al-Ḥāmidī al-Hamdānī. M. Ghalib, *A'īn*, 87-8.

⁴ Qurashī, *Nuzhat al-Afkār*, i, 89-90. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 270. Ghālib (ed.), *Kanz al-Walad*, 30.

⁵ Ed. M. Ghālib, Beirut 1979.

⁶ Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Baḥth Tārīkhī fī Rasā'il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā* "An historical study in the Epistles of the Sincere Brethren", Bombay 1935, 14. Also, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 272, where he says:

وفي اعتبارهم أيها بمثابة القرآن بعد القرآن.

Asghar Ali Engineer, a modern Ismā'īlī scholar, mentions that shaykh Ibrāhīm al-Ṣayfī, a Dā'ūdī-Ismā'īlī scholar, says:

I have heard some '*ulamā*' says that the **Rasā'il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā** are a Qur'ān after [the] Qur'ān and this (i.e., **Rasā'il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā**) is the Qur'ān of knowledge (*'ilm*) as that Qur'ān is the Qur'ān of revelation and this the Qur'ān of [the] Imāmate as it the Qur'ān of [the] Nubuwwa (i.e., Prophethood). Engineer, *the Bohras*, 22.

After his death, al-Ḥāmidī was succeeded by his son Ḥātim (d. 596/1199) who quoted earlier works and wrote several books of his own.¹ When he died, his son ‘Alī (d. 605/1209) became the fourth *dā‘ī muṭlaq* of Yemen and he appointed the celebrated *dā‘ī* ‘Alī ibn al-Walīd to be in his office. ‘Alī ibn al-Walīd² (d. 612/1215) was first appointed as deputy (*nā‘ib*) of Ṣan‘ā’ by Ḥātim al-Ḥāmidī, the third *dā‘ī muṭlaq*. He was the mentor of the fourth *dā‘ī muṭlaq* in 596/1199 and he became the fifth *dā‘ī muṭlaq* after the latter’s death in 605/1209. In addition to preserving a large number of Ismā‘īlī books from loss, as the head of the Ṭayyibī *da‘wa* he produced important works in Ismā‘īlī doctrines. According to Poonawala,³ ‘Alī ibn al-Walīd has twenty-five works most of them on doctrine. In this study, three of these books have been referred to: *al-Dhakhīra fī al-Ḥaqīqa*,⁴ *Tāj al-‘Aqā’id wa Ma‘dan al-Fawā’id*⁵ and *Dāmigh al-Bāṭil wa Ḥatf al-Munāḍil*.⁶ The first book contains thirty-four chapters, all of them on *ḥaqā’iq*. The second book, *Tāj al-‘Aqā’id wa Ma‘dan al-Fawā’id*, explains Ismā‘īlī doctrines classified as a hundred items of beliefs (*i‘tiqādāt*) which reflected the differences between the *da‘wa* in Yemen and the other Ismā‘īlī groupings, i.e., the Ismā‘īlī *da‘was* in Persia, Egypt and Syria. The third, *Dāmigh al-Bāṭil*, may be considered as the first written Ismā‘īlī refutation of Sunnism. It is a refutation of al-Ghazālī’s *Faḍā’ih*, which seems to indicate that the *Faḍā’ih* had spread to Yemen more than a century after its composition. The researcher will give more details about *Dāmigh al-Bāṭil* in this study where he examines the polemical treatises against the Ismā‘īlīs.

¹ Qurashī, *Nuzhat*, i, 93. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 152-155. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 278-9.

² ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Ibrāhīm ibn al-Walīd al-Anf al-‘Abshamī al-Qurashī. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 469. Cf. Ghalib, *A‘lām*, 408-11.

³ Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 157-161.

⁴ Ed. M. A‘zamī, Beirut 1971.

⁵ Ed. Tāmīr, Beirut 1967.

⁶ Ed. Ghālib, Beirut 1982.

However, most of the above-mentioned Ismā‘īlī sources were written about Ismā‘īlī doctrines; but a few of them prove useful for a knowledge of the history of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen. In addition to **Iftitāḥ al-Da‘wa**, there are some books which mention the activities of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* in Yemen and which were written as biographies or autobiographies (*mudhakkarāt*) of the Imāms and their missionaries. This makes ‘**Uyūn al-Akḥbār wa Funūn al-Āthār**¹ the most comprehensive Ismā‘īlī work on the history of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen. In fact, it is, moreover, the most detailed book on the history of Ismā‘īlī Imāms until the occultation of al-Ṭayyib and the Ṭayyibī *da‘wa* in Yemen. The author of this book is Idrīs ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Qurashī (d. 872/1468), the nineteenth *dā‘ī muṭlaq* of Yemen and a descendant of the fifth *dā‘ī muṭlaq* of Yemen, ‘Alī ibn al-Walīd.

It seems that al-Qurashī² continued the history of the Ṭayyibī *da‘wa* in **Nuzhat al-Afkār wa Rawḍat al-Akḥbār**.³ In **Nuzhat**, al-Qurashī deals with the political history of Yemen after the collapse of the Ṣulayḥids in 532/1137 until the year 853/1449. It seems the book had a continuation called **Rawḍat al-Akḥbār wa Bahjat al-Asmār**,⁴ which dealt with the historical events between 853/1449 and 870/1465. In his three books al-Qurashī covers the history of Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in general, and more than eight hundred years of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen. Furthermore, al-Qurashī as a *dā‘ī* wrote some books on Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*), doctrines and some refutation treatises.⁵ Fortunately, one of his books on doctrine was edited by Ghālib

¹ Some of its volumes have been published, volumes (iv), (v) and (vi) were published by Ghalib in Beirut 1973, 1975 and 1984. The fifth volume was also edited by F. Dishrāwī, Tunis 1979, and by M. Ya‘lāwī with more comments and fewer mistakes, Beirut 1985. Some passages of volume(vii) are used by Ḥ. Hamdānī in **Ṣulayḥiyyūn**.

² Henceforward, he will be called al-Qurashī to avoid confusion with the Zaydī author who has the same surname, i.e., ‘Imād al-Dīn Idrīs al-Ḥamzī.

³ A manuscript of two volumes in the Hamdānī collection, and the American University of Beirut, MS 297. 822/121nA.

⁴ Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 173.

⁵ **Ibid.**, 173-5.

shortly before his death. In twenty-one chapters, al-Qurashī discusses *tawhīd*¹ and *tajrīd*² in Ismā‘īlī beliefs. According to Poonawala, this book, **Zahr al-Ma‘ānī**,³ is considered as “the highest watermark” on *ḥaqā’iq* ever achieved by the Yemeni *da‘wa*.⁴

4. Additional Sources by other Muslim historians

One of the earliest sources of Islamic history is **Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī**,⁵ which was written in the third/ninth century by Aḥmad ibn Ishāq al-Ya‘qūbī (d. 292/905).⁶ Some chapters of the book tell the history of Yemen until the reign of the Abbasid Caliph al-Mu‘tamid (d. 256/870). It also describes the origin of Shī‘ism and Ismā‘īlism. In his **Tārīkh**, al-Ya‘qūbī shows a different perspective when he narrates the important events of the early Islamic history, the history of the Rāshidūn and the Umayyads. Although he tried to be objective and neutral in his book, he could not conceal his favour, as a Shiite, to the Alids. Moreover, it becomes clear that al-Ya‘qūbī is a Twelver-Imāmī when he mentions the history of the Shiite Imāms and their point of views against the regime. He writes detailed biographies of the Twelve Imāms, such as Muḥammad al-Bāqir, Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq and Mūsā al-Kāẓim,⁷ whilst giving only a brief mention of the rebellion and death of Zayd ibn ‘Alī.⁸

¹ *Tawhīd*: declaration of the Oneness of God, belief in that Oneness or Unity, monotheism. I. R. Netton, *A Popular Dictionary of Islam*, 248.

² *Tajrīd*: lit., abstraction, considering or declaring God to be above and beyond anthropomorphic elements or description, which means that God has no like. In the view of Islamic theologians it is usually mentioned as a synonymous *tanzīh*, which is the opposite of *tashbīh* “Anthropomorphism”. Cf. *Ibid.*, 244, 246.

³ Ed. Ghālib, Beirut 1991.

⁴ Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 173.

⁵ Published under *Houtsma*’s supervision-Leiden 1883, and again by the *Murtaḍawiyya* Library-Najaf 1939, then Beirut 1980.

⁶ Cf. Wiet, *Les Pays*, viii, 244.

⁷ Cf. *Ibid.*, 320, 381, 414.

⁸ Cf. Ya‘qūbī, **Tārīkh**, ii, 326.

Al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), the author of **Tārīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk**, or the so-called **The Annals**,¹ has been used mostly in the first chapter of this study as a primary source.

Al-Mas‘ūdī (d. 346/956) wrote several books, of which two are relevant to this thesis; **Murūj al-Dhahab wa Ma‘ādin al-Jawhar**² and **al-Tanbīh wa al-Ashrāf**,³ which contains the origins of some Muslim tribes and families.

Unlike al-Ṭabarī, Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233) adds his opinions on many historical events in his book **al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh**.⁴ Methodologically, he follows al-Ṭabarī in his way of recording history, but he adds his own analysis of events. Furthermore, the neutral attitude of Ibn al-Athīr towards the period under discussion in this book makes his book the major reference work after **Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī**.

Using **Min Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya** by Ismā‘īl ibn Aḥmad al-Bustī, a Zaydī-Mu‘tazilite theologian (d. ca. 420/1029),⁵ and **Qawāsim al-Bāṭiniyya**⁶ with **Faḍā’ih al-Bāṭiniyya wa Faḍā’ih al-Mustazhiyya**, or the so-called **al-Mustazhiri**,⁷ by Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), provides explanations and insights into an understanding of Ismā‘īlism, from the point of view of the conflict between the Shiites and the Sunnis. Moreover, one can see that Ghazālī’s books created a crisis among the Ismā‘īlīs at that time, which made ‘Alī ibn al-Walīd, the Ismā‘īlī chief *dā‘ī* in Yemen, write his refutation in **Dāmigh al-Bāṭil wa Ḥaṭf al-Munāḍil**.⁸ Such refutations are the subject of a

¹ First published by De Goeje, Leiden 1901. Ed. M. Ibrāhīm, Cairo 1960-9. It is translated into English by *Bibliotheca Persica*-State University of New York, ed. Ehsan Yar-Shater 1989.

² Printed the first time in Būlāq-Egypt in 1283-1866-7, then published with French translation in nine volumes in Paris 1861-1869, and Ch. Pellat in Beirut 1970.

³ Ed. M. J. de Goeje, Leiden 1894, (2nd ed. Beirut 1965). Ed. ‘A. al-Ṣāwī, Cairo 1938.

⁴ Ed. Carolus J. Tornberg, Leiden 1862.

⁵ See below, 108.

⁶ A photocopy of the manuscript was given to me by Prof. Zakkār.

⁷ Ed. ‘A. Badawī, Cairo 1964.

⁸ See above, 23.

separate chapter in this study. An unknown author who is mentioned by his *kunya* as "Abū Muḥammad" wrote a valuable book entitled **Mukhtaṣar fī 'Aqā'id al-Thalāth wa Sab'īn Firqa**,¹ which seems to be a refutation of some Ismā'īlī books, especially al-Sijistānī's **al-Iftikhār**.²

Abū Bakr ibn al-'Arabī (d. 543/1148-9), a Sunnī-Ash'arī scholar, who met al-Ghazālī in 490/ 1097,³ criticized him in **al-'Awāṣim mina al-Qawāṣim**.⁴ During his journey to the Maghrib, Ibn 'Arabī met different Shiite groups, including the Ismā'īlīs or, as he called them "the Bāṭiniyya".⁵ The importance of this book lies in the debates between the author and certain Shiites about their doctrines, which will be mentioned in the specific chapter in this thesis. In different places in his book, Ibn al-'Arabī mentions similar debates between some Sunnī and Shiite scholars, from whom he had sought guidance.

With regard to the history of the Fatimids and the Shiites in general, in Egypt and North Africa respectively, the researcher depends -in addition to the Fatimid sources- on **al-Bayān al-Mughrib**⁶ by Muḥammad ibn 'Idhārī al-Marrākushī (d. ca. 695/1295). This book tells the history of the Western Islamic regions from the Islamic conquest in 20/641 until 541/1147.

Nihāyat al-Arab fī Funūn al-Adab⁷ is one of the distinguished books written in thirty-one volumes during the Mamlūk period by Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī (d. 733/1333). It mentions some of the history of Yemen in various chapters,

¹ A photocopy of a semi-edited manuscript was given to me by Prof. Zakkār. See below, **Abū Muḥammad and his Refutation of Ismā'īlism**, 311.

² Ed. M. Ghālib, Beirut 1980.

³ 'Awāṣim, 30.

⁴ Published by A. ibn Bādīs, Constantine, 1927. The first part was edited by Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, Beirut 1970. The second part was edited by 'Ammār Ṭālibī, Algiers 1974.

⁵ 'Awāṣim, 64.

⁶ Ed. G. S. Colin & Lévi-Provençal, Leiden 1948.

⁷ The first eighteen volumes were edited and published by the *Dār al-Kutub*, Cairo 1923 & 1955; the rest of the book was edited and published by *al-Hay'a al-'Āmma li al-Kitāb al-Miṣrī*, Cairo 1984.

the author relying on the books of Yemeni historians. Sometimes he quotes full texts from Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd’s **Bahjat al-Zaman** without any changes. Even so, the parts about the Carmathians and the Fatimids are an important reference in many studies.¹

When H. C. Kay introduced his book **Yaman** in 1892, he included a translation of the Arabic text which related to the history of Yemen from Ibn Khaldūn’s **Kitāb al-Ibar wa Dīwān al-Mubtada’ wa al-Khabar**.² Despite some misleading information in the text, the Sunnī historian, Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808/1406), is “neutral” when he relates the history of the Fatimids and their relationship with the Ismā‘īlīs in Yemen.

The distinguished book **Ṣubḥ al-A‘shā fī Ṣinā‘at al-Inshā’**³ includes some Yemeni history in some parts of it.⁴ Moreover, its author, Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Qalqashandī (d. 821/1481) reports some information about the Ismā‘īlīs in the first volume, where he calls them *Fidāwiyya*.⁵ He also writes in detail about the Fatimids and their political and social practices, especially in the third volume. Another book by the same author, **Ma’āthir al-Ināfa fī Ma‘ālim al-Khilāfa**,⁶ concerns the history of the Muslim Caliphs and their deputies in the Islamic regions from Abū Bakr, the first Caliph, until the time of the author and has been used in this study. Additionally, al-Qalqashandī mentions some of those who claimed the Caliphate, such as the Umayyads of Andalus and the Fatimids.

Al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442) has been an important work of reference in this study. He uses different sources to write his books and he tries to be impartial. Because he depends on Sunnī references, such as Ibn Khaldūn and Ibn Ḥazm, he displays some

¹ This volume is number twenty five, edited by M. al-Hīnī & ‘A. al-Ahwānī.

² A small part was edited and translated by H. Kay, London 1892. The whole book was published and edited by Ḥasan S. Maḥmūd, Cairo 1957, and republished in Beirut 1958.

³ Published by the **Amīrī Press**, Cairo 1913-1920. Republished by the **Dār al-Kutub**, Cairo 1963.

⁴ **Ṣubḥ al-A‘shā**, v, vi and xiii.

⁵ **Ṣubḥ al-A‘shā**, i, 12-119.

⁶ Ed. A. Farrāj, Kuwait 1964.

bias. For example, he is inaccurate when he discusses the dilemma of the genealogy of the Ismā'īlī Imāms.¹ He is also confused between the two Ismā'īlī *dā'īs* in Yemen.² Nevertheless, his various works, namely, **Itti'āz al-Ḥunafā**,³ **al-Mawā'iz wa al-I'tibār bi Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa al-Āthār**, known as **Khiṭaṭ**,⁴ and **al-Muqaffā al-Kabīr**,⁵ contain very rich information about the Fatimids and the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* in Yemen and elsewhere.

5. Heresiographical and theological Sources

The need of heresiographical and theologian sources always occurs in research on Islamic sects. Therefore, it is necessary to refer to the most reliable sources for Muslims, irrespective of whether they are Shiite or Sunnī. The earliest extant book is **al-Maqālat wa al-Firaq**,⁶ by Sa'd ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Qummī, a Shiite scholar (d. ca. 301/913). The author is a contemporary of two scholars who wrote on the same subject. Firstly, al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī (d. 310/922), who was clearly quoting from the former with some additions, when he wrote **Firaq al-Shī'a**.⁷ The second scholar is the founder of the Ash'arī school of thought, Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl al-Ash'arī (d. 324/935-6). Al-Ash'arī wrote **Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn**,⁸ which has become one of the main references for modern scholars since it was edited.

¹ Cf. *Itti'āz*, i, 18-22.

² *Ibid.*, 166.

³ Ed. J. al-Shayyāl, Cairo 1948.

⁴ Offset print, *Bulāq-Egypt* 1270/1854-5.

⁵ Ed. M. Ya'lawī, Tunis 1987.

⁶ Ed. M. Mashkūr, Tehran 1963.

⁷ Ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul 1931.

⁸ Ed. H. Ritter, Wiesbaden 1929-30.

Al-Qādī al-Nu‘mān (d. 363/973), the author of **Ikhtilāf Uṣūl al-Madhāhib**¹ is one of the props of Ismā‘īlī thought. He was the first Ismā‘īlī scholar who wrote on this subject.²

When he wrote his book **al-Zīna**,³ none of his contemporaries had been suspicious of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and his Ismā‘īlī identity. Even nowadays, nobody can tell from reading **al-Zīna** that the author of the book is an Ismā‘īlī. This book indicates how strict the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* were in hiding their identity by practicing *taqiyya*. Thus, they achieved to attract a large number of followers.

Perhaps the most important texts in this field are written by ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037), ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1063), and Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Shahrastānī (d. 548/ 1153). **Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq**⁴ written by al-Baghdādī is considered one of the greatest works in its field, inasmuch as it shows excellent classification and accuracy in its research procedures. Ibn Ḥazm’s **al-Fiṣal bayna al-Mīlal wa al-Ahwā’ wa al-Niḥal**⁵ has been also considered as an important reference for numerous studies on the same subject. **Al-Mīlal wa al-Niḥal**⁶ of al-Shahrastānī seems to be a short encyclopaedia of religions and philosophy. The objectivity of al-Shahrastānī, however, sometimes earned him scorn and ridicule. He was accused at times of being irreligious and at other times of being an Ismā‘īlī or in favour of them. This hostility probably arose from the fact that he did not attack the Ismā‘īlīs in his book. In spite of the accusation, al-Shahrastānī’s **Mīlal** is, indeed, the

¹ Ed. M. Ghālib, Beirut 1980.

² See above, 9-12.

³ See above, 18.

⁴ Ed. M. Badr, Cairo 1910. Republished by M. M. Abd al-Ḥamīd, Beirut (n.d.). It was translated into English by K. C. Seelye as **Moslem Schisms and Sects**, New York 1920. The second part translated by A. S. Halkin, Tel-Aviv 1935.

⁵ Offset, Būlāq 1317/1899-1900.

⁶ Ed. M. S. Kīlānī, Beirut 1961. Partial English trans. A. Kazi & J. Flynn, **Muslim Sects and Divisions**, London 1984.

best in its field. Moreover, the researcher has referred to other sources for more details, such as **I‘tiqādāt firaq al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikīn**¹ by Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar, known as Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī or Ibn al-Khaṭīb (d. ca. 606/1210); and **al-Munya wa al-Amal** by Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā ibn al-Murtaḍā.²

6. Biographical Sources

Two biographical dictionaries have been major works of reference for many centuries. **Al-Fihrist**³ by Muḥammad ibn Ishāq al-Nadīm, or Ibn al-Nadīm, who was a bookkeeper (*warrāq*) (d. 385/995), mentions every author whose works he read or heard of. The other dictionary, which is also called **al-Fihrist**,⁴ written by Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067), categorizes the Twelver Shiite authors and their books.

The *Ṭabaqāt* literature of the Yemenis have also been of great use in the historical part of this study, as well as the compilations of early biographers, such as Muḥammad ibn Sa‘d (d. 230/845) in his book **al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā**,⁵ the book of Muṣ‘ab ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Zubayrī (236/851) called **Nasab Quraysh**,⁶ Khalīfa ibn Khayyāt’s **Ṭabaqāt** (d. 240/849-50) the work of Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī (d. 279/892) **Ansāb al-Ashrāf**,⁷ Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī’s (d. 356/967) **Maqātil al-Ṭalibiyyīn**,⁸ and the work of ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064) entitled

¹ Ed. ‘Alī S. al-Nashshār, Cairo 1937.

² See above.

³ Ed. G. Flügel, Leipzig 1972. Republished by Dār al-Ma‘rifa, Beirut 1978.

⁴ Introduced by M. Baḥr al-‘Ulūm, Beirut 1983.

⁵ Leiden 1921.

⁶ Ed. E. Levi-Provençal 1953.

⁷ In five volumes, which were edited by different scholars; volume (i) ed. by M. Ḥumayd Allāh, Cairo 1959; (ii) by Iḥsān ‘Abbās, Beirut, 1979; (iii) by ‘A. al-Dūrī, Beirut, 1978; (iv) by M. Schlessinger, Jerusalem, 1938. (v) by S. D. F. Goitien, Jerusalem, 1936.

⁸ Ed. S. A. Ṣaqr, Cairo 1949.

Jamharat Ansāb al-‘Arab.¹ Furthermore, some Shiite personalities can be identified from the **Rijāl al-Kashshī,**² which was written by Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Kashshī in the fourth/tenth century. For identifying most of the non-Yemeni individuals in this study, recourse has been made to such works as **Wafayāt al-A‘yān**³ by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Khallikān (d. 681/1282) and **Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’** by Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Dhahabī.⁴

For Yemeni personalities the researcher must rely mainly on ‘Umar ibn ‘Ali ibn Samura, Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad al-Sharjī, and Aḥmad ibn Šāliḥ ibn Abī al-Rijāl. Ibn Samura, a Shāfi‘ī scholar (d. 586/1190), wrote **Ṭabaqāt Fuqahā’ al-Yaman,**⁵ in which he mentions every Yemeni judge and jurist from the time of the Prophet until his time. The book is the first in the Yemeni ṭabaqāt genre and it focuses on Shāfi‘ī jurisprudence. In 867/1463, Sharjī (d. 893/1488) finished his book **Ṭabaqāt al-Khawāṣ,**⁶ where he mentions the Sufis in Yemen. The book also mentions and identifies some places in Yemen. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl (d. 1092/1681), a Zaydī scholar, wrote one of the most important books in the Zaydī ṭabaqāt genre called **Maṭla‘ al-Budūr wa Majma‘ al-Buḥūr.**⁷

Two modern scholars are also serving the same purposes, Khayr al-Dīn al-Ziriklī in his book **al-A‘lām,**⁸ and Riḍa Kaḥḥāla in his **Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifīn.**⁹

¹ Ed. ‘A. Hārūn, Cairo 1977.

² Published by al-A‘lamī Foundation, Karbalā’ 1970.

³ Ed. Iḥsān ‘Abbās, Beirut 1972.

⁴ Ed. Sh. al-Arnā’ūt *et al.*, Beirut 1981.

⁵ Ed. Fu’ād Sayyid, Beirut 1957.

⁶ Ed. A. Ḥibshī, Beirut 1986.

⁷ MS., *al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr-San‘ā’*, no. 111 *Tārīkh*.

⁸ Cairo 1927.

⁹ Damascus 1957.

7. Geographical Sources

It has proved necessary to give a full geographical description of the Yemeni regions during the period under discussion in this thesis, namely, from the second half of the third/ninth-tenth century until the end of the fourth/tenth-eleventh century. Both maps and geographical texts have been used to identify the Yemeni cities which do not exist any more or have become ruins. To give a full picture of Yemen in the relevant period several maps have been provided which shed light on the following themes:-

1. The political situation in Yemen before the entry of the *Ismā‘īlī dā‘īs*.
2. A geographical map showing the important regions and cities in Yemen.
3. The routes followed by Ibn Ḥawshab and Ibn al-Faḍl, from Ghulāfqa to Sarū Yāfi‘ and ‘Adan Lā‘ah.
4. The movements of the *Ismā‘īlī dā‘īs* in conquering the cities in Yemen.
5. The Ṣulayḥids in Yemen.

The following works of reference were used:

1. **The Turkish map of Yemen (*Sī Yaman Wilāyatī Kharīṭa*)**, Scale 1:1,250,000, issued by the Military General Staff Headquarters in 1323/1905.¹
2. **The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen**, Scale 1:500,000, issued by the Director of Overseas Survey (D.O.S.)1974 (Ordnance Survey 79/790765 S) for the Yemeni Government in Arabic in 1978.²
3. **Ṣifat Jazīrat al-‘Arab**³ by al-Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad al-Hamdānī (d. after 344/955-6),⁴ one of the main reference works for the geography of the Yemeni

¹ A photocopy has been obtained from private collections in Irbid-Jordan.

² A copy was given to me by the Ministry of Public Works, Surveys Department, San‘ā’.

³ Published by Müller as *Al-Hamdānī’s Geographie der Arabischen Halbinsel*, Leiden 1884-1889. Ed. M. al-Akwa‘ 1977.

⁴ Cf. the introduction of *Ṣifat*, 31.

regions and the locations of the cities, towns, mountains, rivers, strongholds, and so on. It also contains precious details about the Arab tribes in Yemen and their positions. Another work **al-Iklīl** by the same author has survived, although most of its twenty three volumes are lost; only the volumes 1,¹ 2, 8² and 10³ are extant. This is a valuable work of reference about the Arab tribes and their origins, especially the Yemeni tribes.

4. **Al-Mustabṣir**⁴ of Ibn al-Mujāwir (d. after 630/1232), who visited Yemen in 618-9/1222 and stayed until 626/1229. The most important aspect of this book is that it mentions the distances between places, and helps to define the location of some of the events mentioned.

5. **Muʿjam al-Buldān**⁵ by Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī (d. 626/1228).

6. This is a shortened edition of **Muʿjam al-Buldān** published in 1984 by Ismāʿīl al-Akwaʿ, who collected all the information mentioned by Yāqūt about Yemen in a book entitled **al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya ʿinda Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī**.

7. **Majmūʿ al-Buldān al-Yaman wa Qabāʾilihā** by Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Ḥajrī (d. 1353/1916-7).⁶ This book was edited by Ismāʿīl al-Akwaʿ in Ṣanʿāʾ in 1984.

8. **Hijar al-ʿIlm wa Maʿāqilīhi fī al-Yaman** by Ismāʿīl al-Akwaʿ, which is the result of many years of the author's research. In five volumes, Ismāʿīl al-Akwaʿ mentions the most important settlements (*hijra*; pl. of *hijra*) which were established by the Zaydīs from the end of the third/ninth century in Yemen. After every *hijra*, the author gives information about some scholars who lived there.

¹ Ed. Akwaʿ, Cairo 1963.

² Ed. A. al-Karmalī, Baghdad 1931. Partial English trans. N. Fāris, **The Antiquities of South Arabia**, London 1938.

³ Ed. M. Khaṭīb, Cairo 1958.

⁴ Ed. Oscar Löfgren, Leiden 1951.

⁵ Ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Leipzig 1866-73.

⁶ A microfilm of the manuscript was generously given to me by Prof. Muḥammad Ṣālḥiyya.

9. **Muʿjam al-Buldān wa al-Qabāʾil al-Yamaniyya** by Ibrāhīm al-Maqḥafī, a modern Yemeni scholar. Despite the accuracy of the information in this dictionary, most of the positions of some places are confused due to a similarity in the names.

10. **An Historical Atlas of Islam**¹ by William C. Brice.

11. **Additional Geographical sources** which help to define the location and distances between cities and towns on the maps in this thesis. These sources were edited by the pioneer scholar, M. J. De Goeje, as **Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum**, and they are: **Kitāb al-Buldān** by Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadhānī, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad (d. 290/903),² **al-Masālik wa al-Mamālik** by Ibn Khurradādhbih, ʿUbayd Allāh ibn ʿAbd Allāh (d. 300/911),³ **al-Aʿlāq al-Nafīsa** by Ibn Rusta, Aḥmad ibn ʿUmar (d. ca. 287/900),⁴ **Aḥsan al-Taqāsīm fī Maʿrifat al-Aqālīm** by al-Maqdisī (or al-Muqaddasī), Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad (d. 375/985),⁵ and **Masālik al-Mamālik** by al-Iṣṭakhrī, Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad.⁶

Secondary Sources

1. The Contribution of Western Scholars

There has been Western progress on Ismāʿīlī studies in the west since the beginning of this century. When Ivanow published his research, which became the basis for all modern Ismāʿīlī scholarship, this encouraged other researchers to produce important works. More advances were made when the Ismāʿīlīs themselves contributed a large number of hidden manuscripts of their literature. In fact, most

¹ Leiden 1981.

² Leiden 1885.

³ Leiden 1889.

⁴ Leiden 1892.

⁵ Leiden 1906.

⁶ Leiden 1927.

modern Ismā‘īlī studies deal with the religious background of the Ismā‘īlīs and their intellectual and religious history, which is interesting for Muslims with different views. Nevertheless, the researcher noticed during his journey to collect the data for this study that most of Ismā‘īlī published works are black listed by the censorship of Islamic governments.

It is rather difficult to divide modern Ismā‘īlī studies into two sections: history and philosophy. Indeed, Ismā‘īlī history and doctrines are discussed together. In the following pages the researcher examines the most important works, which have been written in this field by modern western scholars during the last fifty years, since their conclusions help this study. The researcher has to admit that he also refers occasionally to some of the pioneer studies before that time. Such studies which were written by “the first generation of Orientalists” cannot be neglected in any genuine study, since their methodological aspects and their conclusions are so important for scholars and research in Ismā‘īlism. These include works such as M. Quatremère’s **Mémoires Historiques sur la dynastie des Khalifs Fatimites**,¹ which deals with the history of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī and al-Mu‘izz, and **Exposé de la religion des Druzes**² by S. de Sacy, which was a result of thirty years of study. The latter work contains some parts from Akhū Muḥsin’s book on the early history of the Ismā‘īlīs and their origins. Also worthy of mention are **Mémoire sur les Carmathes du Bahraïn et les Fatimides**³ by M. de Goeje, **The Caliphate**⁴ by W. Muir, **A Short History of the Fatimid Khalifate**⁵ by De Lacy O’Leary, which was the first monograph devoted to Fatimid history written in English, and **Polemics On The Origin of the Fatimi**

¹ JA, 2, 1836, 97-142.

² Paris 1838.

³ Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1886. Arab. trans. H. Zīnā, Beirut 1978.

⁴ London 1891.

⁵ London 1923.

Caliphs¹ by P. H. Mamour. On Yemen, A. Tritton wrote his book entitled **The Rise of the Imams of Sanaa** in 1925.²

In **The Ismā'īlī Tradition Concerning the Rise of the Fatimids**,³ Ivanow investigated the problem of the Fatimids' pedigree. The value of this book is that Ivanow edited and translated some early Ismā'īlī texts, which had been hidden by the Ismā'īlīs. Ivanow also analyzed the genesis and the evolution of the various traditions. It is worth mentioning that Ivanow published his work **An Ismā'īlitic pedigree**⁴ in 1922. His first book is **A Guide to Ismā'īlī Literature**.⁵

In his study, **The Origin of the Ismā'īlism**,⁶ which deals with the historical and socio-religious background of the Ismā'īlīs until the rise of the Fatimid state, Bernard Lewis uses different sources, both Sunnī and Shiite, including Ismā'īlī sources. The work favours a Sunnī point of view, especially on the genealogy of the Fatimid Imāms. Lewis shows the same tendency in subsequent works of his such as **The Assassins**⁷ and "*The Ismā'īlites and the Assassins*".⁸

Stern wrote various articles in **EI**² about certain Ismā'īlī *dā'īs* and philosophers, such as al-Rāzī and al-Sijistānī, and important articles such as "*Abū al-Qāsim al-Bustī and his Refutation of Ismā'īlism*".⁹ In "*The Succession of the Fatimid Imām al-Āmir*",¹⁰ Stern was able to comprehend evidently mysterious accounts and to reveal

¹ London 1934.

² Oxford University Press 1925.

³ London 1942.

⁴ **JPASB**, 1922, 403-6.

⁵ London 1933.

⁶ Cambridge 1940. Translated into Arabic by K. A. Khalīl, Beirut 1980.

⁷ London 1967.

⁸ A chapter in **A History of the Crusades** edited by K. Setton, i, Wisconsin 1969, pp. 99-132.

⁹ **JRAS**, 1961, 14-35.

¹⁰ **Oriens**, vol. 4, 1951, 193-253.

some of the historical and religious consequence of the events which took place after the death of al-Āmir. Like Ivanow, Stern spent much of his scholarly life working on Ismā‘īlism. After Stern’s death in 1969, the Institute of Asian and African Studies in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem published in its memorial series some of his articles in one book as **Studies In Early Ismā‘īlism**,¹ on which the researcher depends in this study.

Corbin focused on Shī‘ism in general but he was also able to understand most aspects of Ismā‘īlī philosophy. During his teaching in Tehran, he established a good relationship with some Shiite scholars there. These scholars spent every effort assisting Corbin in publishing his **Bibliothèque Iranienne**.² The Institute of Ismā‘īlī Studies translated and published two of Corbin’s books: **History of Islamic Philosophy**³ and **Cyclical Time and Ismaili Gnosis**.⁴ Hodgson wrote some articles in EI², such as “*Alamūt*” and “*Ḥasan al-Ṣabbāḥ*”, and “*The Ismā‘īlī State*” in **The Cambridge History of Iran**.⁵ In 1955, he wrote **The Order of the Assassins** where he investigates the struggle of the Nizārī Ismā‘īlīs against the Muslim world and thereby made new insights into Ismā‘īlī history and the doctrines of the Alamūt period.

Through his works, Madelung clarifies the true picture of early Ismā‘īlī doctrines. As he is also a specialist in Zaydism, his works have great value in this study. In addition to his articles in EI² such as “*Ḥamdān Qarmāṭ*”, “*Ḥāmidī*” (Ibrāhīm, Ḥātīm and ‘Alī) and “*Kaysāniyya*”, and in **Der Islam** such as “*Fatimiden und Bahrain Qarmāṭen*”⁶ and “*Bemerkungen Zur imamitischen Firaq-Literature*”,⁷

¹ Jerusalem 1983.

² A series published by **Département d’Iranologie/Institut Franco-Iranien**, Tehran 1961.

³ English trans. L. Sherrard, London 1978.

⁴ Three selected articles translated into English by R. Manheim and J. Morris.

⁵ See, vol. v, Cambridge 1968.

⁶ **Der Islam**, 34, 1959, 34-88.

⁷ **Ibid.**, 43, 1967. Translated into English **Religious Schools and Sects in Medieval Islam**, London 1985.

he brings together the majority of his articles dealing primarily with political and social aspects in **Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam**¹ and **Religious Schools and Sects in Medieval Islam**.² Madelung wrote **Der Imām al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen**,³ and he also edited some important Zaydī texts, such as **Arabic Texts Concerning the History of Zaydī Imāms**⁴ and **The Sīrā of Imām Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh**.⁵ According to Madelung's article *The Sīrat al-Amīrayn al-Ajallayn al-Sharīfayn al-Fāḍlayn al-Qāsim wa Muhammad ibnay Jaʿfar ibn al-Imām al-Qāsim ibn ʿAlī al-ʿAyānī*,⁶ R. al-Sayyid and ʿA. ʿAbd al-ʿĀḍī edited the book which has been mentioned by Madelung and has the same title.⁷

The well-known "Islamic Surveys", which is published by Edinburgh University Press, includes two of our reference works. The first book is **Islamic Philosophy and Theology**⁸ by W. M. Watt, which gives some details on the Islamic schools of theology from the beginning to the modern period. The second book is H. Halm's **Die Schia**,⁹ which was edited and translated into English as **Shiism**.¹⁰ The book is a

¹ Norfolk 1992.

² London 1985.

³ Berlin 1965.

⁴ Beirut 1987.

⁵ Exeter 1990.

⁶ Cf. **Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam**, xii, 69-87.

⁷ Beirut 1993.

⁸ Edinburgh 1962.

⁹ Darmstadt 1987.

¹⁰ Edinburgh 1991.

comprehensive survey of all Shiite groups from their origin to the present day. Halm is the author of other important books on Shiite Islam, including **Die Islamische Gnosis**¹ and **Das Reich des Mahdi**,² as well as many articles.

In 1993, Walker published **Early Philosophical Shiism**, one of the most recent valuable works in Ismā‘īlī studies. This deals with the Ismā‘īlī Neoplatonism of Abū Ya‘qūb al-Sijistānī. The book is divided into two parts; the first is al-Sijistānī’s heritage, the second is his universe. Walker also translated into English the important work of al-Sijistānī, **Yanabī‘ al-Ḥikma** or simply called **al-Yanābī‘**, as **The Wellsprings of Wisdom**.³ In 1996, the Institute of Ismā‘īlī Studies published for him his book **Abū Ya‘qūb al-Sijistānī: Intellectual Missionary**. Walker also has many articles such as “*Cosmic Hierarchies in Early Ismā‘īlī Thought: The View of Abū Ya‘qūb al-Sijistānī*”⁴ and “*Abū Tammām and his Kitāb al-Shajara: A New Ismaili Treatise from Tenth-Century Khurasan*”.⁵

2. The contribution of Eastern Scholars

Numerous books written in Arabic, Urdu or Persian by Ismā‘īlī scholars have been not republished. In the Muslim world, this is a result of government censorship. In the west, the difficulty of the languages in which these books are written limits the spread of such books. For example, works such as **Tarīkh Faṭimiyyīn Miṣr**⁶ and **Ismā‘īlī Madhhab**⁷ by Zāhid ‘Alī, cannot enjoy the same readership as ‘Assāf Fayzee’s works which are in English. Fayzee wrote several works: articles such as

¹ Zürich 1982.

² Munich 1991. Translated from the German into English by M. Bonner, Leiden 1996.

³ Salt Lake City 1994.

⁴ *Muslim World*, lxvi, 1976, 14-28.

⁵ *JAOS*, 114, 1994, 343-52.

⁶ Hyderabad 1948.

⁷ *Hamārī Ismā‘īlī Madhhab ki Ḥaqīqat aur us kā Nizām*, Hyderabad 1954.

"*Qādī an-Nu‘mān*",¹ "*Ismā‘īlī Law and its Founder*"² and "*The study of the Literature of the Fatimid Da‘wa*",³ articles in EI, such as "*Nu‘mān*" and "*Imām Shāh*", and books on Ismā‘īlī law such as *The Ismā‘īlī Law of Wills*⁴ and *Compendium of Fatimid Law*.⁵ Fayzee was an expert on Ismā‘īlī manuscripts, especially as he owned a large collection of his own. Bombay University received two hundred manuscripts as a donation from him in 1957. Moreover, he classified "*A collection of Fatimid manuscripts*".⁶

H. Hamdānī's first published works were in 1932 when he wrote "*Rasā‘il Ikhwān aṣ-Ṣafā*"⁷ and "*The History of Ismā‘īlī Da‘wat*".⁸ From the collections of the Ismā‘īlī manuscripts that he inherited from his family, Hamdānī, unlike some Ismā‘īlīs, started to reveal what he could from the hidden Ismā‘īlī literature by editing and publishing certain manuscripts in different languages. Hamdānī's most important works in this study are: *Al-Ṣulayḥiyyūn*⁹ and "*The Genealogy of the Fatimids*".¹⁰

It seems that Hamdānī when he was in Cairo gave some copies of manuscripts to scholars who were interested in Ismā‘īlī studies for the purpose of editing and

¹ JRAS, 1934, 1-32.

² IC, ix, 1935, 107-12.

³ One of the lectures was presented in honor of H. A. R. Gibb in *Arabic and Islamic Studies in Leiden* 1965, ed. G. Makdisi, 232-49.

⁴ Oxford 1934.

⁵ Simla 1969.

⁶ *Essays in honor of Professor D. N. Marshall*, ed. N. Gidwani, Delhi 1973.

⁷ Cf. *Rasā‘il Ikhwān aṣ-Ṣafā in the literature of the Ismā‘īlī Taiybi da‘wat*, *Der Islam*, xx, 1932, 281-300.

⁸ *The history of Ismā‘īlī daw‘at and its literature during the last phase of the Fatimid Empire*, JRAS, 1932, 126-36.

⁹ Cairo 1955.

¹⁰ *On the Genealogy of the Fatimid Caliphs*, School of Oriental Studies-American University-Cairo, Occasional Paper No. 1, 1958.

publishing them. M. K. Ḥusayn, who was a professor in Egyptian literature at Cairo University and a friend of Ivanow, received some of the manuscripts. He edited some of them, such as *Sīrat al-Ustādh Jawdhar*, *Rāḥat al-‘Aql*, *Sīrat al-Mu‘ayyad* and *al-Majālis al-Mu‘ayyadiyya*.¹ He was also able to draw on these manuscripts when he wrote his books: *Fī Adab Miṣr al-Fāṭimiyya*,² *Ṭā‘ifat al-Ismā‘iliyya*³ and *Ṭā‘ifat al-Drūz*.⁴ Unlike M. K. Ḥusayn, who depended on Ismā‘ilī sources to write his books, another scholar, Ḥ. I. Ḥasan, depended on Sunnī sources for his works. He published *Tārīkh al-Dawla al-Fāṭimiyya*,⁵ and then collaborated with Ṭ. Sharaf in publishing the history of the two Fatimid Caliphs, *‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī*⁶ and *al-Mu‘izz li-Dīn Allāh*.⁷

M. ‘Anān utilized every available Ismā‘ilī source which was available when he examined the Ismā‘ilī *da‘wa* and its philosophy in his book *al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh*.⁸ ‘Anān tries to analyse and elucidate every problem faced by scholars in Ismā‘ilī history and doctrines. Thus, his book strays too far from its main subject, i.e., *al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh*. Nevertheless, ‘Anān is successful when he mentions differing views on controversial subjects, such as the genealogy of the Fatimid Caliphs and the ranks of the *da‘wa*. M. Jamāl al-Dīn, like ‘Anān, used varied references, especially western and Ismā‘ilī sources, and followed the same line as ‘Anān. His book *Dawlat al-Ismā‘iliyya fī Irān*⁹ is divided into two parts: the Ismā‘ilī state in Iran (*Alamūt*), most

¹ See above.

² Cairo 1950.

³ Cairo 1959.

⁴ Cairo 1962.

⁵ First published in 1932. The second edition with amendments and more details, Cairo 1958.

⁶ Cairo 1947.

⁷ Cairo 1963.

⁸ Cairo 1959.

⁹ Cairo 1975.

of which consists of quotations from Stern's "*Early Ismā'īlī Missionaries*", or is simply an Arabic translation of that article. The second part is an edition and Arabic translation of Juwaynī's Persian text, **Tārīkh Jahāngushāy**.

5 'A. Badawī, the editor of al-Ghazālīs' **Mustazhirī**, edited, translated and published several books on Islamic philosophy. In **Madhāhib al-Islāmiyyīn**,¹ one of our reference works, Badawī examines in two volumes the most important "sects" in Islam, namely the Mu'tazilites, the Ash'arīs, the Ismā'īlīs, the Carmathians, the Nuṣayrīs and the Drūze. A. Ṣubhī is also an expert on Islamic sects, especially Zaydism. His book **al-Zaydiyya**² has been used to identify the Zaydī Imāms. In 1990,
10 he published **Yaḥyā ibn Ḥamza**, which deals with the most important doctrines and beliefs of Yaḥyā ibn Ḥamza as a Zaydī Imām.

Through the efforts of two Ismā'īlī scholars, 'A. Tāmīr and M. Ghālib, some hidden manuscripts that belonged to the Ismā'īlī community in Syria have been published. They also wrote their own books. It is a serious flaw of Tāmīr's works, such
15 **al-Qarāmiṭa**³ and **Tārīkh al-Ismā'īliyya**,⁴ that they do not have any footnotes, except for a few sources that are mentioned at the end of each book. Even when editing manuscripts, Tāmīr sometimes misleads his reader, as for example in his edition of **Shajarat al-Yaqīn**,⁵ which he alleged that the book was written by the famous Carmathian *dā'ī*, 'Abdān. It seems that Tāmīr has not noticed that **Shajarat al-Yaqīn**
20 is the same book that he edited as **al-Idāḥ** by Abū Farās.⁶ Again, Tāmīr published **al-**

¹ Beirut 1972.

² Cairo 1980.

³ Beirut (no date).

⁴ London 1991.

⁵ Beirut 1982.

⁶ Beirut 1964.

Risāla al-Mudhhiba by al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān in his book **Khams Rasā’il Ismā‘īliyya**,¹ and after thirty two years, he published the same book, alleging that he had discovered that the book was written by Ibn Killis.² Ghālib also has the same tendency to neglect footnotes in his books, such as **al-Ḥarakāt al-Baṭīniyya fī al-Islām**.³

5 Compared with Tāmīr, however, Ghālib’s books are more trustworthy, especially as he sometimes refers to earlier Ismā‘īlī works in the following works of his: **al-Imāma wa Qā’im al-Qiyāma**,⁴ **Tārīkh al-Da‘wa al-Ismā‘īliyya**⁵ and **A‘lām al-Ismā‘īliyya**.⁶ It is sometimes useful to consult these books in order to know the author’s opinions as an Ismā‘īlī on certain topics.

10 Among the studies published in recent years two have been helpful in our research: **Les Doctrines Religieuses au Yémen**⁷ by A. F. Sayyid, and **The Ismā‘īlīs**⁸ by F. Daftary. **The Ismā‘īlīs** is the first exhaustive study of Ismā‘īlī history and doctrines. In this book Daftary refers to every Ismā‘īlī book and manuscript which has recently become available. His book is in fact an encyclopedic piece of research on

15 Ismā‘īlism from its beginnings until the so-called “Post-Alamūt Nizārī Ismā‘īlism”. Nevertheless, Daftary’s work does not preclude other scholars working on subjects which do not receive detailed coverage in his book, such as the Ismā‘īlīs in Yemen. It should be noted that during the writing of this study, Daftary published his second

¹ Salamiyya 1956.

² See above, 12.

³ Second edition, Beirut 1982.

⁴ Beirut 1981.

⁵ Second edition, Beirut 1965.

⁶ Beirut 1964.

⁷ Cairo 1988.

⁸ Cambridge 1990.

book **The Assassin Legends**¹ and also been the editor of **Mediaeval Ismā‘īlī History & Thought**.²

Another work of A. F. Sayyid, **Les Fatimides en Egypte**,³ is divided into two parts, the first dealing with the political history of the Fatimids from the rise of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī, as the Ismā‘īlī Imām and Caliph in 297/908, until the fall of the Fatimid state in 569/1173 and the second dealing with Fatimid organizations and civilization. The value of this book lies in its use of a wide range of sources and in the conclusions which he gives at the end of his analysis of every controversial subject, such as the genealogy of the Fatimid Caliphs.

There are other sources which have not been discussed here.

¹ London 1994.

² Cambridge 1996.

³ Cairo 1992.

Chapter One

Introduction: A Brief History of the Shiites and the Development of Ismā‘ilism The Shiites

To examine the origins of Ismā‘ilism, the main subject of this study, it is important to trace the meaning of the term Shiite or *Shī‘a*, and the beginning of the Shiite division as the source from which Ismā‘ilism sprang. The term Shiite came from the Arabic word *shī‘a*, which means “party”. The first usage of the term, in its literal meaning as “followers” or “supporters”,¹ occurs several times in the Qur’ān.² It is more appropriate here, however, to follow the later usage of the term in its applied meaning as a particular designation for the followers of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib (d. 40/661) and his household as *shī‘at ‘Alī*, and thereby a distinct group within Islam against the main body of the believers. According to the Shiite point of view, the Prophet did in fact appoint ‘Alī, his cousin and son-in-law, as his successor when he was returning from Mecca and stopped at Ghadīr Khumm³ on 18 Dhū al-Ḥijja 10/16 March 632.⁴ Therefore, the Shiites held the belief that ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib was designated by the *naṣṣ*.⁵

After the death of al-Ḥusayn on 10 Muḥarram 61/10 October 680, the term “*shī‘a*” became a religio-political definition. Henceforward, it has been employed for

¹ Lane, *Lexicon*, iv, 1632.

² See, for example, Qur’ān: 9/69; 28/15; 37/83.

³ A pond or a stream situated a few miles from Mecca on the road to Medina. Cf. EI², ii, 993.

⁴ *Ibid.* Cf. Mufīd, *Irshād*, trans. I. Howard, 124-5.

⁵ *Naṣṣ*: lit. means text. According to the Ismā‘ilī belief, it means “explicit designation”, that is the unequivocal declaration of the succession of the Imāmate. EI², iii, 1062. Also see, Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 378. Netton, *A Popular Dictionary of Islam*, 192.

the followers of the Prophet's household (*āl al-bayt*).¹ According to most of the Muslim historians and heresiographers, the first division within Shī'ism itself occurred after the death of al-Ḥusayn, with a group known as the Kaysāniyya.² They believed that the fourth Imām was Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, known as Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya (d. 81/699), who came after his father and his two half brothers, i.e., al-Hasan and al-Ḥusayn.³

Therefore, the Kaysāniyya were called "the Fourer" Shiites by analogy with the later "Twelver" and "Sevener" Shiites, since they recognised only four Imāms from the *āl al-bayt*.⁴ According to their belief, Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya had gone into occultation (*ghayba*) and one day he would reappear as the promised *Mahdī*, "the Rightly Guided One".⁵ The Kaysāniyya were thus the first to bring into prominence three key ideas that were henceforth to be of great importance in the development of Shiite thought: the idea of Mahdism, as a term with its various messianic connotations, *badā'*,⁶ and

¹ *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, trans. I. Howard, xix, 75. Mufid, *Irshād*, 326.

² There is confusion in the sources as to whether the eponym of the name "Kaysāniyya" was Kaysān, or a nickname given by Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya to al-Mukhtār. It seems that the heresiographers, who traced the name of the Kaysāniyya from Kaysān, disagree on Kaysān himself; was he a *mawlā* of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, a *mawlā* of Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya, or one of the Kūfan *mawālī* called Abū 'Amra Kaysān who was appointed by al-Mukhtār to be the chief of his personal guards. It is most likely that it referred to Abū 'Amra Kaysān, who probably lived after the death of al-Mukhtār and became the leader of the movement, and he organized the personal guards of al-Mukhtār, most of whom were from the *mawālī*. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, v, 229 & 237.

³ Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, iii, 196.

⁴ Cf., Halm, *Shiism*, 19.

⁵ Ash'arī, *Maqālāt*, 18-23. Mas'ūdī, *Murūj*, iii, 77-79. Cf. Baghdādī, *Firaq*, 38. Shahrastānī, *Milal*, i, 147.

⁶ *Badā'*: lit. to manifest or reveal; nevertheless, in its idiomatic usage it means a change in will or command, especially for God. According to al-Shahrastānī, al-Mukhtār ibn 'Ubayd was the first who adopted the doctrine of *badā'* by his claim that he knew future events, either because of a prophecy he had received, or because of a message from the Imām. Whenever he foretold an event to his followers, and the result was in accordance with what he said, he would make use of it as a proof of the truth of his mission. If, however, it turned out otherwise he would say that God had changed His mind. In this matter, al-Mukhtār made no differentiation between abrogation (*naskh*) and *badā'*, but simply said:

what is called "docetism" or the concept of occultation (*ghayba*) and return (*raj'a*).¹

Nevertheless, it appears that the majority of the later Shiites believed that the fourth Imām after al-Ḥusayn was his son 'Alī, well known as "the embellishment of God's servants" (*zayn al-ābidīn*) and also called "the frequently prostrating one" (*al-Sajjād*). Such a belief was not held during the lifetime of 'Alī Zayn al-Ābidīn himself, i.e., 38-94/659-712,² because he himself had no interest in political life and lived the life of an ascetic.

It was during the lifetime of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq (80-148/699-765)³ that dissension started among his disciples. They all agreed on the Imāmate itself, and its transmission down to al-Ṣādiq, but they disagree as to which one of his sons should be appointed as the Imām after him. The division of the Imāmī Shiites originated when a controversy arose in the rank of the Shiites as to the rightful Imām after Ja'far ibn Muḥammad, who had seven sons;⁴ 'Abd Allāh and Ismā'īlī from his wife Fāṭima;⁵ Muḥammad (d. 203/818),⁶ Mūsā (d. 183/799)⁷ and Ishāq from a slave concubine

"If abrogation of commands is possible so also is change in the foretelling of future events". Accordingly, *badā'* may be understood in different ways: firstly, it may be taken as a change in knowledge, in the sense that God may attain to a knowledge which is the opposite of His knowledge; secondly, as an enlightenment with respect to will, that is, that God may discover that the opposite to what He had willed and decreed was right; thirdly, as a change in command, that is, that God should command something and afterwards command its contrary.

Shahrastānī, *Milal*, i, 148 & 160. Cf. English trans. A. K. Kazi, *Muslim Sects and Divisions*, 127.

¹ Ash'arī, *Maqālāt*, 18-23. Baghdādī, *Firaq*, 38. Shahrastānī, *Milal*, i, 147. See also, Mas'ūdī, *Murūj*, iii, 77-79.

² Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, iii 196. Cf. 'A. al-Qummī, *al-Anwār al-Bahiyya*, 92 & 112.

³ Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, i, 327.

⁴ Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, 14. Cf. Shahrastānī, *Milal*, i, 167.

⁵ Fāṭima bint al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. Zubayrī, *Nasab Quraysh*, 51 & 63. Nawbakhtī, *Firaq*, 68. Shahrastānī, *Milal*, i, 167. Cf., Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamharat*, 59.

⁶ Muḥammad *al-Dībāj* "silk brocade". It seems that *al-dībāj*, as a *kunya*, was used for a handsome youth. Cf. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ii, ed. I. 'Abbās, 605.

⁷ The seventh Imām of the Twelvers.

(*'umm walad*) called Ḥamīda;¹ al-ʿAbbās and ʿAlī are also from different concubines.² Except Ishāq and al-ʿAbbās, the other five sons were considered as Imāms by different groups of Shiites from Jaʿfar’s followers. According to the doctrine of the Imāmī Shiites, the Imām should appoint his successor during his life under the divine guidance (*naṣṣ*).³ Some of them, later called “the Pure Ismāʿīlīs” (*khāliṣa*),⁴ or as al-Shahrastānī called them “the Wāqifiyya”,⁵ believed that Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq appointed his son Ismāʿīl (d. ca. 136/754)⁶ to be their Imām.⁷

The Development of Ismāʿīlism

The Imāmate

After the death of Ismāʿīl ibn Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq in 136/754, during his father’s lifetime, the group of the Ismāʿīlī Wāqifiyya asserted that Ismāʿīl was still alive. They alleged that Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq was afraid that the Abbasid Caliph al-Manṣūr (d.

¹ Nawbakhtī, *Firaq*, 76.

² Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamharat*, 59-61. Cf., Zubayrī, *Nasab Quraysh*, 63.

³ See (*naṣṣ*), 46 & 65 .

⁴ Cf. Nawbakhtī, *Firaq*, 68.

⁵ The Wāqifiyya: ‘those who stand fast’ by their last Imām, upholding his return from “the occultation” (*ghayba*) as a Mahdī. Here, “Wāqifiyya” refers to those who stopped the Imāmate at Ismāʿīl. Shahrastānī, *Milal*, i, 167.

⁶ Ismāʿīl ibn Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib was born in Medina between 80-83/699-702 and died in 136/ 754. See, Daftary, *The Ismāʿīlīs*, 97-8. Cf. Ghālib, *Aʿlām*, 164-5.

⁷ The title “Imām” was particularly used by Shiites in reference to the persons recognized by them as the heads or leaders of Muslim community after the Prophet. The Shiites regard ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib and certain of his descendants as Imāms. They believe that the Imām should be *maʿṣūm*, which means fully immune from sinful wrong (*khaṭaʿ*) and from plain error (*ḍalāl*); they are generally held to be also divinely appointed, and divinely guided in the discharge of their special spiritual functions. See; Daftary, *The Ismāʿīlīs*, 562. Halm, *Shiism*, 45. Cf. Netton, *A Popular Dictionary of Islam*, 121.

158/775)¹ would kill his son, whom he had hidden for his own safety. Al-Qurashī mentions that such a ruse from al-Ṣādiq, which is a real example of practising *taqiyya*,² misled the Abbasids and protected his successor from his enemies.³ Other groups, from the followers of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, believed that the Imāmate transferred to one of his sons. Al-Nawbakhtī, a Shiite heresiographer and theologian from the third/eighth-ninth century, classified these groups into four sects, each of which had several schisms; first, the Ismā‘īliyya, i.e., the early Ismā‘īlīs, held the belief that the Imām after Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq was his son Ismā‘īl. Second, the Sumayṭiyya, also called the Shumayṭiyya,⁴ a group which was headed by Yaḥyā ibn Abī al-Sumayṭ (or Shumayṭ), said that the Imām is Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far. Third, the Faṭḥiyya, or the Afṭḥiyya, believed in the Imāmate of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far, who was called *al-Afṭaḥ* “the broad-headed”. Finally, the origins of the Twelvers, who followed Mūsā ibn Ja‘far as the rightful Imām after his father.⁵

Al-Nawbakhtī also mentions two subdivided groups under the Ismā‘īliyya, the Mubārakiyya and the Khaṭṭābiyya.⁶ The Mubārakiyya, named after their leader al-

¹ Abū Ja‘far al-Manṣūr, the second Abbasid caliph (95/714 -158/775). Ṭabarī, vii, 469-74 & viii, 62-102. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, v, 161-2. Mas‘ūdī, *Murūj*, iii, 282. Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vii, 83. Cf., EI, v, 248-9.

² *Taqiyya*: it comes from *waqā*; an Arabic verb which means to shield or to preserve. It means precautionary dissimulation of one’s true religious beliefs in time of danger. The Shiites believe that *taqiyya* is an exceptional dispensation granted only in cases of emergency and compulsion, which are the enforced, precautionary or apprehensive, arcane, and symbiotic. According to the Shiite belief, it should be practised whenever there is a danger which would impair faith. H. Enayat, “*Taqiyyah*”, *Shi‘ism*, ed. S. H. Nasr and others, 208. Cf., J. van Lent and H.-U. Qureshi, *Glossary and Index of Technical Terms*, E.I.², 288. Daftary, *The Ismā‘īlīs*, 566. Cf., Netton, *A Popular Dictionary of Islam*, 245.

³ Qurashī, *Zahr al-Ma‘ānī*, ed. Ghālib, 198-9.

⁴ Cf. Baghdādī, *Farq*, 61-62 & Shahrastānī, *Milal*, i, 167.

⁵ Nawbakhtī, *Firaq*, 67-8. Cf. Ash‘arī, *Maqālāt*, 16-31. Qummī, *Maqālāt*, 80. Baghdādī, *Farq*, Baghdādī, 62-3 & Shahrastānī, *Milal*, i, 167.

⁶ Nawbakhtī, *op. cit.*, 68-9.

Mubārak who was a *mawla*¹ of Ismā‘īl, held the belief that while al-Ṣādiq was alive, he appointed Ismā‘īl as his successor. They also believed that before the death of Ismā‘īl, Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl was appointed by his father to be the following Imām. Accordingly, one can assume that the Mubārakiyya is the origin of the Ismā‘īlī sect. Al-Khaṭṭābiyya, one of the exaggerator groups (*ghulāt*), was named after their leader, Abū al-Khaṭṭāb al-Asadī (d.138/755),² who was a pupil of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq and became later the spiritual father and close friend of Ismā‘īl.³ They held the belief of transmigratism, that is the “divine spirit” of al-Ṣādiq transferred to Abū al-Khaṭṭāb and then to Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl.⁴

Nevertheless, it was not before the death of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq that Ismā‘īlism became a sect, when disagreement arose between al-Ṣādiq’s followers on the heritage of the Imāmate. One can agree with most of the historians about the similarity between early Ismā‘īlism, i.e., the Wāqifiyya, and the Khaṭṭābiyya in the doctrinal domain, such as the divinity of the Imām and transmigratism. It should be noted that such beliefs did not exist in the Fatimid period. The second Fatimid Caliph al-Qā’im (d. 334/946),⁵ for example, cursed the exaggerators in religion, and al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān explained this by comparing what happened with Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq with Abū

¹ *Mawlā*: a person linked by proximity to another person, a patron; client; freedman; a party to an egalitarian relationship of mutual help, that is, a kinsman, confederate, ally or friend. EI², iv, 44, vi, 874 & Glossary, 209. Cf., Netton, *A Popular Dictionary of Islam*, 167. See also, Lewis, *The Arabs in History*, 70, where *mawlā* is mentioned as: any Muslim who was not a full member by descent of an Arab tribe, especially, a non-Arab convert to Islam who became the “client” of an Arab.

² Abu al-Khaṭṭāb ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Zaynab al-Asadī al-Ajda‘. *Ibid.*, 69. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *Zīna*, iii, 289. See also, Maqrīzī, *Khiṭaṭ*, 352, where he mentions his name as “Abū al-Khaṭṭāb Muḥammad ibn Abī Thawr, or said Muḥammad ibn Abī Yazīd”.

³ Massignon, *Salmān Pāk et les prémices spirituelles de l’Islam iranien*, English trans. J. M. Unvala, 10. Also see; Arabic trans. Badawī, *Salmān al-Fārisī wa al-Bawākīr al-Rūḥiyya li al-Islām fi Irān* within *Shakhṣiyyāt Qaliqa fi al-Islām*, 48.

⁴ Nawbakhtī, *op. cit.*, 71. Qummī, *Maqālāt*, 82-3. Cf. Abu Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *Zīna*, iii, 289. Shahrastānī, *Milal*, i, 179.

⁵ Al-Qā’im bi-Amr Allāh, the second Fatimid Caliph-Imām. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 63.



al-Khaṭṭāb and his group. Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq sent al-Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Amr¹ to go to Abū al-Khaṭṭāb’s followers to persuade them to dissociate themselves from him. According to al-Qādī al-Nu‘mān, al-Ṣādiq was very insistent on this, and went to great lengths in dissociating himself from Abū al-Khaṭṭāb and in anathematizing him.²

5 The Concealment of the Ismā‘īlī Imām

Most Ismā‘īlī sources agree that Ismā‘īl went into concealment after he appointed his son Muḥammad as his successor.³ Then Ismā‘īl fled from Medina to the east to survive Abbasid persecution. To protect himself and protect the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* from danger, Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl went into concealment. The Ismā‘īlī historians called this period, from that time until the appearance of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī (d. 10 322/934)⁴ as an Ismā‘īlī Imām in 297/910, “the time of concealment” (*dawr al-satr*).⁵ It began when the Ismā‘īlī Imām hid not only from his enemies, but also from his followers and most of his *dā‘īs*. Hence, a confusion in the Islamic sources occurred, where nobody, including the Ismā‘īlī historians, gives exact names of the Ismā‘īlī 15 Imāms at the time of concealment. Those names which are given are really little more than theories or guesses, which are not based on historical fact.

¹ Al-Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Amr al-Ja‘fī, one of Ja‘far’s disciples, see; Nu‘mān, *Da‘ā’im*, i, 50. Ṭūsī, *Fihrist*, 203.

² Nu‘mān, *al-Majālis wa al-Musāyrāt*, 84. Cf. Shahrastānī, *Milal*, i, 179.

³ Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, *Sarā’ir wa Asrār al-Nuṭaqa’*, 246. Buzā‘ī, *Trātib*, fol. 103A.

⁴ Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, iii, 117-8.

⁵ *Dawr*: period, era or cycle of history; according to the Ismā‘īlī doctrines, the hierohistory of mankind is divided into seven cycles (*adwār*; pl. of *dawr*), each cycle has seven speakers, the first speaker of each cycle is also called “lord of unveiling” (*ṣāhib al-kashf*) or so-called *al-Qā’im*. Ikhwān al-Ṣafā, *al-Risāla al-Jāmi‘a*, ed. M. Ghālib, 285-286 & 324-325. M. Ghālib, *al-Imāma wa Qā’im al-Qiyāma*, 305-308. Also see; Corbin, *Cyclical Time*, 90-1 & 185. Daftary, *The Ismā‘īlīs*, 560.

Two problems always face scholars in Ismā‘īlī history: the Imāmate and the meaning of *qiyāma*.¹ Therefore, it is important to discuss the doctrine of the Imāmate in Ismā‘īlī belief, and to try to explain the confusion among the Ismā‘īlī sources concerning the names of their Imāms. According to the Shiite point of view, the Imām should be a descendant of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and his wife Fāṭima. Except for the Zaydīs, the Shiites also consider that the Imām must be a descendant of al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī. As ‘Alī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn was the only surviving son after the martyrdom of al-Ḥusayn, the Imāmate, it was believed, should be from amongst his progeny. Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn, and then his son Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, were acknowledged by the Twelvers and the Ismā‘īlīs as the fifth and the sixth Imāms.

After the death of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq in 148/765,² his followers split into groups. The only surviving groups are the Twelvers, who acknowledged Mūsā al-Kāẓim as the successor Imām, and the Ismā‘īlīs who held the belief that the Imām after Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq was his grandson Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl. According to the Ismā‘īlī point of view, before the death of Ismā‘īl, he appointed his son Muḥammad as his successor in the Imāmate.³ After the death of Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl in 193/808-9, disagreement occurred between the Ismā‘īlīs themselves concerning the legitimate Imām. When the Carmathians did not recognize any Imām after Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl and held the belief that he went into concealment, other Ismā‘īlīs maintained that the Imāmate lay with the progeny of Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl.

¹ Cf. The meaning of the *qiyāma* in the Ismā‘īlī belief within the discussion of Abū Muḥammad’s *Mukhtaṣar*. See below, 388-91.

² Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, i, 327.

³ Cf. Nu‘mān, *Sharḥ al-Akḥbār*, xiv, 309. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *Zīna*, ed. ‘A. Sāmarrā’ī, 287-8. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, iv, 333-5. Cf. Buzā‘ī, *al-Tarātib*, fol. 102b.-105a.

The Hidden Ismā‘īlī Imāms Aḥmad al-Taḳī (d. 229/843-4), also called Muḥammad

According to the official Fatimid version,¹ Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl, who was called al-Maktūm (the hidden one) by the Ismā‘īlīs themselves, appointed his eldest son ‘Abd Allāh al-Rādī (the agreeable one) as his successor. ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl (d. ca. 212/827-8), also called Aḥmad al-Wafī (the faithful one)² was considered the first in the series of the hidden Ismā‘īlī Imāms (*al-a‘imma al-mastūrīn*). Al-Qurashī describes in detail al-Rādī’s journey when he escaped from the Abbasids and sought refuge in Persia. Al-Qurashī reported that after al-Rādī changed his residence in different places in Persia, he eventually settled in al-Ahwāz, where he lived for some time.³ But soon he felt that he was in danger. He therefore entrusted his brother al-Ḥusayn with the Ismā‘īlī secret organization and appointed him as a guardian of the *da‘wa* for the succeeding Imām, Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Taḳī (the pious one). ‘Abd Allāh al-Rādī fled to Sāmarrā’, where he lived for some time, then he went to Salamiyya in Syria.⁴ Salamiyya became the “abode of emigration” (*dār al-hijra*) of the Imāms and the headquarters of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*.⁵ ‘Abd Allāh al-Rādī lived in Salamiyya as an ordinary Hāshimite merchant, and most likely he changed his name.⁶

¹ Nīsābūrī, *Istitār al-Imām*, ed. & trans. Ivanow, in *Ismā‘īlī Tradition*, 161-66, the Arabic text was edited in *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Egyptian University*, iv, 1939, 93-107. 95-7. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, iv, 333-5. Cf. Buzā‘ī, *al-Tarātīb*, fol. 102b.-105a.

² Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 344. M. K. Ḥusayn, *Ṭā‘ifat al-Ismā‘īliyya*, 17.

³ Ahwāz: a province in Khūzistān. Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam*, i, 284. Brice, *An Historical Atlas of Islam*, 25-7 Cb.

⁴ Salamiyya or Salamiya, is a small town in Syria, between Ḥamāh and Ḥiṣ. Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam*, iii, 240. Cf. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, iv, 363-5.

⁵ *Dār al-hijra*: lit. abode of emigration, or, as in *EI*, the land of emigration; it means any place which is free of danger to flee to. For example, when the Prophet Muḥammad was harassed by his people in Mecca, he fled to Yathrib as a *dār al-hijra*. *EI*, i, 302-3.

⁶ Nīsābūrī, *Istitār*, 95. Ivanow’s trans, 162.

According to al-Qurashī, Aḥmad al-Taqī (d. 229/843-4), also called Muḥammad al-Taqī,¹ who according to the Fatimid version was the author of *Rasā'il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā'*,² married a woman from Salamiyya and spend the rest of his life there.³ Before he died he appointed his elder son al-Ḥusayn al-Zakī (the pure one), also called Muḥammad,⁴ to succeed him in the Imāmate. Al-Qurashī mentions that al-Ḥusayn al-Zakī was the Ismā'īlī Imām who sent the two *dā'īs*, Ibn Ḥawshab and Ibn al-Faḍl,⁵ to Yemen.⁶ Al-Qurashī adds that before the death of al-Ḥusayn al-Zakī in 267/880-1,⁷ he chose his brother, who was also called Muḥammad and known as Sa'īd al-Khayr with the additional *kunya* Abū al-Shala'la' (or al-Shalaghlagh), to be the guardian of the *da'wa* for the succeeding Imām. After the death of Abū al-Shala'la' in 289/902, 'Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī became the Ismā'īlī Imām.⁸

Al-Buzā'ī, al-Nīsabūrī and al-Qurashī, all mention that before 'Ubayd Allāh took charge of the leadership of the *da'wa*, Abū al-Shala'la' tried unsuccessfully several times to keep the Imāmate in his progeny. The Ismā'īlī sources add that all of Abū al-Shala'la's sons died before they received the Imāmate.⁹ As a result of the

¹ Cf. Ghālib, *A'lām*, 110. M. K. Ḥusayn, *Ṭā'ifat al-Ismā'īliyya*, 18.

² Cf. H. Hamdānī, *Rasā'il Ikhwān aṣ-Ṣafā'* in the literature of the Ismā'īlī Ṭayyibī Da'wat, *Der Islam*, 1932, 281-5. Netton, *Muslim Neoplatonists*, 97-8.

³ Qurashī, 'Uyūn, iv, 367.

⁴ It should be noted that all the hidden Ismā'īlī Imāms had assumed the name "Muḥammad". Cf. Daftary, *The Ismā'īlīs*, 108.

⁵ See the next chapter.

⁶ Qurashī, 'Uyūn, iv, 396

⁷ M. K. Ḥusayn, *Ṭā'ifat al-Ismā'īliyya*, 18. Cf. Ghālib, *A'lām*, 265 & *Tārikh al-Da'wa al-Ismā'īliyya*, 157.

⁸ Qurashī, 'Uyūn, iv, 402-4. Cf. Buzā'ī, *al-Tarātīb*, fol. 106a.-108a.

⁹ Buzā'ī, *al-Tarātīb*, fol. 106a.-108a. Nīsabūrī, *Istitār*, 95-6, Ivanow's trans. 162-3. Qurashī, 'Uyūn, iv, 402-4.

extreme secrecy of the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa* in hiding the name and the identity of the Imām, it seems that even after he took charge of the *da‘wa*, ‘Ubayd Allāh faced a series of difficulties in identifying himself as the Imām, which reflected many troubles in dealing with the chief *dā‘īs*. And it seems also that the *Ismā‘īlī dā‘īs* at that early stage of the *da‘wa* were not prepared to accept some concepts of the *da‘wa’s* hierarchy, especially those which were related to the guardian or the “trustee Imām” (*al-mustawda‘*).

The Carmathians’ Dilemma

One cannot discuss the history of the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa* during the third/ninth century without mentioning the Carmathian movement as an early *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa* in Iraq and Baḥrayn. According to Ibn al-Nadīm, the Carmathian *da‘wa* was organized in 261/874-5.¹ It began soon after the death of the eleventh Imām of the Twelvers, al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī al-‘Askarī (d. 260/874),² who, according to the *Ismā‘īlī* as well as the Sunnī sources died without leaving any sons to succeed him in the Imāmate. The *Ismā‘īlī daw‘a*, in its Carmathian form as a call for the advent of Muḥammad ibn *Ismā‘īl* as the Mahdī, spread in Iraq through the efforts of Ḥamdān ibn al-Ash‘ath (disappeared in 280/893), who was nicknamed Qarmaṭ.³

Ḥamdān Qarmaṭ -the eponym of the Carmathians- was converted to *Ismā‘īlism* by al-Ḥusayn al-Ahwāzī.⁴ Al-Ḥusayn al-Ahwāzī lived peacefully in a village called

¹ Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 265.

² Abū Muḥammad, al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Mūsā ibn Ja‘far al-Šādiq. Mufīd, *Irshād*, 512. Irbilī, *Kashf al-Ghumma fi Ma‘rifat al-A‘imma*, iii, 196-7 & 226.

³ Also read “Qirmiṭ” and “Qurmuṭ”. Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat al-Arab fi funūn al-Adab*, xxv, ed. M. Ḥīnī and A. Ahwānī, xxv, 187.

⁴ Nothing is known about al-Ḥusayn al-Ahwāzī except what is mentioned by Akhū Muḥsin in al-Nuwayrī’s *Nihāyat* (*ibid.*), namely that he was a disciple of the hidden *Ismā‘īlī* Imām, who accompanied him for some time, and his *dā‘ī* to southern Iraq. Cf. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 25-6. See also, Halm, *The Empire of the Mahdi*, trans. M. Bonner, 26 & *Shiism*, 166.

Quss Bahrām.¹ When he died, Ḥamdān became his successor and received instructions directly from Salamiyya.² It seems that correspondence was established between Ḥamdān and the hidden Ismā‘īlī Imām in Salamiyya. Ḥamdān succeeded with his brother-in-law ‘Abdān (d. 286/899)³ to organize the *da‘wa* in Kūfa and the surrounding villages in the south of Iraq. ‘Abdān then appointed a number of *dā‘īs* in the nearby districts, such as Zakrawayh ibn Mahrawayh (d. 294/906-7)⁴ as the *dā‘ī* of western Iraq and Abū Sa‘īd al-Jannābī (d. 300/913) as the *dā‘ī* of southern Fars.⁵ Al-Ṭabarī reports that in 278/891-2 the Carmathians began their movement against the Abbasids.⁶ Although the Abbasids realised the danger of the Carmathians at that time, they did not take any action against them.

In 286/899, Abū Sa‘īd al-Jannābī spread the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in the coastal region of eastern Arabia and gained more followers when he conquered a large part of Baḥrayn and also took al-Qaṭīf.⁷ In the following year, Abū Sa‘īd besieged Hajar,⁸ the capital of the region of al-Aḥsā’.⁹ Despite the Abbasid attempts to stop the

¹ Nothing is found in the sources about this village.

² Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar wa Jāmi‘ al-Ghurur*, vi, 44-6.

³ Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdān ibn al-Rabiṭ al-Ahwāzī, the lieutenant and chief assistant of Ḥamdān Qarmaṭ, and one of the most celebrated early Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs*. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 168. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 265. See also; De Goeje, *Mémoire*, 33, cf. the Arabic trans. by Ḥ. Zīna, 36. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 31.

⁴ Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vii, 550-1. Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar*, vi, 87-9.

⁵ Abū Sa‘īd al-Ḥasan ibn Bahrām al-Jannābī, the founder of the Carmathian state in Baḥrayn. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vii, 493-5 & viii, 83. De Goeje, *Mémoire*, 33-4, cf. the Arabic trans., 36-39. EI², ii, 452. See also, Halm, *The Empire of the Mahdi*, 192. Daftary, *The Ismā‘īlīs*, 130.

⁶ Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, xi, 337. Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vii, 444.

⁷ Cf. Yaqūt, *Mu‘jam*, iv, 378.

⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, v, 393.

⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, i, 111-2.

Carmathian invasion of Hajar, Abū Sa‘īd finally overwhelmed the Abbasids in 290/903 and took Hajar, which became his capital.¹ Abū Sa‘īd al-Jannābī was the founder of a state which lasted for nearly two hundred years.

According to al-Nuwayrī, Dawādārī and al-Maqrīzī,² when ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī succeeded as Imām, Ḥamdān was suspicious of the changing style of the Imām’s letters to him. Therefore, he sent ‘Abdān to Salamiyya to find out how the matter stood. ‘Abdān arrived there, learned about the death of the Imām and the succession of his son, and had an interview with the latter. At the meeting, when ‘Abdān saw ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī for the first time, ‘Abdān asked who was the Imām to whom they owed obedience and what was his proof (*ḥujja*).³ ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī answered by posing a question:

“who [do you think] the Imām is”?

“Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Ja‘far, the Imām of the time (*ṣāhib al-zamān*)”, ‘Abdān replied.

‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī denied that and said:

“there was no Imām but my father, who is dead, and [now] I am taking his place (*aqūm“ maqāmah”*)”.⁴

The Carmathian *dā‘ī* returned to Kūfa and discussed the matter and what he had discovered with the chief *dā‘ī* (*dā‘ī al-du‘āt*) in their *jazīra*.⁵ They realized that the

¹ Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar*, vi, 56-7. Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxv, 235-239.

² *Ibid.*, 229-231. Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar*, vi, 65. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 167.

³ *Hujja*: the proof of God’s presence or will and as such, a term used amongst the Shiites which refers to that person who at any given time served as evidence among mankind of God’s will. The *ḥujja* is a high rank in the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* coming under the *bāb*. The *ḥujja* conducts the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*, and should be in charge of a separate *da‘wa* region which is called *jazīra*. The term generally denotes the chief representative of the Imām. EI², i, 832, ii, 97 & iii, 544.

⁴ فقال الإبن: "ومن الإمام؟" فقال عبدان: "محمد بن اسماعيل بن جعفر صاحب الزمان". فأنكر ذلك وقال: "لم يكن إمام غير أبي، وأنا أقوم مقامه".

Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 167. See also, Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxv, 229-31. Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar*, vi, 65.

⁵ The Ismā‘īlīs called a propaganda district *jazīra*; the world was divided by them into twelve districts, each of them called islands (*jazīra*). Cf. EI², ii, 523. Halm, *The Empire of the Mahdi*, 47. See below, 123.

existence of Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl had nothing whatsoever to do with the entire affair, and that all of this was nothing but falsehood. They, therefore, decided to attack Salamiyya in 289/902. This movement alerted the Abbasids to the whereabouts of the Ismā‘īlī Imām after a century of secrecy.¹ In 286/900, shortly before the Carmathian invasion, ‘Ubayd Allāh fled from Salamiyya and went to Ramla.² There, he decided to change his direction to a new *dār al-hijra*, to the Maghrib instead of Yemen. As a result of changing the direction of his journey, there was much confusion among the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* of that time. No further information about ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī was sent from the headquarters to Yemen to facilitate the *dā‘īs*’ preparations for the expected *qiyāma*.

According to Ismā‘īlī doctrines there are three kinds of Resurrection, the smallest (*ṣuḡhrā*), the intermediate (*wuṣṭā*) and the greatest (*kubrā*). The smallest happens after the appearance of the hidden Imām and the end of practising *taqiyya*. Usually it happens in between two Imāms. The intermediate is in the period before the beginning of each cycle (*dawr*), that is between two speakers (*nuṭaqā’*),³ i.e., after the end of the old religious law (*sharī‘a*) and the beginning of the new one.⁴ The greatest (*‘uzmā*), also called “Resurrection of the Resurrections” (*qiyāmat al-qiyāmāt*), is at the end of this earthly life, or the Day of Judgment. This helps to explain why Ibn al-Faḍl abandoned the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* and also helps to clarify the disagreement between the two *dā‘īs* in Yemen, as will be shown in the next chapter.

¹ Yamānī, *Sīrat Ja‘far al-Ḥājjib*, ed. Ivanow, Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts-Egyptian University, iv-1939, 109-10, Ivanow’s trans. within *Ismā‘īlī Tradition*, 187-8. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 178-9. See also, M. K. Ḥusayn, *Ṭā‘ifat al-Ismā‘īliyya*, 15.

² A city in Palestine. Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam*, iii, 70. Cf. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 90.

³ *Nuṭaqā’*, pl. of *nāṭiq*; lit. speaker: a Prophet, who has the divine right to bring a new religious law (*sharī‘a*) and abolish the old one. Cf., EI², iv, 203. According to Ismā‘īlī doctrine there are seven “speakers”: Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muḥammad, and al-Qā‘im. Ibn Maṣūn al-Yaman, *al-Kashf*, ed. M. Ghālib, 61 (f.n. 2). Ḥāmīdī, *Kanz al-Walad*, ed. M. Ghālib, 27, 206, 216-7.

⁴ For more details see; Corbin, *Cyclical Time and Ismaili Gnosis*, 67-8, 90 & 185-7.

Abū Sa‘īd al-Jannābī, who became the head of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Baḥrayn and one of the Carmathian chief *dā‘īs*, sided with the other Carmathian *dā‘īs* and rejected the Imāmate of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī. Like the others, he believed that Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl was still alive, and that he was the truly-guided Imām of the
5 time. However, when Abū Sa‘īd al-Jannābī discovered that he was being used by the Ismā‘īlī headquarters in Salamiyya that and his belief in the existence of Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl was false, he announced his independence and claimed that he represented the awaited *mahdī*. According to the meaning of *al-qiyāma al-wuṣṭā* and as a deputy of the *mahdī*, Abū Sa‘īd al-Jannābī abolished the old *sharī‘a* and
10 established himself in Aḥsā’ in 286-7/899-900.¹

The *da‘wa* in Yemen seized upon the same idea as the Carmathians of Iraq and Baḥrayn: it took the same line and began preaching on behalf of the local Ismā‘īlī leader as a recent Imām (*Imām al-zamān*). The announcement of the apostasy in Yemen and Baḥrayn, in fact, coincided with the killing of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī* in the
15 *Maghrib*, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī,² in 298/911 by ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī. And this raises some questions about the true Ismā‘īlī Imām, such as, why Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī and his brother Abū al-‘Abbās (d. 298/911),³ as well as Abū Sa‘īd and ‘Alī ibn al-Faḍl were confused when they knew that the expected *mahdī* was ‘Ubayd Allāh? Did Ibn al-Faḍl have some connections with the Carmathians?

20 It is therefore necessary to explain that according to the Ismā‘īlī doctrine of the Imāmate, there are two types of Imām, trustee (*mustawda‘*) and permanent

¹ Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vii, 493 & 498-9.

² Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī; al-Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Zakariyyā’ al-Ṣan‘ānī. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, viii, 31, 50-1. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 67-8 & Muqaffā, 25 & 38. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, i, 178. Juwaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahān-gushāy*, Arabic trans. M. Jamāl al-Dīn, 163. See also; Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 246.

³ Abū al-‘Abbās (*al-makḥṭūm*); Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Zakariyyā, The elder brother of Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, viii, 18. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, 68 & Muqaffā, 25 & 38. Cf. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, i, 178. Juwaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahān-gushāy*, 163.

(*mustaqarr*).¹ When the *mustaqarr* Imām or his distinguished *dāʿīs* feel that the life of the Imām in danger or that he was about to die, the Imām would delegate his authority as an Imām to the most trusted *dāʿī*, usually one of his brothers, and then the Imām would hide even from his distinguished *dāʿīs*. According to the Ismāʿīlī traditions, the *mustaqarr* Imām usually appointed one of his sons in a special ceremony to be his successor before he died or went into concealment.² Therefore, the *mustawdaʿ* Imām and the distinguished *dāʿīs*, who officiated at the ceremony, worked under the guidance of the previous Imām until the young Imām became eligible. Then, the Imāmate would be transferred to him by the *mustawdaʿ* Imām in another ceremony.³

The doctrine of the *mustawdaʿ* Imām was held by the early Ismāʿīlīs until the death of the last Mustaʿlian *mustawdaʿ* Imām, ʿAbd al-Majīd (d. 544/1149).⁴ Whilst the Nizārīs held the belief of the "present Imām" (*ḥādir*), Ṭayyibī history does not show any cases of the *mustawdaʿ* Imām.

The idea of "depositing" the Imāmate reflects an Ismāʿīlī strategy during times of danger. At that time, while the Imām remains unknown and hidden, some of the high ranking *dāʿīs* may pretend to assume the title of the Imām just to protect the real Imām. This strategy saved the Ismāʿīlī *dāʿīs* much trouble in operating their activities without exposing their Imām to danger. Within the same strategy, the *mustawdaʿ* Imām may also pretend that he is the father of the following *mustaqarr* Imām, who was appointed by the real Imām to be his successor. Accordingly, the *mustawdaʿ* Imām gives his name to the following Imām to make the latter seem to be one of his

¹ *Mustaqarr* Imām is the real Imām who has the authority of vesting the Imāmate in his successor. The word *mustaqarr* is derived from *istaqarra*, which means "settle". According to the Ismāʿīlī doctrine of the Imāmate, the *mustaqarr* Imām is better than the *mustawdaʿ* Imām. Nuʿmān, *al-Majālis wa al-Musāyarāt*, ed. H. Faqqī *et al.*, 411. Cf. Tritton, *A Theological Miscellany*, BSOS, ix, 925, where the author mentions some cases of the *mustawdaʿ* Imāms.

² Cf. Buzāʿī, *al-Tarātib*, fols. 104 b.-108 a.

³ Nisābūrī, *Istitār*, 95-6, cf. Ivanow's trans. in *Ismāʿīlī Tradition*, 162-3.

⁴ Al-Ḥāfīz, *Abū al-Maymūn ʿAbd al-Majīd ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Mustanṣir li-Dīn Allāh*. Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāz*, iii, 137.

sons. This made for confusion among the Ismā‘īlī as well as non-Ismā‘īlī sources in tracing back the genealogy of the Fatimid Imāms as the hidden Ismā‘īlī Imāms of the Ismā‘īlīs.

From the time when the Fatimids announced their state, doubts had been raised by their enemies on the origin of the Fatimids as descendants of the Prophet’s daughter Faṭīma, the wife of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. The fact remains that such doubts were an echo of the anti-Fatimid propaganda, which had been supported by the Abbasids. Ibn Rizām¹ appears to have been the first author who attacked the Ismā‘īlīs in his work. His book was used as the main reference by one of his contemporaries, al-Sharīf Akhū Muḥsin.² Most of Akhū Muḥsin’s work, which is also lost, has been preserved in Nuwayrī’s *Nihāyat al-Arab*.³ The account of Ibn Rizām reflected the Sunnī view which is based on the allegation that the Fatimid genealogy was non-Alid but traced back to Maymūn al-Qaddāh.

Al-Qurashī identifies al-Qaddāh as Maymūn ibn Ghaylān ibn Baydar ibn Mahrān ibn Salmān al-Fārisī⁴ and describes him as a guardian of Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl and *mustawda‘* of the Imāmate.⁵ While the sources, both the Ismā‘īlī and anti-Ismā‘īlī, agree that Maymūn and his son ‘Abd Allāh were the organisers of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* at its beginning, Ivanow, on the other hand, tries to prove that the story of Maymūn al-Qaddāh is a myth, or “a tissue of lies”, a pure fabrication which was

¹ Abū ‘Abd Allāh, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Rizām al-Ṭā’ī al-Kūfī was alive in the first half of the fourth/tenth century. Mas‘ūdī, *Tanbih*, 396. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 22. See also, Lewis, *The Origins*, 7.

² Abū al-Ḥusayn, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, was alive in 373/985. Dawādārī, *Kanz*, vi, 7. Maqrīzī, *op. cit.* Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxv, ed. M. al-Ḥīnī and A. al-Ahwānī, Cairo 1984, 189. EI², vi, 917.

³ Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxv, 195-316.

⁴ Cf. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 264-5. Baghdādī, *Farq*, 282. Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 18b. Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, see below, 527 & 631. Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxv, 189.

⁵ Qurashī, *Zahr al-Ma‘ānī*, 200. Cf. ‘Uyūn, iv, 335.

invented by certain anti-Ismā‘īlī historians.¹ Moreover, modern progress in Ismā‘īlī studies has shown that the account of Ibn Rizām and Akhū Muḥsin about Maymūn al-Qaddāh and his son ‘Abd Allāh is not true.

The identity of the Ismā‘īlī Imāms remain indefinite. Since their names of the Imāms were recorded by certain early Ismā‘īlī historians, more allegations have arisen by anti-Ismā‘īlī historians on the origin of the Fatimid Imāms. Even al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān, as an important official Fatimid source, omits the name of the concealed Imāms in his works, especially, **Iftitāḥ al-Da‘wa** and **Sharḥ al-Akhbār**. It seems strict secrecy has made a great deal of confusion in identifying the real Imāms, i.e., the *mustaqarr* Imāms from those who were *mustada‘*.

Modern studies in Ismā‘īlī history reflect the same obfuscation in the names of the Ismā‘īlī hidden Imāms at the period of concealment. For example, Lewis clarifies the biographies of Maymūn and his son ‘Abd Allāh and makes every effort to prove that the Qaddāhids were *mustawda‘* Imāms.² According to the Ismā‘īlī sources, during the time of the concealment of the Ismā‘īlī Imāms, many attempts were made by the *mustawda‘* Imāms to seize the Imāmate unlawfully from the immature *mustaqarr* Imāms.³ It is difficult to ascertain facts about the names of the hidden Ismā‘īlī Imāms for the simple reason that during the period of the concealment nobody knew the real Imām, i.e., the *mustaqarr*; they knew only his *mustawda‘*; and because some of the *mustawda‘* Imāms were not sincere, they claimed the Imāmate for themselves and their sons. Hence, the mystery around these names occurred, and even the early official Fatimid sources kept silent. Even with some attempts of certain modern scholars to reveal the puzzle, their conclusions are still considered as mere hypotheses.

¹ Ivanow, *The Alleged Founder of Ismā‘īlism*, 174.

² Lewis, *Origins*, 72.

³ Buzā‘ī, *al-Tarātīb*, fols. 104b.-108a. Nīsābūrī, *Istitār*, 95. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, iv, 402-3. Cf. Ibn al-Ṭuwayr, *Nuzhat al-Muqlatayn fī Akhbār al-Dawlatayn*, ed. A. F. Sayyid, 26-7.

The Occurrence of Ismā‘īlism in Yemen

The First Ismā‘īlī State in Yemen

(268-320 A. H./ 882-932 A. D.)

5 The start of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen

Few Ismā‘īlī texts record the origin of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen, while other sources mention it as little more than isolated events in Islamic history. Except for the Yemeni Ismā‘īlī writers, the Ismā‘īlī sources, such as **Iftitāḥ al-Da‘wa** and **Sīrat Ja‘far al-Ḥāḥib**, describe it as a mission which spread the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in
10 Yemen. On the other hand, the anti-Ismā‘īlī sources, especially those emanating from Yemen, portray it as an invasion by a secretive group of dissenters, mostly described as *Bāṭiniyya* and *Malāḥida*. As a result of the discrepancy between the Ismā‘īlī, anti-Ismā‘īlī and more “neutral” sources,¹ it is difficult to confirm dates and names amongst these groups of sources, or to delineate the right geographical areas for the
15 spread of the *da‘wa* in Yemen. This chapter will rely on Ismā‘īlī sources to establish dates during the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*, as well as to provide the names of the Imāms, missionaries (*dā‘īs*) and other spiritual figures. Both the anti-Ismā‘īlī and “neutral” sources may be called upon for purposes of comparison.

The geography of Yemen will be compiled from early Yemeni texts, including
20 **Ṣifat Jazīrat al-‘Arab** and **al-Iklīl**.² Some of these texts have been edited recently by modern Yemeni scholars, who are using the works to redefine Yemeni regions and tribes; for example, **Majmu‘ al-Buldān wa al-Qabā’il al-Yamaniyya**³ and **al-Buldān**

¹ Such as Ibn al-Athīr and al-Maqrīzī.

² By Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad al-Hamdānī, cf. 40, f.n. 3 and 41, f.n. 1, 2 and 3.

³ By Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Ḥajrī, cf. 41 and f.n. 5. Also the same title by I. Maqḥafī, cf. 41.

al-Yamāniyya ‘Inda Yāqūt.¹ In spite of that, one recognizes the difficulty of encompassing the whole picture of the Ismā‘īlī movement without a map to identify the precise places where the events occurred.²

Yemen before the arrival of the two *dā‘īs*

5 Before the arrival of the two Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* to Yemen and during the third/ninth century, as the central Abbasid caliphate lost what limited authority it once had on the region, Yemen began to be ruled by indigenous Yemeni dynasties, i.e., the Ziyādids of Zabīd, the Manākhids of the Southern highlands, and the Yu‘firids of Shibām.³ The Ḥimyarite power, ambitions, and prestige reemerged. It was also a time when the
10 tribes of the northern highlands began to assert their identities and proclaimed their independent sovereignty from the Ḥimyarite dominance. These two integral developments were crucial to the introduction and initial success of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen.

The Ziyādids

15 In 199/814-15, three dissenters were brought to the caliph al-Ma‘mūn, who interrogated them and ordered two of them to be put to death. The condemned men were members of the Umayyad family, one of whom was called Muḥammad ibn Ziyād. Ibn Ziyād sought the pardon of al-Ma‘mūn, who was sufficiently impressed to release him.⁴ In 203/819, Ibn Ziyād was appointed as *Amīr* by the caliph who
20 supported him with a strong army and sent him to put down an anti-Abbasid revolt in Yemen. Ibn Ziyād entered Yemen after the *ḥajj*, conquered Tihāma⁵ and rebuilt

¹ Cf. 41, 5 and f.n. 4.

² Cf. the discussion in the introduction, 34 and the maps provided at the end of this thesis.

³ See map 1.

⁴ ‘Umāra, *al-Mufid*, 47-48. H. Kay, *Yaman* trans. of the history of Yaman by Najm al-Dīn ‘Omāra, 2. Cf. Ibn al-Mujāwir, *Mustabṣir*, ed. O. Löfgren, 66.

⁵ Tihāma: the steppe zone laying parallel to the Red Sea. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, ed. M. Akwa‘, Ṣan‘ā’, 1990, 94. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘ Buldān al-Yaman wa Qabā’ilihā*, ed. I. Akwa‘, Ṣan‘ā’ 1984, i, 156-62. I. al-Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya ‘Inda Yāqūt al-Hamawī*, Kuwait, 1985, 58. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam Buldān wa al-Qabā’il al-Yamaniyya*, Ṣan‘ā’, 1988, 94.

Zabīd¹ in Sha‘bān 204/January 820.²

In Dhū al-Ḥijja 205/May 821, Ibn Ziyād sent his client (*mawlā*) Ja‘far to al-Ma’mūn³ with tribute and valuable presents as spoils from Yemen.⁴ Ja‘far returned to Yemen in 206/821 with an army of two thousand horsemen,⁵ who were given by al-Ma’mūn to Ibn Ziyād to support his position in Yemen.⁶ As a consequence of these reinforcements, Ibn Ziyād went on to conquer most of the Yemeni coast, from Ḥaḍramawt⁷ to Ḥalī,⁸ and he ruled the Yemeni tribes in the name of the Abbasids. He and his posterity had the Friday speech (*khuṭba*) recited in the name of the Abbasid Caliphs in this part of Yemen.

In the other parts of Yemen, the mountainous areas, where Ibn Ziyād spread his authority, the rulers, i.e., the Yu‘firids and the Manākhids, used to mention the Abbasid Caliph and Ibn Ziyād in the *khuṭba*. In addition, coinage was struck in his

¹ Zabīd: a well known valley in the southwest of Yemen ending at the Red Sea, included some villages, one of them called al-Husayb which was later called Zabīd and became the capital of the Ziyādids and then the Ayyūbids in Yemen. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, ii, 380-2. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 286-287. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 129. See map 1.

² ‘Umāra, *al-Mufīd*, 51. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 44. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 38. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Bughyat al-Mustafīd*, ed. Y. Shalḥad, 49.

³ One could not find any information about Ja‘far except what is mentioned above, that he was “a man of great capacity and astuteness, it was through him that the dynasty of Ibn Ziyād acquired its greatness”. ‘Umāra, *al-Mufīd*, ed. Kay, English trans. 5. Cf. Arabic edition by Akwa‘, 53. Ḥamzī, *Kanz al-Akhyār*, 44. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 38.

⁴ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 44. Cf. Ibn al-Mujāwir, *Mustabṣir*, 67.

⁵ It should be noted that all of the primary sources in this study are not immune from exaggeration especially in numbers.

⁶ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 44. Cf. Waṣābī, *al-I‘tibār fī al-Tawārikh wa al-āthār*, ed. ‘A. Ḥibshī, 22.

⁷ Ḥaḍramawt: the southeastern part of Yemen; it was named after Ḥaḍramawt ibn Saba’. ‘Umāra, *al-Mufīd*, f.n. 5, 53. Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, ii, 369. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, ii, 263-4. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 177.

⁸ Ḥalī: a port in the northwest of Yemen; today it belongs to Saudi Arabia. ‘Umāra, *al-Mufīd*, f.n. 2, 54. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 189.

province.¹ One may assume therefore that the Yemeni highlands were never ruled directly by the Ziyādids, but by so called “decentralized governments” which were autonomous. These “self-governing states” had to support the Abbasids, pay taxes to them and ally with the Ziyādids against their enemies. Ibn Ziyād died in 245/859.² He was succeeded by his son Ibrāhīm (d. 290/911),³ who was alive and in office when the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* appeared in Yemen.

The Manākhids

The southern part of Yemen owed allegiance to the Abbasids after the death of Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad (Dhū al-Muthla) al-Manākhī⁴ in 249/863.⁵ Ibrāhīm had been the leader of a rebellion against the Abbasids in the province of al-Kalā‘.⁶ When he defeated the Abbasid army in 214/829, he became the ruler of the southern highlands.⁷ He ruled his domain for thirty five years without any serious action being taken against him by the Abbasids.⁸ After his death, his son Ja‘far (d. 292/905) succeeded his father and ruled this region for more than forty years.⁹ He established Mudhaykhira¹⁰ as capital of his domain until he was defeated and killed by Ibn al-Faḍl.¹¹ It is clear that the year 214/829 was the start of the establishment of Manākhid

¹ Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Bughyat*, 52. ‘Umāra, al-Mufīd, ed. Kay, English trans. 5. Cf. Arabic edition by Akwa‘, 57.

² Yahyā ibn al-Husayn, *Ghāyat al-Amānī*, ed. S. ‘Āshūr, 158.

³ *Ibid.*, 189.

⁴ Ja‘far ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad (Dhu al-Muthlah) ... ibn Shuf‘a ibn Zur‘a (Dhu Manākh) a descendant of Himyar al-Akbar. Cf. Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, ii, 94.

⁵ Khzrajī, ‘*Asjad*, ed. S. Zakkār within *Akhbār al-Qarāmiṭa*, 621.

⁶ Al-Kalā‘: the old name of what is called nowadays al-‘Adīn including Dhū Sufāl, Ḥubaysh and Ibb. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 118 and *Iklīl*, ii, f.n. 2, 2. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 665. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 539. Cf. map 2.

⁷ For more details, cf. Mad‘aj, *The Yemen in early Islam*, 212-214.

⁸ Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Akwa‘, 217.

⁹ Cf. Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, ii, 94. Khzrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 621.

¹⁰ Mudhaykhira: a city on Thawmān, which is a mountain in the northwest of Aden and southeast of Zabīd. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 578. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 119. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iii, 592-3 & iv, 702. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 255. Cf. map 2.

¹¹ See below, 81-3.

rule of the southern highlands, and the development of effectual local leaders with enough power to be able to rule their own territories.

The Yu‘firids

The Yu‘firids, or Banū Yu‘fir, were the descendants of Yu‘fir ibn ‘Abd al-
5 Raḥmān al-Ḥiwālī,¹ the leader of a rebellion in the central area of the Yemeni
highlands against the Abbasids in 227/841-2.² Ṣan‘ā’ was ruled by an Abbāsīd
governor (*wālī*) until al-Muwaffaq, the brother of the Abbāsīd caliph al-Mu‘tamīd (d.
279/892), appointed Muḥammad ibn Yu‘fir as governor of the central and the
10 northern highlands of Yemen in 257/870-1.³ This gave Muḥammad confidence to
proceed to the south where he conquered Ḥaḍramawt⁴ in 262/876-7.⁵ After he had
allied himself with Ibn Ziyād and become the ruler of Ṣan‘ā’, al-Janad⁶ and
Ḥaḍramawt,⁷ he went on the *hajj*. In Mecca, Muḥammad received permission from al-
Muwaffaq to appoint his son Ibrāhīm as his successor and deputy.⁸ In 263/877,
Muḥammad announced his abdication.⁹ Nu‘mān alleges that this action was a result
15 of his belief in a prophecy which warned him that his kingdom would collapse at the

¹ Cf. The genealogy of the Yu‘firids; Geddes, *The Yu‘firids Dynasty of Ṣan‘ā’*, London 1959, 166. Mad‘aj, *The Yemen in Early Islam*, 219-20.

² Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, ii, 177. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 154. Cf. A. Mad‘aj, *The Yemen in early Islam*, 219.

³ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 51.

⁴ *Ibid.* Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 45.

⁵ *Ibid.* Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 163.

⁶ Al-Janad; a city to the north-east of Ta‘izz. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, i, 194. Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 130. See map 2.

⁷ Khazrajī, *‘Asjad*, 112.

⁸ Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 45.

⁹ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 51.

appearance of the *dā'ī* of al-Mahdī.¹ Although, the account of al-Nu'mān may contain some germs of truth, the main reason for his abdication was the conspiracies of his family, i.e., his father and his son Ibrāhīm, to dethrone him.

It seems clear that there were disagreements between Muḥammad and his father Yu'fir, which most probably were connected with the dispute between Yu'fir and the Abbasids.² Subsequently, Yu'fir commanded his grandson Ibrāhīm (d. 279/892)³ to kill his father Muḥammad and his uncle Aḥmad, which he did in 270/883-4.⁴ Thereafter, the devotees of Muḥammad rose in revolt against Ibrāhīm and his grandfather. The Abbasids solved this problem by sending an army. Ibrāhīm received an order from the Abbasids to cede the governorship to his son 'Abd al-Raḥīm who took over until 273/886-7, when his father desposed him.⁵

Ṣan'ā' at this time was a centre of struggle between the Yu'firids and their previous comrades, such as al-Faḍl ibn Yūnis al-Murādī, the sons of Yu'fir's client Ṭarīf ibn Thābit and al-Makramān,⁶ and most of the people from Ṣan'ā' and the surrounding areas stood against the Yu'firids,⁷ especially when al-Du'ām ibn Ibrāhīm (d. 298/910), the Lord of Kahlān and the leader of Hamdān,⁸ turned against Ibrāhīm.

¹ Nu'mān, *Iftitāḥ*, 13. Qurashī, 'Uyūn, v, 32. Cf. Ḥammādī, *Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya*, ed. M. 'Azab, 45.

² Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 163.

³ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 52. Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 165, where he mentions the death of Ibrāhīm in 277/890.

⁴ Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, ii, 178. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 51. Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 164 and Ibn 'Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 45.

⁵ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 52. Ibn 'Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 46.

⁶ One could not find any information about these people.

⁷ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 52.

⁸ Al-Du'ām ibn Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Yās al-Arḥabī. 'Abbāsī, *Sīrat al-Hādī*, 395. Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, x, ed. Muḥib al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, 179. Zirīklī, *A'lām*, ii, 339.

Consequently, Shibām¹ became the new capital of the Yu‘firids² when the rebels under al-Du‘ām’s leadership took over Ṣan‘ā’ and fought the Abbasid governor.³ Ibrāhīm continued the alliance with the Ziyādids, but his reign did not endure long. He was succeeded by his cousin ‘Abd al-Qāhir ibn Aḥmad.⁴ After he dethroned ‘Uthmān ibn Aḥmad in 293/906, As‘ad ibn Abī Yu‘fir Ibrāhīm (d. 332/943-4) took hold of the central and the northern highlands of Yemen.⁵

The Ismā‘īlī mission and its preparation

Two *dā‘īs* were sent to Yemen by the Ismā‘īlī Imām,⁶ they were al-Ḥasan ibn Ḥawshab (230-302/844-914)⁷ and ‘Alī ibn al-Faḍl (d. 303/915). Abū al-Qāsim al-Ḥasan ibn Faraj (Farah) ibn Ḥawshab ibn Zādān al-Kūfī, according to Qurashī,⁸ was a descendant of Muslim ibn ‘Aqīl ibn Abī Ṭālib, the Prophet Muḥammad’s uncle. He was a native of Kūfa where his family followed the teaching of the Twelver Shiites. “The victorious one of Yemen” (*Manṣūr al-Yaman*), is the additional *kunya* of Ibn Ḥawshab, which was given to him by the Ismā‘īlī Imām after he had success in Yemen.⁹ However, ‘Imād al-Dīn Idrīs al-Ḥamzī (d. 714/1314), a descendant of al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, writes:

¹ Shibām: a mountain in 23 Km. to the north-east of Ṣan‘ā’. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 86 and 172. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iii, 441-4. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 343. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 150. Cf. map 2.

² Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 52.

³ ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, nicknamed “Juftum”, arrived to Yemen in Ṣafar 279/May 892 and he left it in 282/895-6. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 165-67 and f.n. 2, 165.

⁴ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 52. Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, ii, ed. Akwa‘, 183 and f.n. 1.

⁵ Ḥamzī, *op. cit.*, 55.

⁶ Nu‘mān, *Iftitāḥ*, ed. F. al-Dishrāwī, 9-11.

⁷ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn al-Akḥbār*, ed. M. Ghalib, v, 31. Cf. ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-Hamdānī, *Tathbīt Dalā’il al-Nubuwwa*, ed. A. ‘Uthmān, 107 & 376. M. Ghalib, *A‘lām al-Ismā‘īliyya*, p. 233.

⁸ *Ibid.* Cf. Nu‘mān, *Iftitāḥ*, 9-11, where the author does not mention that Ibn Ḥawshab was a descendant of the Prophet’s family.

⁹ *Ibid.* Al-Nu‘mān says: “He was named *Manṣūr al-Yaman* when the victory was facilitated to him”.

وسمي منصور اليمن (المصور باليمن) لما أتيه له النصر.

"al-Manṣūr is originally from Kūfa, his name is al-Ḥasan ibn Zādān. He is descended from 'Aqīl ibn Abī Tālib, although our companions (*aṣḥābuna*) do not know any of his lineage".¹

'Alī ibn al-Faḍl ibn Aḥmad al-Jadnī was a Yemeni from Jayshān² and was related to Banū Khanfar ibn Saba' ibn Ṣayfī ibn Zar'a ibn Saba' al-Aṣghar.³ In **Iftitāḥ al-Da'wa**, al-Nu'mān characterizes Ibn al-Faḍl as a handsome and well-bred person from a wealthy Shiite family, who came from Jayshān in the highlands south of al-Janad.⁴

The first meeting between these two *dā'īs*, who established the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* in Yemen, was in Kūfa in 267/880 after the pilgrimage (*ḥajj*) to Mecca, when the Yemeni 'Alī ibn al-Faḍl and some Shiites from Jayshān passed through Kūfa.⁵ As Shiites, they continued their holy journey to al-Ḥusayn's mausoleum. When Ibn al-Faḍl arrived there in Muḥarram 267/August 880, he witnessed an enormous gathering of Shiites. The sight so overwhelmed him that he sobbed openly, attracting the attention of the pilgrims and an Ismā'īlī *dā'ī*, who was standing at a discreet distance. The Ismā'īlī *dā'ī* approached Ibn al-Faḍl and questioned him on his Shiite beliefs. He then promised Ibn al-Faḍl that he would meet the Ismā'īlī Imām. According to the Ismā'īlī account, the Imām of that time was al-Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad (d. ca. 268/881).⁶ The Imām had a meeting with Ibn al-Faḍl, urged him to follow him and become one of the Imām's *dā'īs*.

¹ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 55. Cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 49.

² Jayshān: an old city which is now only a ruin. Ḥajrī, *Majmū'*, ii, 202-4. I. al-Akwa' (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 79. Maqḥafī, *Mu'jam*, 138. See map 2.

³ Cf. Janadī, ed. Akwa', *Sulūk*, i, 231. Ahmad ibn 'Abd Allah al-Rāzī, *Tārīkh Madīnat Ṣan'ā'*, ed. Ḥusayn A. al-'Amrī, 622. Ibn 'Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 50. Wāsi'ī, *Furjat al-Humūm wa al-Ḥazan*, 177. Ziriklī, *al-A'lām*, v. M. Ghālib, *A'lām al-Ismā'īliyya*, 386. Maqḥafī, *Mu'jam*, 432.

⁴ Nu'mān, *Iftitāḥ*, 9.

⁵ Nu'mān, *Iftitāḥ*, 11. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 42-43. Cf. Halm, *The Empire of the Mahdī*, 191.

⁶ Al-Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, one of the Ismā'īlī hidden Imāms. See the genealogy tree of the Ismā'īlī Imāms.

Whilst on the one hand the Yemeni sources mention that ‘Alī ibn al-Faḍl met Maymūn al-Qaddāh and his son ‘Ubayd Allāh, who persuaded him to join the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*,¹ al-Nuwayrī mentions that ibn Abī al-Fawāris, one of ‘Abdān’s *dā‘īs*, sent Ibn Ḥawshab (Abū al-Qāsim al-Najjār), Ibn al-Faḍl’s colleague, to Yemen.² The most likely hypothesis is that, as mentioned by the Ismā‘īlī historians, most of them quoting from al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān, Ibn al-Faḍl’s first meeting was with an Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī* who arranged for him to meet the Imām, who himself was hidden in a village near Karbala’.³ Then Ibn al-Faḍl was introduced to one of the distinguished *dā‘īs*, i.e., Ibn Ḥawshab, who was to be his companion in spreading the *da‘wa* in Yemen.⁴

It seems that the mission to Yemen was planned before Ibn al-Faḍl’s arrival in Kūfa,⁵ and most probably, the Ismā‘īlī headquarters had had full cognizance of his impending arrival.⁶ It would appear likely that Ibn Ḥawshab had already been prepared as chief of the mission with the great responsibility of supporting and teaching Ibn al-Faḍl how to deal with people within the *da‘wa*’s domain.⁷

The mission to Yemen started after the pilgrimage (*ḥajj*) when the two Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs*, Ibn Ḥawshab and Ibn al-Faḍl, entered the country in Muḥarram 268/August 881⁸ from the port of Ghulāfqa.⁹ Ibn Ḥawshab had been ordered by the Ismā‘īlī Imām

¹ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 55. Janadī, ed. Akwa‘, *Sulūk*, i, 231. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 41. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 615. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Qurrat al-‘Uyūn*, ed. M. Akwa‘, i, 179.

² Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, 245.

³ Nu‘mān, *Iftitāh*, 8. Cf. Ibn Khaldūn, ‘*Ibar*, iv, 65, where he mentions that Ibn Ḥawshab and Ibn al-Faḍl met the Ismā‘īlī Imām in Salamiyya.

⁴ Nu‘mān, *Iftitāh*, 11. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 43. Janadī, ed. Akwa‘, *Sulūk*, i, 232. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 617.

⁵ Nu‘mān, *Iftitāh*, 8-11.

⁶ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Anbā’ al-Zaman fī Akhbār al-Yemen*, ed. M. Mādī, 66.

⁷ Nu‘mān, *Iftitāh*, 11. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 44.

⁸ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 32.

⁹ Ghulāfqa or Ghalāfqa, also pronounced Ghalafiqa, known today as Ghulayfiqa; a port on the east coast of the Red Sea, 15 mile north of Zabīd. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Bughyat al-Mustafid*, ed. Y. Shalḥad, 49. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 617. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 45. See also, Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 625. I. Akwa‘, *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 208. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 483. Cf. map 2.

to go to ‘Adan Lā‘a,¹ whilst Ibn al-Faḍl received instructions to proceed to Saru Yāfi‘.² At that time, it was necessary to practise *taqiyya* to protect the spread of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen³ from Yemeni tribes who had allied themselves with the Abbasids.⁴ Therefore, Ibn Ḥawshab pretended to be a Sunnī teacher while Ibn al-Faḍl, who also came originally from a Twelver Shiite background, simulated the life of an ascetic⁵ in order to achieve their goal.

Without doubt, the Ismā‘īlī headquarters must have had some kind of “Shiite organization” in ‘Adan Lā‘a which informed the headquarters about the political situation and which possessed extensive knowledge of the geographical regions of Yemen. According to al-Nu‘mān, in *Sharḥ al-Akḥbār*, Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq had met some Shiites from Yemen who had come to learn from him. Ja‘far asked them about places in Yemen. Ja‘far then described Mudhaykhira, al-Janad and Jayshān to them in detail as he had been there.⁶ From this one can assume that an organization for the Shiite *da‘wa* had developed secretly in Yemen, sending reports from time to time to the Imām. Furthermore, the Ismā‘īlī Imām told Ibn Ḥawshab to go to ‘Adan Lā‘a, a place which was generally neglected and unknown even by most inhabitants of the region, including the local people themselves.⁷ Although Ibn Ḥawshab encountered

¹ ‘Adan Lā‘a: a town in Hajja. It is different from ‘Adan Abyan which is nowadays called Aden. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 677. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 191. ‘Umāraī, *Mufīd*, 61-62. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 432. See map 2.

² “Saru”: lit. means “honour”, it also means “a foot of a mountain” or “the high land”. Saru Yāfi‘: a town in the northeast of Aden and to the east of Ta‘izz. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 53. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 773-4. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 138 and 293. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 705. See map 2, 3 & 4.

³ Before this year, there were a number of Yemenis who lived under the veil of *taqiyya* as Shiites because Ismā‘īlism had not yet crystallized. Evidence about ‘Adan Lā‘a was received by the Ismā‘īlī Imām in Kūfa. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 36. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 47. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 617.

⁴ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 38.

⁵ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 37. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 47 and 53.

⁶ Nu‘mān, *Sharḥ al-Akḥbār fī Faḍā’il al-A’imma al-Akhyār*, ed. M. al-Jalālī, xv, 405-406.

⁷ It is mentioned that ‘Alī ibn al-Faḍl, who was a Yemeni, had never heard of ‘Adan Lā‘a when he was told about it in Kūfa before the mission. Nu‘mān, *Iftitāḥ*, 10. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 36.

difficulties, he insisted on remaining there, not because he was told to, but because there must have been some kind of hidden organization there to help him spread the *da‘wa* secretly in its first stage.

It seems that a strategy had been adopted for the *da‘wa* by the Ismā‘īlī headquarters, especially after the conflict between the Yemenī tribes who allied themselves with the Abbasids in Yemen, i.e., the Banū Manākh and the Banū Yu‘fir who had both at certain points owed allegiance to the Banū Ziyād. This strategy was aimed at undermining the Abbasids’ authority in different regions at the same time. One should note that the Ismā‘īlī mission had been sent to Yemen to ruin the internal power of the Abbasids in Yemen. No more than a quick glance at the map will be cogent proof that the positions of both *dā‘īs* in the peripheral regions -Ibn Ḥawshab in the northwest where the Yu‘firids were and Ibn al-Faḍl in the southeast where the Manākhids ruled- were chosen for their strategic value.

It was necessary that the starting points for the spread of the *da‘wa* in Yemen and for the revolutionary movements should be out of reach of the Abbasids. Furthermore, Yemen had been one of the major areas of revolutionary movements from the fifth decade of the first/seventh century, when ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās, the Prophet’s cousin, had suggested to al-Ḥusayn that he should go to Yemen, because:

“It has fortresses and mountain passes. It is a wide and long land, and your father had followers in it”¹

This text from al-Ṭabarī² shows the extent of the already existing concentration of Shiites in Yemen which was to assist the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* there.

