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ABSTRACT


The thesis is anchored upon a text extracted from an important 11th/17th century Yemeni historical work. This text deals primarily with al-Hāḍī ilā 'l-Haqq, the founder of the Zaydi imamate in the Yemen that lasted well over a thousand years. Al-Hāḍī's imamate, of considerable significance in itself, also coincides with one of the most turbulent periods of early Yemeni mediaeval history. The edited Arabic text, with its accompanying apparatus criticus, is to be found at the opposite end of this volume.

The introduction considers various aspects of Imam al-Hāḍī's life, religious ideas and aspirations and matters directly connected with the edited text and the work of which it forms a part. Among the most important subjects discussed are the MSS used in the production of the edited text, the problem concerning the authorship of Ghayat al-amāḥ大众 and the relationship of the latter work to Anbā' al-zaman. A short biography of al-Hāḍī is provided, together with a treatment of the historical background to al-Hāḍī's imamate. The introduction also describes the editorial method followed with regard to the text, and certain key personal names and toponyms are dealt with there.

The method employed by the author of the Ghayat is to record the events of any one year by itself. I have translated one year at a time and then followed it by the annotations appertaining to it. It is hoped that by means of these annotations, (some of which through necessity are quite detailed), the text will be better understood. The numerous personages, tribal names and toponyms are considered, as well as problems concerning points of chronology and various matters of historical and religious significance. Specific comment is made upon certain interesting terms or any unusual or striking vocabulary. The thesis concludes with maps, genealogical tables and a comprehensive bibliography.
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The horses and every spear testify
to my tenacity, prowess and courage.

Truly Dhūl-Faqār bears witness that
I gave its two blades to drink of the
blood of vile folk.

Time and time again I quenched its thirst
in every confrontation,
seeking to avenge the Faith and Islam.

So that Dhūl-Faqār recalled battles
waged by him who possessed power,
the leader, the noble one.

My grandfather is 'Alī, he of transcendent
virtues and perspicacity,
the sword of God and the smasher
of the idols.

The true brother of the Apostle and,
after the Prophet, the best whom
the earth ever covered up,
the Imam of every imam.

(Al-Ḥādī Yaḥyā b.al-Ḥusayn)
INTRODUCTION

The historical setting

It has been rightly suggested that the year 284 / 897-8 is a date of supreme significance in the Islamic history of the Yemen. [1] This was the year in which a scion of the Prophet Muḥammad arrived in the northern Yemeni city of Sa’dah (for the second time but this time to stay) and there, having been given allegiance as imam, and taking the title of al-Hādī ila ’l-Haqq, established a Zaydī imamate which was to continue almost uninterruptedly well into the present century.

For the next fourteen years, that is up to the death of al-Hādī in 298 / 911, the Yemen witnessed a struggle between three conflicting elements. It was at its most intense around the ancient city of San’ā’ and in the central highlands, although practically the whole of what is now the Yemen Arab Republic was involved: from al-Janad, not far from present-day Ta’izz in the south, to Najrān just inside modern Saudi Arabia. Tihāmah, the plain running parallel to the Red Sea, was also not exempt from the conflict.

Al-Hādī soon found himself in dispute with the Yu’firids an indigenous Yemeni dynasty who, several decades previously, had established themselves in central Yemen and who nominally gave allegiance to the Abbasid caliph. The third element was the Fatimids. [2] Shi’Is like the Zaydi’s, who, led by Ibn Hawshab and Calf b. Fadl had for the past twenty-five years, been gradually increasing their control over large areas of the Yemen.

In addition to these three forces there were numerous independent or semi-independent rulers not committed to any particular brand of Islam, imam or caliph, but who out of self-interest were prepared to enter into alliance with anybody and whose movements were often dictated by their
loyalty to a particular tribe or tribal confederation. Moreover, tribal factors and considerations often influenced the activities of the main conflicting parties.

The events of these years are described in a work called *Ghayat al-amānī fī akhbār al-qutr al-Yamānī*. It covers the period from the appearance of Islam until well into the 11th/17th century. It is that section of the work which deals with the years 280-298 / 893-911, (280 being the year when al-Hādi first visited the Yemen), which forms the subject of this thesis.

"Ghayat al-amānī"

A brief discussion of the work as a whole would perhaps be appropriate here. It is certainly not short and in the printed edition occupies over 700 pages. The aim of the author, (whose identity will be discussed below), as stated at the outset of his book was to provide a history exclusively of the Yemen, a topic which he considered had been neglected by other historians, only referring to events which occurred elsewhere in the Islamic world where they would enrich the understanding of his own subject. Although he defines al-Yaman as being tantamount to the Arabian Peninsula! (reminiscent of the champions of the "Yaman al-Kubrā" theories of this century), yet in practice the Yemen means to him the equivalent of the two Yemens of the present day (especially that area now covered by the Yemen Arab Republic) as well as Najrān, Abū Ārifsh, Ṣabyā and the Sarawāt which, although they are at present technically not part of the Yemen, are nevertheless historically and culturally Yemenite.

After a brief astronomical and geographical excursion, the author launches straight into the birth of the Prophet Muḥammad and a terse account of his life as an act of piety, neglecting completely the pre-Islamic history of his country, for it is clearly Islamic Yemen that is
his concern. Up to 280 / 893-4, the history is much more general in character. The Umayyad and Abbasid governors over the Yemen are mentioned, but the author is more interested in the revolts led by imams from Ahl al-Bayt in the Hejaz and elsewhere. For instance, he gives details of the insurrection in 169 / 786 headed by al-Hasan b. Aifi b. al-Hasan considered by the Zaydi as one of their imams. The first eight decades of the 3rd / 9th century are covered in just sixteen pages (of the printed edition). Indeed it could be said that the history proper begins with the arrival in 280 in the Yemen of al-Hadi Yahya b. al-Husayn.

This fact is not surprising. The author is clearly a fervent Zaydi and views the whole of Yemeni history as being centred around the personality of the imams and their attempt to propagate their rule and the madhhab of the Ahl al-Bayt. Other happenings in the Yemen like, for instance, the exploits of other rulers and their dynastic feuds are usually (but by no means exclusively) only mentioned if they have a direct bearing upon the policies and activities of the Zaydi imams and serve the narrator in his principal task: that of extolling the role of the imams (who alone, in Zaydi eyes, possess the legality to rule since they are considered the sole legitimate inheritors of the imamate of Aifi b. Abd Talib).

Seven and a half centuries later, our historian relates the rise (qiyaam) of a scion of al-Hadi, Imam al-Manṣūr bi-llah al-Qasim b. Muḥammad who continued the jihaḍ of his distant cousin al-Mutawakkil Yaḥya Sharaf al-Dīn and his son al-Muṭahhar against the Turkish invaders, and the narrative comes to an end during the imamate of al-Qasim's eldest son, al-Mu'ayyad Muḥammad, with the exit in Sha'ban 1045 / January 1636 of the last Turkish garrison from the Yemen.
The research topic

The text with which this thesis is concerned, takes up just 35 pages (including notes) of the printed text. That the author has been able to compress sixteen exceptionally eventful years into such a space was no mean feat. The style is thus succinct, often extremely so. The text is replete with numerous toponyms many of which are abstruse, also names of tribes and clans, and names of individuals whose identity is sometimes obscure. The text is also packed with action—campaigns, battles, conspiracy. All these factors coupled with the interaction of the three conflicting forces referred to above, together with the response of the tribes and the various petty dynasties to the dramatic events which were taking place on Yemeni soil, combine to make this text not only one of the most fascinating sections of the whole work but also one of its most complex.

With this text from Ghayat al-amānī as its "axle", I have attempted in the present study to portray a clear, detailed picture of what happened in the Yemen during those two momentous decades, with al-Ḥāḍir Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn as the central character of the drama. Thus I have omitted from my consideration those parts of the text which have no real connection with the activities of al-Ḥāḍir nor with the Zaydī imamate which he founded. I have omitted in particular that long digression where the writer describes how the Fatimid da'wah to the Yemen began and where he narrates the early fortunes of the two da'īs. [12] I have included however the movements of Alī b. Faḍl from his occupation of al-Mudhaykhirah, and the subsequent killing of Ja'far al-Manakhī, since this passage leads up naturally to Ibn Faḍl's advance across the southern highlands and his taking of Ṣan'a'. [13]

Ṣan'a' was the city which not only Alī b. Faḍl but also As'ad (the Yu'firid) and al-Ḥāḍir aspired to control, and so it is especially
in the central highlands and in Şan 'ār itself and the region round about that
the movements of the three parties in the power-struggle become intertwined
one with another. Thus, to attempt to separate the activities of al-Hādī from
those of his rivals would both distort the historical perspective and, most
probably, confuse the reader.

The printed text

At an early stage in my research, I suspected that the
printed text of Ghāyat al-amanī could not be regarded as authoritative, and my
suspicions were substantiated after comparing Cašūr's text with microfilms
of the two MSS used by him in his edition. In the printed Ghāyat al-amanī
there are several errors in the reading of the MSS which could not possibly be
explained away as printing errors, some of which are serious. There are
also omissions, in one case of a whole sentence. Moreover, certain key
proper names whose correct pointing has generally been agreed upon by
scholars, like Khultum, Ibn al-Ruwayyah, Uthāfit, have been incorrectly pointed
in the printed text, quite arbitrarily it seems.

Although the editor does state that he took one of the two
MSS he used as his asn, he obviously did not intend to present a critical
edition since he does not mention a word about any method he may have used
to arrive at his text. Thus one has no idea of what his actual asl looked
like nor is there any indication where the asl differs from the second MS.

Furthermore, where the spelling of certain individuals and
toponyms in the asl is clearly wrong, the editor neither emends the name in
his printed text nor ( if he chose not to do this ) does he point out the
correct version in a footnote or in his introduction. Thus, for instance,
al-Hādī's Cūmil Muhammad b. Čubahdullāh appears on three occasions as
Muhammad b. Č Abdullāh without comment, and similarly the village of Kitāf as
K-nāf and Itwah as L-b-wah, ( see below, pp. 57, 60 ).
These numerous shortcomings in the printed edition of 
Ghāyat al-aman spurred me to embark upon a new critical edition of this 
section.

The MSS

The two MSS used by Ẓ̣ašur, I too have used. The 
first one belongs to the Ẓ̣a Amīr Library in Istanbul. No. 2375, and is 
dated 1179 / 1766, the scribe being Muḥsin b. Mahdī b. Ḥusayn al-Hibbī.

The second MS belongs to the Khudā Bakhsh Oriental Public Library at Patna (more exactly, Bankipore) in the Indian state of 
Bihar. It is No. 2315, and is dated 1199 / 1785. The name of the scribe 
is Muqbil b. Ẓ̣Abduh b. al-Ḥājj Ẓ̣-t-l-h. Ẓ̣ašur gives the date as 
1196 [14] and certainly this date appears in figures above the words 
wa-tisna in the colophon, but the scribe has written unmistakably the 
words tisna and it is impossible for this tisna to be taken as 
a sittah. The date in figures has clearly been added by another hand.
He also says that the MS consists of 139 folios, which is misleading since 
f. 139 is a blank. In fact the text of the Ghāyat ends half-way down 
f. 137b, and the two stories that follow, (until the bottom of f. 138b), are 
etirely unconnected with it.

Sayyid [15] gives the place of the second MS as 
Khudā Bakhsh, Patna (Ẓ̣ašur has, wrongly, Matnah), the number of folios 
as 139 and supplies the incorrect date. However, he then goes on to list 
a third MS at Bankipore obviously not realizing that Khudā Bakhsh Patna and 
Bankipore are one and the same library. He gives the date of this 
"Bankipore" MS as 1199, the number of folios as 138 and the number of 
the MS as 1099. It is clear that Sayyid has gleaned his information 
directly from the Bankipore catalogue. There, [16] under entry 1099 the 
MS, (which is described by its longer and lesser-known title), is said to
have 138 folios and is dated Thursday, 16 Rajab 1199. The MS was transcribed for a certain qadi whose name was Wajih al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Yahyā al-ʿAnisī. The name of the scribe is given (untransliterated) as Muqbil b. ʿAbduh b. al-Ḥājj ʿAlī b. ʿAbdullāh. This information is identical with that found in our second MS, (described above), except in one small detail. In the colophon of the MS, the last part of the scribe’s name appears as ʿAlī b. ʿAbdullāh, whereas the catalogue has "b. ʿAbdullāh"). I believe it safe to presume, however, that entry No. 1099 of the Bankipore catalogue and Khuda Bakhsh No. 2315 are one and the same manuscript and that "b. ʿAbdullāh" was a slip on the part of the compiler of the catalogue.

The fact that the Bankipore catalogue describes the MS as having 138 folios, whereas ʿAshūr says that the Khuda Bakhsh MS has 139 (which is also the number found in the formal description of the MS within the microfilm), may have further misled Sayyid into supposing that he was dealing with two separate MSS. Moreover, he may even have been misled by the fact that the catalogue does not mention at all the better-known name of the work. The reason for this omission on the part of the compiler of the catalogue, was probably that he did not notice the words wa-yusamma Ghayat al-amanī etc. which appear, quite unobtrusively and in a slanting fashion, along with a lot of other writings and jottings of various description around the longer title of the work and its author.

With regard to both the ʿAlī Amīrī and Khuda Bakhsh MSS, I have used copies of microfilms lodged with the Institute of Manuscripts at the Arab League in Cairo.

In addition to the ʿAlī Amīrī and Khuda Bakhsh MSS, I have used a third. It was formerly No. 9745 of the Staatsbibliotek in Berlin and now belongs to the Staatsbibliotek Preussischer Kulturbesitz in that city. The title of the MS is Anbāʿ al-zaman fī akhbar al-Yaman, of which Ghayat al-amanī is allegedly an abridgement. However, even a cursory comparison between this MS and the two MSS of Ghayat al-amanī
mentioned above, will show that all three MSS are but three different copies of the same work. [18]

As will be discussed below, Anba' al-zaman most probably exists but it is certainly not this MS in Berlin. The date of the third MS is 1296 / 1878 and the scribe was a sayyid called Husayn b. Abdulhah. [19]

The authorship of "Ghayat al-amani"

Now I should like to turn to the question of the author of the Ghayat and the relationship of the latter to Anba' al-zaman.

Both the Istanbul and Khuda Bakhsh MSS contain a brief preamble at the head of which appears the full title of the work followed by its author, namely: "The book C Aqilat al-diman [being an] abridgement (mukhtasar) of Anba' [the hamzah is indicated in the Khuda Bakhsh MS] al-zaman [the hamzah is indicated in the Khuda Bakhsh MS] sayyid, al-Sayyid al-Calla'mah al-majid al-fahhamah C imad al-Islam C ayy a y a n a l-C itr a h al-kir a:m, Yahya b. al-Husayn b. Amir al-Muminin al-Mu'ayyad bi-'Ilah Muhammad b. al-Qasim b. Muhammad b. C Alif, peace be upon them [all]." [20] The position of the words, "[otherwise / better-] known as (wa-yusamma) Ghayat al-amani [ff akhbar al-qutr al-Yaman]," in the Khuda Bakhsh MS has been noted above. In the C Alif Amiri MS, however, they could not miss being noticed for they have been written (albeit as an afterthought it seems) just above the longer title.

Regarding the name of the author, in the C Alif Amiri MS the scribe wrote originally the author's name as Yahya b. al-Husayn b. Amir al-Muminin al-Qasim b. Muhammad. Afterwards this was corrected by him or by a later hand (it is difficult to tell which), in that "al-Mu'ayyad bi-'Ilah Muhammad b." has been written above the line to follow Amir al-Muminin, i.e. one is meant to read, ".....Amir al-Muminin
al-Mu'ayyad bi-`Iliāh Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim "...". However, in the Khudā Bakhsh MS, that part of the author's name, "...Amīr al-Mu'minīn al-Mu'ayyad bi-`Iliāh Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim " is very distinct and has undergone no correction. Then, the scribe originally went on to write, incorrectly, " al-Qāsim b. ṣAlf " , but afterwards " b. Muḥammad " was written by him just above the line ( to follow " al-Qāsim " ), so that the latter part of the name appears clearly, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. ṣAlf. As will be seen below, a similar error ( " al-Qāsim b. ṣAlf " ) occurs on the title-page of the Berlin MS, but there it has not been corrected.

( It should perhaps be pointed out at this juncture that the title of deference sayyīdī , or sīdī , that precedes the honorific epithets, could have been said by the original amanuensis, a later scribe, or even the scribe who wrote the MS. It might indicate that he was a pupil or close associate of the author, his son, a relative, or a descendant. The term is not confined to the living. )

Then, at the beginning of the preamble, one reads, " The author ( mu'allīf ) of Anbā' al-zaman ( may God have mercy upon him ) mentioned that he had gathered together [ the information in it ] from numerous historical works », and then follows a list in detail. At the end of the list of works and their authors there follows a brief remark about the benefit derived from a study of history, a pious invocation and then the words: " [ That is what ] the compiler ( al-musannīf ) said, may God have mercy upon him, and [ this important wāw is omitted by ṣAshūr despite its presence in both the ṣAlf Amīrī and Khudā Bakhsh MSS ] [21] the compilation [ of the work ] was commenced in the year 1065 [ 1654-5 ] ".

The words at the end of the preamble, gāla `l-musannīf followed by the wāw, I believe are crucial for the understanding of the passage. They are kind of " summing-up " words by the scribe ( most
probably the original amanuensis) referring to what preceded in the preamble.

The musannif must be the author of the work of which this is the preamble (scil. Ghāyat al-amānī) since it would not make sense to refer to another work in this context. However the meaning is made clear beyond doubt by what follows qāla 'l-musannif, viz. wa-kāna 'btidā' jamā'īhi where it is manifest that the pronoun in jamā'īhi can only refer to Ghāyat al-amānī and to no other work.

The meaning of the beginning of the preamble now seems to be clear. It is the writer of Ghāyat al-amānī who is speaking and he wishes to draw his reader's attention to the author of Anbā' al-zaman who composed his book from numerous sources and so on, where the enclitic in jamā'āhu obviously refers to Anbā' al-zaman. Because of what follows, I believe one must here state the obvious, viz. that the author of Ghāyat al-amānī is not speaking of himself when he says, dhakara mu'allif Anbā' al-zaman. If the writer of Ghāyat al-amānī had also written Anbā' al-zaman, that is to say he was now writing a preamble to an abridgement of his own work, he would not have expressed himself in such an abstruse way. Even if he had chosen to speak impersonally, he would have said something like: dhakara 'l-mu'allif annahu jamā'ā (kitābahu) Anbā' al-zaman min tawāriḵh ʿadīdah ..... .

Of course, if the imprecation rahimahu 'llāh, (which follows immediately dhakara mu'allif Anbā' al-zaman), were the actual words of the author of Ghāyat al-amānī, this would clinch the matter. However, since such words, (as is also the case with expressions like radiya 'llāh ḍā'āhu and Salāḥy 'l-salām) are often the work of scribes and so traditionally are not regarded as an integral part of the nāss, I therefore do not believe that this imprecation can be taken to establish a point in the present argument. In this particular case, it is possible that the writer of
Ghayat al-amānī and that of Anbā' al-zaman were contemporaries (if one accepts the traditional authorship of the latter), as will be seen below. Similarly, the same formula after qāla 'l-muṣannīf was probably added by a scribe other than the original amanuensis.

It is truly remarkable that Āshūr, without any discussion whatsoever, asserts categorically that Ghayat al-amānī is the work of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim. The latter is the grandson of the renowned imam, al-Mansūr bi-‘llāh al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad (reg. 1006-1029 / 1597-1620) and thus Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Mu‘ayyad Muḥammad would be his first cousin (once-removed).

Why did Āshūr jump to such a conclusion? Was it because of the correction, referred to above, in the name in the Alī Amīrī MS? I hardly think so because Āshūr makes no mention of this in his edition. I believe that the most probable reason for Āshūr’s error lies in the presence of a title-page in the Alī Amīrī MS, (there is no such page in the Khudā Bakhsh). This page, (the front of a leaf), is separated from the aforementioned title and preamble (f. 1a) by another leaf on the front of which, (strangely, photographed three times in the microfilm), is written a line of poetry (twice) from a poem by al-Mutanabbī, (which, incidentally, first appears by itself on the front of the leaf before the title-page), various pious sentiments, and also jottings concerned largely, so it appears, with the ownership of the MS. The verso of the latter leaf is almost a blank. This leaf has clearly nothing whatsoever to do with our text.

On this "title-page", (the verso of which is a blank), there is no mention of Āgīfat al-dimān nor of Anbā' al-zaman, and the title appears simply as, Kitāb Ghayat al-amānī fī‘akhbār al-qutr al-Yamanī. This work is described as being the composition (ta’līf) of "al-Sayyid al-‘allāmah [and then follow the other epithets in the order listed above] Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. Amīr al-Mu‘minīn al-Qāsim b. Alī [sic], upon whom be peace". The writing, not that of the scribe of the text, is manifestly
more recent and not far removed from a scribble.

It seems that \( \text{\textsuperscript{C}}\)Ashur took this title-page to be authoritative and on that premise, after he had heard that Yahy\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{23}}\) b. al-Husayn b. al-Qasim was commonly held to be the author of \text{\textsuperscript{Anb\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{4}}\) al-zaman}. Naturally assumed that Ghayat al-am\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{\text{\textsuperscript{m}}}}\) was by the same author and that thus Yahy\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\) had in fact abridged his own work. He spotted that \"al-Qasim b. \text{\textsuperscript{\textit{Ali\textsuperscript{\footnote{23}}\)}} \" was manifestly incorrect, substituted for it \"al-Qasim b. Muhammad b. \text{\textsuperscript{\textit{Ali\textsuperscript{\footnote{23}}\)}} \" and then reproduced the title with its alleged author on the front page of his edition. Thus \( \text{\textsuperscript{C}}\)Ashur neglects completely the name of the author as found clearly at the head of the preamble of both MSS he was using, and which he himself faithfully transmitted in his own edited text. ( Vol.1, p. 48 )! Moreover, he does not even mention the name that appears there anywhere in his preface preferring, so it would seem, the evidence of a title-page which is entirely divorced from the text that he took as his asl.

In the preface to his edition of the Ghayat, \( \text{\textsuperscript{C}}\)Ashur asserts that the author of \text{\textsuperscript{Anb\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{4}}\) al-zaman (scil. Yahya b. al-Husayn b. al-Qasim) came to the conclusion that \text{\textsuperscript{Anb\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{4}}\) al-zaman was too long and that it contained certain [particular] details and excursus that should be omitted (..... wa-anna bihi min al-tafs\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{\text{\textsuperscript{r}}\) al-istit\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{\text{\textsuperscript{r}}}\) at m\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{\text{\textsuperscript{a}}}\) yanbaghi hidhfuhu } and thus set about making an abridgement (scil. Ghayat al-am\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{\text{\textsuperscript{m}}}}\) ), but he gives no authority for what he writes.

In many recent publications, one finds Yahya b. al-Husayn b. al-Qasim accepted unquestionably as the author of Ghayat al-am\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{\text{\textsuperscript{m}}}}\). That seems to be the direct result of \( \text{\textsuperscript{C}}\)Ashur’s publication and, particularly, the printing of the incorrect name on the front page, plus (perhaps) an uncritical acceptance of \( \text{\textsuperscript{C}}\)Ashur’s assumptions in his preface.

For instance, Sayyid \( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{24}}}\) lists six works of Yahya b. al-Husayn b. al-Qasim of which No 4 is Ghayat al-am\( \text{\textsuperscript{\footnote{\text{\textsuperscript{m}}}}\). Brockelmann
also records the Bankipore MS under the number 1099, using the alternative, less known, title of Ghāyat al-amānī, Aqīlat ad-dimān (sic), but, unlike Sayyid, he gives the name of the author as found in the Bankipore catalogue and in the MS itself: viz. Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Muʿayyad bi-ʿllāh. Sayyid's carelessness in this respect is inexcusable: he seems simply to be following blindly CĀshūr.

Hībshī [26] includes Ghāyat al-amānī erroneously among the works of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim and in an edition of Rāzī's history [27] it is also listed as being his composition.

Anawai, [28] when reviewing CĀshūr's Vol.I, just assumes that the author of Anbā' al-zaman made an abridgement of his own work and Jāsir, [29] in a lengthy and harsh criticism of CĀshūr's edition (some of which itself is not beyond reproach), does not, however, question CĀshūr's conclusions concerning the authorship. Wilson, [30] when discussing Ghāyat al-amānī, which was the principal text employed in his thesis, regretfully does not hesitate to attribute it to the author of Anbā' al-zaman, scil. Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim. CĀshūr's edition of Ghāyat al-amānī, one of the principal sources for Gochenour's thesis, is listed without question by Gochenour [31] as being from the pen of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim.

Fortunately CĀshūr's conclusions have not been accepted by all. Smith [32] sensed, correctly, that Ghāyat al-amānī could not be the composition of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim, author of Anbā' al-zaman. Although Jirāfī [33] was incorrect when he suggested that the preamble (dībājah) to Ghāyat al-amānī actually contains the information that the latter was the work of the author of the asl, Anbā' al-Zaman, he does state the name of the author as found at the head of the preamble (discussed above) viz. Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim. Then Jirāfī provides an interesting observation, namely that in the library of the Great Mosque in Šanqā' he had seen a list [34] of the works of the author of Anbā' al-zaman (referring
to Yahya b. al-Husayn b. al-Qasim), numbering 53 in all, the list having been written allegedly by the author himself, and that Ghayat al-amānī was not among them. This piece of information is substantiated by Ibrāhīm b. al-Qasim b. al-Mansūr al-Qasim (d. 1145 / 1732-3) in his Tabaqat al-Zaydiyyah al-kubra [35] who does not mention Ghayat al-amānī as being among the works of Yahya b. al-Husayn b. al-Qasim, although he does mention Anbā' al-zaman and the two works that compliment it, namely, Bahjat al-zaman fī ḥawādith al-Yaman and al-Ibrā fī mulūk Himyar.