Ibn Ḥawshab in Yemen

Except for Idrīs ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Qurashī (d. 872/1468), the sources do not give an exact route for Ibn Ḥawshab after he left the port of Ghulāfqā. Al-Qurashī

¹ Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, xi, 275.

² Cf. ‘Abbāsī, *Sīra*, ed. Zakkār, 17. Aḥmad ibn ‘Umar, *al-A‘lāq al-Nafīsa*, ed. M. J. De Goeje, 133.

mentions that Ibn Ḥawshab went northeast to the province (*mikhlāf*) of Ṭarīf,¹ then Naqīl ‘Ajīb² and Ṣan‘ā’.³ When he could not find his way to ‘Adan Lā‘a, Ibn Ḥawshab went to ‘Adan Abyan passing through Naqīl Bardān⁴ and al-Janad.⁵ In Naqīl al-Bardān, he hid in a cave when he saw the Yu‘firid army going to attack al-Mudhaykhira.⁶ Al-Qurashī, who is usually quoting from al-Nu‘mān, mentions some events which happened during Ibn Ḥawshab’s journey. Although most of these stories contain legendary elements,⁷ they all show that Ibn Ḥawshab had been expected, as the *dā‘ī* of the Mahdī, by the Shiites in Yemen. Al-Nu‘mān reports that when Ibn Ḥawshab lost his way to ‘Adan Lā‘a, he asked people about its location.⁸ In Janad, Ibn Ḥawshab met some of its Shiites. He asked them about ‘Adan Lā‘a, but they did not know anything about it.⁹ He then traveled to ‘Adan Abyan where he met another group of Shiites called the Banū Mūsā, one of the big families and traders there, who organized his journey to ‘Adan Lā‘a. They contacted the Ismā‘īlīs in ‘Adan Lā‘a asking them to send some of their people to meet Ibn Ḥawshab in ‘Adan Abyan and take him back with them to ‘Adan Lā‘a.¹⁰ The Banū Mūsā in ‘Adan Abyan could

¹ Banū Ṭarīf: a Yemeni tribe from Hamdān. It seems they lived at the northeast of Ghulāfqa. Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 403. See map 3.

² *Naqīl*, in Yemeni language means a mountain road. ‘Ajīb: a town at the mountain road near Ṣan‘ā’. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 158 & 220. See also, Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iii, 581. Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 431. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 190. See map 3.

³ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 32-3.

⁴ There are no details about Naqīl Bardān in sources, such as al-Ḥajrī’s *Majmū‘*, al-Maqḥafī’s *Mu‘jam* and Yāqūt’s *Mu‘jam*, except what is mentioned by Ḥammādī, namely that it is near Ta‘kar. It seems to be in the north of Ta‘kar mountain and between Ṣan‘ā’ and al-Janad. Cf. *Kashf*, 56. Kazrajī names it “Naqīl al-Budān”, ‘*Asjad*, 621. See also Hamdānī, who mentions “al-Bardān” in *Ṣifat*, 228, 254, 266, 347, 370 and 380. See map 3.

⁵ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 33.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Cf. Nu‘mān, *Iftitāḥ*, 18-26. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 31-8.

⁸ Nu‘mān, *op. cit.*, 15.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 16. Qurashī, *op. cit.*, 35.

¹⁰ Nu‘mān, *Iftitāḥ*, 16. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 36-37. Ḥammādī mentions Banū al-Wazzān instead of Banū Mūsā, *Kashf*, 47. Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxiii, 74.

have sent some of their clan with Ibn Ḥawshab to ‘Adan Lā‘a instead of adopting the above strategy and is not clear why they did not do so.

When he came to ‘Adan Lā‘a, Ibn Ḥawshab was led to the house of Ibn Khalī‘,¹ the leader of the Ismā‘īlīs in ‘Adan Lā‘a. Ibn Khalī‘ had been waiting for the arrival of Ibn Ḥawshab before he was arrested and put into the Yu‘firid prison, where he later died. Al-Nu‘mān explains the reason of the internment of Ibn Khalī‘ in **Iftitāḥ**, where he mentions that he was preparing for this day, the day of the *dā‘wa*’s arrival, and was collecting weapons. When the Yu‘firids received information, they put him in prison.² Ibn Ḥawshab secured these weapons³ and lived as a Sunni teacher until 270/883. Shortly thereafter he married Ibn Khalī‘’s daughter. Through this marriage he would be protected as he had become closely affiliated with Ibn Khalī‘’s tribe.⁴ Thus he could advance his cause and spread the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* as one of their own community and their religious leader, especially when Ibn Khalī‘ had left no son.

One may assume that Ibn Ḥawshab had been given directions before he left Kūfa; otherwise why did he go to the northeast where ‘Adan Lā‘a is? And had he really lost his way to ‘Adan Lā‘a or had something happened to make him change his direction?

It is hard to believe, as is mentioned by al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān in **Iftitāḥ al-Da‘wa** and al-Qurashī in **‘Uyūn al-Akḥbār**, that Ibn Ḥawshab lost his way to ‘Adan Lā‘a.⁵ It is most probable that Ibn Ḥawshab could have reached ‘Adan Lā‘a by simply going north if he had spent more time in Ṣan‘ā’, but he left Ṣan‘ā’ because he was afraid of the Yu‘firids. That he was afraid is indicated in the accounts in **Iftitāḥ** and **‘Uyūn**. When he saw the Yu‘firid army going to battle against the Manākhids, he hid in a

¹ Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Khalī‘ was dead in the prison of the Yu‘firids before the arrival of Ibn Ḥawshab in ‘Adan Lā‘a. Nu‘mān, **Iftitāḥ**, 23. Qurashī, **‘Uyūn**, v, 33.

² Nu‘mān, *op. cit.*, 16.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 15. Qurashī, **‘Uyūn**, v, 37

cave,¹ believing that the Yu‘firids had information about him and were searching for him, especially after the prophecy which told about the appearance of the *dā‘ī* of the Mahdī in Yemen, and the arrest of Ibn Khalī‘. One can also assume that Ibn Ḥawshab received news about the internment of Ibn Khalī‘ during his way to ‘Adan Lā‘a. This means that Ibn Ḥawshab knew about what was happening for the Ismā‘īlīs in ‘Adan Lā‘a before he was told by the Banū Mūsa, and this made him think that the Yu‘firids were lying in wait for him in ‘Adan Lā‘a. Moreover, it becomes clear that when Ibn Ḥawshab asked about ‘Adan Lā‘a, he wanted to know about the political situation there more than about its geographical position.

It was a matter of safety, as is mentioned above, for both sides, Ibn Ḥawshab and the people of ‘Adan Lā‘a. The decision to send some Ismā‘īlīs from ‘Adan Lā‘a to ‘Adan Abyan instead of choosing the easy way of taking Ibn Ḥawshab to ‘Adan Lā‘a, also supports the view that Ibn Ḥawshab was afraid to go there without any further information about the political situation.

In 269/882-3, Ibn Ḥawshab secretly took his first steps in spreading the *da‘wa* in towns and villages near ‘Adan Lā‘a. He then moved with his family to live in al-Hayfa.² It seems that the Yu‘firids suspected that such a Shiite movement was hiding there. They sent Ishāq ibn Ṭarīf³ who attacked the Shiites and killed some of them in al-Hayfa. Ishāq then plundered the villages nearby before he burnt them.⁴ Ibn Ḥawshab and his followers left al-Hayfa and went to al-Tihām and ‘Aṭwa.⁵ He secretly sent letters to the Imām, who gave him permission to embark on the next stage, military action.⁶

¹ Nu‘mān, *Iftitāḥ*, 15-6. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, v, 37. H. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 33.

² Al-Hayfa: a village in Maswar mountain near ‘Adan Lā‘a. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 48. Cf. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, v, ed. M. Ya‘lāwī, 70, f.n. 26, where it written al-Hayf. See map 2.

³ Ishāq ibn Ṭarīf ibn Thābit al-Kibārī al-Ḥāshidī, a *mawla* of Ibn Yu‘fir al-Ḥawālī, the lord of Shibām. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, v, ed. M. Ya‘lāwī, 70, f.n. 27. M. Ḥaddād, *al-Tārīkh al-‘Āmm li al-Yaman*, ii, 184.

⁴ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, v, 38.

⁵ Al-Tihām and ‘Aṭwa are two small towns on Maswar mountain. Cf. Qurashī, *ibid.*, ed. M. Ya‘lāwī, 70, f.n. 28.

⁶ Nu‘mān, *Iftitāḥ*, 18.

According to some Yemeni sources, Ibn Ḥawshab started to collect the *zakāt* from his followers in Maswar¹ so that he could protect the *da‘wa* and fight, as he alleged, the “moral depravity” of the Yemeni tribes nearest to him.² From Ibn Ḥawshab’s point of view, as he explained to his followers, the protection of the *da‘wa* should be started by having a stronghold. They agreed with him and they mentioned some strongholds in the Maswar mountain. He then selected ‘Abr Maḥram³ and made an agreement with the Banū al-‘Arjā’ to hire ‘Abr Maḥram from them.⁴ Before Ibn Ḥawshab moved into ‘Abr Maḥram with five hundred of his followers and their families, he rebuilt the stronghold and bought weapons and equipment with which to fight his enemies.⁵ When the tribes near him learned about his “suspicious” preparations, they attacked him several times but without success.⁶ Thereafter, Ibn Ḥawshab began his military action.

The Ismā‘īlī sources, such as **Sharḥ al-Akhbār**, **Ifitāḥ al-Da‘wa** and **‘Uyūn al-Akhbār**, do not give definite dates for the historical events of this period. Therefore, gaps occur for the movements of Ibn Ḥawshab in particular, especially

¹ Maswar mountain, 7 miles southeast of Ḥajja. Hamdānī, **Ṣifat**, 125. Ḥajrī, **Majmū‘**, iv, 708. Maḥafī, **Mu‘jam**, 424 and 594. See map 2.

² Qurashī, **‘Uyūn**, v, 38-39. Ḥammādī, **Kashf**, 49. Khazrajī, **‘Asjad**, 618.

³ “‘Abr” means the side of the river. ‘Abr Maḥram: A stronghold on Maswar mountain, 7 miles southeast of Ḥajja. Qurashī, **‘Uyūn**, v, 39. Maḥafī, **Mu‘jam**, 424 and 594. See map 2. It should be noted that the name “عبر” is capable of having several readings depending upon the pointing, or lack of it, in the individual books. It is written ‘Ayn (عين) Maḥram by Ibn al-Dayba‘, **Qurrat**, 184, and it is written ‘Athr (عثر) by al-Ḥammādī, **Kashf**, 48 and al-Khazrajī, **‘Asjad**, 618. Cf. Ḥamzī, **Kanz**, 55. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, **Bahjat**, 51.

⁴ Banū al-‘Arjā’: a Yemeni tribe from Hamdān lived in Maswar and owned the stronghold. Ḥammādī, **Kashf**, 48.

⁵ Ḥammādī, **Kashf**, 48. Ḥamzī, **Kanz**, 56. It is mentioned by al-Qurashī that just fifty fighters with their families went with Ibn Ḥawshab to ‘Abr Maḥram. Ḥ. Hamdānī followed al-Qurashī in his assumption. Cf. Qurashī, **‘Uyūn**, 38-9. H. Hamdānī, **Ṣulayḥiyyūn**, 33.

⁶ Ḥammādī, **Kashf**, 48.

when he conquered the cities nearest to Maswar. Non-Ismā‘īlī sources provide dates for this period, and these have been used to fill in the gaps of the otherwise missing twenty years.

In 270/883, Ibn Ḥawshab announced the *da‘wa* in the name of the Ismā‘īlī Imām and began to conquer the cities nearest to him.¹ He moved east to the mountain of al-Jumayma,² and then to the mountain of Maswar where he took Bayt Rayb.³ Thereafter he dominated Maswar. It should be mentioned that Ibn Ḥawshab’s army, which started with five hundred fighters in ‘Abr Maḥram, had become three thousand by the time he attacked Bayt Rayb.⁴ From Maswar, Ibn Ḥawshab was set to conquer the lands west of Ṣan‘ā’ in 273/886-887.⁵ In short order ‘Ayyān,⁶ Shāwir,⁷ and Humlān⁸ fell. He then turned his attention to the Ḥimyar region: Fā’is⁹ and Shibām¹⁰ were captured. While Ibn Ḥawshab was otherwise occupied, a certain Jarrāḥ ibn Maḥjar¹¹ seized Kawkabān,¹² breaking his commitment to Ibn Ḥawshab not to rule

¹ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, 38-9.

² Al-Jumayma: a mountain at the north of San‘a’. Hamdānī, Ṣifat, 125. See also, Maqḥafī, Mu‘jam, 129.

³ Bayt Rayb: a stronghold on Maswar mountain, southern Ḥajja. Hamdānī, Ṣifat, 307. ‘Azab edits it as “Bayt Rabīb” instead of Bayt Rayb in Ḥammādī, Kashf, 50. Also see, Ḥajrī, Majmū‘, ii, 374. Maqḥafī, Mu‘jam, 297. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya, 45.

⁴ Ḥamzī, Kanz, 56.

⁵ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, Ghāyat, i, 165.

⁶ ‘Ayyān: a mountain overlooking Ḥajja from the south, and also a name of a small town on the same mountain. Ḥajrī, Majmū‘, iii, 618. Maqḥafī, Mu‘jam, 475. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya, 202 and f.n. 1. Hamdānī, Ṣifat, 125 and f.n. 2. See map 4.

⁷ Shāwir: a place in Ḥajja. Ḥajrī, Majmū‘, ii, 244 & iii, 441. Maqḥafī, Mu‘jam, 341. Hamdānī, Ṣifat, 220. See map 4.

⁸ Humlān: a mountain overlooking Ḥajja from the north. Maqḥafī, Mu‘jam, 192. Cf. Hamdānī, Ṣifat, 125 and f.n. 2. See map 4.

⁹ It is read by Ghālib as “Fādhir” in Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, v, 39. The correct form is Fā’is or Fāyish, called nowadays Bayt Fā’iz: a village and a stronghold on the mountain of Maswar. Ḥajrī, Majmū‘, iv, 631-2. Maqḥafī, Mu‘jam, 490. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya, 46. Hamdānī, Ṣifat, 307.

¹⁰ The word is corrupted by Ghālib and written as “Shiyām” in Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, v, 39.

¹¹ One could not find any information about “Jarrāḥ” or “Kharāj”, except that he was one of the vassals “mawālī, pl. of mawla” of Ibn Yu‘fir al-Ḥawālī. It should be noted that the name “حراج بن محجر” is capable of having several readings depending upon the pointing, or lack of it, in the individual books. It is “Kharāj ibn Maḥjar” in Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, v, ed. Ghalib, 39. “Kharāj ibn Maḥjan” in the other edition of Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, v, ed. Ya‘lāwī, 71. “Al-Husayn ibn Jarrāḥ” in Ḥammādī, Kashf, 51. “Ibn Jarrāḥ” in Ḥamzī, Kanz, 60. “Jarrāḥ ibn Bishr” in al-‘Abbāsī’s Sīrat, 391.

there. Once Shibām Ḥimyar was secure, Ibn Ḥawshab moved his overwhelming forces against Ibn Maḥjar and captured Kawkabān, Ḍula¹ and Dūiram² in the Ḍahr³ valley.⁴ In 290/903, Ibn Ḥawshab sent a lot of money and numerous valuable presents, as a sign of his victory, from Yemen to the Imām. Therefore, the Ismā‘īlī Imām bestowed the honorific title “*Manṣūr al-Yaman*” on him.⁵

‘Alī ibn al-Faḍl

Ibn al-Faḍl separated from his companion Ibn Ḥawshab in Ghulāfqa. He journeyed to al-Janad and Jayshān, his native town, and then he settled in Yāfi‘.⁶ There he chose an isolated spot at the foot of a mountain, called “*saru*”, where he lived far from the inhabitants. Thereafter he pretended to lead the life of an ascetic. When he had gained the people’s trust and respect, they requested him to live in their midst. For a long time he would not consent, until, after they had persisted in their demand for some time, he agreed.⁷ His acceptance was conditional on the people of

¹² Kawkabān: a palace and a stronghold have the same name as the most famous mountain in Yemen, to the north-west of Ṣan‘ā’. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 212 and f.n. 4. See also, Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 668-9. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 234. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 543-544. See map 2 & 4.

¹ Ḍula‘: a stronghold in a place which has the same name as a mountain connected with Kawkabān and overlooking Shibām, called nowadays Ḍula‘ Kawkabān. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 205, 211, 213 and 172. See also, Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iii, 553. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 397.

² Dūiram: known nowadays as Ṭība; a stronghold overlooking the Ḍahr valley, to the west of Ṣan‘ā’ at an altitude of 2423 meters above sea level. Qurashī, *‘Uyūn*, v, 39. See also, Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, ii, 334. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 407.

³ It is written Zahr by Qurashī, cf. *‘Uyūn*, v, 39. Cf. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iii, 554. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 398.

⁴ Concerning the description of Ibn Ḥawshab’s direction to conquer the cities in Yemen, see also; Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 49-51. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 55-57. Khazrajī, *‘Asjad*, 618-619. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 34-35.

⁵ Nu‘mān, *Iftitāḥ*, 17. Qurashī, *‘Uyūn*, v, 39. The year is mentioned by: Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 51-2. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 57.

⁶ While the Yemeni sources agree that Ibn al-Faḍl went to Yāfi‘, the Ismā‘īlī sources did not mention it as a station on Ibn al-Faḍl’s route when he entered Yemen. Al-Khazrajī, al-Janadī, and ibn al-Dayba‘ mention that Ibn al-Faḍl went to al-Janad then Abyan and Yāfi‘. Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Akwa‘, i, 236. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Qurrat al-‘Uyūn*, ed. M. al-Akwa‘, i, 188. Khazrajī, *‘Asjad*, 620. Ḥammādī mentions that Ibn al-Faḍl was in Jayshān before he went to Yāfi‘. Cf. *Kashf*, 53. Nuwayrī is content to mention that Ibn al-Faḍl went to his town (*balādihi*), which is Jayshān. Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxviii, 74. Cf. Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 205. See map 2, 3 & 4.

⁷ Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 198. Khazrajī, *‘Asjad*, 621.

Yāfi‘‘s obeying God by following His path and avoiding sins. They accepted.¹ As the first step in his plan of action, Ibn al-Faḍl asked them to rebuild a constructed fortress nearby. The location of the fortress was east of the *saru*, in a place called Ṣanā‘.² With his followers, Ibn al-Faḍl rebuilt the fortress to be their stronghold and the centre of his *da‘wa*.

Unfortunately, more than twenty years of Ibn al-Faḍl’s *da‘wa* activities are covered by myths more than facts. Both the Ismā‘īlī sources and Yemeni sources mention nothing of Ibn al-Faḍl’s military moves from 268/881 to 288/900. The accounts begin with the announcement of the appearance of “the agreeable Imām from Muḥammad’s household” (*al-riḍā min āl Muḥammad*)³ by Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī in 288/900. It would appear that during the missing twenty years, Ibn al-Faḍl must have been very successful in gathering a great number of followers from the Yemeni tribes. He then set about the task of spreading the *da‘wa* by force throughout the adjacent regions.

The success of Ibn al-Faḍl in his *da‘wa* brought him into combat with Ibn Abī al-‘Alā’,⁴ the prince (*amīr*) of Laḥj and Abyan.⁵ Ja‘far ibn Ibrāhīm al-Manākhī (d. 292/905), the prince of al-Kalā‘,⁶ watched with interest the unfolding events because,

¹ Ibid.

² Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 53-54. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 620. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Qurrat al-‘Uyūn*, i, 189. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 368. See map 2, 3 & 4.

³ Ibn Khaldūn, *Tārīkh*, iv, 66.

⁴ ‘Alī ibn Abī al-‘Alā’ ibn Aṣḥab ibn ‘Amr al-Ḥimyarī (d. 290/903). Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 95 and f.n. (2). Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 219. Ḥammādī and Khazrajī mention him just as “Ibn Abī al-‘Alā’”. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 54. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 620. Mad‘aj in his article wrongly says “Muḥammad ibn Abī al-‘Alā’”. Mad‘aj, “*‘Alī ibn al-Faḍl wa Da‘watihi fī al-Yaman*”, *al-‘Uṣūr*, iii, 1, London 1988. 91.

⁵ See map 2. See also, Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, i, 55-6 & iv, 677. I. al-Akwa‘, *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 16 & 235. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 12 & 548.

⁶ Al-Kalā‘ is a wide area in the southwest corner of the Arabian Peninsula, it includes ‘Adīn, Dhū al-Sufāl, Ḥubaysh and Ibb. Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, ii, 244 & *Ṣifat*, 118 and for more details see f.n. 2. See also, Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 665. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 219. Cf. map 2.

according to al-Ḥammādī, Ja‘far had a “destructive history” with Ibn Abī al-‘Alā’.¹ However, it is more likely that Ja‘far recognized the superiority of Ibn al-Faḍl’s forces, poised to extinguish the dominant local chieftains.² Whatever his motivation may have been, Ja‘far sent his personal congratulations and troops to Ibn al-Faḍl. In 290/903,³ a decisive battle in Khanfar⁴ saw the death of Ibn Abī al-‘Alā’ and a victory for the allies Ibn al-Faḍl and Ja‘far. Ibn al-Faḍl became one of two main powers in the southern region.⁵ The victory of his army attracted large groups of people eager to join the winning side and later encouraged to join the *da‘wa*.⁶ New additions to Ibn al-Faḍl’s company included the tribes of Madhḥaj and tribes from Zabīd.⁷ Ibn al-Faḍl no longer needed to hide his aggressively expansionist policy, nor did he need an excuse to exercise it. An opportunity presented itself when Ja‘far sent a messenger to Ibn al-Faḍl asking for a share of the booty. Ibn al-Faḍl interpreted the request as an end to their alliance and he moved against Ja‘far.

In Ramaḍān 291/July 904, Ibn al-Faḍl suffered a series of defeats from Ja‘far, forcing him back to Ṣanā‘ in Yāfi‘ after a battle at Naqīl al-Bardān. Ja‘far chose not to pursue Ibn al-Faḍl, but this was a significant tactical error, enabling Ibn al-Faḍl to reorganize his troops. While Ja‘far and his men were encamped, Ibn al-Faḍl invaded

¹ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 54.

² Cf. Mad‘aj, *‘Alī ibn al-Faḍl wa Da‘watihi fī al-Yaman*, 91.

³ The presumption of 290/903 as the year when Ibn al-Faḍl defeated Ibn Abī al-‘Alā’ is based on the fact that the sources mention that Ibn al-Faḍl attacked al-Mudhaykhira in the following year 291/904. Khazrajī, *‘Asjad*, 620. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 55-56.

⁴ Khanfar: an old city, in the middle of Abyan’s valley east of Aden, which is now only ruins. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 95 and f.n. 2. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Qurraṭ al-‘Uyūn*, i, 190. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, ii, 310-1. Maḥḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 219. See map 2.

⁵ The other power was his ally, Ja‘far ibn Ibrāhīm al-Manākhī.

⁶ Qurashī, *‘Uyūn*, v, 39.

⁷ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 55. For more details about Madhḥaj and Zabīd, see; Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 175 and 132. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 699-702. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 255 and 129. Maḥḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 576 and 286. See map 1 & 4.

al-Mudhaykhira and al-Ta‘kar in Şafar 292/December 904.¹ Ja‘far was compelled to flee. He escaped to Qurṭub,² a village in Tihāma near Zabīd,³ where he asked for assistance from the ruler of Zabīd who sent him an army under the command of Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī.⁴ After Ja‘far had been joined by a great army,⁵ he moved on Mudhaykhira, but Ibn al-Faḍl had already advanced to attack him. At the stronghold of Ḥawāla,⁶ in a valley called Nakhla,⁷ a battle began between the two armies. As a result, Ja‘far was killed in Rajab 292/May 905, leaving Ibn al-Faḍl in control of the southern regions.⁸ After his victory in the battle, Ibn al-Faḍl conquered al-Mudhaykhira, which subsequently became his capital.⁹

¹ Al-Ta‘kar or Ta‘kur: an invincible castle on a mountain of the same name, overlooking Jibla and Ibb from the south, and Dhū Sufāl and al-Janad from the north. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, i, 36 & 155. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 91. Hamdānī, *Şifat*, 118, for more details see the f.n. p. 119 and 120. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 55. See map 4.

² ‘Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 389. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 219. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 511. Hamdānī, *Şifat*, 131.

³ See map 4.

⁴ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 392. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 621. Because of the similarity in names; there is confusion in the sources, where some of the historians mistake him for Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Ziyād, who according to Abū Makhrama died in 280/893 whilst Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn states that he died in 290/903. Cf. Abū Makhrama, *Tarīkh Thaghr ‘Adan*, ed. O. Löfgren 1950, ii, 2-3. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 189 & *Anbā’ al-Zaman*, fol. 33b.

⁵ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 56. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 58. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 621. Al-‘Abbāsī in *Sīrat*, 389, says that Ja‘far asked Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad to support him, but he did not.

⁶ Ḥawāla; in this form it is corrected by the editor of *Şifat*, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Akwa‘, which is acceptable, whereas Hamdānī, Ḥammādī and Khazrajī write it “Jawāla”. See; Hamdānī, *Şifat*, 139 and the f.n. 1, 140. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 56. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 621.

⁷ Nakhla: a famous Yemeni valley, which begins at the Tihāma and ends at the Red Sea. Hamdānī, *Şifat*, 86, 118 and 130. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 741. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 657. See map 4.

⁸ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīrat al-Hādī*, 389. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 56. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 621. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 58.

⁹ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīrat al-Hādī*, 389.

In Muḥarram 293/November 905,¹ Ibn al-Faḍl began a new wave of attacks. He advanced on the territories of As‘ad ibn Abī Yu‘fir, taking Yaḥṣub² followed by Mankath.³ In Mankath he used al-Hādī’s mosque and most of its buildings for his army.⁴ He then arrived in ‘Ans⁵ and sent word to ‘Īsā ibn Mu‘ān, the ruler of Hīrān,⁶ to join the *da‘wa*, which he did. Thus, the way was paved for Ibn al-Faḍl to take Ṣan‘ā’. He crossed the mountain until he reached Dhamār.⁷ Then he advanced to the village of Zubwa⁸ from Hīrān, where his army succeeded in pushing the Yu‘firids back to Ṣan‘ā’ itself.⁹ Ibn al-Faḍl stationed his army at Nuqum¹⁰ for three days, before attacking Ṣan‘ā’ in Muḥarram 293/November 905.¹¹ Resistance in the city

¹ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīrat al-Hādī*, 389.

² Yaḥṣub are two: the upper and the lower; what is meant here is the upper near Dhamār. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 199-201. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 775-7. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 707. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 293-294. Cf. map 4.

³ Mankath; where al-Hādī, Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, built a mosque in 288/901, to the southwest of Yarīm. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 100. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 722. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 637. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 265. See map 2 & 4.

⁴ Some Yemenī historians alleged that Ibn al-Faḍl destroyed the mosque. One can assume that Ibn al-Faḍl could not find a better place for his headquarters, or, perhaps, it was an asylum for his enemies. Cf. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 60. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 621. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 58. Also, Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 637.

⁵ ‘Ans, a village in a wide *mikhlaḥ* has the same name to the west of Dhamār. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 152. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iii, 613. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 200. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 468. See also, *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, (*D.O.S.*), 1978, 160/40-41. Map 2.

⁶ Hīrān: a stronghold on a mountain to the north of Dhamār of the same name. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 152. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 751. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 290. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 677. See map 4.

⁷ Dhamār: an important city which lay 8000 feet above the sea and 98 km. to the south of Ṣan‘ā’, on the road connecting ‘Adan Abyan with Ṣan‘ā’. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 206-7. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, ii, 341. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 113-4. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 251. See map 4.

⁸ It is written Dabwa by al-‘Abbāsī, cf. *Sīrat al-Hādī*, 390. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 409. See map 4.

⁹ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīrat al-Hādī*, 390. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 54 and 58-59. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 60. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 621.

¹⁰ Nuqum: a mountain overlooking Ṣan‘ā’ from the east. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 744. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 664. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 280. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 156. See also, *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, (*D.O.S.*), 169-170/41-42. Map 4.

¹¹ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīrat al-Hādī*, 390. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 59. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 60. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 621 & *Anbā*’, fol. 35a. Janadī, ed. Akwa‘, *Sulūk*, i, 238. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Qurraṭ al-Uyūn*, i, 194-195.

quickly crumbled.¹ The Yu‘firid *amīr*, As‘ad ibn Abī Yu‘fir fled to Shibām² and then to Ghuraq³ upon hearing that Ibn Ḥawshab was moving from Dhukhār⁴ to Shibām to meet ibn al-Faḍl.⁵

The Meeting Between the Two *Dā‘īs*

5 Thus the plan involving the meeting-up of the two *dā‘īs*, Ibn Ḥawshab and Ibn al-Faḍl, which had been carefully devised by the Ismā‘īlī headquarters, reached a successful conclusion. The movement of the two *dā‘īs* started from inside the Yemeni regions, then spread to conquer the cities, until the two reached each other at a specific point. This point was in the Shibām mountain and near Ṣan‘ā’.⁶ Ibn Ḥawshab was surprised when he saw Ibn al-Faḍl’s strong army for the first time in 293/905.⁶ According to most of our sources, Ibn al-Faḍl’s troops acted with brutality towards the people, especially in Ṣan‘ā’. Ibn Ḥawshab tried to reform their behaviour, but he could not. Apparently, Ibn Ḥawshab understood the independent tendencies of Ibn al-Faḍl, but he was not able to restrain Ibn al-Faḍl because of his fear of him and his
10 desire to protect the *da‘wa*.⁷ Ibn Ḥawshab could do nothing but advise and remind Ibn al-Faḍl to keep his promise to the person who had sent him on this mission.⁸ On the other hand, the time was not yet right for Ibn al-Faḍl to announce his independence.

¹ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīrat al-Hādī*, 390.

² Shibām: a mountain 23 km. to the north-east of Ṣan‘ā’. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 86 and 172. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iii, 441-4. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 343. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 150. See the maps. Ḥammādī in *Kashf*, 370, mentions “al-Jawf”; probably, he means al-Jawf al-A‘lā (the upper Jawf), where al-‘Abbāsī, in *Sīrat al-Hādī*, 390, mentions Shibām, which is most likely, because al-Jawf is not far from Ṣan‘ā’, only 1 km. (see Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 135), and therefore, one should give preference to al-‘Abbāsī.

³ Ghuraq: a place in al-Jawf al-A‘lā, it is called, nowadays, Sūq al-Du‘ām (al-Du‘ām’s Market). See map 2 & 4.

⁴ Dhukhār: a mountain, well-known as Ḍila‘ Kawkabān, where Shibām is at its eastern foot and Kawkabān, the city, on its summit. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, ii, 340. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 294. See map 2.

⁵ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīrat al-Hādī*, 391. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 60.

⁶ Al-‘Abbāsī alleges that Ibn al-Faḍl’s army was about forty thousand fighters. Cf. *Sīrat al-Hādī*, 390.

⁷ Qurashī, *‘Uyūn*, v, 42.

⁸ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 60.

Hypocritically he avoided taking Ibn Ḥawshab's advice while proclaiming to Ibn Ḥawshab that he was still faithful, saying to him:

"I am one of your swords".¹

In 293/906, Ibn al-Faḍl ignored his companion's advice to remain in Ṣan'ā', for a year at least, rebuilding the army and assembling followers.² Instead, Ibn al-Faḍl insisted on continuing his conquests, advancing from al-Bayāḍ³ westward to Tihāma, and occupying cities on his way. When he was on the road to al-Lahab,⁴ Ibn al-Faḍl was attacked and besieged by the inhabitants of the area, and Ibn Ḥawshab was constrained to help him. They went back to their first locations, Ibn Ḥawshab to Shibām and Ibn al-Faḍl returned to Ṣan'ā', where the latter reorganised his army. Thence, the two armies went in different directions, literally and metaphorically.

Ibn al-Faḍl left his companion and moved on Ḥarāz,⁵ Mulḥān, al-Mahjam,⁶ al-Kadrā'.⁷ When he reached Zabīd, which was ruled by the Ziyādids, he confronted Abū al-Jaysh Ishāq ibn Ziyād (d. 371/981-2),⁸ the leader (*amīr*) of the Ziyadid army

¹ Ibid. Khazrajī, 'Asjad, 622.

² 'Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 391. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 59. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 60. Khazrajī, 'Asjad, 422.

³ Al-Bayāḍ: a province laying to the west from Ḥajja, and also a stronghold with very rugged tracks, westward from Ṣan'ā'. I. Akwa' (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 44. Cf. Map 2.

⁴ Lahab: an area in Ḥajja. Ibn al-Dayba', *Qurraṭ*, i, 189 and f.n. 3. Cf. Ḥajrī, *Majmū'*, iv, 682. See map 3.

⁵ Ḥarāz: a wide fertile valley which has the same name as its mountain, and is located about 81 km. west of Ṣan'ā'. It has been the home town of the Ismā'īlīs in Yemen from the third/ninth century until this time. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 209. Ḥajrī, *Majmū'*, ii, 252-4. I. Akwa' (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 84 and f.n. 1. Maqḥafī, *Mu'jam*, 164.

⁶ Al-Mahjam: a place in Surdad valley, between the mountain of Milḥān and al-Zaydiyya. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 97 and f.n. 4. I. Akwa' (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 267. Maqḥafī, *Mu'jam*, 639. Ḥajrī, *Majmū'*, iv, 725. See also, 'Umāra, *Mufīd*, 105. Map 4 and 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, (*D.O.S.*), 1978, 169-170/32-33.

⁷ Al-Kadrā': a city in Shibām valley, to the southeast from al-Ḥudayda, nowadays it is in ruins. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 97 and f.n. 2. Ḥajrī, *Majmū'*, iv, 664. I. Akwa' (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 232 and f.n. 1. Maqḥafī, *Mu'jam*, 535. See map 4.

⁸ Ishāq ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Ziyād. Ibn al-Dayba', *Qurraṭ*, i, 322.

and the actual ruler of Zabīd. In the same year, 293/906, the Ziyādids were defeated.¹ Ibn Ziyād escaped death, though most of his troops were killed. Furthermore, the victorious army continued the massacre in al-Malākhīt.² Then Ibn al-Faḍl returned to al-Mudhaykhira where he secured his position as a ruler in Yemen in 298/911, and behaved like one, especially after he killed Muẓaffar ibn al-Ḥājj, the deputy of the Abbasid Caliph al-Mutawakkil bi Allāh (d. 295/908).³

The Ismā‘īlī Imām and His Change of Plans

In 286/900, the Ismā‘īlī Imām went to al-Ramla⁴ shortly before the Carmathian invasion.⁵ There, he decided to change his direction to a new *dār al-hijra*, the west (*al-maghrib*) instead of Yemen. Therefore, there was much confusion. No further information about al-Mahdī was sent from the headquarters to Yemen to facilitate the *dā‘īs’* preparations for the expected *qiyāma*, the advent of the figure from the Prophet’s household who was called *al-mahdī* or *al-qā‘im*. The emergence of the *mahdī* would be the signal for the end of one era and the beginning of a new one. It would therefore be the time of reward and punishment, Paradise for the faithful and Hellfire for the unbeliever.⁶

¹ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, 198.

² Al-Malākhīt: a ruined town near Zabīd, called “al-Mashāhīt”, where after the invasion of Ibn al-Faḍl, his army, as our sources allege, killed 4000 captive virgins from Zabīd after they raped them. One does not know Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Akwa‘, a modern Yemeni scholar and editor of a large number of Yemeni manuscripts, corrected 4000 or 35000 women, as al-‘Abbāsī alleges, to 400. It is wrongly written in most of the sources as “al-Malāhīt”, see the corrected form by M. al-Akwa‘ (ed.) in al-Janādī’s *al-Sulūk* (i, 239). Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 132 and f.n. 5. Maḡḡafī, *Mu‘jam*, 627. See map 4. Also see; ‘Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 394. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 60. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 56.

³ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 57.

⁴ A city in Palestine. Yaḡūt, *Mu‘jam*, iii, 70.

⁵ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 90.

⁶ Concerning the Ismā‘īlī doctrine of the *qiyāma*, see below, *Abū Muḥammad and his Refutation of Ismā‘ilism*, 360-1, 387-8, 416 & 420.

The Chief *Dā‘ī* Abandoned his Imām

In Egypt, Fayrūz, the chief *dā‘ī*, who was a Kufan and had accompanied the Imām from Salamiyya and al-Ramla to Egypt, heard that ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī had changed the plan of his direction and would go to the *maghrib* instead of Yemen. There is not much information about Fayrūz, except what is mentioned by al-Yamānī in *Sīrat al-Ḥājib*, al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān in *Iftitāh al-Da‘wa*, although Fayrūz is not mentioned by name, and by al-Qurashī in ‘*Uyūn al-Akḥbār*. They relate that Fayrūz was the chief *dā‘ī*, who directly gave the *dā‘īs* their orders and sent them to their chosen destination. This means that most of the *dā‘īs* learned the secrets of the *da‘wa* from him, or at least knew him as a chief *dā‘ī*. According to *Sīrat al-Ḥājib*, Fayrūz was disappointed and took the change in the plans of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī harder than the other *dā‘īs*. Thereupon, he deserted his master on the eve of his departure and went to Yemen to join Ibn al-Faḍl.¹

It is mentioned by al-Yamānī in his *Sīrat al-Ḥājib* that after Fayrūz left the Imām, i. e., ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī, he went at first to Ibn Ḥawshab, who recognized the authority of Fayrūz as a chief *dā‘ī*. It is said that Ibn Ḥawshab was promoted or became a *dā‘ī* in the *da‘wa* because of Fayrūz.² Ibn Ḥawshab therefore showed him generosity and respect. Fayrūz seems to have had a plan to dethrone his master and he tried to lead Ibn Ḥawshab astray. However, when he realised that he would fail with Ibn Ḥawshab, he thereupon went to Ibn al-Faḍl, where he achieved his aim.³ So, the movement of Ibn Al-Faḍl in Yemen deviated from the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* and became independent.

It should be noted that the *da‘wa* in Yemen seized upon the same idea as the Carmathians: it took the same line and adopted preaching to the local leader as the

¹ Yamānī, *Sīrat al-Ḥājib*, 114-5, cf. English trans. by Ivanow within the *Rise of the Fatimids*, 195-6. See also; Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 96.

² Cf. Ivanow (ed. & trans.), *op. cit.*, 196, f.n. 3.

³ Yamānī, *Sīrat al-Ḥājib*, 115, cf. the trans. 196-7. Also see, Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 95.

Imām of the time (*Imām al-zamān*).¹ The announcement of the apostasy, in fact, coincided with the death of Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī² in 298/911, which raises some questions, such as, did Ibn al-Faḍl have some connections with the Carmathians of Baḥrayn? Or did he simply use the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* to achieve his ambitions of being the king of Yemen?

The Conflict between Ibn Ḥawshab and Ibn al-Faḍl

There was contact and concerted action on the part of the two *dā‘īs* to unite in fighting disease and poverty under the Ismā‘īlī Imām’s authority. Nevertheless, it seems that Ibn al-Faḍl was determined to be independent. It seems likely that the announcement by Ibn al-Faḍl of his sovereignty in Yemen as an independent ruler came after the killing of Fayrūz.³ Al-Qurashī states that Ibn al-Faḍl imputed the murder to Ibn Ḥawshab.⁴ Then Ibn al-Faḍl announced war and rebelled against his old companion. He threatened Ibn Ḥawshab with war if he did not submit to his authority.⁵ The following year, in Muḥarram 299/ August 911, Ibn al-Faḍl besieged Ibn Ḥawshab in his fortress for eight months.

According to Ḥammādī, when Ibn al-Faḍl was on his way to Shibām, Ibn Ḥawshab sent an army to al-Maṣānī‘,⁶ where the latter’s army was fortified by the

¹ The Ismā‘īlīs believe in the following *ḥadīth*:

من مات لا يعرف إمام دهره حياً، مات ميتة جاهلية.

This translates as:

“He who dies without knowing the Imām of his time when still alive dies in ignorance”.

Nu‘mān, *Da‘ā‘im*, i, 25. Cf. Kulaynī, *al-Kāfī*, viii, 146. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, iv, 96.

² Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī; al-Ḥusayn ibn Ahmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Zakariyya al-Ṣan‘ānī, he was murdered on the first day of Dhū al-Ḥijja 298/31 July 911. E I, ii, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī.

³ Nothing is mentioned concerning the date and the way of killing Fayrūz.

⁴ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 96.

⁵ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 62. Khazrajī, *Sulūk*, 425. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 40.

⁶ Maṣānī‘ Ḥimyar: a mountain to the north-west of Ṣan‘ā’ in a place called Thula. Maṣānī‘ means dams. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, i, 166-7 & iv, 709. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 259. Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 599. See map 2.

mountain. After a long day of fighting, Ibn al-Faḍl rode by way of al-‘Aḍud¹ to Lā‘a. From there he climbed al-Jumayma to attack Ibn Ḥawshab himself in Bayt Rayb where he besieged him.² Both parties suffered from starvation and the long siege itself. At the end of Sha‘bān 299/ April 912, and after eight months, Ibn al-Faḍl made an agreement with Ibn Ḥawshab under a truce. Ibn al-Faḍl promised to leave the region to Ibn Ḥawshab on one condition, that he send his son as a hostage. On the first of Ramaḍān of the same year, Ibn al-Faḍl returned to Ṣan‘ā’ on his way to al-Mudhaykhira. It is reported that Ibn Ḥawshab’s son, who was a hostage, returned to his people after one year from al-Mudhaykhira, where he was treated honorably and generously by Ibn al-Faḍl.³

Some of the Ismā‘īlī historians⁴ explain the reason for this conflict as a result of two factors: firstly, Ibn al-Faḍl’s disloyalty towards the Imām; and secondly, which is also agreed by most Sunnī and Zaydī historians,⁵ the moral degeneration of Ibn al-Faḍl’s troops. Zakkār explains this behaviour as an announcement of the resurrection (*al-qiyāma*).⁶ Presumably both *dā‘īs* knew at that moment, according to the Ismā‘īlī astronomical calculations, that it was the time of the appearance of the one who would bring about the resurrection (*qā’im al-qiyāma*). On the other hand, they did not have any authority to make the announcement of the coming of the Resurrection, and

¹ Probably he means ‘Uḍḍān; a village and stronghold to the west from Ṣan‘ā’. *Ibid*, 449. Cf. *Iklīl*, i, 526 and *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 197.

² Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 62.

³ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 398. Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, text, 146. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 68. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 61. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 57.

⁴ Nu‘mān, *Iftitāḥ*, 159. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 42. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 391. See also, Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 45. Cf. Daftary, *The Ismā‘īlīs*, 131.

⁵ In Zaydīs see; ‘Abbāsī, *Sīrat*. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*. Nashwān, *al-Hūr*. ‘Imāra, *al-Mufid*. For Sunni versions see; Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*. Maqrizī, *Itti‘āz*. Ibn Khaldūn, *Tārīkh*. See also, A. Sayid, *Les Fatimides en Egypte-Nouvelle Interpretation*. Surūr, *Siyāsāt al-Faṭimiyyīn*.

⁶ Zakkār, *Akhbār al-Qarāmiṭa*, 230.

each one of them had a different view. They were told that al-Mahdī would rise and restore justice on earth from Yemen. But when al-Mahdī fled from Salamiyya to the so called *dār al-hijra*, he, against all expectations, went to the *Maghrib* instead of Yemen.

5 According to Ḥ. Hamdānī, a modern Ismāīlī scholar, tendencies towards independence on the part of Ibn al-Faḍl existed before the arrival of Fayrūz in Yemen, but they emerged more fully when he met Fayrūz, who, from his side, encouraged such behaviour.¹ But why did Fayrūz do such a thing? One may suggest that there was an internal disagreement in the highest ranks of the Ismāīlī *da‘wa*
10 about the Imāmate of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī. The *dā‘īs* of Iraq, Baḥrayn and the Maghrib refused to acknowledge that ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī was their Imām. Therefore, the Carmathians in Iraq staged a revolt and Baḥrayn became an independent state. In the Maghrib, there was a clash between ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī and his *dā‘īs*, namely; Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī and his brother Abū al-‘Abbās. It
15 should not be a surprise therefore when Ibn al-Faḍl followed the path of the others and established himself as an independent ruler.

Whether Ibn al-Faḍl had any connection with the Carmathians or not, it appears that he had information about what was happening in their regions. Al-Ḥammādī and al-Janadī mention a sentence which gives a clue. In the two-way correspondence of
20 the Yemeni *dā‘īs* shortly before the conflict between them, Ibn al-Faḍl wrote:

“Verily, this world is an ewe; he who gains it, devours it; and I take Abū Sa‘īd al-Jannābī as my model because he dethroned Maymūn and his son.² Then he summoned (people) to himself, just as I am summoning (people) to myself.”³

¹ Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 40.

² In spite of wrong names that were given by al-Ḥammādī and al-Janadī for the Imām, al-Khazrajī mentions the same story with the correction for the name of the Imām, i.e., ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī. Khazrajī, *‘Asjad*, 425.

³ Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 202. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 58. The text is translated from the latter;

إنما هذه الدنيا شاة، من ظفرَ بها افترسَها، ولي بأبي سعيد الجنابي أسوة؛ لأنه خلعَ ميمونا وابنه ودعا لنفسه، وأنا أدعو لنفسي.

This text shows how Ibn al-Faḍl followed al-Jannābī's tactics in becoming an independent ruler in Yemen. Possibly, the Ismā'īlī *dā'īs* who thought they had already reached a high rank in the Ismā'īlī organisation of the *da'wa* discovered that they were no more than instruments used by other *dā'īs* to increase their authority and to become more powerful in the matter of decision making. One should assume that each *dā'ī* understood what he preached and on whose behalf, i.e., the Ismā'īlī Imām. When 'Ubayd Allāh suddenly proclaimed the Imāmate, he was rejected by the Carmathian *dā'īs* as well as Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Shī'ī and his brother Abū al-'Abbās in the *Maghrib*, and Ibn al-Faḍl in Yemen.

The names of some hidden *dā'īs* appear in **Istitār al-Imām**, where it seems that 'Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī tried to change the internal organization of the *da'wa*. Shortly before the Carmathian invasion of Salamiyya, the Imām said to Abū al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Aswad,¹ one of his distinguished *dā'īs*:

"O Abū al-Ḥusayn, I appoint thee to be the head of all *dā'īs*; whomsoever thou makest a headman, he shall be the headman, and whomsoever thou makest a subordinate, he shall be the subordinate. Thou shall reside on the road of Egypt."²

Some *dā'īs* did not recognize 'Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī as the true Imām. They may have thought that he gave what he did not own to those he did not deserve to be thus honoured. This perhaps explains the behaviour of Fayrūz and the reaction of Ibn al-Faḍl;

"which was provoked by the machination of Abū al-Ḥusayn, who stirred us up against each other."³

It should be noted that there is disagreement about the time and the place of the

¹ Nothing is known of this *dā'ī*, except that he was the *dā'ī* of Ḥamāt. Yamānī, **Istitār al-Imām**, trans. Ivanow, **Ismā'īlī Tradition**, 163.

² يا أبا الحسين قد قدمتك على جميع الدعاء، فمن قدمت فهو المقدم، ومن أخرت فهو المؤخر، وأنت على طريق مصر.

Ibid.

³ وهذا من فعال أبي الحسين الذي أفلقتنا وأقلقك.

This sentence was said by Abū Mahzūl, a Carmathian *dā'ī*, when he apologized to al-Mahdī in al-Ramla. Ibid, 167.

announcement of Ibn al-Faḍl's independence from the Ismā'īlī *da'wa*. It appears that he returned to Mudhaykhira after his second attack at Zabīd in Ṣafar 287/October 909. He remained in wait for an opportunity without undertaking his usual activity in preaching the *da'wa* or fighting the allies of the Abbasids. In 298/911, Ibn al-Faḍl announced his independence and wrote from Mudhaykhira to Ibn Ḥawshab inciting him to declare his autonomy and affiliate himself with him. When Ibn Ḥawshab refused, Ibn al-Faḍl marched with his army to subjugate him.

Ibn al-Faḍl and his Relations with the Local Powers

Ibn al-Faḍl adopted a new policy with the local powers, i.e., the Yu'firids and the Ziyādids, after he became independent. At the end of 298/911, As'ad ibn Abī Yu'fir was working on reinforcing his position in Ibn al-Faḍl's territories, especially Dhamār which was the most important city in his sphere of influence after Mudhaykhira. Nevertheless, Ibn al-Faḍl did not oppose this act when he passed through the area on his way to attack Ibn Ḥawshab.¹ It seems that Ibn al-Faḍl recognized, after years of experience in war with these powers, that their annihilation was impossible. Consequently, he tried to get closer to them, contenting himself with their allegiance, especially after some of his followers deserted him.²

It was after the conflict with Ibn Ḥawshab that Ibn al-Faḍl adopted this armistice policy as he became less powerful. After he taken control of the tribes in Mikhiāf Ja'far and some of the southern regions nearest to him to secure his borders, he tried to protect what he had in his hand.³ When he began gradually losing his control over other regions, he endorsed Ṣan'ā' as capital of the Yu'firids.⁴ In Dhū al-Ḥijja 299/July 912, his supreme commander and his right hand man, Dhū al-Ṭawq al-Jayshānī, who was dispatched by Ibn al-Faḍl to incite the tribes against the Abbasid

¹ 'Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 398-399.

² *Ibid.*, 394.

³ Cf. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 66.

⁴ 'Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 399.

governor, was killed.¹ Then, his deputies were killed one by one by the Yemeni tribes. Two of them, Muḥammad ibn Dirham al-Jayshānī² and Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī al-Malāḥif al-Ṣan‘ānī,³ were killed by the Abbasid governor in Mecca, ‘Ujj ibn Sājj.⁴

5 In Ṣafar 300/September 912, Ibn al-Faḍl invaded Zabīd. When he reached there, he found the city entirely deserted. The tactic of the governor of Zabīd⁵ was to leave the city rather than face the strong army of Ibn al-Faḍl. The governor departed with his army and the people of Zabīd north to al-Mahjam. Ibn al-Faḍl remained a few days in Zabīd before returning to al-Mudhaykhira in Rabī‘ I/October of the same
10 year. A few months later, in Shawwāl 300/May 913, he marched towards Madhḥajid territories until he reached Sarū Yafi‘, he then remained a few months in the first place that he made as a stronghold for himself, Ṣanā‘.⁶ The Madhḥajids tried to protect themselves from Ibn al-Faḍl by attacking him, but they failed in these attempts. Accordingly, an agreement was made between the Madhḥajids and Ibn al-
15 Faḍl, which stipulated that the Madhḥajids should pay a tribute in order that Ibn al-Faḍl should leave their territories for good.⁷

In Ṣafar 301/September 913, Ibn al-Faḍl received news that al-Mudhaykhira had been invaded by an army from Zabīd. He then left Sarū Yāfi‘ by night and went to al-Mudhaykhira. When he arrived in his capital, he discovered that it had been

¹ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 400-401.

² *Ibid.* It is written as “al-Janābī” in *Ghāyat al-Amānī*. Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 202.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.* Also read as ‘Ajj ibn Sājj. Cf. ‘Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 401.

⁵ The name of this governor is mentioned as Mulāḥiz (d. 303/915), and nothing has been found yet about him. Cf. ‘Abbāsī, *op. cit.*, 401 & 403. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 203.

⁶ ‘Abbāsī, *op. cit.* Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *op. cit.*

⁷ ‘Abbāsī, *op. cit.*, 402.

plundered.¹ According to Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, when Ibn al-Faḍl saw this he displayed his sorrow but took no action against the invaders.²

The End of the First Ismā'īlī State

There is disagreement amongst historians on the years of the deaths of the two Ismā'īlī *dā'īs*. Most of them put the death of Ibn Ḥawshab in 302/914 and Ibn al-Faḍl in 303/915,³ while the rest give different dates. For example, Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn in **Ghāyat al-Amānī** mentions the death of Ibn al-Faḍl in 303/915⁴ but he puts Ibn Ḥawshab's death in 331/943-4.⁵ **Uyūn al-Akḥbār** indicates that Ibn Ḥawshab died after Ibn al-Faḍl,⁶ which made Ḥ. Hamdānī speculate that if Ibn Ḥawshab had died before Ibn al-Faḍl, the latter would have overwhelmed Ibn Ḥawshab's territories. Ḥ. Hamdānī states that Ibn al-Faḍl's death was in 302/914, and Ibn Ḥawshab's death in 303/915.⁷

Ḥ. Hamdānī relies on **Uyūn** and perhaps neglects other sources, such as **Sīrat al-Hādī**. Al-ʿAbbāsī,⁸ who lived during the fourth/tenth century, was almost a contemporary of the two Ismā'īlī *dā'īs*; even if he was not, he at least narrated his stories on the authority of Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān al-Kūfī,⁹ who without any doubt

¹ *Ibid.*

² Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, **Ghāyat**, i, 205.

³ Hammādī, **Kashf**, 67. Janadī, **Sulūk**, ed. Kay, text, 149-150. Khazrajī, **ʿAsjad**, 427 and 429. Cf. Daftary, **The Ismā'īlīs**, 92 and 132.

⁴ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, **Ghāyat**, i, 208.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 219.

⁶ Qurashī, **Uyūn**, v, 44.

⁷ Ḥ. Hamdānī, **Ṣulayḥiyyūn**, 47-48.

⁸ ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿUbayd Allāh ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUbayd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ʿUbayd Allāh ibn Abī al-Faḍl al-ʿAbbās ibn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib. Cf. Zakkār (ed.), the introduction of **Sīrat al-Hādī**, 15.

⁹ Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān al-Kūfī lived at the end of the third/ninth century and the beginning of the fourth/tenth century, one of al-Hādī's companions. Kaḥḥāla, **Muʿjam al-Muʿallifīn**, x, 54. Brockelmann, **GAL.**, i, 209 - S., i, 346.

witnessed the events. In his *Sīra*, al-‘Abbāsī says that Ibn Ḥawshab, “the Carmathian who lives in the mountain of Maswar”, perished on Saturday 11 of Jumādā II 302/ 1 January 915.¹ This is very solid evidence which leads one to reject Hamdānī’s account. According to al-Qurashī in ‘*Uyūn*, Ibn Ḥawshab’s affairs had been settled after the death of Ibn al-Faḍl, “the cursed-one” (*la‘īn*), and Ibn Ḥawshab ruled for some years more.²

Ḥ. Hamdānī also lists the names of Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* in Yemen from Ibn Ḥawshab until the Ṣulayḥids. He relies on Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn in *Anbā’ al-Zaman fī Akhbār al-Yaman* who alleges that the death of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās al-Shāwirī (d. 333-4/945-6)³ was in 336/947-8.⁴ Accordingly, it is so hard to believe that Ḥasan, the elder son of Ibn Ḥawshab, who refused the leadership of al-Shāwirī on the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen, was await almost thirty-three years in obedience to al-Shāwirī then he killed him. Therefore, one have to be careful with what is reported in *Ghāyat al-Amānī* and ‘*Uyūn al-Akhbār*, that Ibn Ḥawshab died years after Ibn al-Faḍl, or in 331/943.⁵

According to al-‘Abbāsī, Ibn al-Faḍl died in al-Mudhaykhira on Wednesday 15 Rabī‘ II 303/28 October 915. The historians disagree about who killed Ibn al-Faḍl. Where al-Qurashī credits the killing to one of two missionaries sent to Yemen by al-Mahdī, al-Yamānī alleges that Ibn al-Faḍl was killed by Ibn Ḥawshab.⁶ Al-Ḥammādī,

¹ وهلك القرمطي المقيم بجبل مسور يوم السبت لإحدى عشرة ليلة خلت من جمادى الآخرة سنة إثنين وثلاثمائة.

‘Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 402.

² واستقر أمر المنصور الداعي أبي القاسم -قدس الله روحه- في اليمن بعد قتل هذا اللعين وملك أكثر مدة من السنين.

Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 44.

³ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 220.

⁴ Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 59. Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Anbā’*, fol. 43.

⁵ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 219. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, v, 44.

⁶ Yamānī, *Sirat Ja‘far*; *Ismā‘īlī Traditions*, ed. Ivanow, 197.

al-Janadī and al-Khazrajī mention that Ibn al-Faḍl was killed by a physician who was sent by As‘ad ibn Abī Yu‘fir.¹ Al-Ḥammādī describes the killer as a noble and zealous Muslim and al-Janadī adds that he was sent by the Abbasid Caliph.² Al-Maqrīzī, on the other hand, indicates that the killer was sent by Abū al-Qāsim Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā (d. 301/913-4),³ the Zaydī Imām.⁴

All the stories seem persuasive, except that of al-Maqrīzī because Abū al-Qāsim ibn Yaḥyā died two years before the killing of Ibn al-Faḍl. Nevertheless, one also should exclude the Ismā‘īlī account, because if Ibn al-Faḍl was killed by the Ismā‘īlī Imām or his deputy, then this means that the Imām was planning to replace him. In other words, if the Imām was trying to protect the *da‘wa* in Yemen from its enemies by killing the Ismā‘īlī leaders, he would have had to intensify his support to his followers and he would therefore have to send reinforcements to kill the enemies of the *da‘wa*. It is improbable that the killing was instigated by the Ismā‘īlī Imām. Most likely, the responsibility for killing Ibn al-Faḍl should be laid upon Ibn Abī Yu‘fir’s shoulders, who led the war against Ibn al-Faḍl’s followers and pursued the Ismā‘īlīs, killing and enslaving them.⁵

According to the Yemeni historians, Ibn al-Faḍl was succeeded by his son “al-Fa’fā’” who was killed by As‘ad ibn Abī Yu‘fir.⁶ Al-‘Abbāsī states that when al-Fa’fā’ succeeded his father, correspondence was made between some of the tribal chiefs of the Mikhlāf Ja‘far and As‘ad asking him to lead a battle against al-Fa’fā’.⁷

¹ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 63. Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 205-206. Khazrajī, ‘*Asjad*, 427.

² *Ibid.*

³ Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥasanī, who stepped down from the office of the Imāmate in Dhū al-Qa‘da 300/June 913. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 202.

⁴ Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 167.

⁵ Cf. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 66. Nashwān, *Hūr*, 254.

⁶ It is most likely that his name was al-Faḍl, and this name is a nickname by reason of his stammer. It is also read as “al-Fa’fa’”. Cf. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 70. Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 207. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 209 & *Anbā’ al-Zaman*, fol. 38b.

⁷ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 403.

When As‘ad reached Mikhlāf Ja‘far, he took an oath of allegiance from the leaders of the Mikhlāf and then marched to al-Mudhaykhira. In Rajab 304/January 916, As‘ad captured al-Mudhaykhira, where he took al-Fa‘fā’, his brother and three sisters prisoner. He selected one of Ibn al-Faḍl’s daughters, called Ma‘ādha, as a gift for his nephew Qaḥṭān ibn ‘Abd Allāh. Ma‘ādha brought up her son ‘Abd Allāh ibn Qaḥṭān (d. 387/997), who later became a supporter of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen.¹ He overpowered Tihāma and then Zabīd in 379/989 and announced the *khuṭba* in the name of the Fatimid Caliph al-‘Azīz bi-Allāh (d. 386/996).² According to al-‘Abbāsī, al-Fa‘fā’ and his brother were killed in Ṣan‘ā’ in Dhū al-Qa‘da 304/May 916 on As‘ad’s order and their heads were sent to Baghdād.³

Shortly before his death, Ibn Ḥawshab wrote to the Imām recommending two names to the succession of his office, his son, whose called Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī (d. 336/946-7),⁴ and al-Shāwirī. Because al-Shāwirī was personally known to the Imām, (Ibn Ḥawshab had sent him once on a mission with a letter and presents to ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī),⁵ the Imām appointed al-Shāwirī after the death of Ibn Ḥawshab. The Imām was al-Qā‘im bi-Amr Allāh (d. 334/946) who appointed al-Shāwirī, not ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī, as most of our sources mention.⁶

Abū al-Ḥasan was not satisfied with the decision of the Imām and refused to accept that al-Shāwirī would become his leader, but he could do nothing about it. He

¹ Cf. Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 150.

² Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 57.

³ ‘Abbāsī, *Sīra*, 404.

⁴ Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Abī al-Qāsim Maṣṣūr al-Yaman al-Ḥasan ibn Ḥawshab. Madelung (ed.), *The Sīra of Imām Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh*, from Musallam al-Laḥjī’s *Kitāb Akhbār al-Zaydiyya bi’l-Yaman*, 42. Cf. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 67. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 219-220, where it is written “al-Ḥasan” instead of “Abū al-Ḥasan”.

⁵ Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 208.

⁶ See for example; Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 68. Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 208-209. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 76. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 73. Ahdal, *Tuḥfat al-Zaman*, 163.

confided his feelings to his brother Ja‘far (d.380/990)¹ who did not agree with him. Ja‘far tried to subdue his brother’s anger and upbraided him, but without any success. According to al-Ḥammādī, al-Janadī and Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, Ja‘far left Yemen after the killing of al-Shawirī.² It is most likely that al-Shāwirī was killed by Abū al-
5 Ḥasan in 333-4/945-6.³ As a result of his brother’s behavior, Ja‘far left Yemen for the Fatimid headquarters in 334/946. He then reached al-Mahdiyyah⁴ after Shawwāl 334/May 946 when he was told about the death of the Imām, i.e., al-Qā’im bi-Amr Allāh.

After the death of al-Shāwirī, Abū al-Ḥasan declared in 334/946 that he had
10 abandoned Ismā‘īlism and become a Sunnī. He then massacred the Ismā‘īlīs from amongst those who failed to follow in his apostasy.⁵ Before he left Maswar, he appointed Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd as his deputy. Ḥasan followed the rejectors from Maswar to ‘Abr Maḥram where he was confronted by Ibn Abī al-‘Arjā’, the ruler of the region, who attacked Ḥasan and killed him.⁶ Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd
15 proclaimed himself sovereign of Maswar and he banished the family of Ibn Ḥawshab out of his district. They fled to ‘Ashab⁷ where they were attacked by the people, who robbed, plundered and murdered them.⁸

¹ Ja‘far ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, one of the celebrated Ismā‘īlī authors. For more details; see above, 12.

² Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 208. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 69. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 220.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Al-Janadī mentions that Ja‘far fled to Qayrawān, see; Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 210. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 69. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 52. Al-Mahdiyya was the first capital of the Fatimids in Ifrīqiyyah; Tunisia.

⁵ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 69. Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 210. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 220.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Banū A‘shab or ‘Ashab were a Yemeni tribe who lived in the mountains between Lā‘a and Surdud, in the east of Ḥajja. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 85. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 446.

⁸ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 70. Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 211. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 220.

An agreement had been made between Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd and Ibn Abī al-‘Arjā’ to divide the region between them. As a result, many Ismā‘īlīs were killed, others who hid their belief survived. Nevertheless, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd found and killed the head of the Ismā‘īlīs, Mūsā ibn Abī al-Ṭufayl, who became the chief *dā‘ī* of the Fatimid Caliph after the killing of al-Shāwirī.¹ Al-Qurashī mentions that the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* Ja‘far ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abbās and then ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Bishr, who came after Ibn Abī al-Ṭufayl, were living in extreme secrecy.² The time of *taqiyya* endured until the rise of the Ṣulayḥids in 439/1047.

Al-Ḥammādī and al-Janadī provide some names of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* after the death of al-Shāwirī, and a little information, which is sometimes confusing about them. Musallam al-Laḥjī in his book *Akhbār al-Zaydiyya fī al-Yaman* also gives a list of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* in Yemen starting with ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣulayḥī,³ who succeeded al-Zuwāḥī, up to al-Ḥusayn al-Muntāb, then Hārūn ibn Muḥammad ibn Ruḥaym al-Lā‘ī.⁴ As the head of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen, al-Qurashī lists, in more detail, the names of the all Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* at that time.⁵ According to ‘Uyūn al-Akhbār, the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* after al-Shāwirī were:⁶

1. Yūsuf ibn Mūsā ibn al-Ṭufayl, who was the head of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* during the reign of the Fatimid Caliph al-Mu‘izz li-Dīn Allāh (341-365/953-975).

2. Ja‘far ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abbās, who was probably al-Shāwirī’s nephew. Most likely he was the *dā‘ī* of the Yemen towards the end of al-Mu‘izz’s reign and the beginning of al-‘Azīz’s reign (365-386/975-996).

¹ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 71.

² Cf. H. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 59.

³ See below, *The Second Ismā‘īlī State in Yemen*, 269.

⁴ Also read as “Raḥīm”. Cf. Madelung (ed.), *The Sīra of Imām Aḥmad b. Yahyā* from Musallam al-Laḥjī’s *Kitāb Akhbār al-Zaydiyya bi l-Yaman*, 42.

⁵ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, v, 38-9, vii, 1-2. Cf. H. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 55-60.

⁶ Qurashī, *Uyūn*, vii, 1-2. Cf. H. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 59-60.

3. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿAbbās, the brother of the previous *daʿī*. He was the *dāʿī* of the Yemen during the reign of al-ʿAzīz.

4. Hārūn ibn Muḥammad¹ ibn Ruḥaym al-Lāʿī, who was the head of the Ismāʿīlī *daʿwa* during the reign of al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh (386-411/996-1021). The name of Hārūn ibn Muḥammad is mentioned in one of the Fatimid *sijjils*,² which was sent by al-Ḥākim to the *dāʿī* in Dhū al-Qaʿda 391/August 1001.³

5. Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad (Muḥammad) al-Ashajj, who succeeded Ibn Ruḥaym as the head of the *daʿwa* in Yemen. He was alive during the reign of al-Ḥākim.

Musallam al-Laḥjī, who narrates from ʿAbd Allah ibn ʿUmar al-Hamdānī,⁴ provides his reader with a list of the names of some of the Ismāʿīlī *dāʿīs* and army leaders who were killed during the battles between the Ismāʿīlīs and their enemies. He mentions Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl al-Jūbī and Yūsuf ibn Yaʿqūb al-Wardī as the greatest Ismāʿīlī army leaders.⁵ He adds the names of Sālim ibn Ḥamza al-Jūbī, Aḥmad ibn Musā al-Aʿshabī al-Lāʿī,⁶ Muḥammad ibn Ruḥaym al-Lāʿī,⁷ ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abī al-Malāḥif al-Ṣanʿānī, Ibn Abī Jaḥsh al-Lāʿī, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ṣamad al-Khashabī, Muḥammad who was known as al-Lummayd al-Adrānī, Falāḥ al-ʿAyyānī,

¹ According to Musallam al-Laḥjī, Muḥammad ibn Ruḥaym married the daughter of Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Maṣūm al-Yaman, therefore, Hārūn was probably the grandson of Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī. Cf. Madelung (ed.), *The Sīra*, 114.

² *Sijjil* was one of the general terms for a document. EI², ii, 320.

³ Cf. Qurashī, *ʿUyūn*, vi, 301-2. See below.

⁴ See Madelung(ed.), *The Sīra*, the introduction, v-vi.

⁵ Madelung(ed.), *The Sīra*, 114.

⁶ *Ibid.* 102.

⁷ The father of Hārūn, *ibid.* 114.

Ibn al-Ḥajjāj al-Mulḥānī,¹ Ibn Silb al-Ḥajjī, al-Ḥajjāj ibn Abī Shurb al-Lā‘ī who was known as Ibn Akī, Hishām al-Mudda‘ī, Ibn Idrīs al-Lā‘ī who was known as al-Qumlī, ‘Abd al-Salām al-Shāwirī, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sakn al-Dafa‘ī al-Ḥufāshī, Ibn Yu‘mir al-Maswarī and the Ṣan‘anī poet, al-Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad.²

5 In spite of the strain, it appears that the Ismā‘īlī community was living in wealthy circumstances. In 391/1001, al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh (d. 411/1021) replied to the Yemenī Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī*, Hārūn ibn Muḥammad ibn Raḥīm, who had sent his letter in 390/1000. The letter of al-Ḥākim shows that he received gold and silver from the Ismā‘īlīs in Yemen.³ After the death of Ibn Raḥīm, Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Ashajj
10 (d. before 410/1019) replaced him in the post. He propagated secretly on behalf of al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh.⁴ He was then succeeded by Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir al-Zuwāḥī (d. before 427/1036), the ruler of Kawkabān. According to the Yemeni sources, al-Zuwāḥī was a man of great wealth, of which he made use to attract people to join his *da‘wa* in favour of al-Ḥākim and then al-Zāhir li-I‘zāz Dīn Allāh (d.
15 427/1036).⁵

By the death of al-Zuwāḥī, the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* started a new era when ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣulayhī established the second Ismā‘īlī state.

¹ It is read by Madelung as “al-Milḥānī”. *Ibid.*

² It should be noted that some of the above names may read in a different way. Cf. *Ibid.*

³ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vi, 301-2.

⁴ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 71. Janadī, *Sulūk*, ed. Kay, 211. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 60.

⁵ Ḥammādī, *op. cit.*, 71-72. Janadī, *op. cit.*, 211-212.

Chapter Two

Min Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya wa Ghawār Madhhabihim

من كشف أسرار الباطنية وغوار مذاهبهم

by

Abū al-Qāsim Ismā‘īl ibn Aḥmad al-Bustī (d. ca. 420/1029)

The Importance of the Manuscript

After the fall of the first Ismā‘īlī state in Yemen in 320/932, the Ismā‘īlīs tried hard to gather their strength to stand against their enemies from amongst the Yu‘furids and the Zaydīs. When they failed to defeat them or to resist attacks, they tried to deal with the new circumstances in an efficient way, and therefore, they adopted *taqiyya*. The Yemeni-Ismā‘īlī literature did not appear until the second half of the fifth/eleventh century after the establishment of the second Ismā‘īlī state. Since there were thus no Ismā‘īlī works written in Yemen in the preceding centuries, the Fatimid literature came to fill this gap. Even Ja‘far ibn Maṣṣūr al-Yaman, the celebrated Ismā‘īlī-Yemeni author, did not write any of his books when he was in Yemen. The fact remains that he wrote all of his books in the Fatimid court during the reigns of al-Qā’im bi-Amr Allāh, al-Manṣūr bi-Allāh and al-Mu‘izz li-Dīn Allāh, i.e., from 322/934 until Ja‘far’s death in 380/990.

The military confrontation between the Zaydīs and the Ismā‘īlīs in many regions was a struggle between two different Shiite groups. In Yemen, however, the struggle between them became not just a matter of survival, but a holy war for establishing the legitimate right of the Imām in his claims to the Imāmate. Works such as al-‘Abbāsī’s *Sīrat al-Ḥādī*, al-Laḥjī’s *Sīrat al-Imām Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā* and al-Raba‘ī’s *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*¹ give the history of the Ismā‘īlīs in Yemen as an integral part of the history of the Zaydīs without any indications of the doctrinal disagreements between the two Shiite groups.

¹ Concerning al-Raba‘ī and his work see above, *Non-Ismā‘īlī Yemeni Sources*, 5.

Ismā‘īlī doctrines are neglected by the early anti-Ismā‘īlī historians of Yemen, who do not give any consideration to them in their writings. It should be noted that the focus on Ismā‘īlī doctrines by the anti-Ismā‘īlīs began with the establishment of the Fatimid state. The earliest work was by Ibn Rizām,¹ which has not yet been found.

5 The book of Ibn Rizām was used as the main reference by one of his contemporaries called al-Sharīf Akhū Muḥsin.²

The Zaydīs inherited Mutazilite concepts and beliefs. One can confidently say that most Zaydī scholars were Mutazilites, at least until the seventh/thirteenth century, as they followed Mutazilite scholars in their methodologies of theology
10 (*kalām*).³ It is due to that al-Bustī⁴ in his works refers to his teachers (*shuyūkh*) and shows in many places in his works that his teachers discussed and refuted Ismā‘īlism. In his book *al-Baḥṭh ‘an Adillat al-Takfīr wa al-Tafsīq*,⁵ al-Bustī mentions Mutazilite scholars, such as *Qāḍī al-Qudāt*,⁶ that is al-Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār ibn Aḥmad al-Hamadānī (d. 415/1024),⁷ as well as Abū Qāsim al-Wāsiṭī⁸ and Abū Hāshim al-
15 Jībā’ī (d. 321/933).⁹

¹ Abū ‘Abd Allāh, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Rizām al-Ṭā’ī al-Kūfī was alive in the first half of the fourth/tenth century. Mas‘ūdī, *Tanbīh*, 396. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 22. See also, Lewis, *The Origins*, 7.

² Abū al-Ḥusayn, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, was alive in 373/985. Dawādārī, *Kanz*, vi, 7. Maqrīzī, *op. cit.* Nuwayrī, *Nihāya*, xxv, ed. M. al-Ḥinī and A. al-Ahwānī, Cairo 1984, 189. EI², vi, 917.

³ A. ‘Ārif, *al-Ṣila bayn al-Zaydiyya wa al-Mu‘tazila*, 63-8.

⁴ See below.

⁵ See below.

⁶ Bustī, *al-Baḥṭh ‘an Adillat al-Takfīr wa al-Tafsīq*, fol. 1b.

⁷ ‘Imād al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Abd al-Jabbār ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-Hamadānī al-Asad-Ābādī. Cf. Jushmī, *Sharḥ ‘Uyūn al-Masā’il*, fol. 75 a., m.f. 169, *Dār al-Kutub*, Cairo. EI², i, 59. Ziriklī, *A‘lām*, iii, 273-4.

⁸ كان شيخنا أبو القاسم الواسطي رحمه الله يذهب إلى أن الله تعالى بكونه سمياً بصيراً حالة زائدة على كونه حياً. Bustī, *al-Baḥṭh*, fol. 4b. Cf., Ibn al-Murtaḍā, *al-Munya wa al-Amal*, ed. T. Arnold, Hyderabad 1902, 64.

⁹ Abū Hāshim ‘Abd al-Salām ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Jībā’ī. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, i, 292. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, ii, 55.

Cf. امتنع شيخنا أبو هاشم رحمه الله عن كون القديم قادراً على إيجاد حرفين مختلفين في محل واحد في وقت واحد، وقطع بذلك. Bustī, *al-Baḥṭh*, fol. 9b. Also see, Ibn al-Murtaḍā, *Munya*, 54.

The following Arabic text is a manuscript¹ of a work called **Min Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya wa Ghawār Madhhabihim**.² This work shows the very beginning of the Zaydī refutation of Ismā‘īlism. It was a new strategy, at that time, to attack the doctrines of the Ismā‘īlīs from their books. The manuscript also reflects the style of writing on such a subject, i.e., the refutation of Ismā‘īlism, during the lifetime of al-Bustī, that is between the second half of the fourth/tenth century and the beginning of the fifth/eleventh century. This kind of writing was developed to be more precise and probing by Muslim scholars who lived during the fifth-sixth/eleventh-twelfth century, such as ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037),³ Abū Ḥamid al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), Abū al-Muzaffar al-Isfarāyīnī (d. 471/1078)⁴ and Abū Muḥammad, the author of **Mukhtaṣar**.⁵

The Manuscript’s Location and Description

The manuscript of al-Bustī’s **Min Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya wa Ghawār Madhhabihim** came to light in the second decade of this century through the Orientalist Eugenio Griffini,⁶ who declared in 1915 the existence of this manuscript in his article “*Die jüngste ambrosianische Sammlung arabischer Handschriften*”.⁷ Thereafter, the book was mentioned by some western scholars of that time, such as I. Goldziher in 1916 and L. Massignon in 1922.⁸ Griffini bequeathed his books to the Ambrosiana Library in Milan. After his death, the Ambrosiana Library received 1221

¹ Many thanks are due to Professor W. Madelung for lending a microfilm of this manuscript.

² The title is translated by Stern as “*From the Exposure of the Secrets of the Bāṭiniyya and the Destruction of their Doctrine*”. Stern, “*Abū ‘I-Qāsim al-Bustī and his refutation of Ismā‘īlism*”, JRAS, 1961, 14 & *Studies In Early Ismā‘īlism*, 300.

³ Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, v, 203.

⁴ Abū al-Muzaffar Ṭāhir ibn Muḥammad al-Isfarāyīnī, also called Shahfūr ibn Ṭāhir, was from a small town called Isfarāyīn (or Asfarāyīn) near Nīshāpūr in Khurāsān. EI², iv, 107. Ziriklī, *A‘lām*, iii, 223. Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam*, i, 246.

⁵ See below.

⁶ E. Griffini was born in Milan in 1878 and died in Cairo in 1925. Cf. BSOS, x, 1923-25.

⁷ ZDMG, “*Griffini, Die jüngste ambrosianische Sammlung arabischer Handschriften*”, 69, 1915, 81.

⁸ Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 299.

books, most of them on Islamic and Arabic studies, and 56 Arabic manuscripts. There is some doubt that the following text is one of those manuscripts since it appears that the first folio of the manuscript mentions both the names of G. Caprotti and E. Griffini.¹ Caprotti, who was an Italian merchant, spent thirty years in Yemen and brought a collection of sixty Arabic manuscripts from Ṣan‘ā’ to Italy. All of them were sold to the Ambrosiana Library when Griffini was its librarian.² It is possible that Griffini catalogued them in numerical order under his own name, or perhaps this manuscript was added to his collection later on, since it is labelled “GRIFFINI No 41”, and there is also an “ex libris” label with his name on it. As is indicated on folio 2, the work **Min Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya wa Ghawār Madhhabihim**³ was dictated by a Mutazilite scholar, and most likely a Zaydī, known as Abū al-Qāsim al-Bustī. Unfortunately, no other copy of the work has yet come to light. The following study of the work is therefore restricted to Griffini’s copy.

In April 1961, S. A. Stern published nearly three folios from this manuscript, from 17v. to 19v., in the **Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society**.⁴ Stern depends on Griffini’s copy, but for some reason he does not manage to put the folios in the correct order; perhaps he had a photocopy which was wrongly numbered.⁵ The manuscript, edited in the text which follows, is also Griffini’s copy. It seems that the manuscript is in very bad condition. The manuscript is only partially pointed and most of its folios are corroded, especially in the upper middle of every folio. The work is incomplete and it has only 25 folios. Folio 1a. is illegible and it seems that it is the end of a different work, since folio 2 starts with the title of the work and the name of the

¹ A partly legible sentence is written on the first folio of the manuscript:

“G. Caprotti from Ṣan‘ā’ to the Ambrosiana E. Griffini in Milan 8 February 1906”.

² Cf. N. al-‘Aqīqī, **al-Mustashriqūn**, i, 435-6. Daftary, **The Ismā‘īlis**, 25.

³ The title is translated by Stern as “*From the Exposure of the Secrets of the Bāṭiniyya and the Destruction of their Doctrine*”. Stern, **Studies**, 300.

⁴ **JRAS**, 1961, 14-35.

⁵ Cf. *ibid.* Stern, **Studies**, 300.

author. It is common in Yemen that a volume may contain a collection of works (called مجموع), sometimes about the same subject¹ or by the same author.²

Folios 1a. and 1b. show the stamp of Griffini's collection in the Ambrosiana Library, the number of the manuscript "41" and a note which mentions the names of G. Caprotti and E. Griffini. As Stern noticed:

"the MS., even in its complete state, did not contain the whole of al-Bustī's treatise".³

It should be noted that fol. 25a. ends with (مسح الراس), and where the sentence should be completed on the following folio, instead fol. 25b. shows the Arabic alphabet and gives meanings to its letters.⁴ This demonstrates that there is not any logical connection between the two folios and indicates that the rest of the manuscript is missing. Folio 25b. seems to be the last folio of the work, bearing as it does a signature of the son of the owner of the manuscript:

"This book is one of the books of my father Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad ibn Abī al-Rijāl".⁵

هذي الكتاب من جملة كتب الوالد شهاب الدين احمد بن سليمان بن احمد بن ابي الرجال.

Folio 26a. contains a poem by al-Sayyid Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Hādawī, which has no connection with al-Bustī's book. It seems that it is attached to the book by mistake, probably because of confusion caused by the fact that both the main manuscript and this folio show the name of Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad. To confirm

¹ For example مجموع في الطب, *Jāmi' al-Kabīr*, no. 2254.

² Such as: مجموع الإمام زيد no. 417-25, مجموع الإمام القاسم no. 712 and مجموع الإمام الهادي no. 708.

³ Stern, "al-Bustī", 14-5 & *Studies*, 300.

⁴ Cf. al-Bustī, *Min Kashf*, folio 25 b.

⁵ Aḥmad ibn Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad ibn Abī al-Rijāl, was alive during the Imāmate of the Zaydī Imām Yaḥyā ibn Ḥamza (729-749/1329-1348). He is mentioned by Aḥmad ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Abī al-Rijāl in *Maṭla' al-Budūr wa Majma' al-Buḥūr* as a "Qāḍī" and "Chief-Qāḍī":

القاضي الصدر جليل الرتبة والقدر شمس الإسلام أحمد ابن سليمان ابن أحمد ابن ابي الرجال رضي الله عنه كان صدرًا جليلاً وبدراً جميلاً وتسمياً بقاضي القضاة ووسع الله في عمره وذات يده وجمع من الكتب ما لا يجمعه الا القليل من علماء الديار اليمنية حرسها الله تعالى ووقف لها الاوقاف وكان قبل ظهور الامام يحيى ابن حمزة عليه السلام قائماً بوضيفة (وظيفة, correct) القضاء ووقع من الامام معارضته في قضاء دار الضربوه بثلا ثم بعد الدعوة تولى له القضاء وعرف بقاضي القضاة...

Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla' al-Budūr wa Majma' al-Buḥūr*, i, fol. 122.

this hypothesis, one has only to compare the size of the two folios, where folio 26 is half the size of any of the manuscript's folios. This indicates that folio 26 should be ignored and not be added to this edition.

Abū al-Qāsim Ismā‘īl al-Bustī: his life and his works

5 The author of the work is Abū al-Qāsim Ismā‘īl ibn Aḥmad al-Bustī (d. ca. 420/1029),¹ who was a disciple of the celebrated Mu‘tazilite scholar al-Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-Hamadānī. It is mentioned by Ibn Abī al-Rijāl that:

10 The *shaykh* the imām, the tongue of the speakers (i.e. eloquent), Ismā‘īl ibn Aḥmad (al-Bustī),² the mercy of God be up on him, the preserver of the *madhhab* and the *shaykh* of the Zaydīs in Iraq, and the *nisba* of the *madhhab* is traced back to him as is [mentioned] in the annotations of the ‘*ulamā*’ on *al-Ziyādāt*³ and on *al-Luma*‘,⁴ and the popularity of this is clearer than the sun. Some of our ‘*ulamā*’ were mistaken when they considered him to be the collector of *al-Ziyādāt*. The collector of *al-Ziyādāt* is the *Shaykh*, the master (*al-ustādh*) Ibn Tāl,⁵ the
15 mercy of God be upon on him.⁶

¹ Al-Bustī has been already identified by Griffini and Stern. *ZDMG*, "Griffini", 69, 1915, 81. Stern, *Studies*, 300.

² The word البستي which is written on the left margin of fol. 236, has the same hand writing; it is probably added therefore, by the copyist of the manuscript.

³ *Al-Ziyādāt* is a book written by the Zaydī Imām al-Mu‘ayyad bi-Allāh Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Hārūn (d. 411/1021). Cf. Abū al-Qāsim al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan al-Hawsamī, *al-Ziyādāt li al-Mu‘ayyad bi-Allāh Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Hārūnī*, MS. no. 1133, al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr-Ṣan‘ā’.

⁴ The only book which was written in the fifth/eleventh century and has almost a similar name is a book called *al-Luma*‘ fī Uṣūl al-Dīn by ‘Abd al-Malik ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Juwaynī (d. 478/1085-6). This work is contained amongst the manuscripts of the Great Mosque in Ṣan‘ā’. Cf. MS. no. 463, al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr-Ṣan‘ā’.

⁵ Abū al-Qāsim ibn Tāl al-Hawsamī al-Nāṣirī. Cf. *Fihrist Makḥṭūṭāt al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr*, ii, 990. Stern, *Studies*, 303-4.

⁶ This was a translation of:

الشيخ الامام لسان المتكلمين اسماعيل ابن احمد (البيستي) رحمه الله حافظ المذهب وشيخ الزيدية بالعراق واليه نسبة المذهب كما في تعاليق العلماء على الزيادات وعلى اللمع وشهرة ذلك اظهر من الشمس وان كان قد وهم بعض علمائنا بجعله جامع الزيادات وجامع الزيادات هو الشيخ الامتاذ ابن تال رحمه الله.

Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, i, 236-7. This is new information which was not mentioned by Stern or anyone else.

Ibn Abī al-Rijāl adds that al-Ḥākim al-Jushmī [al-Bayhaqī]¹ says:²

Al-Bustī took instruction from the Qādī, wrote many books, and was clever in disputation; he inclined towards the Zaydiyya. He accompanied the Chief Qādī, and when he [the Qādī] was asked a question, he would refer it to him [al-Bustī]. He [al-Bustī] disputed with al-Bāqillānī³ and silenced him, because the Chief Qādī thought himself above talking to him [al-Bāqillānī].⁴

As is mentioned by Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, many scholars confusedly think that al-Bustī was a companion of the Zaydī Imām al-Muʾayyad bi-Allāh al-Hārūnī.⁵ It seems, however, that the companion of al-Muʾayyad was Abū al-Qāsim ibn Tāl (*al-ustādh*), not our Abū al-Qāsim al-Bustī.⁶

Ibn al-Nadīm is also probably misled when he mentions that al-Bustī wrote the following books:

1- *Kitāb al-ashjār wa al-nabāt*. 2- *Kitāb waṣf hawāʾ Jurjān*. 3- *Kitāb jawābih fī qidam al-ʿālam*. 4- *Kitāb fī ʿillat al-wazīr al-muwajjah bi-wajhayn*. 5- *Kitāb*

¹ Abū Saʿīd al-Muḥassin ibn Muḥammad ibn Karāma al-Jushmī al-Bayhaqī (d. 445/1150), well-known as al-Ḥākim al-Jushmī. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭlaʿ al-Budūr*, iv, 208. Cf. Brockelmann, *Gal.*, i, 524, S., i, 731-2. Ziriklī, *Aʿlām*, v, 289. Ṣubḥī, *al-Zaydiyya*, 228-30.

² This is a translation of:

البُستِي أَخَذَ عَنِ الْقَاضِي وَلَهُ كُتُبٌ كَثِيرَةٌ وَكَانَ جَدِيلًا حَذِيقًا يَمِيلُ إِلَى الزَيْدِيَّةِ وَصَجِبَ قَاضِي الْقَضَاةِ حِينَ حُجِّ وَكَانَ إِذَا سُئِلَ عَنِ مَسْأَلَةٍ أَحَالَ عَلَيْهِ وَنَاطَرَ الْبَاقِلَّانِي فَقَطَعَهُ لِأَنَّ قَاضِي الْقَضَاةِ تَرَفَّعَ عَنِ مَكَالَمَتِهِ.

Jushmī, *Sharḥ ʿUyūn al-Masāʾil*, i, *The library of al-Jāmiʿ al-Kabīr-Ṣanʿāʾ* no. 706- *ʿIlm al-Kalām*, fol. 129, see also, Khalīl Yaḥyā Nāmī, *al-Biʿtha al-Miṣriyya li-Taṣwīr al-Makḥtūtāt al-ʿArabiyya fī Bilād al-Yaman*, microfilm no. 306, fol. 129, and microfilm no. 169, fol. 135 v. Cf. ZDMG, "Griffini", 69, 1915, 81. Stern, *Studies*, 301.

³ Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ṭayyib ibn Muḥammad ibn Jʿafar ibn al-Qāsim al-Bāqillānī (d. 403/1013). Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, iv, 269. al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, v, 379. Ziriklī, *Aʿlām*, vii, 46. M. ʿAbd Allāh, *al-Baqillānī wa ʿĀrāʾuhu al-Kalāmiyya*, 135.

⁴ This text of al-Ḥākim al-Jushmī is quoted by Ibn Abī al-Rijāl in *Maṭālīʿ al-Budūr* and Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā ibn al-Murtaḍā (840/1437) in *al-Munya wa al-Amal*, cf. Stern's translation of the text. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭālīʿ al-Budūr*, i, fol. 237. Ibn al-Murtaḍā, *al-Munya wa al-Amal*, ed. T. W. Arnold, 69. Stern, *Studies*, 301-2.

⁵ Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Hārūn ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Hārūn ibn al-Qāsim ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Zayd ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib (d. 411/1021). Cf. Ṣubḥī, *al-Zaydiyya*, 590. Madelung, *The Zaydī Imāms*, 292.

⁶ Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 303-4.

ṣawn al-‘ilm wa siyāsat al-nafs. 6- Kitāb risālatih fi sayr al-‘uḍu al-ra’īs fi jism al-
'insān.¹

Unfortunately, none of these books has survived.

One can agree with Stern when he mentions that al-Bustī usually wrote on
5 philosophical subjects, and it is also appears that al-Bustī lived too late to be included
in the *Fihrist* of Ibn al-Nadīm.² On the other hand, some of the above titles which are
mentioned in the *Fihrist* seem to reflect a philosophical perspective, such as *Kitāb*
jawābih fi qidam al-‘alam and *Kitāb ṣawn al-‘ilm wa siyāsat al-nafs*. Ibn al-Nadīm
mentions in his *Fihrist* that he has not seen al-Bustī’s books, but that he was told
10 about them by “the copyist Abū ‘Alī ibn Siwār who works in the treasury of the
endowments in Baṣra”.³ Moreover, Ibn al-Nadīm, who wrote his book in 377/987 and
died in *ca.* 385/995,⁴ left spaces in many places in his book and he tells any reader of
his work who had information about missing information on a work, time, place or
author to complete the gaps.⁵

15 According to what is said in the biographical article of Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allah
al-Jundarī in his index of the persons mentioned in the commentary by ‘Abd Allāh ibn
Miftāḥ on Ibn al-Murtaḍā’s *al-Azhār*,⁶ Stern mentions:

1- *al-Mūjaz*. 2- *Kitāb al-Ikfār wa al-Tafsīq*. 3- *Kitāb al-Marātib fi Manāqib*
Ahl al-Bayt. 4- *Kitāb al-Bāhir*.⁷

20 These are titles more appropriate for our al-Bustī. None of them has survived,
except the second book *Kitāb al-Ikfār wa al-Tafsīq*. It should be noted that a book
with a broadly similar title is found as a manuscript in the Great Mosque (*al-Jāmi‘ al-*

¹ Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 199. Cf. Brockelmann, *GAL.*, i, 524, S., i, 731-2.

² Stern, *Studies*, 304.

³ Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 199.

⁴ Cf. the introduction of the *Fihrist*, ب .

⁵ Cf. for example, Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 273-4.

⁶ Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā ibn al-Murtaḍā, *Al-Azhār: Tarājim al-Rijāl al-Madhkūra fi Sharḥ al-Azhār li-Shaykhinā Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Jundarī*, 7. Stern, *Studies*, 2.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 303.

Kabīr) of Ṣan‘ā’. The manuscript was written in 723/1323 by Muṭahhar ibn Muḥammad ibn Turayk (or Tarīk)¹ (d. 748/ 1347-8), and entitled **al-Baḥṭh ‘an Adillat al-Takfīr wa al-Tafsīq.**²

In fact, all the books, which were mentioned by al-Bustī in **Min Kashf**, were written by Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* who were originally from Persia or lived there. There may be speculation about where al-Bustī lived when he wrote his book. It must have been a place where the names of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* were not secret and their books were available. As already mentioned, al-Bustī was a companion of the Chief Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār who, according to al-Ḥākim al-Jushmī, was in Rayy after 360/971 until his death in 415/1024.³ If al-Bustī was a pupil and then became a disciple of the Chief Qāḍī,⁴ he would have learned from him when he was between fifteen and twenty years of age,⁵ and become a disciple after that. It also seems that al-Bustī travelled with the Chief Qāḍī to Mecca at the time of the *ḥajj*, and there he disputed with al-Bāqillānī and silenced him,⁶

Nothing is mentioned about the place that al-Bustī came from or where he lived. However, his *nisba* shows that he was probably of Persian origin and a native of Bust.⁷ It also seems that he lived some time in Rayy, where he studied and met the Chief Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār. He then left Rayy to live in Iraq; this relies on the

¹ Muṭahhar ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Uthmān ibn Turayk (or Tarīk). Cf. **al-Baḥṭh ‘an Adillat al-Takfīr wa al-Tafsīq**, fol. 43 a.

² MS. no. (239) 42-*maǰāmi‘*, *al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr*, Ṣan‘ā’. Cf. **Fihrist Makhṭūṭāt al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr**, ii, 551. **The List of Arabic Manuscripts of the Yemen**, 6, *Dār al-Kutub*, 1967. The manuscript of “**al-Baḥṭh ‘an Adillat al-Takfīr wa al-Tafsīq**” has been already edited by the researcher and will be published soon after this study.

³ Jushmī, **Sharḥ ‘Uyūn al-Masā’il**, fol. 75a., m.f. 169, *Dār al-Kutub*, Cairo. Cf. **EI²**, i, 59. Ziriklī, **A‘lām**, iii, 273-4.

⁴ Jushmī, **Sharḥ**, fol. 79b., m.f. 169, *Dār al-Kutub*, Cairo.

⁵ This speculation relies on the idea that the Chief Qāḍī, when he was asked to come to Rayy by al-Ṣāhib ibn ‘Abbād to teach there, would at least teach the very advanced level (?).

⁶ Cf. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, **Maṭāli‘ al-Budūr**, i, fol. 237. Ibn al-Murtadā, **Munya**, ed. Arnold, 69. **Stern Studies**, 301-2.

⁷ Bust, a ruined city in Sijistān (Sistān), lies in the south of Afghanistan. Cf. Yāqūt, **Mu‘jam**, i, 414. **EI²**, i, 1344. Brice, **Atlas**, 17 Ec.

description of him by Ibn Abī al-Rijāl as "the *shaykh* of the Zaydīs in Iraq".¹ According to al-Bustī himself, in his book *al-Baḥṭh ‘an Adillat al-Takfīr wa al-Tafsīq*,² he refers to some of the Iraqī Mu‘tazilite scholars as his teachers (*shuyūkh*).³ It seems clear therefore that al-Bustī definitely came to Iraq and probably spent the rest of his life there after he became a judge and the head (*shaykh*) of the Zaydīs.⁴ It may well be that al-Bustī lived in Baṣra, given that Ibn al-Nadīm says in his *Fihrist* that he has not seen al-Bustī’s books, but that he was told about them by "the copyist Abū ‘Alī ibn Siwār who works in the treasury of the endowments in Baṣra".⁵

A List of Ismā‘īlī Books and Authors

10 In his book *Min Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya wa Ghawār Madhhabihim*, al-Bustī tries to refute what is said by Ismā‘īlī thinkers about creation, intellect, prophecy and interpretation of the Qur’ān. It should be noted that al-Bustī, in his refutation, refers to some works of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* who were Persians, such as al-Nasafī, al-Sijistānī and al-Marwazī (or al-Marwarrūdī) and others who were located or sent to Persia, 15 such as Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādīm and Abū Ayyūb al-Qayrawānī.

The value of al-Bustī’s *Min Kashf* is that the author had read some Ismā‘īlī books, which were written by the above mentioned *dā‘īs*, and he then attacked the Ismā‘īlīs in their doctrines by referring to these books.⁶ Moreover, al-Bustī is sometimes very specific in his arguments, referring to particular chapters in certain 20 Ismā‘īlī books.⁷ Most of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* who are mentioned by al-Bustī can hardly be identified when he gives no details about them. He occasionally mentions some of

¹ Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭālī‘ al-Budūr*, i, fol. 237.

² MS. *Majmu‘-42*, no. 239, *al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr-Ṣan‘ā’*.

³ Bustī, *al-Baḥṭh ‘an Adillat al-Takfīr*, fol. 4b.

⁴ Cf. Jushmī, *Sharḥ*, fol. 79a., where the author lists names of some people who were the disciples of the Chief Qāḍī and who later became judges (*quḍāt*). Al-Bustī was one of them.

⁵ Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 199.

⁶ For example, cf. Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 2b., 4b., 5b., 7a., 8a., 10a. & 24b.

⁷ For example, *ibid.*, fol. 4a., 4b.

them by their *nisba*, such as al-Nasafī, al-Sijzī, al-Marwarrūdhī and al-Naysābūrī, and mentions others by their *kunya*, such as Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādīm and Abū Tamīm. Sometimes he adds only limited information concerning the location of the *dā‘ī*.

It should be noted that al-Bustī mentions these *dā‘īs* as the authors of some works which he refutes, but he neglects other Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* who were spread out in the same regions at the same time. Even those who wrote on the same subjects that al-Bustī refutes are neglected, such as Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 322/934) who was an Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī* and a contemporary of al-Nasafī and al-Sijistānī. Moreover, it also appears that al-Bustī does not refer to the works of the most famous Fatimid authors, al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān and Ja‘far ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman. Indeed, when he mentions **Da‘ā’im al-Islām**, he attributes it to Abū Tamīm, the fourth Fatimid Caliph, al-Mu‘izz li-Dīn Allāh (d. 365/975).¹

Whatever may be the case, one can assume that al-Bustī focuses on what Ismā‘īlī works were accessible to him at the time. On the other hand, al-Bustī provides a list of Ismā‘īlī thinkers which contains the names of several Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* who have never been mentioned elsewhere. He mentions names such as Abū Muḥammad al-Murādī al-Naysābūrī, Abū Ayyūb al-Qayrawānī and the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī* of the Jibāl, whose name is uncertain and written as *الجهري*.² It is useful to introduce these *dā‘īs* as well as to list their works which are mentioned by al-Bustī, and to mention any information obtainable from other sources.

Al-Bustī provides his reader with a valuable list of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* and some of their works. Al-Bustī indicates that the reason for his giving this information is to prove that he does not attribute to them something that they did not say.³ Through his refutation of their works, al-Bustī attacks most of their doctrines.

¹ The fourth Fatimid Caliph Ma‘add ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh. Cf. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 63.

² See below, 116.

³ Cf. Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 4b., where he says:

وإنما ذكرنا هذه الكتب وأصحابها لأن هذه المسألة عندهم تطوّرت جداً. حتى ترى الدعاة يتكلمون فيها ولا يدرون حقيقتها، وأردنا أن نبيّن قولهم لئلا يتوهم إنا حكينا عنهم ما ليس بقول لهم .

1. Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim

According to al-Bustī, al-Maqrīzī, Rashīd al-Dīn and al-Dawādārī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim was the first *dā‘ī* to be sent to Khurāsān.¹ When he was sent by ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī, his first appearance was in Naysābūr where he resided and spread the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa*.² This means that Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim was a *dā‘ī* of Khurāsān between 299-300/911-2,³ the beginning of the reign of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī, until he died in 307/919-20.⁴ In this year, according to some sources, he was succeeded by Abū Sa‘īd al-Sha‘rānī who propagated the *da‘wa* in Naysābūr.⁵ Quoting from Akhū Muḥsin,⁶ al-Dawādārī says:

10 “As for Khurāsān, the one who brought this malicious *da‘wa* was a man known as Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim, who was a servant of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī in the Maghrib”.⁷

The text shows clearly that Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim was in the Maghrib when ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī was there, which means that Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim left his master at least a year after settling in the Maghrib, about 299-15 Khādim left his master at least a year after settling in the Maghrib, about 299-300/911-2.

It seems that when Stern refers to al-Maqrīzī and al-Bustī,⁸ he could not find any information about the arrival of Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim. Therefore Stern

¹ Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 19b & 25a. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 186. Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh, Qismat-i Ismā‘īliyān*, MS. Or. 1684 in the British Museum, fol. 188. Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar wa Jāmi‘ al-Ghurur*, ed. S. al-Munajjid, 95.

² Is he the same person who is mentioned by Abū Firās in *al-Idāh* as “Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Naysābūrī” (?). Cf. Abū Firās, *Idāh*, ed. Tāmir, 141.

³ See below, 115.

⁴ Cf. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 266. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 186.

⁵ Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 266. al-Baghdādī, *Farq*, 283. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 186. Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi‘*, fol. 188.

⁶ Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, who was roughly contemporary with the Fatimid Caliph al-Mu‘izz. It should be noted that Akhū Muḥsin was quoting most of his book (unfound) from a book written by his contemporary Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Ṭā‘ī al-Kūfī; his book is also not extant. Nuwayrī, *Nihāya*, xxv, 189. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 22. Mas‘ūdī, *Tanbīh*, 343. Cf. Lewis, *The Origins of Ismā‘īlism*, 7 & 55.

⁷ . وأما خراسان فإن الذي قديم بهذه الدعوة الخبيثة رجل يُعرف بأبي عبد الله الخادم وكان خادماً لعبيد الله المهدي في المغرب. Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar*, 95.

⁸ Cf. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 186. Bustī, *Min Kashf*, 25a.

suggests that;

“it is impossible to establish the date of his [i.e., Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim] arrival in Khurasān.”¹

Thus, it is safe to agree with al-Dawādārī and there is no reason to follow Stern’s argument which was based on the supposition that Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim was sent to Naysābūr shortly before or during the time of the fleeing of ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī from Salamiyya to the Maghrib.²

Al-Dawādārī adds important information: when Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim was dying, he appointed al-Sha‘rānī as his successor in “taking an oath from the people”, which is a means of assuring the allegiance of the people who joined the *da‘wa*.³ It should be noted that asking people to swear allegiance to the Ismā‘īlī Imām is, according to the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* hierarchy, the duty of the *ma’dhūn*.⁴ Thus, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim, at any rate, had not gone beyond the ninth rank (the *ma’dhūn*) of ten in the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* hierarchy (*ḥudūd*).⁵ Al-Bustī does not mention the title of the book of Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim, the main subject of which seems to have been *ta‘wīl*. Al-Bustī also states that Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim produced a new interpretation (*ta‘wīl*) in the matter of “purity” (*tahāra*), and that he had not read such an interpretation except in a book which was written in Persian by the *dā‘ī* of the Jibāl, i.e., al-Jayrānī.⁶ This may have arisen from an assumption that the Fatimids tried to adjust some of the erroneous beliefs which had been held by some of the early

¹ Stern, *Studies*, 216.

² *Ibid.*, 217.

³ فلما حضرت أبا عبدا لله الخادم الوفاة جعله مكانه في الأخذ على الناس . Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar*, 95.

⁴ Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, *Sarā‘ir wa Asrār al-Nuṭaqā’*, ed. M. Ghālib, 26. Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-‘Aql*, 252-6. Cf. Ghālib, *a-Ḥarakāt*, 122. Daftary, *The Ismā‘īlis*, 228-9. See below, 345.

⁵ Kirmānī, *op. cit.*, 252-6.

⁶ وهذا الذي ذكرناه هو الذي ذكره أبو عبدا لله الخادم، وهو أوّل داع بخراسان، ودعا الناس إلى هذا المذهب. ولم أقرأ لغيره على هذا التفصيل إلاّ للجيراني وهو كان صاحب [صاحب] الجبال إلى الروم، قال في كتاب له بالفارسيّة:

“أنّ الوجه دليل على الناطق لظهوره والبيدين دليل [على] الأساس لأنّه يأخذ عن الناطق ومسح الرأس...

Bustī, *Min Kashf*, 25a. Concerning al-Jayrānī, see below.

Isma‘īlī *dā‘īs*. Therefore, the Fatimid Caliph al-Mu‘izz dictated **Da‘ā‘im al-Islām** to be used by his *dā‘īs* as the official religious book in legal matters.¹

2. Al-Jayrānī (?)

There is another *dā‘ī* who is mentioned by al-Bustī as the *dā‘ī* of the Jibāl;² his name is uncertain and written as الحردادی.³ Because his name is still uncertain, one can assume that he came from a place which is in the Jibāl or a place not far from it, which and has a similar *nisba* to الحردادی.⁴ It should be noted that Rashīd al-Dīn mentions a *dā‘ī* who is called Abū Muḥammad al-Jurjānī (الجرجاني), which is also comparable to the name which is written on the manuscript, and this reading is also conjectural.⁵ However, there is no adequate proof to identify this *dā‘ī* as the one who is mentioned by al-Bustī. To avoid confusion, the name of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī* will be written as “al-Jayrānī” (الجيراني), a *nisba* which relates to Jayrān, which is a small village in the Jibāl.⁶

Al-Jayrānī seems to have used the same method as Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khādim in teaching Ismā‘īlī doctrines. Al-Bustī mentions that al-Jayrānī wrote a book in Persian in which he dealt with the *ta‘wīl*. He states that al-Jayrānī said:

¹ Ibid., fol. 24b. Nu‘mān, *al-Majālis wa al-Musāyarāt*, ed. Ḥ. Fiqqī, I. Shabbūḥ and M. Ya‘lāwī, 306. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vi, 42-4, 232 & 302. Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 57. Fayzee, “*Qāḍī an-Nu‘mān*”- *JRAS*, 1934, 23.

² The Jibāl refers to the highlands between Iṣfahān and Rayy. Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam*, ii, 98.

³ Bustī, *Min Kashf*, 25a.

⁴ The only place that seems appropriate is a city called Jābrawān (or Jābriwān), which is in the region of Adharbayjān, and near Tabrīz (Cf. Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam*, i, 90. Ibn Khurdādhbih, *al-Masālik wa al-Mamālik*, ed. M. J. De Goeje, 119, 121, 213 & 244). The *nisba* of this city is Jābrawānī جابرواني or sometimes, when the “*wāw*” (و) is transferred to “*yā*” (ي), it is written الجبرياني; and as is common in Arabic writing, if one writes long “*ā*” as a slash after the letter, it can be read as الجبرياني. This is only a speculative reading. It could also be read simply as al-Jayrānī (الجيراني); the *nisba* from Jayrān (جيران). See below.

⁵ Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi‘*, fol. 188. Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 228.

⁶ Jayrān: a village near Iṣfahān. Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam*, i, 197. Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣbahānī, *Dhikr Akhbār Iṣbahān*, ii, 210.

"The face is an indication (*dalīl*) to the "speaking-prophet" (*nāṭiq*)¹ because of its emergence. And the hands are an indication to the "founder" (*asās*)² because he took [knowledge] from the *nāṭiq* and the "Second".³ And the rubbing of the head..."⁴

5 Unfortunately, the manuscript is cut from this point, which makes folio 25a the end of the uncontinuing text.

3. Al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī al-Marwazī

Al-Marwazī (also called al-Marwarrūdhī)⁵ is one of the earliest Ismā'īlī *dā'īs* who spread the *da'wa* in Khurāsān. His name is mentioned as the second, after al-
10 Nasafī, by al-Bustī and as the author of a book called **Salwat al-Arwāh**.⁶ Al-Marwazī, who was a Khurāsānī *amīr*,⁷ was converted to Ismā'īlism in 297-9/910-2 by an Ismā'īlī *dā'ī* called Ghiyāth.⁸ He became the head of the *da'wa* of Nīshāpūr⁹ and he extended his command over Khurāsān, especially Ṭāliqān, Maymana, Harāt,

¹ *Nāṭiq*: in Ismā'īlī thought it means one of seven "speaking-prophets", who have brought a new religious law (*sharī'a*), abrogating the previous one. Ibn Maṣṣūr al-Yaman, *Sarā'ir*, 24-26, 29, 214 & 220. Baghdādī, *Farq*, 296. Cf. EI², *Glossary*, 256. See also, Lewis, *Origins*, 110. Walker (trans.), *The Wellspring of Wisdom*, 8. Daftary, *the Ismā'īlīs*, 564.

² *Asās*: the successor of the *nāṭiq*, according to Ismā'īlī doctrines he imparts *bāṭin*, and in turn is succeeded by a series of seven Imāms. For example, 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, according to their belief, was the *asās* of the Prophet Muḥammad. Ibn Maṣṣūr al-Yaman, *Sarā'ir*, 50 & 214. Baghdādī, *Farq*, 296. Cf. Lewis, *Origins*, 110. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 375. Walker (trans.), *The Wellspring of Wisdom*, 6, 19-20 & 34. Daftary, *the Ismā'īlīs*, 559. See below, 344-5.

³ See below; the hierarchy of the Ismā'īlī *da'wā* in Abū Muḥammad and his Refutation of Ismā'īlism, 344.

⁴ أن الوجه دليل على الناطق لظهوره، واليدين دليل [على] الأساس لأنه يأخذ عن الناطق ومن الثاني. ومسح الرأس...

Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 25a.

⁵ Al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī al-Marwazī or Marwarrūdhī (from Marw al-Rūdh). Al-Bustī in *Min Kashf* gives him both *nisbas*, "al-Marwazī" in fol. 2b. and al-Marwarrūdhī in fol. 4b., also see, Stern, *Studies*, 195. On Marw al-Rūdh, see, Yāqūt, *Mu'jam*, v, 112.

⁶ Nothing at present has been found about this book.

⁷ Stern assumes that al-Marwazī was from an aristocratic family. Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 217.

⁸ Nizām al-Mulk, *Siyāsāt-nāma*, 218. Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 33. Stern, *Studies*, 194. Daftary, *The Ismā'īlīs*, 120-1.

⁹ Nizām al-Mulk, *op. cit.*, 218. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 266. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 40. Stern, *Studies*, 218-9. Daftary, *The Ismā'īlīs*, 122.

Gharjistān and Ghūr. He then converted a number of people of these districts to Ismā‘īlism.¹

Stern, who summarized the history of Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* in north-west Persia and in Khurāsān and Transoxania,² mentions that al-Marwazī was appointed by Aḥmad ibn 5 Ismā‘īl, the Sāmānid, as the commander of the Sāmānid forces in Sijistān.³ In 297/910, al-Marwazī failed to conquer Sijistān where he was defeated by the Ṣaffārids. When he was sent for the second time to Sijistān in 300/912-3, he succeeded in occupying the region. He expected to be the governor of Sijistān. But when he was disappointed in this aim, he rebelled against the Sāmānids and was 10 defeated and captured in 306/918. He was imprisoned for some time before he was forgiven and allowed to return to the Sāmānid court. When he returned to Khurāsān and became the head of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* there, he appointed as his successor Muḥammad al-Nasafī.

In two places in **Min Kashf**, al-Bustī mentions al-Marwazī and his book **Salwat 15 al-Arwāḥ**. Firstly, he discusses the Ismā‘īlī belief in the first creation of the human being.⁴ Secondly, he alludes to the disagreement among the Ismā‘īlī thinkers about the simple elements (*mufradāt*) as to whether they appear out of themselves or are caused by the celestial bodies (*ajrām*). Al-Marwazī, as well as al-Sijistānī and Abū Ayyūb al-Qayrawānī, say that the *mufradāt* are caused by the celestial bodies 20 (*ajrām*).⁵

¹ Nizām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāma*, 216.

² Stern refers to the main sources which mentioned "the early Ismā‘īlī missionaries in north-west Persia and in Khurāsān and Transoxania", such as Ibn al-Athīr's *al-Kāmil* and Gardīzī's *Zayn al-Akḥbār*, and others whose texts were added as appendices; such as Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist*, al-Baghdādī's *Farq*, al-Maqrīzī's *Itti‘āz*, Rashīd al-Dīn's *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārikh* (*Qismat-i Ismā‘īliyān*) and al-Daylamī's *Qawā‘id*. Cf. BSOAS, xxiii, 1, 1960, 56-90.

³ Sijistān (Arabic) or Sistān (Persian) is a Persian region with a capital called Zaranj. Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam*, iii, 190-4. Brice, *Atlas*, 24 Ig & 25 Eb.

⁴ Cf. Bustī, **Min Kashf**, fol. 3a.

⁵ *Ibid.*, fols. 3b.-4a.

4. Al-Nasafi

Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Nasafi¹ is the first Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī* and thinker who is mentioned by al-Bustī in his book **Min Kashf**. In fact, al-Bustī’s **Min Kashf** is mainly a refutation of al-Nasafi’s book which is called **al-Maḥṣūl**. As an Ismā‘īlī thinker, al-Nasafi introduced a form of Neoplatonism into Ismā‘īlī thought. His book, **al-Maḥṣūl** has not been preserved, though some quotations from it have appeared in some Ismā‘īlī books such as **al-Iṣlāḥ**² by Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, **al-Riyād** by al-Kirmānī,³ Abū Tammām’s **Shajarat al-Yaqīn** and Abū Firās’s **al-Īdāh**.⁴

About his activity in the *da‘wa* nothing much can be said except what is mentioned by Niẓām al-Mulk and quoted by modern scholars;⁵ namely that he succeeded al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Marwazī to become the chief *dā‘ī*.⁶ Al-Nasafi achieved the conversion of a large number of people in Bukhārā and Samarqand to

¹ Abū ‘Abd Allāh (or Abū al-Ḥasan) Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Nasafi (or al-Nakhshabī), was also called “al-Bazdawī”, this *nisba* came from a village near Nasaf called Bazda. Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāma*, trans. H. Darke, 218-24. Baghdādī, *Farq*, 283. Naṣir-i Khusraw, *Khawān al-Ikhwān*, ed. Y. al-Khashshāb, 113-5. Isfarāyīnī, *al-Tabṣīr fi al-Dīn*, ed. K. al-Ḥūt, 141. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, viii, 404. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 268. Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam*, v, 267. Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 219. Ivanow, *Guide*, 35. Brockelmann, S., i, 35. Walker, *Early philosophical Shiism*, 55-6. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 40-1. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 251. Ivanow, *Studies in Early Persian Ismailism*, 117 & *Guide to Ismaili literature*, 35.

² It is still an unedited manuscript, see below; **Abū Muhammad and his Refutation of Ismā‘īlism**, 120-22.

³ The full title of this book is **Kitāb al-Riyād fi al-Iṣlāḥ bayn al-Ṣādayn Ṣaḥibay al-Iṣlāḥ wa al-Nuṣra** or **Kitāb al-Riyād fi al-Iṣlāḥ bayn al-Shaykhayn, Abī Ya‘qūb wa Abī Ḥātim, fimā awrad Abū Ḥātim fi Kitāb al-Iṣlāḥ wa Abū Ya‘qūb fi Kitāb al-Nuṣra fi Sharḥ mā qālahu al-Shaykh al-Ḥamīd fi Kitāb al-Maḥṣūl**, edited by ‘A. Tāmīr, Beirut 1960. Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 97.

⁴ Concerning Abū Tammām’s **Shajarat al-Yaqīn** and Abū Firās’s **al-Īdāh**, see below, **Abū Muhammad and his Refutation of Ismā‘īlism**, 317.

⁵ Meagre information is given by Rashīd al-Dīn’s **Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh (Qismat-i Ismā‘īliyyān)**, and translated in Stern’s *Studies*, 229:

“And al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Marwarrūdī made his successor in Khurāsān after his death Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Nakhshabī. Al-Nakhshabī went to Transoxania and made propaganda to Naṣr ibn Ahmad the Sāmānid, *amīr* of Khurāsān, which found acceptance. He gained such an ascendancy over Naṣr that Naṣr never disobeyed his orders. When Naṣr died and was succeeded by his son Nūḥ, the latter killed all the companions and friends of Muhammad Nakhshabī”.

Cf. Rashīd al-Dīn, **Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh**, fol. 188.

⁶ *Ibid.* Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāma*, trans. into English H. Darke, 218.

Ismā‘īlism. He was advised by al-Marwazī to go to Transoxania, where he succeeded in converting the Sāmānid ruler Naṣr ibn Aḥmad ibn Ismā‘īl (d. 331/943)¹ to Ismā‘īlism.² Moreover, al-Nasafī succeeded in forcing Naṣr ibn Ismā‘īl to pay one hundred and nineteen thousand *dirhams*³ as blood money (*diyya*) for killing al-Ḥusayn al-Marwazī.⁴ According to Ibn al-Nadīm, the death of Naṣr was a result of the news that the money that he paid as a *diyya* went to the Fatimids; he subsequently became ill from regretting his obedience to al-Nasafī.⁵ In 332/943, al-Nasafī was executed with his associates by the new Sāmānid ruler Nūḥ ibn Naṣr ibn Aḥmad (d. 343/954)⁶ in the Ismā‘īlī catastrophe of Bukhārā.⁷

10 It is mentioned that al-Nasafī wrote numerous books, none of which have survived. Poonawala listed al-Nasafī’s books as follows:⁸

1- **Al-Maḥṣūl.** 2- **‘Unwān al-Dīn.** 3- **Uṣūl al-Shar‘.** 4- **Al-Da‘wa al-Munjiya.** 5- **Kitāb al-Maṣābiḥ.** 6- **Kitāb al-Khuṭab.** 7- **Kitāb Kayfiyyat Kawn al-‘Ālam.**⁹

15 In his work of refutation, al-Bustī seems to focus in his refutation on the major work of al-Nasafī, **al-Maḥṣūl**, which may be the only book of that author that he read.

¹ Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, v, 158. Cf. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 171.

² Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi‘*, fol. 188. Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsāt-nāma*, 219.

³ Ibn al-Nadīm said:

"فخلفه النسفي واستغوى نصر بن احمد وأغرمه دية المروزي مائة وتسعة عشر ديناراً في كل دينار ألف دينار"

"Al-Nasafī succeeded him (al-Marwazī) and he (al-Nasafī) tempted Naṣr ibn Aḥmad and fined him the blood money of al-Marwazī, a 119 *dīnārs*; in every *dīnār* there is 1000 *dīnārs*". Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 266.

It is clear that the text is corrupted in which "1000 *dīnārs*" should be written "a thousand *dirhams*". This may explain the sum of 119,000 *dirhams* which is mentioned by al-Bustī (see below).

⁴ It should be noted that both Ibn al-Nadīm and al-Bustī mention the amount of 119,000. Ibn al-Nadīm mentioned it as a *diyya* of 119,000 *dīnārs*, which was taken from Naṣr, while al-Bustī mentions it as a *wājib* "obligation" of 119,000 *dirhams*, which should be collected by the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī* from the neophyte as a "respondent" (*mustajīb*) to the *da‘wa*. Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 10 a.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, v, 158. Cf. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 171.

⁷ Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 266. Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsāt-nāma*, 224. Cf. EI², vii, 968.

⁸ Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 40-3.

⁹ *Ibid.* Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 268. Baghdādī, *Farq*, 283. Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 219-20. Ivanow, *Guide to Ismaili literature*, 56. Daftary, *The Ismā‘īlīs*, 122-3 and *Mediaeval Ismā‘īlī*, 4. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 336-7.

According to Walker, **al-Maḥṣūl** was written before 322/934. This is based on the fact that Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, who refuted **al-Maḥṣūl** in his book **al-Iṣlāḥ**, died in that year.¹ **Al-Maḥṣūl**, as has been mentioned, shows how Neoplatonism was adapted to Ismā‘īlī doctrines.² It seems that the appearance of **al-Maḥṣūl**, which spread throughout the regions, caused a sharp reaction among Muslims. It was therefore refuted by some of the Ismā‘īlīs, such as Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and al-Kirmānī, as well as others who were not Ismā‘īlīs, such as ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī, Abū al-Qāsim al-Bustī and Abū Muḥammad in his **Mukhtaṣar**.³

The disputation between the Ismā‘īlī thinkers of the fourth/tenth century cannot be completely understood until the manuscript of the **Maḥṣūl** is found. Nevertheless, scholars formed some ideas about the main subject of the book through the **Iṣlāḥ**, **Riyād**, **Idāḥ** and a book called **Shajarat al-Yaqīn**, which is attributed by Tāmir to ‘Abdān, the famous Carmathian *dā‘ī* (d. 286/899).⁴ In his refutation of Ismā‘īlism, al-Bustī focuses on al-Naṣafī when the latter contradicts himself on several issues in **al-Maḥṣūl**.⁵ Al-Bustī also shows that al-Nasafī sometimes holds a view, such as the belief in the reality of the Prophet’s miracles, which is different from the agreed views of Ismā‘īlī thinkers who are contemporary with him.⁶

Al-Baghdādī in **al-Farq bayn al-Firaq** says:

“They [the theologians (*al-mutakallimūn*)] concluded also that their [the Bāṭinīs] *dā‘ī*, who is known as al-Bazdawī, said in his book, which is known as **al-Maḥṣūl**:⁷

The First Originator originated the Soul,⁸ then they as the First and the Second both become the disposers of the world (*al-‘ālam*) through the disposing of the Seven Planets and the Four Natures, and this is exactly

¹ Walker, *Early philosophical Shiism*, 55.

² Concerning the effects of Neoplatonism on Ismā‘īlī thought; see for example, Netton, *Allāh Transcendent*, 203-42 & *Muslim Neoplatonists*, 33-40. Walker, *Early philosophical Shiism*, 37-44, 46-7, 72-80 & 87-113.

³ See the appendix, Abū Muḥammad, **Mukhtaṣar**, 597.

⁴ More discussion about the book and his author can be found below, *Abū Muḥammad and his Refutation of Ismā‘īlism*, 317. Also see, Walker, “*Abū Tammām and his Kitāb al-Shajara*”, *JAOS*, 114, 1994, 343-52.

⁵ Bustī, *Mīn Kashf*, 4a.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 23a.

⁷ Cf. Kirmānī, *al-Riyād*, ed. ‘A. Tāmir, 220-2.

⁸ Cf. Sijistānī, *Tuḥfat al-Mustajībīn*, 14.

the meaning of what is said by the Zoroastrians (*al-majūs*) that "Yazdān" created "Ahriman" and he is with "Ahriman" the organiser of the world; however, Yazdān is the doer of good things and Ahriman is the doer of evil".¹

5 Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, the chief *daʿī* of Rayy, wrote his book **al-Islāḥ** to rectify some of the concepts mentioned by al-Nasafī in his **al-Maḥṣūl**. This was a starting point of disagreement between some Ismāʿīlī thinkers, who expressed their point of view in some of their works, such as al-Sijistānī who supported al-Nasafī and attacked al-Rāzī's **al-Islāḥ** in a book entitled **al-Nusra**,² and al-Kirmānī who
10 attempted in his book **al-Riyād** to solve the dispute between al-Rāzī on one side, and al-Nasafī and al-Sijistānī on the other side.

5. Al-Sijistānī

Abū Yaʿqūb Ishāq ibn Aḥmad al-Sijistānī (or al-Sijzī) was one of the main figures in Ismāʿīlī thought; he is the second Ismāʿīlī thinker mentioned by al-Bustī as
15 al-Sijzī and al-Khayshafūj or al-Khayshafūjī, meaning "cottonseed",³ which was the nickname of al-Sijistānī.⁴ Difficulties arise in identifying the Ismāʿīlī *daʿīs* after the catastrophe of Bukhāra in 332/943, when they forced to hide themselves from their enemies. This is why there is no date for al-Sijistānī's birth or death,⁵ except what can be achieved by guesswork and the hypothesises of some modern scholars who have
20 found scattered information in some sources. The sources are concerned with al-Sijistānī's works more than his life and his activities in the Ismāʿīlī *daʿwa*. However, either by his name or his nickname, al-Sijistānī as an Ismāʿīlī *daʿī* is mentioned by

¹ This is a translation of:

إِنَّ الْمُبْدِعَ الْأَوَّلَ أَبَدَعَ النَّفْسَ، ثُمَّ أَنَّ الْأَوَّلَ وَالثَّانِي مَدْبَرَانِ لِلْعَالَمِ بِتَدْبِيرِ الْكَوَاكِبِ السَّبْعَةِ وَالطَّبَائِعِ الْأَرْبَعِ، وَهَذَا فِي التَّحْقِيقِ مَعْنَى قَوْلِ
الْمَجْهُوسِ:

"إِنَّ يَزْدَانَ خَلَقَ أَهْرَمْنَ، وَإِنَّهُ مَعَ أَهْرَمْنَ مَدْبَرَانِ لِلْعَالَمِ."

غَيْرَ أَنَّ يَزْدَانَ فَاعِلُ الْخَيْرَاتِ، وَأَهْرَمْنَ فَاعِلُ الشَّرِّ.

Baghdādī, *Farq*, 293-4. Cf. the translation of A. Halkin, *Moslem Schisms and Sects*, 131.

² See below, 127.

³ Al-Baghdādī in *Farq*, 283, called him *بندانه* which is a corrupted word from Persian (بنه دانه) = cotton, and *دانه* = seed. A. Hasanayn, *Persian Dictionary*, 139&263. Ghālib read it (دندان), in which, of course, he was mistaken. Cf. Ghālib, *Aʿlām*, 154.

⁴ Walker, *Early philosophical Shiism*, 16. Details concerning al-Sijistānī, his life and works, can be found in Walker's works such as *Abū Yaʿqūb al-Sijistānī* and *The Wellsprings of Wisdom*.

⁵ Ghālib mentioned that the birth of al-Sijistānī was in 271/884-5, but he gives no references. Cf. Ghālib, *Aʿlām*, 154 & *Rāḥat al-ʿAql*, f.n. 7, 109.

some historians and theologians who were alive during the fourth and the fifth centuries, and some of them were probably contemporaries of his, such as al-Baghdādī and al-Bustī.

It appears that al-Sijistānī, some time after the death of al-Nasafī, became the head of the *daʿwa* in Khurāsān and Rayy. In his account about the Banū Ḥammād as the Ismāʿīlī *dāʿīs* of the *Jazīra*,¹ Ibn al-Nadīm mentions that they were designated by the deputy of the Ismāʿīlī Imām Abū Yaʿqūb who lived at that time in Rayy.² Al-Isfarāyīnī mentions in the *Tabṣīr* that “Abū Yaʿqūb al-Sijzī established (*aqām*) his *daʿwa* in Sijistān”.³ Niẓām al-Mulk also mentions two Ismāʿīlī *dāʿīs* who led the *daʿwa* after the death of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, and one of them was called Ishāq who lived in Rayy.⁴

It is also not clear in the references whether the *nisba* of al-Sijistānī was attached to Abū Yaʿqūb Ishāq ibn Aḥmad because he was the *dāʿī* of Sijistān, or simply because he was born there.⁵ Al-Bustī in *Min Kashf* mentions him as “a lord of Sijistān” (*ṣāhib Sijistān*),⁶ which most likely implies the place where al-Sijistānī resided and by which he was known.⁷

About the death of al-Sijistānī, Ivanow noticed⁸ that al-Sijistānī twice states in his book *al-Iftikhār* that “three hundred and fifty odd (*nayyif*)⁹ years have passed

¹ *Jazīra*: means an island as well as a peninsula. The Ismāʿīlīs’ usage of the term designates a district of the *daʿwa*. It is used by Arab geographers to denote the northern part of the territory which is located between the Tigris and the Euphrates. Cf. Yaqūt, *Muʿjam*, ii, 134. EI², ii, 523.

² Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 268.

³ Isfarāyīnī, *al-Tabṣīr fi al-Dīn*, ed. M. Kawtharī, 85.

⁴ Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāma*, 218.

⁵ Ghālib, without mentioning any reference, alleges that al-Sijistānī was from the Yemen, where he studied the structure of the *daʿwa* in the Ismāʿīlī school. Al-Ziriklī, who seems to be referring to Ghālib, says that al-Sijistānī was a Yemeni (*Yamānī*), [indeed he was not]. Cf. Ghālib, *Aʿlām*, 154. Ziriklī, *Aʿlām*, i, 293.

⁶ Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 7a.

⁷ For example, when al-Bustī identified the first and the second Fatimid Caliphs, he said: *ṣāhib al-Maghrib* and *ṣāhib al-Qayrawān*. *Ibid.*, fols. 5a, 19b. He also uses the word “*ṣāhib*” to describe al-Jayrānī as “a friend of the Master” of the Jibāl (fol. 25a.).

⁸ Ivanow, *Studies in Early Persian Ismailism*, 119.

⁹ *Nayyif* (Arabic) = some or odd. H. Wehr, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, 1011.

since the death of the Prophet".¹ Since the date of the death of the Prophet Muḥammad is 11/632, it should be that the **Iftikhār** was written around the year 361/971. Walker suggests that the date of al-Sijistānī's death was after the latter date and before the end of the reign of the Fatimid Caliph al-Mu'izz, which finished in 5 365/975. However, Poonawala, who had access to many Ismā'īlī manuscripts, indicates that the death of al-Sijistānī was probably some time between 386/996 and 393/1003. Poonawala supported his opinion with internal evidence from the **Risālat al-Mawāzīn** and the **Risālat al-Mabda' wa al-Ma'ād**.² He states that al-Sijistānī, in the introduction of the two books, mentions the name of al-Ḥākim bi Amr Allāh, who 10 became caliph in 386/996. This, it implies that al-Sijistānī was alive at that time. Walker expresses doubts in the introduction of these books which indicate that they were composed anonymously even later than the time of al-Ḥākim.³

Rashīd al-Dīn is the only one who mentions that the date of al-Sijistānī's death was during the reign of the Ṣaffārid ruler Khalaf ibn Aḥmad:

15 "Ishāq al-Sizjī, who was the *dā'ī* of Sistān;⁴ was killed by the *amīr* Khalaf ibn Aḥmad al-Sizjī".⁵

Referring to this evidence, Poonawala adds that Khalaf ibn Aḥmad submitted to the authority of Maḥmūd of Ghazna in 393/1003,⁶ therefore, al-Sijistānī's death could

1 - فقد خرج الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم من العالم ومضى بعده ثلثمائة ونيّف وخمسون سنة .
2 - وليس الأمر كما توهمه بعض الناس بأن هذه الآيات نزلت في أثناء غزوات رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم حين عز وجود الماء، لأنه لو كان الأمر كما حسبه الجهال فأى فائدة في قراءة هذه الآية وقد مضى زمانها وناسها، وأي حكمة في ذلك بعد مضي ثلاثمائة ونيّف وخمسين سنة؟

Sijistānī, **Iftikhār**, ed. Ghālib, 82 & 111. Cf. Walker, **Early philosophical Shiism**, 18.

² Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 83.

³ **Ibid.**, f.n. 52, 162.

⁴ Sistān; a Persian name of Sijistān (Arabic), the border district between Persia and Afghanistan. **EI**, v, 456.

⁵ Walī al-Dawla Khalaf ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Layth of the second Ṣaffārid dynasty acceded to the governship of Khurāsān 352-393/963-1003. Bosworth, **The New Islamic Dynasties**, 172-3.

Cf. ديس ازین عصر داعی بسیستان اسحق سجری بود ملقب نجیشفوج که بردست امیرخلف بن احمد سجری.

Rashīd al-Dīn, **Jāmi'**, fol. 188. Cf. Stern, **Studies**, 228 & 231.

⁶ J. Walker, **The Coinage of the Second Saffarid Dynasty in Sistan**, 16. Bosworth, **The New Islamic Dynasties**, 103.

have been between the years 386/996 and 393/1003.

In **Min Kashf**, al-Bustī mentions three of al-Sijistānī's works, one of which is described as an epistle (*risāla*).¹ When al-Bustī refutes al-Nasafī's **Maḥṣūl**, he reveals that al-Nasafī was inconsistent with himself in the matter of the creation of the separate particulars (*mufradāt*), which are caused by the celestial bodies (*ajrām*). Al-Bustī acquaints his reader with the disagreement amongst the Ismā'īlīs themselves when he mentions some other books of certain Ismā'īlī thinkers who had different opinions on this matter.² The first book of these books was **Yanābī' al-Ḥikma**³ by al-Sijistānī, and al-Bustī refers to one of its chapters which was called "*al-Baṣā'ir*".⁴

The second book of al-Sijistānī is **Kashf al-Maḥjūb**,⁵ to which al-Bustī allegedly refers when he talks about "the ancientness of the world" (*qidam al-‘ālam*).⁶ The passages from **Kashf al-Maḥjūb** quoted in al-Bustī's **Min Kashf**, according to

¹ See below, 126.

² Bustī, **Min Kashf**, fol. 4b.

³ *Ibid.* The first edition of **al-Yanābī'** was completed by H. Corbin as "**Le livre des sources**" in his "**Trilogie Ismaélienne**", the second by M. Ghālib; it was then edited and republished by P. Walker in 1994 as a study of Abū Ya'qūb al-Sijistānī's (**Kitāb al-Yanābī'**) **The Wellsprings of Wisdom** including a complete English translation with a commentary and notes on the Arabic text.

⁴ In actual fact, every chapter of the book is called a "wellspring" (*Yanbū'*); the book is divided into forty wellsprings and none of them is entitled "*al-Baṣā'ir*". However, what is mentioned by al-Bustī as al-Sijistānī's statement in **al-Yanābī'** can be found in the same book; chapters 19, 22 & 36. Cf. Sijistānī, **Yanābī'**, ed. M. Ghālib, 114, 120 & 162. Also see the English translation of the book **The Wellsprings of Wisdom**, P. Walker, 73-4, 77-8 & 101-3. It should be noted that Walker was mistaken when he mentioned "*al-Baṣā'ir*" as a book. This mistake can be traced to Poonawala, who classifies *al-Baṣā'ir* as a book in his **Biobibliography**, 88. Walker follows Poonawala, and this leads Walker to read (من) in the following sentence as (و):

قاله الخيشفوجي السجزي في كتاب البصائر من كتاب ينابيع الحكمة

which is read by Walker as

قاله الخيشفوجي السجزي في كتاب البصائر وكتاب ينابيع الحكمة

Cf. Bustī, **Min Kashf**, 4b. Walker (ed.), **The Wellsprings of Wisdom**, 143.

⁵ The Persian text was edited by H. Corbin in Tehran 1949. It was translated by Corbin into French, but the translation of the text recently appeared in 1988 as **Le dévoilement des Choses Cachées: Kashf al-Maḥjūb. Recherches de Philosophie Ismaélienne**, Paris 1988.

⁶ Bustī, **Min Kashf**, fol. 8a.

وقد ذكر السجزي في مواضع ما يدل على قِدَمِ العالم عنده. منها أنه ذكر في كتاب "كشف المحجوب":

"أنَّ العقل والسرور والغم والغبطة كلها معًا حصلت"

Stern, are not found in the Persian version of **Kashf al-Mahjūb**.¹ It is possible, as Stern suggests, that the Persian version of the book did not reproduce the original text in full,² or perhaps, al-Bustī was mistaken when he refers to this book when he probably meant another one.

5 An unknown book is referred to by al-Bustī as follows:-

“Recently, the lord of Sijistān, who is called al-Khayshafūj, has referred to a book, which was used by the early philosophers”.³

Al-Bustī neither gives the title of the book to which al-Sijistānī refers, nor does he mention the name of its author. Referring to the extant works of al-Sijistānī, one can speculate that the book is probably one of Galen’s books, especially when al-Sijistānī in **Sullam al-Najāt**⁴ refers to a book called “Evidences”(al-*Barāhīn*).⁵

The third work of al-Sijistānī is described by al-Bustī as an epistle (*risāla*). Nevertheless, the description corresponds almost exactly with **al-Iftikhār**,⁶ which is described by al-Bustī as follows:-

15 “I saw in al-Khayshafūj’s epistle an objection to this discussion, and he (al-Khayshafūj) was not happy with it, and he mentioned that he would let his master know about this case, and that he would complain to him about the person who said it”.⁷

The rest of al-Sijistānī’s published works are **Sullam al-Najāt**⁸ and **Tuḥfat al-**
20 **Mustajībīn**.⁹ Poonawala lists 27 more titles, most of which are not found yet, such as

¹ Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 307.

² *Ibid.*

³ وقد استدلل صاحب سجستان الملقب بالخيشفوج في كتاب قريبا مما يستدل به القدماء من الفلاسفة.

Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 7a.

⁴ See below.

⁵ *Al-Barāhīn* or *al-Burhān*: a book is attributed to Galen. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 405. Cf. Sijistānī, **Sullam al-Najāt**, fol. 14.

⁶ Ed. M. Ghālib, Beirut 1980.

⁷ وقد رأيت في رسالة الخيشفوج اعتراضاً على هذا الكلام، ولم يكن يرتضيه، وذكر أنه يُعرف مولاه هذه المسألة ويشكو من قائلها هذا إليه .

Bustī, *Min Kashf*, 17b. Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, ed. Ghālib, 19-20. In his list of the works of al-Sijistānī, Poonawala classifies the “*Risāla*” as a book which is mentioned in al-Bustī’s *Min Kashf* without indicating its title. Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 89.

⁸ Edited as a chapter of *Abū Ya‘qūb al-Sijistānī and Kitāb Sullam al-Najāt: A Study in Islamic Neoplatonism*, Ph. D. Thesis by Mohamed Alibhai - Harvard University - May 1983.

⁹ Ed. ‘A Tāmīr, in Beirut in *al-Mashāriq*/March-April 1967, and republished as one of “*Three Ismā‘īlī Epistles*” (*Thalāth Rasā‘il Ismā‘īliyya*), Beirut 1983. Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 87. Cf. Walker, *Early philosophical Shiism*, 165, n. 79.

al-Nuṣra¹ and al-‘Ilm al-Maknūn wa al-Sirr al-Makhzūn² and other works still unpublished.³

6. Al-Murādī al-Naysābūrī

One of the *dā‘īs*, who are mentioned by al-Bustī by their *kunya*, is a *dā‘ī* called
5 Abū Muḥammad al-Murādī al-Nīsābūrī. Al-Bustī describes him as:

“Abū Muḥammad al-Murādī al-Nīsābūrī, who was one of their most eminent *dā‘īs* and was like a “wing” (*janāḥ*)⁴ of Mas‘ūd, who is the son of al-Nasafī. He adduced proofs in the part that he composed on “the First and the Second”⁵ and their rules”.⁶

¹ It appears that al-Nuṣra was on Nasafī and upholds his views in al-Maḥṣūl against Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī in his book al-Iṣlāḥ. Al-Kirmānī quotes some parts from al-Nuṣra and al-Iṣlāḥ in his book al-Riyāḍ, ed. A. Tāmir, Beirut 1960; cf. 49-50. Walker, *Early philosophical Shiism*, 21, 60-3.

² It is mentioned by al-Daylamī (was alive in 707/1308) as a book by Abū Ya‘qūb al-Sijistānī in the “*ta‘wīl*”. Yamānī, *Qawā‘id ‘Aqā‘id Āl Muḥammad*, ed. Kawtharī, 60. Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 88.

³ Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 85-9.

⁴ *Janāḥ*, lit. means “wing”, is a rank in the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* hierarchy, coming after the “limited *dā‘ī*” (*al-maḥdūd*), or the “limited *na‘dhūn*”, and always attached to the “lieutenant *dā‘ī*” (*al-naqīb*). Generally there would be both a right wing and a left wing to assist the “*naqīb*” by implementing his command throughout his domain and to report on the situation there. Cf. Ghālib, *Tārīkh al-Da‘wa al-Ismā‘īliyya*, 34 & al-Ḥarakāt al-Bāṭiniyya fī al-Islām, 122. See below, the hierarchy of the Ismā‘īlī *Da‘wa*, 344-5.

⁵ According to Ismā‘īlī cosmological doctrine, “the First” means the First Intellect (*al-‘aql al-awwal*), which is the First Existent (*al-mawjūd al-awwal*) or “the Preceder” (*al-sābiq*). “The First” is so called because it is the First Originated Being (*al-mubda‘ al-awwal*) by the divine “Will” (*al-amr*) and inclusive of all existing being. The Ismā‘īlīs bring the following proof for this from the Qur’ān:

“But His command, when He intendeth a thing, is only that He saith unto it: Be! and it is.”
Qur’ān: 81/36.

“The Second” is “the Inclusive Soul”, which is “the Second Intellect” and the first to emanate from the First Intellect.

Nu‘mān, R. al-Mudhhiba, ed. Tāmir, 111. Sijistānī, *Tuhfat al-Mustajibin*, ed. Tāmir, 13-4 & *Iftikhār*, 34-7. Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-‘Aql*, ed. Ghālib, 168, 206 & 212-20. Ḥāmidī, *Kanz al-Walad*, ed. Ghālib, 38, 67 & 70. Baghdādī, *Farq*, 285; 293-4. Cf. Ivanow, *Studies in early Persian Ismailism*, 178. Corbin, *Cyclical Time and Ismaili Gnosis*, trans. R. Manheim, 36 & 96. S. Makarem, *The Doctrine of the Ismailis*, 18-22. Daftārī, *The Ismā‘īlis*, 241-3 & *Med. Ismā‘īlī*, “*Abū Ya‘qūb al-Sijistānī and the seven faculties of the Intellect*”, Madelung, 85-8. See below, the hierarchy of the Ismā‘īlī *Da‘wa*, 349-51.

⁶ وقد استدلل أبو محمد المرادي النيسابوري، وكان أحد دعواتهم، كبيرا منهم، وكان كالجنح لمسعود الذي هو ابن النسفي، في الجزء الذي صنّفه في الأول والثاني وأحكامهما.

Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 6b. Stern translated the text as:

“Abū M. al-M. al-N., who was one of their most eminent *dā‘īs* and was like a *janāḥ* (“wing”, assistant, *dā‘ī* subordinated to the head of the “diocese”, *jazīra*) to Mas‘ūd, the son of al-Nasafī, brings the following proof (for the existence of the soul) in his treatise about “the First and the Second and the doctrines concerning them” (*fī juz‘in qad ṣannafahu fī ‘l-awwali wa ‘l-thānī wa-aḥkāmihimā*). Cf. *Studies*, 308.

It is not clear if Abū Muḥammad al-Murādī al-Naysābūrī is the same *dā'ī* of Khurāsān who was mentioned by Rashīd al-Dīn¹ as Abū Muḥammad al-Mu'addib who was a *dā'ī* of Khurāsān. He may also be the same *dā'ī* who was mentioned as Muḥammad al-Adīb by Abū al-Ma'ālī in **Bayān al-Adyān**.² According to Abū al-
5 Ma'ālī, Muḥammad al-Adīb was the *dā'ī* of Khurāsān before Naṣir-i Khusraw, and he propagated the *Ismā'īlī da'wa* in Ghazna.³ Abū al-Ma'ālī does not provide any details about this *dā'ī* or his *da'wa*. Therefore, the identification of this *dā'ī* is highly speculative.

Nothing is known about Abū Muḥammad al-Murādī except what is mentioned
10 above.⁴ However, there is some information about his tutor, al-Ḥasan Mas'ūd ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Nasafī, nicknamed *Dihqān*.⁵

7. Mas'ūd ibn Muḥammad al-Nasafī

According to Nāṣir-i Khusraw,⁶ Mas'ūd succeeded Abū Ya'qūb al-Sijistānī as leader of the *da'wa* of Khurāsān.⁷ Moreover, Nāṣir-i Khusraw reveals two conflicting
15 groups within the *da'wa* when he cites Mas'ūd's account about "limbo" (*barzakh*), and mentions that Mas'ūd accused al-Sijistānī of holding the doctrine of metempsychosis.⁸

It is not clear if Mas'ūd became the chief *dā'ī* of Khurāsān immediately after

¹ Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi'*, fol. 188. Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 228.

² Abū al-Ma'ālī, *Bayān al-Adyān*, "در شرح آریان و مذاهب جاثلیقی اسلام", trans. into Arabic and published by Y. al-Khashshab in the *Journal of the Faculty of Arts*-University of Cairo, xxix, i, 1957.

³ Abū al-Ma'ālī, *Bayān al-Adyān*, 43-4.

⁴ Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 75. Stern, *Studies*, 222.

⁵ *Dihqān* (Persian) means the head of a village (A. Ḥasanayn, *Qāmūs al-Fārisiyya*, 217), then it became a synonym for "leader" (Wehr, *Dictionary*, 296) and "trader" (*al-Munjid*, 227). In Transoxania, the term was applied to the local rulers as well as the landowners. EI², i, 15b; ii, 253b; v, 853b.

⁶ Nāṣir-i Khusraw ibn al-Ḥārith al-Qubādiyānī al-Marwazī, was born in Qubādiyān in 394/1004, and died in the last third of the fifth/eleventh century. Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 111. A. Schimmel (trans.), *Make a Shield from Wisdom*, 1993, 4-5. Y. al-Khashshāb (editor), *Safar-nāma*, 32. Ghālib, *A'lām*, 562.

⁷ Nāṣir-i Khusraw, *Khwān al-Ikhwān*, ed. Y. al-Khashshāb, 112. Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 75. Daftary, *The Ismā'īlīs*, 123.

⁸ Nāṣir-i Khusraw, *Khwān al-Ikhwān*, 112. Cf. Ivanow, *Studies in early Persian Ismailism*, 117.

his father's death or after some interval. The evidence is also inadequate to prove that Mas'ūd was the chief *dā'ī* of Khurāsān after al-Sijistānī. However, one can assume that if al-Sijistānī had been alive when Mas'ūd imputed metempsychosis to him, he would have rebutted this allegation and, at least, mentioned it in one of his books.

5 Thus, it is most likely that Mas'ūd, after the death of his father, was either too young to be in his father's office, or that al-Sijistānī was the most prominent Ismā'īlī *dā'ī* at that time. Therefore, Mas'ūd became the head of the *da'wa* in Khurāsān after the death of al-Sijistānī (*ca.* between the years 386/996 and 393/1003).

10 It should be noted that al-Bustī when he mentioned Abū Muḥammad al-Murādī in **Min Kashf**, used the past tense to identify him. As already mentioned, he stresses that al-Murādī was close to Mas'ūd. It appears that if Abū Muḥammad al-Murādī had still alive, al-Bustī would have used another form of the verb, i.e., the present tense, or maybe he would have given more details about him. Obviously, al-Murādī died before **Min Kashf** was written, probably between the end of the fourth century and
15 the very beginning of the fifth century.¹ As an assistant (*janāḥ*) of Mas'ūd, undoubtedly, Abū Muḥammad al-Murādī would preach his leader's tenets. Therefore, one can be confident when he says that the passages, which are traced to al-Murādī in **Min Kashf**, were a reflection of the view of Mas'ūd and his followers.

20 The Ismā'īlīs of Khurāsān were divided into two groups, the group of al-Sijistānī and the group of al-Nasafī and his followers (*al-Nasafī wa aṣḥābihi*).² This present a puzzle leading to various doubts: is this al-Nasafī the same *dā'ī* who was executed in 332/943 with his associates by the Sāmānid ruler Nūḥ ibn Naṣr, i.e., Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, or his son Mas'ūd? Did al-Bustī, when he mentioned the name "al-Nasafī", mean the son of al-Nasafī "Mas'ūd", who would have had the same
25 last name as his father? The last hypothesis seems to be more in conformity with the events, and is supported by two reasons: firstly, if there had been such fundamental disagreement between the two *dā'īs*, i.e., al-Nasafī and al-Sijistānī, the latter would never have written his book **al-Nuṣra**, which was composed on the basis of upholding

¹ Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 305.

² See below.

his father's death or after some interval. The evidence is also inadequate to prove that Mas'ūd was the chief *dā'ī* of Khurāsān after al-Sijistānī. However, one can assume that if al-Sijistānī had been alive when Mas'ūd imputed metempsychosis to him, he would have rebutted this allegation and, at least, mentioned it in one of his books. 5 Thus, it is most likely that Mas'ūd, after the death of his father, was either too young to be in his father's office, or that al-Sijistānī was the most prominent Ismā'īlī *dā'ī* at that time. Therefore, Mas'ūd became the head of the *da'wa* in Khurāsān after the death of al-Sijistānī (*ca.* between the years 386/996 and 393/1003).

It should be noted that al-Bustī when he mentioned Abū Muḥammad al-Murādī 10 in **Min Kashf**, used the past tense to identify him. As already mentioned, he stresses that al-Murādī was close to Mas'ūd. It appears that if Abū Muḥammad al-Murādī had still alive, al-Bustī would have used another form of the verb, i.e., the present tense, or maybe he would have given more details about him. Obviously, al-Murādī died before **Min Kashf** was written, probably between the end of the fourth century and 15 the very beginning of the fifth century.¹ As an assistant (*janāḥ*) of Mas'ūd, undoubtedly, Abū Muḥammad al-Murādī would preach his leader's tenets. Therefore, one can be confident when he says that the passages, which are traced to al-Murādī in **Min Kashf**, were a reflection of the view of Mas'ūd and his followers.

The Ismā'īlīs of Khurāsān were divided into two groups, the group of al- 20 Sijistānī and the group of al-Nasafī and his followers (*al-Nasafī wa aṣḥābihi*).² This present a puzzle leading to various doubts: is this al-Nasafī the same *dā'ī* who was executed in 332/943 with his associates by the Sāmānid ruler Nūḥ ibn Naṣr, i.e., Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, or his son Mas'ūd? Did al-Bustī, when he mentioned the name "al-Nasafī", mean the son of al-Nasafī "Mas'ūd", who would have had the same 25 last name as his father? The last hypothesis seems to be more in conformity with the events, and is supported by two reasons: firstly, if there had been such fundamental disagreement between the two *dā'īs*, i.e., al-Nasafī and al-Sijistānī, the latter would never have written his book **al-Nuṣra**, which was composed on the basis of upholding

¹ Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 305.

² See below.

al-Nasafī's views in **al-Maḥṣūl**. Secondly, the Ismā'īlī traditions have never mentioned such a disagreement between al-Nasafī and al-Sijistānī; on the contrary, they showed that al-Sijistānī was a student and a friend of al-Nasafī.¹ It is also conceivable that the text was corrupted, and the copyist should have written "Ibn al-Nasafī", but merely wrote "al-Nasafī".

According to al-Bustī, a disagreement arose between the Ismā'īlīs which led to a conflict that made al-Sijistānī complain to his Imām (*mawlāhu*).² This, if correct, means that al-Sijistānī had authority with which to correspond with the Imām, which could never have happened except with the rank of the chief *dā'ī* (*dā'ī al-du'āt*) and above within the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* hierarchy.³ Combining the accounts of al-Bustī in **Min Kashf** and Naṣir-i Khusraw in **Khwān al-Ikhwān**, one can presume that during al-Sijistānī's headship of the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* there was opposition against him from another Ismā'īlī group, which was guided by Mas'ūd. The opposition within the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* in Khurāsān seems to have disagreed with al-Sijistānī on two basic purposes: the priorities and the strategy of the *da'wa*.

Al-Bustī states that:⁴

The talk of the people of Baḥrayn is different from the talk of the people of Khurāsān in most subjects (*mawāḍi'*), they only agree with each other on "the Two Roots" (*al-aṣṭayn*), [i.e. the intellect "the first" and the soul "the second"]⁵ and on the fact that for the apparent meaning (*ẓāhir*) there is an esoteric meaning (*bāṭin*). On the matter of how these matters may be achieved, they disagreed, and violent disagreement occurred between the people of Khurāsān [themselves] on [the priorities] of the *da'wa*.

Al-Nasafī and his followers said:

"The *da'wa* must be spread to the regions (*āfāq*) [only on the subject of ideas of] the soul, the cycles (*adwār*) and the nature of creation (*kayfiyyat al-khalq*)."

¹ Cf. Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 43.

² Bustī, **Min Kashf**, 17b:

وقد رأيت في رسالة الخيشفوج اعتراضاً على هذا الكلام، ولم يكن يرتضيه، وذكر أنه يعرف مولاه هذه المسألة ويشكو من قائلها.

³ Cf. Ḥammādī, **Kashf**, 22. Daftarī, **The Ismā'īlīs**, 227-9; 315-6. Ghālib, **al-Ḥarakāt al-Bāṭiniyya**, 121-2. Walker, **Early philosophical Shiism**, 18.

⁴ Cf. Bustī, **Min Kashf**, fol. 9b.-10a.

⁵ See below, **Abū Muḥammad and his Refutation of Ismā'īlism**, 349-51.

Al-Khayhafūj said:

"The *da'wa* must begin with the law (*sharī'a*) and its [esoteric] interpretation (*ta'wīlahā*)."

5 There occurred great sharpness and enmity between him and the followers of al-Nasafī. They disagreed [with him] on "the duty" (*wājib*), which was a 119 *dirhams*,¹ instead of what should have been taken?

Some of them said:

"It should be taken in exchange for secrets that belong to Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl."

10 Others said:

"It should not be taken on this basis (i.e., Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl's secrets), but should be taken on [the basis of] other [secrets]."

The textual material supplied by al-Sijistānī in **Sullam al-Najāt** on the *da'wa's* method is different from what is mentioned about the methods used by the other
15 group. According to al-Bustī, this group upheld the doctrine of the "microcosm" (*al-ālam al-ṣaghīr*) compared with the "macrocosm" (*al-ālam al-kabīr*). He writes as follows:²

You should know that they have a massive senseless jabber
20 (*hadhayān^{an} kabīr^{an}*) about the small [world] "microcosm" and the big world "macrocosm". If we were to mention it, the book would be long, so, we confine our [remarks] to finding a solution to that which they frequently discuss. According to them, the human being is the microcosm; he was named the microcosm only because all that is in the world can generally be found in the human being, and is found in him in detailed
25 form. Generally speaking, the world is a centre in which the soul is hidden, and the same holds good for the human being. In the world, there are plants, water, minerals (*jamād*) and mountains, and in the heavens (*al-ūlwiyya*) [there are] planets and spheres (*aflāk*). All of that occurs in the human being; because man's flesh is the equivalent of the earth, his
30 bone[s] stand for the mountains, the veins and the blood in him are the equivalent of the rivers, the hair stands for the plants, the eye of the human being represents the planets, and the head of the human being, because of its roundness, stands for the sphere (*falak*), it is above these things, just as the planets and the spheres are celestial entities.

35 This is what is in their books (*rusūmihim*), and the first [thing] that they teach the deceived disciple. They have another analogy: they compare the human being to the planets and their stars. According to their account, the

¹ Cf. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 266. See below, "*najwā*" in Abū Muḥammad and his Refutation of Ismā'īlism, 331.

² Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 17a.-17b.

seven planets are the "kings" (*mulūk*),¹ the signs of the zodiac are twelve, the mansions (*manāzil*), through which the moon passes, are twenty eight, the degrees are three hundred and sixty. According to the astrologers, three of the signs of the zodiac are dark, and nine of them are bright. They said:

"The human being is composed of numbers, this structure divides into these numbers and that which corresponds to the seven planets is what we have mentioned of his [the human being's] internal and external parts".²

They divide the human being into seven divisions; and some of them specify these divisions as a part of the body:³ the first of them is the skin, the second is the nerves, the third is the veins, the fourth is the blood, the fifth is the flesh, the sixth is the bone[s] and the seventh is the brain.⁴ And that which stands for the seven kings in their view are the numbers which they mentioned. The author of this statement (*ṣāhib al-maqāla*) adduces proofs of the planets for the inner parts and the apparent parts, saying:

"What I mentioned and made as a comparison with the planets I did because some of them are above the others, just as the way that the planets have positions, some above the others."

¹ They are: Sun, Mercury, Venus, Moon, Mars, Saturn and Jupiter. Sijistānī, *Yanābī*^c, trans. P. Walker as "The Wellspring of Wisdom", 82.

² According to al-Sijistānī in *Yanābī*^c, The maintenance of the human body depends on the brain, the heart, the kidneys, the gallbladder, the spleen, the liver and the lungs. Sijistānī, *Yanābī*^c, trans. Walker, 81. Cf. 'Abdān (?), *Shajarat al-Yaqīn*, ed. 'A. Tāmīr, 143-4. Also see, Abū Firās, *Idāh*, ed. 'A. Tāmīr, 125. As he mentions, Abū Firās is quoting from al-Nasafī's *Maḥṣūl*.

³ According to Ismā'īlī doctrines, God originates His creations through His command (*amr*) according to a modus operandi of "seven Cherubim" (سبعة كروبيّة), i.e. كروبي قدر, which are called "the celestial hierarchy of the *da'wa*" or "the higher letters" (الحروف العلوية). See below, *Abū Muḥammad and his Refutation of Ismā'īlism*, 350, 354, 359, 361-3. From these letters everything was created by God's determination (قدر). The myth of these letters occurred in Ismā'īlī belief as the explanation for the genesis of the macrocosm. Accordingly, the Ismā'īlīs connect these letters, which they called "the spiritual ranks" (الحدود الروحانية), with earthly ranks, such as the hierohistory of mankind which comprises seven cyclical times, the seven speaking prophets, the seven pillars of Islam, the seven ranks of the *da'wa* and the seven internal organs in the human body. Sijistānī, *Yanābī*^c, trans. Walker, 51-2, 68-9 & 82, *Tuḥfat al-Mustajībīn*, 18-20 & *Iftikhār*, 60-61 & 64. Ja'far ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, *al-Ālim wa al-Ghulām*, ed. Ghālib, 24-6, 28-9 & 35. Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 9 & 20-1. Daftary, *The Ismā'īlīs*, 139 & 141-3. Halm, "The cosmology of the pre-Fatimid Ismā'īliyya"- *Mediaeval Ismā'īlī History & Thought*, 77. Madelung, "Abū Ya'qūb al-Sijistānī and the seven faculties of the Intellect"- *Mediaeval Ismā'īlī History & Thought*, 85.

⁴ It should be noted his classification of the human body cannot be found in any Ismā'īlī book, but, there is another classification of the external parts of the human body which shows twelve "visible" parts, namely, the head, face, neck, breast, belly, back, hands, thighs, and feet. According to the earliest Ismā'īlī cosmology, these twelve visible parts vis-a-vis the twelve constellations of the zodiac, the twelve *jazīra* or the twelve *dā'īs*. Cf. Sijistānī, *Yanābī*^c, 81-2. Abū Firās, *Idāh*, 65.

Al-Bustī, as is mentioned above, said that al-Sijistānī refuted this line of argument. To support his viewpoint, al-Sijistānī wrote **Sullam al-Najāt** where he explains that the *da‘wa* must start with the *sharī‘a* and its *ta‘wīl*. In the introduction of **Sullam al-Najāt**, he says:

5 And now to our subject. By success and support from God, we have inserted (*ḍammannā*) in our book, which is entitled **Sullam al-Najāt**, sentences and quotations that the faithful person will need to oversee to assure his safety in his life and in his afterlife. It was necessary for that to be by way of a work of summary, dispelling doubt and adhering to certainty. We have explained in successive phases the path of knowledge by which faith has come: that is the belief in: 1) God. 2) His Angels. 3) His books. 4) His Prophets. 5) The Last Day. 6) The Resurrection after death. 7) Heaven and Hell. We have inserted in it some anecdotes (*nikāt*) about the seven foundations on which Islam was established, including the secrets and perfection good practice, by means of writing and composing.¹

8. Abū Ayyūb al-Qayrawānī

Min Kashf is the only source which mentions an *Ismā‘īlī dā‘ī* who is not known from any other sources, and nothing is mentioned about him by the *Ismā‘īlī* traditions. This *dā‘ī* is Abū Ayyūb al-Qayrawānī² who is mentioned by al-Bustī as the author of a book **Hidath al-‘Ālam**, which is on the creation of the world in time.³ This book has not been found yet. In his refutation of *Ismā‘īlism*, al-Bustī refers to this book twice; the first, to show the contradictions of the *Ismā‘īlī* thinkers with each other in the matter of the creation of the separate particulars (*mufradāt*), which are caused by the celestial bodies (*ajrām*).⁴ The second time is when he says:

¹ Sijistānī, **Sullam al-Najāt**, fol. 4.

أما بعد، فإننا بتوفيق الله وتأيدته قد ضَمَمْنَا كتابنا هذا الموسوم بسَلْمِ النجاة جُمْلًا وجوامعَ مما يحتاج إليه المؤمن إلى الإشرافِ عليهما مما هي نجاته في معاده وآخرته. وَوَجَبَ أَنْ يَكُونَ ذَلِكَ عَلَى سَبِيلِ جَامِعٍ إِيْتِصَارٍ وَدَفْعِ الشُّكِّ وَلِزُومِ اليقين. وجعلنا سبيلَ المعارفِ على التَّوَالِي الذي جاء الإيمان به، وهو الإيمان: (١) بالله (٢) ملائكته (٣) كتبه (٤) رسله (٥) اليوم الآخر (٦) البعث بعد الموت (٧) الجنة والنار. وَنُضْمِنُ فِيهِ نَكْتًا مَّا هِيَ فِي الْأَبْنِيَةِ السَّبْعَةِ الَّتِي بُنِيَ عَلَيْهَا الْإِسْلَامُ مِنَ الْأَسْرَارِ وَإِتْقَانِ السِّيَاسَةِ مِنْ جِهَةِ الْوَضْعِ وَالتَّأْلِيفِ.

² It is read by Halm and Walker as “al-Farwānī”, cf. Halm, **Kosmologie und Heilslehre der frühen ismā‘īliya**, 135, f.n. 32. Walker, **Early philosophical Shiism**, 50-1 & 59.

³ Bustī, **Min Kashf**, fol. 4b.

⁴ *Ibid.*

Abū Ayyūb al-Qayrawānī brings twelve proofs for the creation of the world in time, all of which affirm the pre-eternity of the soul and the intellect. Among these is that the simple elements (*mufradāt*) [come] before the compounded ones (*murakkabāt*), and the compounded ones are preceded, and what is preceded is created, and the world is [also] compounded; therefore, the world is created.¹

Nothing about this *dā'ī* is known by modern scholars. According to his *nisba*, it is most likely that he was either a native of al-Qayrawān,² or a person originally from that city who was commanded as a *dā'ī* by his Imām, or perhaps the chief *dā'ī*, to go to Persia to spread the *da'wa* there. In the following text of *Min Kashf*, al-Bustī does not mention dates. It is even impossible to speculate on the exact dates of any of the *dā'īs* or the other names which are mentioned in his book.³

9. Abū Tamīm, al-Mu'izz li-Dīn Allāh

In addition to the preceding names of the *dā'īs*, al-Bustī mentions Abū Tamīm al-Mu'izz li-Dīn Allāh as an author of "*Da'a'im al-Milla al-Ḥanīfiyya*".⁴ In fact, there is no difference in meaning between the latter title and the title of the book "*Da'a'im al-Islām*"⁵ which is written on the manuscripts as the title of the book, and also mentioned by the *Ismā'īlīs* themselves.⁶ Al-Qurashī in his book *Uyūn al-*

¹ وقد استدلل أبو أيوب القيرواني على حدث العالم باثني عشرة دلالة، كلها تدل على قدم النفس والعقل. منها: "أن المفردات قبل المركبات، فالمركبات مسبوق، والمسبوق محدث، والعالم مركب، فالعالم إذا محدث".

Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 8a.

² A city in *Ifrīqiyya*, i.e., Tunis. Yāqūt, *Mu'jam*, iv, 420-1.

³ This habit of neglecting the dates can be also found in another book of al-Bustī "*al-baḥth 'alā Adillat al-Takfir wa al-Tafsīq*", MS. no. 239, cf. *The List of Arabic Manuscripts of the Yemen*, 6, *Dār al-Kutub*, 1967.

⁴ Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 24b.

⁵ The full title is "*Da'a'im al-Islām fī dhikr al-Ḥalāl wa al-Ḥarām*". Fayzee, "*Qadi an-Nu'man*"-*JRAS*, 1934, 20.

⁶ Cf. Fayzee (ed.), *Da'a'im al-Islām*, i, 15, 20 (from the introduction) & 2 (from the text). Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 56-7. Madelung, "*The Sources of Ismā'īlī Law*", *JNES*, xxxv-1976, 29-30.

Akhbār describes how this book was written. He narrates:¹

“He [al-Qādī al-Nu‘mān] composed the book **Da‘ā’im al-Islām fī al-Ḥalāl wa al-Ḥarām wa al-Qaḍyā wa al-Aḥkām** referring to the Commander of the Faithful al-Mu‘izz li-Dīn Allāh, and tracing back to the *ahl al-Bayt*. It was when al-Nu‘mān and a group of [his] *dā‘īs* were present at [the court] of the Commander of the Faithful al-Mu‘izz li-Dīn Allāh -upon him be peace-, they mentioned conversations (*aqāwīl*) which were invented, and the doctrines and the opinions that divide the Islamic groups, which had never been gathered [before], and what [these groups] alleged and fabricated [in the way of heresies]...

He [al-Mu‘izz], then, mentioned the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet -God bless him and grant him salvation-:

“When heresies appear among my people, the scholar should bring to light his knowledge, [if he does not,] so God’s curse be upon him”.

Al-Mu‘izz -upon him be peace-, then, looked at al-Qādī al-Nu‘mān ibn Muḥammad -may God be pleased with him- and said to him:

“O Nu‘mān, it is you who are intended this time”.

Then, he [al-Mu‘izz] gave an order to compose the book of **al-Da‘ā’im**. He [al-Mu‘izz] established (*aṣṣala*) its elements (*uṣūl*) [of the book] and divided [ifs] branches for him [al-Nu‘mān], and he related to him the true ascriptions [which are] from the pure [Imāms] from his forefathers, [who were informed by] the Prophet -God bless him and grant him salvation-, [avoiding] those [ascriptions] that the reporters disagreed on, which were collected from what [some of them] had invented. He said to him:

¹ وَأَلَّفَ [القاضي النعمان] كتاب دعائم الإسلام في الحلال والحرام والقضايا والأحكام عن المعز لدين الله أمير المؤمنين، عن أهل البيت. ذلك أنه حضر النعمان وجماعة من الدعاة عند أمير المؤمنين المعز لدين الله ع. م. فذكروا الأقاويل التي أُخترت، والمذاهب والآراء التي اختلفت بها ففرق الإسلام وما اجتمعت، وما ادعت أكثرها وابتدعت...

ثم ذكر [المعز] لهم قول رسول الله، صلى الله عليه وسلم:

"إذا ظهرت البدع في أممي فليظهر العالم علمه، وإلا فعليه لعنة الله".

ونظر المعز عليه السلام إلى القاضي النعمان بن محمد (رضي) فقال له:

"أنت المعني بذلك في هذا الأوان يا نعمان".

ثم أمر [المعز] بتأليف كتاب الدعائم. واصل [المعز] له أصوله وفرع له فروعه، وأخبره بصحيح الروايات عن الطاهرين من آباءه عن الرسول، صلى الله عليه وسلم، من غير ما اختلف فيه الرواة، وابتدعته ولققت من الإختراعات وجمعت. وقال له:

"إننا قد روي لنا عن جعفر الصادق ع. م. أنه قال:

يُني الإسلام على سبع دعائم: الولاية؛ وهي أفضلها، وبها وبالولي يوصل إلى معرفتها، والطهارة، والصلاة، والزكاة، وصوم شهر رمضان، والحج إلى بيت الله الحرام، والجهاد".

Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vi, 42-3. Cf. Nu‘mān, Da‘ā’im, i, 1-2.

"We have been told that Ja'far al-Ṣādiq -upon him be peace- said:

5 Islam has been built on seven props: "guardianship" (*walāya*),¹ which is the best of them -[it is] through acknowledging it and the *walī*, who leads to knowledge of it; [then] "cultic purity" (*tahāra*); the *ṣalāt*; the "alms tax" (*zakāt*); the "fasting" of the month of Ramaḍān; the *hajj* to the Holy *bayt* of *Allāh*, and the *jihād*".

From another point of view, al-Bustī also explained the reason for writing **al-Da'ā'im** when he said:

10 "For this reason Abū Tamīm compiled the **Book of al-Da'ā'im**, which he called **Da'ā'im al-Milla al-Ḥanīfiyya**. He commanded his *dā'īs* not to apply the *ta'wīl* to any meanings (*ashyā'*), except what is included in this [book]. He brought in to it the apparent aspect of Imāmī doctrine, and he established it [i.e., the doctrine] on these seven precepts (*farā'id*).

15 Their tendency in this [*ta'wīl*] is to interpret (*yata'awwalū*) this number, according to what we have mentioned from the [interpretation] of numbers, such as the speaking-prophets, the planets, the Imāms, the days and the provinces (*aqālīm*), about which we talked earlier".²

All the evidence indicates that al-Nu'mān composed the well-known **Da'ā'im al-Islām** from the Imāmī *ḥadīths*, which were traced back to al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq, who are Imāms for both the Ismā'īlīs and the Ithnā-'asharīs. It should be noted that al-Nu'mān failed to mention the names of the rest of the Ithnā-'asharī Imāms after al-Ṣādiq.³ Al-Bustī was absolutely right in describing the book as one of the Imāmī (i.e., Ithnā-'asharī) books of law (*fiqh*) when he mentioned that Abū Tamīm "brought into it the apparent (*ẓāhir*) Imāmī doctrine, and he established it [the doctrine] on these seven precepts". If al-Bustī had read **al-Da'ā'im**⁴ itself, the book would be the only book mentioned by him which is written by a non-Persian *dā'ī*. Al-Bustī adds that **al-Da'ā'im** was written for the purpose of interpreting the meaning of the numbers of "the speaking-prophets, the planets, the Imāms, the days and the provinces". On the other hand, one could not find anything in **al-Da'ā'im** that may be equivalent to al-Bustī's point of view, except what is mentioned in **al-Da'ā'im** as a *riwāya* of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib when he said:

¹ Concerning *walāya*, cf. Fayzee, "Qadī an-Nu'mān"-JRAS, 1934, 22.

² Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 24b.

³ Cf. Madelung, "The Sources of Ismā'īlī Law"-JNES, 1976, 30.

⁴ Cf. Bustī, *Min Kashf*, 24b.

5 Ask for it [i.e., the Night of Power (*laylat al-qadr*)] in the last ten [nights], that the monuments (*mashā'ir*; pl. of *mash'ar*) are seven, the skies are seven, the lands are seven, seven cows,¹ seven green ears² and the human being bows down (*yasjud*) on seven [parts of the body, i.e., the face, the hands, the knees and the feet].³

10 However, one can speculate that al-Bustī read another book, which mentioned the seven speaking-prophets,⁴ the seven planets,⁵ the seven Imāms,⁶ the seven days⁷ and the provinces.⁸ As a matter of fact, this description goes with *Ta'wīl al-Da'ā'im*,⁹ not *al-Da'ā'im*. It is also possible that al-Bustī read both of them and described them as one book. Anyway, it appears that al-Bustī had read *Ta'wīl al-Da'ā'im*, which was also written by al-Nu'mān and under the supervision of al-Mu'izz himself as an explanation of *al-Da'ā'im*.

15 Within the idea of the *bāṭin*, al-Bustī is also attacking the Ismā'īlīs when he inquires why they limited the props of Islam to seven. He, therefore, wonders if they mean by their question why these props had been ordained, or if they meant why the duties of Islam were seven?

As a theologian, al-Bustī, following a nativist approach answers the two questions. He said:¹⁰

¹ Cf. Qur'ān, 43,46/12.

² Cf. Qur'ān, 261/2.

³ "التمسوها في العشر الأواخر، فإنَّ المشاعر سبع، والسموات سبع، والأرضين سبع، وبقرات سبع، وسبع سنبلات خضر، والإنسان يسجد على سبع."

Nu'mān, *Da'ā'im*, i, 282. Cf. Nu'mān, *Ta'wīl al-Da'ā'im*, ii, 57.

⁴ *Ibid.*, i, 52-3, 101-2, 125, 182 & 184.

⁵ Al-Nu'mān did not mention the seven planets in both *al-Da'ā'im* and *Ta'wīl al-Da'ā'im*, but he mentioned in *al-Da'ā'im* what is called "the seven skies", which has not the same *bāṭinī* meaning. Cf. Nu'mān, *Da'ā'im*, i, 282.

⁶ *Ibid.*, i, 52-3, 101-2 & 125.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*, it should be noted that the author mentioned twelve regions, and not seven. However, al-Nu'mān mentioned what is called "the seven lands" in *al-Da'ā'im*, which has not the same *bāṭinī* meaning as the seven provinces. Cf. Nu'mān, *Da'ā'im*, i, 282 & *Ta'wīl al-Da'ā'im*, ii, 74 & iii, 48-9.

⁹ It is also called *Tarbiyyat al-Mu'minīn bi al-Tawqīf* (or, *al-Tawfīq*) 'alā Ḥudūd Bāṭin al-Dīn, ed. M. Ḥ. al-A'zamī, Cairo (no date).

¹⁰ Bustī, *Mīn Kashf*, 24b.

If you mean the first [question], the answer is that God knows that for the sake of His servants (*'abīduh*) that if they make such [props], they will be nearer to not being ill-treated (*yuzlamū*)... and if you mean why did the duty become restricted to them, it is falsehood (*bāṭil*), because we
5 have more duties than these seven, which means there is no need to specify them and seek information about them.

In which case, al-Bustī was right when he said that their (i.e., the *baṭiniyya*), aim of composing *al-Da'ā'im* was to interpret the *ẓahir* into the *baṭin*.¹ This accusation, i.e. *ta'wīl* of the apparent text of the Qurān which gives an inner meaning
10 which appeared in many Ismā'īlī works, is a belief among the Ismā'īlīs themselves, and when al-Bustī accused them of the *ta'wīl* as a false doctrine, they never believed that the faith would be complete without the belief of the *baṭin*.² Furthermore, in *Ta'wīl al-Da'ā'im*, as an example, al-Nu'mān explains the *ẓāhir* and the *bāṭin*, comparing them with the *islam* and the *īmān*, describing them as a small circle inside
15 a big one.³

It seems that al-Mu'izz had been informed that some of his *dā'īs* went too far in the matter of the *ta'wīl*, when some of them confused people with some philosophical theories which were intermingled by the *da'ī* himself without referring to the chief *da'ī* or the Imām.⁴ Al-Nu'mān in *Ta'wīl al-Da'ā'im* says:⁵

20 It is not right, as we have explained, that the neophyte (*mustajīb*) should be taught (*yufātah*) the *baṭin* unless he has previously been taught the *ẓāhir*, which is related to the Imāms. He[, then,] will know what he

¹ Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol 24b. Cf. Nu'mān, *Ta'wīl al-Da'ā'im*, i, 52-3, 101-2, 125, 182, 184, 202-3 & 235.

² Cf. Nu'mān, *Da'ā'im*, i, 22, 25-26 & *Ta'wīl al-Da'ā'im*, i, 48 & 53-4.

³ *Ibid.*, 57.

⁴ Cf. Nu'mān, *al-Majālis wa al-Musāyarāt*, 303-6 & *Da'ā'im*, i, 1. Qurashī, *'Uyūn*, vi, 302 & *Ta'wīl al-Da'ā'im*, i, 60.

⁵ *Ibid.*

وكذلك لا ينبغي كما قدمنا أن يُفَاتَحَ المستجيب بالباطن حتى يُفَاتَحَ قبل ذلك بالظاهر، الذي هو يؤثر عن الأئمة، فيعرف ما يلزمه من إقامة ظاهر الدين، وذلك مثله مثل الإسلام. ثم يَفَاتِحُ بعد ذلك بعلم الباطن، الذي مثله مثل الإيمان، وذلك حسب ما نَقَلَكُم ولي الله عليه في حدود دين الله. ومن أجل مخالفة ذلك أَهْلَكُ كثيرٌ من الدعاة كثيرٌ من المستجيبين، فبدعواهم بالمفاتحة بالباطن فأعرضوا لهم عن ذكر الظاهر فاطرحوه وتهاونوا بما افترض الله عليهم منه، فأهملوه فهلكوا.

needs for performing the *ẓāhir* of the religion, so this appears to be Islam. Then, he should be taught the knowledge of the *batin*, which seems to be the *īmān*, to which the friend of God (*walī Allāh*)¹ transfers you within the limits imposed by the religion of God. Because of opposing that, many *dā'īs* destroyed a large number of neophytes [when] they started teaching them the *bātin* and avoided mentioning the *ẓāhir*. They threw [the *ẓāhir*] away and underestimated what is imposed by God upon them from it, [i.e., the *ẓāhir*], and [when] they neglected it, they were devastated.

Therefore, al-Mu'izz insisted that his *dā'īs* refer to **al-Da'ā'im** when necessary.² Al-Mu'izz, thus, tried to unite the Ismā'īlī *madhhab* in the different regions without any mystification.

¹ Cf. EI², *Glossary*, 302.

² Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 24b. Cf. Nu'mān, *al-Majālis wa al-Musāyarāt*, 306.

Chapter Three

SOME POLEMICAL TREATISES AGAINST THE ISMĀ‘ĪLĪS

I. MIN KASHF ASRĀR AL-BĀṬINIYYA WA GHAWĀR MADHHABIHIM

By

ABŪ AL-QĀSIM ISMĀ‘ĪL IBN AḤMAD AL-BUSTĪ

The following is the Arabic text of *Min Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya wa Ghawār Madhhabihim*, which was written by Abū al-Qāsim Ismā‘īl ibn Aḥmad al-Bustī, a Zaydī-Mu‘tazilite scholar, around the end of the fourth/tenth and the beginning of the fifth/eleventh centuries. It should be noted that the following text is now fully edited for the first time from the uncompleted and unique manuscript of the Ambrosiana Library of Milan.

الحمد لله الواحد الأحد الباقى المستودع الذى خلق على وحدانيته بأياته الباهرة
وشواهد الظاهرة، وسلى الله على نبيه الصطفى وآله وسلم، أما بعد، فإن الذى يعلم أن
جميع هذه المسائل التى يتعلق بها الباطنية، علمني من حالهم أنهم قد بدلوا حقائقهم
والغيبوا وسعهم في [إظهار] آثار الإسلام وقبح أهله، والله تعالى قد أنجز وعده بإظهار حقائقهم

[1] If it occurs in some Arabic reading and writing to convert the "hamza" (ء) to "ayn" (أ),
consequently, (أ) will be converted in the text to (ء).

[2] If it occurs in some Arabic reading and writing to ignore the hamza (ء) when it comes at the
end of the word, the symbol (ء) will be added in the text where it is needed.

[3] If it occurs in some Arabic reading and writing to delete from the word (ء) in the text, consequently, the (ء) will be
deleted from the text whenever it is needed.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

(Fol. 2a.)

وبه نستعين

5 من كشف أسرار الباطنية وغوار مذهبهم

من إملأه الشيخ أبي القاسم إسماعيل بن أحمد البستي رحمه الله

قال :

الحمد لله الواحد الأحد القاهر الصمد، الذي دلَّ على وحدانيته بآياته الباهرة

وشواهد الظاهرة، وصلى الله على نبيه المصطفى وآله وسلّم. أما بعد، فإنّ الذي دعاني إلى

10 جمع هذه المسائل،¹ التي يتعلّق بها الباطنية، علمي من حالهم أنّهم قد بذلوا جهودهم

وأفرغوا وسعهم في إطفاء² نائرة الإسلام وقمع أهله، والله تعالى³ قد أنجز وعده بإظهار دينه

¹ MS. المسائل . It is common in some Arabic reading and writing to covert the "hamza"(ء) to "yā"(ي). Henceforth, (ي) will be converted in the text to (ء).

² It is also common in some Arabic reading and writing to ignore the hamza (ء) when it comes at the end of the word. Henceforth, the (ء) will be added in the text where it is needed.

³ The Arabic letter *alif* (ا) is always deleted from the word تعال in the text, Henceforth, the *alif* will be added to تعلي and wherever else it is needed.

وإعلان كلمته ولو كره الكافرون. ثم كثرة ما دلّسوا على العامة بقولهم إن ما هم فيه لا يقف عليه أحد من المخالفين، وإن من وقف عليه سكت عن الاعتراض على ذلك لعلمه بصحته. وإن جميع من نقض عليهم لم يقف على أصولهم وحكى غير قولهم، فأحببت أن أورد جميع ما تسألون عنه، وأجبت على طريق الاختصار. وأبين غرضهم فيه من كلام المعروفين والدعاة الذين إليهم مفرّعهم. وأبين مذاهبهم في العالم والأنبياء والشريعة وما يتأولون عليه من الشرائع، بعون الله ومنه، ليقف الناس على أغراضهم ويعرفوا باطن أمرهم وما مقصدهم، فيقلّ ضررهم للدين وأهله إذا هتك الله سترهم، والله الموفق للقول والعمل بما يرضيه.

مسألة³.

فمن ذلك قولهم لمن لم يمارس النظر ولا عرف طريقة الجدل:

10 أخبرونا عن الدنيا مع تركيبها وتصويرها وكثرة العجائب، أهي كانت في

الأزل أم حدثت بعد أن لم تكن؟

فإن قال إنها كانت كذلك، يقال له:

¹ MS. إنما.

² MS. تسألون.

³ MS. مسألة. It will be noted henceforth that the copyist distinguished the words "مسألة" "case" and "جواب" "answer" from the text by putting them in large or bold letters.

فَلِمَ اخْتَلَفَتْ أَعْيَانُهَا وَ أَشْكَالُهَا وَأَمَّا كُنْهَا، وَمَا الَّذِي أَوْجَبَ ذَلِكَ فِيهَا، وَلِمَ

لَمْ يَكُنِ الْكَلِّ عَلَى نَسْقٍ وَاحِدٍ وَصُورَةٍ وَاحِدَةٍ؟

فَإِنْ قَالَ إِنَّهَا كَانَتْ مُحَدَّثَةً، قِيلَ لَهُ:

كَيْفَ حَدَّثَتْ بَعْدَ أَنْ لَمْ تَكُنْ مِنْ غَيْرِ أَصْلٍ؟

الجواب عن ذلك هو أن يقال لهم:

تُسَلِّمُونَ أَنَّ هَذِهِ الْأَجْسَامَ الَّتِي نَشَاهِدُهَا مُحَدَّثَةٌ أَمْ لَا؟

فَإِنْ قَالُوا "لَا"، وَ لَيْسَ ذَلِكَ قَوْلَهُمْ، يَدَّلُ عَلَيْهِ مَا ذَكَرَ شَيْوَخُنَا -رَحِمَهُمُ اللَّهُ- فِي

الْكِتَابِ. وَإِنْ سَلَّمُوا بِذَلِكَ¹ فَقَدْ عَلِمْنَا أَنَّ الْمُحَدَّثَ لَا بَدْلَ لَهُ مِنْ مُجْدِثٍ يُحْدِثُهُ، لِأَنَّ حَدِيثَهُ لَا

يَجُوزُ أَنْ يَتَعَلَّقَ بِعِلَّةٍ، لِأَنَّ (Fol. 2 b.) الْعِلَّةَ² إِمَّا أَنْ تَكُونَ قَدِيمَةً أَوْ مُحَدَّثَةً. فَإِنْ كَانَتْ

مُحَدَّثَةً فَالْكَلَامُ فِيهَا كَالْكَلَامِ فِي الْحَوَادِثِ، وَإِنْ كَانَتْ قَدِيمَةً فَذَلِكَ يَوْجِبُ قِدَمَ الْعَالَمِ. لِأَنَّ

مُوجِبَ الْعِلَّةِ لَا يَتَأَخَّرُ عَنْهَا، فَهَتَى تَبَيَّنَ ذَلِكَ لَا بَدْلَ لَهَا مِنْ مُحَدِّثٍ يُحْدِثُهَا، وَإِذَا كَانَتْ

كَذَلِكَ سَقَطَ جَمِيعُ مَا أوردوه فِي هَذَا السُّؤَالِ فَبَطُلَ إِثْبَاتُ الْوِاسِطَةِ بَيْنَ الْفِعْلِ وَالْفَاعِلِ.

وَاعْلَمْ أَنَّ غَرَضَهُمْ بِهَذَا السُّؤَالِ أَنْ يُبَيِّنُوا لِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عِلَّةَ ظَهَرَ مِنْهَا ذَلِكَ الشَّيْءُ، وَإِنْ لَمْ

يُطَلِّقُوا لَفْظَةَ الْعِلَّةِ. وَبَيَّنَّ ذَلِكَ أَنَّ هَذَا السُّؤَالِ قَدْ أوردَهُ النَّسْفِيُّ عَلَى نَفْسِهِ فَأَجَابَ:

¹ ذلك. MS.

² Illegible word, most probably العلة.

أَنَّ الْإِنْسَانَ لَمَّا ظَهَرَ مِنَ الْحِسِيَّةِ [التي] ظَهَرَتْ مِنَ النَّامِيَّةِ، وَالنَّامِيَّةُ ظَهَرَتْ

مِنَ الْمُرَكَّبَاتِ، وَالْمُرَكَّبَاتُ ظَهَرَتْ مِنَ الْمَفْرَدَاتِ، وَالْمَفْرَدَاتُ ظَهَرَتْ مِنَ الْأَجْرَامِ،

وَالْأَجْرَامُ ظَهَرَتْ مِنَ النَّفْسِ، وَالنَّفْسُ ظَهَرَتْ مِنَ الْعَقْلِ، وَالْعَقْلُ ظَهَرَ مِنَ الْأَمْرِ،

وَالْأَمْرُ أَثَرٌ مِنْ آثَارِ الْبَارِيءِ عَلَى^١ التَّقْرِيبِ. [ظَهَرَ] كَالضَّوءِ مِنْ ذِي ضَوْءٍ،

5 وَكَالنَّفْسِ فِي السَّمْعِ مِنَ الْجَائِمِ.^٢

فَعَلَى هَذَا يُرْتَبُونَ مَقَالَتَهُمْ. وَبَيَانُ ذَلِكَ أَنَّ الْأَمْرَ لَمَّا أَوْجَبَ الْعَقْلَ - وَهُوَ الْأَوَّلُ عِنْدَهُمْ،

[و]لِأَنَّ الْأَمْرَ لَا يَدْخُلُ تَحْتَ الْعَدَدِ وَإِنْ كَانَ قَبْلَ الْعَقْلِ - وَكَانَ كَالْوَاسِطَةِ بَيْنَ الْبَارِيءِ وَالْعَقْلِ.

وَالْعَقْلُ أَوْجَبَ الثَّانِي وَهُوَ النَّفْسُ. ثُمَّ تَحَرَّكَتِ النَّفْسُ، فَبِحَرَكَتِهَا تَحَرَّكَتِ الْأَجْرَامُ. وَتَحَرَّكَتِ

النَّفْسُ فِيهَا فَأَظْهَرَتْ الْمَفْرَدَاتِ، وَهِيَ الْحَرَارَةُ وَالْبُرُودَةُ وَالرُّطُوبَةُ وَالْيَبُوسَةُ، فَوَقَعَتْ تَحْتَ

10 الْأَجْرَامِ. وَدَارَتْ الْأَجْرَامُ عَلَيْهَا فَجَمَعَتْهَا^٣ فِي الْمَرْكَزِ وَصَارَتْ^٤ كَالدَّائِرَةِ. وَالْبُرُودَةُ تَرَكَبَتْ مَعَ

الْيَبُوسَةَ وَالْمَرْكَزَ وَاسْتَقَرَّ قَرَارُهَا. وَصَعِدَتْ مَعَ الرُّطُوبَةِ طَلَبًا لِعَالَمِهَا، فَتَرَكَبَتْ^٥ مَعَ الْبُرُودَةِ،

فَأَحَاطَتْ^٦ بِالْأَرْضِ كَالدَّائِرَةِ عَلَيْهَا. ثُمَّ صَعِدَتْ الْحَرَارَةُ عَنِ الْمَاءِ فَتَرَكَبَتْ الرُّطُوبَةَ فَصَارَتْ^٧

^١ MS. علي.

^٢ The same idea would be mentioned later by al-Sijistānī. Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 32.

^٣ MS. فجمعها.

^٤ MS. وصار.

^٥ MS. فتركب.

^٦ MS. فاحاط.

^٧ MS. فصار.

هواء، وأحاطت بالماء والأرض. ثُمَّ انفصلت منها حرارة، وانعكست فاتصلت بالأرض تثبيتها^١،
 فصارت دائرة محيطة بالهواء، أو واسطة بين الفلك والأرض والماء والهواء، وهي^٢ النار. وهم
 يقولون فيها أثير. ثُمَّ لما دارت الأدوار وامتزجت المفردات والمركبات، ظهرت النامية ثُمَّ
 صَفَت، فظهرت من صَفوتها الحيوانات الحسيّة. ثُمَّ صَفَت الحسيّة فظهرت منها الناطقة،
 وهذا هو آخر الخلقة.^٣ وهو الذي يتأولون عليه قول القائل "أولُ الفكرة آخرُ العمل".^٤

5

يُقال لهم:

خَبَرْنَا عَنِ النَّاطِقِ الَّذِي هُوَ الْإِنْسَانُ، أَلَيْسَ قَدْ ظَهَرَ مِنَ الْحَسِيِّ؟

فمن جوابهم "نعم"، يُقال لهم:

كيف ظهر ذلك؟

10

فإن قانوا:

إنما ظهر ذلك بأن تحركت الأدوار على النَّامِي والحَسِيِّ، فتوالد وكبر وفسد بالموت،

فاجتمع في زوايا الأرض فتوالد منه النَّاطِقُ ثُمَّ تناسلوا وكبروا.

¹ Illegible word, it may also be read as: بنفسها.

² MS. وهو.

³ It can be also read as: الحَلَقَةُ.

⁴ It can be also read as: أولُ الفكرة آخرُ العمل. It seems that the sentence is corrupted, it is written as "آخرُ
 العمل" by al-Sijistānī, cf. *Sullam al-Najāt*, fol. 37.

وهذا الذي ذكره المروزي في كتاب "سلوة الأرواح"، واستدل (Fol. 3a.) عليه بأننا

نشاهد فضالة الفارة إذا بال فيها الإنسان تتولد فيها الفارة، وكذلك (...) ¹ إذا وضعناه في

وسط الحبر ² الحار تولد ³ العقرب. وكذلك الآبار والمصانع تتولد السموك والضفادع فيها.

وكذلك لا يمتنع في العقول أن يحصل الإنسان على هذا الحد من غير توالد من ذكر وأنثى.

5 يقال لهم: *أخبر الله ذلك أم خبر رسوله؟*

هذا الذي ادعيتم من ظهور الناطق عن الحسي على الوجه الذي ذكرتم أعرفتموه ضرورة

أم بالخبر أم بالدليل؟

فإن قالوا:

عرفناه ضرورة.

10 يقال لهم: *أخبر الله ذلك أم خبر رسوله؟*

أليس ما يُعلم ضرورة لا يتخصّص به عاقل دون عاقل، وإن العالم يشارككم في هذا

العلم، وما الفرق بينكم وبين من يدعي بطلان قولكم ضرورة؟

فإن قالوا:

¹ sic., illegible word could be read as الفالوذج (?). It should be noted that many words which are written on the first and the last lines are unreadable because of the bad condition of the manuscript itself.

² It can also be read as: الجير .

³ It can also be read as: يُؤلّد .

بالخبر عرفنا ذلك.

يقال لهم:

بخبرٍ يوجب العلم أم بخبرٍ لا يوجبُه؟

فإن قالوا: بخبرٍ لا يوجب العلم، هلَكوا. وإن قالوا: بخبرٍ يوجب العلم. يقال لهم:

ما ذلك الخبر؟ أخبر الله ذلك أم خبر رسوله؟

ولا يجدون في أخبار الله تعالى ولا في أخبار الرسول -صلى الله عليه- ما يدل عليه. فإن راموا الاستدلال على ذلك لم يجدوا إليه سبيلاً.

ثم يقال لهم:

أخبرونا أليس النامي والحسي، لما كان عندكم ابتداءً، وهما حصلاً لا من أصل تولداً

منه وتناسلاً، فحصل في وقتنا الآن على ذلك الحد، على حسب ما ادعيتم، كالفارة والعقرب

والثمار التي تحصل في الجبال من غير أصل لها ولا زارع. فلم لا يحصل الآن إنساناً لا من

تناسلٍ وتوالدٍ. وما بال هذا الجنس اختص بأن لا يحصل إلا من والدٍ ووالده،¹ وهذه الأشياء

كلها تحصل لها على الوجهين. وكذلك الكلام في سائر البهائم والدواب التي لم تجر العادة

بحصولها إلا من ذكرٍ وأنثى. فإن راموا الفصل بينهما لم يجدوا إليه سبيلاً.

¹ ولدٍ ووالده or والدٍ وولده: sic; it is most likely if it is read as:

² وهذه الأشياء كلها التي لم تجر العادة يحصل لها على الوجهين MS.

ثم يقال لهم:

أليس عندكم أن العامة إنما ضلّوا عن طريق¹ الصواب لأنهم قبلوا قول رؤسائهم بلا

حجة ولا برهان. فما بالكم قُلتُم هذا بلا حجة ولا دلالة؟

فإن قالوا:

قد ذكرنا عليه البرهان.

5

وهذا الذي عندهم المطلوب في باب² البرهان، ولهذا يقتصرون بأن يذكروا مثلاً فيظنون أن

المثال هو دليل على المسألة. وكما جاز المثال يجب أن يجوز ما مثّلوا به. وهذا فاسد لأن

الشيء قد يصح ويفسد مثله. فلا يجب، من حيث شاهدنا، [القول بأن] الفارة والعقرب

وكثيراً من الحيوانات خلقها الله تعالى بالعادة. [ولا يجب] عند أمر من الأمور أن تُضيف

10 ذلك الشيء إلى ذلك الأمر. فإذا ثبت ذلك، فلم يوجب وجدانياً حصول هذه الحيوانات عند

هذه الأمور إضافتنا إليه. بل يجب أن تدلّ عليه وتطلب العلة فيه. ثم أن أكثر ما يلزم فيها

(Fol. 3b.) (...) ³ يجوز حصوله هكذا، فإما أن يجوز كون هذه الأشياء موجبة له فمن أثر.

ثم يقال لهم:

¹ طريقة. MS.

² sic; can also be read as: بيان.

³ Illegible words.

خَبَرْنَا عَنْ الْحَيَوَانَ وَالنَّبَاتِ، إِذَا كَانَتْ مُتَقَدِّمَةً عَلَى هَذَا الَّذِي زَعَمْتُمْ فِيهَا أَنَّهَا
الطَّبَائِعَ الْأَرْبَعَةَ، مِنَ الْأَرْضِ وَالْمَاءِ وَالْهَوَاءِ^١ وَالْأَثِيرِ^٢. أَمْ هِيَ كَانَتْ سَابِقَةً لَهَا، أَمْ كَانَتْ مَعًا؟
وَأَيُّهَا ادَّعَوْهُ طَوْلَبُوا الدَّلَالََةَ عَلَيْهِ، وَلَا يَجِدُونَ إِلَيْهِ سَبِيلًا.

ثم يقال لهم إن قالوا بتقدم هذه الأشياء الأربعة عليها:

5 أليست هذه الأشياء الأربعة موجبة وجود الحيوان والنبات؟ ولا بد مَنْ يَعُمُّ^٣ على

أصولهم.

يقال لهم:

إذا كانت هذه الأشياء أوجبت وجودها فَلِمَ صَحَّ تقدمها؟ أليس في ذلك إخراج لها من

أن تكون موجبة لها، بجواز وجودها مع عدم تلك الأشياء؟

10 وهذا فاسد عندهم. فَإِنْ قالوا بحصول الحيوانات أَوْلًا، تجاهلوا. وليس ذا قولهم. وإن

قالوا بحصولهما معًا، يقال لهم:

فَلِمَ صارت هذه الأشياء دونها أصلاً، ولم تَصِرْ تلك أصلاً لهذه الأشياء؟ وهل هذا إلا

تجاهل وحماقات نعوذ بالله منها. إذ القول بها يؤدي إلى الحيرة التي هم فيها.

¹ MS. الهوى.

² sic., it should be written as النَّارُ , cf. Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-ʿAql*, ed. M. Ghālib, 345. See below.

³ sic., it may also be read as: مَنْ يَعُمُّ and مِنْ نَعَمَ.

فصل.

ثم يقال لهم:

خبرونا عن هذه الطبائع الأربعة [أ] بنفسها ظهرت أم ظهرت بغيرها؟^١

فإن قالوا:

تراتبت من المفردات.

5

وهذا قولهم. يقال لهم:

خبرونا عنها، ما تلك المفردات؟ أهى موجودة أم معدومة؟

وإن قالوا بوجودها وحصولها. يقال لهم:

[أ] بالدليل عرفتم أم بغير دليل؟

فإن قالوا:

10

بغير دليل.

[ف] يجب مشاركتنا لهم فيه، مع علمنا من أنفسنا وكثرة عددنا إننا غير عالمين به.^٢ وإن

قالوا:

^١ غيرها. MS.

^٢ بها. MS.

وعلمنا بالدليل. المركبة من البرودة واليبوسة كما لم يجب كونها مركبة من الحرارة

قيل لهم: سها في بعض الأحوال حارة كما توجد باردة، وكذلك نجد رطبة كما توجد

[و] ما ذلك الدليل؟ الأشياء كلها موحدة (فيها لم يجب) (Al. 48. 49) كونها مركبة

فإن قالوا: وجود سها مع علم كسل واحد مذهب بل يجب أن تكون [هذه] الأشياء

5 أعرافاً قد علمنا من حال الأرض أنها باردة يابسة ولهذا صارت جامدة¹، ألا ترى

أن الجامد إنما يتجمد لحصول البرودة واليبوسة فيه، فقد علمنا أن الأرض

مركبة منهما، والماء بارد رطب وكذلك النار حارة يابسة والهواء² حار رطب،

فكل واحدة منها مركبة من جوهرين مفردين. هذه الأشياء مع بقاء حوتها وحصول

بها ثم يقال لهم: اطلعوا ذلك أم لا؟

10 هذا الذي ادعيتم في الأرض، من أنها باردة يابسة، فإنها دعوى لا دليل معها إن

عنيتم بالبرودة ما نعقله. وإن عنيتم برودة لا نعقلها، فإنه لا يلزم حاجة مالا نعقل من

القول. وذلك أن الأرض يجوز عندنا أن تكون فيها حرارة وبرودة ورطوبة ويبوسة، وليس من

حكم ما يتجمد أن يكون بارداً يابساً. ألا ترى أن الحجر فيه نار وكذلك الحطب والحديد

وما بيئنا، كلها من الأجسام التي فيها نار فليس بكونها جامداً اعتباراً. ولو كان الأمر على ما

¹ . صار جامداً MS.

² الهوي MS.

زعمتم لما وجب كونها مركبة من البرودة واليبوسة، كما لم يجب كونها مركبة من الحرارة.
بأننا قد نجدها في بعض الأحوال حارة كما نجدها باردة، وكذلك نجدها رطبة كما نجدها
يابسة. ولو وجدناها وهذه الأشياء كلها موحدة (فيها¹ لم يجب) (Fol. 4a.) كونها مركبة
منها لجواز وجود عينها مع عدم كل واحد منهما، بل يجب [أن تكون]² هذه الأشياء
أعراضاً فيها، وكذلك الكلام في كل واحدة منها.

5

ثم يقال لهم:

ما أنكرتم من قول من خالفكم بأن هذه الأشياء موجودة جواهر متماثلة وهذه أعراض
بغير هيئاتها وليست هذه مركبة منها، بدلالة زوال هذه الأشياء مع بقاء عينها وحصول ضدها
بدلاً منها. فإذا راموا بطلان ذلك لم يتأت لهم.

10

ثم يقال لهم:

خبرونا عن هذه الجواهر المفردة، عندكم جوهر الحرارة ضد لجوهر البرودة وكذلك
اليبوسة ضد للرطوبة، فكيف يصح تركيبها؟

¹ في MS.

² The sentence between () is repeated.

³ Illegible words, أن تكون is added by the editor.

فإذا يسألوا: ¹ برغم المستحيز عند أخذ الأيمان عليه، على حسب الترتيب المحصل في

إنما تَرَكَّبَتْ كلَّ واحدة منهما مع ما يمازجها. وذلك أن الأرض لما كانت

باردة يابسة فبرودتها مزجت برودة الماء، والماء مزجت رطوبته رطوبة الهواء.

وحرارة [ة] الهواء مزجت حرارة النار، و[النار] يبوستها مزجت يبوسة الأرض،

5 فصارت كالدائرة بامتزاج كل شكل مع الرطوبة.² أجمع كثيرة، خصوصاً (ن) قد تفسر

يقال لهم: "المحصل" في دائرة الماء هذا التركيب على هذا الحد وهو الذي أورد

ما أنكرتم من قائل يقول لكم: مع أنكم ناقضتم مسألتنا لكم، وذلك إننا سألناكم عن

تركيب هذه الجواهر بعضها مع بعض فأجبتم بأن "لا امتزاج بينها"، وذلك أن قولكم "أن

برودة الأرض مزجت برودة الماء"، كلام لا معنى له، إذ البرودة مزجت تلك البرودة،

10 وكذلك الكلام في الحرارة والرطوبة³ واليبوسة. ونحن إننا سألناكم عن تركيب هذه المتضادات

التي ادعيتم حصولها في الواحد منّا، وفي الثمار والحيوان. فكأنكم قلتم "لا امتزاج بينها"،

ومتى لم تمتزج، فلماذا صار الحيوان والنبات مركبةً منها؟ فأما مناقضتكم فهي⁴ أنكم

¹ sic. it is written تسألوا , which can be also read as تأولوا , تسألوا or تسألوا. It will make a better sense if it is read as قالوا .

² MS. رطوبة.

³ MS. البرودة.

⁴ MS. فلم.

⁵ MS. فهو.

استدللتم في رسومكم للمستجيب، عند أخذ الأيمان عليه، على عجب الترتيب الحاصل في العالم، [و] جميع المتضادات في شيء واحد. وإنها متى عُلّت إحداها¹ أدّى [ذلك] إلى الفساد، ومتى اعتدلت² عاد إلى الصلاح. والآن قد قلتُم "إنما امتزج كلّ شكّلٍ مع مُماثله"، ولم يمتزج المتضاد منها. فإنّ قال قائل: من أين [عرفتم] أنّ هذه مقالتهُم³ في امتزاج الطبائع الأربعة؟ قيل له: هذا مشهور عندهم، وقد ذكروه في كتبهم في مواضع كثيرة، خصوصاً [و] قد ذكر⁴ النسفي في "المحصل" في دائرة العالم هذا التركيب على هذا الحدّ. وهو الذي أورده في خطبة له "إنّ الله جمع بين المتضادات فقربها بقدرته"، فناقض من حيث لا يدري.

يقال لهم: هذه المسألة لا بد لهم فيها من التناقض على وجه لا يصح حتمياً في

خبرونا عما ادعيتُم من المفردات، [أ]وُجِدت بنفسها أم ظهرت (Fol. 4b.) من غيرها؟ فين جوابهم "إنها ظهرت من الأجرام". وقد اختلفت مقالة صاحب "المحصل" فيه،

فمرة قال "إنّ المفردات ظهرت من الأجرام"، وجعلها⁵ دائرة من أدوار النقطة على [ما]

¹ أحدها. MS.

² اعتدل. MS.

³ هذا مقالتهُم. MS.

⁴ ذكرها. MS.

⁵ وجعله. MS.

سنيّنه في الدائرة التي يُلقون بين العوالم فيها.¹ ومرة قال "إنّ الأجرام هي هذه المفردات وعناصرها"، قال في الدلالة على حدث العالم. فأما غيره ممن قد عمّل لهم في هذا الباب كتاباً فإنهم أطلقوا على أنّ الأجرام هي الموجبة المفردات. قاله الخيشفوجي السجزي في كتاب "البصائر" من كتاب "ينابيع الحكمة"،² وكذلك المرّوزي³ في كتاب "سلوة الأرواح" وكذلك أبو أيوب القيرواني⁴ في كتاب "حدث العالم". وإنّما ذكرنا هذه الكتب وأصحابها لأنّ 5 هذه المسألة عندهم تطوّرت⁵ جداً. حتى ترى الدعاة يتكلمون فيها ولا يدرون حقيقتها. وأردنا أن نبيّن قولهم لئلا يُتوهم إنّنا حكينا عنهم ما ليس بقول لهم.

واعلم أنّ هذه المسألة لا بد لهم فيها من المناقضة على وجوه⁶ لا يصحّ جمعها في الاعتقاد، وذلك أنّ هذه الكواكب حكمها حكم هذه المركبات الأربع، في أنّ زحلّ باردٌ يابسٌ

¹ This *dā'ira* "diagram" is not shown in the text, which appears that it is drawn by al-Bustī at the end of his book. Fortunately, such diagram can be found in many *Ismā'īlī* works as well as Abū Muḥammad's *Mukhtaṣar fī 'Aqā'id al-Thalāth wa al-Sab'īn Firqa*. See below, 621. Cf. Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-'Aql*, 245-6 & 248.

² MS. ينابيع.

³ *Kitāb al-Yanābī'*, or *Yanābī' al-Ḥikma* "The Wellsprings of Wisdom" was edited three times. It was first edited and translated in Frinch by H. Corbin and then for the second time by M. Ghālib, the third time was in 1994 by P. Walker with English translation. *Kitāb al-Yanābī'* is divided into forty "*yanbū'*" Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 85.

⁴ MS. المروردي.

⁵ Unknown *Ismā'īlī dā'ir*, who seems to have lived and died during the fourth/tenth century. Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 308-9. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 46.

⁶ MS. حططرت.

⁷ MS. وجه.

والمُشْتَرِي حَارٌّ رَطْبٌ والمَرِيخُ حَارٌّ يَابِسٌ وكذلك الشمس، وعُطَارِدٌ مُمْتَزَجٌ والزَّهْرَةُ بَارِدَةٌ رَطْبَةٌ وكذلك القمر. فإذا كانت هذه المفردات أظهرت^١ هذه المركبات العلوية، فما بالهم أوجبوا تركيبها ثانيًا في مركبات (السفلية)، ولم يثبتونها^٢ وسائط بين مركب السفلي والعلوي. بل كان من حَقِّهم أن يجعلوا^٣ العلوي منها أصول السفلية. ولا يجعلوا المفردات وسائط، بل يجب عليهم إذا كانت هي مركبة في نفسها من هذه المفردات، أن يكون السفلي مثلها في الصورة [و]مثلها في الهيئات^٤ والأماكن. وما كان يجب اختلافها على وجه من الوجوه، بل يجب أن تكون العلويات كلها سفلية. لأن الذي أوجب كون هذه الأشياء سفلية هو كونها مركبة، فيجب في الكواكب مثل هذا الحكم.

فإن قال قائلٌ منهم:

هذا واجب فيه إلا أنه بقهر قاهر حصل كذلك، ولولا قهره لها لكان الكل

إنما يكون على حالةٍ واحدةٍ ولما كانت تختلف أشكالها.

يقال لهم هذا السؤال [الذي] يهدم جميع ما أملاه، وذلك:

¹ MS. ظهرت.

² MS. سويها; it can also be read as: يثبتونها.

³ The sentence between () is repeated.

⁴ MS. الصورة مثلها والهيئات.

إنّ هذا إذا جاز أن يكون كذلك بقهرٍ قاهرٍ وإرادةٍ مريدة، فلمَ لا يجوز أن يعتقدوا

الحق، بأنّ يقولوا إنّ هذه الصُّور والأشخاص والهيئات إنّما اختلفت (Fol. 5a.) لاختيار

مختارٍ لها، اختار أن تكون كذلك. وما بالكم اشتغلتم بطلب علّيتها (وهـ...¹)، وإنّ لكل

شيءٍ منها علّةٌ أوجبت كونه كذلك. فمتى صحّ ذلك بطل ما اعتذر به في سؤاله، من اختلاف

5 حال هذه المركبات السفلية (والعلوية). على أنه لو تعلّق ذلك باختار مختار وقهر قاهر، كان

يجوز أن لا يقهره ولا يختاره. بل كان في زمان لا يمتنع أن يختار كون هذه الأشياء² أن

تصير على ما هي عليه علويًا، والعلويُّ سفليًا، وهذا عندهم فاسدٌ لا يجوز.

على أن من مقالتهم "إنّ هذه الأشياء الكثيفة من طبعها النزول والهويّ، ولهذا لزمّت

المركز، وأحاط بها جميع ما هو أطف منها". وليس فيما يجب لزومه سفلي إلا في زُحل، وهو

10 أعلى³ الكواكب عندهم. فكيف أوجبت البرودة والرطوبة لزوم الأرض سفلي، وأوجب لزوم

زحل⁴ فوق هذه الكواكب السبعة، وليس [فيه] إلاّ اليبوسة والبرودة؟ فهذا هو قول من قال إنّ

هذه الأجرام مركبة من هذه المفردات الأربعة. فأما من قال بأنّ هذه الأجرام غير المفردات في

¹ Illegible words.

² The sentence between () is repeated.

³ MS. علي.

⁴ MS. الرحل.

قوله، قد بينا أنه ناقص. لأنه¹ قال في موضع إنها غير المركبات، وقال مستدلاً على حدوثها بتركيبها. وقد ذكّر في باب تركيب الأفلاك:

إنّا إنّما وصفنا هذه الأجرام بالحرارة والبرودة والرطوبة واليبوسة لأنّ تأثيرها

هي هذه الأشياء، لا إنّها في نفسها مركبة منها على طريق التفصيل.

5 هذه تدل من حاله على قلة تحصيله، وقلة مبالته بما يطلقه في كتابه. وليس العجب من

مناقضاته أو اعتراف أصحابه له بالفضيلة والرتبة. ولكن العجب من اعتقاده أنّ مولاه، أعني

صاحب المغرب،² لا يجوز عليه السهو [والغلط، بل يعرف [ما في] ضمائر دعائه ويؤيدهم

بتأييد الإلهية، بحيث هم وإن كانوا غائبين³ عنه أشخاصاً. [ف]كيف لم يؤيده في هذه

المسألة؟ بل كيف لم يُبين له مناقضته حين بعث كتابه إليه؟ فهذا يدلّ من حالهم إنّهم

10 ممخرون محتالون، يتكلمون بما يخطر ببالهم من الوسواس. وإنّما اختصرت الكلام في هذه

الفصول لأنّ شيوخنا -رحمهم الله- قد تكلموا على أصحاب الطبائع بما يغني عن التطويل

فيه. ولأنّ الكلام في هذا يتكرر في مسائل لهم من بعد [و]نحتاج إلى بيانها فيتصل الكلام فيها

[و]بهذه الأصول التي لهم.

¹ لانها. MS.

² i.e., the first Fatimid Caliph.

³ على. MS.

فصل

واعلم أنهم ذكروا في كتبهم أن النفس، وهي الثاني، لما ظهرت من العقل تحركت في نفسها، فمن تحركها تحركت (Fol. 5b.)¹ الأجرام والكواكب، واتصلت بالعالم الطبيعي² طلباً للعلم، تبذعه على ما سنذكره عند بيان الأدوار. إلا أنه يجب أن نتكلم فيما يهذون به فيها. فيقال لهم :

5

أليس العلم بوجودها يجب أن يكون متقدماً على العلم، بكونها موجبة للأجرام ولسائر

صفاتها؟

فإن قالوا "نعم"، يقال لهم :

ما الدليل على [أن] وجودها (متقدماً على الأجرام)³ ولم ادعيتموها؟ أبديلي عرفتم

10

كونها أم لا؟

فإن قالوا "عرفناه بدليل"، قيل لهم : فهل الدلالة عليها.

واعلم أنهم قد هذؤا في الدلالة على وجودها بما لا يجدي الكلام فيه، والذي اعتمدوا

¹ The word is repeated.

² MS. بعالم الطبيعي , it may be also read as عالم الطبيعة, henceforewords the word عالم will be defined with (ال) when it will be necessary.

³ MS. يجب ان يكون متقدما على العلم بكونها موجبة للأجرام.

عليه في هذا الباب، وجوه من الشُّبه وآيات من القرآن. قال النُّسفي في "المحصل":

إنَّا قد علمنا أشياء هي مُصوِّرة في نفوسنا مما قد شاهدناه بعد غيبتنا

عنها، بل تصوِّر في أنفسنا ما لم نذكره. فعلمنا أنَّ هذا ليس هو علم متعلِّق

بالمحسوسات لا يتميز عند غيبتها، وإنما يُعلم إذا كانت حاضرةً مشاهدَةً. فعلمنا

5 أنَّ الذي يُصوِّر هذه العلوم غير الحواس، فإنَّ هذه الحواس أبوابٌ له توصله إلى

العلم. بيِّن ذلك أنَّ الإنسان وهو في نومه، لا يدرك بشيء من حواسه، ويعلم

أشياء ويصوِّرها في حال نومه. بل يخاطب من غاب عنه ويستخبره في حال

غيبته عن أهله فيرجع إليهم، والحواس ساكنة.^٢ فلولا أنَّ الذي غاب وتكلَّم

وعلم في حال النُّوم غير الجسد، لكان لا يحصل هذا التمييز. فلما حصل هذا

10 علمت أنَّ النَّفس غير هذا الظاهر الكثيف. وإذا ثبت كونه غيرًا لهذه الطبيعات

الجزئية، لما علمناها علمنا أنَّ لها أصولاً إستدللاً بالشاهد على الغائب.

واعلم أنَّ هذا الكلام فساده لا يخفى على أحدٍ من العقلاء، وذلك أنَّ قوله "علمنا أشياء

عند غيبتنا عنها"، فإنَّ هذا لا يوجب أنَّ يكون العالم غيرنا. لأنَّ هذا يجب أن ننظر فيه أن

¹ MS. الشُّبه، it can also be read as الشُّبه or الشُّبه.

² MS. . It seems that the copyist repeats some words from the upper line.

العالم مَنْ هو. فإنَّ صحَّ له أنَّ هذا العالم غير هذا الشخص، تمَّ له بعد ذلك ما يريده.

واختلاف العالمين لا يوجب أن يكون العالم بأحدهما غير العالم بالآخر، ولا اختلاف أحوال

العالم توجب ذلك. فإنَّ كان العالم هو غيرنا وهو فينا، يجب أن لا تختلف أحوال المعلوم،

ويجب أن لا تتعلَّق بالإدراك. لأنَّ هذه الحواس ليست بعالمة. فلمَّا لم تكن هي عالمة، فيجب

5 أن لا تعتبر صحتها أو فسادها. لأنَّ حال العالم لا تتغير، بل العالم عندهم بهذه الأمور عالم

لذاته. فكيف يعلم في بعض الأوقات ويجهل^١ في بعضها؟! فلمَّا اختلفت أحواله علم أن

الإنسان هو العالم. وإنَّما اختلفت الأحوال بحصول العلم فيه لقدمه، فخرج^٢ من أن يكون

عالمًا. مع أنَّ الذي قد ذكر من أنَّ العلم بالمحسوسات إنَّما يحصل عند مشاهدتها، فإنَّه

مناقضة منه. وذلك أنَّ العالم إنَّ كان هو النَّفس، (Fol. 6a.) والنَّفْس لا يجوز خروجها عن

10 كونها عالمة. فكيف يصحَّ إطلاق بأنَّ المحسوسات إنَّما يحصل العلم بها عند مشاهدتها؟

وأما قوله "في النوم وما يرى النَّائم"، فإنَّه يدل على الحماقَّة. وذلك أنَّ التي^٣ يراها

النَّائم في نومه، هي أمور أكثرها لا أصل له، ولا يميِّز بين ما هو صحيح وما هو سقيم. فكيف

يمكن أن يدَّعي فيه أنه علم، فضلاً من أن يدَّعي فيه أنه أقوى العلوم على ما ذكره. ولا

¹ MS. جهل.

² MS. جُرح، it can also be read as: جُرح.

³ MS. الذي.

فصل¹ بين من يجعل هذا دليلاً على بطلان قوله، إذا قال "إنني قد علمت إن الإنسان في حال نومه يتبين أمور أهاليه وأشياء عظيمة نحو أن يرى نفسه مقتولاً، وبين كونه على أحوال لا يجوز أن يكون عليها وهو حي". فعلمت أنه لا أصل له، وإنما هي خواطر² فاسدة وشك³ إذا ادعيت أنه يعلم ويخاطب في حال نومه مستدلاً على النفس، فلما لم يكن بين قولك وبين ما هو فاسد عندكم فصل، فيجب بطلان ما ذهب إلىه. فإن قيل:

فلم⁴ اختلفت⁵ أحوال العلوم؟ ولم يرى النائم في حال نومه أمارات؟ وما الذي

يراه النائم عندكم؟ إذا كان عرف هذا، لا يصح إلي أن يفتينا إدراكه عالمه.⁶

قيل له:

أما العلم بالمدرجات عند مشاهدتها [ف] لا تختلف حالها، سواء أدركها المدرك أو لم

يدركها،⁷ إلا في القوة والضعف. ومعنى قولنا القوة هو أنه: لا يجوز أن يسهو عنه إذا لم

يكن مدركاً له مع كمال عقله. والذي يختلف إنما هو صفة المدرك، وعلوياً آخر تقترن بكونه

مدركاً عندنا⁸. [و] الإدراك يحصل على طريق التفصيل متعلقاً بأحوال المدرك، فلهذا اختلفت⁹

¹ sic. It can also be read as: فضل.

² MS. وانه إنما هو خواطر.

³ MS. اختلف.

⁴ sic. It is probably read: عرف هذا لا يصح إلى أن يفتينا إدراكه عالمه.

⁵ MS. . سوا ادركه المدرك أو لم يدركه.

⁶ MS. عند.

⁷ MS. اختلف.

أحواله عند إدراكه وعدم إدراكه. وأمّا الكلام في المنامات فإنّ شيوخنا -رحمهم الله- قسّموه إلى¹ أقسام: فمنها ما هو كلام الشياطين ووسواسهم؛ يخاطبون النَّائم ويؤذونه، فيسمع ذلك ويظنّ أنه يشاهده، لنقصان عقله في حال نومه. ومنها ما يجوز فيه أن يكون كلاماً لبعض الملائكة، ويكون ذلك أمانة أن يصيبه نفع أو ضرر. ومنها ما يجوز أن يكون اعتقادات يعتقدها في حال انتباهه، فيراها² في حال نومه. ومنها ما يكون لفساد مزاجه ولعللٍ تحصل. فتنقسم⁵ الرؤيا هذه الأقسام، وهذه الوجوه لا فرَجَ للقوم فيها. فأما إذا صحّ هاهنا جزء³ عالم فيجب أن يكون له كلُّ⁴، قياساً على الطبيعيات. فإنّا قد بيّنا فساد القول بأنّ هاهنا جواهر هي أصول الطبيعية،⁵ ومتى بطلَ فكيف يمكن ردّ غيره إليه.

على أنه يقال لهم:

ولم يجب إذا كان هذه المدركات أصولاً للحيوان أن يكون (Fol. 6b.) لكلّ شيء⁶ أصل،⁷ ولكلّ جزء كلٌّ؟⁸ فإنّ قال "لأنّي علمت في هذا أنه لما كان له جزئي"⁹ كان له كلي،⁹ فيجب أن يكون لكلّ جزء كلٌّ". يقال له:

¹ MS. على .

² MS. فيراه .

³ MS. حر .

⁴ MS. كلا .

⁵ sic. It may also be read as: الطبيعة .

⁶ MS. اصلا .

⁷ MS. كلا .

⁸ MS. جزيا .

⁹ MS. كلياً .

ما أنكرتُ على قولك أن يكون هاهنا عالم للسواد، لأننا وجدنا أن له جزءًا فيجب أن

يكون لذلك الجزء كلُّ. وكذلك سائر الألوان والطعوم والأرائح وجميع الأغراض، يجب أن

يكون لكل واحد منها عالم كلي. فلما لم يجب ذلك، لم يجب ما ذكرته شُبْهَةً لَهُمْ، وهو

دليل آخر بزعمهم. وقد استدلَّ أبو محمد المرادي النيسابوري - وكان أحد دعواتهم، كبيراً

5 منهم، وكان كالجنح لمسعود، الذي هو ابن النسفي - في جزء¹ قد صنّفه في الأوّل والثاني

وأحكامهما. بأن قال:

قد علمنا أن كل شيء لا قرار إلا على عالمه، وإنه إذا كان في غير عالمه يطلب

عالمه. ولذلك إذا رمينا الحجر يعود إلى عالمه وهو الأرض.² وكذلك الماء لا يبقى

في جوف الأرض بل ينبعث ويظهر. وكذلك إذا صار حاراً وصعد إلى الهواء،³

10 فإنه يتراجع مطراً عوداً إلى عالمه ومركزه. وكذلك إذا أوقدنا النار فإنها لا تلبث

إلا وتصعد، ولا تبقى طلباً لفائدتها وعالمها. وكذلك الواحد منّا إذا فتح عينه فإنه

يُدرِك الكواكب المضيئة، لما كان جوهره من جنسها فاتصل بها. وقد علمنا أنّا

¹ حرر. MS.

² بل ينبعث ويظهر. MS.

³ الهوي. MS.

قد أحطنا علماً بالأفلاك، وجاوزتها علومنا، ولا يقف [علمنا] مقصوراً عليها.

فعلّمنا أنه إنّما كان كذلك طلباً لعالمه، وهو عالم النفس.

وهذا أيضاً جهلٌ عظيم، وذلك إنّ ما ذكروه، من أنّ كلّ شيءٍ يعود إلى عالمه ولا

يستقرّ إلاّ فيه، كلام لا تحصيل فيه [أو] له. وذلك أنا لا نسلم شيئاً من ذلك، بل نقول:

5 إنّ الذي أوجب رجوع الحجر إلى الأرض هو معنى فيه، وهو الثقل والاعتماد، [و]لولا

اختصاصه^٢ بهذا الغرض لما رجع قط. وأمّا ما ادّعى من الماء، فلأنّ فيه اعتماداً في جميع

الجهات. فمتى وُجد النفوذ في جهة منها، ذهب في تلك الجهة، سواء كان ذلك علوّاً أو

سفلًا أو يمينًا أو يسرةً. وأمّا النار فإنّها إنّما صعدت لأنّ فيها اعتماداً^٤ أصعد أو أوجب

صعودها. والعين فيها شعاع ينفصل منها فيتصل بما يقابله. فمتى كان حكم هذه الأشياء على

10 ما وصفنا، فقولبه "إنّ هذه الأحكام واجبة لأمر يرجع إلى جواهرها" لا يكون إلاّ مجرد

دعوى.^٥ والدعوى إذا تجرّدت عن الدلالة تقابل بمثلها.

¹ حاورها. MS.

² انما. MS.

³ "لولا اختصاصه" is repeated.

⁴ اعتماد. MS.

⁵ الدعوى. MS.

⁶ انما. MS.

ثُمَّ يُقَالُ لَهُ فِي قَوْلِهِ "لَمَّا جَاوَزْتَ" ١ عِلْمُنَا بِالْأَفْلَاقِ، عَلِمْنَا إِنَّهُ إِنَّمَا كَانَ كَذَلِكَ طَلِبًا

لِعَالِمِهِ"، بِمِ ادْعِيَتِ ذَلِكَ فِيهِ، وَفِي سَائِرِ مَا رَدَدَتْ إِلَيْهِ، إِنَّ رَجُوعَهُ إِنَّمَا كَانَ لِمَا ذَكَرْتَهُ؟ فَإِنَّ

رَامَ أَنْ يَدَلَّ عَلَيْهِ لَا يَتَأْتِي لَهُ ذَلِكَ. ثُمَّ يُقَالُ لَهُ: ٢ هَذَا يُوجِبُ عَلَيْكَ أَنْ تَقُولَ إِنَّ عَالِمَ النَّفْسِ

فَوْقَ عَالِمِ الْعَقْلِ. بَلْ يُجِبُ أَنْ يَكُونَ مَحِيطًا بِالْأَمْرِ، لِأَنَّ الْعِلْمَ يَتَجَاوَزُ النَّفْسَ وَالْعَقْلَ (Fol.)

5 (7a.) عِنْدَكَ. لِأَنَّكَ تَذَكَّرَ ظُهُورَ النَّفْسِ مِنَ الْعَقْلِ، وَإِنَّ الْعَقْلَ ظَهَرَ مِنَ الْأَمْرِ، وَكَيْفَ أَنَّ النُّطْقَاءَ

وَالْأُتْمَةَ وَالْأَسْسَ يُقْتَبَسُونَ الْعِلْمَ مِنْهَا. ٣ إِذْ لَوْ كَانَتْ إِحَاطَةُ عَلِمْنَا بِالْأَفْلَاقِ -عَلَى زَعْمِكَ-

تُوجِبُ أَنْ يَكُونَ طَلِبًا لِعَالِمِهِ، فَيُجِبُ أَنْ يَكُونَ تَجَاوَزَهُ عَنِ النَّفْسِ وَالْعَقْلِ عِنْدَكَ أَنْ يُوجِبَ

ذَلِكَ. فَلَمَّا لَمْ يَصِحَّ ذَلِكَ عِنْدَكَ، فَيُجِبُ أَنْ لَا يَكُونَ مَا ذَكَرْتَهُ مَحِيطًا بِهِ دَلِيلٌ آخَرَ. وَقَدْ

اسْتَدَلَّ صَاحِبُ سَجِسْتَانَ الْمَلْقَبِ بِالْخِيْشْفُوجِ ٤ فِي كِتَابِ قَرِيبًا مِمَّا يَسْتَدِلُّ بِهِ الْقَدَمَاءُ مِنَ

10 الفلاسفة، وهو أنه قال:

الحركات على وجهين: حركة غير بينة وحركة من داخل. فالحركة غير

¹ MS. جاوز.

² MS. لهم.

³ MS. وان النطقا والايمة والاسس كيف يقسسون العلوم منها.

⁴ MS. كان.

⁵ MS. محيط.

⁶ MS. فحركة العبر سه.

البينة^١ هي التي من خارج، وهي على سثة أوجه: فوق وتحت ويمنة ويسرة
وقدام وخلف. والتي من داخل فعلى ضربين: طبيعي واختياري. فالطبيعي على
وجهين: فوق وتحت. وحركة الحيوان ليست بطبيعية، فيجب إذاً أن تكون
اختياراً. لأن ما به وقع ذلك خارج من الطبيعة. فالنفس إذاً خارج من الطبيعة.

- 5 وهذا أيضاً فاسد، لأن قوله "الحركات على وجهين"، كلام لا معنى [له]. لأن
حقيقتها هي أن يصير بها الجسم في جهة بعد كونه^٢ في غيرها بلا فصل. وإذا كانت هذه
حقيقتها فلا تختلف أحكامها،^٣ وإنما تختلف أحكام محلها. فمنه ما تحصل فيه^٤ الحركة
موجبة عن الاعتماد، ومنه^٥ ما تحصل فيه يكون ذلك المحل من جملة القادر عليها. وهذه
الأحكام ترجع إلى محلها لا إليها، فلا يمكن أن يُستدلّ بها على حكم من حلت فيه. على
10 أنه إن أراد أن يبين أن هاهنا حركة تقع باختيارنا، فما كان يجب أن يُطوّل ويُهَوّل بقوله
غير بيّنة وطبيعية واختيارية. بل كان له أن يقول: قد علمت وقوع هذه الحركة خلاف
وقوعها^٦ على طريقة الوجوب. فيجب كون ما وقع منه مختاراً. وهذا وإن صح فإنه لا يدلُّ

^١ فحركة العبر سه. MS.

^٢ بعد كونها في كونها. MS.

^٣ وإذا كان هذه حقيقتها هذا لا يختلف أحكامها. MS.

^٤ فيها. MS.

^٥ منها. MS.

^٦ وقوعه. MS.

على شيءٍ ممَّا قصد إليه. لأنَّه إنَّما وقعت تلك منَّا على هذا الوجه، لكوننا قادرين عليها. ولا يجب من حيث إنَّا كنَّا قادرين، أن تكون فينا [و]معنا، ولها¹ كلُّ خارج العالم محيطٌ بها.² ولو أردنا أن نستقصي عليهم جميع ما يوردون من مذاهبهم، لخرج هذا المجموع من الغرض. فلهذا نقتصر على نُكَّته في باب الاعتراض عليهم. وأمَّا تعلقهم بالقرآنِ فسنذكره من بعد إن شاء الله.

5

فصل.

اعلم أن عندهم إنَّ النَّفسَ إنَّما ظهرت من العقل، وهي عالمةٌ قادرةٌ حيَّةٌ لنفسها. وكذلك العقل، وإنَّ العقل فوق النَّفس. ولهم فيه كلامٌ طويلٌ نوردته فيما بعد إن شاء [الله]. والآن فإنَّه يقال لهم:

10

خبرونا عن النَّفس، أكان وجودها مع العقل أم قبل العقل أم بعده؟ وأيُّها يقولون طولبوا بالدلالة [عليه]. ولا دليل لهم في ذلك على حسب ما قلنا في أنَّ النَّفس أوجبت الكواكب. ولا فرق بينهم وبين مَنْ يعكس عليهم ترتيب الخلق، بأن يقول: أول ما خلق الله إنَّما هو (Fol. 7b.) الإنسان ثمَّ الحيوان ثمَّ النَّامي ثمَّ الجماد ثمَّ الطباع ثمَّ النَّفس ثمَّ العقل

¹ له. MS.

² به. MS.

ثم انتهى إليه. وبينهم إذ جعلوا العقل أول الخلق. ومع ذلك يمكن أن يعارضه به في باب الترتيب، بأن يجعلوا ما قدموه مؤخرًا وما أخروه مقدمًا. وما ذكروه واسطة يمكن أن يجعل هو الأول والأول واسطة. ولا يمكن الانفصال عن شيء من ذلك.

ثم يقال لهم:

5 خبرونا عن العقل، أهو كائنٌ بعد أن لم يكن، أم ليس لوجوده أول؟

فإن قالوا "كائنٌ بعد أن لم يكن"، يقال لهم:

أينفسه حدث أم كانت له علة أم جاعلٌ جعله؟

فإن قالوا "مُبدعٌ أبدعه"، يقال لهم:

أأبدعه³ بواسطة أم بغير واسطة؟

10 فإن قالوا "بواسطة الأمر"، يقال لهم:

ذلك الأمر قديمٌ أم محدثٌ؟ وهل [لوجوده أول (أو لا) أول لوجوده؟

فإن قالوا "لا أول لوجوده"، لزمهم قدم العالم، لوجوب العقل عنه، ولوجوب النفس عن

¹ MS. اذا.

² MS. يجعلوا.

³ MS. ابدعه.

⁴ Repeated next.

العقل، والأجرام عنها والمفردات عنها والمركبات عنها، على ما رتبناه لهم. وإن قالوا
"لوجوده أول"، يقال لهم:

أمبدع¹ أبدعه أم علة أوجبت أم كائن بنفسه؟

فإن قالوا "علة أوجبت"، لزمهم قَدَم العالم. لأن تلك العلة لا بُدَّ لهم من قدمها، والقول

5 بقدمها يوجب قَدَم الموجب عنها. وهذا يؤدي إلى القول بِقَدَم العالم. وإن قالوا "مبدعاً أبدعه"²

بلا واسطة"، لزمهم القول بوسائط لا نهاية لها. فحصل من هذه الجملة إثماً طعنوا به على

أهل الإسلام، في أن مذاهبهم غير معقولة. إذ قالوا "أن الله تعالى خلق الأشياء لا من شيء،

وأنه أنشأها ابتداءً، [وأنه لا بعقل]³". [وهذا] لازماً لهم من حيث لا حيلة لهم فيه على

حسب ما بيناه.

10 واعلم أن غرض⁴ القوم في القول بأمر⁵ الواسطة بين العقل والباريء أن يبينوا قَدَم العالم.

وقد صرحوا بذلك في مواضع كثيرة، منها ما حكيناه عن النسفي؛ "أن الأمر أثر من آثار

الباريء على التقريب كالضوء من ذي الضوء"⁶. وذلك أنه جعل الأمر تأثيراً من الباريء -

¹ MS. امبدعا.