Regarding the third MS used in this study, that is the Berlin MS already referred to above, the title Anbā' al-zaman is clearly wrong but the name of the author is the same as that of the other two MSS of Ghayat al-amānī up to the author's grandfather, thus - Yahya b. al-Husayn b. al-Mu'ayyad b. al-Qasim. Then the name in the MS continues: b. Muhammad b. al-Qasim b. al-'Alī. That is obviously an error on the part of the scribe since al-Mu'ayyad's father was al-Qasim, not Muhammad. [36] Either the scribe did not realize that Muhammad b. al-Qasim, when he was elected imam, took the laqab of al-Mu'ayyad bi-'Ilāh, or he was simply confused and put the name of al-Qasim's father, Muhammad, before that of the son, the correct order of course being al-Mu'ayyad (Muhammad) b. al-Qasim b. Muhammad b. al-'Alī, (reg. 1029-1054 / 1620-1644). It is noted that the honorific epithets that precede the name of Yahya are the same as those found in the other two MSS referred to, except that the word sayyid does not appear.

Just to the left of the title and name of author, the same scribe, apparently, has written that "perhaps this history [was written by] (sayyid) Yahya b. al-Husayn b. al-Qasim" and refers to another work by (sayyid) Ibrāhīm b. al-Qasim b. al-Mu'ayyad, mentioned above, where Anbā' al-zaman fī akhābār al-Yaman is cited in the margin. [37] It is interesting that the editor of the Berlin MS prefers the first version of the author's name, Yahya b. al-Husayn b. al-Mu'ayyad [38] (for reasons which will be
mentioned below when discussing briefly Anbāʾ al-zaman and its authorship) but he, like Strothmann [39] and Brockelmann, [40] does not question the title given to the MS, Anbāʾ al-zaman fī ḥikbār al-Yaman.

Even without a reference to what is known concerning the character of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Muʿayyad Muḥammad, his learning and achievements (all to be discussed below), there would seem little reason to doubt that he was indeed the writer of Ghāyat al-āmaīn. One has the testimony of three MSS whose place of origin was the Yemen and which were copied by Yemeni and where the name of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn together with his genealogy, back to the grandfather of his great-grandfather, is written out clearly (at least, in two of them) at the beginning of the MS. It would not be rash to suspect that there exist further MSS of this work in the Yemen today.

Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim - a character sketch

Although no Yemeni biographical work accessible to me mentions Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Muʿayyad Muḥammad (1044-1090 / 1635-1679) as being the author of Ghāyat al-āmaīn, yet what we can glean about his character from such works would be most compatible with his being a writer of history. Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn appears to have belonged to the radical Shiʿī wing of Zaydism (al-Jārūdīyyah), so Shawkānī's article on him [41] is somewhat tainted by his well-known hostility to that school of thought. [42]

We do learn, however, that Yahyā was noted for possessing a good memory, that he studied medicine, was a poet and was concerned with usūl and figh. He performed the Pilgrimage several times and held important provincial governorships under Imam al-Mahdī Ḥasan b. al-Qāsim (reg. 1087-1092 / 1676-1681).

One learns much more about the personality of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn from Bughyat al-murīd wa-ʿuns al-farīd by ʿAmir b. Muḥammad
b. Abdullah which (as the full title suggests) is a biographical work about the descendants of [the father of al-Mansūr al-Qāsim] Alī b. Muḥammad al-Raḥīm and which was probably completed in 1130 / 1718. There, he is described as an outstanding scholar who attained the rank of mujtahid and had an amazing memory. He possessed a keen intellect and a thorough grasp of his sources (dhīn waqqād wa-riwāyah wa-asnād) especially concerning ʿulūm ʿAlī Muḥammad, and was a poet of excellence.

On the death of al-Mutawakkil Ismāʿīl (1087 / 1676) he did not make an attempt to claim the imamate (lam yata arrad li-da wah - sic) even though the people hoped that he would because of "his completeness" (kamālīhi) i.e. he possessed all the qualities which an imam should have.

Unfortunately, the author of Bughyat al-murīd does not inform us much about Yahyā’s literary output contenting himself with the statement wa-lahu maqālāt wa-hawāshī wa-stinbatāt.

Yet more information about our author is contained in Nasamat al-sahar bi-dhikr man tashayyaʿ wa-shaʿara which perhaps is not remarkable seeing that its compiler was Yūsuf, one of the eight sons of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Muʿayyad, who completed his task in 1111 / 1699 and who tells us that he was about nine in the year before his father’s death. The account is packed with biographical detail, and the picture that emerges, even allowing for possible exaggeration on the part of the son, is that of an outstanding personality, active in the administration of the Zaydī state, a man of great learning and piety. The people were expecting him to become imam, seeing him to be fully qualified for the office, even in the days of al-Mutawakkil Ismāʿīl b. al-Qāsim (reg. 1054-1087 / 1644-1676) to say nothing of other times. Then follows a statement that even Yūsuf could not have made if it had not been true or at least near the truth: Yahyā was the most learned of ʿAlī Manṣūr, the descendants of al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad, put together, the most pious of them and the most
Although Yūsuf tells us that his father was an assiduous collector of books and that he took most of them with him on his numerous journeys, he does not provide details of his literary output. However in one passage there is, I believe, a remark of some significance. After describing his father as a scholar, a mujtahid, an authority on hadīth and as having an outstanding memory (ḥāfiz may not be used in a technical sense here), he goes on to say that he was ja‘ilan fi ḍahwat al-tarīkh (this is how I interpret the MS which has sahwat, unpointed), literally "going back and forth in the pool of history". In this context, (it is followed by the remark [wa-kāna] ʿimāman il-fārāʾīyāt), I understand that to be a clear indication of his historical activity. Even without that statement, however, what we have already indicated concerning the character of Yāhūd b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Mu‘ayyad only points to the suitability of his having been the author of Ghāyat al-ʿamānī and substantiates the evidence of his name in the MSS.

With a family background such as that possessed by Yāhūd, it is hardly surprising if he turned out to be a man of considerable learning and literary accomplishment. His great-grandfather al-Mansūr al-Qāsim was a renowned theologian and mujtahid. His great-uncles al-Ḥusayn and al-Mutawakkil Ismāʿīl and the latter’s son al-Mu‘ayyad Muḥammad, Muḥammad and al-Ḥusayn - sons of his great-uncles al-Ḥasan, his father al-Ḥusayn, his uncle al-Qāsim b. al-Mu‘ayyad (who twice claimed the imamate) - all these were men of scholarly activity and disposition.

Anbāʾ al-zaman

It would seem to be outside the scope of this present study to discuss Anbāʾ al-zaman and its authorship. However, since Ghāyat al-ʿamānī is alleged to be a mukhtasar of it and because the author of
Anbāʾ al-zaman has been, in my view, erroneously credited with the authorship of the mukhtasar. I feel that a few remarks concerning the other work would not be out of place here.

At the outset it must be stressed that since Anbāʾ al-zaman remains entirely in MS form and has not yet been the subject of a scholarly analysis, no definitive comparison of course can yet be made between it and Ghāyat al-amanī. A modern Yemeni writer is obviously too hasty when he asserts that both works are one and the same. [53] I do not share Wilson's pessimism that Anbāʾ al-zaman may no longer be extant. [54]

The work has in the past often been mentioned by Yemeni writers and has never been described as lost. Sayyid [55] notes several MSS of this work (two of which will be mentioned below - unfortunately he includes Berlin 9745 and Māqī’s publication in his list, q.v. above, p. 23f.). From his few words of introduction it would appear that Sayyid has actually perused the text.

One can be reasonably sure that Anbāʾ al-zaman (like Ghāyat al-amanī) ended with the events of 1045 / 1635-6 since the historical composition Bahjat al-zaman fī ḥawādith al-Yaman, which is believed to have been written by the author of Anbāʾ al-zaman as a ḏhayl to the latter, commences with the year 1046 / 1636. [56]

As was mentioned above, the author of Tabaqāt al-Zaydīyyah al-kubrā attributes Anbāʾ al-zaman to Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim (Imam al-Manṣūr bi-llāh) b. Muḥammad (c. 1035-1100 (?)/1625-1688), who was thus a contemporary of the writer of Ghāyat al-amanī. In another work by the author of Tabaqāt, al-Nafahāt al-miskiyyah fī 'l-ʿulamāʾ wa-ʾl-fuguhāʾ min al-Zaydīyyah, referred to by the scribe on the title-page of the Berlin MS, the former says: [57] Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim has [many] compositions, the best of which being the one he derived from [other] historical works (āḥsanuḥu mā naqalahu min kutub al-tārīkh).
The scribe observes that in the margin of the Nafahāt, Sayyid C Abdullāh b. C Isā b. Muḥammad al-KawkabānT (c. 1170-1224 / 1756-1809) had commented. "[Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn] called it Anbāʾ al-zaman fī akhbār al-Yaman".

In Bughayt al-murīd (a work completed twelve years or so before the Tabaqāt), there is mention of a book on fiqh, Sharḥ al-Aznār by Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim and mention of his letters and margin-commentaries, but of no historical work. However, in a slightly earlier work completed apparently in 1118 / 1706 (the MS is dated 1191 / 1777) and concerned in particular with events in the Yemen in the second half of the 11th / 17th century, Tabaq al-halwā wa-sihāf al-mann wa-l-salwā by C Abdullāh b. C Aḥī ibn al-Wazīr, the author says that he has become acquainted with a history written by a son / scion of one of the Yemeni kings (li-baʾid abnāʾ mulūk al-Yaman). Apparently this history was Ibn al-Wazīr’s principal source. In the margin there is written (but clearly not by the scribe who copied out the MS): "[The writer] refers to the scholar Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim concerning what he related in Bahjat al-zaman regarding events in the Yemen which he witnessed in his own lifetime up to 1090 [ / 1679, and which i.e. Bahjat al-zaman] he made a supplement to Anbāʾ al-zaman". It must be remembered that this comment in the margin was written at least 70 years after the actual book was compiled. However, it agrees with the Tabaqāt already referred to and in fact up to this day both Bahjat al-zaman and Anbāʾ al-zaman are attributed to Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim without dissent.

It is noteworthy that Ibn al-Wazīr, writing less than 20 years after the death of Yahyā, (described by a contemporary of Ibn al-Wazīr as being among Ayyūn A Muḥammad and who was the first-cousin once-removed of the reigning imam, al-Mahdī Muḥammad "Sāḥib al-Mawāhib") should have described someone whom he goes on to praise
and to whom he is so much indebted merely as \( \text{ba}^\text{c} \text{d} \text{abn}^\text{a} \text{l} \text{Yaman}. \)

This abstruseness of language might suggest that Ibn al-Wazīr was deliberately trying to avoid a direct mention of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim. There is, however, no conceivable reason why Ibn al-Wazīr should have wished to do this, especially bearing in mind that both Yahya and the reigning imam belonged (as has been seen) to the same branch of the sayyids which had ruled the Yemen since 1006/1597. Rather, the expression \( \text{ba}^\text{c} \text{d} \text{abn}^\text{a} \text{mulūk} \text{al-Yaman} \) would suggest strongly that the book Ibn al-Wazīr was making use of (most probably \( \text{Bahjat al-zaman} \)) was in fact anonymous, and consequently, so was \( \text{Anbā' al-zaman} \) too, although both books were known to have been written by a descendant of Imam al-Mansūr al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad, or else Ibn al-Wazīr had deduced this from the intimate family details contained in them.

Māḏī, believing the text he was editing to be a part of \( \text{Anbā' al-zaman} \), points to the unlikelihood of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim having written the work. He bases his argument on Yahyā’s curt treatment of his alleged father al-Ḥusayn in the final part of the book. His remarks are most pertinent if his MS had actually been \( \text{Anbā' al-zaman} \), and on that premise he could also have remarked upon Yahyā’s adulation of his alleged uncle, al-Ḥasan b. al-Qāsim, and of the prominent role he gave to him. However, of course, without having before one the authentic text of \( \text{Anbā' al-zaman} \), it would be foolhardy to make any further comment at this stage.

Sālim in his \( \text{Mu'arrikhūn} \), 77-82, discusses the work of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim, in particular a Cairo MS of \( \text{Anbā' al-zaman} \) (called by him, \( \text{Anbā' abnā' al-zaman} \)), cf. Sayyid’s \( \text{Ibnb'sanbā' al-zaman - Masādir, 246} \). He includes a short extract from the text of that MS (see \( \text{Mu'arrikhūn}, 81 \)). A comparison has been made between the extract and the parallel passage in \( \text{Ghāyat al-amānī} \).
If this extract be indicative of the entire work, then it is clear that the Cairo MS is distinct from Ghāyat al-amānī. Of course, a thorough comparison between both works, in their entirety is necessary before any definite conclusion can be reached. The matter is further complicated by the assertion, at the very end of the Cairo Anbāʿ al-zaman, that the work was in reality an abridgement of Anbāʿ al-zaman carried out by ʿIṣmāʿīl b. ʿAlī b. al-Mutawakkil. According to Ṣālim, however, Fuʿād Sayyid, (the father of the compiler of Masādir tārīkh al-Yaman), always maintained that this Cairo MS was identical with the other MSS of Anbāʿ al-zaman that he had examined.

Sayyid also lists a MS of Anbāʿ al-zaman, allegedly an autograph, in a private library in Ṣanʿā’. This perhaps, too, is a work distinct from Ghāyat al-amānī.

Ṣīrat al-Hāḍī

The important biographical work, Ṣīrat al-Hāḍī, is the principal source, perhaps the only one, for all subsequent writers on the imamate of al-Hāḍī and it is also a primary source for information concerning the ʿUffīrīd dynasty and the fortunes of the Fatimid daʿwah in the Yemen. It is not remarkable therefore that the Ṣīrat should constitute the main source used by the author of Ghāyat al-amānī in the text with which we are concerned. It was written by ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. ʿUbaydullāh who was a descendant of Abū ʿl-Faḍl al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbī Ṭālib, and who thus possesses the twin nisbahs of al-ʿAbbāsī and al-ʿAlawī. His father was one of al-Hāḍī’s most trusted and loyal henchmen and was governor of the troublesome and politically sensitive oasis-wadi of Najrān situated on the northern borders of al-Hāḍī’s domains. ʿAlī himself became a close associate of the imam soon after the latter had settled in the Yemen.

Our author sometimes takes from the Ṣīrat verbatim, but usually he changes a word here or there and supplies a synonym or a neat paraphrase. Occasionally, however, his reading of the Ṣīrat is perfunctory or too hasty which results in a few inaccuracies. At times he gives a
summary of events which is so condensed, and he becomes so arbitrary in the selection of his material that the Sīrat must be consulted in order to get a clear picture of what actually happened. Sometimes numerous pages of the Sīrat are summarized in just a line or two, and this is especially the case with regard to events in Najrān which appears to have been almost always in a state of rebellion throughout the whole of al-Hādī's imamate. No doubt our author, intent more on emphasizing the successes of the imams of Ahl al-Bayt, deliberately did not dwell on the constant opposition to al-Hādī in Najrān choosing rather to recount more positive aspects of al-Hādī's rule elsewhere in the Yemen.

Other sources used by the author of the "Ghayat"

In addition to the Sīrat al-Hādī, but to a much lesser extent, our author also had recourse it seems to the works of at least two other historians who provide information which either is not found in the Sīrat at all or differs from the account related therein.

These works were, Kanz al-akhyār fī maʿrifat al-siyar wa-ʿl-akhbār by Abū Muḥammad Idrīs b. ʿAlī (d. 714 / 1314), [71] which is the earliest surviving general chronological history of the Yemen from the beginning of the Islamic period, and the history of Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Khazrajī. Both works and their authors are mentioned in the preamble of Ghayat al-amānī where the author's sources are listed. [72] Al-Khazrajī (d. 812 / 1409) wrote several historical works but the Tarīkh referred to in the preamble is probably al-ʿAsjad al-masbūk fī man waliya ʿl-Yaman min al-mulūk, [73] a work extolled later by the historian Ibn al-Dayba ʿC (d. 923 / 1517) and which served both as the basis and the model for his Qurrat al-ʿayūn. [74]
Imam al-Hāḍī ʻl-Ḥaqq

Al-Hāḍī ʻl-Ḥaqq al-Mubān, Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥusayn usually known just as al-Hāḍī is, as has been intimated at the outset, a figure of special significance in the Islamic history of the Yemen. He was the first imam of the Zaydī Shi'a in the Yemen and the ancestor of the vast majority of the imams in the Yemen who came after him including the Ḥamīd al-Dīn imams of modern times. In fact, of the 73 imams in the Yemen noted by a recent writer, 60 are direct descendants of al-Hāḍī. [75] Not only this, but most of the numerous families of sadah living in what is now the Yemen Arab Republic have al-Hāḍī as their common ancestor. [76]

Also, al-Hāḍī's da'wah can, from the perspective of history, be considered a successful one despite often intense opposition to Zaydism, ( or Madhhab Ahl al-Bayt as it is more often known to its adherents ), in al-Hāḍī's own lifetime and for centuries afterwards from other dynasties and the like, Sunnī and Shi'ī, which competed with the Zaydī imams in their attempt to gain control over the Yemen and the ancient city of Ṣan'ā' in particular. From 284 / 897 for the next eleven centuries, except for brief periods, there was always a Zaydī imam somewhere in the Yemen, ( sometimes two, three imams or even more in rivalry with each other ), and from the mid-11th / 17th century there was usually an imam in Ṣan'ā' itself.

Another factor which gives al-Hāḍī a special significance is that the dominant school of jurisprudence ( fiqh ) to be followed in the Yemen during the ensuing centuries was destined to be that of this imam. Thus the Yemenites were to follow the personal judgements ( ijtihādāt ) of al-Hāḍī in the practical application ( viz. furū'ī ) of their religion, and it is the Hadawi fiqh that was eventually to gain the ascendancy in the Zaydī state which was established around the Caspian in the mid-3rd / 9th century.

The discerning traveller Burckhardt notes early in the 19th century that most
of the șarīfs of Mecca are followers of al-Hādī. [77] Today in the Yemen Arab Republic, the four-volumed Sharh al-Azhār by Imam al-Mahdī Ahmad b. Yahyā b. al-Murtadā ( d. 840 / 1436 ). [78] which is substantially the fiqh of al-Hādī in a concisely set-out form, is regarded by the ulema and their students in the Zaydi regions as authoritative.

His biography

Al-Hādī Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn is listed by the aforementioned Ahmad b. Yahyā b. al-Murtadā in his al-Bahr al-zakhkhar as being ( according to the Zaydis ) the twenty-first imam of Ahl al-Bayt after Amīr al-Mu’minīn C'Alī b. Abī Tālib. [79]

Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn was born in Medina in 245 / 859 a year before the death of his grandfather al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm, [80] who for the Zaydis is one of their principal authorities in dogmatic theology ( viz. usūl ) and was known as Najm Al Rasūl Allāh and Turjumān al-Dīn. [81] It is said that al-Hādī was named Yahyā by his father after a brother of the latter who had died. Al-Qāsim on being told this exclaimed: " Truly this is Yahyā, master of the Yemen ( sāhib al-Yaman ) [82] and the Zaydi chroniclers like to record how Yahyā’s departure for the Yemen and his imamate there were predicted by the Prophet Muhammad himself and foretold by C'Alī. [83]

Yahyā’s mother was Umm al-Ḥasan, the daughter of a distant cousin of his, al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Sulaymān. [84] Yahyā married his first cousin, Fāṭima, daughter of al-Ḥasan b. al-Qāsim who became the mother of his two successors in the imamate Muḥammad al-Murtadā and Ahmad al-Nāṣir and his two daughters, Fāṭima and Zaynab. The mother of his son al-Ḥasan was a lady from San’ā’. [85] The Yemeni genealogist Muḥammad b. C'Abdullāh b. C'Alī known as Abū C'Allāmāh ( d. 1044 / 1635 ) records [86] six other sons of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn.
but apparently they either died young or had no male offspring.

Surprisingly, little is known about Yahyā’s life before he first set out for the Yemen in 280 / 893 except for one important incident, his visit to Ṭabaristān (to be discussed below). Otherwise the sources content themselves mainly with relating a few incidents that occurred in his youth to demonstrate that he possessed extraordinary physical strength. [87]

Apparently Yahyā grew up in Medina or in the neighbourhood of the city. Āmirī (d. 893 / 1487-8) says that he received his education both in the Hejaz and in Iraq. [88] It is recorded that in Baghdad he took part, incognito, in a scholarly gathering. [89] He became known for his knowledge and piety. Later, Yahyā moved to the vicinity of al-Rass where he probably had relatives. It was there that his grandfather al-Qāsim had settled after leaving Egypt with his family ca. 212 / 827. [90]

Although Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn began to write when he was 17 years old, [91] one does not know the title of his first work, nor can one be sure when his numerous works (48 in number according to one authority) were written except that he commenced his celebrated composition on fiqh, Kitāb al-Ahkām al-jāmi’ li-usūl mā yuhtaju ilayhi min al-halāl wa-’l-haram in Medina. It has been suggested however that, except for parts of the latter, and perhaps al-Muntakhab fi ’l-fiqh and Kitāb al-Funūn, all al-Hādī’s works belong to his pre-Yemen years. [92] The Ahkām and Muntakhab are his best known works on fiqh and he also wrote many treatises and letters on usūl, a commentary on part of the Qur’ān, tracts against his opponents and those whose doctrines he disputed, and an important tract concerning the proof (tathbīt) of the imamate of ʿAlī b. Abī Talib. [93]

It is clear from the Sīrat that al-Hādī was an accomplished poet and he gloried in his descent from Muḥammad and ʿAlī and in his possession of ʿAlī’s famous sword, Dhū ’l-Faqār. [94]
His concept of the imamate

Al-Hadhaf considered himself to be the legitimate successor of 'Abd b. Abi Talib in the imamate (not the sole legitimate successor because there was at the time a Zayd imam in Iran - see below). Al-Hadhaf did not believe, however, that he had become imam by a designation (nass) either from his father (who was not an imam) or from any imam before him. He had inherited the imamate, but only in the sense that he belonged to the Ahl al-Bayt for, in Zayd thought, the imam had to be both 'Ali and Fatimah which meant, in practice, a descendant of either al-Hasan or al-Husayn.

According to the Zayd view, al-Hadhaf was a rightful imam by virtue of his own perception, in the first instance, that he fulfilled all the necessary conditions of the imamate which stipulated, for example, that the imam should be devout, learned, brave, ascetic, generous, .... - 14 conditions are usually listed. Any Hasan or Husayn so convinced of his own merits was then obliged to proclaim publicly the fact, that is to make the da'wah to himself as imam, (that someone da'wa ilana natsihi is an expression found frequently in Zayd chronicles).

The actual act of making the da'wah public and known is usually called the khuruj (often tantamount to an armed insurrection). And then it becomes incumbent upon all the Muslims to give the imam allegiance as their Amir al-Muminin .... Ia yasa'uhum isyanuhu wa-lahum yahillu lahum khidhi'nuhu bal tajibu alayhim ta'atuhu wa-muw'allatuwa wa-yu'adhibu 'Ilah man khadhalahu wa-yuthibuhum nasarahu ....... Thus, according to the Zayd view (or, at least, according to al-Hadhaf and those who follow his teachings) an imam owes his office neither to the act of being given allegiance nor to any election, but is imam solely by virtue of his da'wah.

Concerning the khuruj, this presupposes that the imam possesses sufficient nusrah (i.e., armed support), the minimum taken to be
the number of men who fought alongside the Prophet Muḥammad at Badr in the year 2 / 624, viz. some 310.\[95\]

Such an uncompromising doctrine concerning his own status would have meant, automatically, enmity and rivalry between al-Hādī and the Abbasid caliph since the latter was just as adamantly in his claim to be the sole legitimate Amīr al-Mu'minīn of the Muslims. Only the Zaydīs, the Fatimids, the Abū Sa'īdīs in eastern Arabia,\[96\] the Ibadūs in Cūmān and N Africa and other "Khārījī sects", disputed the Abbasid claim. Local dynasties like the Yūfīris and the Ziyādīs in the Yemen, the Aghlabīs in N Africa and, later, the Samanīs and the Ghāznavīs in the east, even though they often acted as if they were independent rulers nevertheless never disputed the prerogatives of the Abbasids in whose name the khutbah was pronounced, and from whom they were careful to extract the necessary patent which would in turn give their own rule some measure of legality.

In the Yemen the khutbah was said in al-Hādī’s name in all the areas under his control, and it is recorded that the khutbah was also said in Mecca in al-Hādī’s name for seven years.\[97\] Indeed throughout the history of the Imamate in the Yemen, the khutbah in Mecca, Medina and elsewhere in the Hejaz was often said in the name of the Zaydī imam of the time.

From an early age, Yāhūb b. al-Ḥusayn would have been no stranger to the doctrine of the imamate and of its crucial role in Zaydī Shi'ism. His grandfather al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm is generally listed among the Zaydī imams and is singled out for mention in the Ahkām.\[98\] al-Qāsim’s brother Muhammad known as Ḳabātab had in 199 / 814 led a rebellion in Ḳufa which posed a severe threat to Abbasid rule and al-Hādī’s great-grandfather on his mother’s side, Muḥammad b. Sulaymān b. Dā’ūd (d. c 200 / 815), was an imam.\[99\]
Why did al-Hāḍī, however, choose the Yemen as a country in which to set up the Zaydī imamate? It might be retorted that he did not actually choose the Yemen since he was invited by the powerful B. Fuţaym clan to go there and be their imam. However, he would hardly have made the long journey south and settle in Sa'dah in a remote part of the Yemen if he had not been optimistic of his success, and this applies especially to his second departure in Dhū 'l-Hijjah 283 / January 897. It is most unlikely, in the opinion of this writer, that Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn's departure for the Yemen was fortuitous or simply because he gave in to the importunities of a Yemeni tribe. Rather, it may be reasonably conjectured, his decision was based upon his awareness of the history of Ahl al-Bayt and of the imams in particular.

All his predecessors in the imamate had failed in their attempt to overthrow Umayyad, then Abbasid rule. The failure of al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah in Medina, of his brother, Ibrāhīm, at Basra, of al-Ḥusayn b. Alī b. al-Ḥasan at Fakhkh near Mecca, and then, more recently, the failure of several Zaydī revolts in Iraq and the Hejaz at the very end of the 2nd / early 9th century, must have caused Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn to realize that in a direct confrontation with the Abbasids, the Shī'ah could not expect to win. Even his grandfather al-Qāsim had not dared to make his da'wah public in Egypt and eventually had given up and retired to the Hejaz.