² MS. ابدعها.

³ sic.

⁴ MS. الغرض.

⁵ MS. بالامر.

⁶ Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 32-33.

تعالى الله عن ذلك - لا على طريق الفعلية، لأنّ الضوء لا ينفصل عن الأجسام المضيئة على

طريقة الفعلية، بل كالموجب عنها. فيلزم أن يكون الأثر مع المؤثر قديمًا فيما لم يزل. وهذا

هو تصريح بقدم العالم. بل يلزمه أن يكون جسمًا حتى يصح انفصال الآثار عنها، لأنّ الأثر

لا يكون إلا جزءًا¹ منه. ويلزمه أن يكون مركبًا طبيعيًا. ويلزمه إثبات عقول كثيرة و أنفس

5 (Fol. 8 a.) لإيثار الآثار. لأنّ أثرًا واحدًا إذا وجب، فيجب أن تكون كلها. وإلا لماذا² صار

ذلك الواحد موجبًا؟³ وقد ذكر السجزي في مواضع ما يدل على قدم العالم عنده. منها أنه

ذكر في كتاب "كشف المحجوب"⁴:

"أنّ العقل والسرور والغم والغبطة كلها معًا حصلت".

وعنده أنّ العقل أول الأشياء، وليس قبله⁵ الأول معلوم. فصار حصول هذه الأشياء

10 كحصول العقل. وهذه الأشياء لا تكون إلا في المركبات عندهم. فمتى جعل حصول المركبات

مع العقل، صار كأنّ لا ترتيب. لأنّ الذي أوجب القول بحدوث هذه الأشياء عنده كونها بعد

¹ حرا. MS.

² MS. ل.

³ The following passage, which is written in *italic*, is edited by Stern, *Studies*, (f.n.) 11, 307.

⁴ *Kitāb Kashf al-Mahjūb* ed. and trans. by H. Corbin, Institute Franco-Iranien -Tehran and Paris-, 1949 and translated as *Le Dévoilement des choses cachées*, 1988. Cf. Paul E. Walker, *Early philosophical Shiism*, 190. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 88.

⁵ It is read قبل , by Stern, cf. *Studies*, 307, f.n. 11.

العقل، وكون العقل سابقاً لها. وقد صرَّح بفساد هذا. فيجب أن لا يكون عنده دليل يدلّ على حدث العقل، ولا على حدث هذه الأشياء. وقد ذكر في هذا الكتاب في موضع آخر، أنّ الذي يعرف الواحد منّا إنّما هو الأوّل والثاني. وأنّه لا علم لنا بما هو قبل العقل على أي وجه أوجب العقل، لأننا لا يمكننا أن نتجاوز¹ عن عالمنا، فلا ندرك أنفسنا إلاّ به² وهو العقل.

5 فهذا هو القول بقدم العالم، أو بجواز قدمه. مع أنّه تبحّر³ في مذهبه [و]ليس يدري أصول ما بنى⁴ عليه. وقد استدلّ أبو أيوب القيرواني⁵ على حدث العالم باثنتي عشرة دلالة، كلّها تدلّ على قدم النفس والعقل. منها: "أنّ المفردات قبل المركّبات، فالمركّبات مسبوقة، والمسبوقة محدث، والعالم مركّب، فالعالم إذاً محدث". فهذا هو القول بقدم العالم. إلاّ أنّ الدعاة والمأذونين إنّما يرتّبون المذهب على أنّ القول بحدوث ما سوى الباري واجب. والذي ذكرناه لا يعرفه إلاّ من قد تباهى⁶ منهم في اللغو والزندقة. على أنّ الله تعالى هتك أستارهم، فأوقع
10 كتبهم بأيدي الناس فوقفوا على حيلهم و مخرقتهم.

¹ MS. نجاوز, read by Stern as تجاوز .

² MS. بها . Cf. Stern, *Studies*, f.n. 11, 307, where the sentence is read as: ولا تدرك نفسنا الا بها .

³ MS. مبحر. It is read مبحر by Stern, *ibid*.

⁴ MS. بنا , cf. *ibid*.

⁵ MS. القرواني .

⁶ MS. باثني عشر .

⁷ It can also be read تناهى .

ومن ذلك قولهم: إن كان الله عزَّ وجل فيما لم يزل، ولم يكن العالم، ثمَّ خلق العالم

ولم يتغيَّر عمَّا كان عليه في ذاته، فلم صار العالم موجودًا ولم يكن من قبل، وحال القديم

على¹ ما كان عليه من قبل؟ فإنَّ أثبتَّ تغييرًا في ذات القديم أوجبتم حدوث ذاته.

5 والجواب عن ذلك، هو أنَّ هذا السؤال لا يخلو إمَّا أن نسأل بأن يقال: لم يجعل²

العالم موجودًا بعد أن لم يكن، ولم تغيَّرت الصِّفة على العالم؟ فإنَّ كان هذا هو المراد، فإنَّه

إذا تغيَّرت الصِّفة على العالم لاختيار مختارٍ ولأنَّ موجودًا أوجدته. فلتعلقه بالفاعل جعل

موجودًا [أ] وان إرادته.³ ثمَّ صار القديم فاعلاً بعد [أن] لم يكن. فإنَّه يحتمل أمرين: أحدهما

بأنَّ يقول أتبيَّن الذي صحَّح كونه فاعلاً. والجواب هو: أنَّ كونه قادرًا صحَّح كونه فاعلاً،

10 ويحتمل أن يُراد "لم حصل بصفة الفاعلين"؟ فإنَّ كان هذا هو المراد، فإنَّه لا صفة للفاعل

بكونه فاعلاً. ومتى (Fol. 8 b.)⁴ لم يكن هناك صفة لا يصحَّح أن يُعلَّل فيقال "لم كان كذلك".

لأنَّ هذا يُوهِم أنَّ هناك صفة تُطلَب علَّتْها. وإنَّ أراد [من] سؤاله أنه لأيِّ غرضٍ فعل هذا.

فإنَّه إنَّما فعله تعالى لنفع غيره ولحسنه. فحصل الجواب على أيِّ وجهٍ أراد السائل إيراد

¹ MS. علي.

² MS. يحصل.

³ MS. حصل موجوداوان ارادته.

⁴ (متى) is repeated.

سؤاله. واعلم أنّ هذا السؤال لازم لهم، ولا يمكنهم أن يجيبوا بمثل ما أجبنا به. وغرضهم

بهذا السؤال هو أن يحيروا الناس ويشككوهم في اعتقادهم.

وإنما يلزمهم هذا لأننا نقول لهم:

خبرونا عن العقل كيف ظهر من الأمر؟ [أ]تغير الأمر في ذاته أم لم يتغير؟ فإن تغير

5 فيجب أن يكون محدثاً، ويجب أن يكون؛ إذا كان محدثاً، أن يكون هو الأول لا العقل.

وإن لم يتغير، فلم حصل العقل منه بعد أن لم يكن؟

فإن قالوا بحصولهما معاً، وليس ذلك قولهم، يقال لهم:

فكيف حصل الأمر من الباريء بعد أن لم يكن؟ [أ]تغير الباريء في ذاته أم لم يتغير؟

فإن تغير [ف]يجب أن يكون محدثاً. وإن لم يتغير، فلم حصل الأمر منه بعد أن لم يكن

10 حاصلًا؟ فإن راموا أن يقولوا مثل ما قلنا لم يمكنهم. لأن هذه الأحكام كلها تلزمهم أن

يعقلوها بجاعل جعل هذه الأشياء عليها، فيفسد عليهم ترتيب الخلق.

مسألة.

ومن ذلك قولهم: أن الفاعل عندكم لا يفعل إذا كان عالماً بالفعل، وهو غير

مضطر إلا لجر منفعة حاصله، أو ينتظر ذلك لدفع مضرّة في الحال وفي العاقبة.

15 والتقديم لا يصح عليه ذلك. فلم فعل العالم بما فيه؟ وما الغرض بفعله؟

والجواب عنه ، أنَّ الفاعل إذا لم يكن ساهياً ولا عابثاً ، فإنَّه يفعل الفعل لجرِّ المنفعة

أو لدفع المضرَّة أو لحُسْنِه ، ولما للغير فيه من المنفعة . وقد بيَّن شيوخنا -رحمهم الله- هذا في

غير موضع عند الكلام عن المجبِّرة ، بأن قالوا :

قد يُرشِد الواحد منَّا الضالَّ عن الطريق وإن لم يخطر بباله ، هل له فيه نفع

5 أم لا؟ وكذلك يفعل الواحد منَّا البرِّك والمصانع ، وإن لم يكن نفعه بعائد عليه ،

بل ربما لا يراه أصلاً .

وإذا صحَّ ذلك فالقديم تعالى إنما خلَق الخلق لما لهم فيه من النفع ، وهذا لازم لهم لا محالة .

لأنَّه يقال لهم :

هل يجوز أن يفعل الفاعل [الفعل] لا لجرِّ منفعَةٍ أو دفعِ مضرَّةٍ؟

10 فإن قالوا "نعم" ، بطلَ سؤالهم . وإن قالوا "لا" ، يقال لهم :

لم أبدع الباريء الأمر والعقل وهذه الأشياء؟ [أ] لجرِّ منفعَةٍ أو لدفعِ مضرَّةٍ؟

ولا يمكنهم [أن] يثبتوا أحد هذين فيه . والذي أجبنا به عن السؤال ، لا يمكنهم أن يقولوا

[به] هاهنا ، لأنَّ القديم عندهم لا صنَع له في العالم . لأنَّ العقل غير مختار ، والعالم إنما وُجد

من النَّفس ، فعلى جميع الأحوال لا يخرج من أن يكون عابثاً في فعله . فإن قالوا "نقول"²

¹ يقال ها لهم . MS.

² It may also be read as: بقول or بقول .

البارىء إنما أبداع العقل ليحصل من جهته هذه (Fol. 9a.) الأشياء التي صحَّ الانتفاع بها. لأنه يُخرج البارىء من أن يكون عابثاً في ابتداعه¹ العقل. لأنَّ العقل في نفسه لا يصحُّ الانتفاع منه² عندهم، وإن صحَّ الانتفاع فيما حصل من جهته". فإن تمَّ لهم هذا الكلام فإنما يتم في العقل، ونحن الزمناهم في البارىء حين أبداع العقل. فإن قالوا "نحن نصِّف هذه الأشياء إلى البارىء لأنها ظهرت³ من إبداعه". فإنَّ ذلك ليس بمقالة لهم. لأنهم لا يصفون شيئاً من المركبات إلى البارىء، بل لا يُجوزون إجراء العبارة عليه فضلاً من أن يوصف. بل طعنوا في كتبهم على أهل الحق. بل قالوا "أضفتم هذه الأشياء الناقصة، مثل خَلْقِ الزَّمَنِ والصورة القبيحة وما فيها من النجاسات؛ نحو الدم وما يجري مجراه، إلى البارىء مع عِظَم شأنه". ولا يمكنهم إذا كان هذا قولهم أن يُضفوا هذه الأشياء، مثل خَلْقِ الإنسان والحيوان، إلى البارىء. فصحَّ أنه لا يمكنهم أن يُجيبوا بمثل ما أجبنا به، فراموا أن يُفسدوا اعتقاد أهل الحق، فأفسدوا على أنفسهم اعتقادهم أن تأملوا.

مسألة.

ومن ذلك قولهم:

¹ sic. probably ابداعه .

² MS. عليه .

³ MS. لانه ظهر .

إن كان الله تعالى حكيمًا عالمًا لا يفعل إلا^١ الحكمة والصواب، فلم يَخَلِّقْ من

عَلِمَ أَنَّهُ لا يَنْفَعُ ذَاتَهُ، [ف]فِي خَلْقِهِ لَهُ فَسَادٌ لَهُ وَجَوْرٌ، فَأَيْنَ^٢ الْحِكْمَةُ فِي ذَلِكَ؟

والجواب هو أن الله تعالى خلقهم لينفعهم، فَحَصَلَ^٣ حَكِيمًا فِي فِعْلِهِ، مَصِيبًا فِي تَدْبِيرِهِ.

ثُمَّ إِنَّهُمْ أَثْبَتُوا خَسَارَهُمْ^٤ [و]لم يَنْتَفَعُوا بِمَا انْتَفَعَ بِهِ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ، فَهَلَكَ مَنْ هَلَكَ عَنْ بَيِّنَةٍ. وَعِلْمُهُ

٥ تَعَالَى بِأَنَّهُمْ لا يُؤْمِنُونَ، لا يُخْرِجُ فِعْلُهُ مَنْ أَنْ يَكُونَ حُكْمُهُ إِحْسَانًا^٥ إِلَيْهِمْ وَتَفَضُّلاً عَلَيْهِمْ. كَمَا

أَنَّ الْوَاحِدَ مَنْ إِذَا قَدَّمَ طَعَامًا إِلَى جَائِعِينَ، [و]غَلَبَ عَلَى ظَنِّهِ أَنَّهُ لا يَأْكُلُ أَحَدُهُمَا طَعَامَهُ، لا

يُخْرِجُ مِنْ أَنْ يَكُونَ مُحْسِنًا إِلَيْهِ، وَإِنْ أَسَاءَ هُوَ إِلَى نَفْسِهِ مِنْ حَيْثُ لَمْ يَتَنَاوَلَ [الطعام]. وَقَدْ

بَيَّنَّ شَيْوَحْنَا -رَحْمَهُمُ اللَّهُ- ذَلِكَ فِي كِتَابِهِمْ بِمَا يُغْنِي. وَاعْلَمْ أَنَّ غَرَضَهُمْ بِهَذَا السُّؤَالِ أَنْ

يُبَيِّنُوا أَنَّ فَاعِلَ الْأَشْيَاءِ سِوَى الْقَدِيمِ،^٦ وَإِنْ مِنْ فِعْلِهِ قَدْ يَقُولُ^٧ مَا لَيْسَ بِحِكْمَةٍ أَوْ صَوَابٍ. وَأَنَّ

١٠ يُضْفُوا خَلْقَ الْإِنْسَانِ إِلَى الطَّبَائِعِ وَالْأَجْرَامِ وَالنَّفْسِ، عَلَى حَسَبِ مَا بَيَّنَّاهُ قَبْلَ. وَالَّذِي أوردوه

في السؤال لازم لهم، وذلك أنه يُقال لهم:

ومن ذلك قولهم

^١ MS. الي .

^٢ MS. وصررفانس .

^٣ sic.

^٤ MS. لسواحسارههم .

^٥ MS. حكمه و احسانا .

^٦ MS. ان حسوا ان فاعل للاحسان سواالقديم .

^٧ MS. يفعول -ل . It can also be read as يفعل .

خبرونا عن البارىء لما أبدع العقل، [أ]عَلِمَ أَنَّ الْعَقْلَ تَحَدُّثُ مِنْهُ النَّفْسُ؟ وَإِنَّ تِلْكَ

النَّفْسُ إِذَا تَحَرَّكَتْ ظَهَرَ مِنْهَا الْكُونُ وَالْفَسَادُ؟ وَإِنَّ الْفَسَادَ تَغَلَّبَ عَلَى الصَّلَاحِ، حَتَّى إِنَّ أَكْثَرَ

من يحصل من العقلاء والحيوان لا يتهيأ لهم الرجوع إلى عالمهم. فَإِنَّ قَالُوا "عَلِمَ ذَلِكَ (Fol.)

(9b) وَمَعَ عِلْمِهِ أَبْدَعَهُ عَلَى هَذَا الْحَدِّ"، لَزِمَهُمُ الْقَوْلُ بِأَنَّهُ سَفِيهٌ هُوَ.^٢ وَإِنَّ أَبَوَا ذَلِكَ لَزِمَهُمُ

5 الْقَوْلُ بِأَنَّ الْأَمْرَ وَالْعَقْلَ وَقَعَا^٣ مِنْهُ لَا بِاخْتِيَارِهِ، أَوْ وَقَعَا^٤ مِنْهُ وَهُوَ جَاهِلٌ بِهِ. وَالَّذِي أَجَبْنَا بِهِ

لَا يتهيأ لهم أن يجيبوا بمثله. لِأَنَّ عِنْدَهُمْ أَنَّ النَّفْسَ إِنَّمَا تَرْجِعُ إِلَى عَالِمِهَا، إِذَا كَانَتْ قَوِيَّةً

وَلِهَا مَادَّةٌ. وَلَيْسَ شَيْءٌ مِنْ ذَلِكَ يَلْتَبِسُهُ الْإِنْسَانُ^٥ عِنْدَهُمْ. وَالَّذِي ذَكَرْنَاهُ فِي الْبَارِيءِ فَإِنَّهُمْ لَا

يَمْتَنِعُونَ مِنْ إِطْلَاقِ الْقَوْلِ فِيهِ بِأَنَّهُ عَالِمٌ أَوْ غَيْرُ عَالِمٍ. فَجَمِيعٌ مَا أَلْزَمْنَاهُمْ فِي الْبَارِيءِ لَازِمٌ لَهُمْ

فِي الْعَقْلِ، لِأَنَّهُ الرَّمْزُ الْأَعْلَى، وَهُوَ حَكِيمٌ. فَصَحَّ بِهَذَا أَنَّهُ لَازِمٌ لَهُمْ، لَا جَوَابَ لَهُمْ عَنْهُ عَلَى

10 حَسَبِ مَا أَجَبْنَا بِهِ. فَحَسِبَ أَنْ يَكُونَ عَالِمًا فَكُلٌّ مِنْ حَصْفَتِ^١ لَهُ هَذِهِ السُّؤَالَةُ عَلَى مَا يَتَعَبَقُ

مسألة.

ومن ذلك قولهم:

¹ سمى. MS.

² sic. "هو". If the bracketed word, i.e., هو, is omitted, the sentence becomes more correct.

³ وقع. MS.

⁴ وقع. MS.

⁵ sic. MS. جلسه للإنسان.

إنَّ العاقل كيف يعرف الحقَّ، وكيف يميّزه من الباطل، مع كثرة المُبطلين

وقلة المُحصّلين المُحقّقين؟^١ وكلّ واحدٍ منهم^٢ قد استوى^٣ في دعواه، وفي أنّه عالمٌ

بما يدّعيه، وعالم ببطلان ما يدّعيه خصمه. فمِن قائلٍ يدّعي قِدَمَ العالم، ومِن

قائلٍ يدّعي حدوثه. وكلّ واحدٍ من الفريقين يدّعي لنفسه حُجّةً وبرهاناً. فكيف

5 الخلاص من الحيرة؟ وما الأمانة التي بها نعرف حقيقة الحقّ التي لا يتأتّى

للمُبطل ادعاؤها؟

والجواب عن ذلك مَبْنِيٌّ على أنّ هاهنا علومًا ضروريةً، وإنَّ حقيقته أن يكون اعتقاد

الشيء^٤ على ما هو به مع سكون النفس. فإن سُلِّمَ [ب-ذلك]، وإلا تبيّن الكلام فيه على

حسب ما تكلم السوفسطائية.^٥ وإن سَلِّموا [ب-ذلك]، فقد علمنا مشاركة هذه العلوم المكتسبة^٦

10 لها في هذه الحقيقة، فيجب أن يكون عالمًا. فكلّ من حصَلت^٧ له هذه الصّفة على ما يدّعيه

فلا يشكّ في اعتقاده. ولا يجوز خلاف ما اعتقده عند تشكيك المُشكِّك له، فهو مُحقِّقٌ فيه.

وأنّه بهذه الصّفة يعلمه في كلِّ مَنْ حصل له هذا الاعتقاد. [و]يعلم من نفسه، فلا يحتاج فيه

^١ MS. المخبر .

^٢ MS. منهما .

^٣ MS. استويا .

^٤ MS. شي .

^٥ MS. علوم .

^٦ MS. اللّهي .

^٧ MS. السعسطاه .

^٨ sic. أمكلسه .

^٩ MS. حصل .

إلى دليل وأمارة تدلّ عليه. لأنّ وجد أنه في نفسه أقوى من برهان يدلّ عليه. واعلم أنّ
 غرضهم بهذا السؤال هو أنّ يُثبِتُوا الباطن، وأنه أمانة الحق، وأنه لا يختلف، وإنما يختلف
 الظاهر. لأنّ عندهم أنّ هذه الشرائع المختلفة، مع كثرة الخلاف بين أهلها، [ف]الباطن
 واحد. وأنّ ذلك الباطن باطن لها كلّها ولا يختلف. واعلم أنّ هذا لازم لهم، لأنّهم اختلفوا في
 مسائل كثيرة،¹ في النفس وفي الأمر. ويختلف كلام أهل البحرين وأهل خراسان في أكثر
 المواضع، وإنما اتفقوا في [ال]أصلين وفي أنّ للظاهر باطناً.² فأما في كيفية هذه الأمور (Fol.
 10a) فقد اختلفوا، وقد وقع الخلاف الشديد فيما بين أهل خراسان في الدعوة. حتى قال
 النسفي وأصحابه:

إنّ الدعوة إنّما يجب أن تكون³ إلى الآفاق في النفس والأدوار وكيفية الخلق.

وقال الخيشفوج:

إنّ الدعوة يجب أن تكون مبتدأة بالشرعة وتأويلها.

حتى جرى بينه وبين أصحاب النسفي بها حدة عظيمة وعداوة.⁴ واختلفوا في الواجب،⁵

¹ MS. كسره, it may also be read as: كبيرة .

² sic., it is most likely if it is read as للظاهر باطناً وفي أنّ للأصلين وفي أنّ للظاهر باطناً .

³ MS. حكونى .

⁴ MS. حره عظيمة وعدواه .

⁵ Najwā; see below, 331.

الَّذِي هُوَ مِائَةٌ وَتِسْعَةٌ عَشْرَ دَرْهَمًا،^١ عَلَى مَا [ذَا] يُؤْخَذُ؟ فَقَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ "يُؤْخَذُ فِي أَسْرَارٍ تَرْجَعُ إِلَى مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ إِسْمَاعِيلَ".^٢ وَقَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ "لَا يُؤْخَذُ عَلَيْهِ، وَإِنَّمَا يُؤْخَذُ عَلَى أَسْرَارٍ أُخْرَى".

فيقال لهم:

إِذَا اخْتَلَفْتُمْ أَنْتُمْ فِيمَا بَيْنَكُمْ، فَأَثَبْتَ بَعْضُكُمْ مَا نَفَاهُ الْبَعْضُ، فَمَا الْأَمَارَةُ أَنْكُمْ قَدْ أَصَبْتُمْ

5 الْحَقَّ إِذَا كَانَ كُلُّ وَاحِدٍ مِنْكُمْ يَدَّعِي أَنَّ الدَّلِيلَ مَعَهُ، وَأَنَّ غَيْرَهُ مَخْطِئٌ مُبْطَلٌ؟! عَلَى أَنَّهُمْ يَقُولُونَ إِنَّ لِلظَّاهِرِ بَاطِنًا، وَإِنَّ لِهَذِهِ الشَّرَائِعِ تَأْوِيلًا، وَإِنَّ أَهْلَ الْحَقِّ لَذَلِكَ يَدْعُونَ. فَصَارَ حُكْمُهُمْ حُكْمَ سَائِرِ الْفِرَقِ، وَصَارَ^٣ هَذَا السُّؤَالُ لَازِمًا لَهُمْ كَلِزُومِهِ لغيرهم. وَقَدْ بَيَّنَّا غَرَضَهُمْ وَأَيَّ شَيْءٍ أَجَابُوا عَنْ هَذَا مُسْتَدَلِّينَ عَلَى مَخَالَفَتِهِمْ^٤ أَنَّ الْحَقَّ مَعَهُمْ؛ [ف]يُجَابُونَ بِمِثْلِهِ إِذَا سَأَلُوا.

مسألة.

ومن ذلك قولهم:

إِنَّ الْقَوْلَ بِأَنَّ اللَّهَ مُشَبَّهٌ بِالْأَشْيَاءِ^٥ كُفْرٌ عِنْدَنَا.^٦ ثُمَّ إِنَّكُمْ شَبَّهْتُمُوهُ بِالْعِبَادِ،

فَكَأَنَّكُمْ نَاقَضْتُمْ، وَذَلِكَ أَنَّكُمْ قَلْتُمْ: "إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَالِمٌ قَادِرٌ حَيٌّ مُوجُودٌ سَمِيعٌ بَصِيرٌ"،

^١ دراهم. MS.

^٢ The seventh Ismā'īlī Imām and the first hidden Ismā'īlī Imām, nicknamed "al-Maktūm", Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.

^٣ فصار. MS.

^٤ مخالفهم. MS.

^٥ للأشياء. MS.

^٦ عندكم. MS.

والواحد مناً بهذه الصفات. فقد سَوِّيتُم بين وصف القديم وبين وصف الواحد

مناً، وهذا هو نفس التشبيه. وإلا فما الجواب عن ذلك؟ ولما [ذا] صار [ت] بعض

الصفّات تشبيهاً وبعضها لا يكون تشبيهاً؟

والجواب عنه هو: أن المراد بقولنا "تشبيهه" يجب أن يكون معقولاً. ثُمَّ نَنْظُر، فَإِنْ كُنَّا

5 قد وصفنا الله بما يجب التشبيهه، فَلَعَمْرِي هذا السؤال يلزمنا. وإن لم تكن واصفين له بما

يوجب التشبيهه، فقد زال عنا القَدْح. والمراد بقولنا "تشبيهه"، ليس هو ما أراد به أهل اللغة.

لأنَّ عندهم أن كلَّ مَنْ وصف الشيئين بصفةٍ أو سمّاهما باسم، يقال عنه¹ مُشَبَّهٌ وإنه شَبَّهَهُمَا.

وإن المراد بقولنا "تشبيهه"،² هو إننا إذا وُصِفَ الله تعالى واعتُقِدَ فيه أنه على صفةٍ من الصفات

تقتضي تلك الصّفة، كونه جسمًا أو كونه على بعض الحقائق والصفات التي [أحدتتها]

10 المحدثات لأنفسها، فهو مُشَبَّهٌ. لأنه أوجب بوصفه له بتلك الصّفة، كونه من جنس ذلك

المُحَدَّث. ولا يجوز في الشيئين من جنسٍ واحد، أن يكون أحدهما قديماً والآخر محدثاً. وليس

في شيءٍ من الأشياء، التي وصفنا القديم تعالى [بها]، ما يقتضي كونه على صفةٍ من صفات

النفس. تلك الصّفة حاصلة في المحدث لنفسه، واقتضت³ تلك الصّفة حدوث (Fol. 10b.)

¹ . فيه MS.

² . بيه MS.

³ . انصي MS.

ذاته. فلما لم يكن في شيء من صفاته ما يقتضي مشاركته للمحدث أو اقتضى حدوثه، لم نكن بوصفنا له مُشَبَّهين له خلقه. تبيّن ذلك إنَّ وصفنا له تعالى بأنه موجود لا يقتضي الحدوث، ولا يقتضي مشاركة القديم المُحدث في أخصّ أوصافه. لأنَّ المُحدث لم يكن مُحدثاً لأنَّه موجودٌ، وإنَّما كان مُحدثاً لوجوده عن عدم، واستحقَّ هذه الصِّفة بالفاعل. ولو كان القديم تعالى لم يكن واجب الوجود، وكانت صفة الوجود فيه جائزة، لكان لَعَمْرِي قد شارك المُحدث فيما يقتضي 5 جواز حدوثه. فلما كان تعالى واجب الوجود، وكانت صفة الوجود فيه جائزة، والمحدثات وجودها جائز، واختلفا في هذه الوجوه، فلم يكن الوصف له بالوجود تشبيهاً. وكذلك وصفنا له بأنه شيء،¹ لا يقتضي مشاركته للمحدثات فيما يقتضي حدوثه أو جواز حدوثه. ولا يفيد قولنا شيئاً حسيّاً،² بل يقتضي أنَّ المُسمّى مما يصحّ أن يُعلم وأن يُخبر عنه، سواء كان معدوماً أو موجوداً. وإذا كان هذا هكذا،³ لم يجب التشبيه من حيث قلنا إنه شيء وإنَّه موجود. فلا 10 يجب بوصفنا له أنه عالم، تشبيهه له بخلقه. لأنَّه لا يفيد الجنس، بل يفيد صحّة وقوع الأفعال المنبثقة منه. وكذلك قولنا "حيٌّ وقادرٌ وسميعٌ وبصيرٌ وغنيٌّ"، وسائر ما نصفه به، إذا كانت الصِّفة مما يرجع إلى الذات. أما الصِّفات التي يوصف القديم بها لأنَّه فعلٌ أمراً، نحو

¹ . شيا . MS.

² . سي حستا . sic.

³ . مكذي . MS.

كونه رازقاً ومحسناً، فهو يُبَيِّن¹ في أنه لا يقتضي مشاركة المحدثات في صفاته التي تختصه.

فإن قيل:

ما أنكرتم من الذي جعلتم حقيقة التشبيه فإنه لا يلزم مخالفيكم² القول به،

لأنه يجري مجرى اصطلاح منكم، وليس يجب مساعدتكم فيه. فالذي ذكرتم من

5 [أن] "المُشَبَّه هو مَنْ وَصَفَ اللهُ أَوْ اعْتَقَدَ فِيهِ كَوْنَهُ مُحَدَّثًا، أَوْ يَجُوزُ عَلَيْهِ

الحدوث، لمشاركة المُحدث له في تلك الصِّفَةِ لِنَفْسِهِ"، فليس هذا في اللغة. بل في

اللغة أَنْ مَنْ وَصَفَ شَيْئَيْنِ بِصِفَةٍ مَا يُقَالُ [لَهُ] مُشَبَّهٌ، وَإِنْ شَبَّهَ ذَلِكَ الشَّيْءَ

بصاحبه. فإذا كان كذلك فيجب أن يكون وصفكم لله بأنه "شيءٌ موجودٌ قادرٌ

عالمٌ حيٌّ سميعٌ بصيرٌ"، إلى سائر صفاته مُشَبَّهًا له بخَلْقِهِ.

10 قيل له:

إنَّ الَّذِي ذَكَرْتَهُ مِنْ أَنَّ هَذَا مَوَاضِعَهُ مَنَا فَعَلَطَ. وَذَلِكَ أَنَّ أَهْلَ اللُّغَةِ لَمْ يَقُولُوا فِي كُلِّ

الصفات، وإنما قالوا:

إذا كان الإنسان شَبَّهَ الشَّيْءَ بِغَيْرِهِ بِصِفَةٍ، فَتَجْرِي مَجْرَى³ الإِبَانَةِ لِذَلِكَ الشَّيْءِ. أَلَا تَرَى

¹ MS. حين .

² MS. مخالفكم .

³ MS. وسحري محري .

أنه يُقال "فلانٌ كالأسد" إذا كان قويًا، لما كانت القوة في السبع تجري مجرى الإبانة من سائر الحيوانات. ويقال "فلانٌ حمارٌ" إذا كان بليدًا، لما كان الحمار فارق الإنسان بعدم العقل، فيقال "شَبَّهه بالحمير"، و[لا] يقال "شَبَّهَهُ بالسبع". يبيِّن ذلك أنهم لا يقولون في الأسود أنه يشبه الأبيض،¹ وإن شاركه في أكثر صفاته. فقد بيَّن قصدهم بذلك ما قصدناه، إلا أنهم لم يتحققوا من المعاني ما تحققناه. وذلك إننا قد علمنا أن الذي (Fol. 11a.) يوجب التجنيس 5 والمشابهة في سائر الصفات هي صفة الذات، دون صفات العِلل والتي تلتحق بالفاعل.² فأجرينا هذه التسمية إلى من اعتقد هذا المعنى أو أخبر في القديم، لا [ل]أنا خالفنا أهل اللغة فيما قصدوا بهذا اللفظ. يُبيِّن ذلك أنهم يقولون فيمن شبَّه الشيء بالشيء بصفة الذات "أنه مُشَبَّه على الحقيقة"، فقد وافقونا في هذه القضية. ثم نظرنا فيما قالوه من الزيادة، فلم يكُ صحيحًا من حيث المعنى. فتركناهم يستعملون هذه اللفظة على تعارفهم، إذا كان الأمر على ما 10 وصفنا. فلم يكُ الواصف للشيين بصفة واحدة مُشَبَّهًا على الإطلاق، فلم يلزمنا ما قاله السائل على أن هذا السؤال شيء. على أن المُجمِعين أجمعوا، [بأن] المُشَبَّه لله عزَّ وجلَّ بخلقه كافر، فيجب أن يرجع إليهم في مرادهم. وقد علمنا أن أحدًا لم يمتنع من إجراء هذه الصِّفات على

¹ sic.

² الفلل والذي تستحق بالفاعل MS.

الله تعالى، فعُلمَ أنَّ هذه الصِّفة لا تقتضي التشبيه. وقد استقصى¹ شيوخنا -رحمهم الله- هذا الكلام في كتبهم، فلا نحتاج أن نُكلف الكلام فيه.

واعلم إنَّ غرض القوم بهذا السؤال إنما هو التعطيل. إلاَّ إنَّهم يوطنوا² بمقدِّماتٍ ووسائطٍ إلى ذلك. وذلك أنَّهم يقولون في الجواب عن هذا السؤال "إنَّ الباريء لا يجوز أن يثبت على

5 صفة من صفات المخلوقين، ولا يجوز أن تُنفى عنه تلك الصفة". فإذا قيل لهم: أتصفون الله تعالى بأنَّه شيء؟ يقولون:

لا نقول إنَّه شيء ولا نقول إنَّه لا شيء، وكذلك لا نقول إنَّه موجود ولا ليس

بموجود، وكذلك لا نقول إنَّه عالم ولا إنَّه ليس بعالم؛ إلى سائر صفاته. لأنَّ

إثباته على هذه الصِّفة تشبيهٌ له بخَلْقِه، وانتفاء هذه الصفات عنه تعطيلٌ له.

10 فيجب أن لا نقول لا هذا ولا ذاك.

واعلم أنَّهم ناقضوا في كلامهم، مع أنَّهم لا بدَّ لهم من التشبيه والتعطيل، على زعمهم،

والخروج عن قسمة العقل. وذلك أنَّه يقال لهم:

خبرونا عن الباريء تعالى، أهو بهذه الصِّفات، و[هل] يجوز أن يوصف بها؟³ فإنَّ قالوا

¹ MS. استقصوا.

² MS. يوطنوا.

³ MS. أهو بهذه الصفات ويجوزان يوصف به وليس هو بهذه الصفات. the underlined words are repeated. It is most likely if underlined words are omitted, the sentence makes excellent sense.

"ليس هو على شيء من الصفات"، فقد نَفَوْه وهذا هو التعطيل. وإن قالوا "بين الإثبات والنفي واسطة"، فقد خرجوا عن قسمة العقل. وذلك أنه قد عُلِمَ عدم الواسطة بين النفي والإثبات. فأَيَّ قول قالوا [به]، تجاهلوا على زعمهم. وأمَّا مناقضتهم، فهي¹ أنهم وصفوه بأنه باريء، وإن كان قولنا "شيء وموجود وقادر" صار تشبيهاً، فلمَ لم يضرَّ كونه باريئاً تشبيهاً. بل هذا يجب أن يكون على قَوْدِ قولهم أكثر،² لأنَّ الباريء هو الذي برأ الشيء، وبأنَّ فعله هذا³ قد 5 شاركه فيه أهل كلِّ صناعة، وإن اختلفت صنعتهم.

فإن قالوا "قلنا فيه هذا ضرورة، وهو أنه لم يكن بُدُّ أن نُعبِّرَ عنه". يقال لهم:

[أ] عقلتُم معنى هذه الكلمة فيه، ثمَّ لم يكنْ لكم بُدُّ من أن تُعبِّروا، أم لم تعقلوا معناها؟⁴

فإن عقلتُم معناها،⁵ فقد عقلنا نحن معنى⁶ هذه (Fol. 11b.) الصِّفَات، فيجب أن تُجَوِّزوا

سائر الصِّفَات عليه كما جَوِّزتم هذه. وإن لم تعقلوا معنى هذه الكلمة فيه، فلمَ قلتُم الضرورة 10

أجرتنا على⁷ هذه الكلمة. وأي ضرورة بكم من إجرائها عليها ومعناها⁸ غير حاصل فيه، فلا

بدَّ لهم مما ألزمتناهم.

¹ MS. فهو.

² MS. مودمولهم أكد.

³ MS. سان معله وهذا.

⁴ MS. معناه.

⁵ MS. معناه.

⁶ MS. معنا.

⁷ MS. عليه.

⁸ MS. عليه ومعناه.

يقال لهم:

خبرونا هل يجوز أن تعتقدوا أن القديم على شيء من الصفات، أم لا يجوز؟ فإن قلتم

”يجوز أن نعتقد“، فلا يخلو¹ إما أن يكون ذلك الاعتقاد علمًا، أو لا يجوز أن يكون علمًا.

فإن جاز أن يكون علمًا، فقد اعتقدتموه على حسب ما اعتقدتم الحوادث، وهذا ترك

5 لمذهبكم. وإن لم يكن ذلك الاعتقاد علمًا، فلماذا² أنكرتم أن الخبر عنه لا يجوز على وجه من

الوجوه؟ لأن ذلك الخبر لا يكون عنه إذا لم يكن اعتقاده. لأنه لا يجوز أن تُخبر إلا بالقصد،

والقصد لا يصح إلا بعد أن يُعتقد ذلك الشيء على ما هو به أو يُعلم. وقد أثبتتم هذا، فيجب

أن لا يجوز أن يُخبر عنه. ومتى لم يجز ذلك، فما أنكرتم من خبركم أنه مُبدع العقل

وبارى³،⁴ وإنه لا يجوز أن يوصف بصفات المخلوقين، وإن الأمر أثر من آثاره، وإن العلم لا

10 تحيط به قلة اخبار⁴، بل لا يمتنع أن يكون كذبًا، وأن يكون مُخبر هذه الأخبار على خلاف

ما هو به.

ويقال لهم:

¹ MS. يخلوا .

² MS. فما .

³ MS. بار .

⁴ MS. سفار حنار .

خَبَرْنَا عَنْ مَخْبِرٍ قَوْلِكَ "بَارِيءٌ"، هَلْ يَجُوزُ أَنْ يُعْلَمَ أَوْ لَا يَجُوزُ؟ فَإِنْ قَالُوا "لَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ يُعْلَمَ"، فَقَدْ نَفَّوهُ، وَإِلَى ذَلِكَ يَشِيرُونَ فِي كِتَابِهِمْ دَائِمًا، وَيَقُولُونَ "عَلِمْنَا لَا يَتَجَاوَزُ عَالَمَنَا". وَإِنْ قَالُوا "يَصِحُّ أَنْ يُعْلَمَ"، فَقَدْ دَخَلُوا فِيمَا عَابُوا عَلَيْنَا [فِيهِ]. ثُمَّ يُقَالُ لَهُمْ عَلَى هَذَا الْقَوْلِ، إِذَا قَالُوا "صَحَّ أَنْ يُعْلَمَ":

5

خَبَرْنَا عَنْ هَذَا الْمَعْلُومِ الْمَذْكُورِ، أَهْوَ مَوْجُودٌ أَوْ لَيْسَ بِمَوْجُودٍ؟

فَإِنْ قَالُوا "لَيْسَ بِمَوْجُودٍ"، فَقَدْ نَفَّوهُ، وَإِنْ قَالُوا "مَوْجُودٌ"، فَقَدْ قَالُوا بِمَا عَابُوا. وَلَا يُمْكِنُ أَنْ يُدَّعَى بَيْنَ النَّفْيِ وَالْإِثْبَاتِ وَاسِطَةً لِأَنَّهُ يُعْلَمُ ضَرُورَةً. وَإِنْ قَالُوا بِوَجُودِهِ، يُقَالُ لَهُمْ: خَبَرْنَا عَنْ هَذَا الْمَوْجُودِ، أَهْوَ بِصِفَةِ الْقَادِرِ مِنَّا؟ (فَإِنْ قَالُوا "لَيْسَ بِصِفَةِ الْقَادِرِ مِنَّا" صَحَّ)،³ فَقَدْ أَثْبَتُوهُ كَالْجَمَادِ وَالْأَعْرَاضِ فِي أَنَّهُ لَا يَصِحُّ مِنْهُ الْفِعْلُ. وَهَذَا نَقْضٌ لِمَذْهَبِهِمْ فِي كَوْنِهِ مُبَدَعًا لِلْعَقْلِ. وَإِنْ قَالُوا "هُوَ بِصِفَةِ الْقَادِرِ"، فَقَدْ وَاْفَقُوا الْحَقَّ. وَكَذَلِكَ الْكَلَامُ فِي سَائِرِ الصِّفَاتِ، لِأَنَّ الْكَلَامَ فِي الْكُلِّ يَجْرِي مِنْ نَفْيٍ وَإِثْبَاتٍ. وَلَا وَاسِطَةَ بَيْنَ النَّفْيِ وَالْإِثْبَاتِ، فَلَا بَدَّ لَهُمْ مِنَ الْقَوْلِ بِالْحَقِّ أَوْ التَّعْطِيلِ إِذَا كَانُوا مُخَالَفِينَ فِي الْمَعْنَى. وَمَتَى قَالُوا "إِنَّمَا امْتَنَعْنَا مِنَ الْعِبَارَةِ، فَأَمَّا حَقِيقَةُ هَذِهِ الصِّفَاتِ فَتُنْقَرُّ بِهَا، وَإِنَّ الْقَدِيمَ عَلَيْهَا"، فَقَدْ خَالَفُوا فِي الْعِبَارَةِ، وَإِنْ

10

¹ . محذر. MS.

² . وقد. MS.

³ The sentence between () is written vertically on the left margin.

كانوا مُخطئين فيه. وذلك أنه لا بُدَّ لهم أن يُعَبِّروا عما عِلْموه وعقلوه، فأَيَّ عبارة اختاروها له
فالكلام فيها كالكلام فيما أبوا. فقد تبيّن بهذه الجملة فساد ما يهزون به. والكلام في معنى
هذه الصِّفَات (Fol. 12 a.) عندهم، وأنَّ الموصوف بها مَنْ هو، فسندكر[ه] في بَيَان مذهبهم
في الشريعة وفي تأويل القرآن عندهم فيما بعد إن شاء الله.

5

مسألة.

ومن ذلك قولهم:

إن كان الله تعالى عندكم لا تجوز عليه المنافع والمضار، فأين¹ الحكمة في

أن كَلَّفَ عباده التكليف الشاق؟ فإن قلت "ليكون في ذلك نفع"، قيل لكم: ذلك

النفع كان قادراً على إيصاله إليهم من غير مَشَقَّةٍ تلحقهم [و]تحصل لهم، فلماذا

10

حَمَلَهُم هذه المشاق؟

والجواب عن ذلك هو أن الله تعالى مُتَفَضِّلٌ في إيجاده الخلق، ومتفضل بإيصال

المنافع إليهم. وقد عَلِمْنَا بأنَّ المنافع على ضَرْبَيْنِ: منفعة تحصل بالغير على طريق التفضُّل،

ومنفعة تحصل منه على طريق الوجوب. وقد تقرر في عقول العقلاء أن المنفعة الحاصلة على

طريق الوجوب أعلى رتبة من المنفعة الحاصلة على طريق التفضُّل. ولهذا اختاروا تحمُّل

¹ ماسى MS.

المشاق وليستحقوا الآخرة على تحملهم تلك المشاق. فلو ابتدأ ذلك المستأجر بإعطاء أجره لا على طريق الوجوب، لكان في العقلاء مَنْ لا يختاره. وإذا تقرر في العقول أَنَّ المنفعة الحاصلة على طريقة الوجوب أعلى رتبة وأجلّ قدرًا من المنفعة التي يتفضّل بها. وكأنّ الله تعالى أراد أن يُوصّل إليهم أعلى المنازل وأسانها. ولم تك تلك الرتبة إلا باستحقاق كلفهم لهذا المعنى، فكان هذا هو الوجه في تكليفه إياهم. فإن قالوا "هلاً" أوصل إليهم على هذا الحدّ من غير أن 5 كلفهم؟" قيل لهم: ² قد تقرر في العقول أنّ الذي يُعقل على طريق الوجوب، يقبح أن يفعل تفضلاً على طريق الابتداء. يُبين ذلك أنّ الواحد منّا إذا كان عنده ولد، قد رباه وموله وعلمه العلوم، يقبح منه أن يُسوي بينه في الرتبة وبين مَنْ لا بُدّ له على وجه من الوجوه. وإذا كان ذلك قبيحاً، فإنّ فعل تعالى بمن لا يستحقّ الثواب ثواب المستحقّ لكان يكون ³ قبيحاً. ولا يجوز أن يفعل تعالى ما هو قبيح. فسقط بهذا ما سألوا عنه، واستقصاء هذه المسألة في الكتب. 10 واعلم أنّ غرض القوم في هذا السؤال هو إبطال الشرائع ونفي هذه العبادات. وأنّ تكون لله تعالى، وأنّها ليست من قبيله، وإنّه لا تكليف. ⁴ وإنّ التكليف إنّما هو العِلْم، وإنّ سائر

¹ MS. لا . هل .

² MS. له .

³ sic. It may be changed as: لكان ذلك , to settle the meaning.

⁴ MS. ليس .

⁵ MS. كلف . It may also be read as: بُكّف .

⁶ MS. التكليف إنّما هو .

التكاليف إنما هي¹ من جهة الأنبياء عليهم السلام. أرادوا بها² اشتغال العامة وسياسة أمرها، ليكون العاقل منّا يشتغل بعلم النفس والعقل وحقائق هذه الأمور، لا يمنعه منه مانع. وإنّ هذه التكاليف أمارات ودلالات على العالم وما فيه. واعلم أنّ هذا السؤال لزّم لهم، وأنّ الذي قصدوا إليه لا سبيل إلى إثباته. وذلك إنّنا قد بينّا فساد ما ذهبوا إليه في أمر النفس، وإنّه لا طريق يدلّ عليها. والذي ذكروا من أنّ التكاليف إنّما هو العلم، فلعمري إنّ أجد ما 5 كُلفَ العبد [به] هو العلم بالله تعالى وبصفاته. إلاّ أنّه لا يتعلق هذا العلم بما ذهبوا إليه من علم الآفاق والأنفس والطبائع والمفردات. وإذا كان الأمر على ما وصفنا، فقولهم إنّ العبد إنّما كُلفَ العلم بهذه الأمور كلّها لا دليل معه. فيقال لهم:

لِمَ قَلْتُمْ إِنَّ الْعُلُومَ بِهَذِهِ الْأَشْيَاءِ (Fol. 12 b.) إِنَّهَا مِنْ جِهَةِ الْأُمَّةِ وَالْأُسُسِ³ وَالْأَنْبِيَاءِ،

بِمَاذَا عَقَلْتُمْ هَذَا؟

فإنّ قالوا "بدعوة الأنبياء إليها"، كذّبهم العيان. وإنّ قالوا "إنّما عرفناه من طريق الباطن"، جوّزوا عليه الكتمان، وفي جواز الكتمان إبطال النبوة. وقولهم "إنّ الأنبياء إنّما بُعثوا ليُخرجوا هذه المُكْتَمَاتِ إِلَى الظهور"، فقد بينّا من قبل أنّه لا أصل له، وسنتكلّم عليه من

¹ . هو MS.

² . به MS.

³ . الاثني عشر MS.

بعد. ولهم آيات وأخبار يتعلّقون بها مُستدلّين على أنّ للظاهر باطنًا، نتكلّم عليها مِنْ بعد

عند إيراد تأويل ما يتأوّلون عليه مِنَ القرآن.

فصل.

ومِنْ ذلك قولهم:

5 إذا كان عندكم [أَنَّ] هذه الأنبياء مِنْ قِبَلِ الله تعالى، فكيف خاطبهم الله عزَّ

وجَلَّ؟ فإنّ قلتم بالوحي، يقال لكم: فكيف ذلك الوحي، وكيف كان يَرِدُ عليه،

وكيف كان يعرف ذلك الرسول، وكيف المَلَكُ والوحي، وكيف يُفهم؟

والجواب عن ذلك هو أنّ الله تعالى أرسل الرسل وعرفهم مصالحنًا، بأن أرسل إليهم

مَلَكًا من الملائكة؛¹ حيًّا عالمًا ناطقًا مميّزًا عبدًا من عباد الله تعالى مُكرّمًا. وعرفَ ذلك الرسولُ

10 مُرادَ الله -جَلَّ وعَزَّ- بأحدِ أمرين: بأن يسمع كلامًا لغير الله تعالى [غير معجز، وآخر

معجز من الله].² فاستدلّ بذلك المُعْجِز على أنّه خطاب لله تعالى، نزل به على رسوله،

وأظهره الله تعالى للنبي -صلى الله عليه- معجزة. [ف]علم بذلك أنّه صادق في أنّه رسول

من الله عزَّ وجلَّ إليه. وقوى الله تعالى شعاع بصر النبي -صلى الله عليه-، حتى رآه

¹ الملائكة. MS.

² The additional sentence between [...] is added by the editor to make sense.

وأُظهِرَ إلى قصده وسمع خطابه، ثُمَّ ادَّعى النبوة. وأظهر الله تعالى المُعْجِزَ عند ذلك، ليستدلَّ به على صدقه. والكلام في ذلك شيء على أصول، متى خالف فيها يكون تاركًا للسؤال. وهو أنَّ العالم محدث، وأنَّ له محدثًا، وأنَّ ذلك المحدث قادرٌ عالمٌ حيٌّ سميعٌ بصيرٌ غنيٌّ عالمٌ بقبیح القبائح وغنيٌّ عنها، لا يفعلُ القبيحَ ولا يُضِلُّ العباد عن الدين ولا يُصدق الكذاب. فمتى صحَّ هذا وقد عَلِمنا (أنَّ المعجزات فعل الله تعالى، عَلِمنا)² أَنَّهُ إِنَّمَا أَظْهَرَهَا لِأَنَّ المُدَّعي صادقٌ في دعواه. فمتى عَلِمنا صدقه وأخبرَ أَنَّ الَّذِي يُعَلِّمه هذه الأمور هو جبريل -عليه السلام- بنزَلِ عَلَيَّ³، صدَّقناه في قوله. فمتى ناقضَ في شيء من هذه الأصول، يدلَّ على أَنَّهُ تاركٌ لسؤاله. واعلم أنَّ جوابهم عن هذا السؤال مُعَلَّقٌ بأصولهم، وهي أقصى أغراضهم. فعليه مدار الدَّعوة وعند هذا يُحَلِّفون المستجيب، وهو السِّرُّ المكتوم، وهو العِلْمُ الروحاني عندهم. وذلك عندهم أَنَّ العقل لَمَّا ظَهَرَ ظَهَرَتِ النَّفس فتحرَّكت طيب لجلالة قدرها وعظم محلَّها، إنها هي الصانع. حتى نظرت فرجعتُ إلى العقل فرأته فوقها، فعَلِمْتُ أَنَّهَا والعقل ليسا بخالقَيْن، أعني الباريء الَّذي هو المبدع عندهم، فقالت "سبحان الله". وَعَلِمْتُ أَنَّ العلم لا يُحيط بالباريء وأَنَّه عبد. ثُمَّ تحركت (Fol. 13 a.) على نفسها، إلى أن اتصلت ثانيا بالعقل

¹ MS. اظطر. It may also be read as: اُظْهَرَ or اِضْطَرَّ.

² The sentence between () is written vertically on the left margin.

³ MS. عسرل علي.

ست^١ دوائر. على حسب ما يأخذ الواحد من الفرجار ويضعه على اللوح، ويديره^٢ حتى تصير دائرة مستوية، ثم نحو ذلك الدور^٣ ست دوائر حوت^٤ تلك الدائرة المحيطة بها لاتزيد ولا تنقص وهي في الوسط سابعة^٥. ثم إذا جعلت تلك الست^٦ داخل دائرة محيطة، يقع طرف الخط المحيط بالدوائر على طرف الدائرة، نحو تقطيع الأول اثنتي عشرة دائرة^٧ ولا تزيد ولا تنقص. فعندهم أن النفس تحركت على نفسها دائرة، على حسب ما يدور عمود الفرجار 5 على مركزه، فأظهرت ست دوائر أولها دائرة الأجرام. ثم تحركت دائرة ثانية فأظهرت المفردات. ثم تحركت دائرة ثالثة فأظهرت المركبات. ثم وقع لها مقابلة المركز عند تحركها، وهو العقل، فأظهرت الحسية لقربها من العقل.^٨ ثم تحركت السادسة وأظهرت الناطقة، لما انتهت إلى آخر ما ابتدأت منه. فلما عادت إلى النقطة التي تحركت منها، أظهرت النطقاء 10 من الناطقة، وهم الأنبياء عندهم. وهذا معنى قولهم إن النفوس ثلاثة: النفس النامية والنفس الحسية والنفس الناطقة.^٩ ثم إن هذا الناطق الذي يظهر يكون له أحوال ثلاثة: حالة^{١٠} أخذ

¹ MS. ستة .

² MS. ويضعها علي اللوح ويديرها .

³ sic., it is most likely read as تلك الدورة or تلك الدائرة .

⁴ MS. ستة دواير حوا .

⁵ MS. سابعاً .

⁶ MS. الستة .

⁷ MS. اثني عشر دواير .

⁸ It should be noted that there is a missing "cycle" (*dā'ira* or *dawr*) that the author does not mention.

⁹ MS. نفس .

¹⁰ MS. حالاً .

فيها من غيره، فيتصوّر حالة النفس ويطلب عالمها حتى يتصورها،¹ يقال لهذه الحالة "جَدُّ". ثُمَّ يتصل فيأخذ العلم منها، فيقال لهذه الحالة "فَتْحٌ". ثُمَّ إنَّها إذا اتصلت به تؤد [ي] به عن العقل علوم الإلهية فيقبل هذه العلوم، التي هي علمٌ بحقائق العالم وتركيبه عن العقل بواسطة النفس. وهو أَجَدُّ ما يبلغ إليه حال الأنبياء عليهم السلام عندهم، ويقال لهذه الحالة "خيال". وعلى هذه الأحوال يُرتَّبون حال الأنبياء عليهم السلام وهذه الأسماء.

5 [و]عليه يتناولون ما وردَ في كتاب الله -جَلَّ وَعَزَّ- من أسامي هؤلاء الملائكة المقربين -عليهم السلام- نحو جبريل وميكائيل وإسرافيل. وذلك أنهم سمعوا خبراً من أخبار الآحاد أن جبريل يأخذ العلم من ميكائيل. فوضعوا مكان جبريل "جَدُّ" ومكان ميكائيل "فَتْحٌ" ومكان إسرافيل "خيال"، لما كان في هذا الخبر أن إسرافيل يأخذ العلم عن اللوح المحفوظ أو عن الله -جَلَّ وَعَزَّ-. فهذا معنى النبوة عندهم، وهذا هو معنى الوحي، وهذا هو الغرض في

10 الخلق. وهذا الذي يُلقن المستجيب بأول ما يجيب وعليه يحلف. ثُمَّ يرتقي من هذا الكفر الظاهر إلى التعطيل ونفي الشرائع والنبوات حالاً بعد حال، على ماسنينه من بعد وعلى ما مرَّ فيما تقدّم. وهذا لو اقتصرنا على كشفه، لكان للعاقل فيه غنية عن الكلام عليه.

على أنه يقال لهم:

¹ sic.

خبرونا عن هذه الأشياء التي ادعيتم، بماذا عرفتم صحتها؟

فإن قالوا "عرفناها" بدلالة العقل، فقد بينا أنه ليس في العقل دليل يدل على شيء مما

قالوه من أمر النفس والعقل. فمتى لم يمكن أن يدل على إثباتهما، فسائر ما يضاف إليهما

ويتعلق بصحةهما أولى أن لا يصح. وإن قالوا "عرفنا ذلك بالخبر"، يقال لهم:

كيف^٢ (Fol. 13 b.) وإن الإنسان قد كلف النظر فيها على الوجه الذي ذكرتموه؟

فإن قالوا:

يدل على ذلك الآيات الواردة في القرآن مثل قوله: ﴿أَفَلَا يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَى الْإِبْلِ

كَيْفَ خُلِقَتْ﴾،^٣ الآية، وقوله: ﴿سَنُرِيهِمْ آيَاتِنَا فِي الْآفَاقِ وَفِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ...﴾،^٤

وقوله: ﴿وَفِي أَنْفُسِكُمْ أَفَلَا تُبْصِرُونَ﴾،^٥ إلى سائر أشكالها، فدلّت هذه الآيات

على أننا كلفنا^٦ النظر في هذه الأمور.

قيل لهم:^٨

^١ MS. عرفناه .

^٢ MS. كيف .

^٣ Qur'an: 17/88.

^٤ Qur'an: 53/41.

^٥ Qur'an: 21/51.

^٦ MS. فدل .

^٧ MS. .

^٨ MS. له .

هذه الآيات التي ذكرتموها لا تدلّ على شيء مما قصدتموه. وذلك أنّ الخلاف لم يقع

في أنّ النظر في هذه الأشياء هل هو واجب أم لا. وإنّما وقع في الوجه الذي عليه يجب النظر

في كيفية طبائعها. ثمّ ادعيتم فيها أشياء ليس لها أصل أوجبتم النظر فيها، ونحن قلنا يجب

النظر فيها لنعرف صانعها وحكمة صنعه وحسن تدبيره. وليس في القرآن ما يدلّ على ما

أردتم، فقد بطل ما ادعيتم وجوبه. فلم يصحّ قولكم "إنّ العبد إنّما كلف العلم بهذه الأمور".⁵

وأما إلزام السؤال لكم فهو أنّ يُقال لكم:

أخبرونا عمّن يُعبّدا بهذه العبادات؟ أهو حكيم أم ليس بحكيم؟

فإنّ قالوا: "ليس بحكيم"، فقد سفّوها الأنبياء. وإنّ قالوا: "بحكمتهم"، يُقال لهم:

ما وجه الحكمة في تكليفهم العامّة هذه المشاق؟

فإنّ قالوا "شغلّوهم بهذه العبادات عن تفتيش أمر الخاصة"، يُقال لهم:

فهلّا شغلّوهم بطلب العلم. ولم يجب أن يُكلّفوهم المشاق لإصلاح أمر الغير؟ وهل هذا

إلاّ تمييز له من أن يُضرب زيد² لإصلاح عمرو؟! فإنّ حاولوا الجواب لم يتأتّ لهم على

أصولهم، فقد لزمهم تحوير ما اعتقدوا فيهم أنّهم حكماء وأنهم أنبياء. والذي أجبنا به لا

¹ . فان MS.

² . زيدا MS.

يمكنهم أن يجيبوا به على أصولهم هذه، لأنه لا غرض في تكليف الشرعيات عندهم إلا
اشتغال العامة بها. فإذا كان هذا هو الغرض، وكان يمكنهم شغلها بأن يكلفوا طلب العلم
والاشتغال به والاختلاط بأهله، فصار العدول عنه إلى ما هو أشقُّ منه وأبعد عن المراد، لا
يكون إلا نفس السَّفَه على ما يُرى.

فصل.

ومن ذلك قولهم:

إنَّ الله تعالى إذا كان حكيماً ومن حكمته إرسال الرسل إلينا، فلماذا أرسلهم¹

ليُعرِّفونا ما قد عرفناه بعقولنا ويجوز أن نعرِّفه؟ أم ليُعرِّفونا شيئاً لا يُعرِّف

بالعقل؟ فإنَّ قلتُم "إنَّه إنما أرسلهم ليُعرِّفونا ما يجوز أن نعرِّفه بالعقل، [أو] ممَّا

قد عرفناه أو لنا سبيل إلى معرفته"، فلا معنى في إرساله إليهم. وإنَّ قلتُم

"إرساله إليهم ليُعرِّفونا ما لا يجوز أن يُعرِّف بالعقل"، فقد أوجبتم مخالفة

العقل، وهذا فاسد.

والجواب عن ذلك هو أنَّ الله تعالى إذا كان عالماً بصالح عباده، وإنَّه لا يمتنع أن

تكون بعض الأفعال تدعو² إلى بعض. في أنه متى فعل هذا الفعل، يكون أقرب إلى أن يفعل

¹ is repeated. أرسلهم
² تدعو. MS.

الفعل الثاني. فلم يكن يمتنع في العقل، أن تكون بعض الأفعال لطفًا لنا في أن لا نَظْلِمَ، وأن نشكر المنعم، وأن نَرُدَّ الودائع ونَتَّقَف. فلما لم يكن العقل يمنع من هذا، وقد علمنا أن ما عنده يقع الواجب، يجب كوجوبه. فيجب إذا كان المعلوم (Fol. 14a.) في بعض الأفعال أن الواجب يقع عنده -إن يجب ذلك الفعل- كوجوب ذلك الواجب. ومتى كان ذلك واجبًا، فلا بد من أن يُعَرَّفنا القديمُ تعالى وجوبه لما كَلَّفنا الواجب، الَّذِي هو لطفٌ فيه. وليس في العقل دليل يدل على هذا، فلا بد أن يُعَرَّفنا لا بالعقل. ومتى عَرَفنا فلا بد أن يُخاطبنا. وذلك الخطاب إما أن يخاطب به الكل أو الواحد، فيُرسل إلينا ونعرفه ذلك، ليخاطبنا ذلك الرسول عنه تعالى، ويبين لنا مصالحنا عند ظهور المعجز عليه. وهذا من مُقْتَضَى العقل، وليس فيه مخالفة العقل. وإن كان فيه إفادة علم من جهتهم، لا يُعَلِّم إلا بهم -عليهم السلام-، على ما رتبته شيوخنا -رحمهم الله-. وليس الغرض إلا بيان ما يُموِّهون به هؤلاء القوم، ويُمخِّرون ويوهمون العامة أنهم في شيء ليغترّوا بهم. فلهذا نقتصر على جواب واحد وعلى نكته.

واعلم أن غرضهم بهذا السؤال التَّطَرُّق إلى أن للظاهر باطنًا، لا يقف عليه أحد إلا من جهتهم. وأن ذلك الباطن مُودَع في العقول، يحتاج إلى فاتح حتى يحصل العلم به. فهم إنما

جاءوا عند القوم ليتنبهوا¹ على ما في نفوسهم من العلوم كما يدعون من الأصليين والعناصر،
وُيرتّبوا لهم ما يتطرقوا به إلى عالم النفس. وقد أورد النسفي هذا السؤال على نفسه ثم أجاب
عنه بما حكيناه. ومثله بهذا القثاء² التي يخرجها الناس، فقال:

هذه الثمار والأشجار كانت مودعة في تلك الأرض في ذلك الماء، إلا إنه احتيج

5 في أن يظهر ذلك الكامن. فلم يكن يظهر إلا لمن يظهر ذلك الماء، فيجري على
الأرض، والأرض تُخرج نباتها من بعد. فكذا هذه العلوم، هي كامنة في نفس
الإنسان لا تظهر بالعقل إلا بعد من يظهرها، والأنبياء هم المظهرون لها،
مُخرجون من الكمون إلى الظهور.

يقال لهم:

10 خبرونا هل يجوز على الأنبياء كتمان ما لأجله بُعثوا، أم لا؟

فإن جَوَّزوا عليهم الكتمان، يُقال لهم:

من أين لكم أنهم كانوا أنبياء؟ (وهلاً جَوَّزتم)³ أن يكون إنما كان غيرهم، وهم لم

يُظهروا لكم ذلك وكتموه؟ ومن أين الأمان أن هذه الشرائع والأحكام بتأويلها على ما تزعمون؟

¹ يُبَيِّنُوا. MS. لِيَسْمَعُوا, it may also be read as: يُبَيِّنُوا.

² MS. العبلى.

³ Words between () is written vertically on the right margin.

وَمِنْ أَيْنَ [الأمان] أَنْ مَا ظَهَرَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَهُمْ كَانُوا مُخْتَصِّينَ بِهَا؟ وَفِي هَذَا خُرُوجَ مِنَ الْقَوْلِ الَّذِي

اعترفوا به، ومما طلبوا له وجه الحكمة. وإن لم يُجَوِّزُوا ذلك، يقال لهم:

فَمَا أَنْكَرْتُمْ أَنْ الَّذِي ادْعَيْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ فَاسِدٌ بَاطِلٌ، إِذْ لَمْ يَدَّعِ¹ وَاحِدٌ مِنْهُمْ ذَلِكَ، وَلَا دَعَا

إِلَيْهِ، بَلْ إِنَّمَا دَعَوْا إِلَى الظَّاهِرِ وَإِلَى مَعْرِفَةِ الصَّانِعِ وَعَدْلِهِ وَإِلَى طَاعَتِهِ. فَإِنْ قَالُوا بِذَلِكَ تُطَلَّبُ

مَقَالَتِهِمْ.

5

ويقال لهم:

خَبَّرُونَا عَنْ تِلْكَ الْعُلُومِ الَّتِي ادْعَيْتُمْ أَنَّهَا مِنْ جِهَةِ (Fol. 14 b.) اللهُ تَعَالَى، [أَبْدَلِيلِ]

عَرَفْتُمْ ذَلِكَ أَمْ بِخَبَرِ الرَّسُولِ؟

فَإِنْ تَعَلَّقُوا بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ ذَلِكَ، تَبَيَّنَ أَنَّهُ لَا يَدُلُّ ذَلِكَ الظَّاهِرَ عَلَى مَا ادَّعَوْهُ، عَلَى مَا نُبِئِنَاهُ

مِنْ بَعْدُ.

10

عَلَى أَنَّهُ يُقَالُ لَهُمْ:

أَلَيْسَ مَا فِي خَبَرِ اللهِ -عَزَّ وَجَلَّ- إِنَّمَا هُوَ ظَوَاهِرٌ فَلَا بَدَّ مِنْ بَاطِنٍ.²

فَيُقَالُ لَهُمْ:

¹ يدع ذلك واحد. MS.

² حلى. MS.

ما أنكرتم أن يكون إنما أريد بذلك الإخبار ضد ما تأولوها عليه. فلا يمكنهم أن يتمسكوا بشيء من الأخبار، مع قولهم بأن لكل ظاهر باطنًا. وإن قالوا "إنما عرفنا ذلك بخبر الصامت وهو الوصي"؛ يريدون به أمير المؤمنين عليًا -عليه السلام-. يقال لهم:

الصامت نفسه بماذا عرفتم أن صامت وإن قوله حجة؟ أبقوله عرفتم ذلك، أم بقول

5 غيره؟

فإن قالوا "بقوله عرفنا ذلك"، تجاهلوا مع ما يلزمهم من أن يُقلدوا جميع من يخالفهم، كما أوجبوا اتباعه بلا حجة ولا برهان. وإن قالوا "عرفناه بمعجزة ظهرت عليه"، كذبهم العيان. لأننا علمنا أنه لم يظهر بعد محمد -صلى الله عليه- -مُعجزة. وإن قالوا "بخبر الله -عز وجل- وبخبر رسوله -صلى الله عليه- عرفنا ذلك"، فقد بينا أنه لا يمكنهم

10 التمسك بشيء من الظواهر مع قولهم بالباطن.

على أنه يقال لهم:

إذا كان مفزعكم في هذه الأمور إلى أخبار الله -عز وجل- وأخبار الرسول -صلى الله عليه-، فهل أولتم ما قد علمنا من دين رسول الله -صلى الله عليه- -ضرورة أن الملائكة تنزل عليه، وأنهم عباد الله يعبدونه فلا يعصونه، وأنهم صورٌ وأجسامٌ، يجوز عليهم النزول والصعود والتنقل في الأماكن. فإن حاولوا دفع ذلك لم يجدوا إليه سبيلاً. على أنه يقال لهم:

15

أليسَ عندكم أنكم قد عرفتم أنَّ للظاهرِ باطنًا من قصد رسول الله -صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ-

بما يستدلُّون عليه من الظواهر. فإنَّ قالوا "نعم"، يقال لهم:

فهلَّا قبلتم قوله فيما قد عَلِمتم ضرورةً من دينه واعتقاده، أنَّ جبريل -عليه السلام-

كان ينزل عليه على صورة دحية الكلبي.^١ وأنه قد رآه في صورته التي خلقه الله تعالى عليها

مرَّتين، إلى سائر ما قد تواتر الخبر ونَطَقَ ظاهر القرآن به. فإنَّ راموا دفع ذلك لم يتأتَّ

لهم،^٢ ولو اشتغلنا بما يلزمهم من الجهالات لخرجنا عن الغرض.

واعلم أنَّ الذي أوردوه من الأدوار فإنَّ مدار مذهبهم عليه. لأنَّهم يحصرون الشرائع على

أعداد الدوائر السبعة، ويُرتَّبون بأنَّ يذكروا ما يعدونه سَبْعًا.^٣ فيهذون فيه على ترتب،^٤

ويذكرون أنَّ الأنبياء إنما جاءوا يعقدون^٥ هذه العقود ليستروا (...)^٦ إلى العالم العلوي.

فيرتبون الشريعة ونفس الإنسان وتركيبه والعالم ترتيبًا واحدًا فيسترون (...)^٧ الكل من جهة

¹ Dihya ibn Khalīfa ibn Farwa ibn Faḍāla al-Kalbī al-Quḍā'ī (d. ca. between 41-60/661-668), became a Muslim before the battle of Badr, the Prophet's messenger to the ruler Buṣrato give him the letter that gave to Hercules. Dhahabī, *Siyar*, ii, 550-6. Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, iv, 249. Ibn Khayyāṭ, *Tārīkh*, 79.

² MS. لم .

³ It seems that some of the first words on the lines, on left folios (Fol. b.) are illegible. Therefore, the uncompleted or uncertain words will be written in *italic*.

⁴ *sic*.

⁵ MS. ويعقدون .

⁶ Illegible word.

⁷ Illegible word.

التمثيل والعدد. وذلك أنهم ذكروا في كتبهم أن العوالم خمسة: عالمٌ روحاني، وهو عالم العقل والنفس. وعالمٌ علويٌّ، وهو عالم الأجرام والأفلاك. وعالمٌ طبيعيٌّ،¹ وهو الأرض وما بها. وعالم الشرائع بما فيها. و[الـ]عالم الصغير. فيسوّون² هذه الأشياء الخمسة التي ادّعوا، ويقولون (Fol. 15 a.) إن الأنبياء كانت دعوتهم إلى هذا المعنى، وهو التكليف.

5 والناجي من عرف هذه الأمور، والهالك من عدل عنه. ووجه التسوية³ بين هذه العوالم، وهو أنهم ذكروا أن العقل لما صار أولاً وظهر منه الثاني، صار العقل الأول له مركزاً، وصارت النفس دائرةً دارت عليه، وظهر من تدويرها ست دوائر على ما تقدّم ذكره. هذا هو صورة عالم العلوم.⁴

ثم إن المحاكاة بالشبه اثنتي عشرة دائرة فجاء اثنا عشر شيئاً⁵: وهو العقل الأول، والثاني النفس، والثالث الأفلاك، والرابع الكواكب، والخامس المفردات، والسادس 10 المركّبات، والسابع النامي، والثامن الحسيّ، والتاسع الناطق، والثلاثة فروع على هذه التسعة؛ وهم النطق؛ يعنون به الأنبياء، والأسس؛ يعنون به الأوصياء، والأئمة. فهذه

¹ MS. الطبيعي.

² sic., it is more likely if it is read as فيفسرون.

³ sic.

⁴ It is probably عالم العوالم.

⁵ Illegible word, it may be also read as نقيباً or نقباً.

الثلاثة فرعية مُرتَّبة على هذه التسعة فصار مجموعها¹ اثنا عشر عددًا نظير ذلك العدد، لأنَّ نهايته اثنا عشر. ألا ترى أنَّ الآحاد لا تتكرر إلا في التسعة ثمَّ العشرات ثمَّ المئات² ثمَّ

الألوف. والأفراد ليس إلا اثنا عشر وعليه مدار جميع الأعداد. ويقولون إنَّ هذا يظهر بالحسِّ، وذلك إنَّك إذا ضربت واحدًا في واحدٍ فإنَّما يكون خطأً طويلًا وخطأً عريضًا.

5 فالخطان³ لهما أربعة أطراف وأربعة فروج والعقد فصار تسعة. فهذا هو الذي ظهر بالفعل

تسعة أشياء معدودة، فضربنا الواحد في الواحد فصار العشرات والمئات والألوف إذا أضيف

إليها صار اثنا عشر. [ب]أنَّ يُخَطَّ لكلِّ واحدٍ منها خطٌّ يدلُّ عليه. فهذا هو الذي يُصَوَّرُون

من أمر العالم الروحاني والذي ظهر منه إلى الفعل. فأما العالمُ العلوي فإنه يترتب على هذا،

وذلك أنه إنما هو اثنا عشر بُرجًا وسبعة⁶ ملوك وخمس طبائع. وذلك أنَّ بروجَه صار[ت]

10 بعدد ما ظهر من النفس والعقل عددًا سواء. فالملوك السبعة صارت موازية⁷ للدوائر السبعة،

التي تقدَّم ذكرها، وطبيعة الخمسة موازيًا للعوالم الخمسة. وإنما عَنَوْنَا بالطبيعة الخمسة كون

¹ . لمجموعها. MS.

² . المائتين. MS.

³ . فالخططين. MS.

⁴ . خطا. MS.

⁵ . عالم. MS.

⁶ . سبع. MS.

⁷ . صار موازيا. MS.

عطاردا^١ ممتزجاً، وكونه ممتزجاً جعلوه طبيعة خامسة. وأمّا العالم^٢ الطبيعي فهو الأرض بما
تحملة^٣، وذلك أنّها أقاليم سبعة واثنتا عشرة^٤ جزيرة. وهي مركبة من هذه المفردات الأربعة،
وظهرَ منها الصلاح لمكان الاعتدال، فصار الاعتدال خامساً للمفردات الأربعة. فهذه الخمسة
مجاري لما ذكرناه من العوالم، واثنتا عشرة^٥ جزيرة مقابل لما ذكرناه من المعدودات والأقاليم^٦
السبعة مقابلة للأدوار السبعة. وأمّا العالم الصغير، وهو الإنسان، فهو مشبّه بهذه العوالم من
5 وجوه كثيرة. عنه^٧ بجواز ذلك الإنسان مركّب من هذه الطبائع الأربعة ولا يكمل إلا بالنفس.
فصارت الطبائع والنفس خمسة. ولها سبعة أعضاء ظاهرة وسبعة باطنة، وأمّا الظاهرة فالرأس
واليدان^٨ والظهر والبطن والرّجلان^٩، وأمّا الباطنة فهي الدماغ والقلب والكبد والرئة
والكلّيتان^{١٠} والطحال. وأمّا الاثنا عشر فهي الثُّقب التي في الإنسان، مثل الأذنين والعينين
والمنخرين والفم والتديين والسرة والدبر والإحليل. وأمّا عالم النطقاء فهم السبعة، أولهم آدم
10

^١ MS. العطاردا .

^٢ MS. عالم .

^٣ MS. حملها .

^٤ MS. اثنا عشر .

^٥ MS. اثنا عشر .

^٦ MS. اقاليم .

^٧ sic .

^٨ MS. اليدين .

^٩ MS. الرجلين .

^{١٠} MS. الكلّيتين .

والثاني نوح والثالث إبراهيم والرابع موسى والخامس عيسى والسادس محمد -صلوات الله

عليهم- والسابع ما ينتظرونه. خمسة منهم أصحاب الشرائع، أولهم نوح وآخرهم محمد -

عليهما السلام-، ولكل واحدٍ (Fol. 15 b.) منهم أساس. ولكل أساس سبعة أئمة. ولكل

إمام اثنا عشر جناحاً، وهم الدعاء في الجزائر. فهذا هو ترتيب العوالم عندهم، وعليه مدار

مذاهبهم، وإليه يردون سائر ما في العالم وسائر ما يأتي به الأنبياء -عليهم السلام-. ونحن

نبين سائر ما في شريعتنا مما يتأولونه ويرتبونه على هذه المقدمات بعد أن نبين فساد ما

ذكروه بما يوجب حيرتهم فيه. مع¹ أنه ظاهر الفساد لأن تأويله تنزيهه.² وذلك أن كل من

رزقه الله عقلاً وافرأ، ورأى [رأى] أهل العلم وسمعه، أو راجع نفسه، علم بفطرة عقله فساد

ما ذهبوا إليه، وإن القوم ممخرقون محتالون في إطفاء نور الإسلام. وكلاً أن يكون كذلك، فإن

الله تعالى ينصر دينه ولو كره المشركون.

واعلم أن الذي ذكروه من الأعداد، ولفقوا بين هذه الأشياء، فهو مبني على أن هذه

الأشياء وُجِدَت على هذه الوجوه. وهذا لا يصح، لأن الشيء إذا لم يكن [له] وجود لا يصح

أن يكون له ترتيب على ما ذكروه. ونحن نبين في كل واحدٍ من الأعداد أنه لا أصل له، ولا

¹ . معاً MS.

² sic.

يصح وجوده على ذلك الحد. وذلك إنَّ أوَّل ما ذكروا من العالم الروحاني، وما ظهر منه¹ فقد

بيننا من قبل أنه لا أصل له. وإن كان له أصل أيضاً، فلا يمكنهم أن يذكروا الواحد منهما،

من الصفات، إلا ما هو للآخر حاصل. وذلك أن كل واحد منهما بسيط غير مُركَّب، لا يمنع

كما تمنع الأجسام الكثيفة من التداخل. فكل واحد منهما عندهم² عالمها فوق الفلك. وكل

5 واحدٍ منهما قادر عالم حيّ عندهم. فلا يتميِّز عن صاحبه على وجه من الوجوه، إلا بدعاوى

تتجرد عن القوانين. مثل أن قالوا "أحدهما دار على نفسه وأظهر العالم بما فيه، والآخر

مركزٌ ثابتٌ في مكانه، وأحدهما يشبِك³ بالعالم الطبيعي طلباً للعالم الروحاني والآخر لم

يشبِك". وهذا كلُّه مذاهب لا برهان معها.

فيقال لهم: ما لكم من قبل أن اللزومات التي من عندهم عندهم على ما ذكرتم.

10 ما أنكرتم أنه ليس هناك إلا شيئاً واحداً، وأن الذي ظهر إنما هو من ذلك الواحد، وإنَّ

ذلك الواحد هو الذي يشبِك. وهو الذي أظهر سائر ما في العالم على ما قاله أكثر القدماء. لأنَّ

أكثرهم قالوا بالنفس الكلية⁴ وبالهيولى وهو العقل، فلا يجدون إلى الفصل ولا إلى البرهان على

¹ منها. MS.

² عندهم. MS.

³ It can be also read as يسكن.

⁴ الكلية. MS.

مقاتلهم سبيلاً. ثمَّ يقال لهم:

ما أنكرتم أن يكون الذي ادعيتم من الأفلاك لا أصل لها، على وجهٍ من الوجوه على

ما قال بعض المنجمين. وذلك أن عند بعضهم أنه ليس هناك جرم سوى أجرام الكواكب،

فأمَّا الأفلاك فالمراد بها إنما هو دوران هذه الكواكب على نفسها واختلاف مطالعها. فأمَّا أن

5 يكون هناك جرم آخر تدور بدورانه الكواكب فلا. فيقال لهم:

ما أنكرتم من هذه المقالة، وما الدلالة على بطلانها، وهل عندكم ما يُخلِّصكم من هذه

المطالبة أم لا؟ فإن حاولوا الاستدلال لم يجدوا إليه سبيلاً. لأنَّ الأصول التي يبني عليها

المنجمون هذا نحن نخالفهم فيها، فلا يمكنهم تصحيح ذلك. ثمَّ يقال لهم:

أليس قد بيَّنا لكم من قبل أن المفردات، التي هي عناصر عندكم على ما ذكرتم، لا

10 أصل لها، وأنكم متخوِّضون في ذلك لا دليل لكم على شيء منها. فكيف يمكنكم أن تجعلوها

أصلاً من الأصول؟ إذ يجب أن نبيِّن الشيء أولاً وندلَّ على وجوده، ثمَّ نتكلم في أحكامه.

(Fol. 16 a.) فكيف يمكنكم مع هذا أن تجعلوه واحد الأعداد. ثمَّ يقال لهم:

أليس هذه المركبات متركبة من (...ن) وهي نفسها لاغير. فإن قالوا "لا"، تركوا

¹ . اصل MS.

² Illegible word, most probably it is اثنين or شيتين .

مذهبهم ، وإن قالوا "نعم" ، يقال لهم :

فكيف يصح أن تجعلوا شيئاً واحداً شيئين وتدخلوه تحت العدد؟ وكذلك يقال لهم فيما

ادّعوه من الأنفس الثلاثة ، وهي النامية والحسية والناطقة :

خبرونا عن هذه الأنفس التي هي مختلفة في ذواتها ، أهي واحدة اختلفت لاختلاف

5 أماكنها؟ فمن جوابهم "لا ، بل هي واحدة ، وإنما اختلفت الأسماء عليها". لأنهم إن لم يقولوا

ذلك ، لزمهم أن يكون لهذه الثلاثة كائناً يحسبها¹ وهذا ليس بقول لهم. وقد ذكروا أن

الأسماء² تختلف على النفس بحسب أجرامها وفلكها³. وقد شبهوها بالشمس إذا طلعت

فوقعت على الكوة ، فمتى كانت كبيرة كان ضياؤها أكبر ،⁴ ومتى كانت صغيرة فتخبيها⁵.

فكذلك النفس إذا كان يشبكها قليلاً كان ذلك الجسم يتحرك حركة خفيفة. فيقال "كيف

10 الحركة ، حركة النامي؟ ومتى كان تداخلها في الجسم⁶ أكبر ، يكون ذلك الجرم ناطقاً مميزاً".

وإذا كان هذا قولهم ، فكيف يمكنهم أن يعدّوه عدداً ، مع أنه ليس هناك اختلاف ، وإنما

¹ كائنات تحسبها ، it may be read as كازآنا يحسبها # MS.

² . اسامي MS.

³ . فلتها MS.

⁴ . سبهوه MS.

⁵ . أكثر It can be also read as .

⁶ . فبحسبها MS.

⁷ . الحرسم MS.

اختلفت العبارة على أجرامها وأشخاصها التي هي مجاورة لها. فمتى لم يمكنهم تحصيل ما قد عدوه أو لا، بطل جميع ما ذكروه وما¹ شبهوه من العدد، وأنه مواضة من العقلاء. ولو كان الإصطلاح منهم غير واقع على هذا الحد، فبماذا كانوا يستشهدون على مقالتهم؟ لأن اللغات والأعداد طريقة الاصطلاح، فلا يمكن أن نجعل اصطلاحهم حجة على غيرهم. على أنه كان غير صحيح² أن يجعلوا لكل عدد اسماً يختصه يتميز عن غيره ولا يتكرر. فلو فعلوا ذلك أترى كان هذا المخذول يثبت الأصول على حسبتها أم كان يستدل بغير العدد. ومن الناس من قال أن الأعداد ليس³ تتكرر وإنما هو اسمان جعلا اسماً واحداً. وكان هذا أسهل عليهم من ابتداء مواضة أخرى، فهذا يُفسد ما قالوه. ثم الذي ذكروه من أن هذا يظهر للحس، فكلام لا معنى له. وذلك أن الخطئين اللذين يفعلان عند ضرب الواحد في الواحد لا اعتبار بأطراف الخط، وإنما الاعتبار بالنقطة التي هي العقد بين الخطين. وكيف يمكن أن نجعل ذلك مثلاً لما ادعوه. ألا ترى أن الاثنين متى ضربا في اثنين فإن الخطوط تزيد والعقد لا يزيد على أربعة، فصح أن العبرة بالعقد دون الخطوط. ثم يقال لهم:

هَبْ أَنْ أطراف الخط يقع عليها العدد، فما ليس بشيء كيف يُعد؟ وذلك أن الفرج

¹ . شبهه (ذكره وما)

² MS. ممسح .

³ sic.

التي بين طرفي الخط هو الذي كان من قبل. ولم يحدث هناك أمر ولا شيء هناك، فكيف جعلتموه معدوداً؟ وهل هذا إلا السُخف والهذيان، ولولا اغترار هؤلاء المدابير بكم وإلا فأياً فائدة في هذا الكلام.

ثم يقال لهم فيما ادعوه من هذه المعلومات من السبعة البروج، أليس هذا التقسيم إنما

- 5 هو مواضع بين المنجمين. وإنهم هم الذين قسّموا الفلك هذه الأقسام، وجعلوا لهذه الكواكب بيوتاً وستراً فيها على الحساب، على حسب ما رتبوه وجعلوه أمانة له، ليعرفوا بها ما أجرى - الله عز وجل - بها العادة في أن يفعل عند سيرها إلى بعض المواضع. فإن قالوا "ليس ذلك بمواضع واصطلاح"، كابروا وظهر أمرهم لمن تأمل وعرف حال (Fol. 16 b.) المنجمين. وإن قالوا "هم الذين قسّموه هذه الأقسام"، يقال لهم:

- 10 فلو زادوا في القسمة أو نقصوا كيف كان يصير ترتيبكم لها على ما ادعيتم؟ فقد عُلِمَ أن ترتيبهم الأفلاك والأنجم على مقالتهم، يدلّ من حالهم على ركاكة علومهم. فإن قالوا "ليس هذا عندنا"، وعند بعض أصحابكم أن أصله ثنوي. قيل له:

الذي هو ثنوي عندهم هو العلم بسيرها وبمعرفة ما نفع عنده ومعرفة الأبعاد وغيره،

وهو أيضاً يجري مجرى المواضع. ثم يقال لهم:

- 15 هذا الذي ادعيتم من أمر الأقاليم والجزائر والاعتدال والطبائع، أعرفتموه ضرورة أم

دَلِّمَ عَلَيْهِ دَلِيلٌ؟ فَإِنْ عَرَفْتُمُوهُ ضَرُورَةٌ لَا بَدَلَالَةَ، فَلِمَ [لَمْ] نَشَارِكْكُمْ فِيهِ؟ وَإِنْ عَرَفْتُمُوهُ

اسْتَدْلَالًا فَلِمَ لَا تَسْتَدْلُونَ عَلَى صِحَّتِهِ؟ وَإِنْ رَامُوا الدَّلَالََةَ عَلَيْهِ لَمْ يَجِدُوا إِلَيْهِ سَبِيلًا. فَإِنْ قَالُوا

”هَذَا مَوَاضِعَةٌ مِنَّا“، يُقَالُ لَهُمْ:

بَيِّنْتُمْ قَوْلَكُمْ عَلَى مَا تَخْرُصْتُمُوهُ، وَهَلْ هَذَا إِلَّا تَمِيزٌ لَهُ. قَائِلٌ يُقَابِلُكُمْ فَيَقُولُ ”الْأَقَالِيمُ

عَشْرُونَ وَالْجِزَائِرُ أَرْبَعُونَ“، فَإِذَا لَمْ يَكُنْ بَيْنَكُمْ وَبَيْنَهُ فَصْلٌ، فَلَمْ جَعَلْتُمْ مَقَالَاتِكُمْ حُجَّةً وَمِثَالًا،

وَتَسَوَّفْتُمْ بَيْنَهُ وَبَيْنَ الشَّرَائِعِ وَالْأَفْعَالِ.

ثُمَّ يُقَالُ لَهُمْ فِيمَا أَدَعَوْهُ مِنَ الْإِنْسَانِ:

لَمْ جَعَلْتُمْ أَعْضَاءَ الْإِنْسَانِ سَبْعَةَ دُونَ أَنْ تَجْعَلُوهَا عَشْرَةَ؟ وَلَمْ اخْتَصَصْتُمْ أَنْتُمْ بِقِسْمَةِ

الْإِنْسَانِ دُونَ غَيْرِكُمْ؟ فَإِنْ أَرَادُوا أَنْ يَسْتَدْلُوا عَلَى تَرْجِيحِ قَوْلِهِمْ لَمْ يَجِدُوا إِلَيْهِ سَبِيلًا. فَإِنْ

قَالُوا ”إِنَّمَا جَعَلْنَا هَذِهِ الْأَعْضَاءَ سَبْعَةَ أَقْسَامٍ لِأَنَّهَا إِذَا فُصِّلَتْ جُرِحَ الْإِنْسَانُ مِنْ كَوْنِهِ حَيًّا“.

يُقَالُ لَهُمْ:

لَمْ أَدْعَيْتُمْ هَذَا؟ وَهَلْ هَذَا إِلَّا تَخَوُّصٌ¹ مِنْكُمْ. وَنَقُولُ:

أَلَيْسَ قَدْ تَقَطَّعَ يَدُ الْإِنْسَانِ مِنْ مَنْكَبِهِ وَلَا يَمُوتُ، وَقَدْ جَعَلْتُمُوهَا² عَضْوًا مِنْ أَعْضَائِهِ،

فَظَهَرَ بِهَذَا بَهْتِكُمْ. ثُمَّ يُقَالُ لَهُمْ:

¹ . بحرص . MS.

² . جعلتموه . MS.

أليس على زعمكم كل ما يُقَطع يجب أن يكون عضوًا من أعضائه إذا لم يبقَ حيًّا مع

عدمه. فإن قالوا "نعم"، يقال لهم:

فهل جعلتم صدر الإنسان عضوًا، وكذلك كتفه، لأننا نعلم أن مع فقدهما لا يبقى حيًّا.

كما جعلتم بطنه عضوًا وظهره. فإن راموا الفصل لم يجدوه. ثم يقال لهم فيما ادعوه من

5 الأعضاء الرئيسة الباطنة:

جعلتموها سبعة، ولم لم تجعلوا المعدة¹ منها وهي أعظمها² نفعًا. ولا يمكن الواحد

منهم أن يدفع أن لها من التأثير في قوام البدن ما ليس للرئة والكليتين والطحال. بل ما

أنكرتم من قول بعض الأطباء أن الأعضاء الرئيسة ثلاثة: الدماغ والقلب والمعدة. فإن راموا

الفصل لم يجدوا، فتبين مخرقتهم فيما رتبوه في العالم³ الصغير، ونحن نستقصي قولهم في

10 العالم الصغير فيما بعد.

ثم يقال لهم فيما ادعوه من أدوار الأنبياء عليهم السلام:

لم جعلتم هؤلاء الستة مخصوصون⁴ دون سائر الأنبياء - عليهم السلام -، ولأي

¹ . تجعلواها المعدة . MS.

² . اعطها . MS.

³ . عالم . MS.

⁴ . مخصصا . MS.

اختصاص؟ فإن قالوا "لأنهم كانوا أولي العزم، وهم -عليهم السلام- كانوا أصحاب

الشرائع"، يقال لهم: *هذا البيت المظنون كان على العاصم أو غيره من أصحابهم فيما أوردوه*

من أين لكم أنه لم يكن لغيرهم شريعة، وأنهم كانوا مختصين بها؟ أو ما علمتم من

دين المسلمين أنه لا يجوز بعثة نبي من الأنبياء بلا شريعة. فكيف صرتم مدعين على الأنبياء

5 ما ليس بحسن في صفات الله إذ بعثهم، إنما يحسن من الله ليُعلم من جهتهم مصالح

الشريعة. وهذا يُبطل (Fol. 17 a.) جميع ما تبنون عليه أصولكم. والذي ادّعوه من أمر

محمد (بن اسماعيل¹ فإنه لا يُعرف له أصل. بل قد عُلم من ذكر رسول الله -صلى² الله

عليه- ضرورة بحيث لا يلبس على الصبيان المراهقين أنه -صلى الله عليه- كان خاتم

النبیین، وأنه لا يجيء بعده من يرفع شريعته. فكيف ادعيتم على رسول الله -صلى الله

10 عليه وآله- ما قد عُلم من دينه خلافه. وليس العجب منهم، بل العجب من المخذول الذي

يجيؤهم³ مع أنهم يدعون تأويل الظواهر وبيان الشرائع. فكيف لا يلتمس منهم الجواب عما

قد عُلم من دين المسلمين أن الأنبياء كلهم كانوا أصحاب شرائع⁴، وما قد عُلم من دينه

¹ Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. See above, *The Development of the Ismā'īlis*, 51-3.

² The sentence between () is written conversely above the line.

³ MS. حلهم .

⁴ MS. الشرائع .

ضرورة، حتى علم اليهود والنصارى من دينه -صلى الله عليه- أنه لا نبي بعده. بل لو لم يكن في اعتقاداتهم إلا هذا البُهت العظيم، لكان على العاقل أن يترك مقالتهم فيما أوردوه ورتبوه. ولن¹ نتكلم على فصل فصل لثلاث نطوّل، ويمكن أن يعارضوا من المعارضات المسخفة على مقالتهم هذه بما لا حصر له، ولكن كرهنا الإطالة فيه. وقد يتكرر هذا في تأويلاتهم، فربما نتكلم عليه ونحن نصور دوائرهم التي عليها² يتكلمون، ليكون أقرب إلى إفهام الناظرين 5 فيه.

فصل.

واعلم أن لهم في العالم³ الصغير والكبير هذياناً كبيراً. ولو أوردناها لطلال بها الكتاب، إلا أننا نقتصر على حلّ ما يدور عليه كلامهم. وذلك أن عندهم أن الإنسان هو العالم الصغير، وإنما سُمي العالم الصغير؛ لأنّ جميع ما في العالم حاصل في الإنسان على طريق الجملة، 10 وحاصل فيه على طريق التفصيل. فأما على طريق الجملة، فللعالم مركز النفس كامنة فيه، وكذلك الإنسان. وفي العالم نبات وماء وجماد وجبال، وفي العلوية كواكب وأفلاك، وفي

¹ . ولم MS.

² . الذى عليه MS.

³ . عالم MS.

⁴ . عالم الصغر MS.

الإنسان كل ذلك حاصل.¹ لأن لحم الإنسان بمنزلة الأرض، وعظمه بمنزلة الجبال، والعروق والدم فيه² بمنزلة الأنهار، والشعور³ بمنزلة النبات، وعين الإنسان بمنزلة الكواكب، ورأس الإنسان لتدويره بمنزلة الفلك، وهو عالٍ على هذه الأشياء كما أن هذه الكواكب والأفلاك علويات. فهذا هو الذي في رسومهم وأول تلقينهم للمتعلم⁴ المخدوع. ولهم تشبيه آخر، يُشبهون الإنسان بالأفلاك وكواكبها. وذلك أن عندهم أن الكواكب السبعة هي الملوك،⁵ والبروج هي الاثنا عشر، والمنازل التي⁶ يقطعها القمر ثمان⁷ وعشرون، والدُرَج ثلاثمائة⁸ وستون درجة. فتلاثة⁹ من البروج مظلمة وتسعة منها مضيئة، على حسب ما يذهب إليه أهل التنجيم. قالوا "فالإنسان مركبٌ من جهة الأعداد، وهذا التركيب⁹ ينقسم إلى هذه الأعداد، فالذي يقابل هذه الكواكب السبعة، ماذكرنا من أعضائه الباطنة والظاهرة". ويقسمون الإنسان إلى سبعة أقسام، ويجعلون بعضهم الأعضاء هذه الأقسام: أولها الجلد

10

الإنسان، نحو الرأس واليد والقدم والكف والساعد والرسغ والكم والعضد والساعد والرسغ والقدم والكف واليد

¹ MS. حاصله.

² MS. فيها.

³ It is most likely if it was written as الشَّعْر، to avoid the confusion with the meaning of الشعور as "feelings".

⁴ MS. للمعلم.

⁵ MS. الذي.

⁶ MS. ثمانيه.

⁷ MS. ثلثمائة.

⁸ MS. فتلته.

⁹ (وهذا التركيب) is repeated.

وثانيها العَصَب وثالثها العروق ورابعها الدم وخامسها اللحم وسادسها العظم وسابعها المخ.

فَالَّذِي يَقَابِلُ الْمُلُوكَ السَّبْعَةَ عِنْدَهُمْ هَذِهِ الْأَعْدَادُ الَّتِي ذَكَرُوهَا. وَيَسْتَدِلُّ صَاحِبُ هَذِهِ الْمَقَالَةِ

عَلَى مَنْ جَعَلَ مَقَابِلَةَ الْكُوكَبِ لِلْأَعْضَاءِ الظَّاهِرَةِ وَالْأَعْضَاءِ الْبَاطِنَةِ^١ بِأَنْ قَالَ "إِنَّ الَّذِي ذَكَرْتَ

وَجَعَلْتَهُ فِي مَقَابِلَةِ الْكُوكَبِ لِأَنَّ بَعْضَهَا فَوْقَ بَعْضٍ، كَمَا أَنَّ لِلْكُوكَبِ^٢ أَمَاكِنَ (Fol. 17 b.)

5 بَعْضًا فَوْقَ بَعْضٍ". وَقَدْ رَأَيْتُ فِي رِسَالَةِ الْخَيْشْفُوجِ اعْتِرَاضًا عَلَى هَذَا الْكَلَامِ، وَلَمْ يَكُنْ

يَرْضَاهُ. وَذَكَرَ أَنَّهُ يُعَرِّفُ مَوْلَاهُ هَذِهِ الْمَسْأَلَةَ، وَيَشْكُو مِنْ قَائِلِهَا هَذَا إِلَيْهِ. وَلَسْتُ أَدْرِي كَيْفَ

يُعَرِّفُهُ وَهُوَ عِنْدَهُمْ يَعْلَمُ سِرَّهُمْ وَنَجْوَاهُمْ.^٣ إِلَّا أَنَّ مِنْهُمْ مَنْ قَدْ ذَكَرَ هَذَا فَأَرَدْنَا أَنْ نَذَكَرَ مَقَالَتَهُمْ

لِيَقِفَ النَّاسُ عَلَى أَغْرَاضِهِمْ وَمَقَاصِدِهِمْ. وَالَّذِي يَقَابِلُ الْبُرُوجَ، هَذِهِ الثُّقُبُ الَّتِي فِي الْإِنْسَانِ.

وَذَلِكَ مَا ذَكَرْنَا مِنَ الْأَذْنَيْنِ وَالْعَيْنَيْنِ، إِلَى سَائِرِ مَا تَقَدَّمَ ذَكَرَهُ. وَقَالُوا "ثَلَاثَةٌ مِنْهَا مَظْلَمَةٌ:

10 الثَّنِيدَانُ^٤ وَالسَّرَّةُ، وَالْبَاقِي كُلُّهَا مَضِيئَةٌ"، وَيَعْنُونَ مُفْتَحَةً. وَالَّذِي يَقَابِلُ الْمَنَازِلَ عِنْدَهُمْ أَبْعَاضُ

الْإِنْسَانِ، نَحْوَ الرَّأْسِ وَالْعُنُقِ وَالْكَتِفَيْنِ وَالْعَضْدَيْنِ وَالسَّاعِدَيْنِ وَالزَّنْدَيْنِ وَالْكَفَّيْنِ وَالصَّدْرِ

وَالْجَنْبَيْنِ وَالْخَصْرَيْنِ وَالْفَخْذَيْنِ وَالرُّكْبَتَيْنِ وَالسَّاقَيْنِ وَالْكَعْبَيْنِ وَالْقَدَمَيْنِ، فَهَذِهِ تَقَابِلُ^٥ مَنَازِلِ

الْمَقَالِ لَا يَرَى نَفْسَهُ اعْتَدَلَ مِثْلَ هَذَا الْكَلَامِ بِعَرَاكِفِهِ وَقَدْ بَيَّنَّا أَيْ الَّذِي ذَكَرْنَا مِنْ مَنَاسِكِ

^١ . الرباطية MS.

^٢ . الكواكب MS.

^٣ . نجواه MS.

^٤ . الثنيدان MS.

^٥ . فهذه هي تقابل MS.

القمر التي هي السرطين والبطين،¹ إلى آخر ما يُذكر. والذي يقابل البروج هي هذه العظام الصغار، وهي عندهم ثلاثمائة وستون [عظماً]. ولهم تشبيه آخر، يُشبهون الإنسان بالأرض، وذلك أنها عندهم أقاليم سبعة وجزائر على ما ذكرنا. وأن نصفها عمران ونصفها خراب، وربعا مسكون وربعا غير مسكون، نحو المفاوز وعليها نبات. وهذا عندهم صورة الإنسان، وذلك أن الذي يقابل الأقاليم ما ذكرنا من الأعضاء، وكذلك الجزائر على ما تقدّم. فأما كونها عمران، فعمران الإنسان ما نقابله. لأن حلية الإنسان وحسنه إنما هو ما نواجهه، نحو الوجه إلى قدمه، وسائر ما يمكنه أن يتعرف فيها إنما يمكنه من جهة القدام، ولا يتهيأ له التعرف من جهة الـ خلف. فأما الربع المسكون فما بين المفصل والمفصل، لا يمكن الإنسان أن يفعل به، وإنما يفعل بأن يُحرّك المفاصل. فصار المنتفع بأعضائه وبدنه مواضع الفصل. فأما النبات فعلى ما ذكرنا من الشعور، وكذلك المياه هي العروق، إلى سائر ما ذكرنا. وهذا كله الكشف عنه هو النقض عليه، لأن علم العاقل في احتيالهم؛ في ترتيب هذه الأمور وتلفيق هذه الأشياء، يدلّه على مخرقة القوم وعلى أنهم محتالون، وإن هذا يظهرون ولا يعيدون. إذ العاقل لا يرضى لنفسه اعتقاد مثل هذا الكلام مع ركاكته. وقد بيّنا أن الذي ذكروا من انقسام الفلك وهذه الكواكب السبعة فإنما صار[ت] كذلك على ما هي عليها من الانقسام لنستدل

¹ sic.

بحسابها على ما أُجري العادة فيها. ألا ترى أنَّهم قَسَموه إلى الثواني والدقائق¹ حتى يلغوه

إلى أدنى ما يمكن في الصغر. فَلَمْ صاروا بأنْ ذكروا هذا القسم من أقسامهم ولم يذكروا الدقيقة

والثانية، (Fol. 18 a.) إلى سائر ما ينقسم إليه حساب المنجمين؟ وإذا كان ذلك مواضع،

فلا يكون من نفس الخلقة، ولا يوجب أمراً من الأمور. وقد بيَّنا أنْ ما ذكره من انقسام

5 الأرض فإنه لا أصل له، فَبَطُلَ جميع ما رتبوه. وَلَمْ صاروا - في ما ذكره من أعضاء الإنسان

وأبعاضه - إلى أنْ قَسَموا هذا القسم دون غيره؟ وَلَمْ لا يجوز أنْ يُزاد فيه وأنْ ينقص منه؟ فإنْ

راموا الاستدلال على شيء مما ذكره وقَسَموه لم يجدوا إليه سبيلاً. إذ العقل لا يدلّ عليه ولا

السمع. وإنْ هذا التقسيم أولى من غيره ليستفاد علماً،² إذ لا يحصل هذا ببال العقلاء، ولا

التكليف يتعلق به. وإنْ صح ما قالوه، كان [ذلك] يدل على عجائب صنع الله - عزَّ وجلَّ -

10 وحسن أفعاله. إذ جَمَعَ لنا ما في العالم في هذه الصورة الصغيرة. و[من] نظيره قد فعل تعالى،

لأنَّه جمع ما³ في الفيل في البعوضة وزاد فيها جناحين. ولولا قَلَّة دينهم لما اشتغلوا بهذه

الخرافات عما يلزمهم، بل كانوا ينظرون لأنفسهم فيُخَلِّصونها من العقاب الدائم. إلا أنْ

القوم، لجهلهم بما وجب عليهم، تركوه فخسروا خسراناً مبيناً. وإنما ذكرنا هذا الكلام

¹ MS. الدقيقة .

² A word, could be read عقلا , is written above the line.

³ MS. مالا .

بطوله، لأنَّ الشرائع عندهم كلّها مُرتبة على هذه الخرافات. وأردنا أنْ نكشف أسرارهم

فيها، فلم يكن لنا بد من ذكر هذه الأشياء، ليقف عليها الناظر فيه على خسرتهم.¹

واعلم² أنهم يدعون العامّة؛ التي لا تعرف شيئاً من النّظر ولا طريقة الجدل ولم تجالس

أهل الفضل، بضروبٍ من الخدعة على حسب ما هو عليه من الديانات. فإنْ كان ممن يرجع

5 إلى تديّنٍ واعتقادٍ للإسلام، خدعوه بما تقدّم من المسائل، ليشككوه في اعتقاده. فإنْ كان

الرجل لا يطيعهم [في]³ ذلك، خدعوه بالشرعيات وأحكامها واختلاف أركانها واختلاف

شرائع الأنبياء، [وذلك] بأنْ يسألوه⁴ عن اختلافها. فأى جوابٍ يجيبه يقولون "هذا ليس

بجوابٍ عمّا سألناه، ويجب أنْ تعرف الجواب". فإنْ رجع المخدوع إليهم، قالوا "فاطلب

فإنّك تجده في أهله". ثمّ يومئ إلى أنْ هذا في أهل بيت أمير المؤمنين عليٍّ -عليه السلام-

10 وإنّك تجده إنْ طلبته. ويردّ عليه أنواعاً من المخرقة، ويظهر له من التديّن والصلاة والصوم،

ما يتحير المخدوع في أمره وكثرة استكائه. ويسأله إنْ كان تالياً للقرآن عارفاً به، عن معاني

ما في القرآن من المتشابه وما يتعارض من الآي في الظاهر. فالمسكين لا يعرف عن شيءٍ منها

¹ This is the start point of S. M. Stern when he edited the text and included it to his article "Abū Ḥ-Qāsim al-Bustī and his Refutation of Ismā'īlism", JRAS, 1961, 15-35.

² A space, اعلم is written on the left margin. It seems that the copyist had left a space in the beginning of some sentences, and wrote the starting word on the margin to fill the space later with either different ink or font. It should be noted that at the middle of the text the copyist ignores to fill the spaces.

³ [إلى] , cf. Stern, *ibid.*, 30.

⁴ . يسألوه MS.

جواباً، ولا يعرف طريقة الحق. فيخذه عن نفسه، فيخضع¹ له. ثم لا يزال يروّضه، ويقدم

فيما² يعتقد ويذم الظاهر. ويذكر من مآلِب مَنْ تلبّسَ بالعلم، إلى أن يشق ذلك المخدوع إلى

مقالته. فيتقدّم إليه ويلتمس من جهته الخلاص مما هو فيه، فيأمره بالصوم ثلاثة أيام. ثم

يدنيه من نفسه إن كان هو داعياً، وإن كان مأذوناً يحمله إلى الداعي الذي في بلده. فيُحلّفه

5 بأيمانٍ غليظة أولها بالله وبآياته وبرسله، وبجميع ما عهد الله إلى أنبيائه وبولاية الصالحين

وعداوة أعداء الله، وبأمواله وبطلاق نسائه وبعثاق عبده، وبوجوب العبادات عليه، مثل

الحج والجهاد والصوم طول³ عمره، وبإباحة دمه لهم إن أظهر ذلك لمخالفه⁴ نطقاً أو إيماءً،

[أو] بكتابة أو إشارة، أو تصديقاً لمن يخبر به على وجه من الوجوه. ثم يكرر عليه هذه

الأيمان إن هو عنى⁵ به غير الإمام الذي هو يذبُّ عنه. (Fol. 18 b.) فالمخدول يأتي بهذه

10 الأيمان بطولها، ثم يبتدىء⁶ فيلقنه ما ذكرناه، من السبعة الكواكب والأقاليم والنطقاء والبروج

¹ فيخدع ، cf. Stern, *Studies*, 316. It should be noted that when Stern's article was republished by the Hebrew University as a chapter in *Studies In Early Ismā'ilism*, the Arabic text, which was transliterated by Stern in 1961, written in Arabic in 1983.

² في ما ، [In the original article the text is given in transcription. It was rendered into Arabic characters without the benefit of consulting the original manuscript], *ibid.*

³ وطول ، cf. Stern, "Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Bustī", *JRAS*, 30.

⁴ لمخالفه ، *ibid.*

⁵ كنى ، *ibid.*

⁶ يتدع ، cf. Stern, *Studies*, 316.

والجزائر والأئمة والدواعي^١ والأصليين والناطق والأساس والجد والفتح والخيال على ما تقدّم

بيانها.^٢ إذا تصوّر المخدوع هذه الأشياء، يجيء إلى الشهادة وإلى أركان الشريعة فيرتبها على

هذه الأعداد. وكذلك يفعل باليهود والنصارى. وإن كان الرجل غير متدين في ملته ويكون من

السلاطين، فإنه يصوّر له أنّ هذه الأمور لا أصل لها، وأنّ الإنسان يجب أن يكون وراء لذاته

وما يعود عليه من نفع أبدانه وأزواجه. وإنّ لهذا الملك الذي هو فيه زوالاً، وإنّ المغربي^٣

يخرُج فيجعل الملوك عبيداً، ويجعل أصحابه ملوكاً. فيُخدع الملوك لاستبقاء الملك عليه بهذه

الطريقة. وإنّ كان الرجل من ملوك العجم، فإنّ الطريقة تسهل معه، لأنّ جميع ما بنوا عليه

هو مذهب المجوس، لأنّ مدار المذهب على الأصليين كما قالوا. ولا يقع الخلاف بين الباطنية

وبين المجوس، لأنّ جميع ما بُني مذهب الباطنية عليه إنّما هو مذهب المجوس، من

الأصليين ومن حفظ هذه الجواهر الأربعة عندهم، وما عليه اعتقاداتهم أنّ النور مُخلص من

الظلمة، وما قالوا من أنّ الله -جلّ وعزّ - يظفر إبليس فهو مذهبهم في النفس. فيقولون لمن

قصدا خديعته من المجوس "إنّ جميع ما أنت عليه حقٌ وصوابٌ، إلّا أنّك لم تعرف المقصد

¹ sic., it is most likely if it is written as الدعاء .

² بيانہ , *ibid.*

³ i.e., the Ismā'īlī Imām, the founder and the first Caliph of the Fatimid state in the Maghrib, 'Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī (q.v.).

بما تَعَبَّدَتْ به وبم تعتقده". يسندون هذا الكلام بأنَّ العرب ودولتهم^١ تنتهي إليهم،^٢ وأنَّ

القائم الذي يخرج إنما يكون من أولاد العجم، وإنَّ الملك يعود إليهم. وإنَّهم مغلوبون الآن، ثمَّ

يصيرون إلى ما كانوا عليه^٣ في زمان الأكاسرة، وتعود دولة العجم، فينخدع بهذا. وهذا على

التحقيق هو أغراضهم في الدعوة، وذلك أنَّ الأصل في هذا المذهب هو برمك البلخي؛^٤ وكان

5 خادم بيت النيران. فلما علم سعادة الإسلام وعلوَّ أهله، وأنَّهم قد انتشروا في مشارق الأرض

ومغاربها، وأنَّ العجم قد خمدت نيرانهم، تحسَّرَ في أمره. وكان ممَّن يعرف شيئاً من

الفلسفة وعلم مذهب الثنوية وتشوُّشها،^٦ وتفكَّرَ في أمر دولة العجم ودبرَ فقال لنفسه

"لا يمكنني جمع الرِّجال والأموال ومحاربة العرب في دولتهم،^٧ وليس لي من يُعينني على

مُرادي، فالأولى أن أدخل عليهم من جهة الكلام والملاطفة، وأدعوهم إلى مقالات خفيَّة".

10 وساعده على ذلك أمورٌ منها أنَّ الثنوية قد ظهرت في العالم، وكان هذا في زمن بني مروان،

¹ . ودولتها . MS.

² MS. اليكم . Cf. Stern, "Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Bustī", 31 & Studies, 317.

³ MS. اليه . Cf. Stern, *ibid.*

⁴ Abū al-Ḥasan 'Abd Allāh Barmak al-Balkhī, the founder of the Barmakids, an Iranian family, who converted to Islam, most probably from Buddhism, during the reign of the Umayyad Caliph Hishām ibn 'Abd al-Malik (d. 125/743). The name "Barmak" is driven from a Sanskrit word "pārmak", which means "superior, chief", and because he was the high priest of the temple of Nawpahār, near Balkh, he was called Barmak al-Balkhī. Yāqūt, *Mu'jam*, v, 307-8. Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, viii, 189. Cf. EI², i, 1033. 'A. Dūrī, *al-ʿAṣr al-ʿAbbāsī al-Awwal*, 122.

⁵ MS. تحير . Cf. Stern, "Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Bustī", 31 & Studies, 317.

⁶ MS. حسوسها . Stern read it تشوئشها , cf. *ibid.*

⁷ MS. دولتها .

وكان قد انتشر في الناس مذاهب الفلاسفة والقدماء. وقد رأى مَيْلَ الناس إلى كلامٍ دقيقٍ يَبْعُدُ

عن الأفهام، فبنى مقالته على الأصليين ليدعوَ الثنوية إليها، ويُلقَقَ بين مذاهب المجوس

ومذاهب الثنوية ومقالات¹ الفلاسفة في الهيولى² والصورة وفي العقل والنفس. فبنى المذهب على

الأصليين، وكانت هذه أوّل محرقة ابتدعها.³ ثمَّ نظرَ في الإسلام كيف يُمكنه رده إلى

5 الأصليين، فيُلَقِّقَ بينه وبين هذه المذاهب. فكان لا يمكنه التمسك بشيء من ظاهر الإسلام

يوافق ما ذهب إليه، فجعلَ للظاهر باطنًا، ورتَّبَ في نفسه أن لهذه الأمور -التي وردت

الشرائعُ بها- تأويلاً غيرها وباطنًا. ومما ساعده أمور بني أمية، وما فعلوا مع آل بيت رسول

الله -صلى الله عليه- من الاستخفاف والإهانة والقتل والحبس. (Fol. 19 a.) فجعل هذا

مُقَدِّمًا،⁴ و[هو]⁵ تقبيح أمر المسلمين في وجوه العامة، وبابتداء قوله⁶ " أن للشرعية باطنًا وأنها

10 مُغْيِرَةٌ مُبَدِّلَةٌ". كما أنهم غيروا وبدّلوا مُحَافِظَةَ حُرْمَةِ رسول الله -صلى الله عليه وآله وأهل

بيته عليهم السلام-. ومما ساعده ما ظهر في الأمة من المُشَبِّهَةِ؛ من التشبيه الظاهر والأخبار

الموضوعة على رسول الله -صلى الله عليه-، ما يوجب تشبيهه الله -عزَّ وجلَّ- بخلقه.

¹ The word was مذاهب , then it is corrected to be مقالات .

² الحيولى, Studies, 317.

³ MS. وكان هذا اول محرقة ابدعه .

⁴ MS. مقدم .

⁵ مُقَدِّمٌ [دَعَوْتِهِ], Stern, "Abū Ṭ-Qāsim al-Bustī", 32 & Studies, 317.

⁶ تأييداً لقوله , ibid.

فجعل هذا بدءاً دعوته وتقبيحاً للإسلام،^٢ في أنه مُتَقَرَّرٌ في العقول، خلاف ما وردت به الأخبار. فهذه الأمور هي التي ساعدته فيما دسَّ ورتَّب في نفسه، وكان لا يزال مفكراً فيه ولا يُبديه ويُرتِّبه إلى حين. ثمَّ كان له ابنٌ فأظهر سرَّه إليه ودعاه إلى ذلك الأمر، فساعده عليه فصار خاطراً واحداً خاطرين. فجعلوا يطلبان ما يخرقان به، ويدعوان الناس إلى موافقتهما.

5 فكانا على ذلك مدّة من الزمان ولم يظهر لأحد. ثمَّ مات البرمك بعد أن قد طاف الدنيا وعلم أحوالها. ورتَّب لابنه ابتداء هذا المذهب، فكان ابنه بعده^٣ يقفو أثره ويطلب مَنْ يُعِينه على ذلك. وكان في بلاد خوزستان، وكان عارفاً بالشعبذة وبشيءٍ من النيرنجات. فابتدأ بالدعوة ودعا النَّاس إلى نفسه، فوقف النَّاس على أمره فأخذوه وقتلوه، وزعموا أنه كان مُتَنَبِّئاً. وقد ذكر أبو عبد الله محمد بن رزام الكوفي رحمه الله في كتابه أنه كان يدعي النبوة.^٤ وعلى ما بلغني من اختلاف أحوالهم وابتداء أخبارهم، أنه لم يكن يدعي النبوة، وكان داعياً إلى ما ذكرناه، ويدعي لنفسه محلاً رفيعاً. والتبس على العامة وظنوا أنه متنبئ فقتلوه، وكان هو القداح. ثمَّ [أن] ابنه ميمون قد تأمَّل في حال نفسه وما جرى على والده، وكان صغير السن،

¹ MS. بدو .

² MS. تفبيح للإسلام . Cf. Stern, "Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Bustī", 32 & Studies, 318, where it is incorrectly written as (وتفبيح الإسلام).

³ بعده , is written above the line.

⁴ Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Rizām al-Ṭā'ī al-Kūfī, who was alive in the beginning of the forth/tenth century. Mas'ūdī, *Tanbih*, 386. Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, i, 22.

⁵ Cf. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 264.

خوزستان إلى العراق. ثُمَّ تَأَمَّلَ وَجْهَ الْحَيْلِ، فَقَالَ "لَا أَرَى لِنَفْسِي أَوْلَى مِنْ أَنْ أَتَمَسَّكَ بِأَوْلَادِ

رَسُولِ اللَّهِ -صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ-، فَرَبِمَا يُمْكِنُنِي أَنْ أَدُسَّ هَذَا فِي جَمَلَةِ مَذَاهِبِ الشَّيْعَةِ".

فَاخْتَلَفَ إِلَى الصَّادِقِ¹ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ إِلَى أَنْ مَضَى لِسَبِيلِهِ، وَأَظْهَرَ مِنْ نَفْسِهِ الزَّهْدَ وَالتَّقَشُّفَ،

وَتَعَلَّمَ النَّاسَ لِلْأَحْكَامِ² وَالشَّرَائِعِ. فَتَبِعَهُ عَالَمٌ مِنَ النَّاسِ وَهُمْ الْمَيْمُونِيَّةُ. وَأَخَذَ يَطْلُبُ مَا يَتَأَوَّلُ

عَلَيْهِ مَذْهَبَ الْإِمَامِيَّةِ. وَهُوَ الَّذِي دَسَّ الرَّجْعَةَ فِي جَمَلَةِ مَذَاهِبِهِمْ، وَلِهَذَا لَا تَرَى مَا تَأَوَّلُوا مِنْ

الشَّرَائِعِ إِلَّا عَلَى مَذْهَبِ الْإِمَامِيَّةِ، وَجَمِيعِ مَا هُوَ عَلَيْهِ الْإِمَامِيَّةُ فِي الظَّوَاهِرِ وَالْإِعْتِقَادَاتِ.

فَعِنْدَهُمْ أَنَّ ذَلِكَ هُوَ عَلَى التَّأْوِيلِ الْمُسْتَوِيِّ، وَأَنَّ سَائِرَ الْمَذَاهِبِ لَيْسَتْ هِيَ³ عَلَى التَّأْوِيلِ. لِأَنَّ

أَكْثَرَ هَذِهِ الْأُمُورِ مِنْ دَسِيسَتِهِ⁴، وَهُوَ الَّذِي أَضَافَ ذَلِكَ إِلَى الصَّادِقِ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. وَنَحْنُ نَبِينٌ فِي

تَأْوِيلِ الشَّرَائِعِ مَذْهَبَ الْإِمَامِيَّةِ وَتَأْوِيلِهِمْ لَهَا. ثُمَّ لَمْ يَدْعُ مَيْمُونٌ إِلَى مَقَالَتِهِ أَحَدًا إِلَّا ابْنَهُ

عَبْدَ اللَّهِ بْنِ مَيْمُونٍ. فَأَجَابَهُ إِلَى ذَلِكَ، وَجَعَلَهُ وَلِيَّ عَهْدِهِ بَعْدَ وَفَاتِهِ. وَكَانَ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ [قَدْ] دَعَا

مُحَمَّدَ بْنَ إِسْمَاعِيلَ إِلَى مَذْهَبِهِ، وَزَوَّرَ عَلَيْهِ "أَنَّ الصَّادِقَ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ أَوْدَعَنِي سِرًّا عَلَى لِسَانِ

وَالِدِي، وَأَنَّ الْإِمَامَةَ إِنَّمَا كَانَتْ لِإِسْمَاعِيلَ بَعْدَ الصَّادِقِ، وَأَنَّ الدُّنْيَا لَوْلَدِ إِسْمَاعِيلِ". وَأَظْهَرَ لَهُ

¹ Ja'far ibn Muhammad ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib (d. 148/765). Mufīd, *Irshād*, 408. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, i, 327.

² الأحكام , Stern, "Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Bustī", 33 & Studies, 318.

³ MS. ليس هو .

⁴ MS. دسيه . It is read دسيه by Stern, cf. *ibid*.

⁵ إلى , Stern, *Studies*, 319.

وأظهر له هذه المذاهب المبنية على الأصليين، وقرّر عنده مذاهب الفلاسفة: في النفس الكلية¹

واتحادها بالجزئية،² وما قرّر من التأويل لهذه الشرائع. وقال إن الأئمة كلهم كانوا على

مذهبهم، وأن الأنبياء المتقدمين كانوا على ما هو عليه، وأن الأئمة والأنبياء كانوا يدعون

إليه. وأنهم أخبروه أن الله يؤيده (Fol. 19 b.) ويملكه العالم، ويتصل به تأييد الإلهية

الذي كان متصلاً بالأنبياء والأئمة. فساعده محمد بن إسماعيل على ذلك، وتصوّر جميع ما

قال واعتقد. وأخذوا يدعون الناس إليه، حتى وقف السلطان على دعوتهم وأخذ في طلبهم،

فهربا جميعاً إلى سواد الكوفة. ولم يزل³ من زاوية إلى زاوية ومن قبيلة إلى قبيلة يهربان.

وكانا يدعون الناس ويأخذان البيعة إلى أن مات محمد بن إسماعيل. ولم يظهر ذلك لأحد،

وكتّم موته وستره، ولم يظهر حديثه إلى أن بلغ محمد بن محمد الذي اختلف الناس فيه.

فقالوا "هو محمد بن عبد الله بن ميمون القدّاح". وقال بعضهم "لا، هو محمد بن محمد بن

إسماعيل". وإنما التبّس الحال لأنهم كتموا موت محمد بن إسماعيل ولم يظهرُوا أن له ولداً.⁴

فلم تزل⁵ الدعوة مستورة والسلطان في طلبهم إلى أن حصّل⁶ أحمد بن محمد أخوه محمد

¹ . نفس الكلي . MS.

² . بالجزسى . MS.

³ . يزل . MS.

⁴ . ولد ، Stern, "Abū ʿI-Qāsim al-Bustī", 34.

⁵ . تزل كانت . MS.

⁶ . حصّل ، Stern, "Abū ʿI-Qāsim al-Bustī", 34.

وحسين بن محمد وسعيد بن الحسين.¹ ففي هذه الأيام كانت الدعوة باطنة، فلما حصل سعيد بن الحسين وظهرت الدعوة، وانتشر وكثر شيعتهم² وأموالهم والملتبسون³ إليهم من الأعراب⁴ والقبائل، ظهر أمرهم وصار لهم حزبٌ وطائفةٌ، وجرى بينهم وبين السلطان مقاتلات⁵ عظيمةٌ ومحاربات⁶. إلى أن مضى سعيد بن الحسين وجلس ابنه أبو القاسم الحسين بن عبيدا لله صاحب القيروان،⁷ واستوت⁸ له الدولة والمملكة وبيت المال. وفي زمنه كانت 5 الفتن العظيمة، وفي زمنه مُنع الحاجُّ من الحجِّ، وقد وَقَعَ في بيتِ الله ما قد شاع خبره. وفي زمنه ظهر ما ظهر من أمر قرمط⁹ وأمر البحرين وأمر دندان الأصفهاني¹⁰ وما دعا إليه. والباطنية قد اختلفت مقالاتهم، فمنهم من يقول "محمد بن عبدا لله كان ابن القائم (سبباً ونسباً)". ومنهم من يقول¹¹ "سبباً لا نسباً، والسبب أقوى من النسب". ومنهم من يقول "أنه

¹ See above (The Genealogy of the Fatimid Caliphs).

² MS. سيعهم , it is corrected by Stern as تبعهم , "Abū ʿI-Qāsim al-Bustī, 34 & Studies, 319.

³ MS. الملتسين , it is corrected by Stern as المتبسون , cf. *ibid.*

⁴ العرب , Stern, *Studies*, 319.

⁵ مقاتلة , *ibid.*

⁶ محاربة , Stern, "Abū ʿI-Qāsim al-Bustī, 34 & Studies, 319.

⁷ القيرواني , Stern, *ibid.*

⁸ استوى . MS.

⁹ Ḥamdān ibn al-Ashʿath, the Carmathian leader in Iraq. (q. v.)

¹⁰ Abū Jaʿfar Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Saʿīd ibn Ḥammād ibn Saʿīd ibn Mahrān. Cf. B. Lewis, *The Origins*, 69-70. Ghālib, *Aʿlām*, 95.

¹¹ It is agreeable what Stern mentions "Text corrupt, but if bracketed words are omitted, the remainder makes excellent sense." Stern, "Abū ʿI-Qāsim al-Bustī, 35 & Studies, 320.

ونسباً". ثم بقيت¹ الولاية فيهم إلى اليوم، فرتبوا دعوتهم وأقاموا الدعوة إلى البلاد. وقسموا

الأرض إثني عشر قسمًا، بعثوا كل واحدٍ إلى ناحيةٍ منها. فمن الدعوة حسن² النجار الذي

ظهر من أمره في بلاد الفرس ما ظهر. ومنهم دندان الإصفهاني، وجعلوا إليه الجبال والعراق.

ومنهم [أبو]عبدالله الخادم،³ بعثوه إلى خراسان. وهم كانوا أول من أظهروا للناس هذه

الدعوة في سائر الممالك. ولهذه الجملة قلنا أن مذهبهم على الحقيقة مذهب المجوس، وهو

مقصدهم ومغزاهم. فلا يصعب عليهم دعوة المجوس لما ذكرناه، وعلى هذه الطريقة يخدعون

الناس.⁴

فصل

واعلم أن سائر ما ورد من أركان الشرائع تأولوه على مذهبهم، وكثير من آيات القرآن،

عل حسب ما يكشف أسرارهم فيها من بعد. والآن فلا بد من أن نتكلم معهم فيما ادعوه من

الباطن، ونبيّن أنه لا أصل له على وجه من الوجوه، وأنّ المعلوم في دين رسول الله -صلى

الله عليه-، ومن سائر الأديان الأديان خلاف ما ادعوه. ثمّ نورد كلامهم فصلاً فصلاً، ونتكلم

¹ MS. يعى .

² sic. حسين , Stern, *ibid.* It may be Hasayn al-Ahwāzī, or al-Ḥasan ibn Ḥawshab who was called al-Najjār.

³ Cf. Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, i, 186. Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi'*, fol. 188. Dawadārī, *Kanz al-Durar*, vi, 95.

⁴ The end of Stern's editing of the text.

⁵ There is a space in the middle and took third of line, فصل is written on the right margin.

عليه.¹ على أنه لا يجوز أن يكون للظاهر باطنٌ بخلافه، وأن الله تعالى إنما بعث الرسل

ليبينوا لنا مصالحنا. فمتى جَوَزْنَا عليهم التَّقِيَّةَ² في مرادهم، وأن يضمروا خلاف ما يُظهرون،

لا نأمن أن يكون جميع ماذكروه (Fol. 20 a.) أرادوا به خلاف ذلك. فلا سبيل لنا إلى

معرفة مرادهم على وجهٍ من الوجوه مع جوازنا عليهم التَّقِيَّةَ.³ فمتى صحَّ ذلك، بَطُلَ قول

5 مَنْ قال "أنَّ للشرائع ولما أتى به الرسول باطنًا يخالف الظاهر". يبيِّن ما ذكرناه أنا قد علمنا

من دينِ نبيِّنا، ومن أديانِ الأنبياء -عليهم السلام-، أشياء ضرورة أنهم كانوا يتدينون بها،

والقوم قد تأولوا ذلك. ولإنَّ جاز هذا مع الإضطرار إلى القصد، لتَجَوَّزَ أنَّ [يكون] في جميع

خطاب النَّاسِ ذلك. وقد علمنا أنَّ هذا تجاهل، فما أدَّى إليه يجب القول بفساده. ثمَّ يقال

لهم:⁶

10 خَبَرْنَا أبا الدليل عرفتم أم بالضرورة؟ فإذا قالوا "بالدليل عرفنا"، وهذا قولهم، يقال

لهم: أعقلي ذلك أم سمعي؟ فإنَّ قالوا "عقلي"، يقال لهم: ما هو؟ فإنَّ قالوا "هو أنا قد علمنا

أنَّ الأشياءَ كُلَّها مزدوجة، أمثالها أزداد أو أمثال، نحو الذكر والأنثى والليل والنهار والسماء

¹ A space in the beginning of the line, والذي يدل is written on the right margin.

² MS. . النعمية .

³ MS. . النعمية .

⁴ MS. . ولين .

⁵ MS. . لتجوزن .

⁶ A space, ثم يقال لهم is written on the left margin.

والأرض والشمس والقمر والروح والجسد والموت والحياة، إلى سائر ما يذكرونه من الأزواج،

فعلمنا أن الظاهر يجب أن يكون له ما يُزاوجه، وليس إلا الباطن". يقال لهم:

هذه الخرافات التي ذكرتموها، لم قلتُم أن يوجب أن يكون للظاهر باطن، وما أنكرتم

أن تكون جميع ما تذكرون من الأمثلة، إنما هو استعمالات من الناس في كلام يذكرونه، لا

5 أن بينهما تعلقًا. يتبين ذلك أن السماء هي من جنس الأرض، لأنه جسم كما أن هذا جسم.

وكذلك الشمس من جنس القمر والليل من جنس النهار، وإنما اختلفت هيئاتها لاختلاف

أعراض فيها. وكذلك الروح من جنس الجسد إلا أن أحدهما ليس بمؤلف وهو النفس، والآخر

مؤلف ضربًا من التأليف، إلى سائر ما ذكرتم. [فبطل قولكم على أن هذه الأشياء كلها

جواهر متماثلة وإنما اختلفت هيئاتها بالأعراض. فإن راموا دفع ذلك لا يتأتى لهم. ثم يقال

10 لهم: فإذا بطل ما قلتُم به، فكيف يصح ردكم الظاهر والباطن إليه.

ثم يقال لهم¹ في قولهم "إن الأشياء إما ذات أصداد أو ذات أمثال":

ما أنكرتم أن هاهنا أشياء لا ضد لها ولا مثل، مثل القدرة، وهاهنا ما لا ضد له وهو

الأصوات. فلم صرتم تردون هذا إلى ما ذكرتم من العبارات، [و]أولى هنا من أن تردوه² إلى ما

¹ A space, ثم يقال لهم is written on the left margin.

² MS. ترده.

ذكرناه. فإن قالوا "للقدرة^١ ضدُّ وهو العَجْزُ"، قيل لهم: ^٢ إنَّ العَجْزَ ليس يَضْدُ^٣ القدرة، كما

أنَّ الخرسَ والسكونَ ليس يَضْدُ الكلامَ.

ثمَّ يقال لهم: ^٤

ما أنكرتم [مِنْ] أنَّ أجناسَ الحيوانات^٥ لا ضَدَّ لصورها على وجهٍ مِنْ الوجوه، وإنَّ كان

5 لها مثل مِنْ جنسها في الصورة. وإذا لم يكن ضَدَّ، فيجب أن يكون حكم الظاهر حكم هذه

الصورة، فكما له في أن يكون لكل ظاهر وشريعة مثل ولا ضد له وهو الباطن. فإن راموا دفع

هذه الإلزامات، والفصل بينها وبين ما هذوا به، لم يجدوا إليه سبيلاً.

ثمَّ يقال لهم: ^٦

ولم لا يجوز أن يخالف هذا سائر ما ذكرتم، إن صحَّ ذلك، وإلى ماذا يؤدي مِنَ الفساد؟

10 فإنَّ أرادوا ذكر شيءٍ لم يتأتَّ لهم، فتبيَّن بهذا فساد ما يتخرصون به. وإنما ذكرنا هذا

الكلام مع ركاكته، لأنَّ جميع مَنْ رأيتهم يستدلُّون في كتبهم مِنْ جهة العقل فيما يثبتون

^١ MS. للقدر .

^٢ MS. له .

^٣ MS. بصاد . It can be also read as بضادِ القدرة .

^٤ A space, ثمَّ يقال لهم, is written on the left margin.

^٥ MS. ان احباس كون الحيوانات .

^٦ MS. بينه .

^٧ A space, ثمَّ يقال لهم, is written on the left margin.

عليه مذاهبهم. ومنهم من يقول "إنما عرفنا صِحَّةَ الباطن من جهة الأئمة، والأئمة عرفوا من

جهة الأساس، والأساس عرف من جهة الناطق". وهذا كلامٌ لا معنى له، وذلك أن إثبات

الأئمة أئمةً طريقه الشرع. وعندهم يجوز أن يُراد بظاهره (Fol. 20 b.) خلاف ما وُضِعَ له،

فإذا لا سبيل لهم إلى معرفة الأئمة أئمةً. وعندهم أن المعجزات لا أصل لها إلا العلوم، فعندهم

5 المعجز هو العلم بهذه الأمور، وأنه عالمٌ بهذه الأمور التي^١ غيره لا يعلمها^٢ إلا بعد أن يعلم

أنه أمام. فإذا [أ] لا يصح القول بإمامته، مع القول بأن للظاهر باطنًا. *وان قيل عند من ليس*

بهم ثم يقال لهم: ^٣

ما أنكرتم من قائلٍ قال لكم: إن أئمتكم الذين يدعون أن للظاهر باطنًا كاذبون في

ادعائهم الباطن متخرون^٤ على رسل الله تعالى، إذ قد علمنا ضرورة من دين نبينا - عليه

10 السلام - وجميع الأنبياء أنهم إنما بعثوا ليُبينوا لنا الأحكام والشرائع التي تتعلق بها

مصلحتنا، وأنه لم يكن مقصدهم التقيّة^٥، وإنهم لم يكتموا شيئًا. وهؤلاء الذين ادّعتهم فيهم

أنهم أئمة لم يثبت بعد صدقهم. لأن من (ادّعتهم فيهم أنهم)^٦ أئمتكم، ممن هو في زماننا هذا

¹ . الـدى . MS.

² . يعلم . MS.

³ A space, ثم يقال لهم is written on the right margin.

⁴ It can be read also as متخرون .

⁵ . التعمية . MS.

⁶ Text corrupt, but if bracketed words are omitted, the remainder makes excellent sense.

إلى الصادق -عليه السلام-، نحن نُنكر إمامتهم. ونقول إنّه لا فَرْقَ بينهم وبينكم في الكُفْر إنْ

كانت هذه¹ سريرتهم. وبين الصادق إلى الرسول -صلى الله عليه- نَقَطَع على أنْهم براءٌ

منكم، ولو ظفروا بكم لَأَتَوْا عليكم. وإذا كان ذلك كذلك، وَجَبَ القول بفساد ما ذهبتم إليه

من الباطن. إذ صَحَّت² نبوة الأنبياء، وَصَحَّ أنْهم دَعَوْا إلى خلاف ما تَدْعُونَ الناس إليه، ولم

5 يَصِحَّ صدق مَنْ ادَّعَيْتُمْ صدقه. فَإِنْ راموا دفع شيءٍ مما ذكرناه لم يمكنهم ذلك.

وبعد، فَإِنَّا وجدنا الأنبياء -عليهم السلام- أظهروا دعوتهم، وَإِنْ قَلَّ عدد مَنْ آمَنَ

بهم. وخرجوا على مَضَادَّةِ قومهم [و]وَطَنُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ على تحمّل القتل والاستخفاف. واعتبر

قصص الأنبياء -عليهم السلام- وابتداء دعوتهم في القرآن والأخبار تجدها³ على ما ذكرنا.

فَإِنْ قَالَ "أليس قد كان ابتداء الدعوة من الرسول -صلى الله عليه وآله- على السرِّ

10 حتى ظهر بعد أن آمن به أربعون". قيل له: "أخطأت في ذلك إنَّ الرسول -صلى الله عليه

وآله- كان معلناً لدعوته مُظْهِراً للخلاف، وَإِنَّمَا أَمَرَ أُمَّتَهُ أَنْ لَا يُظْهِرُوا. ولهذا قام في الناس

وهم على دين قريش، وصعد الجبل ونادى في الناس حتى اجتمعوا عنده، ثُمَّ خَوَّفَهُمْ وَأَنْذَرَهُمْ

¹ كان هذا MS.

² صح MS.

³ تجده MS.

⁴ A space, فإن قال is written on the right margin.

⁵ A space, قيل is written on the right margin.

على ما تواترت [الأخبار] به. ومنهم من تعلقَ بآيِ مِنَ القرآن، وهذا الكلام نأتى عليه ونحن نورده بعد في تأويل القرآن [و] ما تعلقوا به في هذه المسألة. والآن يجب أن نُقدِّم ما لهم من الرموز والألقاب ومعاني عباراتهم التي يتأولون عليها، ثم نبدأ ونبيِّن تأويل الشرائع ونبيِّن تأويل القرآن بتوفيق الله ولطفه.

- 5 فَمِنْ ذَلِكَ^١ قولهم "بارىء"، يشيرون إلى ما لا يصحّ عندهم العلم به ولا الخبر عنه، وهو عندهم كاللغو في المعنى. ويبيِّنون شيئاً آخر ويُسَمِّونه "أمراً"، إلا أنهم يجعلون ذلك المعنى تأثيراً منه على ما تقدّم ذكره. وقالوا "نحن مُضْطَرُونَ إلى أن هاهنا بارىء لا يصح العلم به ولا الخبر عنه ولا العبارة به، وعلينا أن نَسْكُتَ"، فهذا معنى قولهم بارىء. [وفي]^٢ قولهم: "أمراً"، يشيرون إلى ما أوجبَ العقل، ويتناولون قوله تعالى ﴿إِنَّمَا قَوْلُنَا لِشَيْءٍ إِذَا أَرَدْنَاهُ أَنْ نَقُولَ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ^٣﴾. فمتى رأيت في كلامهم أمراً مُطلقاً فإنهم يقصدون ذلك المعنى. [وفي]^٤ نقول له كُنْ فَيَكُونُ^٣، فمتى رأيت في كلامهم أمراً مُطلقاً فإنهم يقصدون ذلك المعنى. [وفي]^٥ قولهم "أولاً"، فإنما يعنون به العقل الكلي، الذي هو فوق النفس، وهو العرش عندهم

^١ A space, ذلك فمن ذلك is written on the right margin.

^٢ A space.

^٣ MS. إِنَّمَا أَمْرُنَا لَشَيْءٍ إِذَا أَرَدْنَاهُ أَنْ نَقُولَ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ, the Koranic verse is corrupted, and it appears that the author means the Koranic text كُنْ فَيَكُونُ إِذَا أَرَادَ شَيْئاً أَنْ يَقُولَ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ, Qur'ān: 82/36.

^٤ Qur'ān: 40/16.

^٥ A space.

^٦ هو is written on the left margin.

وكذلك القلم. وعندهم -لعنهم الله وقَطَعَ دابر آخرهم- هو [ال-ربُّ الأعلى وهو النون،
يزدان عبارة عنه. فهذه الأسامي كلها اسمه يعنون بها ذلك المعنى. [وكذلك¹] قولهم
"ثاني"، وهو النفس وهو الكرسي وهو اللوح وهو (Fol. 21 a.) الهيولى وهو الظلمة وهو
[ال-ربُّ العظيم عندهم. [وكذلك²] قولهم "ناطق" فإنهم يعنون شيئين اثنين؛ أحدهما المميز
والثاني يقصدون صاحب الشريعة. وإنما يُسمَّى عندهم ناطقاً، لأنه ينطق بصور العالم وهيئاته.
5 [وكذلك³] قولهم "أساس" [و] هو الصامت وهو الوصي. يعنون به مَنْ يأخذ عن الناطق،
ويكون إليه التأويل كما كان إلى الناطق التنزيل. وبعد الأساس الأئمة. [وكذلك⁴] قولهم
"جناح"، يعنون أصحاب الجزائر. و"الأبواب" يعنون بهم⁵ مَنْ يُترجم عن الإمام. و"المأذون"
هو الذي أُذِنَ له أَنْ يتكلم في بلده ويدعو الناس. و"الداعي" مَنْ أُذِنَ له أَنْ يتكلم في الجزائر،
وإنَّ كانت بلادٌ كثيرةً. وآخر رموزاتهم "المستجيب" و"المحدود"، وإنما قيل محدودٌ لأنه لا
10 يترك أن يسأل إلا إلى أحدٍ. فمتى زاد عليه، يقال له "كفرت لأنك سألتني وأنا عالم بحالك،
فلا تسلني فإني أقول لك ما تحتاج إليه". وإنما ذكرنا هذا لأن هذه الأسامي تمرُّ في كلامهم

¹ A space.

² A space.

³ A space.

⁴ A space.

⁵ MS. به .

⁶ MS. فان .

في هذه التأويلات، فأردنا أن نورد معانيها ليقف الناظر في هذا الكتاب على مرادهم بها.

فإن¹ قالوا "لَمْ كَانَ أَوَّلَ مَا دَعَا النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَآلِهِ - قَوْلُهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ مُحَمَّدٌ

رَسُولَ اللَّهِ، فَابْتَدَأَ بِالنَّفْيِ وَانْتَهَى إِلَى الْإِثْبَاتِ، وَمَا الْحِكْمَةُ فِي ذَلِكَ وَالْفَائِدَةُ فِيهِ؟"

والجواب² هو أن يُقال لهم:

- 5 إنَّما دَعَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ - صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَآلِهِ - إِلَى مَعْرِفَةِ اللَّهِ - جَلَّ وَعَزَّ - وَالْإِقْرَارَ بِهِ بَعْدَ الْمَعْرِفَةِ. وَلَمْ تَكُنْ دَعْوَتُهُ إِلَى الْعِبَارَةِ فَيُسْأَلُ عَنْ كَيْفِيَّتِهَا. نُبِّئُ هَذَا وَنُوضِّحُهُ، أَنَّ الْإِنْسَانَ إِذَا أَتَى بِالشَّهَادَتَيْنِ لَا عَلَى هَذَا الْوَجْهِ صَارَ مُؤْمِنًا بِاللَّهِ تَعَالَى وَبِرَسُولِهِ - صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ - . أَلَا تَرَى أَنَّهُ لَوْ قَالَ "اللَّهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ"، لَكَانَ يَقُومُ مَقَامَ قَوْلِهِ "لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ"؟ وَكَذَلِكَ إِذَا قَالَ بِالْفَارْسِيَّةِ وَسَائِرِ اللُّغَاتِ. فَقَدْ صَحَّ أَنَّهُ لَا اعْتِبَارَ بِاللَّفْظِ. إِلَّا أَنَّهُ بِجَهْلِهِمْ وَحَمَقِهِمْ³ ظَنُّوا أَنَّ هَذِهِ الْكَلِمَةُ هِيَ مَبْدَأُ الدَّعْوَةِ، وَأَنَّ الْمُعْتَرِفَ لَا يَدَّ لَهُ مِنْهَا. وَقَدْ بَيَّنَّا أَنَّ الْأَمْرَ بِخِلَافِهِ، عَلَى أَنَّهُ إِذَا قَالَ الْقَائِلُ هَذِهِ الْكَلِمَةَ عَلَى هَذَا الْوَجْهِ، فَإِنَّ فِي اللُّغَةِ لَا يَكَادُ يَكُونُ أَفْصَحَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ. وَذَلِكَ أَنَّ مِنْ عَادَةِ الْعَرَبِ أَنَّهُمْ إِذَا أَرَادُوا نَفْيَ الْأَكْثَرِ وَإِثْبَاتَ الْأَقْلَى وَالوَاحِدِ مِنْهُمْ، فَإِنَّهُمْ يَبْدَأُونَ بِالنَّفْيِ. أَلَا تَرَى أَنَّهُمْ يَقُولُونَ "لَا ثَوْبَ لِي إِلَّا وَاحِدٌ" وَ "مَا جَاءَنِي الْقَوْمَ إِلَّا زَيْدٌ" وَمَا شَاكَلَ
- 10

¹ A space, فان is written on the left margin.

² A space, والحواب is written on the left margin.

³ MS. بجهلهم ان حمقهم .

ذلك. وإذا كان المثبتُ أكثر من المنفي فيبدأون بالإثبات، نحو قولهم "جاءني القوم إلا زيّداً"

و"رأيت القوم إلا زيّداً". فإذا ثبتَ ذلك كان الله تعالى واحداً، وكان هو المثبتُ تعالى، وجميع

ما ادّعي له الإلهية منفيّاً. كأن لا يحسن في اللفظ إلا أن ينفي الكلّ ويثبت الواحد تعالى،

فقال "لا إله إلا الله". فصحّ أن هذا في اللغة إنما يكون فصيحاً إذا قيل على هذا الوجه. على

5 أنه إذا كان السؤال لا يسقط على وجه من الوجوه فإنه فاسد. وذلك أنه لو أثبت أولاً ونفى

في الآخر، لكان لقائل أن يقول "لمّ لم ينفي ما ادعى له الإلهية أولاً، ثم أثبت في اللفظ ما هو

مُثبت؟" فلما كان السؤال على أي وجه قيل ثابتاً فيجب أن يكون فاسداً. على أنه لو تعلق

العبادة¹ به على هذا الوجه، لَكُنَّا نقول بأن الله تعالى كان عالماً بأن إيرادهم لهذه اللفظة على

هذا الوجه هو المصلحة، دون إيرادها على غير هذا الوجه، فكلفهم هذا دون غيره، فصحّ

10 بهذه الجملة فساد ما سألوا عنه. مشارفها ومشارفها، ومبطل بلاد أخرى ما روي

واعلم² أن غرضهم بهذا³ السؤال، هو أن يُثبتوا ما يقولون في صفات القديم تعالى، [من]

أنه لاشيء ولا لاشيء، ولا عالم ولا لا عالم. فيقولون "لا يصحّ أن يُنفى ولا يصحّ أن يُثبت

كالمثبتات". وقد بيّنا (Fol. 21 b.) فساده من قبل. وهذا لا يشبه ما قالوه،⁴ لأنه نفي

¹ It can be also read as قطعت العبارة .

² A space, واعلم, is written on the left margin.

³ في هذا MS.

⁴ وهذه الا MS.

⁵ MS. قالوا .

وإثبات على الحقيقة. والذي قالوه نفي ونفي النفي، فلم يُشبه الشهادة، فبطل ما راموا به إثباته. واعلم¹ أن لهم في الشهادة كلاماً لو تقصيناها لطال الكلام، ولكن نورد عمدتهم في ذلك. وذلك أن كلمة "لا إله إلا الله" الشهادة، قالوا "مبنية"² من أربع كلمات واثنى عشر حرفاً، وفيها³ سبع فصول، وهي نفي وإثبات. فشبّهوها بأشياء كثيرة، منها أنهم قالوا "أراد بها أن تدلّ على صفة الأرض، بجميع ما فيها عند انعقاده بهذه الكلمة. وذلك أن الأرض مبنية 5 على أربعة أقسام: عمران وخراب ومسكون وغير مسكون، فصارت القسمة أربعة، وقابلت كلمات الشهادة. ثمّ نصفها خراب ونصفها عمران، وكلمة الشهادة نصفها نفي ونصفها إثبات. وهي سبعة أقاليم، وكلمة الشهادة سبع فصول. وهي مقسومة على إثني عشر جزيرة، وكلمة الشهادة حروفها في مقابلة الجزائر. وهذا هو معنى قوله -صلى الله عليه-:

10 زويت لي الأرض فرأيت مشارقها ومغاربها، وسيبلغ ملك أمّتي ما زوي لي

منها.⁴ عرفت عن الجواب يدل على كثرة التحميل وكثرة الجهل، وذلك أن قوله أي عرفت بها بحقائقها وضربت لها مثلاً، وهو كلمة الشهادة".

¹ A space, واعلم is written on the right margin.

² MS. مبنى .

³ MS. فيه .

⁴ Cf. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 5144. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 21415. Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 2102. Abū Dā'ūd, *Sunan*, no. 3710. Ibn Māja, *Sunan*, no. 3942.

ومعنى "سيبلغ ملك أمتي"، قالوا "دعاة أمتي"، وأمته عندهم [هم].

واعلم¹ أنا قد بينا فساد ما ادعوه من الأقسام فيما تقدم. وبيننا أن هذا يجوز أن يُقسَم

على غير ما قسّموه، ونذكر من حالها خلاف ما ذكروه. وأما قولهم في عمرانها وخرابها

ومسكونها وغير مسكونها فإنه كلامٌ لا معنى له. لأن المسكون هو العمران، والخراب هو الذي

5 ليس بمسكون. فإن قالوا "ليس هذا غرضنا، بل غرضنا بالخراب والعمران أنه في ناحية

الجنوب والشمال أرضاً لا يجوز أن ينبت فيها نبات ولا يصل إليها حيوان. وهو مثل هذه

الأماكن التي بينهما، التي يجوز أن ينبت النبات فيها ويسكن الحيوان، وإن لم يكن الإنس

في كلّها. وغرضنا بالمسكون هو الأمصار والبلدان. وغرضنا بغير المسكون هو المفاوز والبحار وما

جرى مجراها".

10 قيل له:

الذي ادعيت من الجواب يدل على قلة التحصيل وكثرة الجهل، وذلك أن قولك "لا

يجوز أن ينبت النبات عليها، ولا يجوز وصول الحيوان إليها"، يمنعك من إثباتها. لأن هذا

لا يعلمه إلا من قد شاهد، أو سمع بالخبر ممن شاهدها. ولا يصح مشاهدة مكان لأنه للحيوان

فيه بطوله وعرضه، فإذا قد ثبت بهذا سخفهم وقلة تحصيلهم. فإن قالوا "قد علمناه بخبر

¹ A space, واعلم is written on the right margin.

الله، أو بخبر بعض الأنبياء"، لا يجدون إليه سبيلاً. فبطل بهذه الجملة انقسام الأرض على

ما ذكروه. على أنه يقال لهم:

أليس الذي منع الرسول -صلى الله عليه- من بيان هذه الأحكام التي ادعيتم، أنها

ركن في هذه الكلمة، ولم يفصح بها. فإن قالوا "لأنه لم يكن إليه التأويل"، يقال لهم: لم لم

5 يكن إليه هذا، وأي حكم في أن لا يبين مراده بكلامه ويغمز؟ فإن قالوا "منعه من ذلك قلة

من يعلم ما يقوله، فلم يكن له بد من أن ينصب من يبين مراده [الذي] لم يحتمل أن يكشف

للبيان". يقال لهم: أليس قد بين أحكام الظاهر، وفهم من فهم، وفهم من لم يفهم كالعامة.

وأنها لم تعرف جميعها، ولم يقع فساد من ذلك. فهلاً كان يبين التأويل ولا يكتمه، حتى

كان يفهم كل ما يبلغ إليه، ولا يقع فساد من العامة فيه. أليس المنتظر الذي تزعمون يكشف

10 للناس هذه الأسرار عندكم، ولا يفهم العامة منه، وإنما يفهم من قد عرف وبلغ إلى ذلك.

فهلاً فعله على هذا الحد. فإن راموا ذكر وجه له حسن، يكمل مراده بجميع ما أمر به

ونهى، لم يجدوا إليه سبيلاً. وإذا ثبت ذلك، بطل ما ادعوه أنه أراد أن يدل على (Fol.)

¹ .الدي MS.

² .انه MS.

22 a. صفة الأرض وأقسامها، إذا لم يكن هناك مانع يمنعه من بيانها. ومنها ما قالوه في

السموات التي عندهم [في الكتب]،¹ وهو قولهم:

إنها اثنا عشر برجاً وفيها ملوك سبعة. والبروج مُنقسمة أربعة أقسام:

[ال]قسم² الأول ما يوجب إذا كانت الشمس فيها أن يكون ربيعاً، والقسم

5 الثاني يوجب الصيف، والقسم الثالث يوجب الخريف، والقسم الرابع يوجب

الشتاء. ومنها هوائي وسمائي وأرضي وناري. وكل قسم فيه مُتقلّب وثابت وذو

جسدين، على ما بيّنه أهل التنجيم بزعمهم. ونصف البروج أبداً تكون تحت

الأرض ونصفها فوق الأرض، فصار الفلك مُنقسماً إلى ظاهر من فوق وباطن من

تحت، مقابلة للنفي والإثبات. وصارت هذه الفصول الأربعة التي إذا كان[ت]

10 الشمس فيها، توجب أن يكون فصلاً من فصول السنة، على ما قدمناه، مقابلاً

للکلمات الأربعة. وصارت الملوك السبعة مقابلة لفصول كلمة الشهادة، وعدد

البروج في مقابلة الحروف. وهذا معنى قوله "أُخرجت إلى السماء فرأيت

السموات في أهلها وطففت فيها..."³ إلى آخر الخبر. عني به أن جدّه ارتفع حتى

¹ Illegible words.

² MS. قسم الأول. Henceforwards, the deleting or the adding of the (ال) will be installed in the text where it is needed.

³ Cf. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 237 & 4920. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 1982, 11828 & 12047. Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 2527 & 3082. Nasā'ī, *Sunan*, no. 446.

عَلِمَ ما تحت الأنجم، واتصلت نفسه بالأفلاك فعلمها بحقائقها، فأخبر "بأنِّي

أعرجت إلى السماء". فَصَوَّرَ الملك بأحكامها في كلمة الشهادة.

وقد بيَّنا فساد ما ذكروه في أحكام الفلك وانقسامها، وبيَّنا أنَّ المنجمين اصطَلَحوا على

هذا القدر من القسمة في جُمْل حسابهم، وكان يجوز أن يُزاد فيه ويُنقص منه. فإذا صحَّ ذلك

5 صحَّ أن ما قالوه لا أصل له. على أنه كان يجب أن يذكَر في كلمة الشهادة، إن أراد أن يدلَّ

على علم النجوم، الدرجة والدقيقة والثانية، ولم يقتصر على بعض أحكامه دون بعض. فصَحَّ

بهذا أنهم محتالون ممخرقون في تسويتهم بين هذه الأعداد، وما ذكرناه في الفصل الأوَّل [وما]

نأتي عليه. ومنها ما حكيناه عنهم في العالم الصغير من أعضاء الإنسان والثُّقْب والطبائع

الأربعة، وإنَّ ما يقابل الإنسان هو الذي يصحَّ الانتفاع به والتصرّف، وإنَّ خلق الإنسان لا

10 يمكن التصرف فيه. فقالوا "إنه صَوَّرَ الإنسان بعجائب ما فيه في كلمة الشهادة"، وعليه

تأولوا قوله: ﴿وَفِي أَنْفُسِكُمْ أَفَلَا تُبْصِرُونَ﴾¹، قالوا "إنه عني هذا المعنى". فقالوا:

إنَّ ما يقابله وما خلفه من جسده بمنزلة النفي والإثبات، لعدم النفع بالنفي

ووجود المنفعة بالإثبات، وتركيب الإنسان من الطبائع الأربع بإزاء² كلمة

¹ Qurān: 21/51.

² بإذا . MS.

الشهادة والأعضاء السبعة بإزاء¹ فصول الشهادة وبقية [الأعضاء] بإزاء² الحروف.

وقد بينا أنّ ما ادّعوه في الإنسان لا أصل له من الأعداد فيما تقدّم، فيجب فساد ما قالوه. ومنها ما قالوه في السنة، وذلك أنّها ليل ونهار، واثنان عشر شهراً، والأيام سبعة، والفصول أربعة. فقالوا "الليل والنهار يُقابلا النفي والإثبات، والأشهر تقابل الحروف، والأيام

تقابل الفصول، وفصولها تقابل الكلمات". قالوا "فرتّب الأيام فأحضرها في كلمة الشهادة".

وهذا أيضاً يرجع إلى المواضع من الناس والاصطلاح، لأنّهم جعلوا سيّر هذه الكواكب وطلوعها علامات وأمارات لما يحدث لهم من الأمور. ولما أرادوا أن يفعلوا، وكان يجوز أن يُغيّروا هذا ويجعلوا بدله³ شيئاً آخرًا من الأنجم، نحو زحل وسيّره أو غيره من الكواكب. إلاّ أنّه لما كان الشمس والقمر (كانا)⁴ أكبر من غيرهما، جعل طلوعهما أمانة للأحكام والأحوال.

ولهذا صحّ من أهل النجوم والفرس أن يجعلوا حكم السنة بالشمس دون القمر. فصحّ بهذا أنّهم إنّما يطلبون التسوية، من حيث يتأتّى لهم أن يعدّوا بعدد يوافق ما يخدعون به. ومنها ما يختفون به من الكذب، وهو قولهم بالنطقاء السبعة: ° آدم ونوح وإبراهيم وموسى وعيسى

¹ . بأدا MS.

² . بأذا MS.

³ . بدلها MS.

⁴ sic., if bracketed word omitted, the remainder makes excellent sense.

⁵ . التسعة MS.

ومحمد -صلى الله عليهم-، وما يتخرّصون من أمر القائم، الذي يقتتلون على انتظاره ولا يظفرون به. والله تعالى لم يُجرِ العادة، (Fol. 22 b.) بأن يُحيي الموتى، وبالرجعة إلى دار الدنيا. وما يقولون أنّ لكلّ نبيٍّ أئمة سبعةً، ولكلّ إمام اثنا عشر باباً، والدعوة جارية من طبقات أربع: الناطق والأساس والإمام والمستجيب، وهو الظاهر.

- 5 قالوا "فالظاهر والباطن بمنزلة النفي والإثبات، وهذه الطوائف بمنزلة كلمات الشهادة، والأئمة بمنزلة الفصول، والأبواب [بمنزلة الحروف]". فهذه الوجوه [التي] يتناولون الشهادة عليها ويُرتّبون على ما بيّنا. فأما الأعداد السبعة، فيوردون كثيراً [منها] نحو الجواهر المذابة، مثل الذهب والفضة والحديد والنحاس والصفّر والافك² والرصاص. وغير المذابة نحو الياقوت والزبرجد والبلور واللؤلؤ والفيروزج والنيجارق،³ إلى ما شاكلها من أنواع الأشياء يعدّونها إلى ما ذكرنا. وقال الجبائي⁴ أنّ "لا إله إلا الله" دليل الناطق، وذلك أنّه يأخذ العلم من الأصليين الأوّل والثاني ويؤدي إلى الأساس، ولهذا كان أربع كلمات. و"محمد رسول الله" تدلّ على الأساس، لأنّه يأخذ من الناطق الأوّل والثاني، ويوصل إلى الإمام والداعي
- 10

¹ . اعداد MS.

² sic.

³ sic.

⁴ It can also be read as الحيابي , الجنابي or الحَيَّانِي , who could not be identified.

والمستجيب. فلهذا كان ثلاث كلمات، لأنه يأخذ من الثلاثة¹ ويوصل إلى الثلاثة. ثم إذا
ضربت ثلاثة في أربعة يكون اثني عشر. لأنه يتولد بين الأساس والنطاق اثنا عشر داعياً،
ولهذا كانت² حروف الشهادة إثني عشر وأربعة [كلمات] وسبعة [فصول].³ فهذا هو جملة
كلامهم في الشهادة. واعلم؛ أن هذا لو اقتصرنا على بيانه والكشف عنه لكان فيه غنية. لأن
كل من له عقل وتمييز، يعلم بعقله أنه لا تحصيل لهذا الكلام، وأنهم ممخرقون في ترتيب
5 هذه الأمور. وذلك أن الشيء لا يجوز إلا ويكون بينه وبين غيره مشابهة ما بوجه من الوجوه.
فمن أراد أن يُلَفَّق بين الأشياء فيسهل عليه إذا لم يعتبر جميع أحكامه، وهذه هي⁴ طريقة
القوم. ولا يكفي في الشيء أن يكون دليلاً على غيره بأن يكون مثله، بل يجب أن نعلم أن
بينهما تعلقاً، وأن ذلك التعلق يوجب حكماً من الأحكام. ألا ترى أنه لا يمكن أن نستدل
10 بوجود الصنعة على إثبات الصانع، من حيث اشتراكا في الوجود، في كونهما معلومين وشيئين
موصوفين. بل يجب أن نعتبر فيه تعلق الفعل به، ووقوعه بحسب قصده من حينه، حتى
يدل على كونه قادراً.

¹ MS. الثالث , it will be corrected next.

² MS. كان .

³ Two words could be read as ولكن يكون and are written above اربعة .

⁴ A space, واعلم, is written on the right margin.

⁵ MS. وهذا هو .

وإذا صحَّ ذلك يقال:

هب أنا^١ سلّمنا لكم أنّ كلمة الشهادة هي^٢ مثل هذه الأشياء في صورتها،^٣ فلم يجب أنّ يكون النبيّ -صلى الله عليه- أراد أنّ يبيّن هذه الأحكام في هذه الكلمة، ومن أين أنّه إنّما كان قصده ما زعمتم؟ فإنّ راموا عليه دليلاً لم يجدوا.

ويقال لهم:^٤

خبرونا هل يجوز أن يتأوّل كلاماً قد عُرفَ قصد المتكلّم به على غير ما عُرفَ من قصده؟ فإنّ قالوا "نعم"، تجاهلوا، مع أنّهم يلزمهم أن يتأوّلوا جميع ما سمعوا من دعائهم وأثمّتهم، وإن اضطرّوا إلى قصدهم. وإنّ قالوا "لا"، يقال لهم: لم تأولتم كلمة الشهادة على ما ذكرتم، وقد علمنا ضرورة من دينه -صلى الله عليه- أنّه لم يقصد شيئاً ممّا ذكرتم. بل إنّما قصد بها الدعاء إلى الله تعالى والاعتراف به. فإنّ راموا دفع ذلك لم يجدوا. ويقال لهم:^٥ ما الذي منّع الرسول -صلى الله عليه- من أن يُظهر ذلك؟ فإنّ قالوا "لأنّه لم يكن إليه وإنّما كان إلى أساسه". قيل لهم: ولم لم يكن إليه وهو بالمحلّ الرّفيع، وكان أشدّ تمكّناً من غيره،

^١ MS. هبنا .

^٢ MS. هو .

^٣ MS. صورته .

^٤ A space, ويقال لهم, is written on the right margin.

^٥ A space, ويقال لهم, is written on the right margin.

وكان بعد أن قبلوه لم يكن أحد ممن دخل تحت أمره يرى الخروج من طاعته؟ فإن قالوا "قد أمر بذلك"، قيل لهم: يجب أن يكون الأمر سفيهاً، لأنه عدل عنه إلى غيره في العلم الأشرف. فإن قالوا "قد بين لأساسه ولم يتسع زمانه (Fol. 23a.) لذلك". قيل لهم: كان يجب أن لا يعقد الشرائع ويشتغل بالدلالة على الآفاق والأنفس. فإن قالوا: "الدور دور الظاهر". قيل لهم: ¹ أليس في الناس من قبل الباطن، وكانوا هم الغرض بالدعوة، فهلاً اقتصر عليهم؟ فإن قالوا "أراد سياسة العامة بالظاهر"، قيل لهم: هلاً أشغلهم بمعرفة الباطن؟ فإن قالوا "كانوا لا يفهمون عنه"، قيل لهم: كما لم يفهموا عنه كل الظاهر ولم يمنعه ذلك من القيام به، فكذلك من يجهل جهله للباطن كان لا يمنعه. وبعد، ² فإن أساسه إذا تمكّن من الدعوة وهو دونه، كان هو بأن يتمكّن أولى. فتبين بهذه الجملة حيرة القوم.

ثم يقال لهم: ³

خبرونا عن عقد هذه الكلمة على ما ذكرتم، هل تدل على كثير معلومه، وعلى نبوته وصدق قوله؟ فإن قالوا "نعم"، وهذا من قولهم، يقال لهم: فكل من أورد مثل هذه الكلمة يدل ذلك من حاله على ما دلت هذه على حال رسول الله -صلى الله عليه-. فإن قالوا

¹ له. MS.

² A space, وبعد is written on the left margin.

³ A space, ثم يقال لهم is written on the left margin.

”لا“، تجاهلوا. ويقال لهم: لم صار هذا دليلاً عليه، وكان من أتى مثلها لا يدل على عظيم

حاله، أليس [ت] المعجزات متى دل [ت] على نبوة بعض الأنبياء، فإنهم [ا] تدل على نبوة

كل من ظهر [ت] عليه؟ فإن قالوا ”نعم، تدل على حال من يأتي بمثلها“، يقال لهم: ما

أنكرتم أن قول القائل ”لا دين إلا ظاهر“ هو مثلها في الصورة، يشتمل على أربع كلمات وعلى

5 سبعة² فصول واثنى عشر حرفاً. فيجب أن يكون هذا في الدلالة، إن كان ذلك الذي ذكرتم

دلالة على ما ذكرتم كذلك. وإن من يورده في الفضل مثل من أورد كلمة الشهادة، لأن جميع

ما ذكرتم في كلمة الشهادة من النفي والإثبات والكلمات والفصول والحروف، حاصل منه

كحصوله في كلمة الشهادة. فلم صار ذلك دلالة على فضله ولا يدل هذا على فضل قائله؟ فإن

راموا لذلك دفعا لم يجدوا.

10

ثم يقال لهم: ³

ما أنكرتم أن الآفاق والأنفس وجميع ما ذكرتم كلماتها تدل على بطلان مذهبكم، لأن

الكلمة التي أوردتها مطابقة للآفاق والأنفس والأرض والفلك، وظهرها يوجب أن كل مذهب

مستور ليس بحق، بل هو باطل. فصار هذا دليلاً عليكم ومبطلاً لأصولكم. فإن قصدوا إلى

¹ A slash, كل is written on the right margin.

² MS. سبع .

³ A space, ثم يقال لهم is written on the left margin.

الفرق بينهما لم يجدوا إليه سبيلاً. ولا ينبغي للعاقل أن يشتغل به، فأتى الكلام مع هذا السُخف والكُفر الظاهر. بل يجب أن يُعارضوا بهذه الخرافات، إذ لا يجدون إلى الفرق بينهما مفرعاً. ثم قوله "محمد رسول الله"، فقد تألوه على ما يغني الكشف عنه عن الكلام عليه. وذلك أنهم قالوا:

5 محمّد؛ محا و مد.

قالوا:

محا شريعة من تقدم، ومدّ دعوته.

وقالوا:

هو أربعة أحرف (م ح م د)، فـ[الـ]ميم الأولى¹ تدلّ على النفس

10 ودائرتها، والحاء تدلّ على التأييد المتّصل منها إليه، و[الـ]ميم الثانية تدلّ على

عقد شريعته، والدال تدلّ على الأساس الذي يأخذ منه التأييد. وإنما كانـ[ت]

الميم التي في الوسط كالدائرة لأنهمـ[ا] تعقد الشرائع وتسرها، والدال كانت

مفتوحة لأنها دليل الأساس، وهو يفتح ما عقد صاحب الشريعة.

وقالوا:

¹ . الاول MS.

جملة الإقرار به قوبلت [ب]كلمات محمد و رسول و الله.

والأحوال ثلاثة بدء ما هم فيه وعودهم إلى حالته، ومعنى هذا الكلام هو أن ابتداء

الخلقة كان من النفس ثم حصلت على متمماً بين المركبات، ثم تعود (Fol. 23b.) إلى عالمها

إذا تصوّر جرمها. وربما قالوا "هو دليل الناطق والأساس والإمام". وقالوا "دليل الأول والثاني

5 والناطق". هذا هو كلامهم في الشهادة بالله ورسوله، ولست أدري لو أن الأخبار لم تكن قد

وقعت [ت] في تسمية رسول الله -صلى الله عليه وآله- بمحمد،² بما كانوا يستشهدون،

وعلى أي شيء كانوا يتناولون. فهذا يدل على من حالهم على قلة تحصيلهم وكثرة جهلهم

في إفساد دين الله. وكلاً أن يكون ذلك على ما يقصدون إليه، بل الله ناصر دينه، وإنما لم

يُستقص الكلام عليهم فيما كشفنا من أسرارهم، لأن الغرض كشف ذلك، وكشفه يُغني عن

10 الكلام عليه.

[ثم إنهم]³ قالوا:

أليس كان الرسول مُدَّعياً في ابتداء ما ادَّعى النبوة وفيما دعى إليه من

الشهادة، والمُدَّعي لابد له من برهان فما برهانه؟

¹ MS. ميا.

² MS. محمد.

³ A space.

والجواب عن ذلك¹ هو أن الذي دعا إليه معرفة الله تعالى وأنه لا شريك له، وهذا

فالعقل يدلّ عليه. فأما النبي -صلى الله عليه وآله- فالذي يدلّ على نبوته وصدقه،

المعجزات التي أظهر الله تعالى عليه، مثل القرآن والإخبار عن القبور ومثل دعاية الشجرة²

ومثل حنين³ الجذع وتسبيح الحصى وكلام الجدي⁴ وإطعام الكثير من الطعام اليسير⁵ وخبر

الميضأة⁶، إلى سائر ما شاكلها من الأخبار والمعجزات، التي نقلت الأمة أنها ظهرت على

رسول الله -صلى الله عليه- والكلام في كيفية الاستدلال بها ووجودها، فقد استقصوه

شيوخنا -رحمهم الله- في الكتب، بما يغني عن إيراده في هذا الكتاب.

واعلم⁷ أن غرضهم بهذا القول القَدْح في أحوال الأنبياء -عليهم السلام- وتكذيبهم.

وذلك أن عندهم أن هذه المعجزات لا أصل لها.⁸ لأن هذا قلب الطبائع والأفلاك، وهذا

فاسد، ولا خلاف في هذا بينهم. والذي يُبطل قولهم ما ثبت من حدث العالم وإثبات

¹ A space, and the answer is written on the right margin.

² Cf. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 5328.

³ MS. حسر. Cf. Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 867 & 1953. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 13605. Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 463. Ibn Māja, *Sunan*, no. 1407. Nasā'ī, *Sunan*, no. 1379. Dārimī, *Sunan*, no. 33.

⁴ *sic.*, it is probably كلام الذئب, see; Bāqillānī, *Tamhīd al-Awā'il*, ed. 'I. Ḥaydar, 135. Cf. Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 2156. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 4401. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 7718. Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 3628.

⁵ Cf. Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 5030. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 3801. Mālik, *Muwatta'*, 1451. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 12043. Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 3564.

⁶ Cf. Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 164. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 4225. Mālik, *Muwatta'*, 57. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 2155. Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 3564. Nasā'ī, *Sunan*, no. 75. Dārimī, *Sunan*, no. 25.

⁷ A space, and the answer is written on the right margin.

⁸ This is indeed not correct, cf. Ḥāmidī, *Kanz al-Walad*, ed. M. Ghālib, 213-4.

المحدث المختار، وأنه قادرٌ على رفع هذه الأعراض، بإحداث ضدها بدلاً منها، على ما بُيِّنَ في الكتب. وهم ينكرون ذلك إلا النسفي، فإنه ذكَّرَ في "المحصول" الاعتراف ببعضها وأنكر بعضها. والذي اعترف به تأوله بأن قال:

قد علمت أن الأنبياء قد علموا من حقائق العالم وطبائعه وجميع ما فيه، فلا

5 يمتنع أن يكونوا قد وقفوا على خاصية الأشياء، فعلموا أن هاهنا ما يفكُّ طبيعة

هذه الأشياء ويغيرها.

واستشهدوا على صحة هذا في العقل:

أنه لو لم يكن قد شاهدنا حجر المغناطيس¹ لَكُنَّا إذا أُخبرنا أن هاهنا حجراً

يجذب الحديد لَكُنَّا نعترف لمن ظهر عليه أنه معجز - واستشهد بسائر ما ذكر

10 ابن زكريا الرازي² في كتاب "الخواص". ولولا أنا قد علمنا أن الصنعة والعلاج

تصحُّ في الياقوت حتى يذوب، لَكُنَّا نكذب ونعترف لصاحبه بالمعجز. وكذلك لا

يُمتنع مثله في المعجزات.

والذي يُفسد هذا القول العلم بأن ما ظهر من المعجزات، ظهر على حدٍّ لا يتأتى فيه

العلاج، كمجيء الشجرة وتسبيح الحصى وحنين الجذع، وسائر ما نُقل في الأخبار. فلهذا

¹ Cf. 'Abdān (?), *Shajarat al-Yaqīn*, 143.

² Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakariyya al-Rāzī (d. 313/925). Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 415-20 & 504.

أنكر أكثرهم ذلك. والذي اعترفوا به القرآن وإخباره عن الغيوب، وأطبقوا على معناه، وذلك

أنهم قالوا: الكلي على - والكلي كانت علة بما يجري في العالم، فشيها على ذلك

إنَّ النَّفسَ الجِزئية^١ تتحرك طلباً لعالمها في جسده، فتطلب العلوم من هذه

الحواس، التي هي أبوابها حتى تتصل بالفلك، ثمَّ تجاوره فتتصل بالنفس

الكلية^٢ فيأخذ العلم عنها بلا واسطة. فمتى حصلت على هذه الصِّفة تتضح لها

المعاني البديعة والأفعال التي لا يتأتى لغيرها إثباتها. فلما حصل جرم الشيء^٣

على هذا الحدِّ، ونفسه التي هي مجاورة الجسد (Fol. 24 a.) ولجرمه، أتى ثمَّ

بدأ اللفظ بفصيح الذي تعجز الأجساد الإتيان بمثله. واللفظ جسد المعنى، فأتى

المعنى مطابقاً للفظه، فعجزت الأنفس عن الإتيان بمعانٍ^٤ مثل ما أتى هو به. إن

كان مُختصاً جرمه لمجاورة نفسه من بين سائر الأشخاص والنفس التي كانت

تتصور المعاني في أجساد الناس. فصرف^٥ عن تصوّر النفس التي كانت في جرمه.

فعجزوا عن أن يأتوا بكلامٍ مثل كلامه في فصاحته وجوّد معانيه. فأما الإخبار

^١ MS. الجري.

^٢ MS. الكلي.

^٣ MS. النسي.

^٤ MS. بمعاني.

^٥ sic., it probably read as فعرف.

عن الغيوب، فلأنّ هذه النفس الجزئية لاتصالها بالكلية، وقفت على سائر ما

وقف الكلّي عليه. والكلية¹ كانت عالمة بما يجري في العالم، فشبهها على ذلك

وهي تعين بجسده. فجسده يركبها في الكلام، فتخبر بالغيب على هذا الحدّ.

ولا يجوز أن يقع في العالم شيء يخفى² عليها لهذا المعنى.

5 واعلم³ أنّ هذا الكلام أوضح في الفساد، من أن يحتاج فيه إلى الإفساد، لأنه ينبني على

أشياء غير معقولة. لأننا قد بينا أنّ النفس لا حقيقة لها ولا دلالة تدلّ على وجودها، فمتى لم

يكن عليها دليل؛ وهذا الذي ذكروه فعلٌ من أفعالها، فبأن لا يصحّ أولى. على أنه يقال لهم:

أليس هذا الكلام عندكم هو كلام الرسول؟

فإنّ قالوا "نعم"، ولا بدّ لهم من ذلك، لأنهم لا يمكنهم على أصولهم إضافة هذا الكلام

10 إلى غيره. لأنّ النفس إنّما تتصوّر المعاني دون العبارة، والعبارة فعل الشخص وكلّ مركّب،

فلا بدّ له من العبارة. فإذا كان هذا أصلهم، وكان الكلام هو الحروف والأصوات الدالة على

المعاني بالمواضع، فلا بدّ أن يكون كلاماً لهذا الشخص. فيقال لهم:

¹ . الكلّي MS.

² . بجنح MS.

³ A space, واعلم, is written on the left margin.

أليس قد عَلِمَ مِن دين رسول الله -صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ- ضرورة، ومن حاله حتى لا يخفى

على اليهود والنصارى وسائر أهل الملل، أَنَّ النبيَّ -صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ- كان ينفي عن نفسه

هذا الكلام، ويقول "هو مِن فِعْلِ اللهِ"، واضطررنا إلى قصده؟

فإنَّ قالوا "لا"، كابروا ودفعوا الضرورة. ويجب أن يُجَوِّزوا قول مَنْ يُنكر أن في الدنيا

5 كان مَنْ ادَّعى النبوة، وكان بمكة وهاجر إلى المدينة، إلى سائر أحواله التي عَلِمنا ضرورة.

وهنا يؤدي بهم إلى الدخول في مذهب السوفسطائية.^٢ فإنَّ اعترفوا بذلك يقال لهم:

فكيف حملتم على أنه مِن فِعْلِهِ، ولمَ كذَّبتموه، وكيف يجوز أن يكون التأويل لقول

القائل ما هو تكذيب له؟

فَتَبَيَّنَ بذلك أنَّ غرضهم تكذيبه. فأما قولهم في الإخبار عن الغيوب "أنَّه كان يأخذ

10 العلم بها عن النَّفس الكليَّة"، فقد بيَّنا أنَّه دعوى لا برهان معه. على أنه يقال لهم:

أليس بعد اتصاله لا يجوز أن يخفى عليه شيء؟

فإنَّ قالوا "يجوز أن تخفى عليه الأشياء"، قيل لهم:

فكيف وقد اتصلت به النَّفس العالمة التي تَعَلَّم الأشياء بذاتها؟

¹ MS. الدنبي .

² MS. السوفسطايه .

وإن قالوا "لا بد أن يكون عالماً بما يقع في العالم من الأحوال على طريق التفصيل"،

وهذا قولهم في جميع الأئمة فضلاً عن الأنبياء. لأنه كان عالماً بطوائف الأنبياء وخصالهم

يقال لهم: فدعوا ما يوجب الغلبة عنا في هذه فإن تخرجنا من غير الله

أليس كان رسول الله -صلى الله عليه-¹ يسهو في الأمور وينسى، هل يجوز سهوه في

5 الصلاة؟ وإيراد ذي اليمين عليه "أقصر الصلاة أم نسيت؟"² وإنكاره أن ذلك لم يكن. ولو

كان الأمر على ما زعمتم ما كان يسهو عما فعله في الحال. وإذا جاز أن يسهو فيما يفعله في

الحال، فكيف يصحّ علمه بجميع ما يقع في العالم من الأمور؟ لا يميل إليه بالمعجزة كذلك

وكذلك حين إخبار رسول الله -صلى الله عليه- [قومًا] وهم يُؤبّرون النخل، قال "إن

لم تفعلوا خيرًا لكم". فنزل الناس في تلك السنة، فذهب النخيل ولم يثمر. حتى قال "إذا

10 قلت لكم في الدين شيئًا فاقبلوه، وإذا قلت في أمر دنياكم فأنتم أبصر ودنياكم، إن شئتم فعلتم

وإن شئتم فلا". وكذلك قول الله عز وجل، حين أمره أن ينفي علم الغيب عن نفسه، فدلّ

على كذبكم عليه وتخرصكم في دينه، حيث يقول: ﴿...وَلَوْ كُنْتُ أَعْلَمُ الْغَيْبَ لَا سَتَكُنْتُ

¹ عليه , is written above the line.

² Cf. Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 673. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 696. Mālik, *Muwaṭṭaʿ*, 195. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 6903. Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 365. Ibn Māja, *Sunan*, no. 1204. Abū Dāʿūd, *Sunan*, no. 856. Nasāʾī, *Sunan*, no. 1209. Dārimī, *Sunan*, no. 1458.

(Fol. 24b.) مِنْ الْخَيْرِ وَمَا مَسَّنِيَ السُّوءُ...^١...^٢ إليه وأنَّ الاختصاص إنما هو بالوحي

دون غيره. وأما قول النَّسفي في سائر المعجزات " أنه كان عالماً بطبائع الأشياء وخصائصها،

ولم يعلم غيرهم هذا، فعلموا ما يوجب انقلابها عما هي عليه". فإنَّ شيوخنا -رحمهم الله-

قد بينوا أنَّ الحيلة والعلاج لا يصحَّ في معجزات الرسول -صلى الله عليه وآله-. لأنَّه مُباين^٣

5 لما يقع بالحيلة، وذلك أنه لو كان هناك علاجٌ في مجيء الشجرة، لكان لا يجوز أن ترجع،

ولكان ذلك العلاج أكبر وأعظم من الشجرة، وكان لا يخفى على الناس. وكذلك لا يصحَّ

العلاج في وضع اليد في الميضأة حتى يشرب منه عالم، لأنَّ هذا لا سبيل إليه بالعلاج. كذلك

إطعامه خلقاً كثيراً من طعامٍ يسير، لا يجوز التوصل إليه من جهة العلاج، إلى سائر ما ورد به

الخبر في المعجزات. وقد استقصى شيوخنا -رحمهم الله- في الكتب ما يغني عن الإطالة

10 فيه.

على أنه يقال لهم: أليس [ت] هذه المعجزات إنما فعلها لما علم من خصائص الأشياء؟

فإنَّ قالوا "نعم"، يقال لهم:

¹ Qur'ān: 188/7.

² Illegible sentence, some of its words can be read with extreme difficulty as follow :

...يعني أنه لافرق بينه وبين غيره ... وانه... يوحي

³ It can be also read as مغاير .

فَلِمَ لَمْ يُخْبِرِ أَسَاسَهُ وَأَثْمَتَهُ - عَلَى زَعْمِكُمْ - بِخَصَائِصِ هَذِهِ الْأُمُورِ؟ وَلِمَ لَمْ يَسْأَلُوهُ عَنْهَا؟

فَإِنْ قَالُوا "قَدْ أَخْبَرَهُمْ"، يُقَالُ لَهُمْ:

فَلِمَ لَمْ يَكُونُوا قَدْ أَخْبَرُوكُمْ بِهَذِهِ الْخَصَائِصِ؟

فَإِنْ ادَّعَوْا ذَلِكَ طَوْلِبُوا بِهِ،^٢ وَلَا يَجِدُونَ إِلَيْهِ سَبِيلًا. مَعَ أَنَّهُ يُوجِبُ عَلَيْهِمْ أَنْ يَكُونَ مِنْ

يَسْمَعُ مِنْهُمْ، ثُمَّ تَدْعُوهُ نَفْسُهُ إِلَى الرَّئِيسَةِ وَهُوَ عَالِمٌ بِهَا، أَنْ يَفْعَلَ مِثْلَ مَا فَعَلُوا وَيَدَّعِي النَّبُوَّةَ.^٥

فَإِنْ قَالُوا بِجَوَازِ ذَلِكَ، لَزِمَهُمْ أَنْ لَا يُؤْمِنُوا^٣ فِي سَائِرِ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ، [وَأَنْ يَكُونَ هَذَا حَالَهُمْ وَمَا هُمْ

عَلَيْهِ كُلُّهُ كَذِبٌ وَبَاطِلٌ وَلَيْسَ هُوَ دِينُ اللَّهِ.

فَإِنْ قَالُوا "لَمْ يُعْرِفَهُمْ ذَلِكَ"، يُقَالُ لَهُمْ:

فَهُمْ أَوْلَى بِالنَّقْصِ، إِذْ لَمْ يَعْلَمُوا بِنَفْسِ مَعْجَزَاتِهِ وَكَيْفِ يَفْعَلُهَا. وَهَذَا يَهْدِمُ أَصُولَهُمْ فِي

أَنَّ الْإِمَامَ لَا تَخْفَى عَلَيْهِ خَافِيَةٌ. وَلَا شَبِيهَةٌ لَهُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ مِمَّا يَأْتِي بِهِ الرَّسُلُ، وَتَأْوِيلُهَا^{١٠}

وَحَقَائِقُهَا وَمَعَانِيهَا. فَصَحَّ بِهَذَا بَطْلَانُ مَا قَالُوهُ مِنَ الْخَاصِيَةِ.^٤

فَإِنْ قَالُوا:

^١ . يسأله MS.

^٢ . بها MS.

^٣ . يامنوا MS.

^٤ A space, usually when the writer of this text starts with فإن قالوا nothing would come before it, therefore, it is more likely the space has been left by mistake.

لَمْ كَانَ الْإِسْلَامَ مَبْنِيًّا عَلَى سَبْعِ دَعَائِمٍ: أَوْلَاهَا شَهَادَةُ أَلَّا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ، وَإِقَامُ

الصَّلَاةِ، وَإِيتَاءُ الزَّكَاةِ، وَحَجُّ الْبَيْتِ مَنْ اسْتَطَاعَ إِلَيْهِ سَبِيلًا، وَصِيَامُ رَمَضَانَ،

وَالْجِهَادُ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ، وَالْإِمَامَةُ؟

يَقَالُ لَهُمْ:

5 ما معنى قولكم "بُنِيَ عَلَيْهِ"؟ [أ] عُنَيْتُمْ لِمَ فُرِضَ [ت] عَلَيْنَا هَذِهِ الْفَرَائِضُ السَّبْعُ؟ أَوْ

عُنَيْتُمْ بِهِ لِمَ كَانَتْ [ت] الْوَاجِبَاتُ سَبْعًا؟

فَإِنَّ عُنَيْتُمْ الْأَوَّلَ، فَإِنَّ الْجَوَابَ عَنْهُ:

أَنَّ اللَّهَ قَدْ عَلَّمَ مِنْ مَصَالِحِ عِبِيدِهِ، أَنَّهُمْ إِذَا فَعَلُوا ذَلِكَ يَكُونُونَ أَقْرَبَ إِلَى أَنْ لَا يَظْلَمُوا،

وَلَا يَمْتَنَعُوا مِنَ الْوَاجِبَاتِ الْعَقْلِيَّةِ. وَكُلَّ مَا عِنْدَهُ يَخْتَارُ الْوَاجِبَ وَاجِبًا، كَوَجُوبِ الْوَاجِبِ

10 إِذَا كَانَ الْمَعْلُومُ أَنَّ لَوْلَاهُ مَا اخْتِيرَ الْوَاجِبَ. وَإِنَّ عُنَيْتُمْ "لِمَ كَانَ الْفَرَضُ مَقْصُورًا عَلَيْهَا"، فَهَذَا

بَاطِلٌ. لِأَنَّ عَلَيْنَا مِنَ الْفَرَائِضِ أَكْثَرَ مِنْ هَذِهِ السَّبْعَةِ، فَلَا مَعْنَى لِتَخْصِيصِهَا وَالسُّؤَالَ عَنْهَا. لِأَنَّ

لَمْ نَقُلْ بِوَجُوبِهَا فَقَطْ فَيُسْأَلُ "لِمَ اقْتَصَرْتُمْ عَلَيْهَا". [وَاعْلَمْ] أَنَّ هَذَا السُّؤَالَ سَأَلُوهُ عَلَى مَذْهَبِ

الْإِمَامِيَّةِ، لِأَنَّ عِنْدَهُمْ [أَنَّ] مَذْهَبَهُمْ يَجْرِي عَلَى التَّأْوِيلِ دُونَ سَائِرِ الْمَذَاهِبِ. وَلِهَذَا صَنَّفَ أَبُو

¹ A space.

تميم¹ كتاب الدعائم وسمّاه "دعائم الملة الحنيفية"². وأمر دعائه أن لا يتأولوا أشياء إلا ما

تضمن ذلك [الكتاب]. وأورد فيه ظاهر مذهب الإمامية، وبناه على هذه الفرائض السبعة.

وغرضهم فيه أن يتأولوا هذا العدد على ما ذكرنا من [تأويل] الأعداد، نحو النطقاء والكواكب

والأئمة والأيام والأقاليم، وقد تكلمنا عن هذا فيما تقدّم. وهذا الذي ذكره من الأقسام، فقد

بيننا أن أقسام الواجبات أكثر مما ذكره. ومقصدهم بهذا أن يتأولوا هذه الفرائض وما يتصل

بها على موافقة ضلالتهم (Fol. 25 a.) (...) ³ وبه على كثرة حيلهم ومخاريقهم بعون الله

ومنه⁴.

واعلم أنا قد بينا قولهم في الشهادة وما يتأولون عليه، والآن سنبين قولهم في الصلاة.

قالوا:

10 لِمَ كانت الطهارة مشتملة على أربعة أركان مَسْوُوحِينَ وَمَغْسُولِينَ؟ ولم كان

إيصال الماء إلى هذه الثُّقُب من السنّة، وكذلك الاستنجاء بالماء وهو موضع

النجاسة؟⁶

¹ Abū Tamīm Ma'add al-Mu'izz li-Dīn Allāh, the fourth Fatimid Caliph (d. 365/975). Ghālib, A'lam, 526-41.

² i.e., Da'ā'im al-Islām by al-Qāḍī al-Nu'mān. See above, Primary Sources, 6.

³ Illegible line.

⁴ A space.

⁵ MS. في.

⁶ A space.

ما قد بيّنا، مِن أَنَّ الله تعالى عَلِمَ مِن مصلحتنا ذلك، فكَلَّفنا هذه الأفعال. بعضها على

جهة الوجوب، وبعضها على جهة النَّدْب. فالفرائض منها أَلطاف في الواجبات العقلية،

والنوافل تُسَهِّلُ الفرائض علينا. لأنَّا متى فعلنا النوافل، نكون إلى أَنَّ نفعل الفرائض أقرب.

5 ومتى فعلنا الواجبات، نكون إلى أَنَّ لا نَظْلِمَ ولا نَكْذِبُ ولا نَمْنَعُ الودیعة ونشكر المُنعم

وننصِفُ-أقرب. فلهذا أُوجِبَ الله تعالى وأمر بهذه الأفعال على هذا الوجه. وهذا هو الجواب

عن سائر الشرائع واختلافها. وقد بيّنا أَنَّ سؤالهم في سأل هذا فاسد، متى لَمْ يسألوا عن

المصلحة. لأنه متى زيد فيه ونقص كان السؤال ثانيًا، وما كان يزول السؤال بوجه من

الوجوه. وما هذا صفته² لا يصح السؤال نفسه. [واعلم]³ أَنَّهُم ذكروا تأويل الوضوء، في غير

10 واحدٍ من كتبهم واختلفوا في التأويل. إلاَّ أَنَّ الَّذِينَ يرجعون إليهم في هذا الباب، قد ذكروا

أَنَّهُ أمر بغسل الوجه دلالة على علم الظاهر، لأنَّ الوجه واجهة الإنسان وهو ظاهر. فأراد أن

يدل على نفسه وانعقاد الشريعة بغسل الوجه. وأمر بغسل اليدين ليدل عليه وعلى أساسه.

وأمر بتقديم اليمين⁴ على اليسرى، لأنَّ حاله آكدُ من حال الأساس. فكما أَنَّ الإنسان يستعين

¹ A space.

² MS. صف.

³ A space.

⁴ sic., it is better if it is written as البنى.

باليسرى، إذا أراد أن يحمل بيميناه، فكذلك هو في انعقاد الشريعة. وبقية¹ الدلائل على

[ال]عالم الروحاني لا بد لها² من أساس يستعين به في تأويل ما يعقده من الشرائع، ولهذا

أمر بغسل اليدين دلالة عليه وعلى أساسه. وإنما أمر بمسح الرأس والرَّجْلَيْن، دلالة منه على

اتصال الجزء بعالمه. وذلك أن الرأس [أ]على طرف الإنسان والرَّجُل أدنى، كما أن [ال]عالم

5 الجسماني الطبيعي أسفل الأشياء و[ال]عالم الروحاني فوق الأشياء. فيحتاج هذا الجزئي

الَّذِي فِي الطَّبِيعِيِّ أَنْ يَتَّصَلَ بِالْأَعْلَى الَّذِي هُوَ الرُّوحَانِي. وَإِنَّمَا كَانَ مَسْحًا وَلَمْ يَكُنْ غَسْلًا،

ليكون فرقاً بين ما يدلّ عليه وعلى أساسه، وما يدلّ على العالَمَيْنِ والتباعد بينهما. وإنما أمر

بغسل³ هذه الثُّقْبِ الَّتِي فِي الْوَجْهِ لِيَدلَّ بِهِ عَلَى الظَّاهِرِ، لِأَنَّهَا هِيَ أَبْوَابُ الْعُلُومِ الظَّاهِرَةِ

الكثيفة. لِأَنَّهُ لَا يُدْرِكُ بِهَا إِلَّا الْمُرَكَّبَاتِ [الطَّبِيعِيَّاتِ]، وَقَالَ فِيهَا أَنَّهَا سُنَّةٌ، وَأَضَافَ إِلَى

10 نَفْسِهِ لِأَنَّهُ صَاحِبُ الظَّاهِرِ وَالتَّرْكِيبِ، فَدَلَّ بِهَذَا عَلَى حَالِ نَفْسِهِ وَجَمَعَ بَيْنَهُمَا. كَمَا أَنَّ هَذَا

يُدرِكُ بِهِ عِلْمَ الْمُرَكَّبِ، فَبِذَلِكَ يَعْلَمُ مِنْ جِهَتِهِ الظَّاهِرِ دُونَ الْبَاطِنِ. فَأَمَّا الْاسْتِنْجَاءُ، فَإِنَّمَا أَمَرَ

بِتَنْظِيفِ ذَلِكَ الْمَوْضِعِ، لِيَدلَّ مِنْ حَالِ أَنَّهُ يَنْهَى الْعَوَامَ عَنِ النِّجَاسَاتِ وَالظُّلْمِ وَالقَبَائِحِ، الَّتِي

تَحْصُلُ مِنْ جِهَتِهِمْ. وَأَضَافَ إِلَى نَفْسِهِ لِأَنَّهُ هُوَ الَّذِي يَعْقِدُ عَلَيْهِمْ، وَيَأْخُذُ عَلَيْهِمْ أَلَّا يَظْلِمُوا

¹ . بمس. MS.

² . له. MS.

³ غسل is written above the line.

ولا يفسدوا في الأرض من جهة الظاهر. فقال في الاستنجاء أنه سنة، وأضاف إلى نفسه ليدلّ

على ما ذكرناه من حاله. وهذا الذي ذكرناه هو الذي ذكره أبو عبد الله الخادم، وهو أول داعٍ

بخراسان، ودعا الناس إلى هذا المذهب. ولم أقرأ لغيره على هذا التفصيل إلا للجيراني¹ وهو

كان صاحب [صاحب] الجبال إلى الروم، قال في كتاب له بالفارسية:

5 أن الوجه دليل على الناطق لظهوره. واليدين دليل [على] الأساس لأنه يأخذ

عن الناطق ومن الثاني. ومسح الرأس (Fol. 25 b.)²...

¹ It should be noted that this reading is conjectural. Al-Jayrānī (الجَيْرَانِي) is the *nisba* from Jayrān (جَيْرَان), which is a village near Iṣfahān. Yaqūt, *Muʿjam*, i, 197. Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī, *Dhikr Akhbār Iṣbahān*, ii, 210. Rashīd al-Dīn mentions a *dāʿī* who is called Abū Muḥammad al-Jurjānī (الجرجاني), which is also comparable to the name which is written on the manuscript, and this is still only a speculative reading. Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmiʿ*, fol. 188. Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 228.

² It seems that the rest of the manuscript is removed and could not be found yet.

Chapter Four

The Second Ismā‘īlī State in Yemen

439-532/1047-1137

The Rise of the Ṣulayḥids

5 After more than a hundred and thirty years of adopting *taqiyya*, and shortly before his death, Sulaymān al-Zuwāḥī¹ chose an ambitious and talented lad to be his pupil.² Al-Zuwāḥī, the lord of Kawkabān, who utilized his wealth by buying the alliance of the tribesmen nearest to his territories,³ was able to establish a worthy relationship with the Qāḍī of Ḥarāz.⁴ It is mentioned by ‘Umāra that the Qāḍī of
10 Ḥarāz, i.e., Muḥammad al-Ṣulayḥī, was authoritative among his people and more than forty thousand persons would follow his command.⁵

This friendship could arise both al-Zuwāḥī and Muḥammad al-Ṣulayḥī belonged to different Islamic sects, Muḥammad al-Ṣulayḥī was a Sunnī-Shāfi‘ī while on the contrary al-Zuwāḥī was recognized by his contemporaries as an Ismā‘īlī (*qarmaṭī*).
15 Al-Zuwāḥī made every effort to gain the Qāḍī’s trust and respect, which he

¹ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 71. Laḥjī, *The Sīra of Imām Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā Al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh* from Musallam al-Laḥjī’s *Kitāb Akhbār Al-Zaydiyya bi l-Yaman*, ed. W. Madelung, 42. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 77. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 74. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Qurrat*, i, 242. It should be noted that some sources incorrectly mention his name as “‘Āmir (ibn ‘Abd Allāh) (ibn ‘Āmir) al-Zuwāḥī”, and this because they followed ‘Umāra, who himself was confused between Sulaymān and his son ‘Āmir (d. 492/1099), who was one of the Ṣulayḥid army leaders (cf. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn al-Jalīlayn al-Fāḍīlayn*, ed. R. al-Sayyid and ‘A. ‘Abd al-‘Āṭī, 98, 186, 223 & 311, and Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 337). Cf. ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 88. Ibn Khaldūn, “The History of Yaman” from “al-‘Ibar”, ed. Kay, 145. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, iii, 415. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 248. Ḥarādī, *Ghīrbāl al-Zamān*, ed. M. al-‘Umar, 378. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Bughyat al-Mustafīd fī Akhbār Madīnat Zabīd*, ed. Y. Shalḥad, 55. Zirīklī, *A‘lām*, 328. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iii, 481. Recently, I. al-Akwa‘ mentions the full name of al-Zuwāḥī in his book *Hijār al-‘Ilm wa M‘āqiluhu fī al-Yaman* (cf. iv, 1870) as “Sulaymān ibn ‘Āmir ibn Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Zuwāḥī”, again it is most likely he was confused with the name of the grandson of al-Zuwāḥī.

² ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 82. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 72. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 77. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 257. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Bughyat*, 56. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, iii, 411.

³ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 72. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 78-9. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 74. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 257.

⁴ Ḥarāz: a wide fertile valley which is located about 81 km. to the West of the city of Ṣan‘ā’. It includes seven “administrative provinces” (*makhālīf*; pl. of *mikhhlāf*), namely; Ḥarāz, Hawzan, Lihāb, Mujayyih, Karār, Masār, and Shibām. Ḥarāz has been the home town of the Ismā‘īlīs in Yemen since the third/ninth century. Hamdānī, *Ṣīfat*, 123, cf. 209. I. Akwa‘, *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 84 and f.n. 1. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, i, 252. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 164.

⁵ ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 83.

successfully managed to do.¹ Without any hesitation, al-Zuwāhī seized every opportunity to ride to the Qādī, and made excuses to be alone with ‘Alī,² the son of the Qādī, to teach him the principles of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*. ‘Alī was conscripted by al-Zuwāhī to be an Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī*.

5 Most of the sources agree that shortly before his death, al-Zuwāhī sent to the Ismā‘īlī Imām, i.e., the Fatimid Caliph-Imām al-Zāhir (d. 427/1036),³ asking for his permission to appoint ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣulayhī (d. 459/1067)⁴ to be a deputy *dā‘ī* of Yemen.⁵ After he received permission, al-Zuwāhī designated al-Ṣulayhī as his successor as the head of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen.⁶ And these sources also agree
10 that al-Ṣulayhī, who became the founder of the second Ismā‘īlī state, was qualified to rule Yemen, and he became one of the most important and powerful Ismā‘īlī figures in Yemen.

Without doubt, al-Zuwāhī paved the way for al-Ṣulayhī and saved him from a great number of difficulties by giving him some guidance as well as some secret
15 books of his *da‘wa*. According to ‘Umāra, these books belonged to the Fatimid

¹ Ibid. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn. *Ghāyat*, i, 248. Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh Thaghr ‘Adan*, 159. Ḥarādī, *Ghīrbāl al-Zamān*, 376.

² ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Ṣulayhī from the Banū ‘Ubayd. Their origin is traced to Saba’ ibn Yashjub ibn Ya‘rub ibn Qaḥṭān ibn Hūd. He was born in Qatar, a small village in Ḥarāz, in 403/1012. Ibn Rasūl, *Turfat al-Ashhāb*, ed. K. W. Zettersteen, 117. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 2. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 402. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 65. Zirīklī, *A‘lām*, iv, 328.

³ The seventh Fatimid Caliph-Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Zāhir li I‘zāz Dīn Allāh ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh. Cf. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 63.

⁴ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 90. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 78-9. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 77. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, iv, fol. 34. Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh Thaghr ‘Adan*, ed. O. Löfgren, 162-3. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 55. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, ii, 273-4. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 103. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 406. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 102. When Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn erroneously reported the death of al-Ṣulayhī in 458/1066, other historians follow and quote the authority of ‘Umāra= or Ibn Khallikān who himself quotes from the latter= repeat the year of the death of al-Ṣulayhī as 473/1081. Cf. ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 88. Ibn al-Mujāwir, *Mstabsīr*, ed. Oscar Löfgren, 73. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, iii, 415. Ibn Taghrī Birdī, *al-Nujūm al-Zāhira*, ii/2, ed. W. Popper, 268. Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar*, vi, ed. Ṣ. al-Munajjid, 414-8. Ḥarādī, *Ghīrbāl al-Zamān*, 378. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Bughyat*, 55. Zambour, *Mu‘jam al-Ansāb*, 183. Eī, iv, 516. Lane-Poole, *The Mohammadan Dynasties*, 94. Zirīklī, *A‘lām*, iv, 328.

⁵ Qurashī erroneously mentions that al-Zuwāhī had the permission from al-Mustansīr (d. 487/1094), and this mistake had been quoted by Ghālib (*A‘lām*, 403.) and Ḥ. Hamdānī (*Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 68), when the latter mentions in his book (*Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 60) that al-Zuwāhī was the *dā‘ī* of Yemen during the reigns of al-Ḥākim and al-Zāhir. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 2. Cf. Tāmīr, *Tārīkh al-Ismā‘īliyya*, iii, 152.

⁶ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 2. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 68-9. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 403. Tāmīr, *Tārīkh al-Ismā‘īliyya*, iii, 152.

Imāms.¹ One of these books was **al-Jafr**,² which deals with the prophecies and occult sciences supposedly revealed to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.³ Ibn Khaldūn states that when al-Zuwāhī tried to attract al-Ṣulayhī to the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*, he showed al-Ṣulayhī that his name was mentioned in that book,⁴ i.e., **al-Jafr**.⁵ Al-Ḥammādī adds that al-Zuwāhī

¹ ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 84.

² *Jafr*: lit., “male-goat skin”; the generic name for an esoteric literature of apocalyptic character which arose as a result of the persecution which the descendants of ‘Alī and Fāṭima had suffered. Later, deviating from its original form of esoteric knowledge, reserved for the successors and heirs of ‘Alī, it became assimilated to a divinatory technique accessible to the wise whatever their origin, particularly mystics, consisting of speculations based on the numerical value of the Arabic letters. EI², *Glossary*, 69. According to Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, the book of **al-Jafr** was named after a well where ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib dictated it to his son al-Ḥasan. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, iv, fol. 241. A copy of the manuscript of the book has been bought by the researcher. The manuscript was written in Jumāda I, 1261/June, 1845 by Nawfal ibn Ni‘mat Allāh ibn Nawfal al-Ṭarābulṣī. It seems that this is not the original copy of **al-Jafr** because the name of Muḥyī al-Dīn ibn ‘Arabī (d. 638/1240) is mentioned on folio 73 by the narrator, Kamāl al-Dīn Abū Sālim Muḥammad ibn Ṭalḥa al-Rājī (d. 652/1254). Cf. EI², ii, 376.

³ According to the Shiite tradition as narrated by Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq (cf. Muḥammad Muḥsin -Āghā Buzurg-, *al-Dharī‘a fī Taṣānīf al-Shī‘a*, v, 118-22), there is more than one “*Jafr*”. About the origin of the book of **al-Jafr**, cf. Kulaynī (d. 328-9/940-1), *al-Uṣūl min al-Kāfī*, ed. ‘A. Ghaffārī, i, 344-8, where it is mentioned (p. 347) that **al-Jafr** was divided into two parts: “the white *Jafr*”, which included the esoteric knowledge, and “the red *Jafr*”, which included the “weapon”, which seems to mean the organization and secrets of the *da‘wa*. All the Shiites agree that “*al-Jafr*” was dictated by the Prophet and written by ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, and that this “*Jafr*” was not found, having been hidden by the Imāms. However, Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq was the first Imām who dictated the “*Jafr*” to one of his pupils, Jābir ibn Ḥayyān (d. 200/815-6), and this was called “the black *Jafr*” (*al-Jafr al-Aswad*). Āghā Buzurg, in his book, *al-Dharī‘a fī Taṣānīf al-Shī‘a*, mentions more than sixteen titles which have the name of *Jafr*, without indicating which one is more accurate. It seems that all of the noted *jafrs* were quoted, or translated, from “*al-Jafr al-Aswad*”. For more details, cf. Kulaynī, *al-Kāfī*, i, 344-8. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, iii, 238-41. Āghā Buzurg, *al-Dharī‘a fī Taṣānīf al-Shī‘a*, v, 118-22. EI², ii, 375-7. Nicholson, *JRAS*, 1899, 907-8, where the *Jafr* is translated as “Apocalyptic Skin”.

⁴ It should be noted that most of the Yemeni-Shiites of that time, even the Zaydīs, believed that **al-Jafr** was a book of prophecies which could not be perceived or interpreted without the teaching of the Imām. It is also called **al-Fatrāt wa al-Qirānāt**, and it was misspelled by ‘Umāra as **al-Ṣuwar** (الصور), which could be also an error or misreading from the copyist of **al-Mufīd** (cf. 84). Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 73-4. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, iv, fol. 241.

⁵ Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Ibar*, iv, 457, cf. Kay, *Yaman*, 145. This information, probably, is quoted from ‘Umāra who says:

“It is said that (Sulaymān) possessed a description of al-Ṣulayhī, contained in **Kitāb al-Ṣiwar**”, one of the treasures of the Imāms, he (al-Zuwāhī) made known to him (al-Ṣulayhī) the revelations contained in the book touching the destinies reserved for him in future, and the noble career he was to fulfil. He (al-Zuwāhī) attracted him (al-Ṣulayhī) secretly [to the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*], without knowledge of his (al-Ṣulayhī) father or his people.

وقيل كانت عند (سليمان) حلية الصليحي من كتاب الصور، وهو من ذخائر الأئمة، فأوقفه منه على
تنقل حاله وماله واستماله سرا من أبيه وقومه.

‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 84. Also, Kay, *Yaman*, 19. Almost the same information has been quoted by Ibn Khallikān, cf. *Wafayāt*, iii, 411. It should be noted that Ibn Khallikān was a reliable source for many historians. Al-Dawādārī and Ibn al-‘Imād al-Ḥanbalī, for example, mention the same information of the latter, cf. *Dawādārī*, *Kanz al-Durar*, vi, 414-8. Ḥanbalī, *Shadharāt al-Dhahab*, iii, 346-8.

left al-Ṣulayhī an immense fortune, which was collected from his followers, i.e., the Ismā‘īlīs of Yemen.¹

After the death of al-Zuwāhī,² al-Ṣulayhī spread the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* by a new tactic, which had never been followed by any of the Yemeni Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* before, to attract the Yemeni tribes to join his *da‘wa*. He had been a leader of a *hajj* caravan from Yemen to Mecca for fifteen years.³ Thus, he showed generosity, humbleness and noble-mindedness which tempted a large number of people to become his followers. In this way he became well-known among the Yemenis, and this was part of his tactics. It was among the Yemenis that a rumour spread which claimed that al-Ṣulayhī would become the king of Yemen. He himself denied this rumour after he had been informed of it by some people.⁴

As surprising as it may seem, none of our sources mentions with precision when al-Ṣulayhī first began his ascent to power. In fact, an accurate examination of our available sources makes evident that almost no event in his life is reliably dated. One of the most debated issues in Yemeni history for the fifth/eleventh century was the question of when exactly al-Ṣulayhī first arose and proclaimed his Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* and ruled Yemen as nominal vassals of the Fatimid Caliph. *Al-Mufīd fī Tārīkh Zabīd*, *Itti‘āz al-Ḥunafā* and *‘Uyūn al-Akḥbār*,⁵ three of the pro-Ismā‘īlī primary sources for the dating of this period and the life of al-Ṣulayhī, all of them give the year 429/1038 as the date of al-Ṣulayhī’s self-proclamation of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*, because al-Qurashī and al-Maqrīzī depended on ‘Umāra.⁶

Al-Qurashī (d. 872/1468),⁷ the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī* and a historian who had access to a large number of Fatimid documents such as *al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya*,⁸ and quoted

¹ Hammādī, *Kashf*, 72.

² *Ibid.*

³ ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 87. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 77. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 75. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 248. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, iii, 411.

⁴ ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 88. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, iii, 411.

⁵ Cf. *Primary Sources*, 8, 24, 29.

⁶ ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 88. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, ii, 187. Qurashī, *‘Uyūn*, vii, 6.

⁷ Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 169. M. Ghālib (ed.), *‘Uyūn*, iv, the introduction, 14.

⁸ Some of those which concerned the Yemenī *dā‘īs* are edited by Ḥ. Hamdānī as appendixes in his book *al-Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 302-20. In his book *al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya*, ‘A. Mājid edited a manuscript no. 27155/School of Oriental Studies, which contains some of the *Sijillāt* that had been sent by al-Mustanṣir to the Ṣulayḥids.

some of them in his 'Uyūn,¹ relied sometimes on 'Umāra's accounts. Therefore, one can be almost certain when he raises a doubt about 'Uyūn as it becomes, sometimes, vague and imprecise about dates, events, and place names. Nevertheless, 'Uyūn gives scholars more information about al-Ṣulayhī than any other individual source.

5 But in contrast to these accounts, other sources, i.e., the anti-Ismā'īlī ones, indicate that al-Ṣulayhī seized Masār and proclaimed himself in 439/1047.² Al-Ḥammādī, who was a contemporary of al-Ṣulayhī, mentions that the year 439/1047 was the year of al-Ṣulayhī's appearance on the stage of power.³ Al-Raba'ī, the author of *Sīrat al-Amīrayn al-Jalīlayn al-Fādīlayn*,⁴ who was also a contemporary of al-
10 Ṣulayhī, mentions that the year 439/1047 is the date of the Ṣulayhid revolution.⁵ Since both of al-Ṣulayhī's contemporaries mentioned the same year, i.e. 439/1047, this should make their account more accurate.

Scholars such as Ḥ. Hamdānī, Tāmīr and Ghālib, all modern Ismā'īlī scholars, and also M. al-Akwa', the editor of 'Umāra's *al-Mufīd*, agree with al-Raba'ī and al-
15 Ḥammādī that the rise of al-Ṣulayhī was in 439/1047.⁶ However, it should be noted that al-Akwa' in his disputation guides his reader to agree with his point of view. He puts together a different array of narrations for each date and selects the year 439/1047 and excludes the year 429/1038, without proving any impossibility of the year 429/1038 as the date of the occurrence of al-Ṣulayhī. Nevertheless, one can
20 assume that the historians who mention the rise of al-Ṣulayhī in 429/1038 were victims of 'Umāra's account.⁷

¹ Cf. 'Uyūn, vii, 79-86 and 151-3.

² Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 72. Ibn Samura, *Ṭabaqāt Fuqahā' al-Yaman*, 87, f.n. 6. Laḥjī, *The Sīra*, 42. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 247. Cf. Raba'ī, *Sīrat*, 72. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 76. Also see, Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 102.

³ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 72.

⁴ Cf. Madelung, *Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 71.

⁵ Raba'ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 72.

⁶ M. al-Akwa' argues that 'Umar ibn 'Alī ibn Samura in *Ṭabaqāt* and Yusuf ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥajūrī in *Rawḍat al-Akḥbār*, as careful Yemenī historians, confirm this above date. It should be noted that when Ibn Samura mentions that al-Ṣulayhī arose in Shawwal 439/April 1048, al-Ḥajūrī merely reports the year 439/1047-8. Akwa' (ed.), *Mufīd*, 88, f.n. 2. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 73, f.n. 3. Tāmīr, *Tārīkh al-Ismā'īliyya*, iii, 155. Ghālib, *A'lām*, 403.

⁷ For example, some of the historians who quote from 'Umāra's *Mufīd* (cf. 'Umāra, *Mufīd*, 88-90, f.n. 4.) are: Qurashī in 'Uyūn, vii, 6. Janadī, *Sulūk*, iii, 287. Waṣābī, *Tārīkh Waṣāb*, 32. Khazrajī, 'Asjad, 56. Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh Thaghr 'Adan*, 160. From the "none-Yemenis", Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, ii, 187. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, iii, 412. Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar*, vi, 415.

The year 438/1047 was the beginning of a new epoch for the Ismā'īlīs in Yemen. It was during the season of *hajj* that al-Ṣulayḥī secretly organized a force to start his military action. According to al-Qurashī, in Mecca, al-Ṣulayḥī recruited supporters from a prominent tribal people from Sanḥān,¹ Yām² and Habra³ from Hamdān,⁴ and Jusham⁵ from Ḥimyar,⁶ all of whom swore him an oath of allegiance for life and death.⁷ It seems that a correspondence took place in the following year between al-Ṣulayḥī and his supporters to gather in Masār.⁸ It is also mentioned that in Jumāda I 439/December 1047,⁹ when al-Ṣulayḥī returned to Yemen from the *hajj*, he went to Masār and began to build a stronghold on its summit.¹⁰

¹ Sanḥān: a name which was shared by a number of Yemeni tribes, the one which is mentioned above is called Sanḥān Janb which is located north of Ṣa'da. Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, ii, 246. Ḥajrī, *Majmū'*, iii, 432. Maḥḥafī, *Mu'jam*, 327-8. Cf. Yāqūt, *Mu'jam*, iii, 265. I. Akwa', *Buldān*, 145, f.n. 2.

² Yām: a Yemeni tribe which is a subdivision of the tribe of Hamdān, it was located in a mountain which has the same name and overlooks the Jawf, then they left there and lived in Najrān since. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 145. Yāqūt, *Mu'jam*, v, 426. Ḥajrī, *Majmū'*, iv, 774-5. Maḥḥafī, *Mu'jam*, 706. I. Akwa', *Buldān*, 293, f.n. 4.

³ Habra: is also a subdivision of the tribe of Hamdān. Maḥḥaf, *Mu'jam*, 672.

⁴ Cf. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 75.

⁵ Jusham: is a subdivision of the tribe of Ḥimyar, and they lived in Ibb and Waṣāb. Maḥḥaf, *Mu'jam*, 121.

⁶ Al-Wāsi'ī says that a large number of people from Sanḥān, Hamdān and Ḥimyar followed al-Ṣulayḥī. Wāsi'ī, *Furjat al-Humūm wa al-Ḥazan*, 180. When he mentions the name of the three tribes, al-Wāsi'ī was more specific than the other historian, but on the other hand, his generalization could make one confused and it may become difficult to identify which "Ḥimyar" al-Wāsi'ī means? Does he mean the tribe, the *sarū*, or the *mikhālāf*? (Cf. Yāqūt, *Mu'jam*, ii, 307) However, it is most likely that al-Wāsi'ī meant by "Ḥimyar" a subdivision of the tribe of Ḥimyar. (Ḥajrī, *Majmū'*, ii, 284) Ibn 'Abd al-Majīd al-Yamānī solved the puzzle and made al-Wāsi'ī's statement more appropriate when he said:

"...people from the Ḥijāz, Sanḥān, Yām, Jusham and Habra."

Ibn 'Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 75.

Therefore, one can confidently say that al-Ṣulayḥī's first Yemeni supporters were from Yām and Habra, the subdivisions of the tribe of Hamdān, and from Jusham, the subdivision of the tribe of Ḥimyar.

⁷ Qurashī, 'Uyūn, vii, 3-6. Cf. 'Umāra, *Mufid*, 88. Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh Thaghr 'Adan*, 160. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 71. Ghālib, *A'lām*, 403. Jirāfī, *al-Muqtaṭaf min Tārīkh al-Yaman*, 118.

⁸ Masār: a *mikhālāf* in Ḥarāz, took its fame from the stronghold that was situated on the summit of its mountain and has the same name. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 123 and f.n. 1. 'Umāra, *Mufid*, 88. Ḥajrī, *Majmū'*, iv, 707. Maḥḥafī, *Mu'jam*, 706. Map 5. Cf. Yāqūt, *Mu'jam*, v, 131, where he incorrectly mentions it "Mashār". Also see, *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 167/36.

⁹ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 72. Raba'ī, *Sirat al-Amīrayn*, 72. Laḥjī, *The Sīra*, 42.

¹⁰ 'Umāra, *Mufid*, 98. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 77. Cf. Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh Thaghr 'Adan*, 160. Where he mentions that there was a castle there, and when al-Ṣulayḥī came, he occupied it.

Al-Qurashī states that when al-Ṣulayḥī arrived at Masār, he proclaimed a kind of “rule of action” (*bunūd*) which was due to the preceding *dā‘īs*.¹ This kind of *bunūd* in all likelihood similar to martial law, which was most likely an inducement to convert the public to Ismā‘īlism. It appears that such a plan had been given by the
5 Ismā‘īlī headquarters to their *dā‘īs* to become part of a curriculum or a platform. Therefore, it is probably the case that al-Ṣulayḥī had followed a specific order which had been instructed by the Imām, or simply, he followed Ibn Ḥawshab’s strategy. Nevertheless, it was difficult to comprehend why al-Ṣulayḥī’s action and the reaction of the Yemenis was the same even if it happened in different areas and different
10 times.

It is in ‘Uyūn,² where al-Qurashī states that at the beginning of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen, and when Ibn Ḥawshab managed to have support from some Yemeni tribes, he started to collect some money as a *zakāt*, from them. Ibn Ḥawshab at that time explained his action to his followers as a kind of tactic which would
15 protect the *da‘wa* by using that money to buy arms. Moreover, he used the money to hire ‘Abr Maḥram from the Banū al-‘Arjā’. Within a short time, ‘Abr Maḥram was besieged by the tribes nearest the stronghold. But Ibn Ḥawshab, adds al-Ḥammādī,³ tried to trick them by dispatching a letter which said that he took such an action to protect himself from both sides of the enemy, i.e., the Yu‘firids. This manoeuvre gave
20 Ibn Ḥawshab time. He had an overwhelming victory when they attacked him.⁴

This was more or less the same as what happened to al-Ṣulayḥī when he asked his followers to donate some money for the interest of the *da‘wa*.⁵ At first, al-Ṣulayḥī was besieged by the angry people of Ḥarāz, who lived nearest to Masār and suspected that military preparations had been made by him.⁶ He was threatened by the
25 besiegers who informed him that if he did not leave, they would continue their siege until he and his people were famished. Al-Ṣulayḥī was able to deceive them when he

¹ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 6.

² Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, v, 38-9.

³ Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 47.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 6.

⁶ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 77. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 75.

said to them he did what he did to protect the people of the region from their enemies.¹ Whatever may be the case, the besiegers were contented with his answer and they lifted the siege.²

A few months later, al-Ṣulayḥī proclaimed his Fatimid *da‘wa*. It seems that letters had been exchanged in the same year between al-Ṣulayḥī and the Ismā‘īlī Imām, i.e., the Fatimid Caliph-Imām al-Mustanṣir bi-Allāh (d. 487/1094).³ Al-Qurashī reports that al-Ṣulayḥī’s proclamation of the *da‘wa* was announced two days after the arrival of his two representative *dā‘īs*, who returned to Ḥarāz from the court of al-Mustanṣir in Cairo.⁴ After he rebuilt Masār and was reinforced by the tribes who swore him an oath of allegiance, al-Ṣulayḥī tried to spread his rule in the nearest territories of Ḥarāz mountain.⁵ Al-Qurashī mentions that a manifesto was sent by al-Ṣulayḥī to the people of Ḥarāz and declared the name of al-Mustanṣir in the *khuṭba*.⁶ Such a manifesto means that al-Ṣulayḥī, for the first time, openly his mission and allegiance to the Fatimids.

This was the reason that al-Ṣulayḥī was attacked by some of the local powers under the command of the Shāwiri⁷ *amīr* of al-Mu‘ayyāl,⁸ Ja‘far ibn ‘Abbās,⁹ who led a large number of tribal people from the western regions of Ḥarāz.¹⁰ Al-Khazrajī was the only historian who mentioned that a kind of alliance had been made between the Shāwiri Ja‘far ibn ‘Abbās and the Zaydī *amīr*, Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim al-‘Iyānī (d.

¹ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 6.

² *Ibid.* Cf. Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh Thaghr ‘Adan*, 160.

³ Hammādī, *Kashf*, 72. Cf. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 63.

⁴ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 8. It should be mentioned that al-Qurashī states that the above event took place in the year 429/1038.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ The Banū Shāwir is a tribe from Hamdān. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 73. Cf. f.n. 1. Akwa‘ (ed.), *Mufīd*, 91.

⁸ Al-Mu‘ayyāl was a stronghold which is situated on a mountain in Bayt Qudum to the east of Ḥajja, and took its name from the name of a mountain. Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 613. Cf. Map 5.

⁹ The sources do not give any details about Ja‘far ibn ‘Abbās. Al-Raba‘ī mentions that he was from Shāwir al-Mu‘ayyāl (*Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 72-3), and al-Ḥamzī, Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd and al-Khazrajī describe him as a follower of the Shāfi‘ī *madhhab* “شافعي المذهب” (*Kanz*, 78. *Bahjat*, 75. *Tārīkh al-Kifāya wa al-I‘lām fi-man wulliya al-Yaman wa Sakanhā min Ahl al-Islām*, MS. in Dār al-Kutub-Cairo, microfilm no. 2206, fol. 47). Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 78. M. Akwa‘ (ed.), *Mufīd*, 91 (the footnote) and *Ṣifat*, 125, f.n. 2. Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 613.

¹⁰ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 72-3.

450/1059).¹ It was in the same year, i.e., 439/1048,² that Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim attacked al-Ṣulayhī’s sympathizer, al-Ḥusayn ibn Muhalhal ibn Janāh,³ at his stronghold in al-Akhrūj,⁴ and the Shāwirī’s army besieged Masār. When he unexpectedly faced the latter with a strong army, al-Ṣulayhī easily smashed the Shāwirī’s army,⁵ and killed
5 Ja‘far ibn ‘Abbās.⁶

When he heard about the overwhelming defeat and the death of his ally, Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim left Ḥayma and withdrew his troops from al-Akhrūj.⁷ Consequently, the news of al-Ṣulayhī’s triumph was spread throughout the Yemeni regions, which made some of the tribal chieftains arrange a meeting in Bayt Karib.⁸ They decided in that
10 meeting to depute ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim al-‘Iyānī to be the commander of the tribal allegiance.⁹ Accordingly, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far led a revolt against al-Ṣulayhī somewhere near Ḥayma, where ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far was defeated, captured and brought as prisoner to al-Ṣulayhī in Masār.¹⁰ According to al-Raba‘ī, al-Ṣulayhī kept ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far for some time, but then released him after he

¹ Ja‘far, the Zayidī *amīr* and the ruler of Ṣa‘da; on behalf of his father the Zaydī Imām al-Qāsim ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Zayd ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. Ja‘far was eighty five years old when he died. *Ibid.*, 116-7. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, i, 181-2. See also, Ṣubḥī, *al-Zaydiyya*, 585. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 96. The year of the death of Ja‘far is erroneously reported in 495 A. H. by I. al-Akwa‘ in his *Hijar*, iii, 1519. Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 47.

² R. al-Sayyid and ‘A. Abd al-‘Āṭī (ed.), *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 15, f.n. 3.

³ The Lord of al-Akhrūj who was ruling the region of Ḥayma. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 8. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 78.

⁴ Al-Akhrūj is the old name of Ḥayma. Hamdānī, *Ṣīfat*, f.n. 6, 122 & *Iklīl*, ii, 245. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 21. It is erroneously written as “al-Aḥrūj” by Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 16. Cf. Map 5.

⁵ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 73.

⁶ Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 78. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 75. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 47. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 78.

⁷ More than one place is called Ḥayma in Yemen. What is meant by Ḥayma above is the inner part of al-Akhrūj, the wide region which is situated in the southwest of Ṣan‘a’. Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 205. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, ii, 302. Cf. Madelung, *Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 72. See map 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 164-170/36-40.

⁸ Bayt Karib is a village in Ḥaḍūr mountain, also called the mountain of “al-Nabī shu‘ayb”. Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 535. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, ii, 276-7. Cf. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 73, where the author mentions “Bayt Ma‘dī Karib” as the place of the meeting; such a place, i.e., Bayt Ma‘dī Karib, could not be identified. Therefore, it may be a mistake by the copyist or by al-Raba‘ī himself. M. Akwa‘ mentions it as “Bayt Ma‘dan”(!), cf. Akwa‘ (ed.), *Mufīd*, 92. See map 5.

⁹ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 73. Cf. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 9.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 14. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 74.

pledged not to antagonize al-Ṣulayhī.¹ Nothing is heard of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far thereafter.

Al-Raba‘ī adds that the tribal chieftains of Ḥimyar and Hamdān came to Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim and asked him to rise against al-Ṣulayhī for the purpose of protecting their lands. Soon after he rose with their support, Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim’s army was defeated by al-Ṣulayhī’s army. Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim was taken to Masār where he was put for some time in prison. He was released after he promised al-Ṣulayhī not to rise against him.² Neither al-Raba‘ī nor al-Qurashī give a date for these events, but one can assume that it happened after Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim left Ḥayma, and before al-Ṣulayhī took the stronghold of Yanā‘³ in Rajab 442/October 1050.⁴ Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim kept his promise, left Yemen, went to the Ḥijāz and absented himself from the political life.⁵ Nothing is mentioned about him by the Yemeni historians before the year of 450/1058, and when he was already infirm with age. Thereafter, al-Raba‘ī mentions that a few months after Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim returned to Yemen in Ramaḍān 450/September-October 1058, he died in Dhū al-Ḥijja 450/December-January 1058-9 at eighty five years of age.⁶

After the death of the real ruler of Ṣan‘ā’, Yaḥyā ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḍaḥḥāk,⁷ in 440/1048,⁸ his son was chosen to succeed him by the people of the tribes of Hamdān, Ḥimyar, Banū al-Ḥārith and Khawlān,⁹ with the support from their leaders.¹⁰ Al-Ṣulayhī sent emissaries to express his sympathy to his son, Ḥāshid ibn Yaḥyā al-

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

³ Yanā‘ is one of Ḥayma’s strongholds. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 806. Maḥfāfī, *Mu‘jam*, 717. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 210. See map 5. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 79, and also, Mad‘aj (ed.) of *Kanz’s Ḥamzī*, 78, where it is erroneously written as “Bitāh” in the first and “Binā‘” in the second.

⁴ This account, according to M. al-Akwa‘ (ed., ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 92-3) who refers to a book which he alleges was written by an anonymous author. M. al-Akwa‘ called the book “*Tārīkh al-Yaman li Majhūl*” (!). The account of al-Ḥamzī may support such a hypothesis; al-Ḥamzī mentions the events before 441/1050-1.

⁵ ‘Arshī, *Bulūgh*, 36.

⁶ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 116-7. Cf. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, iv, 37.

⁷ It is read incorrectly by Ḥ. Hamdānī as “al-Ṣaḥārī” instead of “al-Ḍaḥḥāk”, cf. *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 81.

⁸ Khazrajī, *Kifāya*, 47. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 15.

⁹ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 75. Cf. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 181. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, 313.

¹⁰ Akwa‘ (ed.), *Mufīd*, 94.

Ḍaḥḥāk (d. 444/1052).¹ But Ḥāshid considered this action from al-Ṣulayḥī as a sort of an entry into Ṣan‘ā’²’s political affairs. Al-Qurashī adds that Ḥāshid had also considered it as an insult.² Therefore, Ḥāshid gathered the troops of his supporters and marched southwest to attack al-Ṣulayḥī.

5 In 444/1052,³ some of Ḥāshid’s army leaders⁴ attacked some of al-Ṣulayḥī’s followers, one of them was al-Ṣulayḥī’s poet, Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Rasān.⁵ Al-Ṣulayḥī, therefore, moved forward with his large army against Ḥāshid and confronted him at Ṣawf.⁶ Ḥāshid was defeated and killed along with most of his supporters from the leaders of the Yemeni tribes. Al-Ṣulayḥī was encouraged to occupy Ṣan‘ā’. It
10 took him almost six years, from 444/1052 to 450/1058, to spread his authority over all of the territories to the south as far as the border with the southern highlands. During that time, he encountered Zaydī resistance twice, the first with Abū al-Faṭḥ al-

¹ None of the sources, except al-Raba‘ī, provides the first name of Ibn Abī Ḥāshid, and sometimes they were confused between two names, “Abū Ḥāshid” (cf. for example, Akwa‘ (ed.), *Mufid*, 94. Madelung, *Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 72) and “Ibn Abī Ḥāshid” (cf. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 78. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 75. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 249. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 81. Kay (ed. and trans.), *Yaman*, 229 & 251) or sometimes “Yaḥyā ibn Abī Ḥāshid” (Jirāfī, *Muqtaṭaf*, 118). Even al-Raba‘ī, who mentioned his name correctly for the first time as “Ḥāshid ibn Yaḥyā”; [واجتمعوا إلى حاشد بن يحيى وهو يومئذ الرئيس والسلطان من حمير وهمدان...], when he mentioned his name again, he erroneously mentioned it as “Abū Ḥāshid ibn Yaḥyā”;

وسار أبو حاشد بن يحيى في بقية العسكر وجمهوره حتى إذا كانوا يبازل من وادي صوف نزل عليهم عسكر الصليحي فقتل أبو حاشد بن يحيى في عدة من الرؤساء والسلاطين.

Nevertheless, one can confidently agree with al-Raba‘ī when he mentioned his name for the first time as “Ḥāshid ibn Yaḥyā” (cf. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 75).

² Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 15.

³ It appears that all of the Yemeni sources of this period skip the year 443/1051, which provides the confidence to say that nothing important had happened between al-Ṣulayḥī and his enemies at that time. Cf. for example, Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, ‘Umāra, *Mufid*, 98-9. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 78. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 75-6. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 250.

⁴ This leader was ‘Abd al-Akbar ibn Wahīb al-Hamdānī. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 75.

⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, where al-Raba‘ī has not mentioned the place which was attacked by ‘Abd al-Akbar.

⁶ Ṣawf: is a ruined village which took its name from the valley (cf. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 75) which was situated to the southwest of Ṣan‘ā’ between Ḥayma and Ḥaḍūr and has the same name. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 249. Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh Thaghr ‘Adan*, 160. I. Akwa‘, *Hijar*, iii, 1181. Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 388-9. See map 5.