This realization, however, did not lead Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn to join up with a group of the Ahl al-Bayt and their followers who were evolving what might be considered a more passive doctrine of the imamate with only twelve imams, each one designating his successor, and the twelfth imam, ʻal-Hujjah al-Mahdī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-ʻAskarī, being in a state of occultation, although what was to be known later as the Imāmiyyah or Twelver Shiism was at this period still in its formative stage. Yet Yahyā who knew that he
possessed those qualities necessary for an imam and who had clearly been
told this by members of his family ( see below ), did not go to nearby Medina
or to Mecca and instigate the traditional Zaydi khurūj, but instead chose to go
to the Yemen, making not so much a khurūj as a hijrah.

In so doing, Yahyā was perhaps inspired, to a certain extent, by a distant cousin of his, Idrīs b. Ṭabaṭaba, who over a century before, stunned by the catastrophic defeat of a group of Ahl al-Bayt and their
Shī‘ah at Fakhkh, had fled to the Maghreb where he set up a Zaydi state.
More probably though, Yahyā got his direct inspiration from the existence of
a Zaydi imamate on the shores of the Caspian in a region remote from the
centre of Abbasid power which factor, coupled with the mountainous and wild
character of the terrain, guaranteed a charismatic leader some degree of
success. Such a leader was another distant cousin of Yahyā’s, 

al-Hasan b. Zayd, who had successfully established there a Zaydi state ( see
below, pp. 168-9, n.75 ), news of which would constantly have reached Yahyā
via the Pilgrimage.

Of supreme significance, however, was the visit which

Yahyā b. al-Husayn himself had made to Tabaristan, related in the important
Zaydi chronicle Kitāb al-Ifādah fi tārīkh al-a‘immah al-sādah, compiled by

This visit would have taken place after 270 /883, since al-Hasan had been succeeded by his brother, Muḥammad. Yahyā,
significantly, did not go and meet Imam Muḥammad nor al-Hasan b. Ṭabaṭaba
( the future Imam al-Nāṣir “al-Uṭrusḥ “, reg. 284-304 / 897-917 ) who were
together in Jurjān, a province to the east of Āmul where Yahyā, his father and
several of his relatives had taken up residence. The Ifādah relates that
Yahyā was addressed by members of his family only as imān and that he had
apparently become the centre of considerable attention. All this would
suggest that Yahyā was contemplating a khurūj in Iran, perhaps in Āmul itself.
and that he was attempting to build up a following from which would emerge the nusrah with which he could consolidate his da’wah. [105]

The fact that there was an imam in the region (Muhammad b. Zayd) would have been of little consequence for Yahyā b. al-Husayn, for if he had considered himself better qualified for the imamate than Muhammad, and at the same time possessed sufficient nusrah, then it would have been incumbent upon him, (as we have already seen), to proclaim the da’wah to himself as imam. If that had occurred, Muhammad would have been asked to relinquish the imamate and in the case of his refusal, armed conflict would inevitably have ensued. The history of the Zaydī imamate is full of such conflicts between rival imams. [106]

The manner in which Yahyā b. al-Husayn left Tabaristān would also lend support to the above view. Imam Muhammad was clearly apprehensive concerning the goings-on in Amul. Yahyā protested, diplomatically, that he was not plotting against him but it seems that Yahyā then heard of a plot to have him and his family arrested, for only this would explain their remarkably hasty departure. [107] Having returned to the Hejaz, Yahyā would have begun to look elsewhere for a region where he might be successful in establishing a Zaydī state.

The Yemen, or more specifically the highland plateau which stretched from north to south, was an obvious candidate for such a project. A Zaydī imamate in the Yemen would not be in rivalry or conflict with the one which already existed in Iran, for Zaydī doctrine allows for the existence of two imams in two places provided that the latter are at a considerable distance, one from the other. [108] The Yemen’s mountainous terrain, in parts almost impregnable to the outsider, and, consequently, its relative isolation from the centres of Abbasid authority, were truths realized by the Fatimid imam, who had sent his two da’iks there some years before Yahyā’s arrival, and had probably been realized too by Ibrāhim b. Mūsā.
Ibrahim, a grandson of Ja'far al-Sadiq, is regarded as an imam by some Zaydi authorities, with the laqab of al-Murtada li-Din Allah, but he was probably a da'i for Imam Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Zayd who became imam directly after the death of Ibn Tabataba (referred to above) in 199/815. Significantly, the B. Futaym, who urged Yahya b. al-Husayn to be their imam and who in future years proved themselves to be among his loyalist followers, had been also the main support of Ibrahim b. Musa. Perhaps, though, the most important factor that caused Yahya b. al-Husayn to choose the Yemen as the place where he would attempt to set up a Shi'i Zaydi state, and the factor that had also been uppermost in the mind of the Fatimid imam, was the known deep-rooted attachment to Shi'ism and Ahl al-Bayt that had existed in the Yemen among some of the most influential Yemeni tribes ever since the time of Ali b. Abi Talib. As has been recently shown, the Yemenis not only played a dominant role in the Arab conquests, at least after the initial phase, but also in the early conflicts and civil wars that ensued between the Muslim leaders themselves. The Yemenis, it seems, headed the faction determined to remove Uthman b. Affan from the caliphate, yet subsequently, Yemenis formed the majority of the troops in Syria and were pro-Mu'awiyah. In Kufa in Iraq they were the majority and Yemeni tribesmen were the main support of both sides at Siffin. Yemeni chiefs came to Medina to congratulate Ali when he became caliph and one great tribal grouping, Handan, became renowned for their loyalty to Ali especially after Siffin and such, but to a lesser extent, was the case with Madhij too. Handan were described by Mu'awiyah as the "sword of Ali". Such loyalty undoubtedly spread from the Yemenis at Kufa to their fellow tribesmen in the Yemen itself. Similarly it is possible that the hostility towards Ali which
existed among the Yemeni tribes of Himyar, Kindah and Akk in the Umayyad camp. Likewise spread to the Yemen. It is thus perhaps no accident that Yahya b. al-Husayn was opposed from the outset by the Yu firids who belonged to Dhū Hiwāl, a clan originating from Himyar, and that he received steadfast support from the tribes descended from Hamdan (especially from the branch of Bakīl) who were loyal to him as they had been loyal to his ancestor, CAlī b. Abī Talib.\[113\]

In a poem eulogizing Hamdān, al-Hadd exhorts them to come to his aid and fight for the sake of the religion of Muhammad, just as they had fought gallantly alongside the wasf, CAlī. I have considered this poem worthy of being quoted here in full\[114\] since it illustrates admirably the singular position of Hamdān in the affections of al-Hadd, as it is also indicative (by implication) of al-Hadd's conviction that he is the inheritor of the imamate of CAlī b. Abī Talib.

The apprehensions of your distressed heart have long continued,

for the faith of Muhammad has become as if a stranger.

Those through whom its pillar is made strong are sleeping:

they remained so and thus [the Faith] is unavenged.

They neglected coming to its assistance,

and preoccupied themselves

with their farms, ways of making money and their vineyards.

I consider Hamdān's conduct in this matter strange.

[Hamdān] who had been the succour of the distressed caller to battle.

Truth has been cast aside, its mainstay weak.

feeble, like the powerless man when beaten.
Truth is calling out to them for aid but they have disregarded it, like one neglectful through fear.

How long will it be before you rise up, every one of you, for the sake of Truth?

like him enraged [ and ] held in dread.

Hamdān were the supporters of the Prophet.

and after him they came to the succour of the Executor of his Testament ( wasf ), [ wielding ] every knotted reed-lance.

And the Faith, after it had become effaced, triumphs [ totally ]
by their aid.

both when it was disapproved of and approved.

(10) They are not like him who broke his pledges by what he did. and the opinion he held was [ found ] weak and flawed.

Sufficient for me is their coming to the aid of the Faith of Muhammed, for they, by your life, are my help and my good fortune.

Before every [ other ] helper and supporter, it is in them that I have placed my confidence: tell them, and they will trust me!

And by them the Faith is strengthened once again by their rallying to its banner held high.

I still pin my hopes in them for I know their excellence; I single them out for their good cheer and I take them as my close associates.
Because of what I know, in truth, of what they have done in the past ..., God is the best rewarder of those who rally [ to the Faith ].

They gave support to the Commander of the Faithful, [115] and fought
with noble intentions and sincere hearts.

And they were allies in the cause of Truth until they gained the praise with which [ Ālī ] is attributed.

All [ the ] tribes went [ out ] to fight them, goaded on by their youth and old men.

With an august [ company ] of their mature men and with their entire awe-inspiring force.

They struck off the heads of the turncoats ( nākithīn ) [116] and drove all their bloodstained swords into them.

[ Stained ] with the blood of every aggressor and enemy, every wayward opponent of the truth.

For they are the lions of the fray in the heat of combat, like hot coals in the midst of their blazing kiln.

And [ they are those ] who seek vengeance for the Family of Muḥammad, and for the Clan [ of those for whom vengeance ] is sought and [ whose rights have been ] usurped. [117]

I hold them in the highest esteem since they are all, the sons of women and men of proud birth.
They share in the glorious rank of Muhammad's progeny, 
surpassing all others of exalted line and lineage.

Abundant greetings I convey to them:
may He of the Throne bestow upon them
a privileged place [among the blest].

And on the awful day of reckoning
may He grant them succour,
and may He protect them from painful torment!

[ Kāmil metre ]

It is worthy of note that in another poem, al-HādūT not
only eulogizes Hamdān but also singles out Khawlan and Madhhij for their
prowess in battle and steadfastness in his cause. [118]

The known Shi‘T proclivity of many of the Yemenis,
together with the remoteness of the Yemen and the nature of the terrain, and
( as will be seen later in the text and annotations ) the general political
instability in the Yemen as a whole, were thus the factors that were probably
uppermost in Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn's mind and altogether would have made the
Yemen a most attractive proposition as a land where a Zaydī state might be
successfully set up.

The dating of al-HādūT's imamate

On the title-page of this thesis, the imamate of al-HādūT
is dated from 280 / 893. Although Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn returned to the Hejaz
that very year and it was not until 284 / 897 that he arrived in the Yemen
again, this time to stay, there seems no reason to maintain, as one writer has
done, [119] that in 280 Yahyā did not proclaim the da‘wah to himself as
imam and consequently did not demand allegiance.
The Sīrat clearly contradicts such a claim: in 280 it is recorded, [120] .... wa-adhāna lahu 'l-nās wa-ata'ānu ( cf. below, Arabic text, p. 3 ), which can only mean that Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn was given allegiance as imam. The Ghayát significantly speaks of his journey to the Yemen in 280 as a khurūj ( see below, p. 85, n.5 ), and Ḥasan relates, ... wa-qiyānumuhu fī Sa'dah ... sanat thamānīn wa-ma'ātān. ( qiyām being synonymous with khurūj, in that it is a term often used by the Zaydis when referring to the public proclamation by the imam of his da'wah ). Mu'ayyad, ( one of the great ulema of Sa'dah of this century ), says that al-Ḥādi's qiyām was in 280, [122] and this certainly seems to be the traditional Zaydi dating. [123]

Why did al-Ḥādi return to the Hejaz?

The Sīrat says that al-Ḥādi returned in 280 because he did not have sufficient support with which he could confront the opposition to his rule ( see below, p. 85f, n.6 ), or as one contemporary writer has succinctly put it: [124] haythu lam yajid al-nusrah al-kāfiyah min ahl al-Yaman. The Sīrat, however, does not go into detail as to why this opposition should have arisen: it simply says that the Yemenis khadhulūnu wa-raja 'llā mā yuskhitu 'llāh.

What were those reprehensible things that would incite God's wrath? There seems no reason to suppose that the Yemenis were particularly anti-Shī'a and thus would not want an imam from Ahl al-Bayt to be their ruler, indeed, as we have seen, the contrary appears to have been the case. Neither would there be ground for arguing that the Yemenis, once pious Muslims, had become lax. A careful reading of the Sīrat would suggest rather that Islam had so far penetrated only superficially into Yemeni society and that in effect with the setting up of the Zaydi imamate in the Yemen, the bulk of the population were being introduced to the full
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ramifications of Islam. Shi't or Sunni, for the first time. Madânî [125]
is thus unduly optimistic when he describes Yemeni society of that time as a
mujtama takhayyama alayhi rûh al--Islâm wa-'l-qiyan ..., and as a
mujtama tasharraba ta al-islam wa-dhâqa halâwatâ. Such a
description might be apt with regard to Yemeni society several centuries
later, but is hardly appropriate to that of the latter part of the 3rd / late 9th,
early 10th century.

It is true that the fiqh of al-Hadhâf is known to this day for
its rigid interpretation of the Sharî'ah: for instance, the complete ban on all
musical instruments and the obligation upon a woman to cover her face in
public. These restrictions would doubtless have been found irksome by most
of the Yemeni populace. However, there were more serious issues at stake.
It is clear from the Sirat that al-Hadhâf found a society in which prostitution,
loose sexual morality and the imbibing of intoxicating liquor were rife -
habits that manifestly conflicted with the fundamentals of the Sharî'ah and
which would, of course, have scandalized any sincere Muslim leader, be he
Shi't or Sunni (although it is perhaps inapposite to employ these categories
at this early period in Islamic history). Also religious duties such as the
payment of zakâh and the performance of the ritual prayer appear to have been
largely neglected: indeed one suspects that most of the populace did not
know how such obligations were to be carried out. [126]

Al-Hadhâf saw himself obliged to "enjoin what was
acceptable and forbid what was reprehensible" ( al-amr bi-'l-ma ūf wa-
lah-y an al-munkar ). This is the fifth of the five fundamentals of
Islam according to the Zaydîs. [127] and formed the basic tenet of his
da-Sah. In the text of this da-Sah, (related in the Sirat). [128]

al-Hadhâf, after exhorting the people to adhere to the Book of God and the
Sunnah of His Prophet, continues wa-[ ad-ukum ] ilâ 'l-amr bi-'l-ma ūf
wa-l-nahy an al-munkar fa-mâ jâ'anâ bi-hi 'l-kitâbu 'ttabâ nahu wa-mâ
Such an uncompromising doctrine when applied to a society like that described above, cannot fail but meet with much opposition.

**Al-Hādī**: a physical description and summing-up

Imam al-Mansūr ʿAbdullāh b. Ḥamzah (reg. 594-614 / 1197-1217), has transmitted a terse physical description of al-Hādī which deserves mention in full. Al-Hādī had the characteristics of a lion (kāna asadiyyan): wide-eyed (anjal al-ʿaynayn) [and with] muscular forearms, (ghalīf al-sāʿidayn). [He was] broad-chested (baʿid mā bayna ʿl-mankibayn wa-ʿl-sadr), [and his] shanks and posterior were lean, just like a lion (khaffī al-saqayn wa-ʿl-ʿajuz ka-ʿl-asad). He did not have much flesh [on his limbs] so that only a high-mettled horse like Abū ʿl-Jamājim could endure him (fa-lā yatqūhu min al-khayl ʿl-shadhī ka-farasihi Abī ʿl-Jamājim).

In the Yemen, al-Hādī enjoys a special status among all the Zaydi imams, on occasion overshadowing perhaps even Zayd b. ʿAlī himself whose khurūj constitutes the supreme inspiration for all the imams that came after him. Also, of all the Yemeni imams he was singled out for a special mention in the Friday khutbah along with the imam of the time. Even today, in the region around Sa'dah, this writer has observed that the ījtihādāt of al-Hādī in matters of fiqh (the ablutions and the performance of the ritual prayer, for instance), are scrupulously adhered to.

Al-Hādī represents an uncompromising brand of Zaydi Shiism, especially in his doctrine concerning the prerogatives of Āl Muḥammad as a whole and those of ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib in particular. Unconditional
obedience and loyalty to ālī al-Ḥadī is ( in al-Ḥadī's view ) incumbent upon every Muslim immediately after the wilāyah given to God and to the Prophet who, al-Ḥadī insists, clearly designated ālī as his successor and wasāf at Ghadīr Khumm on his return from the Farewell Pilgrimage. [131]

Al-Ḥadī's harsh treatment of the caliphs Abū Bakr and ʿUmar in his tract ṫathbīt al-imāmah [132] shows clearly that his standpoint was akin to that of the Jārūdiyyah [133] branch of Zaydism. It is evident that al-Ḥadī's intense Shiism was not shared by all the Zaydī imams that came after him.

Editorial method

I should like now to discuss the Arabic text and the apparatus criticus that accompanies it. Of the three MSS ( see above, p. 10f ), the ālī Amīrī MS one has been chosen as the asl, ( as ʿAshūr allegedly did for his printed edition ). There are just twenty years between the date of the ālī Amīrī MS and the second, the Khwā Bakhsh ( Bankipore ), which is clearly however not dependent on the first. Neither is obviously more authentic than the other. Nevertheless, there is one quite serious omission in the Khwā Bakhsh MS of seven words ( see Arabic text, p. 48 ) and another ( p. 58 ), small of only two words but worthy of note. Later in the text ( pp. 74, 75 ) there occurs, on two occasions, a small but serious omission ( also found in the Berlin MS ) which led me to prefer without further hesitation the authenticity of the ālī Amīrī MS. Twice, al-Ḥadī's āmil over Najrān is called ābūdullāh whereas his name, transmitted correctly by the ālī Amīrī MS, is Muḥammad b. ābīdullāh.

In addition to these factors, there is the presence of a number of strange smudges in the Khwā Bakhsh MS ( but not throughout the entire MS, it should be added ), caused perhaps by damp conditions under which the MS has been kept in the past but certainly not by the scribe,
which phenomenon alone, might induce one to prefer the $^c$ Alf Amířf MS as
the asl. These ugly smudges, I have noted 17 in all, vary in their size in
that they affect anything from part of a word to three words, either rendering
the word or words undecipherable or else making the reading open to much
conjecture, with the result that, in both cases, one has to have recourse to
the $^c$ Alf Amířf MS.

I have chosen not to mention in the apparatus criticus the
places where these smudges occur in order to avoid overburdening it. None
of the words affected is a crucial proper name ( with the exception of Maṭirah
- see f. 23a, 12; Arabic text, p. 59 ), and in most cases the missing words
could probably be deduced from the context with the help of what can still
be deciphered of the original text, despite the smudge. I should just like
to mention here the bad smudge which occurs in f. 22b, 20 ( Arabic text,
p. 54 ), affecting the words $^c$ askarihi wa-kharajat. The first word is almost
completely illegible, and wa-kharajat does not follow it on the line but has
perhaps been written above it although it is now undecipherable.

The Berlin MS I consider number three in order of
authenticity not because it is dated more than a century later than the $^c$ Alf
Amířf MS, for of course on the basis of date alone there is no reason for
rejecting it ipso facto as the asl. especially since the $^c$ Alf Amířf MS was in
any case written presumably about a century after the original MS. However,
two serious omissions of whole sentences ( see Arabic text, pp. 15, 24 ),
other minor omissions ( see, for instance, pp. 71, 74 ) and also certain points
of detail, give both the Khuda Bakhsh MS ( with which incidentally the Berlin
MS agrees in certain points ) and the $^c$ Alf Amířf MS preference over it.

In the apparatus criticus, the $^c$ Alf Amířf MS is referred
to as $^{h}$. For the Khuda Bakhsh ( Bankipore ) MS I have chosen the
siglum $^{g}$, and for the Berlin MS the siglum $^{f}$. In the annotations,
and henceforth in this introduction, the three MSS are referred to respectively as MS $^q_{\text{Ayn}}, MS ^{\text{Kha'}}_\text{Kha'}$ and MS $^b_{\text{Ba'}}$. Misreadings of the text of a serious nature on the part of $^\text{Ashur}$ (which have not already been pointed out in this introduction), I have indicated in the apparatus criticus so that his edition may be suitably emended. Similarly, mistakes worthy of note in Māḏrī's text have been recorded. These two editions have been allotted the sigla $^q_\text{ق}$ and $^b_\text{ب}$ respectively.

The point in Ghāyat al-āmānī where my edited text begins, that is with the events of year 280, corresponds in the three MSS to the following folios with their respective lines: MS $^q_{\text{Ayn}}, f. 15a.18,[134]$ MS $^{\text{Kha'}}_\text{Kha'}, f. 19a.11$: MS $^b_{\text{Ba'}}$, f. 26b.17. In the text itself a change of folio number, or from side "a" to "b" of a particular folio (that is from $^q_\text{ق}$ to $^b_\text{ب}$), will be indicated within square brackets following the appropriate siglum. Similarly, the pages of $^\text{Ashur}$'s edition of the Ghāyat have also been indicated and year 280 commences on p. 166. However, the pages of Māḏrī's text have not been indicated except in the apparatus criticus where the appropriate page number (in brackets) follows his reading. Those parts of the original text which I have chosen not to reproduce for the reasons stated above (p. 134), I have indicated between double-triangular brackets (thus, $\text{[ [ ]]}$) with details of the folio and line numbers of the respective MSS.

I believe that the aim of producing an edited text with its accompanying apparatus criticus is not simply to impart information to, in this case, a historian or student of early mediaeval Yemeni history but also I consider that such a text should be of value to say a student of Arabic orthography, or of grammar or philology. Thus the edited text should be imbued with an air of authenticity so that, in this instance for example, it looks and reads like a text from a Yemeni 18th century MS. Indeed when dealing with an autograph MS, perhaps even a facsimile might be produced alongside the edited
text for the sake of completion.

So, in reproducing this text, I have striven to be as faithful as is practically feasible to the spirit and letter of the MS I have taken as the asl. Thus I have avoided the use of all punctuation marks with which unfortunately, in my opinion, Arab editors in particular are wont to lard their editions, usually I feel merely to pander to the whims of modernity and in sheer imitation of Western literary conventions that concern languages which practically have nothing in common with Arabic.

Diacritical points are often absent in the three MSS, and especially is this the case with the two dots over the ta' marbutah, and sometimes other marks are used (like a point underneath a dal for instance) which although common features in Yemeni MSS and others, are not today in general use. I have supplied throughout the text diacritical points in conformity with conventional usage and I have not shown in the apparatus criticus the divergences between the MSS themselves in this respect, except in the case of the less well-known proper names and toponyms, since to have done so would have made it an ungainly size.

With regard to vowel points: these are used sparingly in the MSS, usually in quite an arbitrary fashion. Sometimes they are employed incorrectly and of course they are not necessarily from the pen of the scribe himself. The edited text together with the apparatus criticus will be entirely free of vocalization except when a hamzah is accompanied by a vowel. In the latter case the vowel will be indicated because of possible orthographical interest. The vocalization of the numerous proper names and toponyms found in the text, (and of much of the vocabulary as well), will, of course, be evident both in the transliteration throughout the translation, and also in the annotations. The correct vocalization of certain toponyms will be discussed below.
Accusative nunation is indicated quite arbitrarily in the MSS. In the edited text, I have recorded the two strokes above an alif, or just before it, only when they appear in the asl and I have made no comparison in the apparatus criticus with the other MSS, again in order not to overburden it unduly. I have omitted altogether the two strokes sometimes employed for the same purpose above a ta’ marbūtah. However, genitive nunation in the adverbial forms yawma’idhin and hīna’idhin, is recorded.

A problem for any editor is that presented by the hamzah. The three MSS are typical of Yemeni texts in that the hamzah is generally absent, and this feature has become a traditional one right up to the present day. My policy has been to supply a hamzah only when it is found in the asl, and I have indicated its vowel if it has been given one. When the other two MSS do not both agree with the asl, I note the variant readings in the apparatus criticus except in cases where the initial alif of a word is given a hamzah (hamzat al-qat\(^c\)) that is not, however, preceded by the article (if a noun or adjective), nor has a preposition or particle actually attached to it. There are 20 instances of such a case in the asl, whereas with regard to the same word in MSS Khā’ and Bā’ the hamzah has been omitted. This observation has been mentioned here in order to avoid both overburdening the apparatus criticus and also, of course, constant repetition.

In the words, sā’ir, dā’irah, tā’ibūn, g̣ạbā’iḷh, ǧ̣āḷa’iḷh, and so on, (to mention just a few instances), the scribe of the asl has provided dots instead of a hamzah, and this is generally his policy with regard to words of such patterns. Occasionally, however, he omits the dots as well and in such cases I have supplied them, except when the hamzah appears in the asl under the preceding alif or even before. In the latter case, I have recorded the hamzah as in the MS and have noted the variant readings.

Concerning the accusative šay’ān, of special interest perhaps to students of Arabic orthography, although I have chosen to write it always in the text in its usual classical Arabic form, ِّ. I have
nevertheless, noted the various MSS readings in the apparatus criticus. It is interesting to observe that in the asl, the hamzah always appears somewhere in this word: on the first occasion the hamzah, with nunation above it, follows the alif.

Al-Qāsim, ibrāhīm, Ismā'īl, al-Ḥārith, Sulaymān and Uthmān, without the alif of prolongation, are perfectly acceptable orthographical variants, as witness certain editions of the Qurʾān, and so I have not changed them in any way. In the case of ibrāhīm, whereas the asl omits the alif, MSS Khā' and Bā' consistently indicate it, ( except for one instance where only MS Khā' has an alif, and this is duly noted ), and so I wish to make that observation here in order to avoid undue repetition in the apparatus criticus.

Also, ru'ūs, written with one wāw with a hamzah above it instead of two wāws, is a traditional variant and has been retained. A similar case seems to be īltaja'ū, without the alif ( or hamzah ) and with the wāw coming straight after the jīm. ( Normally of course, this 3rd. person plur. of the perfect would have an alif, with a hamzah above it, followed by two wāws ). Unlike ru'ūs, where the hamzah appears in the asl, īltaja'ū is written in the asl with no hamzah above the wāw, but I have supplied one for the sake of clarification.

When a maddah, ( traditionally placed over the alif, wāw, and yā' of prolongation when followed by a hamzah ), is employed in the asl, I reproduce it in the text but I have chosen not to compare its usage in the other MSS. The antique forms of salah and zakāh, with a wāw instead of an alif have been retained, as in all three MSS.