Daylamī (d. 444/1052),¹ and the second with al-Qāsim ibn Ja‘far al-‘Iyānī (d. 468/1075).²

While the Ismā‘īlīs organized themselves and united their forces under the command of al-Ṣulayḥī, who won battles time after time, the Zaydīs, on the other hand, fell into disarray, were gripped by internal conflicts, and lost their gains and their lands one by one. A group of the Zaydīs supported Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim as the deputy, as he alleged, of the hidden Imām,³ i.e., his brother al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Qāsim (d. 404/1013).⁴ Another group supported Abū al-Faṭḥ al-Daylamī⁵ at first, then they were lukewarm, just a few from Khawlān al-‘Āliya⁶ continued their support and stood by him when he had been chased to ‘Ans by the Ṣulayḥid army.⁷

¹ Abū al-Faṭḥ al-Nāṣir ibn al-Ḥusayn ("al-Ḥasan" in Ṣubḥī, *Zaydiyya*, 590) ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Isā ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Alī (he was not mentioned by Ṣubḥī, cf. *ibid.*) ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Zayd ibn al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. (Madelung, *Der Imām al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm*, 246). He was called "al-Daylamī" because in 437/1045 he left his homeland in Daylam and came to Yemen (*ibid.*, 205), where he was joined by Yemeni tribes. He went to Ṣa‘da and then to Ṣan‘a’, where he was expelled by Yaḥyā al-Ḍaḥḥāk and Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim al-‘Iyānī. He then went to Dhū Bīn (Hajrī, *Majmū‘*, ii, 351) where he constructed his own town. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 13. Kay (ed. & trans.), *Yaman*, 303. Jirāfī, *Muqṭataf*, 175. See also, Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 82.

² Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, iv, 37. Ziriklī, *A‘lām*, v, 174.

³ It appears that al-Raba‘ī, the author of *Sīrat al-Amīrayn* was one of this group, who believed in the return of al-Ḥusayn to life as the Maḥdī. Cf. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 72, where he said:

لَمَّا كَانَ مِنْ غِيْبَةِ إِمَامِ الْعَصْرِ وَصَاحِبِ الدَّهْرِ الْمَهْدِيِّ لَدَيْنَ اللَّهِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ الْقَاسِمِ صَلَوَاتُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ، وَكَانَ امْتِحَانًا لِأَوْلِيَاءِ اللَّهِ وَنَقَمَ عَلَى أَعْدَاءِ اللَّهِ.

and 84, where he said:

وَكَذَلِكَ فَعَلَهُ إِمَامُ عَصْرِنَا الْمَهْدِيِّ لَدَيْنَ اللَّهِ صَلَوَاتُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ وَعَلَى آلِهِ الْكَرَامِ.

⁴ Ja‘far propagated that his brother al-Ḥusayn had not been killed, therefore the latter was addressed by the name of "al-Maḥdī", and because of that he had never proclaimed the Imamate and was described as "amīr". Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 239. I. Akwa‘, *Hijar*, iii, 1519. Cf. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 72. A. al-Muṭā‘, *Tarīkh al-Yaman al-Islāmī*, ed. ‘A. Ḥibshī, 230. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 96.

⁵ According to al-Raba‘ī’s belief (see above), Abū al-Faṭḥ was a pretender and had no right to claim the Imamate. One can, therefore, understand why he did not mention Abū al-Faṭḥ in the *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*.

⁶ Khawlān al-‘Āliya is a fraction of the tribe of Khawlān, this fraction occupied east of Ṣan‘a’, between Ṣan‘a’ and Ma’rib. Hajrī, *Majmū‘*, ii, 313, 315-22.

⁷ See map 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 159-160/50 & 54-55.

As it is mentioned by ‘Umāra, al-Ṣulayḥī lived in dread of Najāḥ (d. 452/1060),¹ the ruler of Zabīd,² therefore, he tried to win Najāḥ’s favour by obeying his commands and showing him his goodwill.³ This kind of good relationship between the representatives of the two Islamic caliphates, i.e., the Abbasid and the Fatimid, in Yemen, was strained when Abū al-Faṭḥ was killed. Al-Qurashī states that the relationship deteriorated when Najāḥ began to correspond with Abū al-Faṭḥ. Najāḥ intrigued against al-Ṣulayḥī and sent to Abū al-Faṭḥ, while the latter was in Ṣa‘da, encouraging him to conquer Ṣan‘ā’.⁴ It seems that Najāḥ felt threatened by the accelerated expansion of al-Ṣulayḥī’s rule in the Western Mountains, therefore he tried to weaken al-Ṣulayḥī by fighting him with the Zaydīs. In 444/1052, the Ṣulayḥids defeated Abū al-Faṭḥ and killed him along with a number of his followers at a place called Najd al-Jāḥ.⁵

After the battle of Najd al-Jāḥ, the Zaydīs recognized the great danger which threatened them. They turned to al-Qāsim ibn Ja‘far al-‘Iyānī, well-known as “al-Fāḍil”, and asked him to be their leader against al-Ṣulayḥī. During two years, from 444/1052 to 446/1054, al-Ṣulayḥī had dominant influence over the Western Mountain from Bayt Khawlān⁶ to Tihāma, where he stayed until 447/1055.⁷ There was not much that al-Fāḍil could do to prevent al-Ṣulayḥī from advancing to overwhelm the Yemeni territories, especially after his series of triumphs. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl reported that al-

¹ Al-Mu‘ayyad Naṣir al-Dīn Najāḥ, who managed to establish himself in Zabīd as an independent ruler in 412/1022, acquiring honorifics from the ‘Abbāsīd caliph, whom he acknowledged, and extending his dominion northwards through Tihāma. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 96.

² ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 75. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 236-7. Cf. Kay, *Yaman*, 236. Ḥ. al-‘Amrī, *Al-Umarā’ al-‘Abīd wa al-Mamālik fī al-Yaman*, 27-8.

³ ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 98.

⁴ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 15.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 13-4.

Najd al-Jāḥ: a town in a place called Radā‘ al-‘Arsh which is situated to the east of Dhamār. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, 171, 359-60. I. Akwa‘(ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 118-9. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 103 & 265.

⁶ Bayt Khawlān: is a village on the summit of the mountain of Ḥuḍūr at west of Ṣan‘ā’. Hamdānī, *Ikhlīl*, ii, 285-6. Cf. Ḥ. al-‘Amrī *et al.*, *Fī Ṣifat Bilād al-Yaman ‘Abr al-‘Uṣūr*, 67.

⁷ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 75.

Fāḍil admitted that he could not defeat the Ṣulayḥids by killing them, but he could impoverish them.¹ This was the military strategy of al-Fāḍil against the Ṣulayḥids. He tried to exhaust them financially, and furthermore, by his *fatwā*, he supported the complaint of some tribes that wished to stop paying taxes to the Ṣulayḥids.²

5 In 447/1055, some tribal leaders met al-Fāḍil and complained to him about the Ṣulayḥid control of their lands. They complained that they were being arbitrarily taxed in a way that had never been done before, and they asked him to take action to protect Islam. Al-Fāḍil wrote a letter to al-Ṣulayḥī convicting the Ṣulayḥid tax collectors and administrators of abusing those people by illegitimate taxation. Al-
10 Raba‘ī mentions correspondence which was exchanged between al-Ṣulayḥī and al-Fāḍil.³ Al-Raba‘ī adds that al-Ṣulayḥī tried to explain his favour to *Āl al-Bayt* to al-Fāḍil and asking him to avoid following what the tribes asked or rumoured.⁴ But, al-Fāḍil did not take al-Ṣulayḥī’s advice, even when he had a feeling of mistrust of the tribes and of their support. It is also mentioned that al-Fāḍil feared a revolt of the
15 tribes against him if he did not do what they asked.⁵

In 447/1055, while al-Ṣulayḥī was in Tihāma, al-Fāḍil took the opportunity to attack some of al-Ṣulayḥī’s followers in the upper Bawn.⁶ When al-Fāḍil went to Ṣa‘da to test the depth of his support, al-Ṣulayḥī marched from Zabīd to Ṣan‘ā’, arriving on Dhū al-Qa‘da 447/January 1056. This action from al-Ṣulayḥī made al-
20 Fāḍil hasten to return back to Ṣan‘ā’. Therefore, when the tribesmen came together to al-Fāḍil to pay homage to him again, this time they did so as their Imām. At the same

1 أن الشريف الفاضل [القاسم بن جعفر بن القاسم العياني] كان يقول:

"أما أنا سافقر بني الصليحي فأما القتل لهم فلا أصل إليه".

Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, iv, fol. 35.

² Cf. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 84-5.

³ *Ibid.*, 76-8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 79.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 94.

⁶ Bawn: a wide region north of Ṣan‘ā’, it is divided into two Bawns; the upper Bawn and the lower Bawn. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 220-1. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, i, 130. Cf. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 44. It is mentioned that al-Fāḍil attacked the Ṣulayḥid partisans of the Banū Ḥudhayfa, where he destroyed some of their houses. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 92.

time as he refused to claim the imāmate,¹ he was reluctant to be their leader, but he did what he thought he should do. When he proclaimed the *jihād* in 448/1056, the tribal leaders from Hamdān spread in the regions to collect support. Most of their army came from the tribes of Ḥāshid and Bakīl.²

5 Al-Raba‘ī in his *Sīrat al-Amīrayn* gives a full and clear description of the military confrontation between the Zaydīs and the Ṣulayḥids as the main event of the years 447-8/1055-6.³ According to al-Raba‘ī, al-Fāḍil led his army and went to Ḥāz⁴ while the Ṣulayḥids put up their camp for the night (*amsā*) at Qarātīl,⁵ a short distance away in full view of the Zaydīs. Hence, al-Fāḍil’s suspicions became true. When he
10 commanded his army to attack the Ṣulayḥids they refused to obey his command. He then asked them to follow him to Ṣan‘ā’, but they again neglected his instructions. On the next day, the Ṣulayḥids attacked the Zaydīs and defeated them. Therefore, al-Fāḍil, his family, and two thousand warriors with their families withdrew from Ḥāz, in Jumād I 448/July 1055, to the stronghold of Hirāba,⁶ where they were placed under a
15 Ṣulayḥid siege for seventy days.

In Rajab/October of the same year, the Zaydīs suffered from thirst. After he examined the situation, al-Fāḍil surrendered and went to al-Ṣulayḥī’s camp, where he was treated honorably by al-Ṣulayḥī himself.⁷ Al-Ṣulayḥī forgave the Zaydīs and

¹ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn mentions that some of the historians (most likely he meant al-Raba‘ī) said that al-Fāḍil believed that his uncle, al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Qāsim, was alive and that he was “the expecting Mahdī”. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn adds:

“I said: God denies that this belief is his [al-Qāsim], and he is in the highest position as regards knowledge and merit”.

قلت: ويأبى الله أن يكون هذا معتقده، وهو بالمحل الأرفع من العلم والفضل.

Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 251.

² *Ibid.*, Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 93-4.

³ Cf. *Ibid.*, 94-104.

⁴ Ḥāz: a Ḥimyarī village which is situated 28 km. to the northwest from Ṣan‘ā’ on the border between the land of Hamdān and the land of Ḥimyar. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 157, 213 & 219 & *Iklīl*, ii, 456. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, i, 213. Maḥḥaf, *Mu‘jam*, 142. R. al-Sayyid and ‘A. Abd al-‘Āṭī (ed.), *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 94, f.n. 1. See map 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 171-172/39-40.

⁵ Qarātīl: a village 18 km. to the northwest of Ṣan‘ā’. *Ibid.*, f.n. 2. Map 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 170-171/39.

⁶ The stronghold of Hirāba is in the Bilād Wādi‘a, which is in the middle of Bilād Ḥāshid. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 751, 761-2. Maḥḥaf, *Mu‘jam*, 143 & 677. Map 5.

⁷ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 96-7. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 252.

gave them a choice to leave or stay after he distributed their weapons among his army. He retained only al-Fāḍil, who was transferred as prisoner to Ṣan‘ā’ where he remained for over a year. In Ṣan‘ā’, al-Fāḍil was treated with the utmost consideration personally by al-Ṣulayḥī’s wife, Asmā’ bint Shihāb (d. 479/1086-7),¹ who kept al-Fāḍil under close guard, in order to save his life against some of al-Ṣulayḥī’s army leaders. These leaders alleged that al-Fāḍil was plotting to escape from the jail, but their allegiance had been proved false. Then, his confinement was eased when al-Ṣulayḥī escorted him in some of the conquests of the Yemeni regions.²

The unusual policy which was followed by al-Ṣulayḥī against his enemies in Yemen allowed him to spread his rule throughout the regions without fear of unexpected revolts. In addition to his tolerant religious policy and his experience in the behaviour of the Yemeni tribesmen, his unusual strategy in being escorted by some of the tribal chieftains made his moving through the Yemeni territories easier and safer.³ These tribal chieftains, who were presented by al-Ṣulayḥī as a retinue, were in fact his hostages. Al-Ṣulayḥī guaranteed himself, therefore, that there were no more revolts by the tribes when their leaders were with him. ‘Umāra adds that when al-Ṣulayḥī took the tribal chieftains (*mulūk al-Yaman*) to live with him after he put an end to their rule, he appointed instead of them some of his followers.⁴

Another tactic was also applied by al-Ṣulayḥī to those whom he thought had more power than him, such the Najāḥids. With Najāḥ, the ruler of Zabīd, al-Ṣulayḥī showed friendliness and meekness, even when Najāḥ began to correspond with Abū al-Faḥ and encouraged him to attack al-Ṣulayḥī’s interests. In 450/1058, al-Ṣulayḥī

¹ The identity of the family of Asmā’ bint Shihāb was traced al-Jawād and al-Ṣulayḥī. Cf. Hamdānī, *Sīrat*, 99, 104-5. *Uyūn* (ed. al-Ḥusaynī), 261.

¹ Kay, *Yaman*, 37 & 148. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 61. Cf. Wuṣābī, *Tārīkh*, 38. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 271. Ḥ. Hamdānī mentions that her death was in 467/1074-5, without giving any references. See also, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 66, f.n. 1 & table 2, 335.

Cf. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 107-9. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, iv, fol. 37. Akwa‘ (ed), *Mufīd*, 98-9, f.n. 8. Cf. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 79-80.

² Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 110. Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 252.

³ Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 106, where the author alleges that al-Ṣulayḥī’s strategy -to be escorted by the tribal chieftains- was a kind of bringing out the significance of the Yemeni role in the Islamic conference, which is the *ḥajj*. [indeed, it was not].

⁴ ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 99.

marched through Tihāma, passing by al-Qaḥma¹ and Zabīd,² and went to the stronghold of Suwa,³ where he besieged the leader of the Banū al-Kirandī,⁴ Yu‘fir ibn Aḥmad.⁵ After nine months the siege was raised when al-Kirandī surrendered. During the siege of Suwa, Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim came to see his son, al-Fāḍil, in the hope that al-Ṣulayḥī might release him. Before he asked al-Ṣulayḥī his permission to allow al-Fāḍil to come with him, Ja‘far and his son fell ill. They were both treated for the illness by al-Ṣulayḥī’s physician, then they went to Ṣan‘ā’. Whilst al-Qāsim ibn Ja‘far recovered, his father died and was buried in Ṣan‘ā’.⁶ After the death of Najāḥ in 452/1060,⁷ al-Ṣulayḥī spread his rule in the Yemeni regions, and made Ṣan‘ā’ his own capital.

The **al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya** provides scholars with a collection of letters sent by the Fatimid Caliph-Imām al-Mustanṣir bi-Allāh to al-Ṣulayḥī. The first letter was written in 445/1054 and declares the *‘Īd* of the *fitr*.⁸ It is clear that correspondence was exchanged between al-Mustanṣir and al-Ṣulayḥī, who became the deputy of the Fatimid Caliph in Yemen. According to the accounts of most of the

¹ Al-Qaḥma: a small town to the north of Zabīd. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 96 & 232. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 217. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iv, 647. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 508. Cf. Map 5.

² Al-Akwa‘ raised some doubts about the death of Najāḥ, the ruler of Zabīd, in 452/1060. He said that it is one of ‘Umāra’s illusions. Al-Akwa‘ adds that if Najāḥ died in 452/1060, al-Ṣulayḥī with his troops would not dare to cross the road of Tihāma-Zabīd. Akwa‘, therefore, affirms that Najāḥ died before that date. Akwa‘ (ed.), *Mufīd*, 98-9, f.n. 8. It seems that Akwa‘ tries to make a convincing argument for distrusting the year 452/1060 as the year of Najāḥ’s death, but he does not prove the impossibility of it.

³ The capital of the Banū al-Karandī in the Ḥujariyya from Ta‘izz. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, ii, 232-40 & iii, 433. Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 331.

⁴ The leader of the Banū al-Karandī who ruled al-Janad and al-Ma‘āfir. Cf. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 99, 194-5. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 248. R. al-Sayyid and ‘A. Abd al-‘Āṭī (ed.), *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 109, f.n. 1.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 109. Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 252. Nothing more has been mentioned about Yu‘fir ibn Aḥmad al-Kirandī. Cf. Madelung, (*Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 72), where he mentions his name as Ya‘fur. It should be noted that both of the pronunciations are correct for the Arabic word (يعفر). Cf. Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, ii, 71-2. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 100.

⁶ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 116-7.

⁷ ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 98. Ibn Khaldūn, *Ibar*, iv, 214. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 253.

⁸ ‘A. Mājid (ed.), *al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya*, 55.

Yemeni historians, al-Ṣulayhī manifested the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa* after the death of Najāh in 452/1060.¹ This information is unacceptable in the light of some coins which were found, indicating that the account of the Yemeni historians was not accurate.

It appears that some of these coins, which were issued by al-Ṣulayhī, had the name of al-Mustanṣir. Therefore, one can suggest that if he hid the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa* before the death of Najāh in 452/1060, al-Ṣulayhī would not have minted his money with the name of al-Mustanṣir on it. According to the information provided in excavations, three of these coins were minted in Zabīd almost five years before the death of Najāh. The first coin was minted in 441/1049-50 and has the name of al-Ṣulayhī only. Two other coins, which were minted in 445/1053-4 and in 447/1055, indicate the names of both al-Ṣulayhī and al-Mustanṣir bi-Allāh. Moreover, a *Dīnār* which has the name of al-Ṣulayhī was found with a date of 451/1059.² This gives the impression that al-Ṣulayhī, most likely under the supervision of the Najāhids, had been able to mint his money in the capital of the Najāhids, which reflects good relations with Najāh himself.

Therefore, one can agree with Ḥ. Hamdānī when he mentions that al-Ṣulayhī had no reason to hide the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa* and conceal his dependency on the Fatimid caliphate which spread its influence to Baghdad itself in Dhū al-Qa‘da 450/ January 1059.³ On the other hand, it is most likely that al-Ṣulayhī did not teach his belief to the Yemeni people who had recently become attached to the *da‘wa*. According to what is mentioned by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī,⁴ al-Ṣulayhī announced *Ismā‘īlism* as the *madhhab* of his state. Quoting from al-Laḥjī, Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn mentions that as a result of al-Ṣulayhī’s proclamation, the people of Ṣan‘ā’ began to discuss the

¹ ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 98. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 253. Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh Thaghr ‘Adan*, 161. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Bughyat*, 56. ‘Arshī, *Bulūgh*, 25. Wāsi‘ī, *Furjat*, 180. Muṭā‘, *Tārīkh*, 239. Cf. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 78. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 76. Jirāfī, *Muqtataf*, 119. ‘Amrī, *Al-Umarā’ al-‘Abīd*, 30.

² Casanova, *Dinārs inédits du Yemen*, RN, 1894, 205-9. Bikhazi, *Coins of al-Yaman (132-569 A. H.)*, al-Abḥāth, xxiii, 1970, 78-80. Cf. N. M. Lowick, *Some Unpublished Dinars of the Ṣulayhids and Zuray‘ids*, NC, 1964, 261-270 & *Trade patterns on the Persian Gulf in the light of recent coin evidence*, NENIEH, American University of Beirut, 1974, 321 & f.n., 19.

³ Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, ix, 447. Al-Mu‘ayyad fī al-Dīn, *Sīrat al-Mu‘ayyad fī al-Dīn*, ed. M. K. Ḥusayn, 180-4. Ibn Taghrī Birdī, *al-Nujūm al-Zāhira*, v, 6 & 12.

⁴ ‘Asqalānī, *Raf‘ al-Isr ‘An Qudāt Miṣr*, 194.

doctrine in which al-Ṣulayḥī believed and to make comparisons between him and ‘Alī ibn al-Faḍīl, and that al-Ṣulayḥī might reestablish the latter’s *madhhab*. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn adds that al-Ṣulayḥī was offended by these rumours and he then sealed the doors of the mosques.¹

5 Whatever the case may be, al-Laḥjī seems to have exaggerated when he said that al-Ṣulayḥī sealed the doors of the mosques as a result of people’s tittle-tattle. Generally, what is said by al-Laḥjī is doubtful. But one can assume that al-Ṣulayḥī sealed some of the mosques in Ṣan‘ā’; certainly, the central mosque (*al-masjid al-jāmi‘*), as the main centre in which people gathered, and probably some mosques
10 which were situated near the residence of al-Ṣulayḥī. The reason for sealing their doors appears in the second paragraph as follows:

“Al-Laḥjī says:

Al-Qāḍī Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Salām ibn Abī Yaḥyā² told me that when al-Ṣulayḥī wanted to go to Egypt to visit al-‘Ubaydī,³ he put his
15 money and his treasures, which were allocated for his journey, in the central mosque (*al-masjid al-jāmi‘*). He used it for this purpose as a treasury, where he filled it with boxes and other loads”.⁴

It is thus understandable that al-Ṣulayḥī should seal the door of the central mosque, and perhaps he used other mosques for the same purpose.

20 After the death of Najāḥ, al-Ṣulayḥī wrote to al-Mustansīr asking his permission to conquer the rest of Yemen in the name of the Fatimid Caliph.⁵ When he received the answer, al-Ṣulayḥī began his conquests with al-Ma‘āfir⁶ into the land of the Banū

¹ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 254.

² Probably, al-Qāḍī Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Salām al-Taḳawī, who was one of the sunni *qāḍīs* who converted to Ismā‘īlism after he was appointed by al-Sayyida al-Ḥurra as a *qāḍī* of Ṣan‘ā’ and its province. Cf. Ibn Samura, *Ṭabaqāt*, 235.

³ i.e., the Fatimid Caliph-Imām, al-Mustansīr bi-Allāh.

⁴ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 254.

قال مسلم [اللحجي]: أخبرني القاضي أحمد بن عبدالسلام بن أبي يحيى أنّ الصليحي لما أراد النهوض إلى مصر لزيارة العبيدي جعل أمواله وذخائره المَعْدَةَ لسفره في المسجد الجامع واتخذ خزائنه لذلك، وملاه بالصناديق، وسائر الأحمال...

⁵ Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 261. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 253.

⁶ Al-Ma‘āfir is a wide territory spread west to the south of Ta‘izz. It includes the mountain of Dhakhir, a part of Ṣabir, where the stronghold of al-Dumluwa is located. I. Akwa‘(ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 248. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 194-5. Ḥajrī, *Majmu‘*, ii, 232-40. Maḳḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 607. Cf. ‘Umāra, *al-Mufīd*, 77-8. See map 2 & 5.

al-Kirandī, the land of the Banū al-Taba‘ī,¹ al-Janad, and then Aden.² In 453/1061, the *amīr* of Mecca, Shukr ibn Abī al-Futūh (d. 453/1061),³ discontinued the *khuṭba* for the Fatimid Caliph. As a result, al-Ṣulayhī asked the permission of al-Mustanṣir to discipline Shukr ibn Abī al-Futūh by attacking Mecca and deposing him from office.

5 Al-Mustanṣir instructed al-Ṣulayhī not to attack Mecca to prevent bloodshed of the *Āl al-Bayt*.⁴ During that time, Shukr ibn Abī al-Futūh and al-Ṣulayhī engaged in an exchange of threats and mutual condemnation until the death of Shukr ibn Abī al-Futūh.⁵

10 At the end of 453/1061, Mecca was ruled by Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Abī Hāshim (d. 487/1094),⁶ the son in law of Shukr ibn Abī al-Futūh,⁷ who declared the

¹ It is part of the region of “al-Kalā‘” which was ruled by al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Mughīra al-Taba‘ī (d. 478/1085-6). *Ibid.*, 78-9. Ibn Samura, *Ṭabaqāt*, 105-6. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 15.

² *Ibid.*

³ Shukr ibn Abī al-Futūh al-Ḥasan ibn Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn Mūsā ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mūsā ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamharat*, 47. Fāsī, *al-‘Aqd al-Thamīn fi Tārīkh al-Balad al-Amīn*, v, 14-5. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 104, 125-6. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 413. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 19. Some historians mentioned him as “al-Sulaymānī”, erroneously, as they traced his pedigree to Sulaymān ibn Dā‘ūd ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Abī Ṭālib. This may refer to the account of al-Qalqashandī, who quotes from al-Bayhaqī, who was mistaken and confused a large number of modern scholars by such names, when he mentions that Ibn Ḥazm said:

His death occurred without [leaving] any sons, [as a result] of his death the state of the Banū Sulaymān in Mecca died out.

قال ابن حزم: وكانت وفاته عن غير ولد وانقرضت بموته دولة بني سليمان بمكة.

Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ al-A‘shā fi Ṣinā‘at al-Inshā*, iv, 269.

In fact, Ibn Ḥazm did not say so, and he had never mentioned the state of the Banū Sulaymān when he mentioned Shukr. Ibn Ḥazm said:

[When] Shukr died, without any male offspring at all, command in Mecca fell to one of his slaves.

ومات شكر، ولم يُولد له [ولد] قط؛ وصار أمر مكة إلى عبد كان له.

Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamharat*, 47. Cf. Fāsī, *al-‘Aqd al-Thamīn*, v, 14-5, where the author (quoting from Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, *Mir‘āt al-Zamān*, xii, 88) mentioned that even Ibn Ḥazm was mistaken when he said:

“[When] Shukr died, without any offspring at all” (ومات شكر، ولم يُولد له قط).

He adds that it appears that Shukr had a daughter, because it is said in the *Mir‘āt*, quoting from Muḥammad al-Ṣabī’, that Abū Ja‘far ibn Abī Hāshim was his son in law. Fāsī, *al-‘Aqd al-Thamīn*, v, 16. Cf. ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, f.n. 1, 221. Zambaur, *Mu‘jam al-Ansāb*, 30-1. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 89. Madelung, *Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 73.

⁴ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 19.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 17-19.

⁶ Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ*, iv, 271. See also, Zambaur, *Mu‘jam al-Ansāb*, 31.

⁷ Qalqashandī, *op. cit.*, 270. Cf. Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamharat*, 47, where he mentions that after the death of Shukr ibn Abī al-Futūh, Mecca was ruled by one of his slaves.

name of al-Mustanşir again in the *khutba*. It seems that before the season of the *hajj* of the year 454/1062, Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Abī Hāshim discarded the name of al-Mustanşir from the *khutba*, and restored the name of the Abbasid Caliph. According to al-Qalqashandī, Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Abī Hāshim did not mind
 5 changing the *khutba* and pronounced the name of whoever could pay the most.¹ This was offensive to al-Şulayḥī, who decided to carry out the preparation of his troops for a campaign to Mecca.² In 454/1062, al-Şulayḥī arrived in Mecca, where he was escorted by the Yemeni tribal chieftains.³ He immediately deposed the *wālī* of Mecca and replaced him with Ḥamza ibn Wahhās (or Wahḥāsh) ibn Abī al-Ṭayyib Dā‘ūd (d.
 10 461/1069),⁴ and pronounced the *khutba* for the Fatimid Caliph.⁵ Al-Şulayḥī seems to have spent vast fortunes to win the people’s favour.⁶ With this money, he clothed the

¹ Qalqashandī, *op. cit.*, 270. Cf. Madelung, *Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 84, f.n. 51.

² According to al-Qurashī, al-Şulayḥī send Lamak ibn Mālik (see below) with a letter to al-Mustanşir to have his permission to go to Mecca. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 103.

³ *Ibid.*, 19. It should be noted that most of sources date the campaign erroneously to 455/1063. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Şulayḥiyyūn*, 90. Madelung, *Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 84, f.n. 53.

⁴ Fāsī, *al-‘Aqd al-Thamīn*, i, 440. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Şulayḥiyyūn*, 90-2. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 269. According to the account of al-Şulayḥiyyūn (90-1), al-Şulayḥī took over the rule of Mecca (*intaza‘aha*) from the Banū Abī al-Ṭayyib. It was after the death of Shukr and his son in law Ibn Ja‘far that the head of the Hawāshim (or the Banū Hāshim) became his successor and Mecca was ruled by the Banū Abī al-Ṭayyib (*sic.*). The author gives neither details nor references. Then, it is mentioned (92) that Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far (see below) was the *amīr* of Mecca from 453/1061-487/1094 (*sic.*). From the account of *Itti‘āz* (ii, 273) it is Muḥammad ibn Abī Hāshim (his correct name is Abū Hāshim Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad Tāj al-Ma‘ālī) who was appointed by al-Şulayḥī. However, most of the sources confirm that Ḥamza ibn Wahḥāsh ibn Abī al-Ṭayyib Da‘ūd was the *wālī* of Mecca from 453/1061 until his death in 461/1069, and he was succeeded by Abū Hāshim Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad Tāj al-Ma‘ālī (d. 487/1094).

⁵ Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 269. Cf. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 127, where the author mentions that when al-Fāḍil was in Mecca for the *hajj*, he was told that “the *da‘wa* on this day is Ismā‘īlī” (الدعوة في هذا اليوم اسماعيلية), which means the *khutba* was at that time pronounced for the Fatimid Caliph. This passage also indicates that the *khutba* was shifted frequently between the Abbasids and the Fatimids. See, Madelung, *Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 84 f.n. 51. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Şulayḥiyyūn*, 92.

⁶ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 19. Cf. ‘A. Mājid (ed.), *al-Sijjilāt al-Mustanşiriyya*, 48-50.

Ka'ba, returned its old *kiswa* when it had been taken by the Banū Ḥasan,¹ fed the poor and gave unjustly treated people their rights.²

At the beginning of the year 455/1063, al-Ṣulayhī returned to Yemen, where he appointed As'ad ibn Shihāb (d. 456/1064), his brother in law, as a *wālī* of Zabīd, and
5 'Abd Allāh (d. 459/1067), the brother of al-Ṣulayhī,³ was appointed as a *wālī* of the fortress of Ta'kar.⁴ He also paved the way for his eldest son Muḥammad to be his successor when he wrote to al-Mustanṣir asking him for his permission. Al-Mustanṣir agreed and appointed Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Ṣulayhī (d. 458/1065) as a deputy to his father (*khalīfat al-da'wa fī jazīrat al-Yaman*).⁵ After the death of his uncle, As'ad ibn
10 Shihāb, in 456/1064, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Ṣulayhī became the *amīr* of Zabīd. He ruled Zabīd less than six months before he died of fever at the beginning of the year 458/the end of 1065. Therefore, al-Mukarram Aḥmad, the other son of al-Ṣulayhī (d. 477/1084-5),⁶ was appointed to succeed his brother by the command of the Imām when he sent a letter of consolation.⁷

15 According to 'Umāra, it was before the end of the year 455/1063 that al-Ṣulayhī had subjected the whole of Yemen to his authority.⁸ During that time, Ṣa'da where

¹ Banū al-Ḥasan, probably the progeny of al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. *Ibid.*, 50. Raba'ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 136. Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 55-6. Maqṣūrī, *Itti'āz*, i, 269.

² Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 30. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 254.

³ Ibn 'Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 77. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 257. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla' al-Budūr*, iv, fol. 34. Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh Thaghr 'Adan*, 162. Cf. 'Umāra, *Mufid*, 105.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 114.

⁵ 'A. Mājid (ed.), *al-Sijjilāt al-Mustanṣiriyya*, 53-4. Qurashī, 'Uyūn, vii, 86.

⁶ There disagreement between the historians about al-Mukarram's death. For example, in *al-Mufid*, 'Umāra mentions the death of al-Mukarram in 484/1091 (*Mufid*, 119) when Ibn Samura mentions two dates, 480/1087 and 477/1084-5 (*Ṭabaqāt*, 122-3, cf. f.n., 1, 123). Abū Makhrama gives three dates, 485/1092, 479/1086-7 and 484/1091 (*Tārīkh Thaghr 'Adan*, ii, 9). Al-Khazrajī ('*Asjad*, fol. 80) and Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn listed the death of al-Mukarram under the year 484/1091 (*Ghāyat*, i, 274 & *Inbā'*, fol. 43). Al-Qurashī was more accurate when he mentions the death of al-Mukarram in 477/1084-5 ('*Uyūn*, vii, 126-30), because nothing is sent or received by al-Mukarram to al-Mustanṣir after this year (cf. Majid, *Sijjilāt & Rasā'il al-Qummī*, ed. Ḥ. Hamdānī in *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, appendix 6, 311.). For more of the historians' accounts, see, Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 141.

⁷ Qurashī, 'Uyūn, vii, 76, 78-80. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, appendixes "3", 303 & "4", 304.

⁸ Qurashī, 'Uyūn, vii, 99. Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 254.

the Zaydīs gathered and followed one of the Zaydī *da‘īs*, was the only independent city in Yemen which fought against al-Ṣulayhī.¹ In 458/1066, Ḥamza ibn al-Ḥasan (d. 459/1067)² in Ṣa‘da raised a protest against al-Ṣulayhī. When he heard about the death of al-Ṣulayhī, Ḥamza then gathered a large number of warriors and attacked the Ṣulayhids on his way to Ṣan‘ā’.³ At that time, the Ṣulayhid army leader, the *amīr* ‘Āmir al-Zuwāhī (d. 492/1099),⁴ was informed of this by al-Mukarram, who at that time was besieged in Ṣan‘ā’ with a small army. ‘Āmir al-Zuwāhī immediately changed his direction and marched with his army southward until he reached Ṣan‘ā’.⁵ At Ṣan‘ā’, ‘Āmir al-Zuwāhī supplied and equipped his army with more soldiers from the people of the city. The confrontation between the two armies, the Zaydī and the Ismā‘īlī, ended in 459/1067 in Manwa,⁶ where Ḥamza was killed.⁷

In 459/1067, al-Ṣulayhī received the answer to his request from al-Mustansīr to allow him to come to Egypt after the season of the *hajj*.⁸ After he gave the reins of government to his son al-Mukarram, al-Ṣulayhī left Ṣan‘ā’ with his wife, Asmā’ bint Shihāb, his relatives, and, of course, the Yemeni tribal chieftains. His caravan, which

¹ According to Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, Ḥamza (see next) had never claimed the Imāmate, he arose as a “*muḥtasib*”, who promotes good and forbids evil (cf. EI², iii, 485). Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, ii, fol. 108.

² Ḥamza ibn Abī Hāshim al-Ḥasan (al-Nafs al-Zakiyya) ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Yaḥyā ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥusayn Ibn al-Qāsim al-Rassī. Ibid., 108-10. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 76 & 323. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 117. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 96. Madelung, *Der Imām al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm*, 247.

³ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 255. “*Rasā’il al-Qummī*”, ed. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 312.

⁴ ‘Āmir is the son of the previous Ismā‘īlī *da‘ī*, Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir al-Zuwāhī (q.v.). Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 85 & 93. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 337. Cf., ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 108 & 113. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, iii, 481. I. al-Akwa‘, *Hijar*, iv, 1870. Also see, Zirīklī, *A‘lām*, 328.

⁵ According to al-Qurashī, ‘Āmir al-Zuwāhī was in his way to Mecca. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 93. Cf. *Rasā’il al-Qummī*, ed. Ḥ. Hamdānī in *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, appendix 6, 311.

⁶ Manwa is a place to the west of Būsān (Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, ii, 255); a village in the *mikhla‘f* of al-‘Ābisiyya (Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 417) of al-Ḥada. Ḥajrī, *Majmū‘*, i, 129. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī erroneously mentioned Manwa as “Mathwa”, which is a different place, and when he corrected the name of Manwa in *Rasā’il al-Qummī*, which was already written correctly (cf. appendix 6), he made another mistake and called it “Mulwa”. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 94 & 312. Map 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 163-164/44-45.

⁷ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 255. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, ii, 255.

⁸ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 82.

contained valuable presents to al-Mustaṣṣir, was guarded by his strong army.¹ When the caravan reached al-Mahjam,² he pitched his camp near a well that was called Umm Ma‘bad in a hamlet named Umm al-Duhaym.³ They were there attacked surreptitiously by guerrillas of Sa‘īd ibn Najāh (d. 461/1068).⁴

5 According to ‘Umāra, Najāh, Sa‘īd’s father, who was the founder of the Najāhid dynasty, was poisoned by a concubine given by al-Ṣulayhī to him.⁵ As a result of Najāh’s death, al-Ṣulayhī subjugated Zabīd under his authority, and Najāh’s sons fled from Zabīd.⁶ After a few years, Sa‘īd, who was called *al-Aḥwal*, “the cross-eyed”, returned and hid in Zabīd. During that time, he managed to organize a gang of
10 Abyssinian slaves for the purpose of exacting blood revenge for his father and returning Zabīd under the rule of the Najāhids.⁷ In 459/1067, Sa‘īd ibn Najāh managed to overwhelm the army of al-Ṣulayhī himself when he took them by surprise at Umm Ma‘bad. Sa‘īd massacred al-Ṣulayhī and his brother ‘Abd Allāh, took al-Ṣulayhī’s wife Asmā’ as a prisoner, and captured all the presents, that should have
15 gone to al-Mustaṣṣir, as booty.⁸

It is mentioned by al-Waṣābī that Jayyāsh ibn Najāh (d. 498/1105) wrote to his brother Sa‘īd to treat Asmā’ and the other Ṣulayhid prisoners honorably.⁹ Jayyāsh

¹ *Ibid.*, 86. ‘Umāra, *Mufid*, 105. Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 256, where he mentions this and the following events, until the death of al-Ṣulayhī, in the year of 458/1066.

² Cf. Map 5.

³ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 86. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 76. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 256-7.

⁴ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 90, 112-3. M. al-Akwa‘ assumes that there must have been treason among al-Ṣulayhī’s troops as a part of a plot which had been planned by some of al-Ṣulayhī’s allies, especially from the tribal chieftains who escorted al-Ṣulayhī on his journey (Akwa‘ (ed.), *Mufid*, 105, f.n. 5). All of the events indicate that a plot was made against al-Ṣulayhī, but nothing is mentioned by the historians. On the other hand, Ḥ. Hamdānī, who relies on *Rasā’il al-Qummī*, mentions that the killing of al-Ṣulayhī was a result of two reasons: treason among al-Ṣulayhī’s slaves and because he did not take enough precautions against his enemies (Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 102).

⁵ ‘Umāra, *Mufid*, 98. Cf. Waṣābī, *Tārīkh*, 47. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Bughyat*, 57.

⁶ About the Najāhid dynasty, cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 339. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 101.

⁷ Waṣābī, *Tārīkh*, 47. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 254. Cf. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Bughyat*, 57.

⁸ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 90. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 78-9. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 77. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, iv, fol. 34. Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh Thaghr ‘Adan*, 162-3. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 55. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, ii, 273-4. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 103. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 406. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 102. Cf. ‘Umāra, *Mufid*, 105. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 257.

⁹ The third ruler in the Najāhid dynasty who ruled Zabīd between 482-498/1105-1089. Waṣābī, *Tārīkh*, 54. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Bughyat*, 63. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 281. Cf. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 102.

advised his brother to send a letter to al-Mukarram to negotiate a peace settlement and the release of Asmā' and the other Ṣulayḥids. Al-Waṣābī adds that al-Mukarram refused any notion other than to fight the Najāḥids.¹ In 461/1069, Asmā' was rescued and released from the Najāḥid prison in Zabīd by her son al-Mukarram. He then split
5 his army and attacked the Najāḥids in two locations: Naqīl Ṣayd² and the mountain of al-Sha'ar.³ After he defeated the Najāḥids and killed most of their leaders, al-Mukarram left Zabīd for al-Mahjam, where he took the corpses of his father and uncle to bury them in Ṣan'ā'.⁴ Then, he marched against the Zaydī *amīr*, i.e., al-Fāḍil who was at that time in Shuhāra.⁵

10 During the absence of al-Mukarram, al-Fāḍil broke his pledges to the Ṣulayḥids and tried to collaborate with the Najāḥids against the Ṣulayḥids. Al-Fāḍil sent two envoys to Ṣan'ā' to meet Sa'īd ibn Najāḥ.⁶ Before the return of his envoys, al-Fāḍil received news of the destruction of the Najāḥids by al-Mukarram's army. When al-Fāḍil was in Kharfān,⁷ he heard about the advance of the Ṣulayḥid army towards ḥim.
15 In 460/1068, he withdrew to 'Iyān,⁸ but then he decided to go to Shuhāra, where he

¹ Waṣābī, *Tārīkh*, 48.

² Naqīl Ṣayd is known nowadays as Naqīl Sumara, to the east of Zabīd and north of Ibb. I. Akwa' (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 171. Maḡhafī, *Mu'jam*, 323 & 390. Ḥajrī, *Majmu'*, iii, 548. Map 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 157/42.

³ Al-Sha'ar (or al-Sha'ir) is a *mikhlāf* to the east of Ibb. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 141, f.n. 3. 'Umāra, *Mufīd*, 118, f.n. 1. Cf. Map 5. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 154/41 & 155/44.

⁴ Qurashī, 'Uyūn, vii, 113-6. Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 257.

⁵ Shuhāra: a mountain and stronghold which is situated in the region of Ahnūm to the north of Ḥajja. Al-Raba'ī gives enough details about it in his *Sīra*, 150-5. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 238, f.n. 4. Ḥajrī, *Majmu'*, i, 95 & iii, 460. I. Akwa', *Hijar*, iii, 1510. Cf. Map 5. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 179/36. It was described erroneously as "a stronghold in Ṣan'ā'" by Yaḡūt, cf. I. Akwa' (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 160. It is also called "Shahāra", cf. Maḡhafī, *Mu'jam*, 365, and Madelung, *Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 76.

Cf. Raba'ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 152.

⁶ *Ibid.* Cf. Qurashī, 'Uyūn, vii, 98.

⁷ Kharfān: a village named after a mountain of the same name in Ḥūth, which is located 122 km. north of Ṣan'ā'. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 160, f.n. 3. R. al-Sayyid and 'A. Abd al-'Āṭī (ed.), *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 148, f.n. 2. Ḥajrī, *Majmu'*, ii, 352. Map 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 180/40. It has been read erroneously as "Khīrfān" by Madelung in *Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 75.

⁸ 'Iyān: a small town to the northeast of Ḥarf Sufyān. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 149, f.n. 6. Ḥajrī, *Majmu'*, iii, 618. I. Akwa', *Hijar*, iii, 1510. Maḡhafī, *Mu'jam*, 475. Map 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 182/40.

could find a safe refuge for his followers and their families.¹ Over a period of two years, the Ṣulayḥid troops attacked Shuhāra several times without any success.

The Ṣulayḥids, who fought their enemies on several fronts, succeeded in 463/1071 in converting the *khutba* to the name of al-Mukarram in Ṣa‘da, the capital of the Zaydīs. When the people of Ṣa‘da appealed for his aid, al-Fāḍil had no alternative but to go to Ṣa‘da. He conquered Ṣa‘da, restored the *khutba* in his own name, seized Ja‘far ibn al-Ḥasan al-Shammarī, the *khaṭīb* who announced the *khutba* in Ṣa‘da in the name of al-Mukarram, and put him in jail in Shuhāra.² On his way back to Shuhāra, al-Fāḍil conquered some Ismā‘īlī towns and destroyed others. In 464/1072, al-Fāḍil received a letter from Maṣṣūr ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Muntāb,³ who informed him that he would occupy Maswar in al-Fāḍil’s interest, and that it would become one of the Zaydī strongholds. After his seizure of Maswar, Ibn al-Muntāb soon was joined by the Zaydī *amīr* Dhū al-Sharafayn (d. 478/1085).⁴ Then, al-Fāḍil arrived and joined them.⁵

From Maswar, the Zaydīs attacked the Ṣulayḥid bases. They began with Ḥufāsh,⁶ al-Qufl,⁷ Yanā‘,⁸ Bayt Khawlān⁹ and Dharwa.¹⁰ In the following year, more

¹ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 148-9.

² Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 189-93. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 262-3. Cf. Madelung, *Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 85, f.n. 70.

³ According to al-Raba‘ī’s *Sīra* and Hamdānī’s *Iklīl*, his full name is al-Maṣṣūr ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Muntāb ibn Ibrahīm ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 199) ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥajjāj ibn Shawwāl al-Maswarī (Hamdānī, *Iklīl*, ii, 77).

⁴ The Zaydī *amīr*, Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn al-Qāsim al-‘Iyānī, the younger brother of al-Fāḍil. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 270. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, *Maṭla‘ al-Budūr*, iv, 125-7. I. Akwa‘, *Hijar*, ii, 1060-1 & iii, 1520.

⁵ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 189-93. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 264-5.

⁶ Ḥufāsh: a stronghold which has the name of its mountain and is situated 144 km. to the west of Ṣan‘ā’. Hamdānī, *Ṣīfat*, 124, f.n. 2 & *Iklīl*, ii, 238. Ḥajrī, *Majmu‘*, ii, 277-8. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 94. Maḥḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 182-3. Map 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 169-170/33-34.

⁷ Qufl is a name of several places in Yemen; what is meant above is the stronghold which is situated at the mountain of Ḥufāsh. Ḥajrī, *Majmu‘*, iv, 657. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 224. Maḥḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 521.

⁸ Yanā‘: a stronghold in the inner Ḥīma to the west of Ṣan‘ā’. Hamdānī, *Ṣīfat*, 210 & *Iklīl*, ii, 283. Ḥajrī, *Majmu‘*, ii, 806. Maḥḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 717.

⁹ See above.

¹⁰ Dharwa: a stronghold in Ḥāshid. Hamdānī, *Ṣīfat*, 238, f.n. 3. Ḥajrī, *Majmu‘*, ii, 340. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 113. Maḥḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 250.

Cf. al-Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 213-5, 220-22.

Ṣulayḥid strongholds were defeated by the two Zaydī *amīrs*, including Bukr,¹ Thula,² and in 466/1074, the Zaydīs took Dhū Marmar.³ In that year, i.e., 466/1074, even Ṣan‘ā’, the capital of the Ṣulayḥids, became increasingly unsafe to reside in after the Zaydīs’ attack on its roads and gates. According to Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, as a result of
5 the Zaydī siege, the prices in Ṣan‘ā’ and its provinces became high and the people’s needs could no longer be met. From this development arose conflicts and civil strife.⁴ Therefore, al-Mukarram decided to transfer his capital to Dhū Jibla.⁵

It seems that both parties were exhausted from fighting each other. However, some manoeuvres were made by both sides. In 486/1076, al-Fāḍil seems to have left
10 Shuhāra and chosen ‘Umrān al-Khārid⁶ as his hometown where he settled down with his family. He promised the people there that he would bring irrigation and cultivation to the region again. In the same year, al-Fāḍil was killed by some of its inhabitants.⁷ According to Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, they received the command for the killing from al-Mukarram himself.⁸ Dhū al-Sharafayn became the leader of the Zaydīs in Yemen. He
15 sent a letter to the tribal chieftains explaining to them his aim of revenge for his

¹ Bukr: a stronghold which was situated to the northwest of Ṣan‘ā’, parallel to the mountain of Kawkabān, and to the northwest of the stronghold of Kawkabān. I. Akwa‘(ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 41-2. Ḥajrī, *Majmu‘*, i, 125. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 83. Cf. Jirāfī, *Muqtataf*, 215-6.

² Thula: a stronghold which is situated 45 km. northwest of Ṣan‘ā’. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 212, f.n. 7. I. Akwa‘(ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 60. Ibn al-Mujāwir, *Mustabṣir*, 193. Ḥajrī, *Majmu‘*, i, 166. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 99. Map 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 172-173/38-39.

³ It is also called “Dhimarmar”: a stronghold and a city in the Banū Ḥashīsh, which is nowadays in ruins, it was situated 18 km. northeast of Ṣan‘ā’. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 212, f.n. 7. I. Akwa‘(ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 114. Ḥajrī, *Majmu‘*, ii, 261-2 & 350. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 255. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 171/44.

Cf. Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 189-93, 224, 231. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 265-6.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 267.

⁵ It is also called “Jibla” (I. Akwa‘(ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 65-6): a well-known city to the southwest of Ibb. ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 114-5. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 108-9. Ḥajrī, *Majmu‘*, i, 34. Map 5. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 154/41.

⁶ It is read erroneously as ‘Amrān al-Kharid by Madelung. In fact, ‘Amrān is another place which is 50 km. north of Ṣan‘ā’(cf. Ḥajrī, *Majmu‘*, iii, 610. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 173/39). Madelung, *Religious and Ethnic Movements in Medieval Islam*, xii, 77. ‘Umrān al-Khārid is a town in the Jawf, nowadays it is in ruins. I. Akwa‘, *Hijar*, iii, 1468. Maḡhafī, *Mu‘jam*, 207.

⁷ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 242-6.

⁸ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 268.

brother's murderers and asking them for their support. In 469/1076, he made his attacks against the Nihm and the Banū al-Du‘ām. Consequently, they wrote the Ṣulayḥids asking them for their protection.¹

Al-Raba‘ī mentions that a truce was made between the *amīr* of the Zaydīs, Dhū al-Sharafayn, and the Ṣulayḥid army leader, Aḥmad ibn al-Muẓaffar.² But, this truce seems to have lapsed after the death of the latter.³ Before his death in 477/1084-5,⁴ al-Mukarram deserted his people and lived in the far off stronghold of Ta‘kar, where he spent the rest of his life. This decision was made as a result of an affliction from semiparalysis, which he obtained after he defeated the Najāḥids.⁵ Accordingly, his wife Arwā (d. 532/1138) began to rule the country from Dhū Jibla, which became the capital of the Ṣulayḥids.⁶

¹ Raba‘ī, *Sīrat al-Amīrayn*, 259.

² *Ibid.*, 309-12.

³ None of the sources mention the year of the death of Aḥmad ibn al-Muẓaffar, however, Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn does not mention the events of the year 470/1077-8 until 475/1082, and he skips the year 476/1083-4 (*Ghāyat*, i, 269-70). Therefore, one can suggest that Aḥmad ibn al-Muẓaffar died when the truce was neglected, which was probably at the end of 474/the beginning of 1081.

⁴ See above, 289.

⁵ There is disagreement among the historians about al-Mukarram's isolation. Modern scholars such as, Ḥ. Hamdānī (*Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 137), Ghālib (*A‘lām*, 125) and Tāmīr (*Tārīkh al-Ismā‘īliyya*, iii, 176), as Ismā‘īlīs, follow the account of al-Qurashī (*‘Uyūn*, vii, 122.), whilst most of the historians said that al-Mukarram secluded himself from the people because he went astray indulging in wine and pleasures. Cf. ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 114. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 261. It should be noted that while the account of al-Qurashī provides "half of the truth", the account of ‘Umāra gives "the other half". It is not necessary that one of them is wrong, as a matter of fact, both of them are correct. Al-Qurashī, as an Ismā‘īlī historian, could cover the negative behaviour of al-Mukarram as a "*dā‘ī al-sayf*". On the other hand, the non-Ismā‘īlī historian may do the opposite. One can also comfortably agree, therefore, with Ibn al-Dayba‘ who combined the two accounts. Firstly, he mentions that al-Mukarram abandoned the political life because of his illness. Then, Ibn al-Dayba‘ mentions the story of Jayyāsh, according to Jayyāsh's book "*al-Mufīd*", when the latter went to Dhū Jibla and received news that al-Mukarram had devoted himself to pleasures and become very weak (Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Bughyat*, 60-1). Thus, one can assume that as a result of his illness, al-Mukarram gave his wife a general power of attorney to rule the country. Then, he lived away from people, and during that time he gave himself up to wine and pleasures.

⁶ Arwā bint Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim al-Ṣulayḥī. Qurashī, *‘Uyūn*, vii, 209, 218-9 & 223. ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 113. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 143-53. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 143-207 & "*The life and time of Queen Sayidah Arwa the Sulayhid of Yemen*", *JRCAS*, xvii, 1931, 305-15. Cf. Ibn Rasūl, *Ṭurfat al-Aṣḥāb*, 114-117. A. Hamdānī, "*The Dā‘ī Ḥātim ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī and his book Tuḥfat al-Qulūb*", *Oriens*, xxiii-iv, 1974, 259-60.

When Arwā ruled Yemen, she was not alone. She was under the care of the Ismā‘īlī Imām, who supported her with al-Qāḍī Lamak ibn Mālik (d. 510/1116).¹ In fact, nobody had heard of Lamak before he was sent by al-Ṣulayḥī to Cairo in 454/1062. He was one of the Yemeni ambassadors of al-Ṣulayḥī to al-Mustanṣir to have the latter’s permission for the visit of al-Ṣulayḥī to Egypt after the season of the *ḥajj*. Whatever may be the circumstances, al-Mustanṣir politely refused the request of al-Ṣulayḥī to visit his Imām,² and sent his answer with the same messengers.³ Quoting from al-Ḥāmidī (d. 596/1199),⁴ al-Qurashī mentions that Lamak did not return to Yemen with the embassy. He extended his visit, which eventually exceeded five years, by the command of the Imām. During that time he became a pupil of the Fatimid *dā‘ī al-du‘āt*, al-Mu‘ayyad fī al-Dīn (d. 470/1077).⁵

When he returned to Yemen in 461/1069, he was appointed to the highest religious rank of the *da‘wa* in Yemen.⁶ While al-Mukkaram had been distinguished by al-Mustanṣir with a new title as “the *dā‘ī* of the sword” (*dā‘ī al-sayf*), Lamak was appointed to be the Qāḍī al-Quḍāt in Yemen and had been given an honorable title,

¹ Lamak ibn Mālik al-Ḥammādī al-Hamdānī. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 83, 141 & *Zahr al-Ma‘ānī*, ed. Ghālib, 249. ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 191. Ibn Samura, *Ṭabaqāt*, 234. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 439-41. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 179-80.

² ‘Abbās Hamdānī explains that al-Mustanṣir refused the request of al-Ṣulayḥī to visit Egypt as a result of the severe circumstances, i.e., plague, famine and widespread ruin, which afflicted Cairo. Hamdānī adds that while these circumstances struck the Fatimid state during the period of the year 454/1062 and the year 459/1067, the power of al-Ṣulayḥī reached its summit. Thus, when al-Ṣulayḥī asked for permission, al-Mustanṣir was afraid of this visit which might affect the political life of the Fatimid state. Cf. “the addendum” which was written by ‘Abbās Hamdānī to Ḥ. Hamdānī, *ibid.*, 370-1. It should be noted that what is called *al-shidda al-‘uẓmā* “the great distress” was during 459/1067-466/1074, not as ‘Abbās Hamdānī mentioned above. However, one can agree with him that al-Mustanṣir was afraid of al-Ṣulayḥī’s intervention. One can also assume that al-Mustanṣir did not have time to spend on the reception ceremonies for the arrival of al-Ṣulayḥī, or he probably did not want al-Ṣulayḥī to find out the weakness of al-Mustanṣir when Egypt was under the stress of the conflict, which started in 454/1062 between the Turks and the slaves. The Turks then manipulated the authority until 466/1074. Cf. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, ii, 265-313. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 80-7.

³ For the name of the messengers, cf. Mājid (ed.), *al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya*, 181. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 175

⁴ Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 151-5.

⁵ Al-Mu‘ayyad fī al-Dīn, Hibat Allāh ibn Abī ‘Imrān Mūsā ibn Dā‘ūd al-Shīrāzī. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vi, 325 & *Zahr al-Ma‘ānī*, 249-50. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, ii, 251. Ivanow, *Guide*, 47. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 103-4. M. K. Ḥusayn, *Fī Adab Miṣr al-Fāṭimiyya*, 82. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 596-604.

Cf. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 103.

⁶ Cf. Mājid (ed.), *al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya*, 144.

“the *dā‘ī* of the pen” (*dā‘ī al-qalam*).¹ It should be noted that the religious titles of the *da‘wa* could not be inherited. This became clear when al-Ṣulayhī asked his Imām to appointed his son as a successor, but the Imām did not give him more than those honorable titles which were appropriate to the prevailing political conditions in Yemen.²

At that stage of the *da‘wa* in Yemen, the main body of Yemeni socio-political life could be compared to a wagon which must be drawn by two horses; if one of the horses stopped neither the wagon nor the other horse could continue the journey. Al-Mustanṣir had never ignored the importance of al-Mukarram in spreading the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen by the force of the sword.³ Thus, one can assume that after the death of al-Ṣulayhī, who was capable and authorized to combine both the political and religious forms of the *da‘wa* to be under his authority as the chief *dā‘ī* (*dā‘ī al-du‘āt*) of Yemen,⁴ the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*, as a religious form, was separated from the political organization, i.e., the state. As many of the sources indicate, al-Mukarram was perceived as the head of the state, not the head of the *da‘wa*. Nevertheless, he was always supported by the religious establishment, which was organized by the chief *dā‘ī* or, sometimes, the chief *qāḍī* (*qāḍī al-quḍāt*), who was then Lamak ibn Mālik.

Unlike al-Mukarram, Arwā abandoned social life and dedicated herself to the *da‘wa*.⁵ She was appointed as a “Proof” (*ḥujja*)⁶ of the Imām and the head of the *da‘wa* in Yemen.⁷ At the same time, Lamak was also appointed as “the *dā‘ī* of the

¹ Ibid., 181. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 83. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, Ṣulayhiyyūn, 179.

² Qurashī, op. cit., 67-80 & 86. Cf. Ḥ. Hamdānī, op. cit., 302-3. This was not the first time such a request had been made to the Fatimid Imām by his followers in Yemen. It happened after the death of Ibn Ḥawshab when rivalry occurred between his son Ḥasan and al-Shāwirī, and the Imām chose the latter. See above, 98.

³ Cf. Mājid(ed.), al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya, 138-9.

⁴ According to al-Khazrajī’s ‘Asjad (fol. 71), “Alī al-Ṣulayhī became a *faqīh* in the Imāmī *madhhab* and had a possessing knowledge of the *ta‘wīl* (*mutabaṣṣir^{an} fī ‘ilm al-ta‘wīl*).

أصبح علي الصليحي فقيهاً في مذهب الإمامية متبصراً في علم التأويل.

⁵ ‘Umāra, Mufid, 114.

⁶ The *ḥujja* in the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* hierarchy is higher than “the *dā‘ī* of the message” (*balāgh*) and lower than “the Gate” (*bāb*). See; the hierarchy of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*, 344.

⁷ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 141 & Zahr al-Ma‘ānī, 249.

Message" (*dā'ī al-balāgh*).¹ However, it should be noted that 'Umāra states that after the death of al-Mukarram, "the *da'wa*" was entrusted by a bequest of al-Mukarram himself to the Ṣulayhid *amīr* Saba' ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Muẓaffar ibn 'Alī (d. 491/1098)^{2,3} According to al-Qurashī, who depends on **al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya** for his information,⁴ Arwā hid the death of al-Mukarram until she received a letter from the court of the Imām in Cairo, who designated her son 'Alī ibn al-Mukarram (d. 480/1088), well-known as 'Abd al-Mustanṣir, as a successor of his father's office in the *da'wa* of Yemen.⁵

Saba', the *amīr* of Ashyaḥ,⁶ who was an ambitious person, was disappointed when he was put aside from the headship of the *da'wa* by the Ismā'īlī Imām, i.e., al-Mustanṣir. But, Arwā was clever enough either to gain Saba's allegiance or, perhaps, to avoid his ambitious designs in ruling the country, when she appointed him as a guardian of her son 'Alī. In 480/1088, Saba' found himself again prevented from ruling Yemen. He therefore proposed to Arwa after the death of her son, 'Alī ibn al-Mukarram. When Arwā refused his proposal, Saba' led his army and marched towards Dhū Jibla. She likewise equipped her army and confronted him. The battle between the two armies did not take a few days, and Saba' returned back to Ashyaḥ.⁷

'Umāra explains that Saba's withdrawal was due to the advice of Arwā's stepbrother, Sulaymān ibn 'Amir al-Zuwāḥī (d. ca. 511/1117-8).⁸ He suggested to

¹ The "*dā'ī* of the Message" in the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* hierarchy is higher than "the *dā'ī*-general" (*muṭlaq*) and lower than the *ḥujja*. See below; the hierarchy of the Ismā'īlī *da'wa*, 346. Cf. Qurashī, 'Uyūn, vii, 141.

² *Ibid.*, 168. Cf. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 279 & 'Arshī, *Bulūgh*, 27, where his death is mentioned in the year 492/1099.

³ 'Umāra, *Mufīd*, 119. Khazrajī, 'Asjad, fol. 80.

⁴ Cf. Majid(ed.), *al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya*, 58-62, 91-2 & 166.

⁵ Qurashī, 'Uyūn, vii, 141. Cf. Majid(ed.), *al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya*, 60.

⁶ Ashyaḥ: a stronghold, which is nowadays in ruins, was situated to the northwest of Ḍawrān, south of Ṣan'ā' and northwest of Dhamār. Ḥajrī, *Majmu'*, i, 21-2, 27 & 82. Map 5. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 163/41-42. Maḡhafī, *Mu'jam*, 34.

⁷ 'Umāra, *Mufīd*, 122.

⁸ Cf. H. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 337.

Saba' that if Saba' could get permission for his marriage to Arwā from al-Mustaṣir himself, Arwā would never refuse the command of her Imām. Saba' agreed and dispatched his messengers to the court of al-Mustaṣir in Cairo. As soon as Saba's messengers returned to Yemen, Arwā received a letter from al-Mustaṣir, which was
5 handed to her by Yamīn al-Dawla,¹ commanding her to marry Saba'. Unwillingly, she gave her consent and the contract of marriage was drawn up. But nothing more than that happened between them as man and wife. Saba' secretly sent a letter to Arwā asking her to let him get into her palace, just to avoid gossip. When she agreed to his request, he arrived and stayed just for one night. He then left Dhū Jibla and returned
10 to Ashyah. 'Umāra adds that on that night Arwā did not go to him. She instead sent one of her concubines who looked liked her. Saba' recognized that she was not Arwā. He stayed awake all night, and when the morning came, he left Dhū Jibla and Arwā forever.² Nevertheless, Saba' continued to protect the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* in Yemen as an army leader, and most likely as a "dā'ī of the sword".

15 As the *ḥujja* of "the Yemeni island" (*jazīra*),³ Arwā had to follow instructions which were sent by the Fatimid headquarters in Egypt. Therefore, after the death of the Fatimid Caliph-Imām, al-Mustaṣir bi-Allāh, in 487/1094, she supported al-Musta'li's claim of the Imāmate. Al-Musta'li (d. 495/1101)⁴ was the youngest son of al-Mustaṣir. His succession of his father was strongly challenged by the eldest son of
20 al-Mustaṣir, Nizār (d. 488/1095), the half-brother of al-Musta'li. Consequently, the Fatimids split into two groups: the Musta'lians, who accepted al-Musta'li as the Caliph-Imām, and his rule was a natural continuation of the Fatimid state. The other group was the Nizārīs, who held the belief that Nizār, the eldest son of the Caliph-

¹ Nothing is mentioned about Yamīn al-Dawla, except that he was a *ḥāmil al-duwat* "the one who carries the inkwell", which perhaps means a private secretary, who came from the court of al-Mustaṣir, or probably he was a notary (cf. Kay, *Yaman*, 46, where it is read as *ḥāmil al-madya* & 'Umāra, *Mufid*, 122, where it is read by Akwa' as *ḥāmil al-madhabba*), and he was also called *al-ustādh* "the tutor". Cf. *Ibid.* Qurashī, 'Uyūn, vii, 143.

² 'Umāra, *Mufid*, 122-4.

³ See above, 58 and 124.

⁴ The ninth Fatimid Caliph-Imām, al-Musta'li bi-Allāh Aḥmad ibn al-Mustaṣir bi-Allāh Ma'ad. Cf. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 65.

Imām al-Mustanşir, was the rightful successor of his father, i.e., as a Caliph-Imām.¹

According to the Fatimid version given by the tenth Fatimid Caliph-Imām, al-
Āmir bi-Aḥkām Allāh (d. 524/1130), in **al-Hidāya al-Āmiriyya**, and also by al-
Qurashī, the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī* and Yemeni historian, in **‘Uyūn al-Akḥbār** and **Zahr al-**
5 **Ma‘ānī**, al-Mustanşir appointed al-Musta‘lī as his successor by the *naşş*² in front of
his *dā‘īs* and army leaders. Al-Mustanşir also wrote a letter to al-Şulayḥī announcing
that he had a new-born son who was called Aḥmad and his *kunya* would be Abū al-
Qāsim.³ Al-Qurashī mentions that on the day following the death of al-Mustanşir, the
bay‘a was taken for al-Musta‘lī from the Fatimid *dā‘īs*, army leaders, and also from
10 al-Mustanşir’s two sons, Nizār and ‘Abd Allāh. However, none of the sons fulfilled his
pledge.⁴

Al-Maqrīzī provides a different version of these events. He mentions that after
the death of al-Mustanşir, the powerful Fatimid vizier, al-Afḍal ibn Badr al-Dīn al-
Jamālī (d. 515/1122),⁵ went to the Caliph’s palace, seated al-Musta‘lī on the throne,
15 contented some of the army leaders and forced the others to fulfil their pledge to al-
Musta‘lī as their new Caliph-Imām. Then, al-Afḍal sent to the sons of al-Mustanşir to
give the oath of allegiance to al-Musta‘lī because their father appointed him as his
successor. They refused, each one of them claiming that his father had appointed him.
Nizār said that he had written proof and he would bring it. But Nizār left and never
20 returned. He fled secretly to Alexandria.⁶ As a result, al-Musta‘lī became the ninth
Fatimid Caliph-Imām while Nizār declared war against al-Afḍal and the court of the
caliphate in Cairo. But he was defeated by his foe’s army and was constrained to ask

¹ For more details about the Nizārī-Musta‘lian schism, see; A. Fyzee (ed.), **al-Hidāya al-Āmiriyya**, fol. 9-14. Maqrīzī, **Itti‘āz**, iii, 11-5. Cf. Daftary, **The Ismā‘īlis**, 261-2, **The Assassin Legends**, 28-9, 176-8 & **Mediaeval Ismā‘īlī History & Thought**, 186, 193-4. Lewis, **The Assassins**, 33-6.

² About the meaning of “*naşş*”, see above, 46.

³ Mājid (ed.), **al-Sijillāt al-Mustanşiriyya**, 47.

⁴ Qurashī, **‘Uyūn**, vii, 155-7 & **Zahr al-Ma‘ānī**, 257-9. Cf. Fyzee (ed.), **al-Hidāya al-Āmiriyya**, fol. 20.

⁵ Ibn al-Athīr, **al-Kāmil**, x, 589. Dawadārī, **Kanz al-Durar**, vi, 475. Maqrīzī, **Itti‘āz**, iii, 60. Nuwayrī, **Nihāyat**, xxviii, 279-80. Cf. **EI**², i, 221-2.

⁶ Maqrīzī, **Itti‘āz**, iii, 11-3.

for peace.¹ Of his final days nothing was ever known for certain, i.e., whether Nizār died in jail or was put to death.²

In 489/1096, the mother of al-Musta‘lī sent an epistle (*sijill*) to the Queen of Yemen to confirm the legality of al-Musta‘lī’s succession to his father. In the *sijill*, the mother of al-Musta‘lī explained to Arwā how Nizār first gave his oath of allegiance to his brother al-Musta‘lī, and then retracted from his *bay‘a* when he was consumed with envy.³ Therefore, as mentioned above, Yemen under the rule of the Queen Arwā followed the Fatimid headquarters’ instructions and announced the Imāmate of al-Musta‘lī. Accordingly, he was recognized as the new Caliph-Imām by the Ismā‘īlīs of Egypt, Yemen and India. Meanwhile the “new *da‘wa*”, which acknowledged Nizār and his successors as the true Imāms, was located in Alamūt by al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ (d. 518/1124)⁴ who widely spread the new *da‘wa* in Persia and Syria.⁵

With the support of Lamak as a *dā‘ī al-balāgh* and Saba’ as a *dā‘ī al-sayf*, Arwā continued to be in charge of the *da‘wa* in the Yemeni *jazīra* and its regions, i.e., India, Sind and ‘Umān,⁶ in the name of al-Musta‘lī. After the deaths of Saba’ in Ashyaḥ in 491/1098 and of ‘Āmir al-Zuwāḥī in 492/1099, Yemen gradually slipped from Arwā’s control. Ṣan‘ā’ was attacked and taken by the Hamdānids without any attempt to take it back from Arwā.⁷ To protect the rest of her kingdom, Arwā had to fill the office of the *dā‘ī al-sayf* with someone who was qualified, faithful and could be trusted by her as an army leader. Al-Mufaḍḍal ibn Abī al-Barakāt (d. 504/1110) became that man. He also became the trusted adviser and administrator of Yemen. He was the Queen’s army leader who confronted Saba’ and his army when he marched to overwhelm Dhū Jibla.⁸

¹ *Ibid.*, 14. Cf. Ibn Taghrī Birdī, *al-Nujūm al-Zāhira*, v, 145. Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxviii, 245-6.

² De Lacy O’Leary, *A Short History of the Fatimid Khalifate*, 212. Cf. Halm, *Shiism*, 185.

³ Cf. Mājid (ed.), *al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya*, 111-2.

⁴ Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 625. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 251, 473.

⁵ Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 315-9. Lewis, *The Assassins*, 55-6. Daftary, *Mediaeval Ismā‘īlī History & Thought*, 198-9 & *The Assassin Legends*, 31-2. Halm, *Shiism*, 185 & 188.

⁶ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 123-4. Cf. Rasā’il al-Qummī, ed. Ḥ. Hamdānī in *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, appendix 6, 318. Mājid (ed.), *al-Sijillāt al-Mustanṣiriyya*, 168.

⁷ Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 280. Cf. EI², iii, 128. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 161-2.

⁸ ‘Umāra, *Mufid*, 127.

According to ‘Umāra, al-Mufaḍḍal was first appointed as successor to his father, Abū al-Barakāt, who was the *amīr* of Ta‘kar.¹ Then she appointed him as a private chamberlain, who soon reached the post of supreme administrator of affairs. Thus, he took the position of the first army leader and also the Queen’s first adviser. Arwā could come, consequently, to no conclusion without his supervision. But the state of affairs which allowed al-Mufaḍḍal to reach the highest rank in Arwā’s regime soon declined. He asked for his independence by saying to Arwā that she had to carry the treasures away from the stronghold of Ta‘kar. He also asked her to leave the stronghold entirely to him. Arwā showed that she was wiser than al-Mufaḍḍal when she agreed to his requests. In Tihāma, al-Mufaḍḍal led a secluded life, away from the people and political life, until he received news that Ta‘kar had been invaded.² He then broke his seclusion and went to Ta‘kar to liberate it from the Hamdānids. But he died during his siege of the stronghold in 504/1110.³

One cannot assess the events in Yemen at that time without knowing what was happening in Egypt, where the altered developments often affected the *da‘wa* in Yemen. In 495/1101, al-Musta‘lī met his death at the age of twenty eight. Thereafter, his son, al-Āmir bi-Aḥkām Allāh, became the tenth Fatimid Caliph-Imām. Al-Āmir was five years old when he was put in his father’s office by al-Afḍal, who took the *bay‘a* to al-Āmir from the chief *dā‘īs* as well as the army leaders.⁴ Al-Afḍal thus continued to rule the country alone until he was assassinated in 515/1122. It is mentioned by some sources that al-Āmir was happy when he received the news of the killing of al-Afḍal. Moreover, some sources refer indirectly to al-Āmir as if he had a hand in the assassination of al-Afḍal.⁵

¹ At that time, Ta‘kar became a summer resort for Arwā and its stronghold was used by the Ṣulayḥids as a depository for the booties which were won from battles. *Ibid.*, 126.

² *Ibid.*, 127-8.

³ *Ibid.*, 129. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 283.

⁴ Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 328. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, iii, 27. Ibn Zāfir, *Akhbār al-Duwal al-Munqaṭi‘a*, ed. A. Ferré, 87. Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxviii, 273.

⁵ Ibn al-Ṭuwayr, *Nuzhat al-Muqlatayn fī Akhbār al-Dawlatayn*, ed. A. F. Sayyid, 7-8. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 589-91. Dawadārī, *Kanz al-Durar*, vi, 475. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, iii, 60-1. Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxviii, 279-80. Cf. Ibn Zāfir, *Akhbār*, 88, where Ibn Zāfir erroneously mentioned the year of his death as 525/1134.

In Yemen, Arwā continued to frame her internal and external politics within the regulations of the Fatimid headquarters in Cairo. She announced al-Āmir as the successor of al-Musta‘lī and the new Ismā‘ilī Caliph-Imām, and she ruled the country with the help of Lamak ibn Malik. In 504/1110, and after the death of al-Mufaḍḍal, Arwā appointed his cousin, As‘ad ibn Abī al-Futūḥ (d. 514/1120),¹ as the *amīr* of Ta‘izz and Ṣabir² after the rule of his father. After the death of Lamak, who was in charge of the religious part of the *da‘wa* and the representative of the Fatimid headquarters as the *dā‘ī al-balāgh* in Yemen, Arwā gained permission to appoint his son Yaḥyā ibn Lamak (d. 520/1126) to his father’s office.³ The Fatimid headquarters, nevertheless, seemed to comply with Arwā’s request and appointed Yaḥyā as a chief *qāḍī*, but not to accede his father as a *dā‘ī al-balāgh*. Fatimid practices do not appear to have been opposed to inheriting the job of the chief *qāḍī*. For example, six *qāḍīs* from the progeny of *al-qāḍī* al-Nu‘mān ibn Ḥayyūn (d. 363/974)⁴ inherited the same position of the chief *qāḍī*.⁵

According to the Yemeni Ismā‘ilī *dā‘ī* Ḥātim ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī (d. 596/1119)⁶ in *Tuḥfat al-Qulūb*, Yaḥyā ibn Lamak designated al-Dhu’ayb and Arwā in the Yemeni *jazīra* as a *dā‘ī* (*sic.*).⁷ It was against the hierarchy of the Ismā‘ilī *da‘wa* that the *dā‘ī al-balāgh*, if Yaḥyā was so, be appointed the *ḥujja*, i.e., Arwā, unless Yaḥyā was a chief *qāḍī*, hence, he could declare, not appoint, even the Imām himself.

¹ As‘ad ibn Abī al-Futūḥ ibn al-‘Alā’ ibn al-Walīd. Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh Thaghr ‘Adan*, ii, 17.

² Ṣabir: a great mountain to the southeast of Ta‘izz, where many ruined strongholds were scattered in that area. Hamdānī, *Ṣifat*, 117 & f.n. 2. I. Akwa‘ (ed.), *al-Buldān al-Yamāniyya*, 161. Maqḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 374. Ḥajrī, *Majmu‘*, iii, 462. See, Map 5. Also, *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 149-150/40. Cf. ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 150.

³ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 144, 170 & 187-8. Ibn Samura, *Ṭabaqāt*, 234.

⁴ Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 215.

⁵ Cf. Gottheil, “A Distinguished Family of Fatimid Cadis (al-Nu‘man) in the Tenth Century”, *JAOS*, xxvii, 1906, 239.

⁶ The third Musta‘lī-Ṭayyibī *dā‘ī*, who, according to Poonawala, wrote many books on the *da‘wa*. Cf. Poonawala, *biobibliography*, 151-5 & 469. Ivanow, *Guide*, 54-6. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 197-200. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 273-9.

⁷ Edited by A. Hamdānī in *Oriens*, xxiii-iv, 1974, as “*The Dā‘ī Ḥātim ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī (D. 596 H./1199 A. D.) and his book Tuḥfat al-Qulūb*”, 258-214. Cf. Stern, “*The Succession to the Fatimid Caliph al-Āmir, the Claims of the Later Fatimids to the Imamate, and the Rise of Ṭayyibī Ismā‘ilism*”, *Oriens*, iv, 1951, 193-255.

As explained above, if the leadership of the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa* could be inherited in its political and military part, as happened with al-Ṣulayhī and his son al-Mukarram, the religious part of the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa*, unlike the *Ismā‘īlī Imāmate*, could never be inherited. This appeared in some cases in *Ismā‘īlī* history during the fourth/tenth century, such as the case of Ibn Ḥawshab and his son. The *Ismā‘īlī dā‘īs* seem to have known such rules. However, the *dā‘ī* of the district sometimes could not find someone trusted and qualified to be in charge of the *da‘wa* except his son. This son had usually absorbed the knowledge of the *da‘wa* from his father. No one until that stage of the Yemeni *da‘wa*, i.e., the sixth/eleventh century, had inherited any religious rank in the *da‘wa*.¹

This may explain why the Fatimid headquarters sent Ibn Najīb al-Dawla to Yemen and to be perhaps the deputy in charge as the *dā‘ī al-balāgh*.² Hence, one might agree with the previous information and neglect what is mentioned by al-Qurashī when he describes Yaḥyā ibn Lamak as a “*qāḍī al-quḍāt* and *dā‘ī al-du‘āt* of Yemen”. Al-Qurashī adds that:

“He, [*scil.* Yaḥyā] continued appointing the *dā‘īs*, explaining the features of the religion, restoring its rituals and clarifying its *sharī‘a*, and interpreting its *ta‘wīl* and *ḥaqīqa*.”³

Yaḥyā, even with this statement, appeared as a chief *qāḍī* and also probably a *dā‘ī* with a high ranking position in the Yemeni *da‘wa* which comes below *dā‘ī al-balāgh*. In the rules of the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa* during the era of the Fatimid state, it happened that the announcement of the new Caliph-Imām, which was pronounced in front of the *dā‘īs* and the army leaders, was declared by the chief *qāḍī*. Therefore, one can say that the chief *qāḍī* was the most respected personage in the Fatimid state after the Imām. Thus, with all the more reason, the *dā‘īs* began to practice their duties after they gained permission from the *qāḍī*. This kind of protocol shows to some extent that

¹ According to the list of the Yemeni *dā‘īs*, the *da‘wa* had transferred from father to son or brother to brother until the end of the sixth/twelfth-beginning of the seventh/thirteenth century. Cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 469. Daftary, *The Ismā‘īlis*, 555.

² About Ibn Najīb al-Dawla, see below, 305-8.

³ *Ḥaqīqa*: (pl. *ḥaqā‘iq*) lit. truth, according to the *Ismā‘īlī* belief, *ḥaqīqa* is the unchangeable truth which is contained in the *bātin*. Cf. EI², *Glossary*, 102. Daftary, *The Ismā‘īlis*, 561.

Cf. Qurashī‘*Uyūn*, vii, 144.

فاستمر يُنصَّبُ الدعاة ويوضح معالم الدين ويحيي مراسمه ويبين شريعته ويُفسرُ تأويله وحقيقته.

the job of the *dā‘ī* was a divine duty. Therefore, one can uphold the dissenting opinion of al-Qurashī which indicates that Yaḥyā ibn Lamak was the chief *dā‘ī* of Yemen.¹

The Fatimid headquarters dealt with the *da‘wa* in Yemen by direct supervision. This appears from the correspondence between the Ṣulayḥids and the Imām. Al-Qurashī mentions that al-Afḍal received a letter from Arwā explaining the complicated situation which assailed the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen. She was also in urgent need of help from her Imām.² Accordingly, al-Muwaffaq ibn Najīb al-Dawla (d. 522/1128) was sent by the command of al-Afḍal in 513/1119.³ When he arrived in Yemen, Ibn Najīb al-Dawla went directly to Dhū Jibla, where he stayed for some time to discuss the state of affairs with Arwā. As an adviser, Ibn Najīb al-Dawla introduced a new strategy to gain control of the country. He advanced westwards with the support of Arwā’s army to subdue the rebellious tribes. He then freed the property of the Yemeni people from unofficial taxes. It seems that Ibn Najīb al-Dawla already had an economic agenda which he followed. Soon after he had spread peace in some regions of Yemen, prices were reduced.⁴

In 515/1121, al-Ma‘mūn al-Baṭā’ihī (d. 522/1128)⁵ was appointed to the post of *wazīr* and to fill the office of al-Afḍal after his death. Al-Baṭā’ihī followed the same strategy of his predecessor towards Yemen by supporting Ibn Najīb al-Dawla. He supported Ibn Najīb al-Dawla with a strong army and gave him the authority to act freely in Yemen.⁶ From 515/1121 to 518/1124, after three years of fighting the Yemeni tribes, Ibn Najīb al-Dawla had achieved no success. It seems that he ignored Arwā’s advice to behave kindly to the tribes. After he failed to add any new section to the Ismā‘īlī map of Yemen, he aggravated his relations with Arwā by alleging that

¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 187-8.

² Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 180.

³ Al-Muwaffaq fī al-Dīn, Abū al-Ḥasan, ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Najīb al-Dawla, was a custodian of al-Afḍal’s library in Cairo. *Ibid.* ‘Umāra, Mufīd, 132-7. Cf. Ibn al-Ṭuwayr, *Nuzhat al-Muqlatayn*, 17-9. Abū Makhrama, *Tarīkh Thaghr ‘Adan*, ii, 132-4.

⁴ ‘Umāra, *op. cit.*, 133.

⁵ Muḥammad ibn Fātik ibn Mukhtār ibn Ḥasan ibn Tammām al-Mustansirī. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 629. Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxviii, 288-92. Maqrīzī, *Khiṭaṭ*, i, 462-3 & *Itti‘āz*, iii, 76 & 122. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, v, 229 & 302. Ibn al-Ṭuwayr, *Nuzhat al-Muqlatayn*, 7, 10-11 & 19. Ibn Taghrī Birdī, *al-Nujūm al-Zāhira*, v, 170. Cf. *EI*², i, 1124.

⁶ Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 182.

"she had become feeble-minded (*kharifat*) and that it was therefore necessary to place her in custody".¹

Judiciously, Arwā showed her political experience in dealing with people who tried to attack her. Arwā was acting within the instructions of the Fatimid headquarters and respect for people who were sent to Yemen from Cairo. In 519/1125, she agreed when her followers from tribal leaders asked her to besiege Ibn Najīb al-Dawla in Janad. After the suffering of Najīb al-Dawla, who was threatened by the siege, Arwā sent the command to her followers to raise the siege. She sent a messenger telling Najīb al-Dawla about the power and the wisdom of the "feeble-minded one", i.e., Arwā. Thereafter he came to Arwā in Dhū Jibla and apologized to her. The news about the conflict between Arwā and Ibn Najīb al-Dawla spread to Egypt. The Fatimid headquarters seems to have received news gradually from Yemen by letters which were sent by Arwā herself, or occasionally by their agents.

In 518/1124, al-Āmir sent an envoy with some presents and a letter which expressed his congratulation of Ramaḍān to Arwā and his own followers in Yemen. Nothing is known yet about the identity of this envoy except that he was called Hilāl al-Dawla Siwār.² 'Umāra, who described the envoy as a "liar Prince" (*al-Amīr al-kadhdhāb*), adds that when the envoy came to Yemen and met Ibn Najīb al-Dawla, the latter did not welcome him, but ignored him in front of the Yemeni tribesmen in his court and treated him badly. From 'Umāra's text, one can assume that Ibn Najīb al-Dawla had a feeling that the envoy was nothing but an agent from the Fatimid headquarters who came to Yemen to collect specific information. This emerges from the conversation recorded by 'Umāra in his *Mufīd* between Ibn Najīb al-Dawla and Siwār. According to 'Umāra, Ibn Najīb al-Dawla questioned Siwār at his court as to whether or not he was the chief of police in Cairo. Ibn Najīb al-Dawla meant to embarrass Siwār and reveal his identity to the Yemenis. Siwār, as a result, answered rudely:

"Indeed, I am the one who slaps its [i.e., Cairo,] best people ten

¹ 'Umāra, *Mufīd*, 133. Qurashī, 'Uyūn, vii, 183. Cf. Yahyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 486.

² Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, iii, 103.

thousand [times with the] sandal".¹

When the enemies of Najīb al-Dawla saw the challenge, they gathered around Siwār and asked him to get rid of Najīb al-Dawla. Siwār, therefore, suggested to the Yemenis, who attached themselves to him, to attack Najīb al-Dawla in two ways. 5 Firstly, he advised them to write a letter to al-Āmir stating that Ibn Najīb al-Dawla had spread among them the news that Nizār was the legitimate Imām and asked them to follow his *da'wa*.² Secondly, Siwār recommended that they strike coins in the name of Nizār. He promised them that if they did so, he would hand the letter and the coinage to al-Āmir himself. It was therefore probably 'Umāra who described Siwār as 10 "the liar envoy".³

It seems that circumstances mitigated against the wishes of Ibn Najīb al-Dawla. He was accused of treason by the Imām. The Egyptian sources, such as Ibn al-Ṭuwayr, Ibn Taghrī Birdī and al-Maqrīzī, state that Ibn Najīb al-Dawla was taken as a prisoner from Yemen to Cairo, where he joined al-Ma'mūn al-Baṭā'ihī in 521/1127 15 in the same jail, a place called *khizānat al-Bunūd*.⁴ 'Umāra adds that Arwā, when she arrested Ibn Najīb al-Dawla, treated him honorably. Moreover, when Ibn Najīb al-Dawla was taken to Egypt, she sent her private secretary to escort him with a letter to al-Āmir asking him to be lenient toward Ibn Najīb al-Dawla. But his enemies succeeded in detaining Arwā's private secretary for a few days, and humiliated Ibn 20 Najīb al-Dawla all the way to Egypt alone in a wooden cage. They then shipped him to Cairo, where he was jailed and put to death in 522/1128.⁵ Arwā appointed 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Ṣulayhī, the nephew of al-Ṣulayhī, the founder of the Ṣulayhī state, in

¹ بل أنا الذي أطم خيار من فيها عشرة آلاف نعل.

² 'Umāra, *Mufid*, 136.

³ Cf. Maqrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ*, i, 489.

⁴ Cf. 'Umāra, *op. cit.*, 136-7.

⁵ *Khizānat al-Bunūd* was a store-house for weapons, which was built during the reign of the seventh Fatimid Caliph, al-Zāhir li-I'zāz Dīn Allāh (d. 427/1036), and after it was burned in 461/1069, it became a special prison for high class people, e.g., lords and *amīrs*. Ibn al-Ṭuwayr, *Nuzhat al-Muqlatayn*, 18-9. Maqrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ*, i, 431 & ii, 188. Cf. Ibn Taghrī Birdī, *al-Nujūm al-Zāhira*, iv, 47.

⁶ 'Umāra, *op. cit.*, 138-9. Cf. Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, iii, 119-22 & *Khīṭaṭ*, i, 463, 389.

the office of Ibn Najīb al-Dawla.¹

With the assassination of al-Āmir in 524/1130,² the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* had begun a new era. For the first time in Fatimid history, there appeared the dilemma of searching for an heir to the Imāmate. When Ibn al-Athīr mentions that al-Āmir died
5 without leaving any sons to succeed him,³ al-Dawādārī, as an Egyptian source, states that before the death of al-Āmir, one of his concubines was pregnant. Al-Dawādārī also adds that some of the Fatimid decision makers suggested to wait and see if the baby was a boy. If the concubine’s child was a boy, then the *bay‘a* should be rendered to him. In the event the baby was a girl, then al-Āmir’s cousin, ‘Abd al-Majīd (d.
10 544/1149),⁴ would be “their leader”.⁵ Another account, given by Ibn Muyassar, who was followed by al-Maqrīzī and al-Nuwayrī, says that in 524/1130:

“A son was born to al-Āmir. He named him Abū al-Qāsim al-Ṭayyib and made him his heir”.⁶

Moreover, ‘Umāra, as a Yemeni source which is usually followed by al-
15 Qurashī,⁷ mentioned that a son called al-Ṭayyib had been born to al-Āmir a few months before his death. The Ṭayyibī Ismā‘īlī account, which has been held since the death of al-Āmir until this day in Yemen as a belief, relied on a *sijill* which had been sent by al-Āmir to Arwā. In this *sijill*, al-Āmir announces the birth of his son al-

¹ Nothing is known about ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṣulayhī, except what is mentioned by al-Qurashī that he and his daughter after him, whose name was also Arwā, inherited the properties of Arwā bint Aḥmad. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 186-7.

² Ibn al-Ṭuwayr, *Nuzhat al-Muqlatayn*, 24-6. Ibn Zāfir, *Akhbār*, 91. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 664. Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxvi, 87. Maqrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ*, ii, 291 & *Itti‘āz*, iii, 129. Ibn Taghrī Birdī, *al-Nujūm al-Zāhira*, v, 184-5. Cf. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 190. EI², i, 452-3.

³ Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 664.

⁴ Al-Ḥāfiẓ, Abū al-Maymūn ‘Abd al-Majīd ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Mustanṣir li-Dīn Allāh. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, iii, 137.

⁵ Dawādārī, *Kanz*, vi, 505.

⁶ *وُلِدَ لِلْأَمِيرِ وَكَلَّمَ فَسَمَّاهُ أَبَا الْقَاسِمِ الطَّيِّبِ وَجَعَلَهُ وَلِيَّ عَهْدِهِ.*
Ibn Muyassar, *al-Muntaqā Min Akhbār Miṣr*, ed. A. F. Sayyid, Cairo-1981, 109. Cf. Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, iii, 128. Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, xxvi, 87.

⁷ Al-Qurashī was also quoted from other Ismā‘īlī authorities, such as al-Qādī al-Nu‘mān and the Yemenī *dā‘ī* Ḥātim al-Ḥāmidī (d. 596/1199), the author of *Tuḥfat al-Qulūb*. Cf. Ivanow, *Guide*, 207-8. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 151-3. It should be noted that Ḥātim reproduced the story of the birth of al-Ṭayyib as told by his father, Ibrāhīm ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥāmidī, who was contemporary with the reigns of both al-Āmir and al-Ḥāfiẓ. Ivanow, *op. cit.*, 52. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 87-8.

Ṭayyib.¹ According to al-Qurashī, when al-Āmir was dying, he gathered his *dā'īs* and renewed the *bay'ā* of his new born son al-Ṭayyib.² Al-Āmir had also appointed al-Ḥāfiẓ to be a guardian of his son,³ probably because he was the eldest of the Fatimid household.⁴ Al-Ḥāfiẓ seized power in the name of "the deputy of the Imāmate".⁵

5 Yemen, under the rule of Arwā, was completely faithful to the Fatimids. But, when the style of the letters from the Fatimid headquarters were changed by al-Ḥāfiẓ himself, Arwā refused to adhere to the rule of al-Ḥāfiẓ. In 524/1130, al-Ḥāfiẓ styled himself as "the heir apparent of the Muslims and the cousin of the Commander of the Faithful".⁶ But after he was freed from his prison in 526/1131, he changed his title to
10 "the Commander of the Faithful" (*amīr al-mu'minīn*). When she received al-Ḥāfiẓ's letter, Arwā realized that al-Ḥāfiẓ had dethroned al-Ṭayyib and betrayed his *‘ahd* to the true Imām.⁷ She remained convinced of the right of al-Ṭayyib, gathered the Yemeni *dā'īs* and showed them the letter which was sent by al-Ḥāfiẓ declaring himself as *amīr al-mu'minīn*. Accordingly, Arwā announced the independence of the
15 Yemeni *da'wa* from the rule of al-Ḥāfiẓ.⁸

In 526/1132, the followers of the Musta'lian *dā'wa* split into two schisms; the Ṭayyibīs and the Ḥāfiẓīs, also called the Majīdīs. The Ṭayyibīs became centred in Yemen and India while the Ḥāfiẓīs became the new lineage of the Fatimid Caliphate in Egypt.⁹ Both groups supported the right of their Imām. While the Ṭayyibīs asserted

¹ ‘Umāra, *Mufīd*, 192-3. Cf. Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 192 & *Zahr al-Ma‘ānī*, ed. M. Ghālib, 264-5.

² *Ibid.*

³ According to the Ismā‘īlī doctrine of the Imāmate, ‘Abd al-Majīd was a "Trustee Imām" (*Imām mustawda‘*). Cf. for example, Qurashī, *Zahr al-Ma‘ānī*, 265. Al-Khattāb al-Hajūrī, *Ghāyat al-Mawālīd*, ed. Ivanow in *Rise of the Fatimids*, 38 (Arabic section).

⁴ In 524/1130, al-Ḥāfiẓ was fifty seven years old. Cf. Dawādārī, *Kanz*, vi, 506.

⁵ Ibn al-Ṭuwayr, *Nuzhat al-Muqlatayn*, 27. Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, x, 665.

⁶ ولي عهد المسلمين وابن عم أمير المؤمنين.
Qurashī, ‘Uyūn, vii, 207.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Qurashī, *Zahr al-Ma‘ānī*, 265.

⁹ This was in general. However, there were some groups who believed in al-Ṭayyib in Egypt and Syria, who were designated as "Āmirīs", and also there were some Ḥāfiẓīs in Yemen. Cf. Stern, "The Secession of the Fatimid Imam al-Āmir", *Oriens*, iv, 1951, 198 & 212. Daftary, *The Ismā‘īlīs*, 268.

that al-Ṭayyib was hidden by his faithful followers, the Ḥāfizīs held the idea that al-
Āmir conferred the Imāmate and the Caliphate on his cousin al-Ḥāfiz in the same way
as the Prophet Muḥammad transmitted it to his cousin ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib near Ghadīr
Khum. ¹ Al-Ḥāfiz succeeded in spreading his authority in Yemen by recognizing
5 Saba’ ibn Abī al-Su‘ūd (d. 533/1139) as representative *dā‘ī*. ² When al-Ḥāfiz wrote to
Saba’ asking him for his allegiance to his cause, Saba’ agreed and at the same time
kept up a simulation of faithfulness to Arwā. ³

Right up to the age of ninety two, Arwā continued to be loyal to al-Ṭayyib as the
true Imām. In 532/1138 she died and was buried in the mosque which she built in Dhū
10 Jibla. ⁴ With her death, the *da‘wa* of the Imām al-Ṭayyib, who according to the
Ṭayyibī traditions went into concealment (*satr*), began a new phase under the
leadership of Dhu’ayb ibn Mūsā al-Wadī‘ī (d. 546/1151). ⁵ Al-Dhu’ayb, who held the
office of Yaḥyā ibn Lamak in the headship of the *da‘wa* in Yemen after the latter’s
death in 520/1126, became the chief *dā‘ī* of the Yemeni *jazīra*. With the Ḥāfizī-
15 Ṭayyibī schism, al-Dhu’ayb was declared by Arwā as the “absolute *dā‘ī*” (*dā‘ī*
muṭlaq). He therefore was the first in the line of the absolute *dā‘īs* who led the
Ṭayyibī *da‘wa* in Yemen during the time of its concealment. ⁶ Al-Dhu’ayb,
accordingly, had full authority to control and supervise the *da‘wa* as a religious
organization on behalf of the Imām, i.e., al-Ṭayyib who was hidden from the enemies.

¹ One of the main Shiite beliefs is that when the Prophet went on the *hajj* in 10/632, he stopped in a place between Mecca and Medina called Ghadīr Khumm, and there he appointed ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib as his seccessor. EI², ii, 993-4. Cf. Yaqūt, *Mu‘jam*, ii, 389-90.

² Saba’ ibn Abī al-Su‘ūd ibn Zuray‘ ibn al-‘Abbās ibn al-Kurram ibn Yām ibn Aṣbā ibn Ḥāshid ibn Hamdān. Ḥamzī, *Kanz*, 83. Ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd, *Bahjat*, 81-2. Ibn al-Dayba‘, *Qurrat*, i, 305-9. Cf. ‘Umāra, *Mufid*, 139, 147-8 & 193. Abū Makhrama, *Tarīkh Thaghr ‘Adan*, ii, 86-9. See also, A. Hamdānī, “*The Dā‘ī Ḥātim ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī*”, *Oriens*, xxiii-iv, 1974, 270.

³ *Ibid.* Cf. Stern, “*The Secession of the Fatimid Imam al-Āmir*”, *Oriens*, iv, 1951, 222.

⁴ Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vii, 228. Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ghāyat*, i, 295.

⁵ It should be noted that al-Dhu’ayb, as a *dā‘ī*, was completely ignored by ‘Umāra in his *Mufid*. In this matter, cf. Stern, *op. cit.*, 219-20.

⁶ Ḥ. Hamdānī, “*The History of the Ismā‘īlī Da‘wat and its Literature during the last phase of the Fatimid Empire*”, *JRAS*, 1932, 135. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 293.

At first, al-Dhu'ayb was assisted by al-Khaṭṭāb ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥajūrī (d. 533/1138).¹ Al-Khaṭṭāb held the rank of *ma'dhūn* in the hierarchy of the *da'wa*, and he and al-Dhu'ayb both worked to support the identity of the Ṭayyibī *da'wa* in Yemen during the reign of Arwā. As an army leader with the support of his clan, al-Khaṭṭāb was in fact the protector of the dying Ṣulayḥī state against its enemies the Najāḥids and the Zaydīs. After al-Khaṭṭāb was murdered by his nephew, al-Dhu'ayb appointed Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī (d. 557/1162) in his stead.

In 567/1167, the Fatimid state was overwhelmed by the Ayyūbids. As a result, the Ḥāfizī *da'wa* disappeared from Yemen, though the Ṭayyibī *da'wa* survived, having become limited in its religious aspirations. It was during the decline of the Ṣulayḥids, viz. after the death of Arwā, that the Ṭayyibī *da'wa* lost its political power. It was hard for the Ṭayyibī *da'wa* to face the danger of the anti-Ismā'īlīs from the local power, i.e., the Najāḥids and the Zaydīs, as well as the invaders of the Ayyūbids. To protect itself from its enemies, the Ṭayyibī *da'wa* went into concealment, and began a new era of its history, i.e., the cycle of concealment (*dawr al-satr*).

According to what is mentioned by Ḥasan ibn Nūḥ (d. 939/1533)² in *al-Azhār* and *al-Qurashī* in *Nuzhat al-Afkār*, where they both quote from *Tuḥfat al-Qulūb* of Ḥātim ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī,³ three of the absolute *dā'īs* during the fifth/twelfth century supervised the *da'wa* in Yemen:

1. Al-Du'ayb ibn Mūsā al-Wādī'ī, from 526/1132 to 546/1151.
2. Ibrāhīm ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥāmidī, from 546/1151 to 557/1162.
3. Ḥātim ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī, from 557/1162 to 596/1199.

¹ Sultan al-Khaṭṭāb ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Abī al-Ḥifāz ibn Sharāḥīl ibn al-Ḥārith al-Ḥajūrī, who was converted to Ismā'īlism by al-Dhu'ayb. Al-Khaṭṭāb was considered as an important Ismā'īlī author and poet. 'Umāra, *Mufīd*, 204, f.n., 2. Ḥāmidī, *Kanz al-Walad*, 106-8. Qurashī, *Uyūn*, vii, 224. Ivanow, *Guide*, 184. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 193-5. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 133. Cf. Ghālib, *A'lām*, 280-2.

² Ḥasan ibn Nūḥ ibn Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn Ādam al-Hindī, also called al-Bharūchī. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 178. Daftary, *The Ismā'īlīs*, 302.

³ Cf. Stern, "The Secession of the Fatimid Imam al-Āmir", *Oriens*, iv, 1951, 233. A. Hamdānī, "The Dā'ī Ḥātim ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī", *Oriens*, xxiii-iv, 1974, 286.

Chapter Five

SOME POLEMICAL TREATISES AGAINST THE ISMĀ'ILIS

II. Abū Muḥammad and his Refutation of Ismā'īlism in his book

Mukhtaṣar fī 'Aqā'id al-Thalāth wa Sab'īn Firqa

5

Some modern scholars have referred to a manuscript of a book entitled **Mukhtaṣar fī 'Aqā'id al-Thalāth wa Sab'īn Firqa**.¹ The author of the book has not been discovered yet, except that it is mentioned in the book that his appellation (kunya) is Abū Muḥammad. It seems that none of the well-known early Muslim heresiographers or theologians were called by this kunya, i.e., Abū Muḥammad, except two; al-Nawbakhtī, al-Ḥasan ibn Musā (d. 310/922-3),² and Ibn Ḥazm, 'Alī ibn Aḥmad (d. 456/1064). It is noteworthy that some texts in **Mukhtaṣar** are similar to those in al-Nawbakhtī's **Firaq al-Shī'a**, because both of them describe the Shiite sects, while a few texts probably quoted from Ibn Ḥazm's **al-Fiṣal**.³ It is impossible to believe that Abū Muḥammad was al-Nawbakhtī; indeed he could not have been, simply because Abū Muḥammad refuted **al-Iftikhār** which written in 361/971 by al-Sijistānī, that is more than fifty years after the death of al-Nawbakhtī.⁴

10

As for Ibn Ḥazm, what really induces the reader of the manuscript to believe that the author of the book was Ibn Ḥazm is the large number of paragraphs in **Mukhtaṣar** that begin with "Abū Muḥammad said" - the key of every paragraph in **al-Fiṣal**. On the other hand, several snippets of information in the book indicate that the

20

* Many thanks to Prof. Suhayl Zakkār, who provided a photocopy of the first edited draft of the book during the visit of the researcher to Zakkār's private library in Damascus-Syria 1994.

¹ MS. number 1373, *'Ātif Efendī Library*, Istanbul. For MS description see; H. Ritter, "*Philologika III-Muhammedanische Häresiographien*", *Der Islam*, 1929, 47.

² Amīn, *A'yān al-Shī'a*, xxi, 343 & 372. 'A. Ni'ma, *Falāsifat al-Shī'a*, 192.

³ Cf. for example, Ibn Ḥazm, *Fiṣal*, iv, 182, 188, Abū Muḥammad's **Mukhtaṣar**, (the appendix), 437-41.

⁴ See above, 123.

author was a Yemeni, which Ibn Ḥazm was not. This is mentioned when the author says:

As was narrated as a strange story, from Muḥammad ibn al-Makkī ibn Jābir al-Shanfī,¹ saying: an egg fell from a nest of the bird which is called a stork -the author of the book [i.e., Abū Muḥammad] said: I doubt that we have it in Yemen, or may be it is here but we do not know it.²

Moreover, when he gives an example about the return of the Maḥdī as a belief among the Kaysāniyya, Abū Muḥammad refers to what he calls "the Ḥusayniyya", i.e., the Yemeni-Zaydīs from the followers of al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Qāsim.³ It also emerges that Abū Muḥammad was a Yemeni, from the details which have been mentioned in *Mukhtaṣar* about the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa* in Yemen. For example, he sometimes calls the *Ismā‘īlīs* "the covenantors" (*al-mu‘ahidūn*), a name which nobody had called them but which the Yemeni *Ismā‘īlīs* used when they described themselves.⁴ In addition, when Abū Muḥammad writes about the *Ismā‘īlīs* in Yemen, he gives details that have not been mentioned in other historical books except those by the Yemenī historians. The history of the first *Ismā‘īlī* state in Yemen is provided by Abū Muḥammad as established by Ibn al-Faḍl alone. Aside from a few scattered pieces of information, nothing is mentioned about Ibn Ḥawshab and his movement to

¹ This confusing sentence may well be corrupt: is it "محمد بن المكي بن جابر الشنفي" or "محمد بن المكي عن جابر" ; however, in both cases, the person whose name is mentioned above is hard to be identify since his *nisba*, i.e., "al-Shanfī" (الشنفي) may be also corrupt. Perhaps it is "al-Shalifī" (الشَلِيفِي), where Shalif is a place in Yemen in the region of Ibb (Maḥafī, *Mu‘jam*, 360. I. Akwa‘, *Majmū‘*, ii, 1051, or perhaps the *nisba* for "Shinayf" (شِينَيْف), which is a place in the region of Dhamār, cf. Maḥafī, "*Philologica III-Muhammedanische Häresiographien*", *Der Islam*, 1929, 374. Cf. *The British map of the Arab Republic of Yemen*, Scale 1:500,000, 154-5/40-1 & 160-1/44. According to *al-Idāḥ* (56) by Abū Firās (cf. ‘Abdān (?), *Shajarat al-Yaqīn*, 60, see below), the same story is mentioned in the book, which refers to "Muḥammad who was nicknamed Ibn Jābir al-Sab" (محمد المُكْتَبِي بَابِن جَابِر السَّبِيع), this name is also obscure.

² كما رُوِيَ عن محمد بن المكي بن جابر الشنفي أحدىثة عجيبة، أنه قال: وَقَعَتْ بَيْضَةٌ مِنْ وَكْرٍ طَائِرٍ يُقَالُ لَهُ اللَّقْلِقُ - قال صاحب الكتاب [أبو محمد] ما أظنه عندنا في اليمن، ولعله بها ولا نعرفه.

Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, (the appendix), 494. The highlighted part of the above sentence refers to Abū Muḥammad, when the first part is quoted by Abū Muḥammad from Abū Tammām in *Shajarat al-Yaqīn wa Burhān al-Dīn* (see below). Cf. ‘Abdān (?), *Shajarat al-Yaqīn*, ed. ‘A. Tāmīr, 60. Abū Firās, *Idāḥ*, ‘A. Tāmīr, 57.

³ See above, *The Second Ismā‘īlī State*, 279.

⁴ See below, *The Ismā‘īlī ‘ahd*, 331 & 371.

conquer the Yemeni cities and towns. Abū Muḥammad is content with the history of Ibn al-Faḍl as the founder of the Ismā‘īlī state in Yemen, and omits his companion, Ibn Ḥawshab. This probably because ‘Alī ibn al-Faḍl was a Yemeni and Ibn Ḥawshab was not, or perhaps the information about Ibn Ḥawshab was not available to Abū Muḥammad, who seems not to have read the only book at that time which gives detailed information about Ibn Ḥawshab, **Iftitāḥ al-Da‘wa** by al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān.¹ Abū Muḥammad has also mentioned a list of Yemeni names, *nisbas* and locations of Yemen cities and towns, details which would interest nobody except a scholar who was a Yemeni himself.

It is also mentioned in **Mukhtaṣar** that Abū Muḥammad had read some answers to the founder of the second Ismā‘īlī state in Yemen, ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣulayḥī, which were written in some Ismā‘īlī books.² It should be noted that selecting a text from al-Ṣulayḥī’s **al-Mas’ala wa al-Jawāb** is another proof that Abū Muḥammad is a Yemeni scholar, because no one would keep such a book for a Yemeni Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī*, or give attention to it, except a scholar who was a Yemeni himself.

Other evidence in **Mukhtaṣar** suggests that the author of the book was alive until 540/1145-6. When the author comes to the end of his list of names of the Abbasid Caliphs and the most important events during their reigns, he mentions Muḥammad al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh (d. 555/1160) as the present Caliph of the author’s time. Abū Muḥammad says:

Then, it was after him [i.e., al-Rāshid bi-Allāh],³ and in our time of the year 540, Muḥammad al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh was appointed [as a Caliph].⁴

¹ See below, (the list of the Ismā‘īlī books), 315-7.

² See below, 522.

وقرأت في بعض كتبهم أجوبة من بعض منهم لعلي بن محمد الصليحي عن سؤالات سأله عنها، وهو إذ ذاك بزعمهم داع من دعائهم إلى مقاتلهم هذه بمدينة صنعاء اليمن.

³ Abū Ja‘far, al-Manṣūr ibn al-Mustarshid (d. 530/1136). Bosworth, **The New Islamic dynasties**, 6.

⁴ Abū Muḥammad, **Mukhtaṣar**, (Prof. Zakkār’s semi-edited manuscript), 129-30. Cf. Ritter, **“Philologica III-Muhammedanische Häresiographien”**, *Der Islam*, 1929, 47.

Finally, in the last chapter of his book, Abū Muḥammad identifies (what is called in the Muslim heresiographical and theological works) "the survived sect" (*al-firqa al-nājiyya*). Abū Muḥammad designated the Sunnīs, or "the people of *Sunna* and of the community" (*ahl al-sunna wa al-jamā'a*) as the leading survived people (*al-firaq al-hādiya al-mahdiyya*). He thus labelled himself as a Sunnī.¹

This indicates that Abū Muḥammad, as a sixth/twelfth century Yemeni-Sunnī scholar, read and quoted from some works which were written by Muslim historians, heresiographers and theologians.² Including the large number of works no longer extant, one can assume that a large number of important books on his subject were available during Abū Muḥammad's life time, such as, **Kashf Asrār al-Baṭīniyya** by al-Bāqillānī (d. 403/1012),³ which has not been found yet; **al-Farq bayn al-Firaq** by al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037), **al-Fiṣal fī al-Milal** by Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064); **al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn** by Abū al-Muẓaffar al-Isfarāyīnī (d. 471/1078-9),⁴ and, as a Yemeni, Abū Muḥammad probably read **Kashf Asrār al-Baṭīniyya** by al-Ḥammādī (d. ca. 470/1077). It also indicates that Abū Muḥammad was a *faqīh* who had a good knowledge of the Prophet's *hadīth*. Unlike al-Bustī, Abū Muḥammad refers to the Qur'ān and the *hadīth* to refute some of the Ismā'īlī beliefs.⁵ This may be a sign that Abū Muḥammad was a narrator of the Prophet's *hadīth* (*muḥaddith*) more than he was a theologian or a heresiographer.

In the chapter on "the Bāṭīniyya" in his book, Abū Muḥammad describes the Bāṭīniyya as follows:-

They are called the Khurramiyya, and they are also called the Qarāmiṭiyya and the Ta'limiyya. You should know that God will lead you to the good, [and] that they themselves are divided into six groups: the Kaysāniyya, the Nuṣayriyya,⁶ the Jarīriyya, the

¹ Abū Muḥammad, *op.cit.*, 475.

² Cf. 'A. Badawī (ed.), **Faḍā'iḥ al-Bāṭīniyya**, the editor's introduction.

³ *Ibid.*, see also, Ibn al-'Arabī (Abū Bakr), *al-'Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*, ed. 'A. Ṭālibī, 57.

⁴ Abū al-Muẓaffar Shahfūr, Ṭāhir ibn Muḥammad al-Isfarāyīnī.

⁵ Cf. Abū Muḥammad, *op.cit.*, 444-5, 451-2, 501, 520, 544, 571, 598-601, 603-4, 612, 617, 625-7 & 649-651.

⁶ MS. نصرانية .

Ṭarīfiyya, the Imāmiyya and the Ismā'īliyya.¹

This, more or less, is the same classification of names which were attached to the Ismā'īlīs as mentioned by Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111) in **Faḍā'ih al-Bāṭiniyya**.² In his classification of him, al-Ghazālī, was more accurate than Abū Muḥammad. However, Abū Muḥammad provides his reader with a wide and general knowledge about the Ismā'īlīs and their treatises. According to what he mentions, Abū Muḥammad refutes the Ismā'īlī doctrines and attacks their statements from their books. Abū Muḥammad suggests that he has read many of their books which he lists here.³

Abū Muḥammad describes himself as an expert on the Ismā'īlīs. According to his own words, this was a result of his readings through a large number of their works. He mentions the following books:

al-Iftikhār,⁴ **al-Jafr**,⁵ **al-Mas'ala wa al-Jawāb**,⁶ **Kitāb al-Mu'ayyad**,⁷ **Rasā'il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā**,⁸ **al-Mumāthala wa al-Muḥāšara**,⁹ **Ta'wīl al-Sharī'a**,¹⁰ **Ta'wīl al-**

¹ يقال لها الحُرْمِيَّة، وقد يقال لها القرمطية والتعليمية، واعلم، أرشدك الله للصلاح، أن هؤلاء افترقوا ست فرق: الكيسانية، والنصرانية، والجريرية، والطريفية، والإمامية والإسماعيلية.

See below, Abū Muḥammad's **Mukhtaṣar**, 431.

² Cf. Ghazālī, **Faḍā'ih al-Bāṭiniyya**, 11. See also; Niẓām al-Mulk, **Siyāsat-nāma**, Arabic translation by Y. Bakkār, 283 & the English translation by H. Darke as **The Book of Government**, 238.

³ وذلك أتى خبير بهم جداً، لقرب الدار من الدار، ولكثرة ما قرأت من كتبهم الشنيعة، وعرفت معناها ورموزاتها المؤدية إلى تعطيل الشريعة ككتاب الإفتخار...

See below, Abū Muḥammad's **Mukhtaṣar**, 465.

⁴ The book is written by al-Sijistānī, edited by M. Ghālib.

⁵ MS. الحصر. See above, 270.

⁶ Abū Muḥammad mentions that he read **al-Mas'ala wa al-Jawāb**, a book which was written by al-Nakhsbī (al-Nasafī). See below, Abū Muḥammad's **Mukhtaṣar**, 465, 475 & 545. It should be noted that two Ismā'īlī authors wrote books under the same title, and they are 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣulayhī and al-Mu'ayyad al-Shīrāzī. It appears Abū Muḥammad had also referred to al-Ṣulayhī's book, when he mentioned that "he read some books which contained some of their answers (*ajwiba*; pl. of *jawāb*) and some of them were by 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣulayhī". Cf. Abū Muḥammad, *op.cit.*, 522. Also see; Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 103, 108 & 531.

⁷ It is probably the autobiography of al-Mu'ayyad al-Shīrāzī **Sīrat al-Mu'ayyad** which has been edited twice; the first time in Cairo-1949 by M. K. Ḥusayn as **Sīrat al-Mu'ayyad fī al-Dīn al-Dā'i Du'āt** and the second published in Beirut-1983 by 'A. Tāmīr as **Mudhakkarāt Dā'i Du'āt al-Dawla al-Fāṭimiyya**.

⁸ Edited by 'A. Tāmīr in five volumes including **al-Risāla al-Jāmi'a**.

⁹ This book is only mentioned by Abū Muḥammad. Cf. Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 320.

¹⁰ The full title of this book is **Ta'wīl al-Sharī'a 'an Mawlānā al-Mu'izz li-Dīn Allāh**, it was composed by al-Qāḍī al-Nu'mān. It has often been mentioned that some of al-Nu'mān's books were dictated to him by al-Mu'izz himself. Daylamī, **Qawā'id**, 53. Cf. Bustī, **Min Kashf**, 24b. See also; Ivanow, **Guide**, 37-40 & **Ismā'īlī Literature**, 32-37. It should be noted that Abū Muḥammad has ascribed it erroneously to al-Sijistānī.

Qurʾān,¹ al-Istirshād,² Taʾwīl al-Naḥw,³ al-Izdiwāj,⁴ al-Iṣlāḥ,⁵ Shajarat al-Dīn,⁶ al-Ladhha,⁷ al-Maḥṣūl,⁸ al-Burhān,⁹ al-Maqālīd,¹⁰ al-Bishāra,¹¹ al-Risāla al-

¹ The book has not been found yet. It should be mentioned that the same title was also mentioned by Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān al-Mizān*, v, 167.

² Except for Abū Muḥammad, nobody else mentions this book.

³ Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 317.

⁴ Poonawala raises the question as to whether this book, i.e., *al-Izdiwāj*, is the same book which was written by ʿAbdān and has the title *al-Rusūm wa al-Izdiwāj wa al-Tarātīb*? Unfortunately, nobody knows for certain. Cf. *ibid.*, 33 & 316.

⁵ Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī wrote this book in order to correct some of the Ismāʿīlī concepts which were spread in Persia by al-Nasafī. *al-Maḥṣūl*. Accordingly, al-Sijistānī, who was a pupil of al-Nasafī and upholding his views, wrote *al-Nuṣra* as a criticism of al-Rāzī's *Iṣlāḥ*. Subsequently, al-Kirmānī wrote his *al-Riyād* and put an end to the long debate among the Ismāʿīlī thinkers. *al-Riyād* was edited by ʿA. Tāmīr in Beirut-1960, but *al-Iṣlāḥ* is still in its manuscript form and not edited yet. *al-Maḥṣūl* and *al-Nuṣra* have not been found yet.

⁶ In another context Abū Muḥammad gives a longer title as *Shajarat al-Yaqīn wa Burhān al-Dīn*, and assigns it to Abū Tammām, who was alive during the first half of the sixth/twelfth century, which means that the latter was a contemporary of Abū Muḥammad. When he was in Salamiyya-Syria in 1982, Tāmīr edited a book which was published in Beirut and has the same title *Shajarat al-Yaqīn*. He alleges that it was written by the famous Carmathian *dāʿī*, ʿAbdān (d. 286/899). However, the present researcher has discovered that the book edited by Tāmīr is not written by ʿAbdān, simply because it mentions some books, such as *al-Maḥṣūl* which was written by al-Nasafī (d. 332/943) and *al-Burhān* by al-Sijistānī who was alive in 386/996. The researcher also agrees with Walker who discovered that *Shajarat al-Yaqīn* is almost the same as a work entitled *al-Idāḥ* by Abū Firās (d. in the first half of the tenth/sixteenth century (cf. Walker, *Abū Tammām and his Kitāb al-Shajara*, *JAOS*, 114, 1994, 343-6). According to Poonawala (*Biobibliography*, 294), Abū Firās died either in 937/1530-1 or 947/1540-1. When he edited both of them, *al-Idāḥ* in 1965 and *Shajarat al-Yaqīn* in 1982, Tāmīr seems did not notice that *Shajarat al-Yaqīn* and *al-Idāḥ* are almost the same text. It seems that *Shajarat al-Yaqīn* was written by Abū Tammām in two parts, the first part is a manuscript in the Hamdānī collection, and the second part was edited by Tāmīr as ʿAbdān's book (cf. Walker, trans., *The Wellsprings of Wisdom*, the bibliography, 193). It is also possible that *Shajarat al-Yaqīn* was written by an Ismāʿīlī *dāʿī*, who lived earlier than Abū Tammām, and quoted by the latter during the sixth/twelfth century, and it was quoted again in the tenth/sixteenth century by Abū Firās.

⁷ Abū Muḥammad was the only one who mentioned this book.

⁸ See above, (*Min Kashf Asrār al-Baṭīniyya* by Abū al-Qāsim al-Bustī), 119-22.

⁹ By al-Sijistānī, a non-edited manuscript of this book was found in Syria. ʿA. Tāmīr, *Khams Rasāʾil Ismāʿīliyya*, 17 & *Thalāth Rasāʾil Ismāʿīliyya*, 9.

¹⁰ According to ʿA. Tāmīr (*ibid.*) the full title of this book is *al-Maqālīd fī Maʿnā al-Asr*, cf. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 89. But Ivanow mentions in *Studies in Early Persian Ismailism* (cf. 51) that:

al-Maqālīdu ʿl-Malakūtiyya which is obviously the same work as referred to (as simply *Maqālīd*) by the famous specialist, Sayyid-na Ḥamīdu ʿd-dīn al-Kirmānī, in his *K. Riyād*.

¹¹ Probably it is the same work which is mentioned by Poonawala as one of al-Sijistānī's books, that is *al-Bishārāt*. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 86.

Duriyya,¹ al-Risāla al-Mulaqqaba bi al-Nuzum,² al-Risāla al-Mulaqqaba bi al-Rawḍa,³ Sullam al-Hidāya,⁴ al-Kashf,⁵ Kashf al-Kashf⁶ and al-Sirr.⁷

As he explains, Abū Muḥammad's works of reference were the Ismā'īlī books. Unlike al-Bustī, who refers sometimes to some of his teachers,⁸ Abū Muḥammad never mentions any Sunnī sources, or refers to any Sunnī scholar, except when he narrates a *ḥadīth* or refers to a poem.⁹ In his book, Abū Muḥammad explains to his reader that his book is only a "short discussion" (*mukhtaṣar*) of Muslim divisions; bringing to light their names and some of their views. He explains that he has not mentioned all of the views held by these various divisions, because he feels that if he extends his research, the reader would avoid it. Accordingly, he follows a very attractive style of writing in his book. It is common in Abū Muḥammad's *Mukhtaṣar*

¹As an editor, M. Ghālib referred to it and quoted a passage from it in the introduction of *Rāḥat al-ʿAql* by al-Kirmānī, cf. 42.

²This title, in its form without *tashkīl*, may be confusing; is it *naẓm* نَظْم or *nuzum* نُظْم? Since Abū Muḥammad described it as an "epistle" (*risāla*), one can assume it may be *Risālat al-Nuzum fī Muqābalat al-ʿAwālim baʿḍuhā baʿḍan bi-mā fihā al-Mawjūdāt* by al-Kirmānī. M. Ghālib (ed.), *Rāḥat al-ʿAql*, 47. ʿA. Tāmīr (ed.), *al-Riyāḍ*, 21. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 100. Otherwise, it can be read as *al-Risāla al-Mulaqqaba bi al-Naẓm*, which means it is a kind of poem (*manẓūma*), instead of *al-nuzum* which means "orders or systems". It is difficult to identify such *manẓūma*. However, one can assume that it was written before the first half of the sixth/twelfth century. Accordingly, one can also hypothesize that it was a poem which contains very special doctrinal meanings, such as "*al-Qaṣīda al-Ṣūriyya*" by the Syrian Ismā'īlī *dāʿī*, Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Ḥasan al-Ṣūrī, who was alive during the reign of al-Mustanshir bi Allāh. Cf. ʿA. Tāmīr (ed.), *al-Qaṣīda al-Ṣūriyya*, 17.

³It is most likely that the above mentioned work is one of the following: *al-Risāla al-Rawḍa fī al-Azal wa al-Azaliyya* by al-Kirmānī (cf. M. Ghālib (ed.), *Rāḥat al-ʿAql*, 47 & Kirmānī, *al-Riyāḍ*, 81, 99 & 218), or the book which was written by al-Muʿizz and has the title of *Kitāb al-Rawḍa*, which deals with "the Soul" (*al-nafs*) by way of questions and answers. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 68-9.

⁴This book was written by Ibn Ḥawshab (see above, *the First Ismā'īlī State in Yemen*, 70), according to Poonawala, it was edited by M. K. Ḥusayn in *Collectanea*, 183-213, and in 1948 it was translated into English by Ivanow in *Studies in Early Persian Ismailism*, 54-83.

⁵It was written by Jaʿfar ibn Maṣṣūr al-Yaman, and was edited in Beirut-1984 by M. Ghālib. According to Poonawala, it was edited by R. Strothmann in Berlin. Unfortunately, the researcher had no access to it.

⁶The title of this book implies that this work was probably a kind of commentary on *al-Kashf*. Whether it has another title or not, nobody can guess. It appears that Ismā'īlī books which have the word *Kashf* in their titles are quite few, and by delimiting them within the period before the first half of the sixth/twelfth century, this may point to al-Sijistānī's *Kashf al-Mahjūb*, which is mentioned by al-Bustī in his *Min Kashf*. See above, 125.

⁷Nobody mentions or refers to such a title, but Abū Muḥammad. Possibly it could be identified with *Asrār al-Nuṭaqāʿ* by Jaʿfar ibn Maṣṣūr al-Yaman. The researcher was unable to ascertain whether they are the same work or not.

⁸Bustī, *Min Kashf*, for example, cf. 9a., 14a., & 24b.

⁹Cf. for example, Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 506 & 649.

that the author from time to time mentions a strange story or an exciting poem. A few of the stories and poems which he mentions are nonsense and have no connection with the subject.¹ It should be noted that most of his stories are mentioned in Ismā‘īlī works.

5 It is difficult to classify **Mukhtaṣar**. Historically, it is a brief overview of general events in Islamic history, starting from the death of the Prophet Muḥammad until 540/1145-6. The historical part of Abū Muḥammad’s **Mukhtaṣar** spans less than a quarter of the whole book. On the other hand, the listing of the Muslim sects and explaining of their doctrines takes up more than two thirds of the book, most of which
10 is about the Ismā‘īlī doctrines and scattered periods from their history. What is unusual is that while the author focuses on the Carmathians of Bahrayn and the Ismā‘īlīs in Yemen, the Fatimids are completely neglected in the book. In the rest of **Mukhtaṣar**, that is the end of the book, Abū Muḥammad mentions a number of other religions and some of their main sects according to a Muslim’s point of view.² And
15 finally, he describes “the ‘survived sect” (*al-firqa al-nājiya*) and its system of beliefs according to what is believed by the Sunnīs (*ahl al-sunna wa al-jamā‘a*).

When Abū Muḥammad selects some texts from Ismā‘īlī books and quotes them in his **Mukhtaṣar**, he refutes the Ismā‘īlī doctrines according to his quotations. It should be noted that Abū Muḥammad’s quotations are not the exact Ismā‘īlī texts as
20 written by the Ismā‘īlī authors that he mentions. Nevertheless, he expresses the general idea of their themes. He classifies his refutation of the Ismā‘īlī thinkers into chapters which he calls *abwāb* and *fuṣūl*. Each chapter deals with a specific concept in the Ismā‘īlī doctrines, such as the *bāṭinī* interpretation of the Qur‘ān and the *Ḥadīth*, the meaning of the celestial and terrestrial hierarchy of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* (*ḥudūd al-*
25 *da‘wa*), Paradise and Hell, resurrection (*qiyāma*) and worship.

In **Mukhtaṣar**, Abū Muḥammad gives some Ismā‘īlī names. He often mentions the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* by their *kunya*, i.e., Abū of so-and- so, such as Abū Ya‘qūb, Abū al-Ḥusayn and Abū Tammām. And sometimes he names them by their *nisba*, such as al-

¹Abū Muḥammad, **Mukhtaṣar**, see for example, 490, 497-8.

² وهذا موضع أحببت أن أذكر فيه نيفا من عقائدنا في أهل الأديان، لتقف عليها [إ] إن شاء الله
Ibid., 430.

Sijistānī and al-Nakhshabī. But when he comes to mention the Ismā‘īlī leaders, he gives their names and their *kunya*, such as Maymūn ibn al-Mubāarak al-Qaddāh, Abū Sa‘īd al-Ḥasan ibn Bahrām al-Jannābī and his son Abū Ṭāhir, Zakrawayh ibn Mahrawayh, ‘Alī ibn al-Faḍl and his son Muḥammad, and ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-
5 Ṣulayḥī. However, some Ismā‘īlī leaders are mentioned just by their *kunya*, such as Abū al-Qāsim Maṣṣūr al-Yaman and the Carmathian rebel Abū al-Shāma.¹ He also names the founder of the Fatimid state, but just by his *kunya* as “al-Mahdī”.

It seems that Abū Muḥammad focused on the history of the Carmathians of Bahrayn and the first state of the Ismā‘īlīs in Yemen. On the other hand, he neglects
10 to mention any events during the Fatimid era, so he never mentions the history of the Ṣulayḥids in Yemen. It is difficult to identify the historical references on which Abū Muḥammad depends. Some Yemeni sources give details about the same period that Abū Muḥammad wrote about, i.e., the first Ismā‘īlī state in Yemen. Thus, these could be sources of Abū Muḥammad, especially as they were written before his time. These
15 Yemeni works are ‘Abbāsī’s *Sīrat al-Hādī*, Ḥammādī’s *Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya*, and perhaps he is also referring to the work of his contemporary Musallam al-Laḥjī entitled *Sīrat al-Nāṣir*.

One can also assume that Abū Muḥammad had not read *Ifitāḥ al-Da‘wa* by al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān. This assumption relies on the fact that if he had read it, he would
20 have included it in his list of the Ismā‘īlī books which he mentioned in *Mukhtaṣar*. It seems, however, that Abū Muḥammad had access to additional sources, which must have been Yemeni ones. This assertion is based on a list of Yemeni leaders’ names which is mentioned in his text.² This list includes names of the Yemeni tribal chieftains who formed a confederation in 304/916 to fight the Ismā‘īlīs. It should be

¹ i.e., Ṣāhib al-Shāma, Husayn ibn Zakrawayh ibn Mahrawayh (d. 291/904). Ṭabarī, *Tārikh*, xii, 4. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vii, 530-3. See also, De Goeje, *Mémoire sur les Carmathes du Bahraïn*, Arabic trans., 51-2.

² The Yemeni leaders’ names that have been mentioned by Abū Muḥammad are listed as a group of tribal chieftains who went to As‘ad ibn Yu‘fir (q.v.) to place themselves under his leadership to fight the Ismā‘īlīs. They are mentioned as follows:

وساروا إلى الأمير أسعد بن يعفر الحوالي، منهم: عبدالله بن أبي شرمة السكسكي، وابن الهرامي، وزيد بن محمد، وعبدالله بن يحيى بن أبي الغارات الجندي، وأحمد بن محمد بن إسماعيل الزبيدي، ويزيد بن موسى البكري الكلاعي ونظرائهم.

See below, Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 636.

noted that such local names, that is obscure names, could not be known except by a native Yemeni.

In analyzing this chapter from **Mukhtaṣar fī ‘Aqā’id al-Thalāth wa Sab‘in Firqa** the focus will be mostly on Abū Muḥammad’s quotations from the Ismā‘īlī books and his refutation of them. It is through **Mukhtaṣar**, and al-Bustī’s **Min Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya** before it, that one can form an idea about the understanding of Ismā‘īlism in Muslim societies in the fifth-sixth/eleventh-twelfth century, especially among the Muslim anti-Ismā‘īlī scholars.

Unlike al-Bustī, Abū Muḥammad gives no references in his treatise nor does he mention that he has read from any other books nor does he refer to any of his teachers, as al-Bustī when he refers to his “*shuyūkh*”.¹ This may add more obscurity to the identity of Abū Muḥammad. If he had mentioned some references of his time, these little details would probably have revealed his identity and given us more information about him.

The importance of **Mukhtaṣar** comes from the fact that the author names a number of Ismā‘īlī titles which are not mentioned elsewhere. Furthermore, he selects texts from some Ismā‘īlī books which no longer exist, or have not yet been found, such as al-Nasafī’s² **al-Maḥṣūl**, al-Razī’s **al-Iṣlah** and al-Ṣulayḥī’s³ **al-Mas’ala wa al-Jawāb**. Unlike most other Muslim heresiographers, Abū Muḥammad lived either in a society which contained a group of Ismā‘īlīs, or not far from an Ismā‘īlī city or town.⁴

¹ When he said for example: وقد أورد شيوخنا or وقد قسم شيوخنا, قال شيوخنا .

Cf. al-Bustī, **Min Kashf**, 2a, 5a, 6a, 8b, 9a, 11a, 14a., 23b, 24b.

² Abū ‘Abd Allāh (or Abū al-Ḥasan) Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Nasafī (or al-Nakhshabī), was also called “al-Bazdawī”, *nisba* came from a village near Nasaf called Bazda. Nizām al-Mulk, **Siyāsāt-nāma**, trans. H. Darke, 218-24. Baghdādī, **Farq**, 283. Naṣir-i Khusraw, **Khawān al-Ikhwān**, ed. Y. al-Khashshāb 1940, 113-5. Isfarāyīnī, **al-Tabṣīr fī ‘l-Dīn**, ed. M. Z. Kawtharī, Cairo 1940, 84 & another ed. K al-Ḥūt, Beirut 1983, 141. Ibn al-Athīr, **al-Kāmil**, viii, 404. Ibn al-Nadīm, **Fihrist**, 268. Yāqūt, **Mu‘jam**, v, 267. Cf. Stern, **Studies**, 219. Ivanow, **Guide**, 35. Brockelmann, **S.**, i, 35. Walker, **Early philosophical Shiism**, 55-6. Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 40-1. H. Hamdānī, **Ṣulayḥiyyūn**, 251. Ivanow, **Studies in Early Persian Ismailism**, 117 & **Guide to Ismaili literature**, 35.

³ The founder of the second Ismā‘īlī state in Yemen, ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣulayḥī (d. 459/1067). Qurashī, ‘**Uyūn**, vii, 90. Ḥamzī, **Kanz**, 78-9. Yamānī, **Bahjat**, 77. Ibn Abī al-Rijāl, **Matla‘ al-Budūr**, iv, fol. 34. See above, 315 .

⁴ Cf. Abū Muḥammad, **Mukhtaṣar**, 465. See above, 315, f. n. 3.

The Ismā‘īlī ‘*Ahd*

The Ismā‘īlī oath of allegiance (‘*ahd*) was revealed and completely explained for the first time in a book written early in the fourth/tenth century by Ibn Rizām, although the original work of Ibn Rizām has not yet been found. His contemporary,¹
5 Akhū Muḥsin, an Alid scholar, thoroughly read Ibn Rizām’s work, and used it in his book to attack the Fatimids in their origin.² The book of Akhū Muḥsin is also lost, but his account is quoted by several historians, such as al-Dawādārī,³ al-Maqrīzī⁴ and perhaps by al-Bāqillānī and then by al-Ghazālī.⁵ It appears that most of Akhū Muḥsin’s account can be found in al-Nuwayrī’s *Nihāyat al-Arab*.⁶

10 However, one can also assume that even al-Baghdādī, who is the main source of al-Ghazālī’s *Faḍā’ih*,⁷ quotes from one of these works, i.e., the works of Ibn Rizām or Akhū Muḥsin.⁸ In fact, al-Baghdādī’s *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* is the first surviving original theological and heresiographical work which mentions the Ismā‘īlī ‘*ahd*. According to al-Baghdādī’s story, he met some people from amongst those who had
15 apostatized the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘wa* and he took some information from them.⁹ It is most likely that the Ismā‘īlī ‘*ahd* had been related to al-Baghdādī by those people, otherwise, al-Baghdādī perhaps quoted from Ibn Rizām or Akhū Muḥsin.

It appears that some of the early Muslim theologians, heresiographers and historians, those who came after al-Baghdādī, mentioned the Ismā‘īlī ‘*ahd*, such as

¹ According to what is mentioned in *Kanz al-Durar* Akhū Muḥsin (see next) said that “he was told directly by Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Kūfī, that is Ibn Rizām, that Abū Sa‘īd al-Jannābī learned (*akhadha*) the principles of the *dā‘wa* from Qarmaṭ himself. Dawādārī, *Kanz*, vi, 55.

² Maqrīzī, *Itti‘āz*, i, 22.

³ Dawādārī, *op. cit.*, 7-21, 44-9, 51, 55 & 97-105.

⁴ Maqrīzī, *op. cit.*, 22-9.

⁵ Cf. Badawī (ed.), *Faḍā’ih al-Bāṭiniyya*, the editor’s introduction.

⁶ Nuwayrī, *Nihāya*, xxv, 195-316.

⁷ Badawī (ed.), *Faḍā’ih al-Bāṭiniyya*, the editor’s introduction.

⁸ Cf. for example, Baghdādī, *Farq*, 282, 294-8, 298-302 & 217-20; Nuwayrī, *Nihāya*, xxv, 187-4, 220-4, 195-216 & 303-4.

⁹ Baghdādī, *op. cit.*, 302-3.

al-Ghazālī,¹ al-Daylamī,² al-Nuwayrī and al-Maqrīzī.³ Others, such as al-Isfarāyīnī,⁴ Ibn Ḥazm, al-Shahrastānī, al-Ḥammādī, who joined the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* in Yemen for some time, do not mention it. Al-Dawādārī also does not mention it because, as an anti-Ismā‘īlī, he says in **Kanz al-Durar** that he does not want to continue to explain and refute the Ismā‘īlī principles so as not to violate his book.⁵

Although they are almost alike,⁶ one can see there are some differences between the two *‘ahds* which are mentioned in **al-Farq bayn al-Firaq** and **Mukhtaṣar**. The one which is mentioned by al-Baghdādī in **al-Farq bayn al-Firaq** is longer and has more details than the one cited by Abū Muḥammad in his **Mukhtaṣar**.⁷

On the other hand, Abū Muḥammad mentions some details which are not given by al-Baghdādī, especially about the disavowal of some of the Prophet’s companions, such as the first three Rāshidūn, i.e., Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān. One can perhaps explain that the shortened text in **Mukhtaṣar** relies on Abū Muḥammad’s methodology of research, which he describes in his introduction of **Mukhtaṣar** as being a summary of the history of the seventy three Muslim sects and their doctrines.

This chapter will now present a selection of passages from **Mukhtaṣar**. The first passage is chosen to compare the Ismā‘īlī *‘ahd* which is mentioned in Baghdādī’s **al-Farq bayn al-Firaq** and Ghazālī’s **Faḍā’ih al-Bāṭiniyyā** with the criticisms of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘ī* ‘Alī ibn al-Walīd (d. 612/1215)⁸ in **Dāmigh al-Bātil wa Ḥatf al-Munādīl**, and Abū Muḥammad’s **Mukhtaṣar**. Then, versions the Ismā‘īlī *‘ahd* mentioned by Ismā‘īlī authors, that is **al-Kashf** by Ibn Maṣṣūr al-Yaman and **al-**

¹ Cf. **Faḍā’ih**, 28-9.

² Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Daylamī, a Yemeni-Zaydī scholar, who wrote his book, **Qawā‘id ‘Aqā’id Āl Muḥammad**, in 707/1308. See above, **A Review of the Primary and Secondary Sources**, 6. About the Ismā‘īlī *‘ahd*, cf. Daylamī, **Qawā‘id**, 39-41. See also, Brockelmann, **GAL.**, ii, 241.

³ Cf. **Khiṭaṭ**, i, 396-7.

⁴ i.e., Abū al-Muḥaffar Shahfūr. See above, 317.

⁵ Dawādārī, **Kanz**, vi, 105-6.

⁶ Similarity occurs in several places, for example, cf. Abū Muḥammad, **Mukhtaṣar**, (Prof. Zakkār’s semi-edited manuscript), 272-3, 278, 298 & 475, and Baghdādī, **Farq**, 298-304, 305, 308 & 314-5.

⁷ By a simple comparison, it unmistakably appears that the longest Ismā‘īlī *‘ahd* was mentioned by al-Nuwayrī in **Nihaya al-Arab** (cf., xxv, 217-20), who refers it to Akhū Muḥsin.

⁸ ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Ibrāhīm ibn al-Walīd al-Anf al-‘Abshamī al-Qurashī. Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 156. Ghalib, **A‘lām**, 408-11.

Dustūr wa Da‘wat al-Mu‘minīn li al-Ḥudūr¹ by Shams al-Dīn al-Ṭayyibī (d. 652/1254) are given.² The second passage shows Abū Muḥammad’s account of the hierarchy of the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa*.

The subsequent passages are selected because in them Abū Muḥammad gives the titles of *Ismā‘īlī* books and names the authors. Secondly, some of these passages, especially those which are quoted from **al-Iftikhār** and **Shajarat al-Yaqīn**, can be compared with the original works and, therefore, probably indicate how accurate Abū Muḥammad was with his quotations. Thirdly, Abū Muḥammad quoted from some *Ismā‘īlī* books which do not exist any more, such as al-Nasafī’s **al-Maḥṣūl**, Abū Ḥatīm’s **al-Iṣlah** and al-Ṣulayhī’s **al-Mas’ala wa al-Jawāb**. He has thus preserved some *Ismā‘īlī* texts from extinction, which adds to the importance of his work and justifies the inclusion of these quotations in this chapter.

The *‘ahd* is in fact a kind of an oath of allegiance, taken by the *Ismā‘īlī dā‘ī* from the neophyte as a “respondent” (*mustajīb*, pl. *mustajībūn*), those who were at the novitiate level of the *da‘wa*.

1. The *‘Ahd* in al-Farq bayn al-Firaq:

It is mentioned in **al-Farq** by al-Baghdādī as follows:-³

¹ Ed. ‘A. Tāmīr as a chapter (*risāla*) in his *Arba‘ Rasā’il Ismā‘īliyya*, 2nd edition, Beirut 1978. Cf. Ivanow, *Ismā‘īlī Literature*, 172.

² Shams al-Dīn ibn Aḥmad (or Muḥammad) al-Ṭayyibī, a Syrian *Ismā‘īlī* thinker and the court poet of the Nizārī-*Ismā‘īlī* Imām, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad III, see below, 333. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 306. It should be noted that al-Ṭayyibī says at the end of this work, i.e., **al-Dustūr**, that he heard the information of the *risāla* from his contemporary Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī (d. 672/1274), who himself heard it from ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad, who was the twenty sixth *Ismā‘īlī*-Nizārī Imām, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad III ibn Ḥasan II ibn Muḥammad II ibn Ḥasan ibn al-Qāhir ibn al-Muḥtadī ibn al-Hādī ibn Nizār, (d. 653/1255). Cf. Hodgson, **The Order of the Assassins**, 42 & **The Cambridge History of Iran**, “*The Ismā‘īlī State*”, v, 476-80. According to Ghālib, al-Ṭayyibī was the *hujja* and the chief *dā‘ī* of the Imām, i.e., ‘Alā’ al-Dīn. Ghālib, *op. cit.*, 294-7 & **Tārīkh al-Da‘wa al-Ismā‘īliyya**, 273.

³ Al-Baghdādī’s **al-Farq bayn al-Firaq** was translated into English for the first time in 1920 (Columbia University) by K. C. Seelye, but this edition did not cover the whole of Al-Baghdādī’s **Farq**. Therefore, A. S. Halkin came to continue Seelye’s work and translate the rest of the book in 1935 (Tel-Aviv) as the second part of **Moslem Schisms and Sects -being the: History of the Various Philosophic Systems Developed in Islam-**. The translation of the *Ismā‘īlī ‘ahd* is found in Halkin, **Moslem Schisms and Sects**, ii, 146-7.

جَعَلْتَ عَلَى نَفْسِكَ عَهْدَ اللَّهِ وَمِيثَاقَهُ ، وَذَمَّتْهُ وَذَمَّتْهُ رُسُلُهُ ، وَمَا أَخَذَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى

عَلَى النَّبِيِّينَ مِنْ عَهْدٍ وَمِيثَاقٍ أَنْكَ تَسْتَرُ مَا تَسْمَعُهُ مِنِّي ، وَمَا تَعْلَمُهُ مِنْ أَمْرِي ، وَمِنْ

أَمْرِ الْإِمَامِ الَّذِي هُوَ صَاحِبُ زَمَانِكَ ، وَأَمْرَ أَشْيَاعِهِ وَأَتْبَاعِهِ ، فِي هَذَا الْبَلَدِ وَفِي سَائِرِ

الْبُلْدَانِ ، وَأَمْرَ الْمُطِيعِينَ لَهُ مِنَ الذُّكُورِ وَالْإِنَاثِ . فَلَا تُظْهِرُ مِنْ ذَلِكَ قَلِيلاً وَلَا كَثِيراً ، وَلَا

5 تُظْهِرُ شَيْئاً يَدُلُّ عَلَيْهِ مِنْ كِتَابَةٍ أَوْ إِشَارَةٍ ، إِلَّا مَا أُذِنَ لَكَ فِيهِ الْإِمَامُ صَاحِبُ الزَّمَانِ ،

أَوْ أُذِنَ لَكَ فِي إِظْهَارِهِ الْمَأْذُونُ لَهُ فِي دَعْوَتِهِ ، فَتَعْمَلُ فِي ذَلِكَ حِينَئِذٍ بِمَقْدَارِ مَا يُؤْذَنُ لَكَ

فِيهِ . وَقَدْ جَعَلْتَ عَلَى نَفْسِكَ الْوَفَاءَ بِذَلِكَ ، وَأَلْزَمْتَهُ نَفْسَكَ فِي حَالَتِي الرِّضَا وَالْغَضَبِ

وَالرَّغْبَةِ وَالرَّهْبَةِ .

قال: نعم. فإذا قال "نعم"، قال له:

10 وجعلت على نفسك أن تمنعني وجميع من أسمىه لك مما تمنع منه نفسك

بعهد الله وميثاقه عليك وذمته وذمته رُسُلُهُ ، وَتَنْصَحُهُمْ نُصْحًا ظَاهِرًا وَبَاطِنًا . وَأَنْ

لَا تَخُونِ الْإِمَامَ وَأَوْلِيَاءَهُ وَأَهْلَ دَعْوَتِهِ فِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ وَلَا فِي أَمْوَالِهِمْ . وَأَنْكَ لَا تَتَأَوَّلُ فِي هَذِهِ

الْأَيْمَانَ تَأْوِيلًا ، وَلَا تَعْتَقِدُ مَا يَحِلُّهَا . وَأَنْكَ إِنْ فَعَلْتَ شَيْئاً مِنْ ذَلِكَ ، فَأَنْتَ بَرِيءٌ مِنْ

اللَّهِ وَمَلَائِكَتِهِ وَمِنْ جَمِيعِ مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى فِي كِتَابِهِ . وَأَنْكَ إِنْ خَالَفْتَ فِي شَيْءٍ مِمَّا

15 ذَكَرْنَاهُ لَكَ ، فَلِلَّهِ عَلَيْكَ أَنْ تَحْجَّ إِلَى بَيْتِهِ مائة حجة ماشياً نذراً واجباً . وَكُلَّ مَا تَمْلِكُهُ

فِي الْوَقْتِ الَّذِي أَنْتَ فِيهِ ، صَدَقَةٌ عَلَى الْفُقَرَاءِ وَالْمَسَاكِينِ . وَكُلَّ مَمْلُوكٍ يَكُونُ فِي مَمْلَكَتِكَ ،

يوم تخالف فيه أو بعده، يكون حرّاً. وكلّ امرأة لك الآن أو يوم مخالفتك، أو
تتزوجها بعد ذلك، تكون طالقاً منك ثلاث طلاقات. والله تعالى الشاهدُ على نيتك
وعقد ضميرك فيما حلفت به.

فإذا قال "نعم"، قال له:

5 كفى بالله شهيداً بيني وبينك.

2. The 'Ahd in Faḍā'ih al-Baḥīniyya:

An insignificant difference exists between the 'ahd which is mentioned by al-Baghdādī and al-Ghazālī, perhaps because al-Ghazālī referred to miscellaneous works. Nevertheless, al-Ghazālī adds nothing new to what is mentioned by al-Baghdādī when he mentions the 'ahd. The main reason for citing the Ismā'īlī 'ahd,
10 which is mentioned by al-Ghazālī, is because it is the only available anti-Ismā'īlī text of the Ismā'īlī 'ahd that is refuted by the Ismā'īlīs. Therefore, it is necessary to mention al-Ghazālī's 'ahd with its refutation by the Yemeni Ismā'īlī dā'ī, 'Alī ibn al-Walīd. Al-Ghazālī states that when the Ismā'īlī dā'ī wanted to guarantee the
15 *mustajīb*, he bound him with a very compact oath from which he could not be released. Al-Ghazālī quotes the 'ahd as follows:¹

جعلت على نفسك عهد الله وميثاقه وذمة رسوله عليه السلام، وما أخذ الله
على النبيين من عهد وميثاق، أنك تُسرُّ ما سمعته مني وتسمعه، وعلمته وتعلمه من
أمري وأمر المُقيم بهذه البلدة لصاحب الحق الإمام المهدي، وأمور إخوانه وأصحابه
20 وولده وأهل بيته، وأمور المُطيعين له على هذا الدين، ومخالصة المهدي ومخالصة

¹ Ghazālī, Faḍā'ih, 28.

شيعته من الذكور والإناث، والصغار والكبار؛ ولا تُظهر من ذلك قليلاً ولا كثيراً تدلُّ
 به عليه، إلا ما أطلقت لك أن تتكلم به، أو أطلق لك صاحب الأمر المقيم في هذا البلد
 أو غيره؛ فتعمل حينئذٍ بمقدار ما نرسمه لك ولا تتعداه. جعلت على نفسك الوفاء بما
 ذكرته لك وألزمته نفسك في حال الرغبة والرغبة، والغضب والرضا، وجعلت على
 5 نفسك عهد الله وميثاقه أن تتبني وجميع من أسميه لك وأبينه عندك مما تمنع منه
 نفسك، وأن تنصح لنا وللإمام ولي الله نصحاً ظاهراً وباطناً، وألا تخون الله ولا وليه
 ولا أحداً من إخوانه وأوليائه ومن يكون منه ومناً بسبب: من أهل مال ونعمة؛ وأنه
 لا رأي ولا عهد تتناول على هذا العهد بما يبطله. فإن فعلت شيئاً من ذلك وأنت
 تعلم أنك قد خالفته، فأنت بريء من الله ورسله الأولين والآخرين، ومن ملائكته
 10 المقربين، ومن جميع ما أنزل من كتبه على أنبيائه السابقين، وأنت خارج من كلِّ
 دين، وخارج من حزب الله وحزب أوليائه، وداخل في حزب الشيطان وحزب
 أوليائه، وخذلك الله خذلاًنا بيناً يعجل لك بذلك النعمة والعقوبة إن خالفت شيئاً
 مما حلفتك عليه: بتأويل أو بغير تأويل. فإن خالفت شيئاً من ذلك فله عليك أن
 تحج إلى بيته ثلاثين حجة نذراً واجباً، ماشياً حافياً. وإن خالفت ذلك فكل ما
 15 تملكه في الوقت الذي تحلف فيه صدقة على الفقراء والمساكين الذين لا رجم بينك
 وبينهم. وكل مملوك يكون لك في ملكك يوم تخالف فيه فهم أحرار؛ وكل امرأة تكون

لك أو تتزوّجها في قابل فهي طالق ثلاثاً بتّة إن خالفت شيئاً من ذلك. وإن نويت أو
 أضمرت في يميني هذه خلاف ما قصدت فهذه اليمين من أولها إلى آخرها لازمة لك.
 والله الشاهد على صدق نيّتك وعقد ضميرك. وكفى بالله شهيداً بيني وبينك. -قل
 نعم! - فيقول "نعم!".

5 'Alī ibn al-Walīd insists that al-Ghazālī in fact had not mentioned the same
 Ismā'īlī 'ahd, even when it included some sentences from the real one. He accuses
 al-Ghazālī of intending to distort the Ismā'īlī 'ahd, and change some of the 'ahd to
 make it conform with his refutation. Ibn al-Walīd also mentions that al-Ghazālī
 omitted the part which reflects the main reason for the 'ahd. This part from the 'ahd
 10 shows the Ismā'īlī obligation of establishing the *ṣalāt*, paying the *zakāt*, fasting
 Ramaḍān, doing the *ḥajj*, fighting with the Imām God's enemies as a *jihād*, avoiding
 the forbidden and working on obeying the commands of God.¹ Unfortunately, Ibn al-
 Walīd does not mention the Ismā'īlī 'ahd which he called "the precious oath" (*al-'ahd*
al-karīm). Furthermore, he agrees with al-Ghazālī about the secrecy of the 'ahd when
 15 he admits that it is a kind of safety and wisdom to keep it as this way, and protect it by
 keeping it away from the enemy as well as the ignorant.² Remarkably, Ibn al-Walīd
 in many places of *Dāmigh al-Bāṭil* agrees about the information which has been
 revealed by al-Ghazālī. On the other hand, he refutes the style of al-Ghazālī's writing
 which, as he alleges, indicates more confusion and pictures the Ismā'īlīs within a
 20 sceptical frame.³

¹ إن ما أورده هذا المارق من الكلام الذي زعم أنه نسخة العهد فيه شوان كليم من العهد الكريم قد شابهها بعث (بعض
 - بعث؟) كلامه الذي ليس بثابت في اللفظ والمعنى، ولا مستقيم، والذي استرق ما أورده من ذلك حول ألفاظه، وبدل وأزال درر سمطه
 المنتظمة [التي] كانت فيه عن أماكنها، وعطل ثم أسقط منه هذا المارق ساهو العهدة من المعاهدة على إقامة الصلوات وإيتاء الزكاة،
 وصوم شهر رمضان، والحج إلى بيت الله الحرام، والجهاد لأعداء الله مع وليه عليه السلام، واجتناب المحرمات، والانتهاز من المحضورات،
 والعمل بجميع الطاعات.

Ibn al-Walīd, *Dāmigh al-Bāṭil*, ed. M. Ghālib, i, 114.

² *Ibid.*, 114-5.

³ *Ibid.*, see for example, 96-9, 103, 105 & 107-110.

3. The 'Ahd in Mukhtaṣar:

Abū Muḥammad represents in **Mukhtaṣar** almost the same 'ahd which is mentioned by al-Baghdādī and al-Ghazālī, but with more details. Before he mentions the 'ahd, Abū Muḥammad describes the way that the *dā'ī* gathered the *mustajībūn* in a hidden place, and he came to them pretending asceticism by showing meekness, and he started to read some Koranic verses. According to Abū Muḥammad, at this stage, i.e., before giving the 'ahd, the *dā'ī* reminds the *mustajībūn* that any one of them, who feels that he could not keep his promise, could leave the court without any blame. Then, he explains to the others that they should know that there is no compulsion on them to give such promise.

It appears from the way in which Abū Muḥammad represents this introductory speech of the *dā'ī*, that the *mustajībūn* would be more attracted to reach another rank in the *da'wa*. Therefore, they would not leave the court and stay by out of inquisitiveness. This is indicated when Abū Muḥammad says:

ويتقدم من يأخذ عليهم العهد، مظهرًا للنسك خاشع القلب غاض الطرف.

فيحمد الله تعالى ويصلي على النبي -صلى الله عليه وسلم-، ثم يقرأ عليهم آيات

من كتاب الله تعالى فيها ذكر العهد، كقوله: ﴿وَالْمُؤْفُونَ بِعَهْدِهِمْ إِذَا عَاهَدُوا﴾¹،

وقوله: ﴿وَمَنْ أَوْفَى بِعَهْدِهِ مِنَ اللَّهِ﴾²، وما شابه ذلك. ثم يقول:

إخواني إن الله تعالى دعا إلى الوفاء بعهده، فمن كان منكم راغبًا إلى مقاتلتنا

هذه، داخل في ملتنا، طالب سرًا لله تعالى عليه، مجتهدًا في الدخول بجملة أوليائه

¹ Qur'ān: 177/2.

² Qur'ān: 111/9.

الَّذِينَ ﴿... لَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ﴾^١، فليعاهد، شارحاً لذلك^٢ صدره

محضراً ذهنه مصغياً سمعه، إلى عهد الله الذي قامت به السموات والأرض، فليلزم

ذلك نفسه طائعاً غير مكره ولا مجبور. ولا تكونوا من الذين قال الله فيهم: ﴿وَإِذَا

لَقُوا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا قَالُوا آمَنَّا وَإِذَا خَلُّوا إِلَى شَيَاطِينِهِمْ قَالُوا إِنَّا مَعَكُمْ إِنَّمَا نَحْنُ

مُسْتَهْزِئُونَ﴾^٣. فمن علم منكم في نفسه عجزاً، وقلة كتم لسرنا، فليذهب حيث شاء. 5

ومن كان منكم متواقياً كاتماً فليقف.

When the *mustajībūn* agreed to join the *da‘wa* and nobody left the court, the *dā‘ī* would start to read the *‘ahd* to them. This *‘ahd* is mentioned in *Mukhtaṣar* as follows:-

10 بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

أوجبتم على أنفسكم وألزمتم أعناقكم عهد الله تعالى المسئول المؤكد، وميثاقه

المغلظ المشدد، بطاعة منكم ورضاً على سبيل الرغبة لا الرهبة. ولا يشوب ذلك منكم

تدليس ولا استعمال مراجعة ولا مداينة، بنيات صادقة وأنفس طيبة وسرائر مخلصية

بريئة^٤ من الغش، على ما نطقتم به ألسنتكم عند سماع ما أعاهدكم به. لتعبدوا

15 الله، ووليه فلان بن فلان أمير المؤمنين، بعد أن تشهدوا أن لا إله إلا الله وحده لا

¹ Qur’ān: 62/10.

² MS. لذلك.

³ Qur’ān: 14/2.

⁴ MS. بريئة.

شريك له، وأنَّ محمدًا عبده ورسوله -صلى الله عليه وسلم- وأنَّ عليًّا بن أبي طالب

رضي الله عنه وصيُّه ووليَّ المؤمنين بعده. ثمَّ الأئمة من ذريته، مَنْ اختص الله تعالى

منهم بالإمامة، واحد بعد واحد، لا يخلو منهم زمان ولا أوان. وأنَّ إمام العصر فلان

بن فلان، مفترض الطاعة، إليه منتهى الإمامة، ووصيته وصية من قبله، إليه يكتم

5 هذا السرّ، وكلّ ما يأمركم به من السَّمع والطاعة. فلا تخالفوه ولا تعصوه، وتصدّقوه

ولا تكذبوه، وتنصروه ولا تخذلوهم، ولا تنقضوا ما أمركم به، وتجاهدوا معه أعداءه،

وتفضّلوه على من سواه. وتبرأوا¹ من أبي بكر وعمر وعثمان وطلحة² والزبير³ وعائشة

وأشباعهم وأتباعهم. وتلزموا أنفسكم ما التزمتها من الطاعة والعهد، كاتمين ما

ألقيت إليكم، وسمعتموه من تأويل القرآن، وشريعة آدابها علم من علمنا، مما يجب

10 ستره. رعاية منكم لأمانة رسول الله -صلى الله عليه وسلم- غير مُعترضين ولا

مُصَرِّحِينَ⁴ حتى تلقوا الله تعالى. وعلى أنكم ترضوا بما يجرى به من أحكام عليكم،

من وضعٍ ورفعٍ، وإعطاءٍ ومنعٍ، ومثوبةٍ وعقوبةٍ، ورضاءٍ وسخطٍ. فمن نكث بما أكره

¹ MS. تبرأ.

² Ṭalḥa ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Amr ibn Ka‘b ibn Sa‘d ibn Taym ibn Murra ibn Ka‘b ibn Lu‘ay (d. 36/656). Ibn Sa‘d, Ṭabaqāt, iii/1, 152-61. Ibn Khayyāṭ, Ṭabaqāt, 18, 189 & Tārīkh, 181. Ibn al-Athīr, Usd al-Ghāba, iii, 85-9. Dhahabī, Siyar, i, 23-40.

³ Al-Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām ibn Khuwaylid ibn Asad ibn ‘Abd al-‘Uzza ibn Quṣay ibn Kilāb (d. 36/656). Ibn Sa‘d, Ṭabaqāt, iii/1, 70-80. Ibn Khayyāṭ, Ṭabaqāt, 13, 189, 291 & Tārīkh, 68. Ibn al-Athīr, Usd al-Ghāba, ii, 249-52. Dhahabī, Siyar, i, 41-68.

⁴ It can be also read as مصرّحين or مصرّعين.

على نفسه سراً أو جهراً، مُخْفِيًا [أو] مُخْتَلًا، مدهناً أو غير مدهن، فهو براء من
الله ومن رسوله ومن التوراة ومن الإنجيل والزبور والفرقان العظيم والكلمات التامات.
ولا يقبل الله تعالى له صرفاً ولا عدلاً. وعليه المشي إلى بيت الله الحرام حافياً
راجلاً، لا يأجره الله عليه إلا إن أوفى بهذا العهد. وأشهدتم الله على أنفسكم،
5 وكفى بالله شهيدا. قولوا نعم.

When they said "yes", the *dā'ī* then took from them a sum of money, which is
called *najwā*,¹ after he said:

أعاننا الله وإياكم معاشر المعاهدين على الوفاء بعهده، وختم لنا وإياكم بالنيات

الصحيحة، هاتوا صدقة نجواكم.

10 4. The 'Ahd in al-Kashf:

The early Ismā'īlī thinker Ja'far ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, who was "the gate of
the gates" (*bāb al-abwāb*) of the Fatimid Imām, gives a few lines in his book *al-Kashf*
as an 'ahd, when he tries to remind his reader, in the introduction of his book, that he
should keep what he read in the book as a secret. According to Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman,
15 the 'ahd as an Ismā'īlī belief is the first thing that should be known in the religion by
the believer (*mu'min*).² The Ismā'īlīs believed that when God created Adam, He
took an oath from him, and he then took it from each one of the Prophets.³

¹*Najwā*: lit.; means a private talk between two persons, but according to the inner interpretation
(*ta'wīl bāṭinī*) of the Ismā'īlīs, it is a fixed sum of money, seven or twelve *dīnars*, which is donated by
the Ismā'īlīs on different occasions. Cf. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 25-6. Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, i, 156-7. See also,
De Goeje, *Mémoire*, 34-5. Daftary, *The Ismā'īlīs*, 226. In *Mukhtaṣar* (appendix, 459), Abū
Muḥammad mentions that the amount of the *najwā* depends on the financial ability of the *mustajīb*, if
he is rich he would pay one hundred and twenty *dirham*, and if he is poor he should pay twelve *dirham*.
Cf. Bustī, *Min Kashf*, fol. 10 a. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 266.

² Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, *al-Kashf*, 23.

³ *Ibid.*

Unfortunately, Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman does not mention whether the *‘ahd*, which he cites, is the same *‘ahd* that the *mustajīb* gives or not. In any case, it appears that this *‘ahd* is also similar to the *‘ahd* which was mentioned by al-Baghdādī as well as Abū Muḥammad. The similarity occurs in the first and last sentences, and especially in the style of the dialogue when the *murshid*¹ or the *dā‘ī* pronounces the *‘ahd* and the *mustajīb* should answer just with “yes”.²

Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman says in *al-Kashf*:³

أَوَّلُ مَا يَحْتَاجُ إِلَيْهِ الْمُؤْمِنُ مِنْ أَمْرِ دِينِهِ وَمَعْرِفَةِ الْحَقِّ وَأَهْلِهِ، الْأَمَانَةَ لِلَّهِ

وَلِأَوْلِيَائِهِ، لِقَوْلِ اللَّهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ ﴿إِنَّا عَرَضْنَا الْأَمَانَةَ عَلَى السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَالْجِبَالِ

فَأَبَيْنَ أَنْ يَحْمِلْنَهَا وَأَشْفَقْنَ مِنْهَا وَحَمَلَهَا الْإِنْسَانُ إِنَّهُ كَانَ ظَلُومًا جَهُولًا﴾.⁴ وَإِنِّي يَا

أَخِي آخِذٌ عَلَيْكَ عَهْدَ اللَّهِ وَمِيثَاقَهُ، وَأَشَدُّ مَا أَخَذَ اللَّهُ عَلَى أَنْبِيَائِهِ وَرَسُولِهِ دَائِمًا، مِنْ

عَهْدٍ مُؤَكَّدٍ وَمِيثَاقٍ مُشَدَّدٍ. وَأَحْرَمَ عَلَيْكَ مَا حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ عَلَى أَنْبِيَائِهِ وَرَسُولِهِ وَأَبْوَابِهِ

وَحُجَجِهِ، وَكَذَلِكَ أَبُوكَ الَّذِي سَقَاكَ، وَأَخُوكَ الَّذِي رَضَعَ مَعَكَ مِنْ شَرِبٍ وَاحِدٍ، مِثْلَ

الْمَيْتَةِ وَالِدَمِّ وَلَحْمِ الْخَنْزِيرِ، أَنْ تَذِيْعَهُ. وَلَا يَقْرَأُ غَيْرَكَ وَلَا تَلْفِظُ بِهِ لِأَحَدٍ مِنْ وَلَدِ آدَمَ

﴿فِطْرَةَ اللَّهِ الَّتِي فَطَرَ النَّاسَ عَلَيْهَا﴾.⁵ وَلَا تَكْتُبُهُ لِأَحَدٍ، إِلَّا لِمُسْتَحِقٍّ مُؤْمِنٍ مُحِقٍّ.

فَإِنْ تَعَدَّيْتَ وَفَعَلْتَ غَيْرَ الَّذِي آمَرَكَ بِهِ وَأَذَعْتَهُ، فَقَدْ بَرَيْتَ اللَّهَ مِنْكَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَوَصِيْعَهُ،

وَسَلَّطَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْكَ سَيْفَ الْحَقِّ يَنْفِذُ فِيهِ حُكْمَهُ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ.

¹ See below.

² Cf. Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, *al-‘Ālim wa al-Ghulām*, ed. M. Ghālib within *Arba‘ Kutub Haqqāniyya*, Beirut 1987, 23.

³ Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, *al-Kashf*, 23-4.

⁴ Qur’ān: 72/33.

⁵ Qur’ān: 30/30.

5. The 'Ahd in al-Dustūr:

Shams al-Dīn al-Ṭayyibī, an Ismā'īlī writer, mentions in his book **al-Dustūr** the full Ismā'īlī 'ahd, which is received from the *mustajīb*. Al-Ṭayyibī describes the ceremony which should be practised at the time of taking that 'ahd. The author pictures an Ismā'īlī court, in some place, which includes what he calls "a group of the believers" (*jamā'at al-mu'minīn*), and this court probably contains some distinguished Ismā'īlī *dā'īs* of that region. The *dā'īs* were invited by what is called "the guide" or "the tutor *dā'ī*" (*al-murshid*),¹ who, as it appears, is one of those *dā'īs*. At any rate, they should not be less than three, the head of the court (*naqīb*) and the other two present as witnesses for the 'ahd of the *mustajīb*. Al-Ṭayyibī provides his reader with numerous details about this court and *dā'īs*. He said that the *murshid* should be over forty, and this is also to apply to the president of that court, who is called the *naqīb*. The latter, as al-Ṭayyibī describes, should be a distinguished *dā'ī* and has very good attributes. Al-Ṭayyibī adds that the *naqīb* should have a gentle manner in speaking, be good looking, patient, good in decision making, a good companion and eloquent.²

According to al-Ṭayyibī, at the beginning of the meeting, the *murshid* stands up in front of the other *dā'īs* and says:

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

الحمد لله الذي جعل بعضنا لبعض دليلاً، وبعثَ فينا رسولاً، وأوضح لنا

السبيل، وفتحَ علينا من كشف الأسرار ما هو ﴿أَشَدُّ وَطْناً وَأَقْوَمُ قِيلاً﴾³. والصلاة

والسلام على من نقلته الأصلاب الطاهرة إلى الأرحام الزكية، محمد المصطفى، خاتم

¹ There is no Ismā'īlī rank among the hierarchy of the *da'wa* with such a title, therefore, one can assume that *murshid* has here the meaning of "teacher" or "the tutor *dā'ī*".

² ولا يجوز له أن يفتح المستجيب بشيء أصلاً، إلا بحضور جماعة من المؤمنين يشهدون له بالأهلية والاستحقاق، وعلى الأقل شاهدين ونقيب، وينبغي أن يكون النقيب قد بلغ حد الأربعين، ويكون لئن القول، حسن الصورة، رجب الصدر، لطيف التدبير، ممازج العشرة، فصيح النطق.

Ṭayyibī, *al-Dustūr*, ed. 'A. Tamir within *Arba' Rasā'il Ismā'īliyya*, 53.

³ Qur'ān: 6/73.

الأنبياء، وعلى آله بني علي المرتضى، والأئمة الطاهرين المستورين منهم والظاهرين،
الذين بهم نهتدي، فهم إلى المؤمنين دليلاً، وسلم تسليمًا كثيرًا.

He then praises the *naqib* and his assistants in front of the *mustajib*, to show him the importance of the belief of respecting the *hudūd* of the *Ismā'īlī da'wa*. He says:

5 معاشر المؤمنين الموقنين، وجماعة العارفين الحاضرين، أيدكم الله بأنواره،
وأشهدكم على حقائق أسراره، ولا زلتم شموساً للمحققين، وضياءً للطالبيين، ونجاة
للمرشدين، ومنهاجاً للهدى، وأعلاماً للهداية، يفوز الراغب إلى لقائكم بالنجاة من
مهاوي الغي ومهالك الردى.

Soon afterwards, he introduces his pupil, i.e., the *mustajib*, as a seeker of more
10 and advanced knowledge from the board of the *dā'īs*. He announces:

هذا فلان (...)¹ قد عرفتم ظاهره، وكشفتم سرائره، وقد قصدكم طالباً،
ولأنواركم راغباً، وبأفضالكم مُسترشداً. وأنتم لا يَشقى عندكم جليس، ولا نجيب² في
حبكم أنيس. فصيّلوا حبل معناكم بحبله، وأجيبوه بما علّمكم الله من فضله، وأحيّوه
من موت جهلهم وعرفوه حقائق الدين القويم، وأرشدوه إلى الصراط المستقيم. وزيّنوا
15 ظاهره بجواهر معاني المذهب والشرائع، وباطنه بمعارف عوالم العقول والنفوس
والافلاك والطبائع. وشوقوه إلى أوطانه، ودلّوه على معدنه ومكانه، وأرشدوه إلى معرفة

¹ The space between (...), should be filled in with the name of the *mustajib*.

² *sic.*, it is convenient if read as لا يجيب or لا يجيب .

قطب زمانه وأوانه. وأفيضوا عليه مما أفاض به مولاكم عليكم، وأحسنوا إليه كما أحسن إليكم. واسألوا السيّد الجليل فلان (...)^١، زاده الله إيماناً وإحساناً وتفضيلاً، أن يتصدّق وينظر بعين رحمته إليه. وأن يتولّى تربيته وتكميله وتتميمه، وتعليمه وتقويمه. أعزّ الله سلطان عظمته وكلماته، ونصركم الله بأوليائه، وأظهركم على أعدائه.

5

When the *murshid* finished his speech, and the board of the *dā'īs* agreed with his suggestion, the *naqīb* would sit on his knees and read the Koranic verse:

﴿وَأَوْفُوا بِعَهْدِ اللَّهِ إِذَا عَاهَدْتُمْ وَلَا تَنْقُضُوا الْأَيْمَانَ بَعْدَ تَوْكِيدِهَا وَقَدْ جَعَلْتُمُ اللَّهَ عَلَيْكُمْ كَفِيلًا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَعْلَمُ مَا تَفْعَلُونَ﴾^٢

10 At the moment that the *naqīb* ends the verse, the *mustajīb* embarks on pronouncing the *'ahd*, which is:

أقسم بالله الذي لا إله إلا هو، الحيّ الجبار القهار، عالم الغيب والشهادة، والنقص والزيادة، القائم على كل نفس بما كسبت، القويّ الشديّد الآخذ لها بما [أ]ظهرت وأضمرت، العليم بما في الضمائر، الخبير بمكنون السرائر، الذي لا تخفى عليه خافية في الأرض ولا في السماء، ولا تفوته غوامض الأشياء. الذي من أقسم به 15 كاذباً واستشهده باطناً استحقّ الخزي والخذلان، وحلّ في مقام السخط والهوان. وأقسم به ثانياً وثالثاً ورابعاً، كما أقسمتُ به أولاً. وأقسم بجميع أسمائه الحسنی

¹ Probably he was Şafy al-Dīn Aḥmad, who is mentioned by Tāmīr as the chief *dā'ī* in that region. Cf.

Tayyibī, op. cit., 55.

² Qur'ān: 91/16.

وصفاته العُليا، وأشهد ملائكته المُقَرَّبين وأرواح أنبيائه المُرسَلين، ونفوس الصادقين الصَّالحين من عباده العارفين، إنني طالبٌ راجِبٌ في المذهب الإسماعيلي، من خاص اعتقادي وصميم فؤادي، اعتقاداً لا يَشوبُ باطنه الدَّنَس ولا الشُّكَّ ولا الرِّيب ولا الشُّبهة في الإيمان. وليس لي قصد في هذه الرَّغبة إلاَّ تحقيق أمر الدِّين وطلب معرفة حقيقة الدِّين، وتصحيح الاعتقاد والدَّخول مع الفرقة النَّاجية من الطغيان والفساد، 5 ومعرفة مولانا صاحب الوقت وإمام الزَّمان. وإنِّي إذا فهمتُ أمراً وعرفتُ سرّاً، أكتمه وأخفيه عمَّن لا يعتقد بمعتقدي، ولا أظهره لأحدٍ من الخلائق لا بقولٍ ولا بنيةٍ ولا إشارةٍ ولا عبارة، ولا تكتبه يداي ولا ينطق به لساني. وإن أضمرت خلاف ما أنطق به، أو كُنَّيتُ أو تخَلَّيتُ أو تفكَّرتُ أو توهمتُ، أكون كافرًا بالله وبرسله وأوليائه وملائكته وكتبه، وأكون محارباً لهم ومنكراً أمرهم، ومخالفاً قولهم، وذابحهم وشارب 10 دمائهم، وبريئاً منهم في الدنيا والآخرة، وخارجاً من دين الإسلام والمروءة والإيمان، والله على ما أقول وكيل.

This was the *Ismā‘īlī ‘ahd* for the *mustajībūn*, which is mentioned by an *Ismā‘īlī* author. The *Ismā‘īlī ‘ahd* mentioned in **al-Dustūr**, shows some similarity 15 with the one that mentioned by Abū Muḥammad, or the others which are mentioned by al-Baghdādī, al-Ghazālī and al-Nuwayrī. On the other hand, it shows many differences from them. In addition, there is no available information which indicates whether the *‘ahd* should be pronounced just in Arabic, or could be verbalized in another language, such as Persian, Hindi or Urdu. However, Zāhid ‘Alī, a Dā‘ūdī Bohra scholar, mentions the *‘ahd* in his **Hamārē Ismā‘īlī Madhhab**,¹ which is written 20 in the Urdu language, but it does not reveal if the *‘ahd* in its Urdu form is original or translated from Arabic.² One can assume that if it in Arabic, the *‘ahd*, therefore,

¹ The full title of the book is **Hamārē Ismā‘īlī Madhhab kī Ḥaqīqat aur us kā Nizām** (صماری اسماعیلی)، (مذهب کی حقیقت اور اس کا نظام)، Hyderabad 1954.

² See below, 339-40.

reached the level of a sacred promise, and was treated as an almost divine text. On the other hand, if it was not, the *‘ahd* could be changed depending on the time of the Imām and the race of the Ismā‘īlī society. For example the *‘ahd* would not be the same at the time of concealment (*satr*), when the Imām is hidden and the Ismā‘īlīs in extreme *taqiyya*, as the time of *kashf*. This might explain the differences between the two Ismā‘īlī *‘ahds* in *al-Kashf* and *al-Dustūr*. It would be also different from language to language, and also it might be changed according to the environment of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* and its strength. At any rate, it appears from the Ismā‘īlī point of view that is necessary to receive the *‘ahd* from the *mustajīb* after he exceeds the novitiate level of the *da‘wa*,¹ and becomes a “believer” (*mu‘min*).²

The most interesting part in *al-Dustūr* is the part in which the author describes the ceremonies after the *mustajīb* gives his *‘ahd*. These ceremonies are practised by all those present, i.e., the *mustajīb*, his *murshid* and the board of the *dā‘īs* including the *naqīb*. In short, the author describes the scene in which the *mustajīb* carries a drinking bowl in his right hand and walks in a circle seven times in front of the board of the *dā‘īs*. In each time, he is given different drink³ and he pronounces a different speech. He also mentions in each circle one of the Prophet-speakers (*nuṭaqā‘*), and in the end of the circle he drinks from the bowl and bows down in the position of

¹ See for example, Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, *al-Kashf*, 24-32. Nu‘mān, *al-Himma fī Ādāb Ittibā‘ al-A‘imma*, ed. M. Ghālib, 39-44. Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-‘Aql*, Ḥāmidī, *Kanz al-Walad*, 166. Ibn al-Walīd, *Dāmigh al-Bāṭil*, i, 110-4, *al-Dhakhira fī al-Ḥaqīqa*, 64-6 & *Tāj al-‘Aqā‘id wa Ma‘dan al-Fawā‘id*, 92-5. Abū Firās, *Idāh*, 110 & Maṭālī‘ al-Shumūs fī Ma‘rifat al-Nufūs, ed. ‘A. Tāmīr in his *Arba‘ Rasā‘il Ismā‘īliyya*, 34-5.

² *Mu‘min* is a rank in the religion hierarchy of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*. See below, 343, 374.

³ At the first circle, he is given water, in the second one he is given milk, in the third honey mixed with water, milk with water in the fourth one, in the fifth circle he is given what is the author called “the ray of intellect and the lighting of the arrival” (*شعاع العقل وبرق الوصول*) (*sic.*), the sixth he is given the same as previous with two bowls of water, one in each hand, first he drinks from his left hand, then, in the seventh circle, he drinks from the bowl in his right hand. The text confuses the reader, firstly, it is mentioned that the *mustajīb* is given, instead of the drinks, “the ray of intellect and the lighting of the arrival” in the fifth circle. This may imply that “the ray” (*shu‘ā‘*) is not a name of a kind of drink, but in the second following sentence it is mentioned that “the drink is *shu‘ā‘* and the water in two bowls”, which suggests that may be *shu‘ā‘* is a kind of a perfume flavour added to the water. Without a doubt, leaving the word without any explanation, encourages the anti-Ismā‘īlī scholars to interpret it as a kind of alcoholic drink or probably a kind of drug, such as hashish. One can also assume that according to this explanation the Ismā‘īlīs were called the Ḥashīshīyya. Cf. Ṭayyibī, *op. cit.*, 54-7.

prostration (*sujūd*), then he starts the next circle. When he does the *sujūd*, he is followed by everybody in the court.

Al-Ṭayyibī does not mention how long the ceremony takes. It appears from the text, even while neglecting some parts which are mentioned without explanation,¹ that the ceremony may take half a day. One may be wondering why the author does not mention at what point the daily prayer (*ṣalāt*) in the court as an act of worship should come during that ceremony. And is it true that when the Ismā‘īlī reached an advanced level in the *da‘wa*, the practice of the worship would be invalidated?²

It is difficult for the Ismā‘īlīs to avoid the indictment of hypocrisy, with which they were charged by other Muslim groups, when there is nothing to indicate that the people of that court practised one of the five daily *ṣalāt*. The only mention of *ṣalāt* is for a voluntary one (*ṣalāt taṭawwu‘*), when the *mustajīb* finished with the seven circles. Peculiarly enough, this *ṣalāt*, that is mentioned in **al-Dustūr**, has a call to prayer (*adhān*) and is done with the group. The author calls the *adhān* “the divine announcement” (*al-adhān al-ilāhī*), which is different from the usual *adhān*.³ According to the text, before the *adhān*, the announcer (*mu’adhdhin*) should read a specific Koranic verse, and say a special appeal (*du‘ā*) after the *adhān* and before the *ṣalāt*.⁴ It is also mentioned that a certain Koranic verse should be read in the first

¹ For example, cf. *ibid.*, 54, when the author says that when the *naqīb* ended his speech and after the group (i.e., the board of the *dā‘īs*) testified, the *mustajīb* would sit as he sit in a prayer.

فإذا فرغ النقيب من هذا المقال، وشهدت الجماعة، يجلس كما يجلس في الصلاة.

He does not mention what kind of testimony that is, and about what they testify.

And on page 55, where the author also says:

بعد تجربة الامتحان. (*sic.*)

Which is translated as “after practising the exam”. It probably means after the *mustajīb* was examined by the board of the *dā‘īs*. Al-Ṭayyibī does not provide his reader with the nature or the purpose of such examination, nor how long it takes.

² It appears that the only available time to practise such a ceremony, without interrupting one of the times of the daily *ṣalāt*, is between night prayer (*‘ishā*) and dawn (*fajr*), which takes about eight hours from each *ṣalāt*. Another time, between dawn (*fajr*) and midday (*zuhr*), may sometimes take eight hours also without interrupting by compulsory *ṣalāt*. This time, i.e., between dawn (*fajr*) and midday (*zuhr*), is mentioned by Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman not as the time of the ceremony of receiving the *‘ahd*, but as the time of the *khuṭba* of *Qā‘im al-Qiyāma* on the last day on earth. Cf. Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, *al-Kashf*, 49.

³ Cf. Ṭayyibī, *op. cit.*, 58.

⁴ *Ibid.*

and second bow (*rak'a*) of that *ṣalāt*. It is not necessary that the *ṣalāt* be led by the *naqīb* of the court himself, but by the one who has more knowledge in religion than the others. Before the *ṣalāt*, and during the last sitting of it, every one should repeat the name and the origin (*nasab*) of their Imām. Then, after they have finished the *ṣalāt*, the leader of the *ṣalāt* (*imām*) also makes a speech.¹

In *Hamārē Ismā'īlī Madhhab*, Zāhid 'Alī mentions an additional passage of the *'ahd* that is not mentioned by Ibn Maṣṣūr al-Yaman nor al-Ṭayyibī. It seems that it is quoted from another early Ismā'īlī source. The importance of the following passage stems from the fact that it is almost the same as the version of the last passage in the Ismā'īlī *'ahd*, which is mentioned by al-Baghdādī, al-Ghazālī and al-Nuwayrī. Fortunately, this additional passage of the Ismā'īlī *'ahd* was translated into Arabic by Iḥsān Ilāhī Zāhīr, a Sunnī scholar, in his book *al-Ismā'īliyya*² as follows:-³

فمن نكث منكم... فهو بريء من الله... قولوا "نعم". وجميع ما يملكه وحوته
يداه، من مال أو أثاث أو عقار أو متاع أو عرض أو جوهر أو زرع أو ضرع أو سائمة
أو عمولة أو ركوبة أو رقيق أو كسب من جميع مكاسب الدنيا، فهو صدقة على
مساكين المسلمين غير مرتجع من ذلك بشيء إليه... قولوا "نعم". وكل ما أفاده في
باقي عمره من فائدة، يقلّ خطرهما أو يجلّ، فهي محرمة عليه، لا يفكّه من ذلك إلاّ
الوفاء بما عاهد عليه، قولوا "نعم". وكلّ مملوك يملكه ذكراً أو أنثى، أحراراً لوجه
الله، لا سبيل له ولا لأحد بسببه عليه، قولوا "نعم". وكلّ امرأة له أو يتزوجها في
باقي عمره، فهنّ طوالق ثلاثة البتّة، طلاق الحرج والسنة عند كلّ حيضة تطليقة لا

¹ Ibid., 59.

² *Al-Ismā'īliyya Tārīkh wa 'Aqā'id*, Lahore 1986.

³ Ibid., 639. Cf. Z. 'Alī, *Hamārē Ismā'īlī Madhhab*, 326-7.

رجعة له في ذلك ولا مثوبة، قولوا "نعم". وعليه المشي إلى بيت الله العتيق ثلاثين
 حجة، حافياً راجلاً، لا يقبل الله منه إلا الوفاء، قولوا "نعم". وعليه لعنة الله التي
 لعن بها إبليس وحرّم عليه الجنة... وهو بريء من حول الله وقوته... وألزمتم أعناقكم
 عهد الله الكريم... والحمد لله... العلي العظيم.

5 This passage probably gives answers to some questions. It appears that the anti-
 Ismā‘īlī authors did not provide any additional information to that which was written
 by the Ismā‘īlīs themselves. One can assume some exaggerations from the anti-
 Ismā‘īlīs, but their texts show that even when they exaggerated they did not mention
 any information without proof from the Ismā‘īlī *‘ahd*.

10 To return to the ceremonies and practices of the Ismā‘īlīs during giving and
 receiving the *‘ahd*, it appears that all of these ceremonies and practices were invented
 by the Ismā‘īlīs themselves, which they conveyed from the teaching of their Imāms or
 perhaps from the authorized *dā‘īs*. Nothing similar has been practised by other
 Muslim groups, such as the other Shiites or the Sunnīs. These new religious practices
 15 of the Ismā‘īlīs were interpreted by the enemies of the Ismā‘īlīs as an innovation
 (*bid‘a*), and perhaps this encouraged them to accuse the Ismā‘īlīs of unbelief and
 polytheism. However, similarity can be found nowadays among some extreme
 concealed or secret organizations. Each of these organizations has different interests
 and aims, some of them religious, others social or political. Some of them practise
 20 their activities through a political party, scientific foundation, social committee,
 charitable institution, professional society or vocational union, lodge or club, or
 perhaps a group which follows any specific idea.

It appears that some organizations have some kind of protocol which includes a
 verbal or written pact similar to the Ismā‘īlī *‘ahd*. Disclosure of the organization’s
 25 secrets would lead to chastisement of the betrayer and would inflict a punishment on
 his membership and social or political position, or could penalize him by a fine of a
 sum of money. Some of these organizations might impose a death penalty on the

betrayer. Accordingly, this shows that the punishment is a variable depending on the characteristic nature of the organization and the importance of the secrets. The ceremonies of some of these organizations have been described in some books, which show similarity with each other, and have a similar style of secret customs to those of the Ismā‘īlīs. It should be noted that it appears that some professional organizations have a very strict obligation without any secrecy, such as the physicians and their obligation which is called “the Hippocratic oath”.

One can notice that the previous texts of the Ismā‘īlī oath indicate that the *mustajīb*, by his own will,¹ should swear that in any case and under any circumstances, he will not reveal the secrets of the *da‘wa* to those who are not Ismā‘īlīs. He should never expose, verbally as well as by writing or innuendo, the name or the identity of the Ismā‘īlī Imām or any of his *dā‘īs*. The texts also agree that if the *mustajīb* revealed any secret, he would be punished, either physically or morally. However, while Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman,² al-Baghdādī and al-Ghazālī describe the procedure of the *‘ahd* as an act between two persons, the *dā‘ī* and the *mustajīb*, Abū Muḥammad and Zāhid ‘Alī picture it as a collective promise from a group of the *mustajībūn* to their tutor *dā‘ī*.³ In a variant picture the ceremony of the *‘ahd* appears in **al-Dustūr** as a very special religious occasion, which takes place at a secret time and location,⁴ as an act achieved by high ranked *dā‘īs* of some region, to have an oath of allegiance from a new candidate in the *da‘wa*. This Ismā‘īlī view had not crystallized as an image when it was quoted by the anti-Ismā‘īlīs.

On the other hand, differences appear between the texts of *‘ahd*. Abū Muḥammad mentions that the *mustajīb* should be sworn in the name of God and His scriptures and proclaims his freedom from the obligations which were given to Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān, as well as his desertion of Ṭalḥa, al-Zubayr, ‘Ā’isha and everybody following them. This sentence, as a part of the *‘ahd*, is not mentioned in

¹ Al-Baghdādī adds also unwillingly. Cf. Farq, 303.

² See also, Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, *al-‘Ālim wa al-Ghulām*, 23.

³ Cf. Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 459, when he said:

جمعه هو ومن رغب كرهته إلى موضع حال خفي.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*

another work by Ismā‘īlī or non-Ismā‘īlī author. But Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman in **al-Kashf** mentions their names, by using symbols, as “heads of the evil” (*ru‘ūs al-sharr*).¹ Abū Muḥammad is the only one among the anti-Ismā‘īlī authors who mentions the Ismā‘īlīs and calls them “the covenantors” (*al-mu‘ahidūn*).² It has
5 already been noted that the word “*mu‘ahidūn*” was used as a label by which the Yemeni Ismā‘īlīs identified themselves.³ Accordingly, one can suggest that Abū Muḥammad probably is referring to a Yemeni Ismā‘īlī book when he quotes their oath.

The Religious Hierarchy of the Ismā‘īlī *Da‘wa*

10 It should be noted that the titles and the ranks of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs* have been changed during the history of the Ismā‘īlīs according to the circumstances of the region and the time of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*.⁴ One can notice the differences in the early Ismā‘īlī works; for example, the early Fatimid thinker, Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman mentions in **al-Kashf** some titles which are not used in the next stage of the Fatimid
15 *da‘wa*. Ranks, such as the *kālī* and the *raqīb*,⁵ are not mentioned by the next generation of the Ismā‘īlī *dā‘īs*. According to Ghālib, the editor of **al-Kashf**, these ranks occurred during the period of the concealment (*dawr al-satr*) of the hidden Imāms after Muḥammad ibn Isma‘īl as the titles of the chief *dā‘ī*, and perhaps the *raqīb* was the old position of the wing (*janāḥ*).⁶ However, Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman in **al-**
20 **Shawāhid wa al-Bayān** and **al-Ridā‘ fī al-Bāṭin** mentions seven ranks of the Ismā‘īlī religious hierarchy (*ḥudūd al-Dīn*) as the ranks of the *da‘wa*, which are the Imām, the Proof, the Absorber (*dhū al-miṣṣa*),⁷ the Gate, the *Dā‘ī*, the disputatious (*mukālib* or

¹ Cf. Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, **al-Kashf**, 30, 36, 39-40, 46-50, 67-71, 79 & 115-6. See also, Sarā‘ir wa Asrār al-Nuṭaqā’, 45-6.

² See below, 371, 508.

³ Cf. Rasā‘il al-Qummī, in Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, appendix 6, 311.

⁴ Cf. Ghālib, **Tārīkh al-Da‘wa al-Ismā‘īliyya**, 34-7.

⁵ Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, **al-Kashf**, 27.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ See below; *dhū al-imiṣṣa*, 343.

mukallib)¹ and the Believer.² If one adds to them the speaking-prophet (*nāṭiq*)³ and the foundation (*asās*),⁴ there exist nine ranks.

Al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān, the contemporary of Ibn Maṣū‘ al-Yaman, mentions seven *ḥudūd al-Dīn* in his *Asās al-Ta’wīl*,⁵ and they are: the *naṭiq*, the *asās*, the
5 Imām, the Proof (*ḥujja*), the Adjunct (*lāḥiq*), the Wing (*janāḥ*) and the Respondent (*mustajīb*). In fact, al-Nu‘mān also mentions in the same book, but in different places some other *dā‘īs* titles, such as *dā‘ī* and *ma‘dhūn*.⁶ Therefore, the completed Ismā‘īlī ranks of the *da‘wa* is nine.

In his works, al-Sijjistanī shows the hierarchy of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* of his time.
10 He gives more details about the *ḥudūd al-Dīn*, and classifies them into ten ranks as follows:⁷

1. Speaking-prophet (*nāṭiq*) who also called God’s messenger (*rasūl*).
2. Executor (*waṣī*), also called foundation (*asās*) and adjunct (*lāḥiq*).
3. Imām, also called “consummate” (*mutimm*).
- 15 4. Proof (*ḥujja*), also called “adjunct” (*lāḥiq*).
5. Hand, who is the assistant of the *lāḥiq*, sometimes called “the absorber” (*dhū al-imiṣāṣ*).
6. *Dā‘ī*, who is also called “the wing” (*janāḥ*).
7. Absolute licentiate (*ma‘dhūn muṭlaq*).
- 20 8. Limited licentiate (*ma‘dhūn maḥdūd*).
9. Believer (*mu‘min*).
10. Respondent (*mustajīb*).

¹ Also called *mukāsir*, who is later called the limited licentiate (*ma‘dhūn muḥdūd*), see below, 344-5. Also, cf. Nu‘mān, *Ta’wīl al-Da‘ā‘im*, ed. M. A‘zamī, i, 21-2.

² Cf. H. al-Fiqqī, *al-Ta’wīl*, i, 53.

³ About the meaning of “*naṭiq*”, see above, 59, 117.

⁴ See; 117, 373.

⁵ Ed. ‘A. Tāmir, Beirut 1960.

⁶ See for exmple, *Ta’wīl al-Da‘ā‘im*, i, 98 & 136.

⁷ Sijjistanī, *Tuḥfa*, ed. ‘A. Tāmir, in *Thalāth Rasā’il Ismā‘īliyya*, 17-20, *Iftikhār*, 61-4, 65-9, 70-4 & *Sullam*, fols. 33-4.

In *Rāḥat al-‘Aql*,¹ al-Kirmānī gives more details about the function of each rank of the “terrestrial hierarchy” (*ḥudūd suflīyya*), comparing them with what is called the ten intellectual and spiritual ranks, or the so-called celestial hierarchy (*ḥudūd ‘ulwiyya*). According to al-Kirmānī, the first three are the superior terrestrial ranks (*al-marātib al-kulliyya*), i.e., *nāṭiq*, *waṣī* and Imām, which should be perfect and lead the other seven. He puts them in the following order:

1. *Nāṭiq*, who announces God’s message and proclaims the outward revelation (*tanzīl*).
2. *Asās*, who succeeds the *nāṭiq*, imparts the *bāṭin*, and in turn is succeeded by a series of seven Imāms.
3. Imām, who can lead the Islamic Community (*umma*), and rule the Muslims within the teachings of the *nāṭiq* and the *asās*. Practically, he has the religious and political authority.

Al-Kirmānī then mentions the rest of the *ḥudūd* as affiliated ranks (*marātib tābi‘a*) to the superiors. It should be noted that al-Kirmānī has a different classification of ranks from the other Ismā‘īlī writers. This may support the view that the affiliated ranks were changeable according to the circumstances.² According to what is mentioned in *Rāḥat al-‘Aql*,³ the following seven affiliated ranks of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*, which they begin with the fourth rank following the three ranks discussed above, are:

1. Gate (*bāb*): the head teacher in the *da‘wa* who is authorized by the Imām to prepare the way of understanding the *bāṭin* and decide the meaning of the divine discourse (*faṣl al-khiṭāb*).
2. Proof (*ḥujja*): the supervisor of the *dā‘īs* and the head of the administration of the *da‘wa* in one of the Ismā‘īlī *jazā‘ir*.⁴

¹Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-‘Aql*, 252-4.

² Cf. Sijistānī, *Tuḥfa*, 17-8. Ḥāmidī, *Kanz al-Walad*, 93, 98. See also; Ghālib (ed.), *Yanābī‘*, 17 & *al-Ḥarakāt*, 116-7. Walker (ed.), *The wellsprings*, 116-7.

³ Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-‘Aql*, 254.

⁴ *Jazā‘ir* is a plural of *jazīra*, see above, 58 and 124. See also, EI², ii, 523.

3. *Dā'ī* of the Message (*dā'ī al-balāgh*): in charge of dialectical and eschatological teaching.
4. Absolute *dā'ī* (*dā'ī muṭlaq*): in charge of acquainting the believers with the *ḥudūd* and teaching them the *ta'wīl* within the theoretical worship.
5. Limited *dā'ī* (*dā'ī maḥdūd* or *maḥṣūr*): responsible for teaching the believers the practical worship which is based on the exoteric meaning of *sharī'a* (*zāhir*).
6. Absolute licentiate (*ma'dhūn muṭlaq*): receives the *'ahd* from the *mustajībūn* and teaches them the preliminaries and general knowledge of the *Ismā'īlī da'wa*.
7. Limited licentiate (*ma'dhūn muḥdūd* or *maḥṣūr*, also called *mukāsir* and *mukālib*): attracts the *mustajībūn* to join the *Ismā'īlī da'wa* by asking people very bright, or sometimes very confusing questions, to dumbfound the non-*Ismā'īlīs*.

The *Ismā'īlī da'wa* in Yemen had minor differences from the above mentioned hierarchy. According to **Kanz al-Walad**, al-Ḥāmidī first mentions the *ḥudūd* in the time of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq when he quotes a part from Abū Tammām's¹ *qaṣīda* that says:²

حتى يصير "عالماً" نجيباً	يكون في الأول "مستجيباً"
لمن به من حيرة الشك اهتدى	ثم يصير "داعياً" ومرشداً
قد جعل العلم له مباحاً	ثم يصير بعده "جناحاً"
موفقاً في أمره مسدداً	ثم يصير "لاحقاً" مؤيداً

¹ Nothing definite is mentioned about Abū Tammām by the sources. In his **Ṣulayḥiyyūn**, Ḥ. Hamdānī was mistaken, and probably he misleads his reader, where he states (cf., 289, f.n. 6) that Abū Tammām was a contemporary of 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Walīd who died in 612/1215. It appears that Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī (d. 557/1162) in his **Kanz al-Walad** (203) mentions the *kunya* of Abū Tammām as "Abū al-Tamām", and then he refers to his poem. Cf. Poonawala, **Biobibliography**, 132. It should be noted that Abū Muḥammad points out in his **Mukhtaṣar** (593) that Abū Tammām is an *Ismā'īlī dā'ī*, not Abū Tammām the famous poet, i.e., Ḥabīb ibn Aws ibn al-Ḥārith ibn Qays ibn al-Ashajj al-Ṭā'ī, who died about 231-2/846-7. Cf. Ṣulī, **Akhbār Abī Tammām**, ed. K. 'Asākir, M. 'Azzām and N. al-Hindī, Cairo 1837, 59. Iṣfahānī, **al-Aghānī**, xvi, 303. Baghdādī (al-Khaṭīb), **Tārīkh Baghdād**, viii, 248. Ibn Khallikān, **Wafayāt**, ii, 11.

² Ḥāmidī, **Kanz al-Walad**, 203.

مقدساً مؤيداً تماماً

ثم يكون بعده "إماماً"

من حدّه العالم الكثيف

لأنّه يأخذ باللطيف

This poem shows the stages that the shiite person should progress by steps to reach the title of the *mustajīb*, *‘ālim*,¹ *dā‘ī*, *janāḥ*, *lāḥiq*, and then becomes an Imām. The poem may lead to the confusion, however, it is related to Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, which means that either the poem reflects the successive steps of the Imām alone until he reached the rank of the Imāmate, or improbably, the word "Imām" here means "leader". Retrospective attribution to Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq is the third, and most likely probability.

Then al-Ḥāmidī mentions another classification for the hierarchy of the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa* which is based on al-Sijistānī’s *al-Bishārāt*.² It should be noted that al-Sijistānī has always given different classifications of the hierarchy in his works.³ In *al-Bishārāt*, al-Sijistānī mentions the titles of the terrestrial hierarchy within seven ranks beginning with the *mustajīb*, up to "the perspicacious" (*mustabṣir*),⁴ "the diligent" (*mujtahid*), "the adjunct" (*lāḥiq*), the *ḥujja*, the Imām, and ending the list with the Prophet as the highest rank in the terrestrial ranks.⁵

Al-Ḥāmidī explains that in the time of concealment (*dawr al-satr*), when the Imām hid himself from his enemies, it was necessary for three of the members of the terrestrial hierarchy of the *Ismā‘īlī da‘wa* (*ḥudūd suflīyya*) to be present and practice their duties, namely the limited *ma’dhūn*, the absolute *ma’dhūn* and the absolute *dā‘ī*.⁶ In other words, there is no *dā‘wa* in the absence of these three *ḥudūd*.⁷

¹ Probably it is the same rank as *mu‘min* (q.v.).

² *Ibid.*, the book, which is also called *al-Bishāra*, has not been found yet, and it is mentioned in al-Sijistānī’s *Iftikhār*, 82 & 88.

³ Cf. Sijistānī, *Tuḥfa*, 17-20, *Iftikhār*, 61-4, 65-9, 70-4 & *Sullam*, fols. 33-4.

⁴ It is most likely that the rank is the same rank as the believer "*mu‘min*". Cf. Sijistānī, *Tuḥfa*, 19.

⁵ Ḥāmidī, *Kanz al-Walad*, 259.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 267.

⁷ It should be noted that al-Ḥāmidī expresses his belief which is based on the *Musta‘lī-Ṭayyibī* doctrine while the *Nizārīs* have not held such a belief because their Imām has been always present.

Accordingly, it appears that the titles of the *ḥudūd* and their duties are changeable at the time of *taqiyya* as a result of the possibility of any danger which might threaten the *da‘wa* or the Imām. It seems, however, that al-Ḥāmidī follows al-Kirmānī with the definite ranks of the members of the terrestrial hierarchy of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*. It seems also that ‘Alī ibn al-Walīd and his successor ‘Alī ibn Ḥanẓala al-Wādī‘ī (d. 626/1229),¹ the Yemeni Musta‘lī-Ṭayyibī Absolute *dā‘īs*, followed al-Ḥāmidī in his classification of the hierarchy of the *dāwa*.²

Abū Muḥammad classifies the *ḥudūd* according to what is mentioned in the Ismā‘īlī books,³ although even the early Ismā‘īlī sources do not agree with each other.⁴ It seems that Abū Muḥammad is accurate in the way in which he copies information about the ranks of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*. He devotes a chapter of **Mukhtaṣar** to their titles. Firstly, he mentions some of the Ismā‘īlī terms, which are, according to Ismā‘īlī belief, the celestial hierarchy of the *da‘wa*, i.e., a higher and spiritual form of beings, corresponding to the physical beings, that is the terrestrial hierarchy. Within seven ranks, Abū Muḥammad names the ranks of the celestial hierarchy according to what is mentioned in some Ismā‘īlī works, as follows:-⁵

وهذه تسمية ألقابهم التي رسموها لبناء دعوتهم مفسرة:

¹ Ivanow, *Guide*, 59-60 & *Ismā‘īlī Literature*, 74-5. Brockelmann, *GAL.*, i, 716. Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, 291. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 379-80. Poonawala, *Biobibliography*, 162. Daftary, *The Ismā‘īlīs*, 289.

² Cf. Ibn al-Walīd, *al-Dhakhīra fī al-Ḥaqīqa*, ed. M. A‘zamī, Beirut 1971, 76-81. Wādī‘ī, *Simṭ al-Ḥaqā‘iq*, ed. ‘A. ‘Azzāwī, Damascus 1953, 41 & 45-6 & *Ḍiyā’ al-Ḥulūm wa Miṣbāḥ al-‘Ulūm*, ed. M. Ghālib within *Arba‘ Kutub Ḥaqqāniyya*, 88, 92-3, 95 & 98-9.

³ Cf. Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, *al-Kashf*, 120-1. Nu‘mān, *Ta’wīl al-Da‘ā’im*, i, 136, 214. Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-‘Aql*, 249-56. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 34-7 & *Yanābī‘*, 137. See also, Ghālib, *al-Ḥarakāt al-Bāṭiniyya*, 121-2 & *A‘lām*, 23-8.

⁴ For more details, see; Ḥ. al-Fiqqī, *al-Ta’wīl: Ususuḥu wa Ma‘ānih fī al-Madḥhab al-Ismā‘īlī*, 57-60.

⁵ See below; Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 466-7.

فأولها الكلمة،^١ وهي الأمر.^٢ والأصلين،^٣ وهما عندهم العقل والنفس. والسابق،
وهو القلم.^٤ والتالي، وهو اللوح.^٥ والجدد، وهو البخت. والفتح، وهو وزير البخت.
والخيال، وهو ما يتخيل للأنبياء في أممهم.

Abū Muḥammad is mistaken when he reckons the celestial *hudūd* are eight. He
5 considers that they are:

1. The logos (*al-kalima*), which is the Command of God (*al-amr*).
- 2 and 3. The first two principles (*al-aṣḥayn*), i.e., the intellect and the soul.
4. The Preceder (*al-sābiq*), which is the pen.
5. The Follower (*al-tālī*), which is the Tablet (*al-lawḥ*).
- 10 6. Good Fortune (*jadd*).
7. Inspiration (*fath*).⁶
8. Imagination (*khayāl*).

Abū Muḥammad's mistake arises because he does not know that "the preceder"
(*al-sābiq*) and "the follower" (*al-tālī*) are other descriptions which were attributed to
15 the intellect and the soul. According to the Ismā'īlī cosmological doctrines,⁷ the
celestial *hudūd* are six: *amr*, *aql*, *nafs*, *jadd*, *fath*, *khayāl*. It was through the *amr* of

¹ i.e., "logos" or the divine word of God. Cf. Bustī, *Min Kashf*, 4a.

² Specifically the divine command or God's volition.

³ They are also called "the first two principles" الأصلان الأولان. Cf. Daftary, *The Ismā'īlīs*, 243.

⁴ It is also called "the throne" العرش. Sijistānī, *Tuḥfa*, 13.

⁵ It is also called "the chair" or "the pedestal" الكرسي. Cf. *ibid.*, 14. Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-ʿAql*, 221.

⁶ It should be noted that modern scholars have translated *fath* as "conquest". According to al-Sijistānī's *Tuḥfa* (15), *fath* means *bayān* which is translated as "explanation" or "evidence".

⁷ See for example, Ibn Maṣṣūr al-Yaman, *al-Kashf*, 56-62. Nu'mān, *al-Risāla al-Mudhhiba*, 111-24. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 39-56 & *Tuḥfa*, 13-6. Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-ʿAql*, 236-57. ʿAbdān (?), *Shajarat al-Yaqīn*, 144. Ṣurī, *Qaṣida*, 29-32. Shīrāzī, *Dawḥa*, ed. ʿA. Tāmīr within *Thalāth Rasāʾil*, 48-9. Also see, Stern, *Studies*, 19-25. Netton, *Allāh Transcendent*, 204-43. Walker, *Early philosophical Shiism*, 83-101. Daftary, *The Ismā'īlīs*, 241-3.

God that a light was created and called *kūnī*, that is the intellect.¹ By *kūnī* God brought to being all things when He commanded the first origin (*al-aṣl al-ʿawwal*), i.e., the intellect,² to create from itself a vizier to help *kūnī* to carry out God's command. Accordingly, *qadar* was created to be the second origin (*al-aṣl al-thānī*) which is "the soul" (*al-nafs*).³ Thus, *kūnī-qadar* is in fact fate and the divine decree, and through them God created beings and determined their fate.⁴ Then, *jadd*, *fath* and *khayāl*, which are issued from the two principles as emanations (*inbi ʿāthāt*) are the spiritual power mediating between the spiritual and the physical worlds, and identified with Gabriel, Michael and Seraphiel, the three angels who have specific functions vis-a-vis the prophet.⁵

However, Abū Muḥammad explains correctly what the *Ismāʿīlīs* mean when they mention their invented names for the celestial and terrestrial *hudūd*. He gives more details in a chapter which is entitled "the Disclosure of their Appellations" (*alqāb*), where he says:⁶

باب في كشف ألقابهم:

التي^٧ رسموها لبيان دعوتهم، تشكيكاً منهم على الأغمار والأغبياء، حتى

يخرجوا إلى الزندقة، ولم يؤتوا إلا من قبل الغباوة:

اعلم -أيديك الله- أن الكلمة التي ذكروها "الأمر".

¹ Cf. 'A. Tāmīr (ed.), *Rasā'il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā "Les Épîtres des Frères de la Pureté"*, v, 23.

² It is also called "the Preceder" (*al-sābiq*), "the first intellect" (*al-ʿaql al-awwal*), "the pen", "the Pedestal" (*al-kursī*) and "the sun". Nu'mān, *al-Risāla al-Mudhhiba*, 111. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 39-41 & *Tuḥfa*, 13-4. Kirmānī, *al-Riyāḍ*, 85-6. Ṣūrī, *Qaṣīda*, ed. 'A. Tāmīr, Beirut 1952, 31-2.

³ Also called "the second" (*al-thānī*), "the follower" (*al-tālī*), "the tablet" (*al-lawḥ*), "the throne" (*al-ʿarsh*) and "the moon". Nu'mān, *al-Risāla al-Mudhhiba*, 111. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 39-41 & *Tuḥfa*, 13-4. Kirmānī, *al-Riyāḍ*, 85-6. Ṣūrī, *Qaṣīda*, 31-3.

⁴ Sijistānī, *Tuḥfa*, 14. Cf. Stern, *Studies*, 8-9. Netton, *Allāh Transcendent*, 205-7.

⁵ Sijistānī, *op. cit.*, 11-16. See also, Daftary, *The Ismāʿīlīs*, 242-4.

⁶ See below; Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 476-88. In the following passage, Abū Muḥammad relies on *al-Iftikhār*, cf., 40-56.

⁷ MS. الذي .

قالوا:

وهي علة الخلق، والأصلين "العقل والنفس".

قالوا:

فبالعقل عقل الله تعالى الخليقة، وبالنفس تنفست حتى بلغت مبلغها.

5 وزعموا أنها على سبع قوى: ^١ النامية، والحسية، والناطقية، والعاقلة،

والقدسية، والعالمة، والغاشية. وهي بزعمهم النفس الكلية التي تغشوا حركتها بهذه

الأبدان التركيبية.

قالوا:

ولا تتم صورة إلا باجتماع هذه الأنفس الثلاثة، التي هي النامية

10

والحسية والناطقية.

قالوا:

فأما العالمة، فإن انبعاث العقل [الثاني] ^٢ منها، والنفس متولدة منه.

قالوا:

فبالعقل عقل الله تعالى الخليقة، وبالنفس تنفست حتى بلغت مبلغها.

¹ i.e., the soul.

² The second intellect (*al-ʿaql al-thānī*). Cf. Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-ʿAql*, 241-4.

قالوا: ذلك أرى تولد منه الحيوان فإن ازداد قسماً قسماً تولد منه الإنسان وهو

فيتولد من النفس حركة وهمية وهي "الهيولى"، جوهر لا صورة له،

فيولد من الهيولى سكون وهمي.

قالوا: والأشياء الأسيية عندهم سبعة أنواع: نوع منها "أزواج الطبيعة" التي

وهو الصورة. فيولد من الحركة الوهمية: الحرارة واليبوسة. ويولد من 5

السكون الوهمي: البرودة، ثم يولد منها الرطوبة. النوع "التي تقدم ذكرها،

قالوا: "النسب" "التوليدات الجسدية"، والسابع "التوليدات الروحية"

ثم يولد من الكلّ الكيفيات الأربع، التي هي الاستقصات: النار

والهواء¹ والماء والتراب، وهي الأمهات أيضاً.

10 وقالوا:

والآباء الأفلاك.

قالوا:

فإذا امتزجت هذه الأمهات على الاعتدال الناقص، حدث عنها المعادن.

فإذا ازداد قربها من الاعتدال صرفته التضاد منها وتولد منها النبات. فإذا

¹ MS. الهوى.

ازداد ذلك قرباً تولد منه الحيوان. فإن ازداد ذلك قرباً تولد منه الإنسان، وهو

آخر الأشياء عندهم.

قالوا:

والأشياء الأصلية عندهم سبعة أنواع: نوع منها "أرباع الطبيعة"؛ التي

5 هي الصفراء والسوداء والدم والبلغم، والثاني "عناصرها"، والثالث "عالمها"،

والرابع "القبل والبعء"، والخامس "الأمهات الأربع" التي تقدم ذكرها،

والسادس "المتولدات الجسمية"، والسابع "المتولدات الروحانية".

وزعموا أن الكل ينقسم إلى شيئين: "لطيف وكثيف"، فاللطيف ما ليس

بجسم، وهو الجوهر، والكثيف ما هو جسم، وهو العرض. ولهم في ذلك حماقات

10 شنيعة وجهالات فظيعة، زبدتها القول بقدم العالم وكونه من غير صانع. وهذا باطل

يبطله قوله تعالى: ﴿إِنَّمَا قَوْلُنَا لِشَيْءٍ إِذَا أَرَدْنَا أَنْ نَقُولَ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ﴾¹، وقال

تعالى: ﴿اللَّهُ خَالِقُ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَهُوَ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَكِيلٌ﴾²، وقال: ﴿هُوَ اللَّهُ الْخَالِقُ

الْبَارِيءُ الْمَصُورُ لَهُ الْأَسْمَاءُ الْحُسْنَىٰ يُسَبِّحُ لَهُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَهُوَ الْعَزِيزُ

¹ Qur'ān: 40/16.

² Qur'ān: 62/39.

الْحَكِيمُ ﴿١﴾، فبان بهذا أَنَّ العالم مُحَدَّث، خَلَقَ له، لا خالق له غيره سبحانه وتعالى

عما يصفه الظالمون علوًّا كبيرًا.

نرجع إلى ما كنا فيه من قولهم، قالوا:

فانبجس من هذين الأصليين، الذين هما العقل والنفس، الحروف السبعة

5 العلوية التي ذكروها، أَنَّ تحتها رموزات نفيسة وكلمات عقلية وهي "كوني

قدر". وتفسير معناهم بها يأتي بموضعه فيما بعد إن شاء الله تعالى.

هذا كشف قولهم في السابق والتالي: فَإِنَّهُمَا عندهم القلم واللوح.

قالوا^٢ في كتاب الافتخار:

إِنَّ الله تَأَيَّسَ تَأَيِّسًا لا مِنْ أَيَّسَ قَبْلَهُ،^٣ فتولد من ذلك التأييس:^٤

10 "كن"، يريدون أنه تفكر فكرة، فظهر من فكرته "كن" من غير كلام.

وكذا قال أبو حاتم^٥ صاحب كتاب الإصلاح:

وسألت رحمك الله تعالى عن أمر الله تعالى "كن" كيف كان، بنطق أو

بغير نطق؟ فاعلم أيديك الله أنه بغير نطق، بل تَأَيَّسَ تَأَيِّسًا فتولد منه "كن".

¹ Qur'ān: 24/59.

² i.e., al-Sijistānī.

³ The sentence is erroneously written as تانس تأيسا لا من أنيس . Cf. Sijistanī, *Iftikhār*, 35-6.

⁴ MS. التأيس .

⁵ Abū Hātim Aḥmad ibn Ḥamdān al-Rāzī (d. 322/934). See above, 113, 121-2.

⁶ MS. تانس تأيسا .

يريدون أنه سبحانه غير متكلم، وكلامهم هذا خلاف قوله: ﴿إِنَّمَا أَمْرُهُ إِذَا

أَرَادَ شَيْئًا أَنْ يَقُولَ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ﴾^١، فذكر القول ههنا، والقول لا يكون إلا كلامًا

بصوت وحرَف. وقال في قصة موسى: ﴿وَنَادَيْنَاهُ مِنْ جَانِبِ الطُّورِ الْأَيْمَنِ وَقَرَّبْنَاهُ

نَجِيًّا﴾^٢، والنداء لا يكون إلا كلامًا بصوت وحرَف أيضًا. وقال: ﴿وَكَلَّمَ اللَّهُ مُوسَى

تَكْلِيمًا﴾^٣، فوكَّد بالمصدر معنى الكلام، ونفى عنه المجاز، فيكون تأييسًا؛ كما

ذكروا. وقال: ﴿[قَالَ] يَا مُوسَى إِنِّي اصْطَفَيْتُكَ عَلَى النَّاسِ بِرِسَالَاتِي وَبِكَلَامِي فَخُذْ

مَا آتَيْتُكَ وَكُنْ مِنَ الشَّاكِرِينَ﴾^٤، وقال: ﴿فَلَمَّا أَتَاهَا نُودِيَ مِنْ شَاطِئِئِ الْوَادِ الْأَيْمَنِ

مِنَ الْبُقْعَةِ الْمُبَارَكَةِ مِنَ الشَّجَرَةِ أَنْ يَا مُوسَى إِنِّي أَنَا اللَّهُ رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ * وَأَنْ أَلْقِ

عَصَاكَ...﴾^٥، وهذا كلام من غير تأييس^٦ كما ذكروا. ومع هذا فإن الله تعالى ذم

الأبكم من خلقه بقوله: ﴿صُمُّ بُكْمٌ عُمِّي فَهُمْ لَا يَعْقلُونَ﴾^٧. فكيف يذم شيء يكون

مثله، تعالى عن قولهم وإفكهم علوًا كبيرًا. بل هو الحي القيوم المتكلم السميع البصير

بلا كيف. ومن أعجب ما قالوا، وإن كان كل قولهم عجبًا:

¹ Qur'ān: 82/36.

² Qur'ān: 52/19.

³ Qur'ān: 164/4.

⁴ MS. تائيسا .

⁵ Qur'ān: 144/7.

⁶ Qur'ān: 30-1/28.

⁷ MS. تائيس .

⁸ Qur'ān: 171/2.

إنَّ الملائكة لا ينزلون على الأنبياء، ولا يكلمونهم بحرف وصوت.

قالوا:

لأنَّ الملكُ روحاني ولا صوت له، وإنما ينزل من الله تعالى على قلوب

الأنبياء - صلوات الله عليهم - إضافات علمية فيها مصلحة ذلك الدَّور وتمام

5 شريعة صاحب عصره، لا إنَّه يرسل إليهم ملائكة يكلمونهم.

وهذا الذي ذكره تأويلُ ظاهر الفساد، لأنَّه يؤدي إلى أن القرآن ما أنزل

بحرفٍ وصوتٍ، بل إلهامُ ألهمه الله تعالى الرسول - صلى الله عليه وسلم - والرسولُ

ينطقُ به. وهذا خلاف قوله تعالى: ﴿وَمَا تَنْزَلَتْ بِهِ الشَّيَاطِينُ * وَمَا يَنْبَغِي لَهُمْ وَمَا

يَسْتَطِيعُونَ * إِنَّهُمْ عَنِ السَّمْعِ لَمْعَزُولُونَ﴾¹، فذكر سبحانه وتعالى [بأنهم] عن أن

10 يسمعه في السماء لمعزولون. فلو كان إلهامًا، كما ذكره المخالف، لما ذكر السمع.

وقال أيضًا: ﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ سَبْعَ سَمَاوَاتٍ وَمِنَ الْأَرْضِ مِثْلَهُنَّ يَتَنَزَّلُ الْأَمْرُ بَيْنَهُنَّ

لِتَعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ وَأَنَّ اللَّهَ قَدْ أَحَاطَ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عِلْمًا﴾²، فذكر

سبحانه أن الأمر يتنزل بينهن. وقال أيضًا: ﴿فَلَا أُقْسِمُ بِمَا تُبْصَرُونَ وَمَا لَا تُبْصَرُونَ

أَنَّهُ لَقَوْلِ رَسُولٍ كَرِيمٍ﴾³، يعني جبرائيل - عليه السلام -، ﴿وَمَا هُوَ بِقَوْلِ شَاعِرٍ

¹ Qur'ān: 210-2/26.

² Qur'ān: 12/65.

³ Qur'ān: 38-40/69.

قَلِيلًا مَا تُؤْمِنُونَ * وَلَا بِقَوْلِ كَاهِنٍ قَلِيلًا مَا تَذَكَّرُونَ * تَنْزِيلٌ مِنْ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ ﴿١﴾،

نزل به بحرفٍ وصوتٍ، لا إلهامًا كما ذكروه. وقال: ﴿يُدَبِّرُ الْأَمْرَ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ إِلَى

الْأَرْضِ ثُمَّ يَعْرُجُ إِلَيْهِ فِي يَوْمٍ كَانَ مِقْدَارُهُ أَلْفَ سَنَةٍ مِمَّا تَعُدُّونَ﴾،^٢ فلو كان إلهامًا لما

ذكر هذه المدة. وكيف يثبت محالهم^٣ عند من له عقل: "أَنَّ الْمَلَكَ لَا يَتَكَلَّمُ لِأَنَّهُ

روحاني"، والله تعالى يقول في قصة مريم: ﴿وَاذكُرْ فِي الْكِتَابِ مَرْيَمَ إِذِ انْتَبَذَتْ مِنْ

أَهْلِهَا مَكَانًا شَرْقِيًّا * فَاتَّخَذَتْ مِنْ دُونِهِمْ حِجَابًا فَأَرْسَلْنَا إِلَيْهَا رُوحَنَا فَتَمَثَّلَ لَهَا

بَشَرًا سَوِيًّا * قَالَتْ إِنِّي أَعُوذُ بِالرَّحْمَنِ مِنْكَ إِنْ كُنْتَ تَقِيًّا * قَالَ إِنَّمَا أَنَا رَسُولُ

رَبِّكَ لِأَهَبَ لَكَ غُلَامًا زَكِيًّا﴾،^٤ أفليس قد تكلم إليها الملك بصوتٍ وحرفٍ وأعدت

جوابه. أم كيف نتخطى بهم قوله سبحانه وتعالى: ﴿هُنَالِكَ دَعَا زَكَرِيَّا رَبَّهُ قَالَ رَبِّ

هَبْ لِي مِنْ لَدُنْكَ ذُرِّيَّةً طَيِّبَةً إِنَّكَ سَمِيعُ الدُّعَاءِ * فَنَادَتْهُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ وَهُوَ قَائِمٌ يُصَلِّي

فِي الْمِحْرَابِ أَنَّ اللَّهَ يُبَشِّرُكَ بِيحْيَى مُصَدِّقًا بِكَلِمَةٍ مِنَ اللَّهِ وَسَيِّدًا وَحَصُورًا وَنَبِيًّا مِنْ

الصَّالِحِينَ﴾،^٥ أفليس قد نادته الملائكة بصوتٍ وحرفٍ؟ وقال في قصة إبراهيم -صلى

الله عليه وسلم-: ﴿وَلَقَدْ جَاءَتْ رُسُلُنَا إِبْرَاهِيمَ بِالْبُشْرَى قَالُوا سَلَامًا قَالَ سَلَامٌ فَمَا

¹ Qur'ān: 41-3/69.

² Qur'ān: 5/32.

³ sic., it can be also read as مقالهم .

⁴ Qur'ān: 16-9/19.

⁵ Qur'ān: 38-9/3.

لَبِثَ أَنْ جَاءَ بِعِجْلٍ حَنِينٍ * فَلَمَّا رَأَى أَيْدِيَهُمْ لَا تَصِلُ إِلَيْهِ نَكَرَهُمْ وَأَوْجَسَ مِنْهُمْ

خِيفَةً...﴿١﴾، أي خافهم حيث لم يأكلوا طعامه، لأن الملائكة لا تأكل ولا تشرب،

﴿قَالُوا لَا تَخَفْ إِنَّا أُرْسِلْنَا إِلَى قَوْمٍ لُوطٍ﴾،^٢ أفليس هذا كلام بصوت وحرف؟ لا

ينكر هذا إلا مارق كافر. وفي القرآن من ذكر مثل هذا كثير، وفيما ذكرته كفاية لمن

5 وفقه الله تعالى ونصره بعين الرُّشْدِ.

ثم نرجع إلى ما كنا عليه من قولهم في "كن" فنقول:

قالوا:

فلما تفكر هذه الفكرة، وظهر منها "كن"، علمنا أن الكتاب "الكاف" هو

السابق "والنون" هو التالي، يعنون "القلم واللوح".

قالوا:

وهم زوج زوج، وذلك أن النون مركبة عليه، ويريدون هكذا "كن".

قالوا:

ولأنَّ القلم مفيد غير مستفيد واللوح مستفيد غير مفيد فالأول علة والآخر

معلول.

¹ Qur'ān: 69-70/11.

² Qur'ān: 70/11.

قالوا:

فضوعفت الكاف والنون فصارتا "كوني قدر" "فكوني" مؤنثة، "وقدر"

مذكر، وهي السبعة الأحرف التي ذكروا تحتها علوماً عقلية، وفوائد حكمية.¹

قالوا:

5 فخلق القلم العالم بواسطة اللوح لأنَّ الصُّورَ تظهر عليه مفصَّلة.

قالوا:

وبهذا قال الله تعالى: ﴿...كُلُّ شَيْءٍ خَلَقْنَاهُ بِقَدَرٍ﴾²، وهما عندهما

قديمان لا أوَّل لوجودهما من حيث الزمان. قالوا فـ[الـ]أـ وُل لا يوصف

بوجود ولا بعدم، [و]لا نهاية له. وهذا يؤدي أنهما عندهم إلهان قديمان.

ومنهم من قال:

10

السابق وجه الله، وعين الله، ويد الله، وقدم الله، وروح الله، وكلمة

الله، وحياء الله، وبهاء الله، وآيات الله، والعرش والكرسي، وغير ذلك مما

هو مذكور بالقرآن مضاف إليه كقوله: ﴿... وَلِتُصْنَعَ عَلَيَّ عَيْنِي﴾³، وكقوله:

¹ Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 48.

² Qurʾān: 49/54.

³ Qurʾān: 39/20.

﴿تَجْرِي بِأَعْيُنِنَا...﴾^١، وكقوله: ﴿...كُلُّ شَيْءٍ هَالِكٌ إِلَّا وَجْهَهُ...﴾^٢، وما

أشبه ذلك.

قالوا: ﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَاعْمَلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ لِقَدْ خَلَقَكُمْ مِنْ نَفْسِهِ فَاقْبَلُوا إِلَيْهِ﴾

ولأنَّ السابق وجهه الَّذي به عرفه من عرفه. ﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَاعْمَلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ لِقَدْ خَلَقَكُمْ مِنْ نَفْسِهِ فَاقْبَلُوا إِلَيْهِ﴾

5

قالوا:

ولهذا كل شيء مستحيل من حال إلى حال، إلا هذا السابق، ولهذا قال

الله تعالى: ﴿...كُلُّ شَيْءٍ هَالِكٌ إِلَّا وَجْهَهُ...﴾^٣، وقوله تعالى: ﴿وَيَبْقَى وَجْهُ

رَبِّكَ نُورٌ جَلِيلٌ وَإِكْرَامٌ﴾^٤؛ لأنَّه الأول بلا نهاية، والآخِر بلا غاية، وهو

الَّذي كلم موسى -عليه السلام-.

10

قالوا:

وأما الحبَّه هو التَّالي -يعنون اللُّوح لأنَّه صامت- وأما رضاه فهو القائم

صاحب القيامة والدور الجديد والرَّجعة، وسخطه ضده.

وأوغلوا في ذلك إيغالاً شديداً، ملت عن أكثره ما الله مجازيهم عليه.

¹ Qur'ān: 14/54.

² Qur'ān: 88/28.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Qur'ān: 27/55.

⁵ sic.

ثم نرجع إلى ما كنا عليه، من "كوني قدر" وحروفه السبعة، فنقول: *الرواية*

قالوا: *عن مالك بن سنان عن سفيان بن عيينة عن سفيان بن عيينة عن سفيان بن عيينة عن سفيان بن عيينة*

أنها دالة على النطق السبعة وعلى أسسهم. فأولهم آدم -صلى الله

عليه وسلم- وأساسه شيث، ونوح وأساسه سام، وإبراهيم وأساسه إسماعيل،

5 وموسى وأساسه هارون، وعيسى وأساسه شمعون، ومحمد -صلى الله عليه

وسلم- وأساسه علي، والقائم وأساسه فلان. *السنة على*

قالوا: *صاحب الزمان صاحب نور الذي تنور الدنيا على يده نوراً جديداً*

بالكاف حرف آدم، والواو حرف نوح، والنون حرف إبراهيم، والياء

حرف موسى والقاف حرف عيسى، والبدال حرف محمد -صلى الله عليه

10 وسلم، والراء حرف القائم.¹

قالوا: *والياء آخر على يدنا وهو أن في السماء سبعة كواكب، فليس*

وهو التحية الطيبة، والكلمة النامية، والنعمة الدائمة، صاحب الدور

والقيام.² والمسمى بالواقعة، والحاقة، والآزفة، والطامة، والصاخة،

والقارعة، وجنة المأوى، وسدرة المنتهى، والفاروق الأكبر، والصديق الأعظم،

¹ Abū Muḥammad explains that the letter (ر), which is the seventh letter in (كوني قدر), is an indication of al-Qā'im. Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 51.

² MS. القيمة.

والنَّفْحَةَ الكبرى، والصَّيْحَةَ العظمى. لأنَّ حرفه الراء، وبه نال الربوبية

باستغناء عن سلوك من سبقه. وصار بالأرض ومن عليها، وإليه مجازات

الأنفس، على قدر سعيها وكسبها. وهو صاحب الدور الجديد، لأنَّ حرفه

السابع ولهذا جعل الأيام سبعة. أولها أَحَدٌ وآخرها سَبْتٌ، فالأحد على آدم،

5 والاثنتين على نوح، والثلاثاء على إبراهيم، والأربعاء على موسى، والخميس

على عيسى، والجمعة على محمد -صلى الله عليه وسلم-، والسبت على

القائم صاحب الزمان. صاحب الدور الذي تدور الدنيا على يديه دوراً جديداً.

لأنَّ يومه آخر الأيام، وكذا دوره آخر الأدوار. كما تدور الأيام من الأحد إلى

السبت دوراً جديداً، كذا تدور الدنيا على يديه كما كانت أولاً، هكذا أبداً.¹

بل قالوا:

10

ودليل آخر على مذهبنا وهو: أنَّ في السماء سبعة كواكب؛ شمس وقمر

وزحل ومشتري ومريخ وزهرة وعطارد؛ وهو الذي يقال له الكاتب. والشمس

على آدم، والقمر على نوح، وزحل على إبراهيم، والمشتري على موسى،

والمريخ على عيسى، والزهرة على محمد -صلى الله عليه وسلم-، وعطارد

15

على القائم لأنه الكاتب الذي مدار الأمر والرجعة إليه.²

¹ Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 54.

² Cf. *ibid.*, 60 Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-ʿAql*, 256 & 275.

One can notice that in spite of the fact that Abū Muḥammad takes upon himself to summarize the information in his book, he expatiates upon some details which have no connection with the subject.¹ It seems that such details were mentioned in the Ismā‘īlī books which he refutes.² It also appears that when Abū Muḥammad realizes that he has deviated from the subject, he immediately stops that and turns again to the subject.³ Nevertheless, Abū Muḥammad succeeds in assembling his refutation. This can be noticed when he refutes the interpretation of *kūnī-qadar* as meaning that every letter of it refers the seven Speaking-Prophets.⁴ Abū Muḥammad simply says that the seven Speaking-Prophets are well-known to the people and they do not need an esoteric meaning of *kūnī-qadar* to be an evidence of their existence.⁵ He then continues his refutation of the Ismā‘īlī interpretation of the seven letters of *kūnī-qadar*, as follows:⁶

نرجع إلى ما كنا عليه من ذكر حماقاتهم فنقول:

وإنما اعتمدوا بذكر الأحرف السبعة دلالة على النطقاء السبعة، لتكون موافقة

لأعداد الأسابيع التي تقدم ذكرها، لتقع مكيدتهم من الجاهل على حماقتهم موقعاً،
 فيصدقهم عليها ويدخل في بدعتهم. فما أعجب أمر هؤلاء وأسخف رأيهم، وأبطل
 مقالاتهم.

After this, he deviates from the subject and refutes the Ismā‘īlī *bāṭinī-ta`wīl* of *al-qalam* and *al-lawḥ* as other names of the intellect and the soul. He explains the

¹ For example, cf. Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 490, 492-502.

² For example, cf. Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 493-6, with *Shajarat al-Yaqīn*, 60.

³ When he return to his main subject, Abū Muḥammad usually says "رجع الكلام" or "نرجع إلى ما كنا عليه". Cf. Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 432, 437, 463, 495, 509-12, 515, 524, 526, 542, 548, 550, 565, 595, 600, 612 & 654.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 491. Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 50-1.

⁵ Abū Muḥammad, *op. cit.*, 491.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 492.

meaning of *al-qalam* and *al-lawḥ* according to what is mentioned by the Prophet's *ḥadīth*. He says:¹

وبقي علينا إعلامك بما عندنا في القلم واللوح، الذين سموهما السابق والتالي،

وجعلوهما إلهين قديمين: لا غاية للأول منها، ولا نهاية للآخر أيضا. تعالى الله عما

يقول الظالمون علواً كبيراً عن أن يكون معه من لا غاية له ولا نهاية. فنقول فيهما 5

أنهما مخلوقان غير خالقين، كما روي عن ابن عباس رضي الله عنهما أنه قال:²

أول ما خلق الله تعالى من شيء "القلم" خلقه من هجاء، فقال: قلم. فتصوّر

قلماً من نور ما بين السماء إلى الأرض. ثم خلق اللوح [وجهه] من درة بيضاء وقفاه من

ياقوته حمراء. عرضه ما بين السماء إلى الأرض أعلاه لأصق بالعرش، وطرفه في حجر

ملك. فقال للقلم: اجر. قال: يا ربّ بماذا؟ قال: بما يكون إلى يوم القيامة. فلما 10

خلق الله تعالى الخلق وكلّ بهم الحفظة يحفظون عليهم أعمالهم، فإذا كان يوم

القيامة عرضت عليهم أعمالهم، وقيل: ﴿هَذَا كِتَابُنَا يَنْطِقُ عَلَيْكُمْ بِالْحَقِّ إِنَّا كُنَّا

نَسْتَنْسِخُ مَا كُنْتُمْ تَعْمَلُونَ﴾³، أي من اللوح المحفوظ، فعروض بين الكتابين فإذا هما

سواء.

¹ Ibid., 502-3.

² Cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 21647 & 21649. Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 2081 & 3241. Abū Dā'ūd, *Sunan*, no. 4078. Ibn Māja, *Sunan*, 88. Cf. *Concordance Et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane*, ed. A. J. Wensinch, Leiden, 1936, v, 465 & vi, 157.