Whenever, in the asl, words which conventionally terminate with an alif maqṣūrah are given, instead, a final alif māmdūdah, and vice-versa, no alteration is made in the edited text since these are features frequently met with in MSS. Thus, īṣtāfā, da'ā, sābah, yusummā, musallā, duhā, huda, nādā, lhādā, retain their final alif māmdūdah, and, conversely, fugarā and ithyā are written with a final alif maqṣūrah instead of the classical
alif mamdūdah, (plus hamzah). So too, the classical tawaddā'a appears as
tawaddā, with an alif maqṣūrah and no hamzah. In order to preserve the
character of the aṣl in the edited text, I have chosen also not to alter the
alif mamdūdah in both ṭaṣā'ī and ṭaqāhu which would be written, classically, as
raqiyya and ṭaqiyyahu. For a similar reason, I have retained tawātī rather than
change it to the classical tawātū, and, likewise, quwwat (gawat?) in wa-
quwwat ṣawqat Ibn Faḍl, where quwwiyat (gawiyat) are the classical forms.

As has been pointed out elsewhere, the use of ibn / bn presents quite a problem for any manuscript editor. I too have
decided to follow Wright's rules. Not only do the three MSS differ
among themselves concerning their use of ibn and bn, but each MS itself
pursues no consistent policy, although the aṣl adheres more to the classical
usage than do MSS Khāʾ and Bāʾ. My policy in the editing of the text has
been to correct the aṣl wherever necessary but without noting the fact in the
apparatus criticus nor recording the variant readings if they occur, again so as
to avoid overloading the apparatus criticus.

Thus Ibn Abī Yuʾfir, (scil. As al- ibn Abī Yuʾfir - see
below), will invariably appear in that form, (which is, in fact, usually the
aṣl reading), in the edited text, and I do not note the incorrect Bn Abī
Yuʾfir which often occurs in the other MSS. Similarly, in the case of
Ibn Faḍl, (scil. C Alʾ b. Faḍl), I do not record the variant reading of
Bn Faḍl that occurs invariably in MSS Khāʾ and Bāʾ but only once in the
aṣl. The aṣl has, correctly, names like Ibn Bistām, Ibn C Abbād, Ibn Maḥfūz
and so on. MS Khāʾ is not always correct in this respect and MS Bāʾ
usually prefers, incorrectly, bn, but I have not noted the variant readings in
the apparatus criticus.

A problem occurs when al-Hāḍī and Abū Yuʾfir are
preceded by an ism, in the case of the former by Muḥammad and in the case
of the latter by As'ad. Almost invariably, the three MSS have Muhammad bn al-Hadî and As'ad bn Abî Yu'fir, [139] that is to say, al-Hadî and Abû Yu'fir are treated as if they too were isms, yet al-Hadî is manifestly the laqab of Yahyâ b. al-Hasayn and Abû Yu'fir the kunyah of Ibrahim b. Muhammad. However, it should be added, that if al-Hadî and Abû Yu'fir were the names by which these two men had, respectively, generally become known, then they had in fact become isms and so Muhammad bn al-Hadî and As'ad bn Abî Yu'fir would not be incorrect. [140] Here I believe it would be somewhat injudicious to presume this to have been the case so therefore, following Wright's rules, I have chosen to correct the asl to Muhammad ibn al-Hadî and As'ad ibn Abî Yu'fir throughout the edited text and I have not recorded the very few variant readings that occur.

Four times in our text, the asl ( alone of the MSS ) gives the suffix of an alif to Banû in the case of Banû 'l-Harith. Under the events of 294 and 295, however, this additional alif is not present. This occurrence has been noted here rather than in the apparatus criticus.

In the asl, the word sanah appears in the title of each year, albeit actually joined to the verb dakhalat, ( e.g. dakhalat sanat 280 ). However, invariably in MSS Khâ' and Bâ' sanah is not present, ( dakhalat 280, and so on ), and I have chosen to make this observation here in order to avoid constant repetition in the apparatus criticus. In Madî's edition of the Berlin MS, sanah is consistently indicated.

As has been mentioned above, the Sîrat al-Hadî is undoubtedly the principal source for the author of our text. I have had this work constantly at my side while preparing this present text and I have not hesitated to make small additions to it in order to clarify an understanding of it and I have also made minor emendments to the text where necessary. Any such additions and emendments are within square brackets in the text itself, and the original wording of the text is clearly shown in the apparatus criticus so that there can never be any possibility of mistaking an addition or an emendment for the original text. ( When words found in MSS Khâ' or Bâ' but not in the asl are supplied, round brackets are used ).

In order to establish the correct orthography of certain proper names and toponyms which appear in the text, I have had recourse to the British Library MS of the Sîrat al-Hadî rather than to the printed edition
not only because the former is such a fine manuscript but because it is about 40 years older than the Istanbul MS which was taken as the asl for the printed edition. ( Also, I suspect that there are printing errors in the latter. ) Strange, Zakkār has neglected completely the British Library MS in his edition indeed he does not even mention its existence despite the fact that he had, apparently, been in London.

However, in the apparatus criticus, it is to the printed Sīrat that I refer employing the siglum " : this is on account of its ready accessibility, and for the same reason I also refer to the printed Sīrat in the annotations wherever possible. In the apparatus criticus, " ( or " al-Sīrah ), as opposed to " siyāq al-riwayah fi " and similar expressions, means that the words referred to between square brackets have been extracted verbatim from Zakkār’s edition of Sīrat al-Hādi’. A page and line number is always given.

In the annotations and in this introduction, " Abbāsī, Sīrat, followed forewith by a page number should be taken as a reference to Zakkār’s edition, whereas " Abbāsī, Sīrat MS, followed by a folio number, is a reference to the British Library MS. Also, the Sīrat by itself ( or sometimes the printed Sīrat or the Sīrat MS ), can only refer to the Sīrat al-Hādi’.

There are six proper names that occur in the text ( four personal names, one a tribal name ) and seven toponyms that I wish to discuss here in the introduction in order to avoid loading the apparatus criticus with quite lengthy explanation and, in certain cases, tedious repetition. These names will thus appear in, what I believe to be, their correct form throughout the edited text and no further comment will be made in the apparatus criticus since the variant readings of the MSS will be indicated here.
Muhammad b. C Ubaydullāh al- C Alawī and C Alī b. Muhammad al- C Abbāsī

Five times in the text, mention is made of al-Hādī’s loyal henchman, Muhammad b. C Ubaydullāh (the father of C Alī, author of the Sīrat). Three times, the name appears in all the MSS (and in the editions of C Ashūr and Mādī) as Muhammad b. C Abdullah al- C Alawī, but twice, correctly, elsewhere in the asl (Arabic text, pp. 74, 75) as Muhammad b. C Ubaydullāh, without the nisba - but simply as C Ubaydullāh in MSS Khāʾ and Bāʾ. Once mention is made of his son, C Alī, in the form C Alī b. Muhammad b. C Abdullah.

The name of Muhammad’s father, C Ubaydullāh, appears correctly throughout the Sīrat (both in Zakkār’s edition and in the MS) and since C Abdullah in the Ghayat is manifestly wrong, it has been corrected in the edited text, on the four occasions when it occurs (pp. 10, 26, 28), to C Ubaydullāh.

The second name is closely related to the first. Under the happenings of year 297, our author records that al-Hādī despatched one Muhammad b. C Alī al- C Abbāsī to Ṣanʿāʾ, (along with al-Duʾāmīn). The Sīrat (395, 2f) identifies him as a scion of al- C Abbās b. C Alī but gives his name, however, as C Alī b. Muhammad b. C Ubaydullāh, the author of the Sīrat - al- C Abbāsī and al- C Alawī are twin nisbas (see below, pp 231-2, n.18). Since there would seem to be no compelling reason for doubting the veracity of the Sīrat account and also because no one by the name of Muhammad b. C Alī al- C Abbāsī is recorded in the Sīrat as having been a close associate of al-Hādī, a slip on the part of the author of the Ghayat can be safely presumed. Thus the name has been emended in the edited text (p. 75) to C Alī b. Muhammad al- C Abbāsī, and no comment has been made in the apparatus criticus.
Ibn al-Ruwayyah appears in the text on four occasions and in all three MSS with a bā' instead of a yā'. (However, on the fourth occasion in MS C Ayn, it is unpointed). On the first occasion, our text records the name of al-Rabī' C Ibn al-Ruwayyah (see below, p. 178, n.110). On the other occasions Ibn al-Ruwayyah, (although it is Abū 'l-Ruwayyah in MS Bā' on the last occasion), appears with no first name but he is to be identified as Abū 'l-C Ashūrah Ahmad, brother of al-Rabī' C (see below, p. 188, n.19 and p. 228, n.7).

In the asl on the first appearance of the name, and in all MSS on its first appearance, there is a hamzah over the waw. C Ashūr gives the asl reading throughout his edition except that on the fourth occurrence he supplies a bā'. On the second and third occurrence he decides there should be a sukūn over the waw: viz. Ibn al-Rawbah. The bā' in C Ashūr's version of the name cannot be a printing error for it is clear that the editor intended it so. On the other hand, Mādī gives the correct version, al-Ruwayyah, and even supplies vowels and a shaddah over the yā' but unfortunately he does not indicate anywhere the actual reading of his MS.

In the edited text, the last part of the name has been written as Ruwayyah - see pp. 47,55,70.

C Alī b. Faḍl

The Fatimid daʾī appears in all MSS as C Alī bn al-Faḍl (twice, incorrectly, as C Alī bn al-Faḍl). As has been noted above, he is also referred to in the text as Ibn Faḍl (never as Ibn al-Faḍl). It would be perhaps both confusing and illogical to present C Alī's father in two forms, Faḍl and al-Faḍl, in one text and, moreover, it seems most likely that Faḍl is the original form. In the early 8th / 14th century MS of the Kanz (with one exception) and in the Sīrat, the name appears as C Alī b. Faḍl.
This is likewise the case in al-Hammâdi’s *Kashf asrâr al-Bâtiniyyah*. [148] 

\(^\text{C}^\alpha\text{Ilf}^\beta\text{b. Fadl, not }^\text{C}^\alpha\text{Ilf}^\beta\text{b. al-Fadl, is therefore the version preferred}

throughout the edited text on the six occasions the name occurs – see pp. 65, 66, 70, 72.

**Al-Hasan b. Kabâlah**

At the commencement of the events of year 294, mention is made in the text of the revolt of a client of the Yû firids called al-Ḥasan b. Kanânah, in MSS *\(^\text{C}^\alpha\text{Ay}^\beta\text{n and Khâ'*, and al-Ḥasan b. Kanâbah in MS Bâ’.

Both *\(^\text{C}^\alpha\text{Ashûr* and Mâfî give al-Ḥasan b. Kanânah and so the latter’s reading of his own MS is incorrect. [149]}

Although Kâyâlah is a possibility, I am inclined to favour myself Kabâlah ( or perhaps Kabbâlah ) and so I have written al-Ḥasan b. Kabâlah in the edited text – see p. 70. In the printed *Sîrat*, the name appears consistently as Kâyâlah and it does likewise in Zakkâr’s edition of the *Kashf* and the *\(^\text{C}^\alpha\text{Asjad* without, it should be added, any comment from the editor. [150]}

In the *Sîrat* MS, the name appears as both Kabâlah and Kay(y)âlah but there is an example of the former in a title-heading where the name appears boldly and where the single dot is distinct. [151] However, it is invariably Kabâlah in *\(^\text{C}^\alpha\text{Attâr*’s edition of the *Kashf* and in the Leiden MS. [152]

**B. Salmân**

This tribe descended from Arḥab, appears as B. Sulaymân in all three MSS and in the editions of *\(^\text{C}^\alpha\text{Ashûr* and Mâfî, respectively. I believe B. Salmân to be more probably the correct version since it appears thus throughout the *Sîrat* – both in the printed edition and MS. [153]

See Arabic text, pp. 16 and 24.
Kitāf

Kitāf, the first of the seven toponyms to be considered, is rendered incorrectly in all MSS as K-nāf. The Sīrat narrative makes it clear that Kitāf is the place intended. See Arabic text, p. 57.

Itwah

The second toponym appears varyingly in the MSS (Ayn, Khā' and Bā' respectively) as L-b-wah; Kabwah, or Labwah; and K-b-wah. Again, the Sīrat indicates that the place is in fact Itwah. See Arabic text, p. 60.

Uthāfit

Over a dozen times, a place appears in MSS Ayn and Khā' as 'thāf-th and similarly in MS Bā' except on four occasions in the latter when it is rendered, Thāf-th. There would seem to be little doubt that the final letter is an error for tā' and it seems also that Uthāfit, rather than Athāfit, is the more probable vocalization - see below, p. 108, n.19. Thus the place is written as 'thāf-t throughout the edited text (pp. 11,12, 16,17,18,19,20,23,24), and has been transliterated as Uthāfit in the translation. When, however, MS Bā' has Thāfit, this has been recorded in the apparatus criticus.

Subul

This toponym occurs originally twice in our text and I have also added it once to the text for clarification (extracting the additional words almost verbatim from the Sīrat). - see Arabic text.
On the first occasion, it appears in MS C Ayn as ḏ-y-1 (the second letter is unpointed however); in MS Khā' as Dabal and in MS Bā' as D-b-l. The scribe has written the word kadḥā over the name, after the name (but above the line), and immediately after the name (and then, again, wa-kadḥā above the line), respectively in the three MSS. This clearly indicates that he was in doubt as to the orthography of the name and that, presumably, he did not know its location. This kadḥā will not appear in the edited text.

On the second occasion, the toponym appears in MS C Ayn as Š-Iṭl (or perhaps Š-IṬl), in MS Khā' as Š-IṬl and in MS Bā' as D-IṬl. Āshūr has Š-y-I (his pointing is thus quite arbitrary) in the first instance[156] and Š-IṬl in the second. Madī' gives the reading of his text (scil. MS Bā') but provides, however, a footnote quoting Van Arendonk in both cases. [157]

The detailed narrative in the STrat shows that in fact the place on both occasions is Š-b-I (the vowelling will be discussed below, and see below, p. 184, n.2 for a discussion of its location). The place is mentioned ten times in the STrat narrative in four separate contexts. In Zakkār's edition it is always Š-b-I and likewise in the STrat MS (except on one occasion when it is unpointed). As Š-b-I, therefore, the place will appear in the edited text.

Concerning the vocalization of the name, Van Arendonk prefers Šabul,[158] apparently entirely on the basis of STrat MS, f. 90a.19. There Šabul is indicated (although, incidentally, the bā' is open to other interpretations which is not the case in the other examples, where the bā' is obvious). He does mention Šubul in STrat MS, f. 97a, although, unfortunately, without further detail. There it in fact occurs three times (viz. Šubul) and once unvocalized. Van Arendonk does not mention
that in f. 94b, Șubul (sic) appears, clearly, twice (on the third occurrence it is both unvocalized and unpointed). Also, in f. 95a,b and f. 97b it appears thus: Ş-b-1. Thus the Șfrat MS would clearly support the vocalization Șubul rather than any other. In the printed Șfrat, the place appears on eight occasions as Şab-1, once as Șabul and once unvocalized. However, Zakkar provides no thorough apparatus criticus and therefore I have preferred the evidence of the British Library MS, bearing in mind also its general reliability (as can be seen throughout this thesis) and its age, and consequently have written Șubul in the translation and annotations.

Sana

This toponym appears in our text, once, as S-n-.

It is spelt thus on the YAR map - Arabic edit. (q.v. below, p. 187) and in WaysT, Yaman. 172. However the place appears as S-naC very clearly in the Șfrat MS, f. 94b,20 and the alif is there in Zakkār’s edit. (240,7), notwithstanding his strange reading (viz. S-fāC). Throughout the historical work, Ibn Ḥālim’s Al-Simt al-ghālF’t-thaman [159] (where it is usually linked with the neighbouring Haddah - q.v. below, p. 181, n.121), the place is indicated invariably as S-naC, and it is noteworthy that the MS used for the basis of the printed text is dated only 15 years later than the Șfrat MS. [160] In our own times, AkwaC refers to SanaC in his edition of al-HamdānT’s, IklF II, (285, n.1). I believe, therefore, that there is good justification for considering S-naC to be the older spelling and so I have emended the Ghayat text accordingly, (see Arabic text, p.54).

Regarding the vocalization, Smith [161] prefers Sina but it seems probable that SanaC is more correct: AkwaC notes that the sin has a fathah, and on the YAR map (English edit.) it is SanaC, not SinaC. See below, p. 187, n.18.
Zabwah

The place is mentioned four times in our text. In all MSS it appears as Dabwah, except on the first occasion when MS Khā’ has Zabwah. In the Sīrat the toponym occurs five times. In the printed edition it appears as Zabwah, except on the fifth occurrence when it is Dabwah; ( Zakkār in his index places, incorrectly, every reference under Dabwah - Cabbāsī, Sīrat, 437 ). In the Sīrat MS it is unpointed and unvocalized on four occasions, ( viz. Ṭ-bwah ), but on the final occasion it is Z-bwah - f. 159a,3.

In Hamdānī’s Jazīrat, ( in both Müller’s and Akwa’s editions ), it is Zabwah, and neither edition contains an alternative reading of Dabwah. Akwa specifically spells the place, Zabwah ( 153,n.2 ). On the YAR map it is indicated as Dabwah. However, as the orthography of the Sīrat and the Jazīrat might very well reflect the original pronunciation of this toponym, I have emended the text to Z-bwah: see Arabic text, pp. 50,54,66. See also below, pp. 184-5, n.3.

Wurāqah

The seventh and final toponym to be discussed here is probably the most abstruse of all the toponyms to appear in our text. In MS C Ayn ( f. 17b,24 ), it is W-rāf-y-y-n ( the first yā’ is unpointed ) and in MSS Khā’ ( f. 21b,25f ) and Bā’ ( f. 31a,15 ), W-rāf-y-n. C Ashūr’s reading, Rāz-q-t-y-n ( q.v. Ghayat, 181 ), presumed regretfully by Wilson ( "Investigation", 128f, 277 ) to be the actual Ghayat reading, is utterly fanciful since the first letter of the toponym in MSS C Ayn and Khā’, ( and in MS Bā’ ), could never be taken for a rā’.

The striking difference between the Ghayat MSS and the readings of the Sīrat is the qāf, where the former shows a fā’s: viz. W-rāq-t-y-n ( p. 228,2 ) and Wurrāq-y-y-n, - the two yā’s being unpointed ( f. 89b,7 ), in Zakkār’s edition of the Sīrat and the Sīrat MS respectively.

The context, both in our text and in the more detailed Sīrat account ( see pp. 227,13 - 228,4, - read Ghaymān, 227,14 ), suggests
a place somewhere between Ghaymān and Bayt Baws, and not too distant from Nuqum. The place is probably to be identified with Wurāqah, which is indicated on the YAR map (MB 226931 - sheet, 1544 C2) 9 km NW of Ghaymān, 9½ km NE of Bayt Baws - see Map 3, B2. Wilson ("Investigation", 277) makes a similar suggestion - see below p. 170, n.83. Therefore I have written, tentatively, Wurāqah in the edited text (p. 42) with no comment in the apparatus criticus.

The translation

The translation of any particular year is followed forewith by the annotations which belong to it. With regard to the translation itself, I have attempted to keep to both the spirit and the letter of the Arabic original and have striven constantly to avoid any possible accusation that I have translated "what is not there!". Any clarification whatsoever by myself is included within square brackets.

Words or phrases which catch the eye or are perhaps of particular philological or lexicographical interest, I have transliterated and put between round brackets. With regard to my interpretation of the more interesting or noteworthy vocabulary, I have referred to my source in the appropriate annotation. Such a selection of particular words for transliteration or comment must, I suppose, be somewhat arbitrary in the case of a text which contains so much to arrest the attention of the discerning reader.

The annotations

I have tried to be as concise and to the point as possible. I make no apology if certain annotations have, in effect, turned into small essays, since in such cases I have considered both the
complexity of the subject matter to demand more than a few lines and also because, to my knowledge, the particular point has not been dealt with concisely and in an adequate manner elsewhere. Thus, to give only a few instances, I have dealt at length with such diverse topics as al-Hājār in Wadi Najrān. ( pp. 96-7, n.14 ); Najd al-Zārār, ( pp. 111-12, n.29 ); the identity of Abū 'I-l-Cātāhiyāh, ( pp. 120-22, n.1 ); the identification of al-Cūṣaymāt, ( pp. 123-4, n.9 ); the date when al-Hādī first entered Ṣanā'. ( pp. 154-5, n.27 ); the correct orthography of Wadi Zahr, ( pp. 164-5, n.58 ); the location of Ṣibr Ḥaddayn, ( pp. 174-6, n.100 ); the happenings, ( in year 290 ), in the vicinity of Ṣubul, ( pp. 196-8, n.20 ); Abū 'I-l-Qāsim's imprisonment and subsequent release, ( pp. 201-2, n.34 ); the date when CʿAlī b. Faḍl captured Ṣanā', ( pp. 220-22, n.16 ); and the Dūr al-Cʿalāwiyīn, ( pp. 231-2, n.18 ).

Also, in a few cases, I have summarised events covered by the Sīrat in several pages but often referred to, quite perfunctorily, in our text in just a few words, in order to add to the interest of the reader not familiar perhaps with the text of the Sīrat and also to add to a greater understanding of al-Hādī's imamate and its turbulent background. This last comment applies especially to the events in Wadi Najrān. ( see above p. 31 ). Thus, for instance, pp. 127-33, ( n.19 - n.35 ), which concern events in Najrān in the years 286-7 - described briefly in the Ghāyat ( see pp. 118-9 ), will, I hope, both clarify these dramatic events and also add much of interest to the Ghāyat account. Similarly, the events in the year before the murder of al-Hādī's Cʿamil, Muḥammad b. CʿUbaydullāh, mentioned in just a few words by the author of the Ghāyat, are described more fully in pp. 234-5, n.1, and, likewise, the happenings immediately leading up to the murder, as well as the crime itself, are given greater consideration in pp. 236-7, n.1.

In the annotations ( and in this introduction ), when referring to any MS, I give the line in addition to the folio number, in order
to facilitate reference. For a similar reason, I provide the line along with the page number when referring to the printed edition of the *Strat al-Hadit* and the two editions of al-Hamdâni’s *Sifat Jazrât al-CArab* (see below).

By "text" in any reference, is meant the English translation and when the actual edited text is intended, the reference is to the "Arabic text". When reference is made to another annotation appertaining to the same year, the page number is not given. Of course, the page number is provided along with the number of the annotation when the latter belongs to a different year.

When discussing the numerous toponyms that occur in the text, I occasionally refer to maps other than the sheets of the YAR project (to be discussed below), which are often less detailed and usually less reliable. Also I have frequent recourse to works not only compiled by Yemenis themselves but by other Arab geographers and historians, as well as to the works of European scholars and travellers. Regarding Yemeni works, I single out in particular al-Hamdâni’s *Sifat Jazrât al-CArab* (referred to throughout the annotations as *Jazrât*). I refer more frequently to the Akwa edition than to the much older Muller one, principally because of the useful information often contained in the footnotes of the former but also because of its ready accessibility. Thus in the annotations, unless otherwise stated, it is to the Akwa edition that I refer. Significant differences in MS readings between the two editions are, of course, indicated.

**Cartographical detail**

For the pin-pointing of toponyms met with in the text, I have had frequent recourse to the series of maps entitled, *Yemen Arab Republic 1 : 50,000* published by the Government of the UK, initially in conjunction with the Directorate of Overseas Surveys and subsequently, and currently, with Ordinance Survey, for the Government of the Yemen Arab
Publication commenced with a few sheets in 1980 and the project is still in progress.

Sheets covering the greater part of the YAR have now, (summer 1989), been published: that includes Tiḥāmah from al-Muḵā to Ḥaraḏ, then, moving eastwards, the southern, central and northern highlands from Taʾizz to Ḥūth and al-Ḥarf, Raḍāʾ in the east, the NW highlands, and Sāqayn territory to the immediate west of Saʿdah. Thus the sheets available cover most of the places which feature in our text. However, the projected sheets showing Saʿdah itself and the area immediately to the N and NE as far as Najrān on the present Yemeni-Saudi border, as well as the regions to the E and SE of Saʿdah, (which would include Jabal Baraṭ), have yet to appear.

By means of these maps, one has been able to pin-point accurately, for the first time, places mentioned in the Ghayāt (and in other Yemeni historical works too), since the sheets are equipped with the 1000 Metre Universal Transverse Mercator Grid which enables one to give a precise 6 figure reference. Such a reference has been taken from the approximate centre of the settlement, village or town. In the case of mountains, the more scattered settlements and the larger towns, a 4 figure reference has been provided. Distances from Saʿdah have been calculated from the mosque indicated at MB 157975 on YAR sheet, 1544 C1.

The grid references in the annotations have been restricted to the "YAR 1:50,000" project. The term "YAR map" can only be a reference to this project. Any reference will be followed by the sheet number (usually in brackets), and the reference itself is generally preceded by the letters YAR. With regard to places not covered at present by the YAR maps, I have had recourse to the Tactical Pilotage Chart (J-6C) [163] which has a scale of 1:500,000. This map will be referred to as the TPC.
The translation and annotations are followed by three maps. Maps 2 and 3 are based entirely on the YAR map with the exception of Ḥadaqān on Map 2 (see below, pp. 150-1, n.8). The wadis and mountains shown, have, of course, not been drawn according to any strict cartographical rule and, in the case of the former, the intention has been merely to indicate a stretch of the wadi concerned. Map 1, including the coastline, has likewise been based on the YAR map except for Jabal Barat, Sa'dah, Kitāf and Wadi Najrān, the location of which has been gleaned from the aforementioned TPC.

Although Ḥaraq, Jabal Maswar, al-Sūdah, Khamir, Ǧ Amrān, al-Ḥudaydah, Wu‘lān, Dhū Jiblāh, Ghulāfiqah and al-Mukhā do not feature in our text, neither directly or indirectly, they have been indicated on Map 1 not only because all these places (except al-Mukhā) are mentioned in the annotations, but because many of them might assist a reader familiar only with a map of modern Yemen to find his bearings. For similar reasons, Dhū Bīn, the two Jabal Zīns, Khamir, Ǧāz, Ǧ Amrān (again) and Jabal Ǧ Aybān have been included on Map 2, al-Jirāf, Shāṭūb and Jabal Barāsh on Map 3 and al-Rawḍah on Maps 2 and 3.

Genealogical tables

The maps are followed by three genealogical tables. Table 1 ("Āl Yūfir") is an abridged genealogy designed solely to illustrate the relationship between the Yūfirids that feature in our text.

Regarding Table 2 ("B. Ḥāshim & Ahl al-Bayt"), it should be emphasized that it is very abridged and selective, its object being to portray only the descendants of Ḥāshim b. Ġ Abd Manāf who appear in our text and who are mentioned in the annotations and in this introduction, and, in particular, the descendants of the Prophet Muḥammad through Fāṭimah, his daughter, and ĠAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. Therefore, of course, a degree of prominence is given to Imam al-Hādī Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim and his immediate family and relatives. I have also been highly selective with regard to laqabs and kunyāhs.
When used, they are placed between brackets. Seniority of age is from the left. [164]

Table 3 ("Al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad") is likewise very selective and its aim is to show the relationship one to another of the various descendants of Imam al-Manṣūr bi-ʿllāh, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad who figure in the discussion regarding the authorship of Ghāyat al-amanī and Anbāʾ al-zaman (above, pp. 17-30). Also, the table shows their direct descent from al-Ḥādfī. Al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad had in fact ten sons but only four of them feature in this introduction. As in Table 2, seniority of age is from the left. [165]

Transliteration method

The scheme of transliteration followed throughout this thesis is, in principle, that employed in the occasional academic publication, Arabian Studies. [166]

The letter ʻayn is represented by a "c", moved up a space. The tāʾ marbūṭah at the end of a noun in the construct state (mudāf) is represented as "t", rather than "h". Short vowels at the end of words, except in the case of verbs, are generally not indicated but where they are shown, it is usually in order to facilitate the correct reading of the original. Because of its widespread acceptance, "t" is used to represent the double ẓāʾ at the end of certain nouns and adjectives, (ʿAlawi, Ḥanjūbī), even though "yy" would seem to be more logical. (ʿAlawiy, Ḥanjūbiyy). However, a double wāw is shown by "ww": i.e. ʿadduww, not ʿaddū.
Notes

In the following notes, Ghayat followed by a folio number is a reference to MS \(^{c}\)Ayn (q.v. above, p. 49a). In other cases, the reference is to \(^{c}\)Ashur's printed edition. (see below, n.3).

In any MS reference, (here and throughout this thesis), 'a' (\(a\)) of a folio number is to be understood as the left-hand page of an open book, while 'b' (\(b\)) indicates the back of that page.


2. Throughout the thesis, I refer to the adherents of the Ismā’īlī da’wah in the Yemen as Fatimids since their spiritual heirs, the Dā’ūdī and Sulaymānī Mustafis of today, would seem to prefer this term and, in any case, in the opinion of this writer, it is a more accurate designation for this branch of the Shi’ah. See Hamdānī, "Evolution", 86, and below, p. 90, n.4.

3. Published in two volumes in Cairo in 1388 / 1968 and edited by Sa’īd \(^c\)Abd al-Fattāḥ \(^c\)Ashūr.


5. Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn, Ghayat, f. 1b,5-10.

6. Ghayat, f. 1b,10-12.

7. Ghayat, ff. 2a,2 - 3a,7.


9. See above, p. 35.

10. Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn, Ghayat, f. 117a,29ff.


17. Orientabteilung: Ms. or. fol. 1304.

I have used a microfilm kindly provided by that institution.

18. The years 280-322 of the Berlin MS were published in 1936 in an edition, together with an introduction, by Muhammad Mādfi entitled Jahjā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Muʿajjad al-Jamānī's, "Anbāʾ az-Zaman fī ḥabbār al-Jamān", with the subtitle of Anfänge des Zaiditentums in Yemen. Mādfi is manifestly more thorough than Ǧāshūr although mis-readings of the MS do occur.


20. Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn, Ghāyat, MS C Ayn, f. 1a,1-8.. MS Khāʾ f. 1a,1-5.

21. Ghāyat.1, 50., MS C Ayn, f. 1a, adjacent to lines 32-6 at bottom left-hand side and clearly written by the hand of the same scribe.. MS Khāʾ, f. 1a,32.

22. Ghāyat.1, 6-7.


27. Rāzī, Tārikh, 626-7.


32. Smith, "Tahirid", 149.
34. but not necessarily an autograph copy of Anbā' al-zaman as assumed by Smith in "Tahirid", 149.
36. See below, p. 248, Genealogical Table 3.
   This error on the title-page was not pointed out by Māgī:
37. The text is quoted in full in Anfänge, 24.
38. See Anfänge, 24-5.
40. Brockelmann, GAL, II, 403.
42. Cf. C Amīr, Yemen, 115-119.
43. British Library MS, Or. 3719. See Rieu, Supplement, II, 339.
44. C Amīr b. Muḥammad, Bughyat, f. 60a,21 - 60b,8.
45. Cambridge University Library MS, Browne, C.13.
46. See C Amīr b. Muḥammad, Bughyat, f. 60b,8-9, 18-21.
47. Yūsuf b. Yahyā, Nasamat, ff. 182b - 185b.
50. Nasamat, f. 183b,8.
51. See Fayrūzābādī, Qāmūs, IV, 355.
52. See below, Genealogical Table 3; Shawkānī, Bādār, 146-9, 226-7.
53. Hibshī, Hukkām, 23.
56. Maṣādir, 247.
57. See Māḏf, Anfange, 24.
58. See Shawkānī, Bādār, 391-2.
59. For the dating of the Tabaqāt, see Shawkānī, Bādār, 23-4, n.1.
60. See Āmīr b. Muḥammad, Bughyat, f. 123b, 12-15.

62. Ibn al-Wazīr, Tabag, f. 2a, and see also Rieu, Supplement, II, 384.
63. However, cf. Shawkānī, Bādār, II, 328, where the author, presumably quoting from the Tabaqāt of Ibrāhīm b. al-Qāsim, mentions neither work by name, referring somewhat cryptically to a kitāb al-tāriḵ fī mujalladayn; cf. Zabārah, Nashr, II, 855-6.
64. Āmīr b. Muḥammad, Bughyat, f. 123b, 13.
65. Māḏf, Anfange, 24-5.


68. See Sālim, Muʿarrīkhūn, 82. In the same passage in this MS, Ismaʿīl b. Ālī is taken to task for having marred [his work] by over-abridgement (fa-akhalla ff farti khtisārīhi) and the writer is of the opinion that, in general, abridgements of historical [texts] are spoilt (wa-ʿalā l-jumlah inna l-ikhtisārat ff l-lārīkh mukhill), concluding with the Qur'ānic words: wa-fawqā kull dhī Īlm Ālīm, "over every man of knowledge is One who knows". (Yūsuf, 76).

69. See Masādir, 247. It is in the library of Sayyid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Mansūr. This MS covers events up to year 678 / 1279-80.

70. British Library MS, Or. 3901.

The Sīrat has been published under the title, Sīrat al-Īlāhī lilā ‛l-Haqq Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn alayhi wa-ʿalīhi ‛l-salām in an edition by Suhayl Zakkar, ( Beirut, 1392 / 1972 ).

71. British Library MS, Or. 4581.

72. Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn, Ghiyāt, f. 1a,13,9-10.

73. Part of this work has been edited by Suhayl Zakkar and is contained in pp. 413-431 of the latter’s Akhbār al-Qaramīlah ff ‛l-Ahsāʾ etc. (Damascus, 1400 / 1980).

Whenever al-Khazarjī is mentioned by name in the annotations, it is to the Āṣjad that I refer, (except in p. 95, n.5 and p. 1731, n.98).

When a direct reference to the Āṣjad is made, al-Khazarjī is usually not mentioned and the reference is given simply as: ed. Zakkar, Akhbār, followed by the page number.

74. See Ibn al-Dayba, Qurrat, I, 21.

75. Shamāḥi, Yaman, 323-4.


78. This is the title on the bound cover but, as is clear from the detailed title-page, the work is in fact an abridgement of a larger commentary by al-Mahdi on his own work, al-Azhār, entitled al-Ghayth al-mīdar al-miftah li-kamā'īm al-Azhār, and was compiled by al-Mahdi's pupil, Abū 'l-Ḥasan ʿAbdullāh ibn Miftāh (d. 877 / 1472). See Shawkānī, Badr, I, 394; Ahmad b. Yaḥyā, Bahr, I, 22.

It was published in Cairo in 1357 / 1938, and again in ʿṢanā' in 1401 / 1980-1 (together with Shawkānī's marginal notes).


80. Muḥallīf, Ḥaddāʾiq, f. 16a,1f,8f.


82. Muḥallīf, Ḥaddāʾiq, f. 15b,2-6.

83. Ḥaddāʾiq, f. 16b,12 - 17a,9.

84. Ḥaddāʾiq, f. 15b,17 - 18a,1.

85. Ḥaddāʾiq, f. 29b,10-12.

86. Muḥammad b. ʿAbdullāh, Rawdat, 40.


88. ʿAmīrī, Riyāḍī, 297.

89. See Arendonk, Débuts, 128,n.2,3.

90. See Muḥallīf, Ḥaddāʾiq, f. 4b,20 - 5a,6; and Madelung, Imam, 92.

For al-Rass, see below, p. 87, n.10.

91. Ḥaddāʾiq, 17b,8ff.


94. See, for instance, the poem in Ābāsī, Sīrat, 201-2, and the poem above, p. 9.

95. Zamakhshārī, Kashf al-l, 415. For what has preceded see: Subhī, Zaydiyyah, 69-70, 164-7; Shamāhī, Yaman, 101-3. The quotation, lā yasa'uhum ... etc., is from al-Hādfī, Ahkām, f. 4b,27f; cf. Zaydiyyah, 165, ... muwilātuhum wa-tā'atuhu.


97. Ibn Inabah, Umdat, 204.

98. Al-Hādfī, Ahkām, f. 4b,25f, and see Ahmad b. Yahyā, Bahr l, 228.


100. For a detailed account see Isfahānī, Maqātil, 232-99, 315-86, 431-60, 518-53; and for a terse mention see Kennedy, Caliphates, 131-3, 140-1, 153.

101. See Muhallī, Hādīq, f. 4b,20 - 5a,1-6.

102. See, for instance, Momen, Introduction, 73-5; and Hussain, Occultation, 83-5.


104. The Arabic text is given in Strothmann, Staatsrecht, 53.

105. Cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 128. Perhaps most of the Tabarīs who a decade later came to the Yemen to support al-Hādfī in his military campaigns, were from that group who had become his followers at Āmul: cf. Gochenour, "Penetration", 158.


107. ... wa-kharajū musrīfīn wa-thiyābuhum ānd al-qassār wa-khilāfuhum ānd al-iskāf mā 'starjū ēhā: see Strothmann, Staatsrecht, 53-4.
108. See Şuhbî, Zaydiyyah, 72-3., 228-30.


110. See Hamdânî, Iklîlî, 328-9.


113. See Madîj, Yemen, 146.

Geddes, ( " Yu firîd ", 68-9 ), divides the Yemeni tribes into two branches, the Kahlânî and the Himyaritic, descended respectively from Kahlân and Himyar, the two sons of Saba`. He points out that the various rebellions against the Yu firîds in the period immediately before the arrival of al-Hâdî were all led, with one exception, by tribal chieftains of Kahlân descent. Furthermore, he suggests that with the coming of the Zaydîs, the Kahlânî tribes took on Shi'a affiliations while the Himyaritic tribes were pro-Sunnî, although this could be an over-simplification.

114. The text can be found in C. Abbâsî, Sîrat, 415,10 - 416,19, and in Sîrat.MS, f. 169b,6 - 170a,12. I have preferred the MS reading in the following instances:- 415,15, the MS ( f. 169b,11 ) adds bi-him after mustarîkh, ( which the metre demands: - wa-'l-haqqu mustarîkhun bi-him fa-taghâfâlû, viz. mustarfât ilun mutaflê ilun mutaflê ilun ): 416,11, the MS ( f. 170a,4 ) has wa-bi-dhî 'l-jalâlah, instead of wa-dhawî 'l-jalâlah, ( where the MS reading seems more appropriate; 416,14, the MS has wast hamîsîhâ, instead of wast khamîsîhâ, ( Zakkâr's reading is, manifestly, nonsense, - the MS also provides the correct explanation, wast al-tannûr C an qâmûs [ cf. Zabîdî, Tâj, XV, 557 ] ). See also 416,9, where the tâ' marbûtah in thanâ'îhi is clearly a misprint.
115. Scil. Ālī b. Abī Talib.

116. A reference to those who fought Ālī in the battle of the Camel in 36 / 656: Zābihī, Tāj, V. 376, concerning Ālī's words, umīrītū bi-qītāl al-nākithīn ..., etc., arāda bi-'l-nākithīn ahl waq̱at al-Jamāl li-annahum kānu bāya uhu thumm naqadū bay wa-qātalūhu; and see Mu'ayyadī, Tuhaf, 12.

117. Scil. B. Hāshim vis-à-vis B. al-Abbās. However, perhaps the implication is even wider extending to the first three caliphs and B. Umayyah.

118. See C Abbāsī, Sīrāt, 417,13-17.

119. Abū Zahrah, Īmām, 510; cf. Sharaf al-Dīn, Yaman, 253, where 284 is also given as the start of al-Hādī's imamate, but Shamāni, ( Yaman, 325 ), gives, correctly, 280.

120. C Abbāsī, Sīrāt, 36,8f.

121. C Īsāmī, Sīrat, II, f. 135a,9f.

122. Mu'ayyadī, Tuhaf, 63.

123. See al-Hasan b. Badr al-Dīn, Anwār, f. 149b,17; and Ibn Abī 'l-Najm, Durar, 202. - the former speaks of his giyām, the latter of his zuhūr.

124. Sharaf al-Dīn, Yaman, 245.

125. Mad'aj, " Ālī b. al-Fadl ", 100, 102.

126. Cf. the duties of an Īmālī, below, p. 157, n.35. For a discerning analysis of the situation, see Serjeant, " Interplay ", 18-23.


129. This is the reading of Sīrāt MS, f. 13b,9: Zakkār's edition
(48,13) has, ..... anhu 'hnab-nahu ( ajnabnahu ?).

130. Mu'ayyad Tuhaf, 66.

131. For al-Hādī's doctrine concerning Ālī, see his Ahkām, f. 3b.2 - 4a.8; Ibn Abī l-Najm, Durar, 169 (part of his wisāyah); and cf. Šubhā, Zaydiyyah, 162-3., 205.


133. Q.v. Ess, Frühe, 42-3 (Ar. text.), 39; Ahmad b. Yahyā, Bahār l. 40; and cf. Šubhā, Zaydiyyah, 107-110.

134. This is in reality f. 16a, since the actual f. 5 of the MS has not been numbered and so what has been numbered f. 5 is, in fact, f. 6. However, I have retained the numbering of the folios which actually appears in the MS (even although it is incorrect) in order not to confuse future researchers.

135. See, for example, the beautifully printed Qur'ān produced under the supervision of the Iraqi Ministry of Religious Estates and published in 1398 / 1978. In Āl Īmran, 84, Ibrāhīm, Ismā'īl, and Ishaq appear without the alif of prolongation although a small vertical stroke, traditionally employed to avert the reader from error, is placed above the consonant affected.

136. See the Qur'ān (mentioned in the preceding note), al-Şāffāt, 65, ruūs al-shayātīn and cf. the āyah that follows, fa-māli'una minā 'l-butūn where similarly there is only one wāw (with a hamzah above it).

137. Smith, Ayyubids l, 15.

138. Wright, Grammar l, 23.

139. but note Muhammad ibn al-Hādī (MS Bā', f. 33b.3 and MS Khā', f. 24b.30), and As'ad ibn Abī Yu'fīr (MS Bā', f. 33b.2).

141. The British Library MS is dated 1047 / 1638, while Zakkār’s asl is dated 1086 / 1675-6 (see Abbāstī, Sīrat, 6).

142. Sīrat, 5.

143. It manifestly did not occur to Āshūr that Ābdullāh might be wrong since he makes no comment anywhere in a footnote, but at least Māfī does indicate Van Arendonk’s correct version of the name: see Māfī, Anfānge, (Ar. text) 13, n. 40.

144. See Abbāstī, Sīrat, 7-8, 15-16; ed. Zakkār, Akhbār, 37; Zābārah, "Nayl", 208.


146. See Māfī, Anfānge, (Ar. text) 29, 33, 48. See also Abbāstī, Sīrat, 233, 7, corresponding to Sīrat MS, f. 92a, 4. The former has ya‘ preceded by wāw (without hamzah); in the latter (where the name appears distinctly as part of a title-heading) a ya‘ is clearly intended, even though it is unpointed, and it has a shaddah with a fathah above it, the wāw has a fātah and the ra‘ has a shaddah with dammah. - al-Ruwayyāh. Cf. also f. 93a, 18, where the ya‘ has two points beneath it.

147. The exception in the Kanz is f. 178a, 20. The name appears ten times as Alī b. Faḍl (ff. 178a - 180a). In the Sīrat both in Zakkār’s edition and the MS, Ālī b. Faḍl appears thrice (389, 21, 390, 11, 404, 3; ff. 158b, 18 - very clearly in a title., 159a, 8, 164b, 9).

The MS is preserved in the Leiden University Library and is contained in ff. 1-39b of Or. 6349. In the MS, however, the title is given as Risālat Muḥammad b. Maʿlik al-Nahwī. I refer to it either as Muḥammad b. Maʿlik, Risālat, or as the Leiden MS - according to the context. In this thesis, I usually refer to Ăṭṭār's edition because of its ready accessibility. See Blois, "Abū Tahir's", pp. 21-2.

Ăṭṭār b. Faḍī appears in that form some 20 times in the Kashf (see Ăṭṭār's edit. pp. 20-7). Once, however, in the Leiden MS (f. 14b,8), the name occurs in a title-heading as Ălī b. al-Faḍī.

149. Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥusayn, Ghāyatī, 198, and Māḍī, Anfânge, (text) 48 and 48,n.237. Āshūr was clearly unaware of the existence of variants of the name but Māḍī does mention Van Arendonk's preference, Kayyālah (based on what he deduced from the Sīrat MS - but see below, n.151).

150. See Ăbbāsī, Sīrat, 390-8 (several examples); ed. Zakkār, Akhbār, 225, 423, 426.

151. Sīrat MS, ff. 160a,15, wathaba 'bn K-bālah and 160a,18, ibn K-bālah; but cf. ff. 159b,5, ibn K-yālah and 159b,17 which is unpointed. Van Arendonk prefers Kayyālah but notes the variant readings: Débuts, 238,n.6.

152. Hammadī, Kashf, 27 - three instances; and Muḥammad b. Maʿlik, Risālat, f. 21a, - four instances.

153. See, for example, Ăbbāsī, Sīrat, 98,4, corresponding to Sīrat MS, f. 32b, last line and margin: wa-gawm min Hamdān yuqālu lahum Banū Salmān (cf. Arabic text, p. 16 which has this almost verbatim) wa-dḥālik anna Banī Salmān, and cf. MS, f. 33a,19, Muḥammad b. Sulaymān.

154. Sīrat, 244,15; Sīrat MS, f. 96b,14 (Kutāf); and see below, p. 193, n.7.
155. Sūrat, 247.11, Atwah; but Sūrat MS, f. 97b.15, Itwah, distinctly, with hamzah and kasrah beneath it; and see below, pp. 198-9, n.24,26.


158. Arendonk, Débuts, 226, and n.1., 229.


160. The British Library MS of the Sīmṭ is dated 1062 / 1651-2, and even the Cairo MS, (the second of the three MSS used for the edition), is not much later, viz. 1075 / 1664-5. See Ayyubids, II, 13, and above, n.141.


162. These maps are now classed as "restricted" material.
I was able to study them in the Map Room of the Cambridge University Library.


164. The information for the table has been gleaned from various sources, in particular ibn C Inabah, C Umdat; Mu'ayyad, Tuhaf; and Muḥammad b. C Abdullāh, Rawdat. Cf. Madelung, Imam, 245, 246.

165. As with Table 2, various sources have been used, in particular Shawkānī, Badr: Rawdat, 65, 67, 73, 75; and Tuhaf, 151, 188, 194.
( I have indicated al-Qāsim b. al-Mu'ayyad as an imam since, although neglected in Badr, he claimed the imamate on two occasions - see Zabārah, Nashr, II, 369-73. ).

166. First published in 1974. Seven volumes have been published, and at the time of writing, the 8th. vol. is in the press.
TRANSLATION AND ANNOTATIONS

***************************************************
In [this year], Imam al-Hāḍī ila 'l-Ḥaqq departed for the Yemen: [his name and genealogy is] Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm b. Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib—may the blessings of God be upon all of them:

A pedigree, the brilliance of which is like the forenoon shining upon it.

A shaft of light at daybreak. [1]

This was [al-Hāḍī's] first going-forth [to the Yemen] (al-kharjah al-Īlah). Having arrived at al-Sharafah in Nihm territory, [4] he was given allegiance by the inhabitants (wa-adhāna lahu 'l-nās bi-'l-tāli), since his khurūj had been at their entreaty. However he had not been there long before he realized that [the people] were contravening his ordinances, [ordinances] which were in accordance with the principles (ahkām) of the pure Sharīʿah: so he turned back and returned to the Hejaz. [6]

After [al-Hāḍī's] departure, there occurred in the Yemen feuds and periods of famine which would take too long to describe. Consequently, the Yemenites sent messages once again to al-Hāḍī (upon whom be peace) [in which] they implored him [to come back] (wa-tadarra ilayhi). So they reconciled themselves with him (fa-raja ilayhi) [7] and he returned to [the Yemen], [but] at a date we shall mention later, if God wills.

In Mukhtasar al-asbāb by Shaykh Ahmad b. Muhammad, [8] [it is stated] that the occasion (sabab) for the khurūj of al-Hāḍī (upon whom be peace), was that Banū Ṭūṭaymah of Khawlān Ṣadāh [9] travelled to visit al-Hāḍī at al-Rass [10] in the Hejaz and entreated
him [ to make ] khurūj, [5]  [ at the same time ] appointing him as their ruler ( wa-mallakūhu ardahum ). ( End of [ citation ] ).

Annotations

1. The metre is Kāmil.


3. Cf. Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 36,9: .... al-Sharafah bi-'l-qurb min Sa‘ā‘.

Three places in the Yemen bear this name, but this is most probably al-Sharafah in the upper reaches of Wadi al-Sirr, 31 km NE of Sa‘ā‘ ( q.v. below, p.153, n.18 ), in ( present-day ) Nāḥiyat Khawlān: see Map 1, B3, ( YAR MC 431129 - 1544 C2 ). It is a settlement just to the W of Wadi al-Sharafah and 6 km E of Bayt al-Sayyid. See Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 185,6,n.6; Rathjens & Wissman, Landeskundliche, " Scherafe " on fig. 64; cf. Waysī, Yaman, 71-2, - Ra’s al-Sharafah from which flows Wadi Sa‘wān.

4. Nihm b. Rabī‘ah, a tribe of Bakīl and thus from Hamdān ( not to be confused with the Ḥāshid tribe of Nuham ) who today, along with B. Ḥushaysh, inhabit Hijrat al-Sirr ( scil. Bayt al-Sayyid ) in Wadi al-Sirr ( see preceding note ); Waysī, Yaman, 71; Hamdānī, Ikīn, X, 237, - Ikīn, I, 293,n.5; cf. Kahhālah, Mu‘jam, III, 1198, - Nihm b. Āmr b. Rabī‘ah.

5. What seems to be implied by khurūj here is the traditional open declaration of the da‘wah to himself of the Zaydī imam ( see above, introduction p. 35f ), rather than simply the departure of Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn from the Hejaz to the Yemen.

6. Al-Hadīf did not go back to the Hejaz out of disgust or despair, but
because he seems to have lost the necessary armed support (nusrah) by which he could impose his da'wah (by force) upon the Yemenites: see Abbāsī, Strat. 36.10 - wa-lam yajid alayhim wa-lam yajid alayhim awwāner. See also above, introduction pp. 45-7.


8. Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Ṣalāḥ al-Sharaff (975-1055 / 1567-1645) described shortly before in the Ghāyat (see MS C Ayn, f. 14b,36) as al-Sayyid al-Callāmah, and mentioned as the author of al-La'āif 'l-mudīyyah. He was descended from Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim, (al-Hādi's uncle), and was indeed a man of learning, and a poet too. He was one of the principal henchmen of Imam al-Mansūr al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad, under whom he held official posts, and then a follower of his son al-Mu'ayyad Muḥammad and a teacher of the latter's son al-Ḥusayn, - the father of the author of the Ghāyat. In addition to the La'āif, (which is a biographical work on the House of the Prophet), his works include two commentaries on al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad's celebrated theological treatise al-Asās and a commentary on al-Azhār called Diya' dhawī 'l-absār. See C Amir b. Muḥammad, Bughayt, f. 52b,5 - 53a,4, 60a,12f; Ismā'il b. Muḥammad, Simt, f. 214b - 216a; Mu'ayyadī, Tuhaf, 152.

9. Khawlān Sa'dah (or Khawlān al-Shām) to distinguish them from Khawlān al-Cāliyā (or Khawlān al-Yaman) who inhabited the Mashriq, the region to the E of San'a' (see below, p. 150, n. 6). There has long been a controversy among genealogists as to whether both Khawlāns are descended from Kahlān b. Saba' - like Hamdān, Ḥāshid and Bakīl, and Madhīj, (and Ibn Rasūl, d. 696 / 1296, says that this is the opinion of most genealogists), or from Ḥimyar (Kahlān's brother), or whether one is Kahlān and the other Ḥimyarī. Although al-Hamdānī (Iklīl, I. 203-4, 180-1, Iklīl X, 1-3) traces Khawlān al-Cāliyah's descent from Khawlān b. Amr
b. Malik and eventually back to Kahlan via Udad b. Zayd, and traces Khawlān Saḏā dah (by implication) from Khawlān b. Āmr b. Alḥāf b. Qudaḥ ah (b. Malik) and thus from Ḥimyar (see also Nashwān, Muntakhabāt, 61), he points out, however, that Khawlān al-ʿĀliyah themselves are adamant in their conviction that they are from Ḥimyar, and says that they hold Khawlān Saḏā dah to be of similar descent. Some genealogists even maintain that Qudaḥ ah is Bakr son of Maʿadd b. ʿAdnān, and thus neither from Kahlan or Ḥimyar.