³ Qur'ān: 29/45.

هذا ما ذهبنا إليه والله أعلم. قد كشفت لك أيّدك الله تعالى مقالتهم في السّابق

والتّالي والرّد عليهم مختصراً بقدر المعرفة، والحمد لله.

After he has presented the Ismā‘īlī belief in *jadd*, *fath* and *khayāl*, Abū Muḥammad devotes the following chapter to refuting the doctrine of the Ismā‘īlīs on the same topic.¹ He says:

فصل.

وهذا كشف مقالتهم في الجّد:

اعلم أيّدك الله أنّهم زعموا أنّ² البّخت يعطي ويمنع.

قالوا:

10 فإنّ نفرَ عن قولنا نافرأ إحتجينا عليه بقوله سبحانه وتعالى: ﴿وَأَنَّهُ تَعَالَى جَدُّ

رَبَّنَا مَا اتَّخَذَ صَاحِبَةً وَلَا وَلَدًا﴾.³ ويقول المصلّي في الصّلاة: تعالی جدّك ولا إله

غيرك. ويقولهم في الدّعاء: ولا ينفع ذا الجّد منك الجّد.

قالوا:

فعلى هذا سعادة [بعض] الأشخاص عند ميلاده فيسعده. فلا يزال يرتقي

¹ Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 503-8.

² MS. أنّه.

³ Qur’ān: 3/72.

الدرجة بعد الأخرى حتى يبلغ مرتبة الملوك، وتخضع له الرقاب ويبلغ من الهيبة والجلال المبلغ العظيم. حتى أنه ربما قد صار رباً لمن في الأرض ومدبراً لهم، يملكهم ولا يملكونه ويسوسهم ولا يسوسونه. وقد ربما لا يساعد هذا الجدّ بعض الأشخاص عند ميلاده، فيكون شقيّاً لا ناعمّاً، مملوكاً لا مالكاً، مسوساً لا سايساً، هائباً لا مهيباً.

5

هذا ما ذهبوا إليه وموهوا به، وهو يُكسر عليهم بقوله تعالى: ﴿يَا زَكَرِيَّا إِنَّا نُبَشِّرُكَ بِغُلَامٍ اسْمُهُ يَحْيَى لَمْ نَجْعَلْ لَهُ مِنْ قَبْلُ سَمِيًّا﴾^٢. فذكر سعادته من قبل أن يولد. أفساعد هذا؛ الجدّ الذي سموه، يحيى عند ميلاده؟! فبطل بهذا ما ذكره والحمد لله. وإنما الذي يُسعد ويُسقي ويُعزّز ويُذلّ الله الذي لا إله إلا هو. لأنّه يقول أعزّ من قائل: ﴿قُلِ اللَّهُمَّ مَالِكَ الْمُلْكِ تُؤْتِي الْمُلْكَ مَنْ تَشَاءُ وَتَنْزِعُ الْمُلْكَ مِمَّنْ تَشَاءُ وَتُعِزُّ مَنْ تَشَاءُ وَتُذِلُّ مَنْ تَشَاءُ بِيَدِكَ الْخَيْرُ إِنَّكَ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ﴾^٣، لا هذا البخت الذي ذكروا أنه يُسعد ويُسقي. وأما حجتهم التي احتجوا بها من قوله تعالى: ﴿وَأَنَّهُ تَعَالَىٰ جَدُّ رَبِّنَا مَا اتَّخَذَ صَاحِبَةً وَلَا وَلَدًا﴾^٤، فإنما المعني فيه تعالت

10

¹ بعد MS.

² Qur'ān: 7/19.

³ Qur'ān: 26/3.

⁴ Qur'ān: 3/72.

عظمته من أن يتخذَ صاحبة فيكون له ولد منها. لا أنْ بخت ربنا أعظم من بخت
سواه، فيكون شبيهاً بال مخلوق. وأما المعنى من قول من قال: "ولا ينفع ذا الجد منك

الجد"، فإنما عني بهذا: ولا ينفع منك صاحب القدرة والعظمة شئ من مرادك. وأما

معنى قول المصلي: "وتعالى جدك ولا إله غيرك"، فإنما أراد: وتعالى ذكرك

5 وعظمتك من أن يكون مثلها شئ، [ولم يعن] أنه: وتعالى بختك فيكون شبيها

بالمخلوقين. تعالى [الله] عن ذلك علواً كبيراً. ولا الوقتي هذا صريح ولا قسرة. وإنما

هذا قولهم في الجد الذي سموه بختا. ومن تصديقهم لذلك، وحماقاتهم فيما

هنالك، أنهم صاروا يجتهدون في تقويم الكواكب وضبط الساعات والأوقات، يترجون

بزعمهم فيها وقتاً طيباً مقابلاً بهذا البخت الذي لقبوه "جداً". فيتركون فيه مرادهم

10 لسعدهم فيها، كسفر لتجارة أو نكاح لامرأة أو لبس ثوب أو خروج لقتال عدو،

فيشملهم سعده. وإيم الله لقد كذبوا ولقد رأينا وسمعنا من ينتحل هذا الشيء بعينه،

من أنه ربما ترجى ساعة طيبة موافقة لحاجته التي يريدتها، فيقع الحال بضد

مراده. وقد ربما أدرك مراده في النادر، فاعتقد أنه من البخت الذي ترجاه وأن النجم

أعطاه. ولا والله ما أعطاه غير مالك النجم، و[قد جاء] البخت اتفاقاً لذلك الوقت.

15 ومع هذا فلو كان [المراد] كما ذكروا يُعطى من بخت أو أنه [كذلك]، لكان [المنجم]

1 . وإنما MS.

أَغْنَى النَّاسَ وَأَصَحَّهُمْ جِسْمًا مِنْ عَوَارِضِ الْأَمْرَاضِ وَالْأَسْقَامِ. وَلَا وَاللَّهِ مَا رَأَيْنَا
أَصْحَابَ هَذِهِ الصَّنَاعَةِ هَكَذَا، بَلِ [هَمْ] كَسَائِرِ النَّاسِ. وَمَعَ هَذَا فَإِنَّهُمْ فِي شُغْلِ فِكْرٍ
وَطِيحٍ سَرِّ دَائِمٍ فِي تَقْوِيمِ السَّاعَاتِ وَلِزُومِ الْأَوْقَاتِ بِزَعْمِهِمْ لِحَرَكَاتِهِمُ الَّتِي يَرِيدُونَهَا.
حَتَّى أَنْ مَنْ كَانَ مِنْهُمْ مُتَدَيِّنًا شَغَلَهُ ذَلِكَ مِنْ حُضُورِ الْجَمَاعَاتِ وَالصَّلَاةِ عَلَى
الْجَنَازَاتِ وَزِيَارَةِ الْوَالِدِينَ وَالْقَرَابَاتِ وَغَيْرِ ذَلِكَ مِنَ الطَّاعَاتِ، خَيْفَةً مِنْ أَنْ يُوَافِقَهُ
نَجْمُهُ وَوَقْتُهُ فِي حَالٍ يَكْرَهُهُ. وَمَا وَاللَّهِ لِلنَّجْمِ وَلَا لِلْوَقْتِ فِي هَذَا صَنْعٍ وَلَا قُدْرَةٍ، وَإِنَّمَا
الصُّنْعُ وَالْقُدْرَةُ لِلَّهِ تَعَالَى، لَا اعْتِرَاضَ عَلَى مَرَادِهِ وَحُكْمِهِ، لِأَنَّهُ لَمْ يَشْرِكْ فِي حُكْمِهِ
الْغَيْبِ أَحَدًا.

فصل

10 وهذا موضع كشف قولهم في الفتح إن شاء الله :

زَعَمُوا أَنْ مَرْتَبَتَهُ كَمَرْتَبَةِ الْجَدِّ سِوَاءَ، لِأَنَّهُ وَزِيرُهُ الَّذِي اسْتَنْدَ إِلَيْهِ أَمْرَ تَدْبِيرِهِ
وَسَمَوُهُ مَكَائِيلًا، لِأَنَّهُ يَفْتَحُ مَا أَوْكَاهَ هَذَا الْبَخْتُ الَّذِي لِقَبْوِهِ جَدًّا. وَاحْتَجَّوْا بِقَوْلِهِ
تَعَالَى: ﴿إِنَّا فَتَحْنَا لَكَ فَتْحًا مُبِينًا﴾^١، أَيِ اعْطَيْنَاكَ بَخْتًا عَظِيمًا. وَلَيْسَ كَذَلِكَ وَإِنَّمَا
الْمَعْنَى: ﴿إِنَّا فَتَحْنَا لَكَ فَتْحًا مُبِينًا﴾^٢، أَيِ نَصَرْنَاكَ عَلَى عَدُوِّكَ، وَلِهَذَا قَالَ اللَّهُ

¹ Qur'ān: 1/48.

² Ibid.

تعالى سبحانه: ﴿إِذَا جَاءَ نَصْرُ اللَّهِ وَالْفَتْحُ﴾^١، يعني فتح مكة. وإنما سُمِّيَ بذلك

لِعِظَمِ قَدْرِهِ لِأَنَّهُ فَتَحَ بَلَدَهُ -صلى الله عليه وسلم- ولهذا قال: ﴿فَإِنْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فَتْحٌ

مِنَ اللَّهِ...﴾^٢، أي إن كان لكم نصرٌ من الله. وقد يقال أيضاً: أَنَّهُ فَتَحَ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ

مُغْلَقٍ، بدليل قوله تعالى: ﴿...حَتَّى إِذَا جَاءُوهَا وَفُتِحَتْ أَبْوَابُهَا...﴾^٣، وقال

تعالى: ﴿فَفَتَحْنَا أَبْوَابَ السَّمَاءِ بِمَاءٍ مُنْهَمِرٍ﴾^٤. هذا هو الصحيح، لا ما ذهبوا إليه

من أَنَّهُ وزير البخت وقائم بأمر تدبيره، وَسَمَّوْهُ مَكَاثِيلًا. فافهم محالهم في ذلك أَيَّدَكَ

الله.

فصل

وأما كشف قولهم في الخيال:

10 فإنهم اختلفوا فيه، فزعم قومٌ منهم أَنَّهُ نور الله. وزعم قومٌ أَنَّهُ الَّذِي يَتَخَايَلُ

النَّبِيِّ -صلى الله عليه وسلم- مِنَ الَّذِي يَقَعُ بَعْدَهُ فِي أُمَّتِهِ عَلَى أُمَّتِهِ مِنَ الْغِيلَةِ.

ومنهم من قال: بل هو الَّذِي يَأْتِي الْأَنْبِيَاءَ عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ بِالْأَحْكَامِ الشَّرْعِيَّةِ وَالتَّأْيِيدِ

مِنَ اللَّهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ، لِأَنَّ الْمَلَائِكَةَ لَا تَأْتِيهِمْ تَكَلِّمُهُمْ بِحَرْفٍ وَصَوْتٍ. وقد تقدم الجواب

¹ Qur'ān: 1/110.

² Qur'ān: 141/4.

³ Qur'ān: 73/39.

⁴ Qur'ān: 11/54.

عليهم في إنكارهم أن الملائكة لا تنزل على الرسل يكلمونهم، فأغنى عن الإعادة. فأما
الخيال عندنا فإنه الذي يتخايل للنائم في نومه كأنه يراه في يقظته. ولهذا قال

شعراً:

ألمَّ خيالها بعد الهجوع فغارت إذ رأت سيفي ضجيعي

وظلت بين أعناق المطايا تردد بالذهاب وبالرجوع

أي جاءه خيال خليلته بالنوم، وهو بين ركابه فرأت سيفه ضجيعه فظنت أن له

خليله غيرها فغارت منها¹ عليه. و[ظلت] هي [تردد] بين أعناق المطايا ذاهبة وراجعة، 5

تستركن من ذلك معرفة. وقد يقال له أيضاً الطيف، قال شعراً:

أهلاً بطيف بات يعتسف الدجا تأويني ليلاً فبات ضجيعي

هبط الظلام ولم يهبه فجاءني يهدي تحيته بغير شفيع

فطفقت أئيمه ويشكو جده فأجبتة بتنفيسي ودموعي

أي جاء أيضاً طيف خليلته يعتسف الليل من غير هيبة حتى سلم عليه بلا

شفيع، ولم يكن جوابه له بعد لثمه إلا البكاء من الصبا به له. وقال آخر شعراً:

استزارتة مقلتي في المنام فأتاني خفية واكتتام

¹ . فغارتها. MS.

لَمْ يَكُنْ لِي وَلَا لِمَوْلَايَ عَتْبٌ

غَيْرَ أَنَا فِي دَعْوَةِ الْأَحْلَامِ

وفي الأشعار والأخبار [من ذلك] كثير، وفيما تقدم كفاية، والله أعلم.

In the following chapter Abū Muḥammad gives the meanings of some Ismā‘īlī definitions. He includes in this chapter the ranks of terrestrial hierarchy of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa* and its twelve *jazīras*,¹ each *jazīra* representing a separate region to spread their *da‘wa*. He names the twelve *jazīras* as they are mentioned by the Ismā‘īlīs themselves, as the following: Byzantines, Slavs, Turks, Khazars, Sindis, Indians, Negroes, Abyssinians, Chinese, Daylamans, Berbers and Arabs.² Moreover, he defines the *bāṭinī* meanings of some of their appellations and explains the “job description” of some of the Ismā‘īlī *ḥudūd*. This is presented by Abū Muḥammad as follows:³

فصل

وأما كشف باقي بواطن ألقابهم:

فإنهم قالوا:

الناطق النبي والأساس عليّ، لأنه المسجد الذي أسس على التقوى. والمُتِمُّ الذي هو

على طرف الأساس متمماً له أي تابعاً للشريعة إلى بلوغ إمام عصره. فأما الدعاة والمأذنون

¹ *Jazīra*, pl. *jazā‘ir* (q.v.): according to the Ismā‘īlī doctrine, the world is divided into twelve *jazīras*, which is the name of a *da‘wa* district.

² Cf. Sijistānī, *Ithbāt al-Nubuwwa*, ed. ‘A. Tāmīr, Beirut 1966, 172. Nu‘mān, *Ta‘wīl al-Da‘ā‘im*, ii, 74 & iii, 48-9. It should be noted that al-Nu‘mān mentions Nubians (*nūb*) as a *jazīra* instead of the Turks.

³ Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 507-8.

فإنهم قوم مفسوح لهم بمفاتحة المعاهدين المستجيبين لهذه المقالة بإقامة حدودها ظاهراً

وباطناً.

وكذا الحجج الإثني عشر، زعموا أنهم قوم مبعوثون في الجزائر الإثني عشر التي

هي: الروم والصقالبة¹ والترك والخزر والسند والهند والزنج والحبشة² والصين والديلم

والبربر والعرب، [و]مأذون لهم بمفاتحة من رغب بهذه المقالة. ولهذا إن [أبراج] النجوم⁵

اثني عشر: الحمل والثور والجوزاء والسرطان والأسد والسنبلة والميزان والعقرب والقوس

والجدي والدلو والحوت. وايم الله ما لهذه الحجج التي ذكروا أصل بل توهيم منهم

على ضعفاء العقول. يوحون لهم³ أن دعوتهم هذه قد طبقت الأرض ذات الطول

والعرض. [ولو أنهم كانوا] كما زعموا لما كانوا مستترين في دعوتهم وبدعتهم خوفاً من

10

ظهورها فيُرجمون بالحجارة.

رجع الكلام إلى ذكرنا في ألقابهم: وأما المكّلب فإنه الذي يجلس من جهل عنهم

مقاتلتهم إلى الذي أخذ عليهم العهد تشبيهاً منهم بمقاتلتهم بمكّلب كلاب الصيد.⁴ وأما

¹ . السقالبة . MS.

² MS. . الحيش .

³ MS. . يوجدونهم .

⁴ *Mukālib* or *mukāsir* is the old Ismā'īlī usage for the title of "ma'dhūn maḥdūd" (q.v.) or *ma'dhūn maḥṣūr* (q.v.). It appears that Abū Muḥammad likens the *mukālib*, or in fact traces the name of *mukālib* to the hunting dog because the *mukālib* is hunting the respondents. This comparison is mentioned by al-Qāḍī al-Nu'mān and also al-Ḥammādī, from whom Abū Muḥammad most likely quotes the definition. Cf. Nu'mān, *Ta'wīl al-Da'ā'im*, i, 136. Ḥammādī, *Kashf*, 22.

المستجيب فهو عندهم على ضربين: مستجيب بالغ قد وثقوا لقوله، فإنهم لا يكتفون

عنه¹ قبيح مقالته، ومستجيب غير بالغ لقرب أخذ العهود عليه، وهم خائفون من²

نفوره عنهم. فهم يغالطونه عن قبح كشفها. هذا كشف ألقابهم مختصرة والله أعلم.

It should be noted that Abū Muḥammad notices that the *mustajīb*, as a new member in the *Ismā'īlī da'wa*, should not be completely trusted. Therefore, the *Ismā'īlīs* divide the rank of the *mustajīb* into two: mature respondent (*mustajīb bāligh*) and not mature respondent (*mustajīb ghayr bāligh*).³ Abū Muḥammad recounts the members of the terrestrial *da'wa* hierarchy as follows:-

والناطق، وهو النبي -صلى الله عليه وسلم-. والأساس، وهو علي -كرم الله

وجهه-. والمُتمِّم،⁴ وهو الذي على طرق⁵ الأساس مُكَمَّلًا له. والإمام، وهو معروف.

واللاحق، وهو وزير الإمام. والجناح، وهو جناحه أيضاً لتأكيد المقالة. والحجة، وهو

حجته أيضاً على المستجيبين. والداعي والمأذون، وهما الذان يدعوان إلى هذه المقالة،

مفسوخ⁶ لهما بإفشائها. والمكالب،⁷ وقد يقال له المكاسر⁷ أيضاً، وهو الذي يغوي كل

جاهل ليدخل في بدعتهم. والمستجيب، وهو آخر رتبة رتبوها من ألقابهم.

¹ MS. منه .

² MS. عن .

³ Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 509.

⁴ MS. الموم .

⁵ MS. طرف .

⁶ MS. المكلب .

⁷ MS. المكسر .

There are eleven *ḥadd* that Abū Muḥammad names in **Mukhtaṣar** as the terrestrial *ḥudūd* of the hierarchy of the Ismā‘īlī *da‘wa*, and they are:

1. Speaking Prophet (*nāṭiq*).¹
2. Foundation (*asās*).²
- 5 3. Completer (*mutimm*).³
4. Imām.
5. Adjunct (*lāḥiq*).⁴
6. Wing (*Janāḥ*).⁵
7. Proof (*ḥujja*).
- 10 8. *Dā‘ī*.
9. Licentiate (*ma‘dhūn*).
10. *Mukālib*, also called *mukāsir*.⁶
11. Respondent (*mustajīb*).

Abū Muḥammad, again, is confused by the different ranks which are mentioned
 15 in the Ismā‘īlī works. Indeed Abū Muḥammad has an excuse for his mistake, because
 the Ismā‘īlīs did not agree among themselves about the number of the *ḥudūd*. It

¹ *Nāṭiq* (q.v.), see above, 343.

² *Asās*: also called *waṣī* "executor" the one who succeeds the *nāṭiq*, imparts the *bāṭin*, and in turn is succeeded by a series of seven Imāms. Sijistānī, *Tuḥfa*, 17-8. Kirmānī, *Rāḥat al-‘Aql*, 254. Ḥamidī, *Kanz al-Walad*, 93, 98. See also Ghālib (ed.), *Yanābī‘*, 17 & *al-Ḥarakāt*, 116-7. Walker (ed.), *The wellsprings*, 116-7.

³ *sic.*, according to the Ismā‘īlī doctrines, the *mutimm* (pl. *atimmā‘*) means the seventh Imām in every *dawr*, who usually completes and seals the Imāmate in his *dawr*. Cf. Sijistānī, *Yanābī‘*, 62 & *Tuḥfa*, 18.

⁴ Sijistānī, *Tuḥfa*, 18-9.

According to the early Ismā‘īlī doctrine in the seventh *dawr*, there would no longer be any Imāms, but only *lawāḥiq* (pl. of *lāḥiq*); each *lāḥiq* has control of one of the twelve *jazīras* (q.v.). It is during the absence of the seventh Imām, i.e., during the period of interregnum (*dawr al-fatra*), that the *lāḥiq* would act as a deputy of that Imām. In some Ismā‘īlī works, the *lāḥiq* is also called *ḥujja* (see below). Cf. *E.I.*², i, 832, ii, 97 & iii, 544. Daftary assumes that the word *lāḥiq* is the earliest Ismā‘īlī usage of the term *khalīfa*. Cf. *The Ismā‘īlīs*, 236-7.

⁵ *Janāḥ* (q.v.), see above, 127.

⁶ i.e., the limited licentiate, see above, 343.

seems that he wedges the Completer (*mutimm*) in his list of the terrestrial *hudūd*. Therefore, his list differs from Kirmānī's list, which is based on ten ranks and ignores the *mustajīb* as the lowest rank in the hierarchy of the *da'wa*. And it is also different from al-Sijistānī's list, which is also based on ten ranks and ignores the *bāb* as a rank. 5 But if the eleventh rank, that is of the *mustajīb*, is divided into two, as it is mentioned by al-Sijistānī in some of his works as *mu'min* then *mustajīb*,¹ or as Abū Muḥammad classifies it as a "mature *mustajīb*" and "not mature *mustajīb*", then the hierarchy would become twelve ranks, which correspond with the celestial world and the zodiac.

Abū Muḥammad tries to attack the Ismā'īlīs by refuting their books. He begins 10 with al-Sijistānī's *Iftikhār* mentioning that al-Sijistānī apologizes on behalf of some Ismā'īlī *dā'īs* who exaggerate in interpreting the celestial and terrestrial *hudūd*. It appears that the early anti-Ismā'īlī Muslim scholars recognized that there was a disagreement among Ismā'īlī thinkers about some terms which had several definitions in the Ismā'īlī *bāṭin*.² Abū Muḥammad says:³

15 ومن خوف شناعاتهم هذه، اعتذر شيخ منهم يقال له أبو يعقوب السجستاني
في كتاب له سماه بالافتخار اعتقاداً منه أنه لا بد أن يقف عليها من ينكرها
ويستهزئ بها. فقال:

اعلموا أنّ هذه الألقاب التي جعلناها بناءً لدعوتنا قد ربما سمعها سامع

فأنكر أو نفر عنها بحيث لم يطلع على معانيها المضمّنة وفوايدهـ [أ]

¹ Sijistānī, *Tuḥfa*, 17-20, *Iftikhār*, 61-4, 65-9, 70-4 & Sullam, fols. 33-4.

² See for example, Bustī, *Mīn Kashf*, fols. 10a., 17a. & 17b.

³ Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 467. Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 43, where it said:

ثمّ إنكم عبتم علينا بالجدّ والفتح والخيال، وأظهرتم بها السخرية، التي بها تحيرون وإليها تدعون وفيها تترددون. أيّ رذيلة في هذه الأسماء التي تتوجّه نحو المعاني المضمّنة لها؟ ألسنتم تقولون بجبرائيل وميكائيل وإسرافيل، النفس تنفر من هذه الأسماء أكثر من نفرتها بما قرّناه في بناء دعوتنا. نحن عافاكم الله...

المُسْتَكْنَةَ، ويقع عنده أنها سخرية وليس كذلك. ونقول له: عافاك الله، أستم

تقولون بجبرائيل وميكائيل وإسرافيل وعزرائيل، وهذه ألقاب تنفر عنها

القلوب أشد من نفورها كما ذكرناه من ألقاب مقالتنا لأبناء دعوتنا.

Abū Muḥammad refutes that by saying:

5 وعذر هذا الشيخ يحتاج إلى عذر، لأنَّ الله تعالى ذكر أسماء ملائكته في كتابه،

تسمية ظاهرة لا ألقاباً، فيكون لها بواطن كبواطن ألقابهم.¹ فقال عز من قائل: ﴿مَنْ

كَانَ عَدُوًّا لِلَّهِ وَمَلَائِكَتِهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَجِبْرِيلَ وَمِيكَالَ...﴾² الآية، فبطل بهذا اعتذاره

والحمد لله.

Abū Muḥammad seems to focus on **al-Iftikhār** more than al-Sijistānī's other
10 works. Although he mentions that he refutes al-Sijistānī's **al-Bishārāt** and **al-**
Maqālīd,³ one can not find in **Mukhtaṣar** a single quotation from these books as
evidence of Abū Muḥammad's allegation. But Abū Muḥammad's refutation of
al-Sijistānī is concerned only with the latter's book **al-Iftikhār**, while **al-Bishārāt** and
al-Maqālīd are completely neglected. This can be noticed when Abū Muḥammad
15 devotes a chapter from his **Mukhtaṣar**, which is entitled "Their account on Oneness"
(*fī qawlihim bi-al-tawḥīd*), to refuting **al-Iftikhār** and al-Sijistānī's account of
monotheism (*tawḥīd*). He says:⁴

¹ MS. القاه بهم.

² Qur'ān: 98/2.

³ Cf. Abū Muḥammad, **Mukhtaṣar**, 467, where he says:

ولو ذهبت أيديك الله إلى تحقيق شناعته في كتابه هذا الملقب بالافتخار، وكتاب البشارة، وكتاب المقاليد، لطال ذلك، ومآله قاريه،
وفتر عنه مستمعه، لكن اختصرت ما أنا ذاكره كما شرطته في أول كتابي هذا، وبالله الثقة.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 470.

فصل

في قولهم بالتوحيد:

قال أبو يعقوب السجستاني، في كتاب لقبه بالافتخار:¹

تعالوا أيتها الأمة² المختلفة لنريكم ما به افتخارنا، ونظهر عوراتكم،

5

ونكشف عن عيوبكم. [ونبدأ أولاً بالتوحيد، فأقول:]³

لأنكم رميتمونا بالتعطيل، وسميتم أنفسكم الموحدة وأنتم المعطلون،⁴ لأننا

جردنا مبدعنا عن سمات بريته،⁵ و(أنتم تقولون بخلافه ومع هذا فإنكم)⁶ لما

طلبتم لمبدعكم وخالقكم الأينية التي تؤدي إلى المكان، قال أكثركم إنه في

مكان، ونفى البعض أنه في مكان (آخر بل هو في كل مكان). ونحن لا نقول

10

هو⁷ في مكان ولا لا في مكان.⁸

¹ It should be noted that the following text differs somewhat from the original text of *al-Iftikhār* by al-Sijistānī, cf., 23.

² *Ibid.*, الأمم.

³ Text between [...] is quoted from al-Sijistānī's *al-Iftikhār*, cf., 23. It should be noted that every text, henceforward, mentioned between [...] is quoted from al-Sijistānī's *al-Iftikhār*.

⁴ It is mentioned by al-Sijistānī as:

وسميت أنفسكم موحدة، وأنتم بما رميتمونا به أشد استحقاقاً والزاماً، ونحن بما سميتم أنفسكم به أحقّ منكم.

It should be mentioned that Abū Muḥammad neglects a full paragraph after the previous sentence. Cf. *Ibid.*, 23-4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 24, ثم إننا جردنا.

⁶ A paragraph has been left out by Abū Muḥammad. Cf. *ibid.*

⁷ Between (...) is additional text which is written by Abū Muḥammad and not found in al-Sijistānī's *Iftikhār*.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 24, فلنا أنه تعالى لا.

⁹ About three paragraphs have been omitted by Abū Muḥammad. Cf. *ibid.*, 24-6.

ولما جنتم إلى العدد وأردتم أن تحصوا مبدعكم وتعدوه، قلتُم أنه واحد،

بمعنى ليس باثنين،¹ فصرتم² تقولون في مبدعكم: أنه [إذا] كان معه ملك من

الملائكة، أنه ثاني اثنين، فإذا كان معه ملكان، أنه ثالث ثلاثة. (وهكذا نراكم

أبدًا، وما نراكم وحدتم مبدعكم، وهذا ليس بتوحيد عندنا).³ فأبي افتخار

5 أعظم من درك الحقائق والوقوف على الطرائق.

الجواب أن يقال له:

هذا منك تمويه على من جهل مرادك، لأن اعتقادنا خلاف ما حكيتُه عنَّا لأنَّا

نثبت مبدعنا، ولا ننفيه، وذلك أنا نقول: المخلوقات كلها محدودة متناهية في

الجهات الست، وما حدّ، كان متناهيًا مخلوقًا، فالزمان والمكان من جملة المخلوقات

10 المحدودات المتناهيات ابتداءً وانتهاءً، والله تعالى هو زمن الزمان ومكن المكان،

حيث لا زمان ولا مكان آخر، لأنّ المحدث ما لم يكن فكان، أو ما لوجوده أوّل وله

آخر، فكلّ محدث محكوم عليه بجواز العدم بخروجه من صفات القدم، فكان

متناهيًا لهذه العلة، وأمّا الصانع القديم فلم نقل إنه لا يقتضي زمانًا ولا مكانًا لنفي

¹ Text has been omitted by Abū Muḥammad, in *al-Iftikhār* it says:

وهكذا كل شيء من الأشياء المعدودة هو واحد، بمعنى أنه ليس باثنين. ولكن هو واحد بمعنى أنه ليس باثنين، إذا قارنه واحد آخر صار اثنين.

Cf. *Iftikhār*, 26.

² *Ibid.*, وكذا.

³ A full paragraph is replaced with the text between (...) by Abū Muḥammad. Cf. *ibid.*

التناهي، إنما قلنا ذلك لنفي القدم عن الزمان والمكان، ولو قلنا إنه يقتضي زماناً أو مكاناً لقلنا بقدم الزمان والمكان، والباري جلّت قدرته هو الذي أين الأين وكيف كيف، فلا يجوز أن يقال لمن أين الأين، أين، ولا لمن كيف كيف، كيف، لأن كونه تعالى لا يقتضي زماناً ولا مكاناً، لأن المحتاج إلى محلّ يستند إليه وزمان يوجد فيه محدث مخلوق، تعالى عن ذلك علواً كبيراً، بل هو كما قال: ليس كمثله شيء، 5 وهو السميع البصير، الأول بلا غاية، الآخر بلا نهاية، لا يُدرك بالحواس ولا يُشبهه بالناس، ولا يُعبّر باليأس، لم يقم بالوهم منظوراً لكنه قام معلوماً، كان ولا مكان، فهو الآن كما كان لا تحيط به الأمكنة ولا تحويه الأزمنة، ولا الجهات السّت بل هو يحويها، المتوحد في القدم، المنفي عنه العدم، لا يأخذه نوم ولا سنة، لم يخلق الخلق لحاجة له إليهم لأنه كان ولا خلق، قادراً على أن يخلق قبل أن يُخلق، 10 وليس إنه لما خلق، استحقّ اسم خالق، ولكنه لقدرته على الخلق، كان الخلق موجوداً، وغير موجود، إن شاء خلقهم لا من شيء، فاستحقّ بهذا اسم الخالق لجميع الأشياء، لا خالق لها سواه، وحده لا شريك له ودلّهم على وحدانيته بآيات صنعه فيهم، ليعرفوه حقيقة، وفرّق بين لغاتهم، وقارب بين ألسنتهم، وجعل لكلامه سبحانه وتعالى وجهاً من البيان، وسُبلأً من العبارات، ليتعارفوا بها، ثم 15 دلّهم على كثير مما غاب عليهم وحجب عنهم ما استأثره بعلمه دونهم، فاستيقظ

ذلك لهم من قبل رسله عليهم السلام، ممّا أتوا به، فما دلت عليه الرسل فهو الهدى، وما منعت منه فهو الضلال، لأنه يقول وقوله الحق ﴿وَمَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمُ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوا...﴾¹، ف سبحانه وبحمده، هذا جوابه في التوحيد والله أعلم.

- 5 وأما جوابه عن العدد الذي تشكك به، فإنّ الحال على غير ما ذهب إليه من أنّا نجعله ثاني اثنين وثالث ثلاثة، بمعنى الربوبية، تعالى الله أن يكون معه شريك في ربوبيته لأنه يقول وقوله الحق: ﴿لَوْ كَانَ فِيهِمَا آلِهَةٌ إِلَّا اللَّهُ لَفَسَدَتَا فَسُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَرْشِ عَمَّا يَصِفُونَ﴾²، وإنما نقول: إنه ثاني اثنين وثالث ثلاثة ورابع أربعة وأكثر من ذلك، بمعنى العلم والحفظ، لا بمعنى الشُّرك. لأنه يقول وقوله الحق: ﴿... مَا يَكُونُ مِنْ نَجْوَى ثَلَاثَةٍ إِلَّا هُوَ رَابِعُهُمْ وَلَا خَمْسَةٍ إِلَّا هُوَ سَادِسُهُمْ وَلَا أَدْنَى مِنْ ذَلِكَ وَلَا أَكْثَرَ إِلَّا هُوَ مَعَهُمْ أَيْنَ مَا كَانُوا...﴾⁴، أي عليمٌ بهم وحفيظٌ لهم أينما كانوا، لا بمعنى التشريك كما وهم به هذا الشيخ على ضعفاء المعرفة. ومع هذا فإنّ اثنين لا يثبت عليهما اسم اثنين إلا وواحد موجود قبل الثاني، وإنّ ذلك الواحد قد يوجد ولا ثاني معه. فالواحد مجمع عليه، وإنما يثبت ما بعده ليقع عليه

¹ Qur'ān: 7/59.

² Qur'ān: 22/21.

³ MS. , which is also correct.

⁴ Qur'ān: 7/58.

اسم الثاني، وكلّ عدد سواه. فهو فرد بالإلهية من غير تشريك ولا تعطيل، وواحد في القدرة من غير تمثيل ولا تأويل، يُنفى عنه ما لا يليق به من الأشباه والصفات.

ولهذا قال أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه في بعض خطبه:

الحمد لله على حدوث الأشياء بأزليته، الذي ليس بشيخ، فتنال تكييفه، ولا

5 تحويه الأماكن لعظمته، ولا تدركه المعادن لجلالته، ضعفت الأوهام عن أن تمثله

فهو إله واحد لا من عدد، دائم بلا أمد، ليس له حدّ منسوب، ولا مثل مضروب،

ولا شيء عنه محجوب، فهو الله الواحد القهار، فسبحانه من ربّ ما أعظمه، ومن

جبار ما أكبره.

فاعرف هذا أيّدك الله، واصرف عنك أباطيل أهل البدع والأهواء. هذا جواب

10 أبي يعقوب في التوحيد والعدد، والله أعلم.

In **Mukhtaṣar**, Abū Muḥammad again tries to focus on the disagreement which emerged among the *Ismā‘īlī* thinkers about the *bāṭinī* meanings. He discusses these meanings and compares them with the *ẓāhirī* meaning as a belief of the *Sunnīs*. Then he mentions the other *bāṭinī* definitions of the same meanings among the *Ismā‘īlīs* themselves, which reflects a dilemma in *Ismā‘īlī* thought, during the fourth and the 15 fifth/tenth and eleventh century, in interpreting the inner meaning of the religion (*ta‘wīl bāṭin al-dīn*).¹ He mentions some cases of “ritual purity” (*ṭahāra*) and *ṣalāt* when the *Ismā‘īlī* thinkers have disagreed about its *ta‘wīl*:²

¹ Cf. Nu‘mān, *al-Majālis wa al-Musāyarāt*, 105, 198, 215-6, 407-10, 420, 452-6, 477-8 & “497-500”. Qurashī, ‘*Uyūn*, vi, 302.

² Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 582-3.

وهذا موضع أذكر فيه بعض تأويلهم لأحكام الشريعة:

اعلم أيّدك الله أنهم قالوا:

الإناء الذي فيه الماء للوضوء "الداعي".

وما ذهبنا إليه من أنه الإناء من الشجر والمدر وغير ذلك.

قالوا:

5

والماء نفسه "علم الحقيقة". والتوضيء "الحدود السبعة": الحسن والحسين

وعلي بن الحسين ومحمد بن علي وجعفر بن محمد وإسماعيل بن جعفر ومحمد

بن إسماعيل - رضي الله عنهم -.

قالوا:

فأما الغسل من الجنابة فإنه تجديد العهد على من أفضى [سراً من أسرار

الباطن]. لا إنّه الغسل الذي ذهب² إليه أهل الظاهر. والتيمّم هو "العلم بهذه

المقالة" من المأذون. والمسجد "النبي" - صلى الله عليه وسلم - والوضوء "علي" -

رضي الله عنه - . ووجه القبلة "الإمام". ومحراب المسجد "الحجّة". والأذان

"الدعوة". وصلاة الظهر "النبي"، لأنها أربع ركعات، ولهذا اسمه أربعة أحرف.

¹ MS. ٤ .

² MS. ذهب .

والعَصْر "إقامة دعوة القائم"، لأنَّ القائم اسمه مُحَمَّد، وحروفه أربعة أيضًا، ولأنَّ

العصر آخر صلوات النهار، فكذا [القائم دوره] آخر الأدوار، وصلاة المغرب

"علي بن أبي طالب"، لأنها ثلاث ركعات واسمه ثلاثة أحرف. وصلاة العشاء

"الإمام"، لأنها أربع ركعات واسمه أربعة أحرف. فأما صلاة الفجر فإنها حرفان¹

5

لطيفان.

هذا قول بعضهم، [لا] أن[ها] تلك الصلوات المتعارفة.

One can notice that some of the *hudūd* above have more than one *ta'wīl*. According to the above text, the Prophet means "the mosque" and "the midday prayer", 'Alī means "the *wuḍū'*"² and also "the sunset prayer", and the Imām is interpreted to be the *qibla*³ as well as "the night prayer". This *ta'wīl*, according to Abū Muḥammad, was rejected by al-Sijistānī, who give a different *ta'wīl*.⁴ Abū Muḥammad says:⁵

فأما أبو يعقوب فإنه خالفهم في ذلك فقال:

الوضوء "التبرؤ من أبي بكر وعمر"، لأنَّ موالاتهم حَدَثٌ ولا يرتفع الحَدَث

¹ MS. حمدان .

² *Wuḍū'*: the simple ablution which is a minor ritual washing of some parts of the body before prayer. Netton, *A Popular Dictionary of Islam*, 259. EI², iii, 19.

³ *Qibla*: the direction of prayer towards the *Ka'ba*. Ibid., *Glossary*, 169. Netton, *op. cit.*, 205.

⁴ Cf. Sijistānī, *Sullam al-Najat*, fol. 30 & 60.

⁵ Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 584.

من ذلك إلا بالتبرئ منهما. والصلاة "ولاية الأولياء" التي يجب على الخلق

طاعتهم، لا هذه الصلاة التي تجب على الخلق.

In another part of his *Mukhtaṣar*, Abū Muḥammad mentions al-Sijistānī's *ta'wīl* of the *zakāt* which, according to the Ismā'īlī belief, corresponds with the terrestrial *ḥudūd*, when he says:¹

فأما أبو يعقوب؛ داع من دعاتهم، فإنه قال:

أصل الزكاة أربعة أشياء: زكاة وصدقة وأعشار وأخماس. فالزكاة

"القلم". والصدقة "اللوح". والأعشار "النبي". والأخماس "علي".

هذا قولهم في بطلانها، [و] الله مجازيهم عليه.

فافهم أيديك الله محال الكليم واعتقادهم الفاسد، وتعطيلهم للقيامة وقولهم

بعودة الدنيا تدور أبداً كدوران الأيام السبعة. وهذا منهم كفرٌ ظاهرٌ ومحالٌ شاهرٌ.

نسأل الله العصمة من القول بما قالوه والاعتقاد بما اعتقدوه، أنه ولي ذلك والقادر

عليه.

Abū Muḥammad refutes Abū Tammām, who according to Abū Muḥammad, was an Ismā'īlī *dā'ī*, "a chieftain from the Ismā'īlīs" (*shaykh minhum*) who discussed in his book "*Shajarat al-Yaqīn wa Burhān al-Dīn*" some aspects about "being by force" and "being by act" (*al-insān bi al-quwwa wa al-insān bi al-fi'l*). Saying that:²

¹ Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 586. Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 123.

² Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 643.

حتى أن شيخاً منهم، أعني من الإسماعيلية، يقال له أبو تمام، داع من

دعاتهم، قال في كتابه الذي لقبه بشجرة الدين وبرهان اليقين:

اعلم يا أخي أن الأبالسة من الإنس والجن على ضربين: أبالسة

بالفعل، وأبالسة بالقوة.¹

5 يريد -أيّدك الله- بالقوة؛ الصوت من الجسم الحيواني الذي هو بلا قارع

يقرعه. وبالفعل؛ الشيء الذي لا يكون له صوت إلا بقارع يقرعه، فيخنُّ عند ذلك

كأنه صوت، كالإناء من الصفر وغيره. ولا يكون هذا إلا بقارع يقرعه ومقروع بخلاف

الأول، فإنه يكون بلا قارع، لأنه حيوان وهذا جماد.²

قال هذا الشيخ:

10 والأبالسة من الإنس بالقوة هم الذين أخذت عليهم العهود وارتدوا عن

التأويل والحق، لأنهم أبلسوا من رحمة الله.³

يريد بهذا -أيّدك الله- من أبغضوه من أصحاب رسول الله -صلى الله عليه

وسلم-.

قال:

¹ Cf. Shajarat al-Yaqin, 37.

² Cf. ibid., 42-3.

³ Cf. ibid., 37.

ولأنَّ كيدهم بالقوة أعظم من كيد الشيطان بالقوة، وبلاءهم أعظم من

بلائه، لأنَّ المستجيب المرتدَّ يظهر من التشنيع على أهل الحق ما لا يطيق

القشري على عشر عشير منه.¹

يعني بالقشري: الواحد من المسلمين الذين ليس بباطني من مقاتلهم.²

5

قال:

لذلك ضعف الله كيد الشيطان فقال تعالى: ﴿...إِنَّ كَيْدَ الشَّيْطَانِ كَانَ

ضَعِيفًا﴾.³

قال:

فلهذا جعل الله سبحانه لكلِّ ناطقٍ من النطقاء السبعة إبليسًا وشيطانًا

10

يعانده ويُضِلُّ أمته عن الصراط المستقيم.

قال:

فأولُّ النطقاء آدم -عليه السلام- وإبليس ابنه حام، وشيطانه ابنه يام.⁴

¹ Ibid., 36.

² Cf. *ibid.*

³ Qur'ān: 76/4.

⁴ Text is corrupted; the author, or most likely the copyist, skipped the Prophet Noah (*Nūḥ*). According to *Ismā'īlī* traditions the text could be read as:

فأولُّ النطقاء آدم -عليه السلام- وإبليس الحارث بن مُرّة وشيطانه ابنه قابيل. وبعده نوح -عليه السلام- وإبليس راسب وشيطانه ابنه

حام.

Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, Asrār al-Nuṭaqā', 32, 43 & 57. Cf. *Shajarat al-Yaqīn*, 10.

وبعده إبراهيم عليه السلام وإبليس النمرود بن كنعان، وشيطانه أبوه آزر،
وبعده موسى عليه السلام وإبليس فرعون الذي يقال له الوليد بن مصعب
وشيطانه هامان، وبعده عيسى عليه السلام وإبليس يهودا وشيطانه فيافيا،
وبعده محمد -صلى الله عليه وسلم- وإبليس عمر بن الخطاب وشيطانه أبو

5 جهل بن هشام.²

قال صاحب الكتاب:

أَوْ لَيْسَ مِنْ أَجْلِ عَمْرٍ -رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ- سَاقَ هَذَا الزَّنْدِيقِ الْكَلَامَ مِنْ أَوَّلِهِ.

قال الجاهل عن الحق وطريقه:

ولهذا قال رسول الله -صلى الله عليه وسلم-:

10 اللَّهُمَّ أَعِزِّ الْإِسْلَامَ بِأَحَدِ الرَّجُلَيْنِ: إِمَّا بِعَمْرِ بْنِ الْخَطَّابِ وَإِمَّا بِأَبِي جَهْلٍ

بن هشام.³

أي: اللهم أهلك أحدهما ليعز الإسلام. فاستجاب له ذلك في أبي جهل

بن هشام، أهلكه على يد أضعف الناس؛ عبدا لله بن مسعود رضي الله عنه

كاتبه.

¹ sic. Cf. *ibid.*, 11, where it is written that he was "صارمارس" and "صارمارس" in Abū Firās's *Idāh*, 6.

² Cf. *ibid.* Ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman, *Asrār al-Nuṭqā'*, 101.

³ Cf. Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 3614. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 5431. See also, Ibn Māja, *Sunan*, 102. Cf. *Concordance Et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane*, ii, 519 & 527.

قال :

وَمَنْ زَعَمَ أَنَّ مَعْنَى الدَّعَاءِ: "اللهم أعز الإسلام بعمر ابن الخطاب أو

بأبي جهل بن هشام" أنه بإسلام أحدهما فقد أخطأ.

قال :

5 وأما القائم الذي هو صاحب الدور والكشف والمعان، فإن إبليس

وشيطانه عنه معزولين، لأنه الممد بالتأييد. ولهذا أنظر الله تعالى إبليس آدم -

عليه السلام- من بين أبالسة من بعده إلى وقته. لأنه يقول: ﴿إِنَّكَ مِنَ

الْمُنظَرِينَ * إِلَى يَوْمِ الْوَقْتِ الْمَعْلُومِ﴾¹. والوقت المعلوم قيامة هذا القائم الذي

بقيامه قيام الأشهداء، وجاء وعد الله للمؤمنين، وقصرت يده على الإضرار

10 بهم. ويقر على نفسه يومئذ بالكفر، ويقول ما حكاه الله عنه: ﴿وَقَالَ

الشَّيْطَانُ لَمَّا قُضِيَ الْأَمْرُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَعَدَكُمْ وَعَدَّ الْحَقَّ وَوَعَدْتُكُمْ فَأَخْلَفْتُكُمْ وَمَا كَانَ

لِي عَلَيْكُمْ مِنْ سُلْطَانٍ...﴾². أي قصرت يدي عنكم، فلا سلطان لي عليكم في

هذا الدور.

In another place in his *Mukhtaṣar*, Abū Muḥammad refutes the Ismā‘īlī
15 doctrine of the *qiyāma*, as it is mentioned by the Ismā‘īlī thinkers in their books. In
the following passage, Abū Muḥammad provides his reader with some esoteric

¹ Qur’ān: 80-1/38.

² Qur’ān: 22/14.

explanations by which the Ismā‘īlīs understand the meanings of “the resurrection” (*qiyāma*), and “the riser” (*qā’im al-qiyāma*). Then he gives the meanings of “the renaissance” or “salvation” (*ba‘th*) and “the Day of Judgment” (*al-ḥisāb*) as the result of the *qiyāma*, and how the Ismā‘īlī themselves are confused in their *ta’wīl*.

5 1. Abū Muḥammad’s refutation of al-Sijistānī’s *al-Iftikhār*:¹

اعلم أيدك الله أنهم كَشَفُوا في هذا الباب كفرانهم صراحاً، من غير باطن ولا رمزٍ ولا تسترٍ بل تظاهروا. ومن ذلك قول أبي يعقوب [صاحب] كتاب الافتخار في كتابه:

ومن أعظم ما نفتخر به على أهل الظاهر معرفتنا بالقيامة وأسبابها، وما

10 يلحق بها من علاماتها وآياتها، التي هم عنها وعن معرفتها في غفلة. وعلمهم

فيها علمٌ بعيدٌ عن² البرهان، قريب من العدوان. وهم في هذا أشد الناس إنكاراً

علينا.³

قال:

وأنا أشتهي أن أنصف من نفسي بذكرها، ولا أكتم شيئاً من اعتقادنا

15 فيها من غير رمز. فأقول: إذا ثبتت⁴ التمامية لأمر المبدع سبحانه لدوام

¹ Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 589. Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 74-84.

² MS. من, the correction from: *Iftikhār*, 74.

³ Text is corrected by Abū Muḥammad who summarized what is said by al-Sijistānī in *al-Iftikhār*. Cf. *ibid*.

⁴ MS. تبينت, the correction from: *ibid*, 75.

الأشياء المخلوقة، كان القول بالقيامة لتبديل الخلقة وتعطيلها سخف¹

وحماقة. وإذا بطل هذا وجب خلافه بحدوث شرف حاصل [البشر]². ولا

يوجد ذلك إلا من جهة قيام أفضلهم وأشرفهم في زمان مسعود. يكون بقيامه

لموع آثار نفسانية [تلحق]³ بمن⁴ آمنوا به وانتظروه، ومحرم على من جحده

5 ولم ينتظره.⁵ فهذه هي القيامة عندنا لا ما قالت الظاهرية، (أنها عندهم

الواقعة والحاقة والطامة والقارعة والآزفة والساعة وما شابه ذلك)⁶. وأنها

انشقاق هذه [السماء]⁷ المزيّنة بالكواكب وانتثارها، وخسوف القمر، وزلزلة

الأرض وتسيير جبالها، وغور مياهها. ومجيئ الباري سبحانه وتعالى لمحاسبة

العلوج والزنوج والأنباط وغير ذلك. فإذا أنصف الرجل نفسه، لم تكذ تطمئن

10

إلى ذلك نفس استفادات من [عقل] وعرفت الحق.⁸

¹ MS. , cf. *ibid.*,75.

² The addition from: *ibid.*

³ Cf. *ibid.*

⁴ MS. لمن , cf. *ibid.*

⁵ MS. ينتظروه , cf. *ibid.*

⁶ Text between (), is not mentioned in *al-Iftikhār*.

⁷ *Sijistānī*, *Iftikhār*, 75.

⁸ It should be noted that the text is corrupted by Abū Muḥammad as a summary (*mukhtaṣar*) of what is mentioned in *al-Iftikhār*. However, the summary seems almost shows the same idea which is held by *al-Sijistānī* in *al-Iftikhār*.

يا سبحان الله العظيم، نحن عافاك الله نرى خلاف ذلك، إن القيامة
غير ما ذهبتم إليه من غير تبديل الخلقة ولا تعطيل للأينية. وإنما [هي] قيام
أشرف أهل الوقت، لا القيامة التي ذكرتم في زمان مسعود. لأن الله سبحانه
قد أشار إليه بقوله تعالى: ﴿وَإِذَا وَقَعَ الْقَوْلُ عَلَيْهِمْ أَخْرَجْنَا لَهُمْ دَابَّةً مِّنَ
5 الأَرْضِ تُكَلِّمُهُمْ أَنَّ النَّاسَ كَانُوا بِآيَاتِنَا لَا يُوقِنُونَ﴾¹، لأنه يخرجهم من
الضلالة إلى الهدى، ومن الشك إلى اليقين. فمن [مات] من الخليقة قبل ظهوره
عاد إلى أصله. لأن الإنسان مركب من عالم جسماني وروحاني²، وهو مركب
من الأخلط الأربعة التي هي: الصفراء والسوداء والبلغم والدم. فيعود كل شيء
إلى عنصره الغالب عليه، فتعود الصفراء ناراً، والسوداء تراباً، والدم هواءً،
10 والبلغم ماءً³. فمن كان من تلك الأزواج مستحقاً للعذاب عذبت روحه في
الأفلاك السبعة، التي هي أبواب النار، أبد الآبدين. ومن كان منها مستحقاً
للثواب كانت روحه في الفلك الثامن، الذي هو في الجنة، منعمة فيه أبد
الآبدين. ومن كان منهم يحيا وقت ظهور هذا الظاهر وقيامه، استقبل منهم
دنيا جديدة ودوراً جديداً. ومع هذا، فأين أنتم من زلزلة الأرض التي تنتظرون

¹ Qur'ān: 82/27.

² Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 81.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, 90.

زلزلتها، وقد تزلزلت بكم وأنتم لا تشعرون. لأنها الكرة التي عليها قرار
الخلق،^١ ألا ترونها تزلزل^٢ بكم وتتحرك. أم أين أنتم عن انشقاق السماء التي
ذكرتم أنها قد تنشق، وقد انشقت -والله-، لأنها الشرائع المتقدمة التي
تعلمونها، وهي سقفكم التي تستظلون بها وتتعزفون البركة في استعجالها.
5 أليس قد انشقت ووهنت، وذهبت حلاوتها من صدوركم، فلا تحلّون حلالها
ولا تحرمون حرامها. أم أين أنتم من انتشار الكواكب التي ذكرتم أنها تنتثر
قبل القيامة. أليس قد انتثرت وأنتم عنها غافلون. أم ذلك موت علماءكم،
لأنهم بزعمكم كواكبكم التي تهتدون بها. أم أين أنتم من طلوع الشمس من
مغربها -كما ذكرتم-، وقد طلعت والله شمس المغرب بارزة شعاعها، ظاهرة
10 أنوارها، وأنتم في غفلة منها ساهون، تنتظرون المحال الذي ذكرتم أنه
سيأتي: ﴿ذَلِكَ بِمَا قَدَّمْتُمْ أَيْدِيكُمْ وَأَنَّ اللَّهَ لَيْسَ بِظَلَامٍ لِلْعَبِيدِ﴾.^٣ بل ليت
شعري، كيف يكون اليوم الذي تظهر فيه هذه الأهوال العظيمة التي ذكرتم. أم
أين تكون الجنة الموسعة التي دخولها للمتقين، أم كيف تظهر جهنم لتخليد
المجرمين. فأني افتخار أعظم من إدراك الحقائق، والوقوف على الطرائق.

1. *ibid.*, 81. أليست الأرض التي هي الكرة التي عليها قرار الخلق؟

2 MS. تزلزلت.

3 Qur'ān: 182/3.

فأعجب أيّدك الله من أقوال هذا الشيخ المعطلة للقيامة وأسبابها، من نشرٍ وحشرٍ وحسابٍ وجنةٍ ونارٍ وغير ذلك. ومن افتخاره بتصريح الكفر والتعطيل لما ورد به الكتاب والسنة. وإثبات الرجعة إلى الدنيا على يد هذا القائم الذي ذكره. نسأل الله حسن التوفيق والرضا والتسليم.

5 2. Abū Muḥammad's refutation of Abū Tammām's Shajarat al-Yaqīn:¹

وقال أيضاً شيخ منهم يقال له أبو تمام -الذي ليس بشاعر- في كتاب سمّاه

شجرة الدين وبرهان اليقين:

اعلموا يا إخواني أنّ القيامة التي ذكرها الله تعالى بقوله عز وجل:

﴿...ويوم يقوم الأشهاد﴾²، ليس كما ذهب إليها العامة وإنما ذلك قيام

10 القائم -سلام الله على ذكره-، لأنّه صاحب الدور والرجعة بدنيا جديدة. وهو

المشار إليه بقوله تعالى: ﴿وَعَدَا لِّلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنكُمْ وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ

لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِينَ مِن قَبْلِهِمْ وَلَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِينَهُمُ

الَّذِي ارْتَضَى لَهُمْ وَلَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُم مِّن بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِمْ أَمْنًا...﴾³، فذكر سبحانه أنّه

يستخلفه بمن معه بدور جديد، فيكشف لهم الباطن المحض، ويؤمنهم من

¹Abū Muḥammad, Mukhtaṣar, 165. Cf. Shajarat al-Yaqīn, 48. Abū Firās, Idāh, 48. See below.

²Qurʾān: 51/40.

³Qurʾān: 55/24.

أهل الظاهر وسطوتهم، ومن شر إبليس خاصة. ولذلك حكى الله عز وجل

قوله تعالى وقت ظهور هذا القائم: ﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَعَدَكُمْ وَعَدَ الْحَقَّ وَوَعَدْتُمْ

فَأَخْلَفْتُمْ...﴾^١، أي أنني قد وعدتكم أن أعمل بكم كعملي بمن قبلكم من

الأدوار، فقصرت يدي بدوركم هذا وأتمّ وعده فيكم.

5 قال أبو محمد رضي الله:

وهذا غير صحيح. وإنما الوعد الذي ذكره الله تعالى في الاستخلاف، هو أن

الكفار صدّوا المسلمين عن العمرة عام الحديبية، فقالوا: إن الله تعالى فتح علينا مكة

فندخلها آمنين. فاستجاب الله لهم ذلك فنزلت هذه الآية، ﴿وَعَدَا اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا

مِنْكُمْ وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِينَ مِنْ

10 قَبْلِهِمْ...﴾^٢، يعني أرض مكة، كما استخلف من قبيلهم من بني إسرائيل وغيرهم

بعد هلاك كفارهم. لا أنه استخلاف هذا القائم كما ذكروا بدنيا جديدة. وأما جوابهم

عن الذي تأولوه من قول إبليس عند ظهور هذا القائم بما حكاه الله تعالى عنه: ﴿إِنَّ

اللَّهَ وَعَدَكُمْ وَعَدَ الْحَقَّ وَوَعَدْتُمْ فَأَخْلَفْتُمْ...﴾^٣، الآية، [بـ]أنه عند قيام هذا

القائم فليس كذلك. وإنما المعنى فيه: أن الله تعالى إذا أنفذ حكمه بين الخلائق يوم

¹ Qur'ān: 22/14.

² Qur'ān: 55/24.

³ Qur'ān: 22/14.

القيامة، فأدخل من يشاء الجنة ومن يشاء النار، قام إبليس الملعون في النار خطيباً، وقال ما حكاه الله عنه بقوله: ﴿وَقَالَ الشَّيْطَانُ لَمَّا قُضِيَ الْأَمْرُ...﴾¹، أي لما فرغ الحكم، إنَّ الله تعالى: ﴿... وَعَدَّكُمْ وَعَدَّ الْحَقَّ...﴾: أي يبعثكم بعد الموت، ويثيب ويعاقب، ويدخل من يشاء الجنة ويدخل من يشاء النار، فأنجز وعده. ووعدتكم أنا بالكذب: من أنه لا يبعث ولا يُثيب ولا يُعاقب فأخلفتكم موعدي. 5
﴿... وَمَا كَانَ لِي عَلَيْكُمْ مِنْ سُلْطَانٍ...﴾²، أي من تسليط على جميعكم، فتدخلون معي النار، بل على مَنْ قُدِّرَ [له] دخ[و]لها دون من لم يدخلها. ﴿... فَلَا تَلُومُونِي وَلُومُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ مَا أَنَا بِمُصْرِخِكُمْ وَمَا أَنْتُمْ بِمُصْرِخِيَّ...﴾³، أي لوموا أنفسكم حيث صدقتم ووعي الكاذب، ما أنا اليوم بنافعكم وما أنتم بنافعي. هذا هو التأويل الصحيح لا ما ذهبوا إليه، والله أعلم.

10

رجع الكلام، قال هذا الشيخ:⁴

وإنَّ هذا القائم هو الآخرة، التي أمرُ حكمها إليه لا إلى سواه. فإن أنكر

علينا بذلك منكر، قلنا له: أليس الله تعالى يقول: ﴿... أَنْتَ تَحْكُمُ بَيْنَ

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ i.e., Abū Tammām.

عِبَادِكَ فِي مَا كَانُوا فِيهِ يَخْتَلِفُونَ ﴿١﴾، فَإِنْ كَانَ حُكْمُ الدُّنْيَا حُكْمَ اللَّهِ وَلَمْ

يَتَوَلَّهُ بِنَفْسِهِ، بَلْ أَقَامَ لَهُ رَسُولًا لِتَبْلِيغِهِ إِلَى الْأُمَّةِ، وَلَمْ يَكُنْ ذَلِكَ بِمُنْكَرٍ. جَازَ أَنْ

يُقِيمَ لَهُمْ هَذَا الْقَائِمَ لِيُحْكَمَ بَيْنَهُمْ فِي الْآخِرَةِ. وَلِذَا يَتَوَلَّى ذَلِكَ بِنَفْسِهِ. وَأَنَّ قِيَامَ

هَذَا الْقَائِمِ هُوَ النِّفْخَةُ الثَّانِيَّةُ فِي الصُّورِ فَيُظْهِرُ بِهَوِيَّتِهِ الْبَسِيطَةَ،^٢ وَهُوَ الْيَوْمَ

الَّذِي قَالَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى فِيهِ: ﴿يَوْمَ يَقُومُ الرُّوحُ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ صَفًّا...﴾.^٣

[وهذا ما ذُكِرَ فِي الْخُطْبَةِ] الَّتِي تَقْدَمُ ذِكْرَ بَعْضِهَا آتِيًا، تِلْكَ الَّتِي صَنَفَهَا الْحَمِيرُ

عَلَى لِسَانِ عَلِيِّ بْنِ أَبِي طَالِبٍ -كَرَّمَ اللَّهُ وَجْهَهُ- بِهَذَا الْقَائِمِ وَيُسَمُّونَهَا بِخُطْبَةِ

"الْكَرَّاتِ". وَأَنَّهُ قَالَ: مَكْتُوبٌ فِيهَا يَكُونُ ظُهُورُهُ عِنْدَ انْقِطَاعِ أَمْرِ الظُّلْمَةِ الْكُفْرَةِ الْفَجْرَةِ

وَلِذَلِكَ آيَاتٌ وَعَلَامَاتٌ. أُولَاهَا يَنَادِي مَنَادِي فِي شَهْرِ رَمَضَانَ فِي تِسْعَةِ عَشَرَ لَيْلَةً مَضَتْ

مِنْهُ مِنْ نَاحِيَةِ الْمَغْرِبِ عِنْدَ مَغِيبِ الشَّمْسِ، وَآخِرُهَا يَنَادِي مِنَ الْمَشْرِقِ عِنْدَ طُلُوعِ الْفَجْرِ: يَا

أَهْلَ الْهُدَى هَلِّمُوا أَجِيبُوا دَاعِيَ الْحَقِّ، الْمَفْرَقَ بَيْنَ الْحَقِّ وَالْبَاطِلِ، وَهُوَ دَابَّةُ الْأَرْضِ،

وَهُوَ تَأْوِيلُ هَذِهِ الْآيَةِ: ﴿فِيهَا يُفْرَقُ كُلُّ أَمْرٍ حَكِيمٍ﴾،^٤ يَقُومُ، [و] عَلَى وَجْهِهِ نُورٌ قَدْ

عَلَتْ [هُ] ضِيَاءُ الشَّمْسِ، فِي أَوْلِيَائِهِ وَأَهْلِ عَتْرَتِهِ مِنْ أَهْلِ دَعْوَتِهِ، وَهَنَّاكَ تَأْوِيلُ هَذِهِ

¹ Qur'ān: 46/39.

² Shajarat al-Yaqīn, 48. Cf. Abū Firās, Idāh, 48.

³ Qur'ān: 38/78.

⁴ Qur'ān: 4/44.

الآية: ﴿إِنَّ الَّذِي فَرَضَ عَلَيْكَ الْقُرْآنَ لَرَادُّكَ إِلَىٰ مَعَادٍ...﴾^١. فلا بد من سبع كرات أولها
 [بالتالي]: النَّازِعَاتِ وَالنَّاشِطَاتِ وَالسَّابِحَاتِ وَالسَّابِقَاتِ وَالْمُدَبِّرَاتِ وَالرَّادِفَةَ وَالرَّاجِفَةَ.
 وهو يومئذ تأويل هذه الآية: ﴿...رَبِّ لَا تَذَرُ عَلَى الْأَرْضِ مِنَ الْكَافِرِينَ دَيَّارًا﴾^٢،
 وَتَصَفَّوْا الْأَرْضَ حِينَئِذٍ لِأَهْلِهَا.

5

قال صاحب الكتاب رحمه الله:

وايم الله ما قال هذا علي بن أبي طالب لأنه أشرف من أن يقول بالرجعة إلى
 الدنيا.

نرجع إلى ما كنا عليه، قال هذا الشيخ:

وأما النفخة الأولى فأنها عند انقضاء آخر الأندوار قبل دوره.^٣

10

وهذا تأويل منه وتشكيك بين، لأن النفخة الأولى نفخة الصعق التي تموت من
 شدة صوتها الخلق. والنفخة الثانية نفخة البعث والنشور، لا أنها قيام هذا القائم، والله
 أعلم.

¹ Qur'ān: 85/28.

² Qur'ān: 26/71.

³ Shajarat al-Yaqin, 48-9. Cf. Abū Firās, Idāh. 48.

3. Abū Muḥammad's refutation of al-Nasafī's al-Maḥṣūl:¹

وقال أيضاً صاحب كتاب المحصول في تأويل قوله: ﴿وَجَاءَ رَبُّكَ وَالْمَلَكُ صَفًّا

صَفًّا﴾،² إن هذا القائم هو الروح، فإذا قام عزلت الملائكة عن بعضها بعضاً، كلُّ

فريقٍ منهم على حدته، كما كان أهل هذا العالم السفلي ذوي المراتب؛ رسل ونطقاء

5 وأسس وأئمة وغير ذلك، يكون هؤلاء هكذا أيضاً. فافهم أيديك الله محال الكل

واعتقادهم الفاسد، وتعطيهم للقيامة وقولهم بعودة الدنيا تدور أبداً كدوران الأيام

السبعة. وهذا منهم كفرٌ ظاهرٌ ومحالٌ شاهرٌ. نسأل الله العصمة من القول بما قالوه

والاعتقاد بما اعتقدوه، أنه ولي ذلك والقادر عليه.

فصل

10 وأما الذي عندنا فإنها—[أي القيامة]—حق، وهي التي سماها الله تعالى:

الواقعة والحاقة والقارعة والصاخة والطامة والراجلة والآزفة، وغير ذلك. وهي التي

تأتيهم بغتة كما قال الله تعالى: ﴿بَلْ تَأْتِيهِمْ بَغْتَةً فَتَبْهَتُهُمْ فَلَا يَسْتَطِيعُونَ رَدَّهَا

وَلَا هُمْ يُنظَرُونَ﴾،³ أي تأتيهم فجأة فتبتهتهم وهم غافلون. ولا تقوم حتى تظهر

الآيات التي ذكرها الله تعالى في كتابه بقوله: ﴿...يَوْمَ يَأْتِي بَعْضُ آيَاتِ رَبِّكَ لَا

¹ Abū Muḥammad, Mukhtaṣar, 597.

² Qur'ān: 22/89.

³ Qur'ān: 40/21.

يَنْفَعُ نَفْسًا إِيْمَانَهَا لَمْ تَكُنْ آمَنَتْ مِنْ قَبْلُ أَوْ كَسَبَتْ فِي إِيْمَانِهَا خَيْرًا...^١، وقوله تعالى: ﴿وَإِذَا وَقَعَ الْقَوْلُ عَلَيْهِمْ أَخْرَجْنَا لَهُمْ دَابَّةً مِّنَ الْأَرْضِ تُكَلِّمُهُمْ إِنَّ النَّاسَ كَانُوا بِآيَاتِنَا لَا يُوقِنُونَ﴾^٢، وبقوله: ﴿حَتَّىٰ إِذَا فَتِحَتْ يَأْجُوجُ وَمَأْجُوجُ وَهُمْ مِنْ كُلِّ حَدَبٍ يَنْسِلُونَ * وَاقْتَرَبَ الْوَعْدُ الْحَقُّ...﴾^٣، يعني الساعة. وقال -صلى الله عليه

وسلم-:

بادروا بالأعمال [سِتًّا]^٤ قبل طلوع الشمس من مغربها والدجال والدخان والدابة وخويصة^٥ أحدكم [و]أمر العامة، يعني الساعة^٦.

وروى عنه أيضاً -صلى الله عليه وسلم- أنه قال:

الأنبياء أخوة لعلات^٧، أمهاتهم شتى ودينهم واحد. وأنا أولاهم بعبسى ابن مريم -صلى الله عليه وسلم-، وأنه لم يكن بيني وبينه نبي، وأنه خليفتي في أمتي، وأنه نازل فيقتل الخنزير، يعني الدجال، ويكسر الصليب، ويرفع الجزية، وتضع الأرض أوزارها، ويملا الأرض عدلاً وقسطاً كما ملئت

¹ Qur'ān: 158/5.

² Qur'ān: 82/27.

³ Qur'ān: 96-7/21.

⁴ The addition from the prophet's *ḥadīth*. Cf. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 5240. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 7952. Ibn Māja, *Sunan*, no. 4046. Cf. *Concordance Et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane*, i, 151.

⁵ MS. خوارص, the correction from the prophet's *ḥadīth*. Cf. *ibid*.

⁶ MS. القيمة, which can be also read as القيامة, the correction from the prophet's *ḥadīth*. Cf. *ibid*.

⁷ *sic*.

جوراً وظلماً حتى يرمى الأسد مع الإبل، والنمر مع البقر، والذئب مع الغنم،

وحتى يلعب الصبيان بالحيات.¹

قال صاحب الكتاب:

وهو عندنا المهدي المنتظر قيامه في آخر زمان. روي أنه ينزل من السماء على

5 جبل بيت المقدس؛ الذي يقال له أفيق²، عليه مطرتان دھين الرأس معه حربه يقتل

بها الدجال. ثم يكون عنه ما قال النبي -صلى الله عليه وسلم-، ثم تقوم بعده

القيامة، ويقع الحشر والنشر والحساب والميزان. ويدخل من شاء [الله] الجنة

ويدخل من شاء النار. هذا قولنا، لا ما ذهب إليه هؤلاء من أنه قيام قائم، ثم ترجع

الدنيا على يديه بدور جديد، وهذا لا يكون أبداً، والله أعلم.

10 نرجع الكلام، عن عبد الله بن عباس -رضي الله عنهما- أنه قال:

ينزل عيسى بن مريم عليه السلام، فإذا رآه الدجال ذاب كالشحمة، ويقتله.

وتفر عنه اليهود، لأنهم جنده، ويقتلون. حتى أن الحجر يقول يا عبد الله المسلم هذا

يهودي عندي فاقتله، فيقتله.³

¹ Cf. Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 2070. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 221. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 6971 & 9871. Abū Dā'ūd, *Sunan*, no. 3766. Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 2159. Ibn Māja, *Sunan*, no. 4048. Cf. *Concordance Et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane*, iii, 334.

² Yāqūt, *Mu'jam*, i, 233.

³ Cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 8807 & 10437. Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 2709. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 5203. Cf. *Concordance Et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane*, i, 425.

فإذا ظهرت أيديك الله هذه العلامات أمر الله تعالى إسرائيل أن ينفخ في الصور

من تحت العرش وهي النفخة الأولى التي قال الله تعالى فيها: ﴿وَنُفِخَ فِي الصُّورِ

فَصُعِقَ مَنْ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَمَنْ فِي الْأَرْضِ إِلَّا مَنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ...﴾^١، أي مات الخلق

كلهم من شدة صوتها إلا جبرائيل وإسرافيل وميكائيل ومَلَك الموت -عليهم السلام-.

5 ثم يأمر الله تعالى مَلَك الموت أن يقبض روح ميكائيل وروح جبرائيل ثم روح

إسرافيل. ويقول له: مُتْ يَا مَلِكِ الْمَوْتِ. فيموت وهو آخرهم موتاً. ثم يلبث الخلق

بعد النفخة الأولى إلى النفخة الأخرى أربعين سنة. ثم يجيء الله تعالى إسرافيل عليه

السلام فيأمره أن ينفخ الثانية من بيت المقدس. وهو قوله تعالى: ﴿...ثُمَّ نُفِخَ فِيهِ

أُخْرَى فَإِذَا هُمْ قِيَامٌ يَنْظُرُونَ﴾^٢، ويقع حينئذ الحشر والحساب وغير ذلك، هذا ما

10 عندنا فيها، والله أعلم.

وأما جوابهم عن قولهم: إن الله تعالى ينزه عن محاسبة العلوج والزنوج

والأنباط وغير ذلك.^٣ فإنه يقال لهم:

إن كان عندكم الخالق لهم سواه، فينبغي أن ينزه عن محاسبة من لا يخلق،

لأن الخالق لها غيره. فإن كان عندكم أنه الخالق لهم، [و] لا خالق لهم سواه، جاز

¹ Qur'ān: 68/39.

² Ibid.

³ Sijistānī, Iftikhār, 75.

أن يحاسب بينهم كما خلقهم. تعالى الله عن قولهم علواً كبيراً، بل هو الخالق
للكل، والمحاسب بين الكل.

وأما قولهم: إن الله تعالى يُقيم لهم قيماً يحكم بينهم في الآخرة، كما أقام من

يحكم بينهم في الدنيا.¹ وما احتجوا به على صحة ذلك من قوله تعالى: ﴿...أنت

5 تحكم بين عبادك...﴾². فهذا منهم باطل، لأنه يقول سبحانه بخلاف ما قالوه:

﴿...إِنَّ رَبَّكَ يَقْضِي بَيْنَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ فِيمَا كَانُوا فِيهِ يَخْتَلِفُونَ﴾³، فذكر سبحانه

أنه يحكم بينهم بنفسه، ولم يقل القائم يحكم بينهم. وقال أيضاً في آية أخرى:

﴿...إِنَّ رَبَّكَ هُوَ يَفْصَلُ بَيْنَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ فِيمَا كَانُوا فِيهِ يَخْتَلِفُونَ﴾⁴، فذكر

سبحانه أنه هو الذي يفصل بينهم، لا سواه وقال عز من قائل: ﴿وَمَنْ أَظْلَمُ مِمَّنِ

10 افْتَرَى عَلَى اللَّهِ كَذِبًا أُولَئِكَ يُعْرَضُونَ عَلَى رَبِّهِمْ وَيَقُولُ الْأَشْهَادُ هَؤُلَاءِ الَّذِينَ كَذَبُوا

عَلَى رَبِّهِمْ أَلَا لَعْنَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَى الظَّالِمِينَ﴾⁵، فذكر سبحانه أنهم يعرضون عليه ليحكم

بينهم ثم لعن المكذب به. وقال لرسول الله -صلى الله عليه وسلم-: ﴿إِنَّكَ مَيِّتٌ

وَأَنَّهُمْ مَيِّتُونَ * ثُمَّ إِنَّكُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ عِنْدَ رَبِّكُمْ تَخْتَصِمُونَ﴾⁶، ولم يقل إنكم يوم

¹ Ibid., 80-1.

² Qur'ān: 46/39

³ Qur'ān: 93/10.

⁴ MS. الله .

⁵ Qur'ān: 25/32.

⁶ Qur'ān: 18/11.

⁷ Qur'ān: 30-1/39.

قيام القائم عنده تختصمون. وهذه -أيديك الله- حجج باهرة لا دخل للملحدين

فيها، وبالله الثقة.

وأما جواب أبي يعقوب عن قوله:

وأين أنتم من زلزلة الأرض؟ وقد تزلزلت بكم وأنتم لا تشعرون. أم أين

5 أنتم عن انشقاق السماء؟ وقد انشقت لأنها الشرائع المتقدمة. أم أين أنتم من

طلوع الشمس من مغربها؟ وقد طلعت بارزة شعاعها -يعني الإمام-. بل ليت

شعري، كيف يكون اليوم الذي تظهر فيه هذه الأحوال؟ أم أين تكون الجنة

الموسعة بدخولها المتقين؟ أم كيف تظهر جهنم لتخليد المجرمين؟¹

فإننا نقول له:

10 عافاك الله، الحال غير ما ذهبتي إليه ولبسته على ضعفاء العقول والجاهلين

بمقالتهم. فأما الزلزلة فإنها زلزلة الأرض، من شدة صوت إسرافيل إذا نفخ في

الصور، كذلك قوله تعالى: ﴿إِذَا زُلْزِلَتِ الْأَرْضُ زِلْزَالَهَا * وَأَخْرَجَتِ الْأَرْضُ

أَثْقَالَهَا﴾.² لا كزلزال وقتنا هذا، الذي وهمت به على الجاهل ببدعتكم. وأما انشقاق

السماء التي ذكرت أنها الشرائع، فليس كذلك، وإنما انشقاقها وانفطارها يوم

¹ Text is corrupted. See above, cf. Sijistānī, Iftikhār, 81.

² Qur'ān: 1-2/99.

القيامة. تنفرج لمجيء رب العزة والملائكة يوم فصل القضاء، وهو قوله تعالى: ﴿وَجَاءَ

رَبُّكَ وَالْمَلَكُ صَفًّا صَفًّا * وَجِيءَ يَوْمَئِذٍ بِجَهَنَّمَ يَوْمَئِذٍ يَتَذَكَّرُ الْإِنْسَانُ وَأَنَّى لَهُ

الذِّكْرَى﴾^١. وأما انتشار الكواكب التي ذكرت أنها قد انتشرت، وهي موت العلماء،

فليس كذلك أيضاً، وإنما انتشارها سقوطها من أماكنها إلى الأرض يوم القيامة. وهو

قوله تعالى: ﴿إِذَا السَّمَاءُ انْفَطَرَتْ * وَإِذَا الْكَوَاكِبُ انْتَثَرَتْ﴾^٢، لا إنه موت العلماء

كما ذكرت، وإن كانوا كواكب الأرض لا كواكب السماء. وأما طلوع الشمس التي

ذكرت أنها قد طلعت من مغربها ظاهراً شعاعها، فهذا باطل أيضاً، لأنها لم تطلع

بعد، بل هي طالعة لا محالة وهي أول آيات الساعة. روي عن رسول الله -صلى

الله عليه وسلم- أنه قال:

ستأتي عليكم ليلة مثل ثلاث ليال من لياليكم هذه. فإذا كانت تلك

الليلة عرفها المجتهدون فيقوم الرجل، فيقرأ ورده ثم ينام، ثم يقوم فيقرأ

ورده ثم ينام، ثم يقوم فيقرأ ورده. فبينما هم كذلك إذ ماج الناس بعضهم في

بعض، فيقولون: ما هذا؟ فيفزعون إلى المساجد. فإذا هم بالشمس قد طلعت من

مغربها. فتجيبه حتى إذا توسطت السماء رجعت وطلعت من مشرقها. وذلك

¹ Qur'ān: 22-3/89.

² Qur'ān: 1-2/82.

قوله تعالى: ﴿يَوْمَ يَأْتِي بَعْضُ آيَاتِ رَبِّكَ لَا يَنْفَعُ نَفْسًا إِيْمَانُهَا لَمْ تَكُنْ آمَنَتْ

مِنْ قَبْلُ أَوْ كَسَبَتْ فِي إِيْمَانِهَا خَيْرًا﴾^١، ثم تظهر الدابة قريباً منها.^٢

قيل أنها دابة ذات قوائم أربع لها زغب وريش، تظهر من بعض أودية

تهامة.^٣ وقيل بل تظهر من الصفا معها عصا موسى وخاتم سليمان، وتمسح المؤمن

5 بالعصا وتختم على الكافر بالخاتم، والله أعلم.

فإذا ظهرت العلامات كلها، أمر الله تعالى إسرئيل -عليه السلام- أن ينفخ في

الصور وهي النفخة الأولى. قال الله تعالى: ﴿...تَأْخُذُهُمْ وَهُمْ يَخِصِّمُونَ﴾^٤، بمعنى

وهم يتكلمون في الأسواق والمجالس وغيرها، ﴿فَلَا يَسْتَطِيعُونَ تَوْصِيَةً وَلَا إِلَىٰ أَهْلِهِمْ

يَرْجِعُونَ﴾^٥. يقول: أَعْجَلُوا عَنِ الْوَصِيَّةِ فَمَاتُوا قَبْلَ أَنْ يَرْجِعُوا. وَأَمَّا قَوْلُكَ:

10 يا ليت شعري كيف يكون اليوم الذي تظهر فيه هذه الأهوال؟ أم أين

تكون الجنة الموسعة للمتقين؟ أم أين تكون النار لعذاب المجرمين؟

وسترد وتعلم كما قال الأول [وقال] الشاعر:

¹ Qur'ān: 158/6.

² Cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 6864 & 8857. Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 4269 & 6025. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 226. Abū Dā'ūd, *Sunan*, no. 3758. Ibn Māja, *Sunan*, no. 4058. Cf. *Concordance Et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane*, v, 140.

³ Tihāma is a region in Yaman (q.v.).

⁴ Qur'ān: 49/36.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 50.

حيل ابن آدم في الأمور كثيرة والموت يقطع حيلة المحتال

وهذه بعض أقوالهم في القيامة والردّ عليها مختصر بعون الله تعالى.

فصل

في قولهم بالبعث:

فإنهم تعجبوا من ذلك أشدّ التعجب وقالوا:

يا سبحان الله العظيم، كيف يجمع العظام البالية المتبددة، والجلود
المتمزقة التي قد اضمحلت وذهبت، أليس هذا شيء تنفر عنه النفوس ولا تقبله
العقول؟ وإنما البعثُ عندنا، عافاكم الله، الانتباه من نومة الغفلة، واليقظة من
رقدة الجهالة، والخلاص من أسر الطبيعة، والنجاة من بحر الهيولي، ومن
غمرات الهاوية. ورجوعها إلى حالها الروحاني، وعنصرها وجوهرها النوراني،
[الذي] هو أصلها، غير صوري. وما هنالك اجتماع أجزاء متبددة، ولا جلود
متمزقة، فتعود كما كانت وتبعث للحساب والثواب والعقاب. وإنما عودتها إلى
أصولها وعنصرها فحسب.¹

قالوا:

¹Text is corrupted, cf. Sijistānī, Iftikhār, 85-8.

الآن يجب في هذا كتمه عن النساء والصبيان والجهال وضعفاء العقول.

ولا يعلمون إلا بمقالة أهل الظاهر لأن ذلك جيد لهم. لأنه يدلهم على عمل

الخير، وترك الشر واجتناب المعاصي، وفعل الطاعات وأداء الأمانات، والوفاء

بالعهود، وما يجرى مجرى ذلك. فأما غيرهم من الذين هم عارفون بالعلم

5 بصيرون بالفهم، عالون فوق هذه الطوائف، عالون بحقائق الأمور ورموزاتها

وإشاراتها، فإنهم يجب عليهم مجانية رأي أهل الظاهر بما ادعوه من البعث.

وإنما هو الانتباه من نوم الغفلة ورقدة الجهالة، وحياة النفس بروح المعارف،

وانفتاح أعينها البصيرة بالنظر إلى عالمها الروحاني، ومشاهدة [م]دارها

الحيواني. فمنها ما يكون في موضع المحنة، غارقة في بحر الهيولي. ومنها ما

10 يكون محرقة في حريق الشهوات الجسمانية، بالجوع والعطش، والعري

والخزي، والحر والبرد، والأوجاع والأسقام، وحسد الإخوان وعداوة الجيران،

وثقل التكليفات من صوم وصلاة وركوع وحج وغير ذلك.

قالوا:

فمن كان من طبقتنا هذه، واعتقد أمر حياة الدنيا وأنها على هذه، لم

15 يتصور له أمر البعث إلا على ما ذهبنا إليه. لأن رسول الله -صلى الله عليه

وسلم- قال:

”من مات فقد قامت قيامته“.

قال أبو محمد:

أيديك الله، وهذا تعطيل ظاهر. لأن الله تعالى يقول خلاف ما ذهبوا إليه:

﴿زَعَمَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا أَنْ لَنْ يُبْعَثُوا قُلْ بَلَىٰ...﴾¹، أي قالوا أنهم لا يُبعثون بعد الموت.

قال سبحانه: قُلْ لَهُمْ يَا مُحَمَّد: ﴿...بَلَىٰ وَرَبِّي لَتُبْعَثُنَّ ثُمَّ لَتُنَبَّيُنَّ بِمَا عَمِلْتُمْ وَذَلِكَ

عَلَىٰ اللَّهِ يَسِيرٌ﴾²، وقال عزَّ مَنْ قائل: ﴿وَنُفِخَ فِي الصُّورِ فَإِذَا هُمْ مِنَ الْأَجْدَاثِ إِلَىٰ

رَبِّهِمْ يَنْسِلُونَ﴾³، أي يخرجون من قبورهم إلى لقاء الله تعالى أحياء كما كانوا. فإذا

رأوا حقيقة البعث ذكروا إنكارهم له في الدنيا، وقول الرسل لهم: أنه سيكون.

وصدقوا به حينئذ، وقالوا: ﴿...هَذَا مَا وَعَدَ الرَّحْمَنُ وَصَدَقَ الْمُرْسَلُونَ﴾⁴. وذلك أنه

قيل: من مات على الإيمان رُفعت له روحه إلى ﴿...سِدْرَةِ الْمُنْتَهَىٰ ۖ عِنْدَهَا جَنَّةُ

الْمَأْوَىٰ﴾⁵. ومن مات على الكفر تركت روحه في سجين، وهي الأرض السفلى إلى يوم

البعث، فإذا أراد الله تعالى البعث، أمر الروح الأمين أن ينزل من السماء السابعة إلى

¹ Qur'ān: 7/64.

² Ibid.

³ Qur'ān: 51/36.

⁴ Ibid., 52.

⁵ Qur'ān: 14-5/53.

وَادٍ بِالشَّمِّ يُقَالُ لَهُ الْجَابِيَّةُ،^١ وتطلع أرواح الكفار من تحت الأرض السفلى إلى وادٍ في
 حضرموت يقال له برهوت.^٢ ويأمر إسرافيل أن ينزل إلى بيت المقدس ويقوم على
 الصخرة، ويأخذ أرواح هؤلاء وأرواح هؤلاء. [ثم ينفخ] في الصور ويقول:
 أَيَّتْهَا الْعِظَامُ الْبَالِيَةُ وَالْعُرُوقُ الْمَنْقُوعَةُ وَاللِّحُومُ الْمَتَمَزَّقَةُ، اخْرُجُوا مِنْ قُبُورِكُمْ فَتَجَاوِزُونَ
 بِأَعْمَالِكُمْ. ثُمَّ يُنْفِخُ فِي الصُّورِ فَإِذَا هُمْ [كَمَا] قَالَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى: ﴿...قِيَامٌ يَنْظُرُونَ ۝
 5 وَأَشْرَقَتِ الْأَرْضُ بِنُورِ رَبِّهَا وَوُضِعَ الْكِتَابُ وَجِيئَ بِالنَّبِيِّينَ وَالشُّهَدَاءِ وَقُضِيَ بَيْنَهُمْ
 بِالْحَقِّ وَهُمْ لَا يُظْلَمُونَ﴾.^٣ ثُمَّ يَقُولُ اللَّهُ تَبَارَكَ وَتَعَالَى: يَا مَعْشَرَ الْجِنِّ وَالْإِنْسِ إِنِّي قَدْ
 نَصَحْتُ لَكُمْ فَإِنَّمَا هِيَ أَعْمَالِكُمْ فِي صَحْفِكُمْ. فَمَنْ وَجَدَ خَيْرًا فَلِيَحْمَدْنِي، وَمَنْ وَجَدَ
 شَرًّا فَلَا يَلُومَنَّ إِلَّا نَفْسَهُ. ثُمَّ يَأْمُرُ جَهَنَّمَ فَيُخْرِجُ مِنْهَا عُنُقَ، فَيَلْتَوِي عَلَيْهِمْ. فَتَجَثُّوا
 10 الْأُمَمَ عَلَى رُكْبَتَيْهَا، وَذَلِكَ قَوْلُهُ تَعَالَى: ﴿وَتَرَى كُلَّ أُمَّةٍ جَائِيَةً كُلُّ أُمَّةٍ تُدْعَى إِلَى
 كِتَابِهَا الْيَوْمَ تُجْزَوْنَ مَا كُنْتُمْ تَعْمَلُونَ﴾.^٤ وَيَنْظُرُ اللَّهُ سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى إِلَى خَلْقِهِ
 فَيَقْضِي بَيْنَ الْوَحُوشِ وَالْبَهَائِمِ بِنَفْسِهِ. حَتَّى أَنَّهُ لَيَقْيِدُ الْجَمَّاءَ مِنْ ذَاتِ الْقَرْنَيْنِ، ثُمَّ
 يَقُولُ كُونُوا تَرَابًا، فعند ذلك ﴿...يَقُولُ الْكَافِرُ يَا لَيْتَنِي كُنْتُ تُرَابًا﴾،^٥ أَيُّ أَنْ

¹ Cf. Yāqūt, Mu'jam, ii, 91-2.

² Ibid., i, 405-6.

³ Qur'ān: 68-9//39.

⁴ Qur'ān: 28/45.

⁵ Qur'ān: 40/78.

يجعلني مثل هؤلاء ولا أدخل النار . ثم يقضي بين سائر خلقه ، ﴿...فَمِنْهُمْ شَقِيٌّ

وَسَعِيدٌ﴾¹ . هذا ما جاء عن النبي -صلى الله عليه وسلم- وإخوانه الأنبياء -عليهم

السلام- . نسأل الله تعالى أن يجعلنا من السعداء ولا يجعلنا من الأشقياء ، أنه ولي

ذلك والقادر عليه . هذا أيدك الله كسر ما ذهبوا إليه ، والله أعلم بالصواب .

5 وأما الذي احتجوا به على تعطيل القيامة من خبر رسول الله -صلى الله عليه

وسلم- : "من مات فقد قامت قيامته" ، وأولوا ذلك أنه لا يكون بعث ولا حشر ولا

حساب ولا ثواب ولا عقاب . فليس ذلك كما تأولوه ، وإنما معنى الخبر أنه "من مات

فقد قامت قيامته" ، أي عين أمر القيامة . لأن الموت أول مراحلها ، فيصير بمنزلة من

قد حضرها ، ويختتم على عمله بالموت ، فيقوم يوم البعث على ما مات عليه ، فطوبى

10 لمن كانت خاتمته على خير . ومع هذا أيدك الله ، فإنه لو كان الحال على ما ذهبوا

إليه ، لما ذكر الله تعالى وعدًا ولا وعيدًا ولا هُدًى ولا تهديدًا . ولكن الحال خلاف ما

وهموا به . ألا ترى إلى قول يحيى بن معاذ -رحمة الله عليه- في بعض مواعظه :

أيها الناس مهلاً مهلاً ، فإنكم غداً تحشرون حشراً حشراً ، وتقفون بين

يدي الله تعالى فرداً فرداً ، وتُسألون عما عملتم حرفاً حرفاً ، وكل هذا ﴿إِذَا

¹ Qur'ān: 105/11.

دُكَّتِ الْأَرْضُ دَكًّا دَكًّا * وَجَاءَ رَبُّكَ وَالْمَلَكُ صَفًّا صَفًّا،^١ [في] يومٍ مقداره

خمسين ألف سنة، [وهو] يوم الآزفة والراجفة ويوم الحسرة والندامة. يوم

يقوم الناس لرب العالمين، يوم المناقشة والمحاسبة والمساءلة والموازنة. ﴿...يَوْمٍ

يَنْظُرُ الْمَرْءُ مَا قَدَّمَتْ يَدَاهُ وَيَقُولُ الْكَافِرُ يَا لَيْتَنِي كُنْتُ تُرَابًا﴾،^٢ هذا ما يدين

الله لا ما ذهب إليه هؤلاء المعطّلة. وقد أحسن الذي قال:

فلو إننا إذا متنا تركنا

لكان الموت راحة كلّ حي

ولكننا إذا متنا بُعثنا

ونُسال بعده عن كلّ شيء

عصمنا الله والمسلمين عن القول بما قالوا، ونستغفر الله إن الله غفور رحيم.

فصل.

وأما قولهم بالحساب فإنهم أنكروا ذلك.^٣ قالوا:

وهل الحساب إلا قيام القائم ذي الدّور الجديد.^٤ لا إنه الحساب الذي

ذهبت إليه العوام؛ من السّؤال عن الحسنات والسيئات والمحاکمات

والموازنات وغير ذلك.

^١ Qur'ān: 21-2/89.

^٢ Qur'ān: 40/78.

^٣ من ذلك MS.

^٤ الجديدة MS.

حتى أن أبا يعقوب من كثرة استهزائه بذلك قال:

فلو جَوَزنا القول بذلك وسألكم سائل فقال:

”قد علمنا أن الله تعالى خالق العالمين، الجن والإنس، ليظهر بها

المواليد. ومُرسل الرُّسل ليُصلح بين شأن أشرفها، وهم البشر. وجعل القيامة

لبسط العدل بين خلقه، ويثيب المطيعين ويعاقب العاصين، ويدخل الفريقين

في الدارين: الأبرار في النعيم والفجار في الجحيم. فإذا فرغ من هذه الأشياء

الذي ذكرتم، فما بقي من ربوبيته؟ وفي أي شيء يستعمل قدرته وقد عطل

الأيئية وهدم الخلقة؟ هذا إن كانت القيامة والبعث على ما ذكرتم. فإن تهيأ

لكم جواب لهذه المسائل بما لا تنفر عنه النفوس هاتوه.¹

فاعجب أيّدك الله على تصريحه بتعطيل القيامة، ونفيه للبعث

والحساب والجنّة والنار بلا تأويل ولا تفسير. لكننا نجيبه على محاله فنقول

له:

تكون القدرة مستعملة بعد تعطيل الأيئية وهدم الخلقة التي ذكرت أنها تعطلت

بالشيء الذي كانت فيه مستعملة قبل خلقها. كيف عافاك الله، وما هناك تعطيل

لأيئية ولا هدم لخليقة. بل هي كما كانت، وإنما أدارها من دار الابتلاء إلى دار

¹ Cf. Sijistānī, Iftikhār, 82.

الجزاء. فالقدرة مستعملة في تجديد النعيم لأهل النعيم والعذاب الأليم لأهل الجحيم،
تصديقاً منه لوعده في كتبه، وعلى السنة رُسله. فسبحان الله تعالى عما يصفون،
وتقدّس ذو العزة عما يكيّفون. ولقد استحوذ عليهم الشيطان، فأغواهم وعن طريق
الحق فأرداهم.

5 رجع الكلام. وأما إنكارهم عن الحساب، فإن الله تعالى قد كذبهم بقوله:
﴿اقْتَرَبَ لِلنَّاسِ حِسَابُهُمْ وَهُمْ فِي غَفْلَةٍ مُّعْرِضُونَ﴾^١، وقوله تعالى: ﴿فَأَمَّا مَنْ أُوتِيَ
كِتَابَهُ بِيَمِينِهِ * فَسَوْفَ يُحَاسِبُ حِسَابًا يَسِيرًا * وَيَنْقَلِبُ إِلَىٰ أَهْلِهِ مَسْرُورًا * وَأَمَّا
مَنْ أُوتِيَ كِتَابَهُ وَرَاءَ ظَهْرِهِ * فَسَوْفَ يَدْعُو ثُبُورًا * وَيَصَلِّي سَعِيرًا﴾^٢، وبقوله
تعالى: ﴿فَأَمَّا مَنْ أُوتِيَ كِتَابَهُ بِيَمِينِهِ فَيَقُولُ هَٰؤُلَاءِ أَقْرَأُوا كِتَابِيهِ * إِنِّي ظَنَنْتُ أَنِّي
مُلَاقٍ حِسَابِيهِ * فَهُوَ فِي عِيشَةٍ رَاضِيَةٍ * فِي جَنَّةٍ عَالِيَةٍ * قُطُوفُهَا دَانِيَةٌ * كُلُوا
10 وَاشْرَبُوا هَنِيئًا بِمَا أَسْلَفْتُمْ فِي الْأَيَّامِ الْخَالِيَةِ * وَأَمَّا مَنْ أُوتِيَ كِتَابَهُ بِشِمَالِهِ فَيَقُولُ
يَا لَيْتَنِي لَمْ أُوتَ كِتَابِيهِ * وَلَمْ أَدْرِ مَا حِسَابِيهِ * يَا لَيْتَهَا كَانَتِ الْقَاضِيَةَ * مَا أَغْنَىٰ
عَنِّي مَالِيهِ * هَلْكَ عَنِّي سُلْطَانِيهِ﴾^٣. وفي القرآن من مثل هذا كثير، وفيما ذكرته
كناية لمن وفقه الله تعالى لتصديق ذلك.

¹ Qur'ān: 1/21.

² Qur'ān: 7-12/84.

³ Qur'ān: 19-29/69.

وروى نافع عن ابن عمر عن رسول الله -صلى الله عليه وسلم- أنه قال :

يُحشر النَّاس يوم القيامة كما ولدتهم أمهاتهم حفاة عراة.

فقلت له عائشة -رضي الله عنها- : يا رسول الله ، الرِّجال والنساء؟

قال : نعم.

5 قالت : واسوأته ، أينظر بعضهم عورة بعض؟

فضرب عنكبها وقال : يا ابنة أبي قحافة شغل النَّاس يومئذ عن النظر،

وسمُّوا بأبصارهم إلى السماء موقوفون أربعين سنة ، لا يأكلون ولا يشربون.

فمنهم من يبلغ قدميه عرقه ، ومنهم من يبلغ عنقه من طول الوقوف . فينادي

منادٍ بعد ذلك والملائكة حافيين من حول العرش : أين فلان بن فلان فيشرأب

10 النَّاس إلى نحو ذلك الصوت فيخرج المنادي به . فإذا وقف بين يدي رب

العالمين ، قيل : أين أصحاب المظالم؟ فينادونهم رجلاً رجلاً ، فيؤخذ من

حسناته فيدفع إلى من ظلمه ، فيؤفِّيه لا دينار ولا درهم لأحد إلا أخذ من

الحسنات ورُدَّ من السيئات . فلا يزالون [يستوفون] حسناتهم حتى لا تبقى له

حسنة. ويؤخذ من سيئاتهم فترد عليه. فإذا فرغ حسابه قيل له ارجع إلى أمك

الهاوية.¹ وأما العلم بالأمور.

فإنه: ﴿... لا ظلمَ اليومَ إنَّ اللهَ سَرِيعُ الحِسابِ﴾²، أي سريع المُجازات. فلا

ينفع يومئذ ملك مقرب ولا نبي مرسل ولا شهيد، إلا ظن أنه لا ينجو من شدة

5 الحساب إلا من عصمه الله، والله أعلم بالصواب.

فصل.

وأما قولهم في الميزان فإنهم أنكروا ذلك، وقالوا:

ليس الميزان ما ذهب إليه العامة من وزن الحسنات والسيئات، وإنما

هو ميزان الحكمة مركب من خمسة جواهر، وسبع قطع، واثنى عشر قسطاً.

10 فالخمسة الجواهر دالة على الأبواب الخمسة، والسبع القطع دالة على النطقاء

السبعة، والإثنى عشر قسطاً على الإثنى عشر الحجة المبنوثة في الجزائر التي

تقدم ذكرها.

ومنهم من قال:

¹ Cf. Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 3100. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 5104. Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 3255. Nasā'ī, *Sunan*, no. 2056. Ibn Māja, *Sunan*, no. 4266. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, no. 23131. Darimī, *Sunan*, no. 2682. Cf. *Concordance Et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane*, i, 194 & 483.

² Qur'ān: 17/40.

بل هو الذي إحدى كفتيه الآفاق، والأخرى الأنفس، وحجارته

الشرائع، وأمواله العلوم اللاهوتية.

هذا قولهم في الميزان. وهذا باطل يُبطله قوله تعالى: ﴿وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ الْقِسْطَ

لِيَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ فَلَا تُظْلَمُ نَفْسٌ شَيْئًا وَإِنْ كَانَ مِثْقَالَ حَبَّةٍ مِنْ خَرْدَلٍ أَتَيْنَا بِهَا وَكَفَى بِنَا

5 حَاسِبِينَ﴾^١، وقال: ﴿فَمَنْ يَعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ خَيْرًا يَرَهُ * وَمَنْ يَعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ شَرًّا

يَرَهُ﴾^٢، وقال: ﴿...فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَزْنًا﴾^٣، وقال: ﴿...فَمَنْ ثَقُلَتْ

مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ * وَمَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِينُهُ فَأُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ خَسِرُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ

بِمَا كَانُوا بِآيَاتِنَا يَظْلِمُونَ﴾^٤. ولو كان الحال كما ذهبوا إليه، لما ذكّر الله تعالى مثقال

حبة ولا مثقال ذرة، ولا من خفت موازينه ولا من ثقلت موازينه، والله أعلم.

10 This is what Abū Muḥammad has said about the Ismā‘īlīs. Accordingly, it is necessary to explain the Ismā‘īlī doctrines which have been mentioned above. According to Ismā‘īlī belief, the hierohistory of mankind is divided into seven cycles (*adwār*) and each cycle (*dawr*) has a speaking-Prophet and a *qā’im*. The speaking-Prophet of each cycle is called *sāhib al-kashf* “lord of manifestation”, who has the
15 divine right to bring a new religious law (*sharī‘a*) and abolish the old one. The *qā’im* “the riser” is the seventh Imām, and the last, who has the authority to act as the judge of mankind in his cycle. The time of the resurrection comes when the *qā’im* arises, he then abolishes the *sharī‘a* and manifests the *ḥaqā’iq* “truths”, which are the

¹ Qur’ān: 47/21.

² Qur’ān: 7-8/99.

³ Qur’ān: 105/18.

⁴ Qur’ān: 8-9/7.

unchangable truths contained in the *bā'in*.¹ It should be noted that both Arabic terms, *ba'ṭh* and *qiyāma*, are used as a synonym for resurrection. Some Ismā'īlī thinkers, such as al-Sijistānī, employ each term with a different *ta'wīl*. In his books *al-Iftikhār*² and *al-Maqālīd*,³ al-Sijistānī uses the term *ba'ṭh* to mean "salvation",⁴ where *qiyāma* continues to mean "resurrection".⁵

3. Al-Ṣulayhī and his work *al-Mas'ala wa al-Jawāb*:

One of the important passages in Abū Muḥammad's *Mukhtaṣar* is a quotation of al-Ṣulayhī's answers to a letter sent by one of his adherents in Yemen. These answers are entitled *al-Mas'ala wa al-Jawāb*. Without mentioning the title of the book, Abū Muḥammad says that he read in an Ismā'īlī book the answers to some questions which were sent to al-Ṣulayhī. Abū Muḥammad explains his aim in mentioning some passages (*ba'dⁱⁿ minhā*) from this work, which is to inform his reader of its author's allegations. There is no doubt that the work is written by al-Ṣulayhī, because the same style of writing appears in his letters to al-Mustanṣir bi-
15 Allāh.⁶ In the following passage, Abū Muḥammad refutes al-Ṣulayhī's allegations about the meaning of *ḥudūd*, "limbo" (*al-barzakh*)⁷ as the seventh Speaking-Prophet, i.e., *qa'im al-qiyāma*, and the three hidden Ismā'īlī Imāms. He says:⁸

فصل

وقرأت في بعض كتبهم أجوبة من بعض منهم لعلي بن محمد الصليحي عن

20 سؤالات سأله عنها، وهو إذ ذاك يزعمهم داعٍ من دعواتهم إلى مقاتلتهم هذه بمدينة

¹ Cf. EI², iii, 339.

² Cf. Sijistānī, *Iftikhār*, 74 & 85-91.

³ A manuscript in the Hamdānī collection, see; *iqḥid* number 33, 34 and 35. Cf. Walker, *Early philosophical Shiism*, 134.

⁴ Cf. Kirmānī, *Rāhat al-'Aql*, 508-13.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 513-7. Concerning the *qiyāma*; see above, 53, 59-60, 388-91.

⁶ Cf. 'Uyūn, vii, 79-86 and 151-3. Also see, Ḥ. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, 302-20.

⁷ Cf. EI², i, 1072.

⁸ Abū Muḥammad, *Mukhtaṣar*, 522-7.

صنعاء اليمن. فرأيت بعد خيرة الله تعالى أن أذكر شيئاً منها، ليعجب منها الواقف

عليها من أهل مقاتنا وبا لله الثقة. قال في أولها:

أما بعد، فقد عرضت [ت] علينا مسائلك التي رغبت في الإنابة عن

أجوبتها ما اقتضى محلّك في الدين وحسن اليقين، وإجابتك عنها بما يزيدك

5 في الإيمان بصيرة وتخلص لك في الازدياد من الطاعة سريرة. فنقول لك وبا لله

التوفيق:

أما سؤالك عن فصل قُرِيء في بعض المجالس:

“اطلبوا ما فوق الروحانيين وما فوق الحدود علّوها وسفلها، اطلبوا غاية

الإبداع.”

10 فإننا نقول لك ما قال الله تعالى حاكياً عن قول عيسى بن مريم -عليه

السلام-: ﴿...سُبْحَانَكَ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أَقُولَ مَا لَيْسَ لِي بِحَقِّ﴾¹، وكذا

الأئمة رضي الله عنهم لا يدعون مقاماً فوق ما هو لهم وهذا جوابك.

قال مصنف هذا الكتاب:

ليس هذا بجواب ما سأله عنه، لأنه احتجّ بمعنى الآية وهو بخلافه، وإنما

15 كان الأجود له أن يجيبه على معنى سؤاله، بما يلائم حماقته بأن يقول له: أما

¹ Qur'ān: 116/5.

معنى "اطلبوا ما فوق الروحانيين" فإنه يريد: اجتهدوا أن تكونوا بالطاعة لأئمتكم
والصلاح لأنفسكم من الروحانيين الذين هم أهل الجنة، منعم عليهم أبد الأبدين،
لأنهم فوق الروحانيين الذين هم أهل النار معذبين في أفلاكها أبد الأبدين. فهذا كان
بمعنى هذا.

- 5 وأما معنى قوله: "اطلبوا ما فوق الحدود علوها وسفلها"، فإنه يريد: اعرفوا
فضل الحدود العلوية التي هي السابق والتالي والجد والفتح والخيال على الحدود
السفلى التي هي الناطق والأساس والتمم والإمام والداعي، فهذا كان معنى هذا أيضاً.
- وأما قوله: "واطلبوا ما فوق الحدود العلوية"، فإنه يريد: واعرفوا الأصليين
الذين هما فوق الحدود، والكلمة التي فوق الأصليين، لتناولون بذلك العز الأبدى. فهذا
10 كان جوابه لأنه يلائم حماقته، ولا يلائمها احتجاجه بمعنى الآية، لأنها على غير
ذلك، بل معناها عندنا أن الله أراد أن يخبر محمد -صلى الله عليه وسلم- بما
يقوله يوم القيامة لعيسى بن مريم. وما يجيبه به: ﴿وَإِذْ قَالَ اللَّهُ يَا عِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ
أَأَنْتَ قُلْتَ لِلنَّاسِ اتَّخِذُونِي وَأُمَّيَ إِلَهَيْنِ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ...﴾^١، أي أنت قلت لهم
بهذا في الدنيا، فأجابه: ﴿...لَيْسَ لِي أَنْ أَقُولَ مَا لَيْسَ لِي بِحَقٍّ...﴾^٢؛ أي تنويهاً

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

لك ما ينبغي لي أن أقول ما لا أستحقه، ﴿...إِنْ كُنْتَ قُلْتَهُ فَقَدْ عَلِمْتَهُ...﴾^١؛ أي

أعلم به مني، قبل سؤالك لي عنه، لأنك: ﴿...تَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِي وَلَا أَعْلَمُ مَا فِي

نَفْسِكَ إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ عَلَّامُ الْغُيُوبِ * مَا قُلْتُ إِلَّا مَا أَمَرْتَنِي بِهِ أَنْ اعبُدُوا اللَّهَ رَبِّي

وَرَبِّكُمْ وَكُنْتُمْ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيدًا مَا دُمْتُمْ فِيهِمْ فَلَمَّا تَوَفَّيْتَنِي كُنْتَ أَنْتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ

5 وَأَنْتَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ شَهِيدٌ * إِنَّ تَعَذُّبَهُمْ فَأَنَّهُمْ عِبَادُكَ وَإِنْ تَغْفِرَ لَهُمْ فَإِنَّكَ أَنْتَ

الْعَزِيزُ الْحَكِيمُ﴾^٢؛ فصدق الله جوابه: ﴿قَالَ [اللَّهُ] هَذَا يَوْمٌ يَنْفَعُ الصَّادِقِينَ

صِدْقُهُمْ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٌ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ

وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ ذَلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ﴾^٣. فهذا هو المعنى الصحيح في الآية، لا ما ذهب

إليه من أنهم الأئمة الذين لا يدعون مقاماً فوق ما هو لهم. والله أعلم.

10 رجع الكلام، وأما سؤالك عن البرزخ الذي به، قالوا:

إنَّ الأرواحَ المتنقلة من الأجسام موقوفة فيه إلى حين ظهور القائم وقيامه

لفصل القضاء. فإن ذلك صحيح، لكنه ليس بشخص مشخّص فيشار إليه

بالأصابع، وإنما يتعلّق إلى معرفته بالذهن الصّيقل. فهذا جوابك فاعرفه.

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., 116-8.

³ Ibid., 119.

ويا للرجال من هذا الجواب الفاسد، لأنه أشار به إلى هذا القائم أنه القيامة،

وأنه على يديه القضاء. مع تصريحه بجوابه الذي قال فيه:

وأما سؤالك متى يكون ظهوره؟ فإننا نقول لك، ما قال الله تعالى:

﴿يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ السَّاعَةِ أَيَّانَ مُرْسَاهَا قُلْ إِنَّمَا عِلْمُهَا عِنْدَ رَبِّي لَا يُجَلِّئُهَا

لَوْقَتِهَا إِلَّا هُوَ ثَقُلَتْ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ لَا تَأْتِيكُمُ إِلَّا بَغْتَةً...﴾^١

5

فَبَانَ بهذا مراده أنه الساعة. وهذا خلاف الشرع، لا يقوله مسلم. لأن معنى

الآية خلاف ما احتج به على حماقته، وذلك أن قوماً سألوا النبي -صلى الله عليه

وسلم- عن قيام الساعة، فأنزل الله تعالى: ﴿يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ السَّاعَةِ أَيَّانَ

مُرْسَاهَا...﴾^٢، أي متى حينتها؟ قل "يا محمد": ﴿...إِنَّمَا عِلْمُهَا عِنْدَ رَبِّي لَا

10

يُجَلِّئُهَا لَوْقَتِهَا إِلَّا هُوَ ثَقُلَتْ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ...﴾^٣، ثَقُلَ عليهم وقت قيامها

على أهل السموات والأرض من أن يعلموا به، فلا يعلم به إلا الله سبحانه وتعالى،

ثم أخبر عنها فقال: ﴿لَا تَأْتِيكُمُ إِلَّا بَغْتَةً...﴾^٤، أي لا تأتيهم الساعة إلا فجأة،

لا يعلمون بها إلا وقد أتت. هذا معنى الآية لا ما قد ذهب إليه، والله أعلم.

¹ Qur'ān: 187/7.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

رجع الكلام، إلى جوابه قال:

وأما سؤالك [عمًا] اقتضى ستر أسامي الثلاثة الأئمة المستورين، وما ذكرت أنه لا يكاد يصح لك من أسمائهم شيئاً لاختلاف الروايات فيهم، وحاجتك إلى معرفة الصحيح منها، وأن يساق إليك من البيان ما تعتمد عليه.

5 فإننا نقول لك عن موجب هؤلاء¹ الأئمة الثلاثة -رضي الله عنهم- في حدّ الظلمة والاستتار، عن النبي -صلى الله عليه وسلم-:

من أشرط الساعة مجيء ثلاث ليال متواليات لا يخرق حجاب ظلمتها ضوء النهار. فكانت إشارته -صلى الله عليه وسلم- إلى هؤلاء الأئمة الثلاثة الذين² اشتدت في زمانهم التقيّة، وخفيت آثارهم وأخبارهم وأسمائهم، وهذا جوابك. فاعرف إن شاء الله تعالى.

10

قال أبو محمد:

وهذه حجة باطلة، لأنّ الخبر ورد على غير ما ذكروه، وقد تقدم القول به

فأعنى عن الإعادة ههنا.

قال:

¹ هذه MS.

² التي MS.

وأما استخبارك عن أسمائهم لتعرفها، فليس [ت] معرفة الأسماء

بمنجيةٍ للنفوس ولا رافعةٍ للأقدار. إذ كان العلم هو الذي يرفع الأقدار لا

الأسماء.

قال صاحب الكتاب رضى الله عنه: *لما القى إلى الله تعالى والحق من*

- 5 وفي تخليطه هذا -أيديك الله وزبره- أنه عن تعريضه لعلم أسمائهم حجة، لمن
زعم أن هؤلاء الأئمة المستورين ليسوا من ولد محمد بن إسماعيل -رضى الله عنهم-.
إذ مات ولا عقب له، وإنما هم من ولد ميمون بن مبارك القداح،¹ والله أعلم
بالصحيح من ذلك ما هو.

وفي آخر أجوبته [قال]:

- 10 وأما ما استدعيته من فضلات أكفان آباؤنا لتجعل ذلك في أكفان
المستجيبين من موتاكم، فقد حُيل إليك منه ما تيسر. وأما الكتاب إلى عقيلك
بخطِّ يده بالتبرك به، فقد كتبناه وأصدرناه. وكذا المصحف المطلوب الذي قرأنا
فيه، فقد حملناه متبوعاً بالثوب الذي بتنا فيه، والخاتمين المطلوبين، والدواة

¹ Maymūn ibn Ghaylān ibn Baydar ibn Mahrān ibn Salmān al-Fārisī, well-known as al-Qaddāh (d. ca., the end of the second/eighth century). Qurashī, *Zahr al-Ma‘ānī*, 208. Ghālib, *A‘lām*, 559-61. For more details, see, Ivanow, *The Alleged Founder of Ismailism*, 83-103, 152 & 160. EI², ii, 199. Cf. H. Hamdānī, *Genealogy*, 22. Also see, Daftary, *The Ismā‘īlis*, 109-15.

والأقلام التي هي برسم خاصتنا، والسَّجَادَتَيْنِ اللَّتَيْنِ صَلَّىنا عليهما. قد وَفَّيْنَاكَ

أحسنَ اللهُ توفيقك أجوبةَ السؤالِ، وأحلَّلْنَاكَ المَحَلَّ الَّذِي تستحقه، والسلام.

فاعجب -أيُّدك اللهُ- من سؤاله لما انفذ به، اعتقاداً¹ منه أنه قَرَبَهُ إلى رَبِّه

ونجَّاه² من عذابه. وليس كما ذهب إليه، وإنما القربة إلى الله تعالى والنجاة³ من

5 عذابه بالعمل الصالح مع التوفيق، لا بالخِرْق والأقلام والجِفر. ألا ترى إلى قوله -

صلى اللهُ عليه وسلم- لفاطمة ولأمها رضي اللهُ عنهما:

يا خديجة ابنة خويلد ويا فاطمة ابنة محمد، استوهبا أنفسكما من الله تعالى،

فإني لا أغنى عنكما شيئاً.³

وهما، هما، كيف سواهما؟

10 فبان بهذا فساد ما ذهبوا إليه والله أعلم. قد بينت لك -أيُّدك اللهُ- من

حماقاتهم من كل شيء طرفاً، لتقتدي به على ما بقي منها، إذ الكل هكذا. وجملة

الفائدة في رموزاتهم وألقابهم وما أبطنوه من جهالاتهم، وأخذ العهود عليها مشغلة

موقوفة بالدلالة على: العقل والنفس والقلم واللوح والنطقاء والأسس المتممين والأئمة

¹ منجاه . MS.

² المنجاه . MS.

³ Cf. Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 2548. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, 9417. It should be noted that both references do not mention "Khadīja bint Khuwaylid", the first wife of the Prophet, but they mention instead the Prophet's aunt "Ṣafiyya".

والأجنحة واللواحق والدعاة والمأذونين والمستجيبين، وغير ذلك من ألقابهم التي
رسموها بزعمهم بناءً لدعوتهم. وأتوا عن ذكر الشريعة بالمفروضات والمستحبات،
والفرق بين الحلال والحرام، والوعد والوعيد، والبعث والنشور والحشر، والحساب
والميزان، والجنة والنار، وطاعات الدنيا وأسباب الآخرة، والله أعلم. فالله تعالى
يسألهم عما ندبوا الناس إليه من هذه الجهالات والمحالات، فالحذر منهم.