The B. Futaymah had become the most prominent clan of the B. Saḏ b. Saḏ b. Khawlān especially from the time of ʿIbrahīm b. Mūsā b. Jaʿfar (see above, introduction p. 40). They were not in fact descended from Saḏ b. Khawlān (b. Āmr b. Līḥāf) but from Suhār, one of the other seven sons of Khawlān. They were, however, interrelated with B. Saḏ b. Saḏ on the maternal side and belonged to B. Saḏ b. Ḥādhīr b. Suhār.

The loyal support of B. Futaymah for al-Ḥādfī (and, subsequently, for his sons al-Murtadā and al-Nāṣir) was crucial in the establishment of the Zaydī imamate in the Yemen. Al-Hamdānī describes them as being ʿamūd amrīhi (scil. al-Ḥādfī's) wa-wakr ʿizzīhi wa-nizām dawlatīhi.

See Hamdānī, Ikliʾ, 1. 326-9; Gochenour, "Penetration," 51.

10. More exactly, from al-Fara, a village to the SW of Medina in the vicinity of al-Rass one of the villages of the Qabarliyah range.

See ʿAbbāsī, Sirāt, 17.6, 37.1; Fayruzābādī, Maṣālim, 154-5, 316-7; Samhūdī, Wafāʾ, II. 1218, 1281, 1286; Arendonk, Débuts, 131,n.2; Jāsir, "al-Rass", 6-7.

**********
In [this year], C Alī b. al-Ḥusayn Khuftum [1] set out for Iraq whereupon al-Du'am [2] entered Ṣanā', but it was not long before he departed from [the city]. Then Asad ibn Abī Yuḍir [3] became ruler of [Ṣanā'] and it was during his rule that the Carmathians manifested [themselves] in the Yemen. [4] 

Annotations

1. C Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Dā'ūd Khuftum, Abbasid governor of Ṣanā' (279-282 / 892-6), who was sent to the Yemen to help the Yuḍirids re-establish control in the wake of the chaos which had broken out throughout the highlands of the Yemen in the 270's / 880's: q.v. Geddes, "Yuḍirid", 67-70. Khuftum seems to be the correct vocalization, but the sources have many variants of his name: cf. for instance, Tabarî, Tārīkh, III, 1908., IV, 2025, 2040. - K-f-t-m-r, with variant readings viz. K-f-t-m; Ibn al-DaybaC, Qurrat.l, 163, 164, 165. - J-f-t-m., Qurrat.MS. f. 8b.14, - H-f-t-m., 15. - Ḥuq-y-m and Ḥ-qay-m., 16. - Ḥ-q-y-m; Ibn Ṭabd al-Majīd, Bahjat, 35. - Juftum.

Khuftum's troops (Geddes thinks they were Turkish) stayed behind in the Yemen after his departure and were known as the Khafātim: vide "Yuḍirid", 70.n.52., 72.n.56.. Appendix A. C Alī b. al-Ḥusayn was to be appointed a second time, in 290 / 903, but was killed in Ṣanā' the following year: see below, text p. 191f.
descended from Arhab (through Abd b. Alayyan b. Arhab) and thus from
Bakīl and described by al-Hamdam both as sayyid Hamdān (asrihi) and as
sayyid Bakīl. His name could not have been fortuitous, for his renowned
ancestor was Arfiab b. al-Du'am (al-Asghar) b. Malik b. Rabī'ah
b. al-Du'am (al-Akbar), - cf. below, p. 112f. n.34.

Al-Du'am had been appointed by the Yūfirid ruler Ibrāhīm
b. Muḥammad (r. 265-279/878-892), governor of the Wadi Ghuraq region
in al-Jawf (q.v. below, p. 223. n.22) after the revolt of al-Murādī in 269 /
882-3. Incensed at the murder by Ibrāhīm of his father Muḥammad with whom
he enjoyed a close relationship, and insulted by the former, al-Du'am
subsequently revolted and, after the assassination of Muḥammad b. al-Daffāk,
he managed to gather all Hamdān (Bakīl and Ḥashid) under his leadership.
Al-Hamdam says that he seized all the Yūfirid domains and ruled from
Ṣan'ā'. Idrīs relates that al-Du'am was driven out of Ṣan'ā' by Khufūm
on his arrival in the Yemen in 279/892-3, and that his attempt to recapture
the city after Khufūm's departure was a disaster, fa-dakhalahā thumma
haraba minhā.

See Hamdam, Iklīl.X, 134. 67, 158, 162. 178-181; Nashwān,
Muntakhabāt, 40 (but Arhab ibn al-Du'am al-Akbar, not bn - cf. above ).
Mūlūk, 166-7; Idris, Kanz, f. 177b. 19-20.26; Geddes, "Yūfirid ", 64-7:
Gochenour, "Penetration ", 41-2.

3. Scil. Asʿad b. Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad (d. 332/943-4): the ruler,
(who features prominently later in our text ), of the Yūfirid dynasty
established by his great-grandfather, Yūfir, which traces its descent back
to Ḥimyar b. Saba' (via Dhū Hiwāl): q.v. Geddes, "Yūfirid ".
(genealogies, Appendix B ), 165-6.

Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad was assassinated in al-Muharram 279/ April
892, and was succeeded by his cousin, Abd al-Qāhir b. Aḥmad (scil.

A month later Khuftum arrived and no doubt the Yu'fir ids became little more than figure-heads during his stay in San'a'. The sources mention al-Du'am's abortive attempt to seize San'a' after Khuftum's departure in 282 / 896 (see preceding note), then, according to Ibn Dayba, the Yu'fir ids regained control over the city, q.v. Qurrat.l. 165, after which his account becomes confused. The Kanz is inaccurate at this juncture (see f. 177b,26) but Ibn Abd al-Majid, Bahjat, 36, has succinctly, wa-raja' a 'l-amr ilā Banī Yu'fir wa-mawātīniṃ - and says no more.

Then nothing is known about the fortunes of San'a' until 285 / 898 when a man called Abū 'l-Atāhiyāh (for whom see below, pp. 120-2, n.1), had become its ruler. Apart from a brief restoration of Yu'firid rule by Abd al-Qahir in 288 / 901 (see below, text p. 142), it was not until 291 / 904 (see below, text p. 192) that the city passed once more into Yu'firid hands. San'a' was now ruled, jointly it seems, by As'ad and his cousin Uthmān but the following year As'ad was able to make himself sole master of the city. (see below, text p. 208).

4. Carmathians or Qarmatians (scil. Qaramitah), like the word Batinīs, is a term of abuse, not confined to Zaydī writers, applied to Ismā'īlī Shī'īs in general, whether they were followers of the Fatimid caliphs of North Africa (and, subsequently, of Egypt), or whether they belonged to the various groups which derived their inspiration allegedly from Hamdān Qarmāt (flor. 260's and 70's / 870's and 80's). The mention of the Yemen in the text is a reference to the activity of the two Fatimid da'īs Ibn Hawshab 'Manṣūr al-Yaman' and Ali b. Faḍlī. See above, introduction p. 70, n.2: and below, p. 211f, n.17 and p. 216, n.36.
In Safar [March-April 897] [of this year], Al-Hadī ( upon whom be peace ) arrived at Sa'dah [1] and this was his second going-forth (al-kharjah al-thāniyah) to the Yemen. [2] He put an end to the feud [which had arisen] among the tribe of Khawlan [at] Sa'dah [3] and decreed that a quarter of the zakāh [accruing from] grain crops (ta'am) [4] should be distributed among the poor and orphans.

Al-Hadī stayed in Sa'dah for a few days and then set out in a southerly direction (nahada ila 'l-Yaman). [5] urging the inhabitants to fight for the sake of God. [6]

In Jumādā al-awwal [July-August 897] of this year, Al-Hadī (upon whom be peace) went to Najrān [7] at the head of a large body of men from Khawlan and other [tribes]. The tribesmen of Wādi al-Baydān, Shākir, [9] Yām [10] and the Ahl al-Sa'īd [11] went out to meet him for they were jubilant at his arrival and [thereupon] proffered him allegiance. They were induced to do that [because of] what had occurred between themselves and Banū 'l-Harith, [12] who were the [indigenous] inhabitants of Najrān, in the way of bitter wars and numerous terrible confrontations (al-ahwāl al-adīfah). [13] Al-Hadī (upon whom be peace) proceeded with [the tribes] to Najrān [where] he was met by Banū 'l-Harith [after which] he established peace between the [latter] and their enemies, securing from [both factions] a sworn covenant (al-mawātīn al-adīfah) to abide by their agreement and to refrain from dissension (wa-tark al-shiqaq).

Then the populace rendered allegiance to [Al-Hadī], and [thus] the affairs [of the people] were straightened out thanks to the salutary presence of [the imam] (upon whom be peace) (bi-barakatlhi alayhi 'l-salam). After this, [Al-Hadī] went on to Hajar [14] where
he stayed until the discord had abated and the principles of the peace settlement had become firmly established (wa-taqarrarat qawa'id al-sulh). [15]

Then [al-Hādī] returned to Sā'dah and drew up a covenant (ahd) for the people of the Book (ahl al-dhimmah), namely the Christians of Najrān (and others). [16] Regarding the land they had purchased from the Muslims, [they must pay] one ninth [of the produce] but [regarding] what they had purchased before the advent of Islam, they were entirely exempt (fā-laysa alayhim fīhī shay'). He also stipulated the exact amount [to be paid] by way of the poll-tax (wa-garrarahum alā' l-jizyah) in Najrān, Sā'dah and in all other places which he (upon whom be peace) would bring under his sovereignty. [17]

Annotations

1. See Map 1, B5 - some 180 km N. slightly W. of Sā'dah. It was known before Islam as Juma and is described by Hamdanī as the chief town of Khawālīn territory (kurāt bilād Khawālīn). Before Islam, Sā'dah was the centre of the leather tanning industry. Even early in the Islamic period it became known for its wealth and also as a centre of commerce.

Ibn al-Mujāwir's narrative suggests that the city's present site and subsequent development was a direct result of al-Hādī, Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn's residence there. Ibn al-Mujāwir (flor. early 7th / 13th century) praises the inhabitants for their virtue and common-sense (wa-hum qawm akhyār yadduna 'l-hikmah), and he mentions their knowledge of precious stones and of al-ulūm al-Alawiyyah (scl. ulūm Ahl al-Bayt). They were all followers of Zayd b. Ḥ. and were considered by their co-religionists to be
the most authoritative exponents of their sect, ( wa-hum shawkat al-qawm fi' l-madhhab ). Even today, Sa'dah and the district round about is noted for its ulema and it has perhaps kept to Zaydi Shiism more than any other region in modern Yemen. See Hamdânî, Jazîrat, 98; Istakhîrî, Masâ'ilik, 24; Ibn Hawqal, Sûrat, 36; Nashwân, Muntakhabât, 61; Ibn al-Mujâwir, Mustabsir, 204,206; Waysî, Yaman, 111-2; Akwa, Yaman, 76-7.

2. Cf. above, p. 85, n.2.

From the Sûrat, it can be deduced that al-Hâdi left al-Fara' ( q.v. above, p. 87, n.10 ) on 5 or 6 Dhû 'l-Hijjah of the previous year / 13 or 14 January 897. He had almost given up the idea of going to the Yemen again because of the evil ways of the Yemenites and their little desire for the True Faith ( qillat raghbatihim fî 'l-haqq ) but he was persuaded by a dream in which he saw the Prophet. He arrived in Sa'dah on 6 Safar 284 / 15 March 897. For this and details of the journey see Aabbâstî, Sûrat, 37-41.

3. The feud was between the two Khawlân tribes, B. Sa'd b. Sa'd b. Khawlân ( see above, p. 86f, n.9 ) and al-Rabî'ah ( or Al Rabî'ah ) b. Sa'd b. Khawlân. The initial cause seems to have been the death of Muḥammad b. ABBâd ( the grandfather of Ibn ABBâd - see below, text p. 134 ) of B. Ukayl, who were a section of Al Rabî'ah at the hands of Al Abî Fuṭâymah. The fact that B. Fuṭâymah, ( who had become not only the leaders of B. Sa'd b. Sa'd but virtually the most powerful clan of the whole of Khawlân Sa'dah ), were not from Sa'd b. Khawlân must have further embittered Al Abî Fuṭâymah. See Hamdânî, ikhli, 327: wa-hum ( scil. B. Fuṭâymah ) akthar Khawlân jabatan wa-ab aduhum šitan wa-afrasuhum farūsiyyatan.

Muḥammad b. ABBâd had been given charge of al-Bayâd region by al-Ahwâl b. Mâhân ( often known as Hamdawayh and who had been appointed by al-Ma'mûn, his governor over Yemen 201-2 / 816-8 ). Muḥammad's son, ABBallâh, sought vengeance for his father's death and spread calumniations
against B. Sa'īd b. Sa'īd but the Yufirīd, Yufirī b. Ābād al-Rahmān took the
side of the latter. It is clear that B. Sa'īd b. Sa'īd had become known for
wanting a Yemen independent of Abbasid control and thus would support the
ambitions of the Yufirīds, and that Ḥāl-Rabī'ah were pro-caliphate.

Ṣādīr b. Muḥammad then went to Iraq and managed to persuade
the caliph that Yufirī was planning to overthrow Abbasid rule, for al-Wāthiq
( r. 227-32 / 842-7 ) despatched a force to the Yemen to occupy Ṣan‘ā’.
It seems Ṣādīr hoped the Abbasid army could destroy once and for all
the emerging power of the Yufirīds, deal a crushing blow to his rivals
B. Sa'īd b. Sa'īd and give Ḥāl-Rabī'ah a privileged status among the Yemeni
tribes - with perhaps an important local governorship for himself.


4. According to Ābāsī, Sīrat, 47, this ½ applies to all agricultural
produce, like raisins for instance.

5. ʿIlā 'l-Yaman and ʿIlā 'l-jihāh al-yamanīyyah are used by the author of
the Ghayāt to mean " in a southerly direction " or " to districts to the
south ", the idea probably being yamān ( cf. yaman, yamīn ) in relation to
the Ka'bah. ( see, for instance, below, text pp. 141, 190 ). These terms
are in antithesis to al-jihāh al-shāmiyyah ( see, for instance, MS Āyn f.
43b,28, and cf. use of qibīl and ādānī, to the north / to the south, still
prevalent in modern Yemeni speech, q.v. Rossi, L'Arabo, 219, under
meridionale ). In MS Āyn, f. 37b,31f appears thumma nahada [ 'l-imām ]
ilā jihāt al-Yaman hattā wasalal Ḍhamār, i.e. the imam ( scil. ʿAbd al-
Hāmīn, who was in Ṣa'dah ) went south to Ḍhamār.

By extension, al-Yaman and especially al-jihāh ( al-jihāt )
al-yamanīyyah are applied to that part of the Yemen around Ṣan‘ā’. The
imam Ṣādīr b. Ḥāmzah was preoccupied with problems in al-jihāh
al-yamanīyyah, the text implying Ṣan‘ā’ and the surrounding districts: MS
Āyn, f. 42b,21. In 587 / 1191, Tughtakīn returned from Ṣan‘ā’ to Ta'izz.
however, and it is said, *raja' a ila 'l-Yaman* ( *MS* Ayn. f. 40b.31 ), but for Ta'izz and those more southerly regions our author prefers the term al-Yaman al-Asfal ( cf. al-Yaman al-`Aṣār, - below, text p. 217 ).

(Cf. al-Khazrajī's use of al-Yaman where it is essentially Ta'izz and its district: *Uqūd*.IV, 97, 101, 186, 248, 273, 340 etc., and see also, Smith, *Ayyubids*.II, 215. )

6. There is no mention of al-Hādi's making a journey south in the *Sīrat*. He remained in Sa'dah from 6 Safar until 6 Jumādā II ( 15 March - 11 July 897 ), except for a brief excursion outside Sa'dah ( a few days before he left for Najrán ) to teach his men military tactics and technique. See *Abbāsī, Sīrat*, 41,6f., 48,4f., 66,18 - 67,11.

On his arrival in Sa'dah, al-Hādi had sent letters to all parts of the Yemen exhorting the inhabitants to give him allegiance and urging them to make the *jihād* with him, ( *Sīrat*, 48,6f ).


Najrán is some 70 km NE of Sa'dah - see Map 1, B5. For a good account of this oasis right on the present-day Saudi-Yemeni border, see *Hamzah, AsTr*, 167-191; see also Waysī, *Yaman*, 117-8, and Hamdānī, *Ikīlī*, 14,n.1.


11. Probably a sub-tribe of Yam descended from Habrah and Muwajid (known as the Ahilf) sons of Madhkar b. Yam: cf. Hamdani, Iklî, X. 68, 71. However, that they are a section of a Qahtani tribe known as Tanukh might be a possibility: Kahhalah, Mu'jam, I, 8, 133-4.

12. B. al-Harith (more commonly, Bal-Harith) b. Ka'b. It is not clear whether they are descended from Madhij or from Azd. In either case however they would be descended ultimately from Kahlan (the common ancestor of the Hashid and Bakili tribes): see Ibn QAbd al-Barr, Anbah, 108; Kahhalah, Mu'jam, I, 231-2; Zabidi, Tāj, V, 220.


14. The parallel passage in the Sīrat has qaryat al-Hajar min Najrān which is clearly the same place as qaryat Najrān mentioned before on the same page and from which apparently B. al-Harith had come to meet al-Hādi: 'Abbâsî. Sīrat, 68, 14, 5f. It is tempting to equate qaryat al-Hajar min Najrān and qaryat Najrān (the former being a pleonastic way of saying the latter) with hajar Najrān of al-Hamdānī which is explained by him as meaning qaryat Najrān (the town of Najrān) since he says that the word al-hajar means al-qaryah in the language of Ḥimyar (sic) and the Qahtani Arabs, (he mentions hajar Jāzān, hajar Hasibah): cf. Beeston et al., Sabaic, 56, HGR - town. (But there is no definite article in the south Arabian languages).

Elsewhere, al-Hamdānī distinguishes between al-qaryah al-haddhah and al-qaryah al-qadīmah and identifies the latter with al-Ukhdūd (q.v. below, p. 131, n. 29).

In the Sīrat the place appears frequently as al-Hajar or simply as al-Qaryah and seems to have been the principal settlement in Wadi Najrān. (Hajar of our text, without the article, is probably a slip on the part of the author for he is following closely the Sīrat narrative during these events, and indeed the Sīrat is his sole source for all the events in Najrān during al-Hādi's imamate.) According to my informants in Najrān, there is no
place in Wādī Najrān known today as al-Hajar (or Hajar). Apparently, al-Hajar was situated on the southern side of the wadi in proximity to both al-Hadān and Mīnās, the other two important settlements in that area: see CĀbbāsī. Sīrat, 243,3ff where al-Hadān (Zākkār has al-Ḥisn), qaryat al-Yāmīyyīn (scil. Mīnās) and qaryat al-Hajar are mentioned successively; and see below, p. 127f., n.22. Al-Hajar, as intimated above, belonged to B. al-Hārith: q.v. Sīrat, 164,12f - sāra (scil. al-Hādī) bi-man kāna ma'āhu ilā qaryat Bānī 'l-Hārith allatī tusammā 'l-Hajar.

Akwa C states that even today (in the Yemen presumably) the word al-hajar is used to denote any large village and also any pre-Islamic town now in ruins. See Hamdānī, Jazārat. 170,3f., 318,10; Arendonk, Débuts. 140, n.2.

15. For taqarrara cf. Lane, Lexicon, VII, 2499a; Kazimirski, Dictionnaire, 11, 699 - être établi fermement.

16. According to the Sīrat, the sulh which al-Hādī made with the non-Muslims of Najrān was enacted before he returned to Sa'dah (see following note), since he remained in Najrān for the rest of Jumādā II, Rajab, Shābān and 18 days of Ramaḍān (i.e. from 13 July - 19 October 897):

The Sīrat at this juncture only mentions ahl al-dhimmah or al-dhimmiyyūn. However, the Sīrat mentions elsewhere jiyyat al-nasārā wa-'l-yahūd, and in an anecdote Jews and Christians are mentioned together. Specific mention is made of the Christians who lived at al-Mīnās (q.v. below, p. 127f., n.22) in Wadi Najrān. It is clear that not all the Christians in Najrān were evicted by ĈUmar b. al-Khattāb, contrary to what Madaj has suggested. See Sīrat, 72,3ff., 58,13ff., 62,14ff., 228,14ff; Arendonk, Débuts. 142; Madaj, Yemen, 111-13.

17. The text of the sulh is in the Sīrat and al-Hādī clearly wanted it to be a model for future similar circumstances. It was signed and completed on 22 Jumādā II / 27 July 897. See ĈĀbbāsī, Sīrat, 73-8.
Year 285  [ from 28 January 898 ]

In Şafar [ February-March 898 ] of this year, al-Hāḍī ( upon whom be peace ) proceeded to Baraṭ [1], which is a large mountain whose inhabitants belong to the Hamdānī tribe of Shākir. [2] The inhabitants [ of Baraṭ ] thought that al-Hāḍī ( upon whom be peace ) would not be able to penetrate their territory because of its rugged and impregnable nature and also because of the meagre size of the force [ with the imam ] ( upon whom be peace ) which at that time only amounted to eight horsemen and 26 men on foot.

When [ the imam ] ( upon whom be peace ), approached their territory, [ the inhabitants ] prevented him from obtaining water and stopped him from going any further. At this, al-Hāḍī summoned them and reproached them but they took no notice of what he said and [ instead ] showered him with arrows one of which struck him, and some of his men were wounded. Then [ the imam ] made a decisive attack ( ḥamlah sādīqah ) and God granted him victory. He slew three [ of the enemy ], wounded many of their number and took others prisoner. The remainder fled, but al-Hāḍī’s men pursued them, succeeded in stripping them [ of their arms ] and were on the point of killing them, but al-Hāḍī forbade them to do so, saying, " They are not fighting under the command of anyone! " ( layṣa lahum fi’ah yarjā ʾūna ilayhā ).

When [ the aggressors ] realized what had befallen [ their companions ], they sought protection from al-Hāḍī ( upon whom be peace ) who granted it to them, whereupon they gave [ the imam ] allegiance and [ then ] petitioned him to free the captives and return the arms which had been taken from them. [ All ] this was granted [ by the imam ] so that he might win over their hearts [ to his cause ] ( ta’llītani lahum ).

[ Al-Hāḍī ] stayed in Baraṭ three days and did not ask [ the populace ] for anything, with the result that his men became restless ( ṭaḥība ashābuhu ) and their horses [ started ] eating the trees. So [ the imam ]
returned to Sa'dah after having appointed as his deputy over [Barat],


In Rabi' II [April-May 898] of this year, al-Hâdf received a message from his governor over Washînâh, [4] Muhammad b. Ubaydullâh al-Alawî, [5] informing him that Abû 'l-Du'aîs [6] had gathered around him a large number of his supporters and had refused to pay the obligatory alms (al-wâjibât). [7] At this, al-Hâdf (upon whom be peace) despatched his brother Abdullâh b. al-Îlusayn [8] who engaged them in battle after he [scil. Abdullâh] had done his utmost to exhort them (ba'da'lî dhâr ilayhim) [9] to submit to al-Hâdf's authority, but they had refused. Abû 'l-Du'a's was defeated and Abdullâh's men then proceeded to loot the settlement, but were forbidden [to continue] by Abdullâh. [The latter] granted a safe-conduct to the inhabitants and collected their alms (sadaqâtahum) of which he gave a quarter to their poor, and returned (wa-wasala) a sixth of their alms [10] to the people of the settlement as a compensation for what they had lost.

After this, in the same year, al-Hâdf (upon whom be peace) led a sizeable body of men to Najrân and alighted in a village called Shawkân, [11] where he commanded that its date-palms and grape-vines be cut down as a punishment on their owner who had taken to waylaying travellers. Then al-Hâdf cursed him and God swiftly took His revenge upon him. [12]

In the same year, there arrived letters from al-Du'am b. Ibrâhîm to al-Hâdf (upon whom be peace) requesting [the imam] to appoint him as [his] governor over the territory where [at that time] he [scil. al-Du'am] was [the ruler] (an-yuwâlliyahu 'l-jihâh allatî huwa fîhâ), [13] but al-Hâdf did not agree to what he asked. (Now al-Du'am] was one of [those princes who] exercised control over the territory within his grasp [wa-huwa min
After [these events], al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) proceeded to Khaywān where he was met by the tribes of that region and where he stayed several days. Then he went on to al-Ḥāḍan in the territory of Wādī’ah and from there continued to Uthāfit where there arrived the inhabitants of Bayt Zawd complaining of al-Du’ām and his henchmen. They contested that it was the wont of the latter to imbibe intoxicating liquor and commit abominable transgressions to the extent that one of their number had laid his hands upon a young virgin, deflowered her (fa’-qtaddāhā) and then killed her father, but that al-Du’ām had done nothing about it.

After commanding someone to denounce these acts, al-Hādī went back to Khaywān where he stayed until news reached him that al-Du’ām had set out for al-Bawn at the head of a large force. Al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) thought this to be a ruse on the part of al-Du’ām and that he was in fact making for Uthāfit, so he sent Ābd al-‘Azīz b. Marwān [on ahead] to [that town] while he followed behind. The imam then left [Uthāfit] for a locality called Sir Baklī. He was intending to go on to Bayt Zawd when he received the news that al-Du’ām was about to ascend the pass so he gave up the idea of going to Bayt Zawd and instead started to make for the top of the pass.

When the imam perceived al-Du’ām’s army, he ordered that the standards be unfurled (nashr al-rāyāt) whereupon al-Du’ām retreated to the village of Ḥamudah one of the villages of al-Bawn. After having ordered the pass to be guarded, al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) proceeded to Bayt Zawd and thence moved to a place called Ǧāhīyān.

Then there was a cry from the top of the pass that al-Du’ām had reached Bayt Zawd whereupon al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) went
there, but did not find al-Du'am. On hearing that the latter had ascended the Hamudah pass, al-Hādī set out to do battle with him and caught up with him in Najd al-Ẓabr. When the two forces came in sight of each other (tarā'a l-jamān), al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) ordered his men to get ready to fight. He directed Khawāliḥ and Handān to the right flank, the men of Bayt Zawd and al-Bawn to the left, and Banū Rabī'ah and Banū Ṣuraym to the centre. Al-Du'am likewise prepared his men for battle.

Then al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) alighted from his steed, made ablutions and prayed in the abbreviated form (wa-sa'īfā gasrān). On being informed that al-Du'am's army was approaching, al-Hādī rejoined: "God willing, they will shortly ask us for safe conduct." Then he sent for one of al-Du'am's men and said to him: "Go to al-Du'am and tell him that al-Hādī says, 'Why are tribesmen fighting one another (alā-mā taqtatīl i-l-(arab) baynī wa-baynak)?' Take me on in single combat and, if you kill me, you (alone) will be free of me, but if I kill you, everybody will be delivered from you!""

Al-Du'am's envoy went back and told al-Du'am what al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) had said. Al-Du'am did not like the Imam's proposition, yet he sent back the man to al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) with a conciliatory message, saying that he did not relish an armed conflict. At this, al-Hādī sent back a messenger to al-Du'am admonishing him and censuring him for what he was bent on doing.

So the envoys continued to go back and forth between the two camps until the right flank of the army of al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) drew near to al-Du'am's left flank. Both sides taunted each other (fa-tanābāzū bi-l-kalam), then fighting broke out as the two armies clashed. One of al-Hādī's men was killed and one of al-Du'am's
whereupon al-Hāḍf enjoined his men to stop fighting and they duly did. Repeated attempts were made through envoys to reach a peace settlement until one was actually established at which al-Duʿām went out to meet the imam and swore obedience to him. Then the two sides mingled amicably with each other (wa-khtalatā l-farīqān) after which al-Hāḍf (upon whom be peace) returned to Bayt Zawd whereas al-Duʿām withdrew to Hamudah.

After these events, al-Hāḍf (upon whom be peace) was informed that one of al-Duʿām’s sons named Arḥab had gone to Uthāfīt at the head of a Hamdānī clan known as Banū Salmān. [35]

At this time, al-Hāḍf’s sons - Muḥammad and Āḥmad - were at Khaywān and the enemy (al-qawm) wanted to kill them, but God Almighty prevented them from doing so. [37] Most of the populace of Uthāfīt were deceitful people, having colluded with al-Duʿām’s men (Arḥab b. al-Duʿām’s) when they entered the town (Uthāfīt). [38] Then a man by the name of Abū ʿUmar went out with a small band to confront them (Arḥab’s men) and proceeded with his men to fight them. The latter however proved too numerous for Abū ʿUmar and were able to kill him and enter the town. When news reached al-Duʿām of what had been perpetrated by his tribe, he expressed apparent disapproval (ankarahu frīzāhir al-amr), but then set out himself for Uthāfīt and established his base there.

Al-Hāḍf (upon whom be peace) then moved from where he had been staying to a locality called Mashūṭ. [41] There he summoned the tribes who then gathered around him. He asked what they thought about fighting al-Duʿām and, on their agreeing unanimously to an armed confrontation, he (upon whom be peace) set off with them. When they reached the vicinity of Uthāfīt, al-Hāḍf commanded his men to prepare themselves for battle.
Then al-Du'am led his men out and the fighting commenced continuing into the late afternoon (of that day), many injuries being sustained on both sides. Al-Du'am had taken along with him his heavy baggage from Uthāfit fearing al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) and when the fighting grew intense, al-Du'am ordered that many items of apparel [be brought to him], which were then duly distributed. He then commanded some of his men to call out to al-Hādī’s troops: "Anyone who would like a garment should come over to our side!" Many went over to al-Du'am and were given garments which led to commotion breaking out among al-Hādī’s men. At this, al-Du'am’s men, who were considerably more numerous, made an onslaught. Now al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) threw himself into the fray urging his troops to remain steadfast. The fighting continued into the night and then each side withdrew to its own camp.

After this, al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) set off for a locality known as al-Darb where he stayed while his horses, camels (riḥāluḥu), and men recovered from their weariness. Then he called the people to make haste to his cause, fixing a day when they should be ready (thumma ḥashada 'l-nās wa-waā adahum li-yawm matūm) and indeed they gathered together and arrived at his camp. At this time, Muhammad, the imam’s son, also arrived at the head of a contingent of Khawālīn. Al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) then set out for Uthāfit where he got his men ready for combat.

Al-Du’am [now] appeared at the head of a force of 200 horse and 2,000 foot, whereas al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) had no more than 30 horse and 700 foot. The two sides engaged each other in combat, but the horses could do nothing due to the rugged nature of the terrain. Then Muhammad ibn al-Hādī advanced with a band of his men and almost forced al-Du’am’s troops back to Uthāfit. Al-Du’am, however, had prepared an ambush.
and some of his men [ rushed ] out to attack Muḥammad ibn al-Hādī.

Al-Duʿām [ on his part ] with his horse and foot made for the place where al-Hādī had positioned [ himself ] [ and launched an attack upon him ] but [ the imam ] held his ground ( fa-lam yabraḥ min makānīhī ). [47] Time and time again they assailed [ the imam ] but God Almighty guarded him and protected him from their evil and set fear in their hearts, so they turned away from him realizing that [ he had survived death ] because God was watching over him. [48]

Then al-Hādī ( upon whom be peace ) proceeded to al-Darb in the territory of Banū Rabīʿah. [ Later ], al-Duʿām departed from Uthāfit [ for Khaywān ] [ whereupon ] a band of Banū Ṣuraym attacked the town and ransacked it. [50] When news of this reached al-Hādī ( upon whom be peace ), he condemned [ what they had done ] in the strongest terms and was almost set on leaving the Yemen [ altogether ], saying, " I do not think it legally permissible to fight ( lā ṣṭahlū ḫiṭā ) alongside such [ people ] as these! " Some of [ his ] principal [ henchmen ] ( baʿd al-aʿyān ) persisted [ in their attempt ] to conciliate and propitiate [ the imam ] by offering profuse apologies on behalf of the perpetrators [ of the deed ] ( yatarāḏḏāhu wa-yastaʿfīfahu wa-yubālighu fī ἵ-ʾiʿlā al-dhār wa-ʾi-fā-ilīn ), but he would not accept [ such apologies ] until [ the looters ] had given back everything they had seized. [51]

Annotations

1. See Map 1, B4.

A mountain some 70 km SE of Saʿda on which are many villages and which possesses abundant cultivated land. From al-Hamdānī's day until the present it has been known for its agreeable climate and for the richness of its soil. Cf. Glaser, Reise, map 3; and see Hamdānī, Jazīrat.
2. Al-Hamdání says that the inhabitants of Barat (see preceding note) are the clan of Duhmah descended from Shākir b. Bakī (the latter being Shākir’s distant ancestor). He says that Duhmah are called the Quraysh of Hamdān, for they are the bravest of Hamdān and protectors of women and clients. (anjad Hamdān wa-humāt al-C awrah wa-mana at al-jār): Hamdānī, Jazīrāt, 351,1,3, n.4; above, p. 95, n.9.

3. or farq (q.v. MS C ayn, f. 15b,16). Presumably it will have been similar to the faraq employed in Medina (equivalent to 3 sā C ) rather than that of Iraq which was about half the capacity again: q.v. Hinz, Islamische, 37.

4. W-sh-h-h in MS C ayn is the name of a town (more accurately today a scattered settlement) and a range of mountains SE of Ḥarāḍ and N of al-Sharafayn (but C Āṣūr is misleading when he says near Ḥarāḍ, which is in Tiḥāmah: Yahya b. al-Ḥusayn, Ghāyat, 170, n.2) and would not fit in well with the detailed narrative in the Sīrat nor with al-Ḥāḍir’s actual visit to the same place (a visit not mentioned in the Ghāyat) in Shawwāl of the preceding year both of which suggest a place much closer to Sa C dah than Washḥah. The latter would have been a major excursion for al-Ḥāḍir over difficult terrain, (for the settlement of Washḥah see YAR LD 2935 (1643 C2)).

In both occasions in the Sīrat (Zakkār and MS) the place is Wasāḥah and Was-h-h respectively. On the first occasion the town is mentioned in connection with the B. Bahr (who inhabit Jabal C Urāsh and belong to Al Rabi C ah – see above, p. 93, n.3) and later, Wasaḥah is clearly in the vicinity of Sāqayn: these are indications that it is the Wasaḥah mentioned by al-Hamdānī (elsewhere twice referred to by its pre-Islamic name of Wasakhah) in Khawlān territory in present-day Sāqayn SW.
of Sa'dah. The Si’rat mentions that one of the Yufrids had succeeded in penetrating the rugged mountains around Wasahah, presumably at the head of a military expedition. Also the fact that al-Hadî left Sa’dah on 8 Shawwâl 284 / 8 November 897 and returned later in the same month, suggests strongly that he went to Wasahah and not to the distant Washhah.

See C Abbâsî, Si’rat, 80,16ff., 81,1ff., 85,17., 86,4ff., cf. Si’rat MS, f. 25b,20 (where Was-h-h appears in title.), 28a,3; Hamdânî, Jazîrat, 265,3ff., 250,3ff., 117,1, n.3; Arendonk, Débuts, 145, n.8.

5. Abu Ja’far Muhammadd, who had been appointed by al-Hadî during his visit to Washhah / Wasahah in Shawwâl 284 / November 897: see preceding note and C Abbâsî, Si’rat, 81,6; Abu Muhammad [sic] b. Ubaydullâh., 85,16; and above, introduction p. 57.

6. Abu ‘l-Dughaysh is more likely: It is spelt thus in Si’rat (Zakkâr), cf. 81,4., 85,17., 86,4, and generally so in Si’rat MS, cf. ff. 20a,b; and cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 145, n.1. His nisbah is al-Shihâb and according to the Si’rat and his cousins are described as Shihâbiyyûn. Thus he probably belonged to the Bakr tribe of Shihâb b. Hajib b. Aṣâsah b. Nihm, (Nihm is the brother of Shâkir, see above, n.2, and p. 85, n.4): Hamdânî, Ikli, X, 244, 247.


8. This is one of al-Hadî’s two brothers. He has the kunyah of Abû Muhammadd and is known as C Abdullâh al-Allim. Both he and al-Hadî are from the same mother: see Ibn C Inabah, C Umdat, 204, 206; and above, introduction p. 33. Al-Hadî’s other brother is C Alî, known as al-Shaykh: Muhammadd b. C Abdullâh, Rawdat, 41.

9. “So that no charge of injustice could be imputed to him if he then fought the rebels”, is what seems to be implied: for a’dhara, see Lane, Lexicon, V, 1984a and cf. Dozy, Supplément, II, 106. See C Abbâsî, Si’rat, 86-9 for the detailed account of the incident.

10. According to the Si’rat, it presumably from the amount remaining
after the \( \frac{1}{3} \) had been extracted, thumma amara lahum ba\(^c\)d al-rub\(^c\) bi-nisf suds \(^a\)khar: \(^c\)Abbāsī, Sīrat, 88,7.

11. Described by al-Hamdānī as one of the asrār (sing. sīr) Najrān scil. one of the most fertile stretches of Wādī Najrān, and it is situated in its upper reaches. See Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 166,3,n.2., 318,1; and below, p. 180, n.116.

12. According to \(^c\)Abbāsī, Sīrat, 89,16, his name was Ḥunaysh from the Wādī\(^c\)ah tribe: cf. Sīrat MS, f. 29b, and Zakkār’s Ṣan\(^c\) a’i MS: Ḥubaysh.

13. See above, p. 89, n.2.

14. \(^c\)Abbāsī, Sīrat, 91,15f, describes him as rajulan min mulūk al-Yaman al-mutaghallibah \(^c\)alā amrihā. Al-Ḥādī would not agree until he was certain that al-Du\(^c\)ām would rule strictly according to the Qur’ān and the Sunnah of the Prophet. It seems that al-Ḥādī was concerned in particular that al-Du\(^c\)ām should be absolutely impartial when extracting the zakāh from his subjects, disregarding matters of blood relationship and status in the community: fa‘in ajāba ilā dhālik ........... wa-akhadha ḱ-paq qin min-man wujiba \(^c\)alayhi min qartā’ wa-bā’id aw sharīf aw dānī, wallaynahu hīna’idhin umūr al-Muslimīn. Such assurances from al-Du\(^c\)ām had clearly not yet been given. See \(^c\)Abbāsī, Sīrat, 92,1-7.

15. Al-Hamdānī says that it is the principal town of Ḥāshid territory kūrat Ḥāshid al-\(^c\)uzmā and owes its name to Mālik (who is Khayyān) b. Zayd descended from Ḥāshid. It is inhabited partly by Āl Abī Mu\(^c\)ayd (Abū Mu\(^c\)ayd being the ancestor of Āl al-Ḍahḥāk) and Āl Dhī Ṭiwdān, the former being a Ḥāshid clan and the latter, though Ḥāshidī in origin, give their loyalty to Bakīl. Leaving Ṣan\(^c\) a’ī for Mecca, it was the third staging post, after Raydah and Uthāfīt. It is suggested that its apparent decline in later years was due to the development of nearby Ḥūtht to the SW. See Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 97,10f,n.6., 246,5-7.,265,1f; Hamdānī, Ikhtī, X, 58;
16. This refers to al-Hādī's visit to Batinah Hajūr (Zakkār gives Butnah, incorrectly, ) where he stayed a few days, not to his stay in Khaywān which lasted from 28 Jumādā 1 until 24 Sha' bān, (22 June - 15 September 898):

Abādī, Siṭrāt, 92,8ff - 93,1-10; cf. Hamdānī, Jazītrāt, 247,11,n.4, Batinah, to the west of Wādī Tah territory and near Ḥūth to the north, in al-
Cūsāyāmāt (see Map 1, B4); cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 151,n.1; Wilson, "Investigation ", 374.

17. Cf. Abādī, Siṭrāt, 93,11,12, al-Ḥīṣn, but Siṭrāt MS, f. 31a,6, (in title ) al-Ḥ-dn. See Arendonk, Débuts, 151,n.5; Wilson, "Investigation ", 236-7.

18. See above, p. 95, n.8.

19. See above, introduction p. 60. Uthāfīt is probably more likely than Athāfīt. Al-Bakrī specifically gives a dammah and Akwa Ch insists likewise. However, Yāqūt gives a fathah, and thus it appears throughout the entry in the modern edition of the Tāj. Wilson gives Athāfīt and, strangely, does not even mention the possibility of Uthāfīt. Uthāfah and Thāfīt are alternative names for this, formerly important, staging-post on the Pilgrimage road, known before Islam as Durnā. Apparently, no traces of the place exist today. Since, however, Uthāfīt lay half-way, so to speak, between Raydah and Khaywān, (see Map 1, B3,4 and above, n.15), then its position must have lain not far to the E of Khamīr, or bearing slightly to the NE, or even to the SE of that town (see below, n.42). See Bakrī, Muḥjam,1, 105; Hamdānī, Jazītrāt, 97,2,n.2., 339,4f; Yāqūt, Muḥjam,1, 89; Zābīdī, Tāj,IV, 478; Wilson, "Investigation ", 171; Arendonk, Débuts, 152,n.7.

20. This it seems is the more correct form, (pronounced Zūd by Ḥāshid ). Hamdānī maintains that the place was originally Bayt Zayd (scil. Zayd
b. Sayf b. Amr descended from Ḥāshid but that Ḥimyar turned the ү into a үәw: wa-Ḥimyar tuqallib-Zaydan fa-taqūl-Zawdan. Wilson thought, incorrectly, that Zūd or Zuwad were the Ḥimyaritic form (sic) of the Arabic name Zayd. It is described as being near Uthafit in the Sīfrat (Bayt Dhu’d in Zakkār’s edition, but clearly Z-w-d in the Sīfrat MS) so it could not be the very distant Bayt Zawd (Zūd?) mentioned by al-Hamdānī as a village on mount Tukhlā (now known as Maswar in present-day Liwā’ Ḥajjah) as Āshūr wrongly thought and van Arendonk also (but corrected fortunately however by Ryckmans). Al-Hamdānī surely did not mean that that Bayt Zawd belonged to the fortress-village of al-Arās, for the pronoun of fīnī refers clearly to Tukhlā. The Bayt Zawd of our text lies 12 km N of Raydah: YAR LC 9561 (1544 A1), a very scattered settlement, (Bayt Zūd, sic). See Hamdānī, Iklīl.VIII, 160,n.3; Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 345; Abbāsī, Sīfrat, 94., Sīfrat MS, f. 31a; Wilson, "Investigation", 294 (Bayt Zūd,sic); Yāḥyā b. al-Ḥusayn, Ghāyat, 171,n.1; Arendonk, Débuts, 152 (Bayt Zūd, sic), n.8.

21. or Ḥaqī Amrān. It is the mountain plain that extends from the south of Ḥaqī Amrān to Shuwābah Ḥirrān in the Jawf. There are two Bawns, the upper and the lower, the former being south of the latter. Yāqūt identifies al-Bawn as a city in the Yemen where it is claimed there is "the disused well and the lofty stuccoed palace" of Qur’ān, al-Ḥajj, 45. Al-Hamdānī, however, understands al-Bawn as being a region and associates the celebrated palace, known as Talfum, and the well with Raydah itself. See Waysī, Yaman, 24; Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 243,4,n.3., 96,14,n.3., Iklīl.VIII, 165-7., Iklīl.II, 98,n.4; Yāqūt, Mu’jam,1, 511.

22. According to Abbāsī, Sīfrat, 95,12-14, al-Hādī had appointed him governor of Uthafit. He had originally come from al-Bahrayn, his kunyah was Abū ʿUmar and he was a man of learning and piety.

23. A place in the uplands of Ḥāshid territory zāhir balad Ḥāshid but
inhabited by Bakīl tribesmen. It is not necessarily the same place as al-Sirr mentioned by al-Hamdânī several lines previously, as Wilson assumed. Sirr in Sirr Bakīl certainly implies a fertile locality by a wadi, and the context suggests that it lies to the SE of Khamir. See Hamdânī, Jazīrat, 246.8f., 245.8,n.3; Wilson, "Investigation", 299; below, p. 180 n. 116.

24. Al-naqīl, q.v. Landberg, Datinois III, 2816, route dans les montagnes. The context suggests that this mountain pass is most probably the great Naqīl al-Ghūlah (or ḈAjīb), 4 km SW of Bayt Zawd and 8 km just NE of Ḥamudah (see below, n.26): summit, "Ra’s Naqīl al-Ghūlah", YAR LC 9258 (1543 B2). The foot of the pass is just off the modern Raydah-Khamir highway. See Waysī, Yaman, 82.

25. Or, perhaps, 'that the standards be deployed' i.e. that the sections of the army be ordered to their respective positions, since nashr also contains the notion of tafṣīr; q.v. Zabīdī, Taṣājī, XIV, 216, and the Sīrat has at this juncture, fa-amara bi-‘l-rayāt fa-nushirat: ḌAbbaṣī, Sīrat, 96.2.

26. Ḥamidah according to Akwa and Waysī and it appears thus on the YAR map but the possibility that in fact Ḥamudah is the more ancient pronunciation cannot be ruled out. Today it is a small town in the lower Bawn and it is some 8 km W of Raydah, slightly to the N: YAR LC 893507 (1543 B2). The YAR map marks also a Hijrat Ḥamidah, a scattered settlement 2 km just NW of Ḥamidah itself. Hijrat Ḥamidah is just in the hills whereas Ḥamidah is marked in the Qaṣr al-Bawn so the latter is clearly the Ḥamudah of our text. See Hamdânī, Jazīrat, 157.2,n.1: Bakrī, Muṣjam, II, 468, Ḥamidah; Waysī, Yaman, 82; Werdecker, "Contribution", map, Ḥamuda - NW of Rêde; Wilson, "Investigation", 243; Wilson, "Sites", 72.

It was not fortuitous that al-Dūṭām retreated to Ḥamudah since this
was a settlement which belonged to the Bakr tribes, al-Shawiliyyun and al-Lubbiiyyun. descended, respectively, from Dhu 'l-Shawil and Dhu 'l-Lubb.
- brothers of al-Du'sam's distant ancestor Arhab: see Hamdani. Ikli.X. 134., Jazrat. 244.2f: and above, p. 89, n.2.

27. A village at the foot of Naqil al-Ghulah: Wilson. "Investigation". 339; and see above, n.24. It is not marked on the YAR map. CÀshûr's footnote is not helpful: citing Yaqût, he indicates a Dâhîyân between Najrân and Tâthlîth on the Pilgrimage road from Haçramawt to Mecca! ( Yâhû b. al-Husayn, Ghâyat. 171, n.5 ). Cf. Arendonk, Débuts. 154,n.6 - Dâhîjân. Madû's reading of MS BÎ is incorrect ( viz. Nîhyân ) but, in any case, the Nîhyân of Hamdani. Jazrat. 262.20. is clearly impossible in this context ( cf. Madû. Anfänge. 15,n.54 ).

28. If Najd al-Żabr ( al-Żubr ) has been identified correctly, ( see following note ), then this is probably a different pass from the one identified as Naqil al-Ghulah ( see above, n.24 ).

29. I have not been able to locate a place in the area known as al-Ţ-y-r.
( or al-Ż-y-r. - see Arabic text, p. 14 ). nor al-D-ŷ-r ( CÎbbasû, Sîrat. 98,11 ). The reading, however, of Sîrat MS, f. 32a.15 is Najd al-Ţ-y ( unpointed )-n. Wilson, ( "Investigation", 343 ). following presumably Van Arendonk and Madû. identifies the locality as Najd al-Dîn: cf. Arendonk, Débuts. 154, and n.7: and Madû, Anfänge. 15,n.55. ( Madi's actual reading of his MS, i.e. MS BÎ, as Najd al-Ţ-y ( pointed by him )-r is incorrect - it is manifestly ū-b-r ). Bearing in mind the reading of the Sîrat.MS, it is perhaps possible that the locality lies in the vicinity of the two mountains indicated as Jabal Žîn on the YAR map: LC 9724 and MC 0422 / 0522, sheet 1544 A3. - see Map 2, A2, B2 ).

The two Jabal Žîns. however, are situated to the SE of CÎAmrân, and the context would suggest a locality much closer to Hamudah. ( see Map 2. A4 ). Thus I have preferred the reading of MS BÎ, ū-b-r, since there is a village called al-Żubr 14 km S of Hamudah ( see YAR 874366 - 1543 B4, and Map 2, A3 ), and it would seem probable that Najd al-Żubr.
(or, possibly, Najd al-Zabr. - see below), was the name of a locality or area on high ground, or the name of a desolate tract of land, in its vicinity, — see Zabīdī, Tāj, IX, 201-3.

Zubr or zibr etc. does not exist classically, but Tāj, XII, 378 records dabr, (or dabir), which is a kind of walnut tree that grows in the mountains of SW Arabia (the Sarāh). — see also, Lane, Lexicon, V, 1764c. Here we have perhaps an instance of a word, originally pronounced locally as zabr, being fitted into the classical lexicon under DBR; (cf. Tāj, XII, 410, al-Ḍahr, a mountain in the Yemen apparently called originally al-Ẓahr. — see below, pp. 164-5, n.58). Because of the fathah in dabr, I have thus rendered this toponym in transliteration as Najd al-Zabr, (rather than Najd al-Ẓubr), since this might very well be the original pronunciation.

30. Presumably, Khawlān Ṣa’dah, among whom, no doubt, men from B. Fuṭjamah were prominent: see above, pp. 86-7, n.9.

31. The Hamdānī tribe of al-Āḥrā, according to ʿAbbasī, Sirāt, 96.13f. Apparently they were considered among the number of Ḥajūr, (a Ḥāshidī tribe), in al-Hamdānī’s day and inhabited Bāṭinah Īsaymāt, (presumably Bāṭinah Ḥajūr), which al-Ḥādī had visited shortly before. The Sirāt also mentions the Muʾmiriyūn (wrongly vowelled in Zakkār’s edit.): these are the B. Muʾmir, one of the Wāḍī āh clans (likewise from Ḥāshid); viz. Muʾmir b. Ṣūraym b. Ṣād b. ʿAbdūd b. Wāḍī āh. See Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 124,8,n.6., 159,4,n.2., Ikīfī, X, 97-8., 75; above, p. 95, n.8.

32. They are both cousins of the Wāḍī āh tribe of B. Muʾmir (see previous note), descended from ʿṢūraym and Rabīʾ āh — who were brothers, sons of Mālik b. Ḥarb b. ʿAbdūd b. Wāḍī āh. Apparently, B. ʿṢūraym were the more renowned of the two tribes, wa-hum raʾs al-dīwān min Ḥāshid wa-fīhim al-fūrsān wa-l-najdāh: q.v. Hamdānī, Ikīfī, X, 84; see also Jazīrat, 115,3f; and Arendonk, Débuts, 154,n.8. Of course, the B. Rabīʾ āh must not be confused with the Ḍī Al-Rabīʾ āh of Khawlān (see above, p. 93, n.3).

33. Tribesmen, rather than Arabs: cf. ʿAbbasī, Sirāt, 100.10f ....... yunādūna ff l-a ṣāḥib alladhīna kānū ff c askar al-Ḥādi. The Sirāt has at this juncture (96,22). lā taqtatili l-ʿarab ff-mā baynānā: "Let not tribesmen fight each other over what is between us". A little later in the Sirāt (98,17f), al-Ḥādi’s son, Muḥammad, challenges Arḥab: li-mā yaaqtatili l-nās yā jāhil baynī wa-baynak, ubruz fīf ....... which does not read naturally without fīf-mā. Our author clearly had both occasions in mind, but his narrative too requires fīf-mā to complete the sense, viz. fīf-mā baynī wa-baynak. Perhaps it was a case of too hasty précising on his part.

34. In naming his son Arḥab, al-Dūʾām b. İbrāhīm displays pride in his
35. The fact that B. Salmān are a tribe descended from Arḥab, led here by a man from Arḥab, substantiates the case for rejecting the B. Sulaymān of the Ghāyat narrative, (see above, Introduction p. 59): vide Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 413,2f, wa-ṣ-Ayyān balad Bani Salmān min Arḥab, and see below, text p. 118. ṣ-Ayyān, (perhaps ṣ-Iyān), was an important settlement in Sufyān territory, and Akwa ṣ specifically vocalizes the place ṣ-lyān (Jazīrat, 161,n.4), and Van Arendonk records likewise, (Débuts, 103,n.2., 167, but see n.6). However, on the YAR map, it is ṣ-Ayyān, (on Wadi ṣ-Ayyān - cf. Wilson, "Investigation", 385: "Wadi ṣ-Iyān of the Khaywān region"), indicated as a small village 17 km due N of Khaywān, MD 006168 (1644 CI), and see Map 1, B4.

36. They are two of the three sons of al-Hādī who had issue and they later became imams, (see above, Introduction p. 33f.):
Abū Ḥā-Qāsim Muḥammad, al-Murtadā ʿl-Dīn Allāh (reg. 298-301 / 911-913);
Abū Ḥā-Hasan Ahmad, al-Nāṣir ʿl-Dīn Allāh (reg. 301-325 / 913-937);
Muḥallīf, Ḥadda’īq, ff. 53b, 59b; Mu’ayyadāf, Iḥafāf, 75.

37. Al-qawm refers to Arḥab b. al-Duṭām and B. Salmān who left the vicinity of Khaywān without attempting to take the town. Our narrative then changes abruptly to Uthāfīt, and the jamāʿat al-Duṭām are B. Salmān under their leader Arḥab, not the latter's father al-Duṭām who at this time was probably in Ghuraq in upper Jawf (see Abbāṣī, Sīrat, 97,19., 99,14f, and below, p. 223, n.22). For qawm meaning enemy, see Dozy, Supplément, 11, 424, and for details of the happenings at Khaywān and Uthāfīt see Abbāṣī, Sīrat, 98,3ff., 99,1ff.

38. Q.v. Abbāṣī, Sīrat, 99,7ff, cf. la-Iammā atā Arḥab wa-Banū Salmān Uthāfītan, and see preceding note.

39. Thus in our MSS but, correctly, he is Abū ṣ-Umar, ṣ-Abd al-ṣ-Azīz b. Marwān whom al-Hādī had appointed governor over Uthāfīt. See above, n.22 and Abbāṣī, Sīrat, 99,9,12.

40. Arḥab’s father: see above, n.37.

41. Thus vowelled in the Sīrat (Zakkar’s edit.), and in the Sīrat MS M-sh-w-ṭ is very distinct; cf. Milan MS at Ryckman’s disposal, viz. Masyūl and
the Sanʿaʾ MS, M-s-w-ṭ. Van Arendonk’s reading of MS Bāʾ viz. Maslūṭ is fanciful, three dots for a shīn were clearly intended.

The Sīrat describes the place as belonging to B. Rabfah, and this suggests that it lies to the NE or E of Khamir, or possibly slightly to the SE. See Ḥabib, Sīrat, 99, 17., MS, f. 33b, 5; Arendonk, Débuts, 156, 5; Wilson, "Investigation", 450; Smith, Ayyubids, II, 184.

42. Darb Banī Rabfah. The word darb (meaning in the Yemen, among other things, citadel or round fortress) often appears in topography in the Yemen and the Hejaz as part of a compound. It is significant that the darb of our text was chosen because it could withstand an attack. See Serjeant / Lewcock, Sanʿaʾ, 576, entry darb; Smith, Ayyubids, II, 122, 145, 146; Ḥabib, Sīrat, 110, 1f.

Darb Banī Rabfah was al-Hāf’s base while al-Duʿām was at Uthāfit and the Sīrat narrative indicates that both places were close to each other since, later, al-Hāf while based at Darb Banī Rabfah sent each evening a band of his men to Uthāfit to scare al-Duʿām and keep him awake! See Ḥabib, Sīrat, 104, 21.. 106, 16f.

Later in the Sīrat the place where Banū Ṣuraym lived is mentioned, called at first simply al-Darb and then subsequently Darb Banī Ṣuraym, and both Darbs seem to have been near each other and certainly Darb Banī Ṣuraym seems to have been not too distant from Raydah. It is tempting to think that al-Darb, YAR LC 961652 (1544 A1), 4 km N of Bayt Zawd and about 8 km SE of Khamir, is in fact Darb Banī Ṣuraym. It would thus fit in most appositely with the context especially since Uthāfit must have been in that area (see above, n. 19). If so, Darb Banī Rabfah would have lain close by, presumably to the N. However is it not a possibility that both Darbs were so close one to another that the locality as a whole came to be known later simply as al-Darb, viz. al-Darb on the YAR map, bearing in mind as well that al-Darb appears on
the map as quite a scattered settlement. The Darb mentioned by al-Hamdānī which, if Akwa is right, lies to the W of Khamir, cannot be either of the two Darbs of our text. See Abbāsī, Sīrat, 110,10ff., 111,1: Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 115,2,n.3; and cf. Wilson, "Investigation", 265-6.

43. (Sing. rahl): it is basically a saddle for a camel, but sometimes it is applied to the camel itself, q.v. Lane, Lexicon,III, 1054a.

44. I believe the translation brings out the full significance of hashada in this context, rather than that he simply 'brought the people together': cf. Lane, Lexicon,II, 574c; Zabīdī, Ṭāj,VIII, 26. Our text continues: fa-'jtamā'ū wa-wasalū ilayhi. Cf. the Sīrat at this juncture: thumma wajjaha sarrākhan ff Hashid li-yawm mā lūm fa-'jtamā' a ilayhi 'l-nās ..... : Abbāsī, Sīrat, 101,2f; sarrākh - qui crie à la guerre, q.v. Landberg, Datmois,III, 2126.

45. These were from B. Sa'd according to Abbāsī, Sīrat, 101,3ff, presumably from B. Sa'd b. Sa'd (b. Khawāb), see above, pp. 86-7, n.9.

46. This was on a Friday morning and al-Ḥādfī prayed the noon prayer near Uthāfīt at the beginning of the prescribed time: Abbāsī, Sīrat, 101,20. It is clear that this was not the special Friday Prayer with the khutbah, for the fact that they were technically in a state of travel would have dispensed them from a rite which is obligatory if an imam from the House of the Prophet is in existence.

47. Cf. Abbāsī, Sīrat, 103,1: fa-lam yatazahāzi 'l-Ḥādfī min mawdū'īhi wa-thabata makānahu. According to the Sīrat, (102,19-21), al-Ḥādfī at this stage had only seven horsemen with him whereas al-Du'ām had a force of 100 horse and 1000 foot.

48. See Abbāsī, Sīrat, 103,9ff for the dramatic account by Sa'Cīd b. Abī Sūrah, a renowned horseman who was fighting with al-Du'Cām.
49. Probably on 25 Dhū 'l-Qa'dah (yawm al-arba'a' li-iyyām bāqiyyah ... ) / 13 December 898, which was a Wednesday: see Abbāsī. 
Sirat. 107.17ff.

50. Out of revenge for the inhabitants of Uthāfit not having come to their assistance the day Abū  āmar was slain: fa-kāna ff quilūb Banī Ṣuraym wa-Banī Rabī'ah alayhim higd limā fa'ālū bihim: see Abbāsī. Sirat. 108.4-10.

51. Al-Hādī was scandalized by the looting of Uthāfit not only because it had been perpetrated without his authority (for the administering of al-hudūd was of course his responsibility as their imam), but because of the intrinsic injustice of the act which deeply offended his Zaydi scrupulousness concerning adl. He commanded the looters: wa-ruddū mā 'indakum min mata'i 'l-Muslimūn wa-'l-da'afah wa-'l-masākin wa-'l-arāmil wa-'l-mustad'afīn. For the full account see Abbāsī. Sirat. 108.13 - 109.23.

**********

Year 286 [from 17 January 899]

In al-Muḥarram [January-February 899] of [this year]. Abū 'l-S̲āḥiyah the lord ofṢan'ā' [1] wrote to al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) and ordered his men to betake themselves to [the imam]. Some, however, desisted from so doing and thus he despatched his brother [2] to al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) at the head of 50 horse. They met [the imam] at Darb Banī Ṣuraym after he had moved [there] from Darb Banī Rabī'ah. [3]

When al-Dūm got to hear of Abū 'l-S̲āḥiyah's friendship (muwālah) towards al-Hādī (upon whom be peace), he found this hard to bear (azuma alayhi 'l-amr) [4] and strove to rival Abū 'l-S̲āḥiyah in [the latter's] obedience to [the imam] (upon whom be peace).
So there appeared on his lips words which indicated his inner feelings. At this one of [ al-Du'am's ] henchmen remonstrated. "You ought not to hand over to that Alid dominion (mulkan) for which the Yu'firds and others have fought." Now, Abu 'l-'Atahiyyah had stipulated conditions in his letters to al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) among them [his being given] authority to rule [certain areas] (minhā 'l-wilayah), but al-Hādī would not accede to his request until [a time when] he might know what sincere friendship and real repentance [al-Du'am] actually possessed.

When Abu 'l-'Atahiyyah's men and his brother arrived in the presence of the imam (upon whom be peace), they pledged allegiance to him.

Then al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) was told about the people of al-'Usaymat and reprehensible matters concerning them, harmful customs repugnant to [all] men of common decency. For instance, a guest would sometimes stay with one of [the village folk]. He would be plied with food and drink in a liberal manner and then [his host] would bring him one of the female members of the household (bi-bad mahārimihi) who had decked herself with various adornments. She would stay with him the whole day [during which] he would enjoy looking at her, and he would converse with her and amuse himself with her [his hosts considering] all this to be a mark of real hospitality. Fie on them for what they are perpetrating!

When al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) heard about these things, he exclaimed: "A war against these [people] should be given priority over any other!" He then set off for Hūth and, without delay, summoned [the folk of al-'Usaymat]. A number of their mashāyikh arrived whom he admonished, condemning the things they did. They protested however. "What you have been told about us is not true,
but still we repent." Then they pledged [the imam] allegiance and he got them to swear [support for his cause] (wa-'stahlafahum).

[The imam] then returned to Uthāfit [where] he established a reconciliation between Banū Rabī‘ah and al-Sabī‘ over [a question] of blood-money [resulting from] a killing (r̲a̲q̲ā̲l wa-dhuhul).

Al-Du‘ām at this time was in the territory of Banū Salman.[15] [The latter], nevertheless, feared al-Hadhī because of what previously had been perpetrated by them at Uthāfit. Al-Hadhī sent a message to al-Du‘ām that they should meet at Ayyān [16] where the Banū Salīmān lived. [There] al-Du‘ām requested safe-conduct for [the Banū Salīmān] from al-Hadhī which [the imam] gave and [then] got them to swear to him the oath of allegiance.

Then [the imam] set off for Najrān with al-Du‘ām accompanying him, and on his way there he made peace between Banū Salīmān and Khāliṣan over two Khāliṣanīs who had been killed.[17]

In Najrān he put right some disorders (bad khalal). Then he returned to Sa‘dah for a few days and afterwards went on to Khaywān to settle some disorders which had occurred there [too].[18]

In Najrān there was an attempt by Banū ‘I-Ḥārith[19] to rebel against al-Hadhī who straightaway sent his brother Abdullah b. al-Ḥusayn there. [20] [The tribe] gathered together against Abdullah, but he engaged in fighting with them, then left Najrān [21] and moved to Mushāsh [22] [from where] he wrote to the imam [23] who, leaving Khaywān under the rule of his son Muḥammad assisted by a group of Abū ʿI-ʿAtāḥiyah’s men, set off to meet his brother.[24]

and set off to confront (wa-qasadū) al-Hādī. [The latter, however], fought them slaying a number of them, the remainder fleeing to Jabal al-Ukhdūd. [Al-Hādī] commanded that the slain [from among the rebels] be hung upside down from the trees [while] he [himself] took up residence in the town (al-qaryah). [Al-Hādī] commanded that the slain [from among the rebels] be hung upside down from the trees [while] he [himself] took up residence in the town (al-qaryah).

When the bodies [began] to stink, the relatives [of the dead] requested al-Hādī to give them the corpses, which he did. Then they buried them (fa-waruha) in pits and wells. [Now al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) had said this would happen before it [actually] did.] [After these events], he despatched letters to his son Muḥammad and to Abū 'l-Atāhiyah [telling them] how God had granted him victory over his enemy. [Al-Hādī] remained in Najrān two months [after which he returned to Sa'īdah having appointed as his deputy, over Najrān, Muḥammad b. 'Ubaydullāh al-Alawī].
Annotations

1. Abū 'l-'^Atähiyäh CAbdulläh b. Bishr. Geddes says categorically that he is a member of the B. Nihm: "Yu'^Firid ", 72,n.57. He clearly bases his assertion on Hamdänî. Iklīl.X, 252, where a Bishr b. Ḥarb b. Nihm is recorded, but apart from the coincidence of name there is nothing to link this Bishr with Abū 'l-CÄ†ähiyäh's father. Even if Geddes' assumption is correct, then it is strange that al-Hamdänî does not mention Abū 'l-CÄ†ähiyäh by name as being the son of Bishr, seeing that he mentions elsewhere in Iklīl.X, contemporaries of Abū 'l-CÄ†ähiyäh like al-Dü'^üm b. Ḥibrähim, Aḥmad b. Mūhammad b. al-Ḍähḥāk and Ḥibrähim b. Khalaf when discussing the genealogies of their respective families.

Van Arendonk's thesis ( rejected outright by Geddes ) that Abū 'l-CÄ†ähiyäh is related to Āl Țarīf is in fact much more probable. In C Abbarāt, Sirāt, 204.15f, one reads that [ Abū 'l-CÄ†ähiyäh ] khäfā an yukładîfâ Câyîayî bañû Cāmmīhy min Āl Țarīf, and in a MS compiled in the 6/12th century his name appears as Abū 'l-CÄ†ähiyäh CAbdulläh b. Țarīf ( see Arendonk. Débuts, 209,n.2 ).

In a highly significant passage in the Sirat ( 208.10f. ) a slave ( or a boy ) comes to Abū 'l-CÄ†ähiyäh, after the Friday Prayer in Şan Cā' ( see below, text p. 140 ), fa-akhabarahu bi-khabarî 'bni Cāmmīhy wa-mâ ajmâ'Calayî hy mina 'l-fitnah. Assuming that the pronoun in Cāmmīhy refers back to Abū 'l-CÄ†ähiyäh not to the ghulām, the ibn Cāmmīhy can only be Ḥibrähim b. Khalaf ( see 208,2f,11-13 ) who is a member of Āl Țarīf, ( see below, p. 151, n.12 ).

Gochenour goes further than Van Arendonk and makes Abū 'l-CÄ†ähiyäh the son of Abū Mihjān ( or Abū Mihjān as he prefers ) Bishr b. Țarīf ( he is only mentioned on one occasion by Van Arendonk):
'Un certain Abū Mihjān, esclave des Yaʿurides') and thus Abū Mihjān becomes the kunyah of Bishr, but Gochenour does not detail his chain of reasoning: "Penetration", 44,59,n.43; Arendonk, Débuts, 272. In the sources, Abū Mihjān's full name is never given and the nearest version one has is in Hamdānī, İkni, VIII, 218, viz. Abū Mihjān b. Tarf (ghulām Āl Yuʾfir), cf. Si̇rat, 140,16: ... "Indamā kāna min daʿwatihi ʿala Abū Mihjān (abd Āl Yuʾfir). (Geddes also believes that Abū Mihjān is from Āl Tarf, - q.v. "Yuʾfirid", 65,n.40.)

However, in that same passage of the Si̇rat (140,15-23), there is a statement (140,21) which would appear to clinch the argument and which Gochenour perhaps had in mind: wa-sami nā ‛bnahu ('we heard his son [namely, the son of Abū Mihjān who is]') Abā ’I-ʿAtāhiyah wa-huwa yaqūlu kāna abī Abū Mihjān ...... According to this, Abū ’I-ʿAtāhiyah is manifestly the son of Abū Mihjān. Yet the problem here is that the parallel statement in the Si̇rat MS (f. 50a,9-10) reads: wa-samīnā ‛bnahu atā (with alif maqsūrah having been corrected to an alif mamduḍah) Abā ’I-ʿAtāhiyah wa-huwa yaqūlu kāna Abū Mihjān ...... which of course thus makes Abū Mihjān's son someone other than Abū ’I-ʿAtāhiyah.

Gochenour's suggestion that Abū Mihjān was probably the 'titular governor' over Şanʿā while Khuftum (see above, p. 88, n.1) was in charge of military matters is attractive, (see "Penetration", p. 59, n.43). In the Si̇rat passage (just referred to), al-Hādī had invited Abū Mihjān to give him allegiance. This had occurred apparently in 280 / 893-4.

Abū Mihjān refused and subsequently died a nasty death.

The evidence strongly suggests that Abū 'I-ʿAtāhiyah, like Abū Mihjān, belonged to Āl Ṭarf, but in the opinion of this writer it would be over-hasty to maintain that the former was Abū Mihjān's son, (in view,
especially, of the conflicting readings in the Sīrat passage, discussed above). Perhaps they were close relatives. It seems most likely that Abū 'l-Atāḥiyah was appointed by the Yuʾirids (probably by Asʿad ibn Abī Yuʾir— for whom see above, p. 89f., n.3) to succeed Abū Mihjān in his post. If this appointment had occurred after Khufūm's departure, his responsibilities would presumably have been greater than those of his predecessor. Then, backed up no doubt at first by the other members of Āl Ṭaʿīf (who had already revolted against the Yuʾirids: vide Geddes, "Yuʾirid ", 71), he was able to make himself master of Ṣanʿā'.

2. His name was Jarrah b. Bishr: CAbbāṣī, Sīrat, 111.4.16.

3. See above, p. 114f., n.42.


5. When he said: "Is it not amazing that I should be wearing a black turban (asbāḥtu musawwīdan) and [now] Abū 'l-Atāḥiyah is wearing a white one (asbāḥah ... mubayyīdan)? [Black being the emblem of the Abbasids and white that of the Shiʿīs.] On my part though, I have decided not to fight the scion [lit. "the son" ibn] of the Messenger of God": CAbbāṣī, Sīrat, 111.7-9,n.2.

6. Abū 'l-Atāḥiyah in our text is an error: it should be al-Duʾām, who had communicated with al-Ḥādī when the latter was at Darb Bani Rabī',—q.v. CAbbāṣī, Sīrat, 111,114: wa-qad kānat kutub al-Duʾām taʾlīf 'l-Ḥādī wa-huwa fi Darb Bani Rabīʾah yashtaritu shurūtan ....

7. See preceding note.

8. The Sīrat puts it more forcibly when al-Ḥādī says: "If he [al-Duʾām] were to ask me to appoint him ruler (an ṣawalliyahu) over [just] a foot of land [lit. shabran mina 'l-ard], I would not give him
authority (مَا وَلاَيَتْهُو) over (the) Muslims, neither would that be permissable in the sight of God until he repents and returns to the True Path". ْأَبَّاسْت, ٍسُيِّرَت, ١١١١٢٩; and see above, p. ١٠٧, n.١٤.

9. ِ-ٌٌٍسوَطْمَت, taken as referring to an area extending from ٌٌٍسوَط, northwards (see Map ١, B٤ ), can only be accepted if it was indeed at ٌٌٍسوَط that ٌٌٍسوَط summoned the people of ِ-ٌٌٍسوَطمَت (see below and n.١٢). The full account of ٌٌٍسوَط's movements given in the ٍسُيِّرَت (ْأَبَّاسْت, ٍسُيِّرَت, ١٢٥,٣ - ١٢٦,١٣ ), makes it clear that ِ-ٌٌٍسوَطمَت must be elsewhere.

Wilson's acceptance of the ٌٌٍسوَط account, (when identifying ِ-ٌٌٍسوَطمَت, see "Investigation", ٣٧٤ ), in preference to that of the ٍسُيِّرَت without any discussion even of what the latter contains, seems to be quite arbitrary especially since our author has simply been précising the ٍسُيِّرَت up to this point.

When ٌٌٍسوَط heard about the folk of ِ-ٌٌٍسوَطمَت, (in the ٍسُيِّرَت, ١٢٥,٣,٥,١٧., ١٢٦,٦, it is ِ-ٌٌٍسوَطمُسْم, cf. ٌٍسوُم in the margin of ٌٌٍسوَط ٌعَشْر, he was at ٌٌٍسوَطمُسْم, (NE of ٌٌٍسوَط ), The ٍسُيِّرَت relates that ِ-ٌٌٍسوَطمُسْم was one day's journey or more away (ٌعَالَا ٌسُيِّرَت يَوْم أَوْرَاح), hardly, incidentally, the time needed to get to ِ-ٌٌٍسوَطمَت, just to the west!

ٌٌٍسوَط went from ٌٌٍسوَطمُسْم south to ٌٌٍسوُطمُسْم, (a day's journey ), then proceeded the day after to ٌٌٍسوُطمُسْم (see Map ٢, A٤ ), less than a day's journey away and, apparently, not a great distance from ِ-ٌٌٍسوَطمُسْم.

ٌٌٍسوَط is not mentioned at all in the ٍسُيِّرَت account of ٌٌٍسوَط's itinerary.

The ٌٌٍسوُطمُسْم of the ٍسُيِّرَت is manifestly the ٌٌٍسوُطمُسْمٌ of ٌٌٍسوُطمُسْم (ٌٌٍسوُطمُسْم, ١١٤, and n.٣٥., ٍجَزَرَت, ١٢٢,٢, n.٢ ), who describes it as being situated in ٌٌٍسوَطمُسْم ٌعَشْر, (cf. ٌٌٍسوَطمُسْم ٌعَشْر, -below, p. ١٦٥, n.٦١ ), and is identified by ٌٌٍسوُطمُسْم as the small town of ٌٌٍسوُطمُسْم in بٌٌٍسوُطمُسْم territory NW of Raydah, (see Map ٢, A٤ ). The latter is clearly the ٌٌٍسوُطمُسْم of the YAR map: LC ٨٣٨٥٧٣ (١٥٤٣ B٢ ), quite a scattered settlement ٩ km NW of Hamudah, (q.v. above, p. ١١٠, n.٢٦ ). Wilson says that ٌٌٍسوُطمُسْم is not mentioned in any of the histories that he consulted,

("Investigation", ٤٩٣ ), but of course it is, in the ٍسُيِّرَت, where it is
mentioned three times and called Bayt Yashṭ (125,12,14., 126,11.).

To the knowledge of this writer, there is no place in the area of Yashṭ (Bayt Yashṭ) called al-Usaymat and I would suggest that the latter is an error on the part of the author of the Ghāyat. According to the Sirat (125,14-17), it is from Bayt Yashṭ, not from Ţūth, that al-Hādī sent messengers to summon the people of al-Assūm. It seems that the author of the Ghāyat wrongly interpreted the al-Assūm of the Sirat MS at his disposal as being al-Usaymat (N of Ţūth) and then, realizing that Bayt Yashṭ was a long way to the south and would not fit in with the context, he substituted Ţūth, incorrectly, for Bayt Yashṭ.

Al-Assūm (or Assīm) of the Sirat is probably to be identified with Aṣūmān, (today pronounced Uṣmān), the name of the wadi beneath al-Sūdah (q.v. Map 1, B4). Al-Assūm in the Sirat narrative, might have been the original name of this wadi and of the area round about (or even an alternative name for it), or the name of a village in the vicinity. On the YAR map, al-Sūdah is shown as a scattered settlement, (YAR LC 694647 - 1543 B2), 16 km NW of Yashṭ. See Jazīrat, 115,3,n.3., lkIII,X, 108: Waysf, Yaman, 81 (read Uṣmān for Uqma). 82,83; "Investigation ", 373.

10. Ābbāst, Sirat, 125,7f. is more explicit: hattā yudhkaru annahu yamussu batnahā wa-jismahā wa-yalmisu mawdi al-awrah minnah ......

11. Cf. Ābbāst, Sirat, 125,10f: yanbaghī an nujāhida ḥā'ulā'ī 'I-qawm wa-nabdā'a bhīhim qabl jihād al-Rūm.

12. Cf. Ābbāst, Sirat, 125,14: not for Ţūth, but for Bayt Yashṭ via Uthāfit. See above, n.9.

13. This agrees with Ābbāst, Sirat, 126,11f. See preceding note and above, n.9.

14. Qatūl is sing. (pl. qutl or qutul) and dhuhūl is pl. (sing. dhahl): that is, a killing and the subsequent demanding of blood-money, or a killing and the ensuing enmity: see Zabādī, Ṭāj (Khayriyyah),VIII, 75., VII, 329.
cf. Ṣabbās. Sharḥ, 317. ghulbun tashadhdharu bi-ʾl-dhuḥūlī. The dispute was over a dead man, who belonged to B. Rabī’ah, and the culprits were the folk of al-Sabī‘ and Kharfān: the Sīrat has, wa-kānat Banū Rabī‘ah tadda alā’...... da’wan fīnafis laham indahum. B. Rabī‘ah settled for a diyah of nine hundred dinars.

Al-Sabī‘ and Kharfān (Khirfān) seem to be names of settlements (cf. Sīrat: ahl al-Sabī‘ wa-Kharfān), and the former is probably linked to the Ḥāṣhīdī tribe of the same name, scil. Al-Sabī‘ b. Sabī‘ b. Ṣabī‘. Kharfān is mentioned by Hamdānī along with Uthāfīt (see above, p. 108. n.19), and they appear to be close to each other. This is borne out by Kharfān’s position on the YAR map where it is shown as a scattered settlement, about 17 km NE of Khamir, 8 km N of Dhī Bin: YAR MC 044742 (1644 C3). See Ṣabbās, Sīrat, 126,14ff (cf. al-Subay‘); Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 241,3ff., 278,20 (cf. Müller’s ed.1,135,20). Ikhlīs, 10,1; Ṣabbās, Tāj, XXI, 173.

15. According to Ṣabbās, Sīrat, 127,8, al-Dūʿām was at Ghuraq in upper Jawf. (vide below, p. 223, n.22).

16. Q.v. above, p. 113, n.35.

17. At Madḥāb: perhaps more likely than Mudḥāb (Ṣabbās, Sīrat, 128,17f) and Madāb (Arendonk, Débuts, 167). According to Akwa, the Yemenites never pronounce Madḥāb with a dammah. It is a well-known place in balad Sufyān (according to Akwa), and al-Hamdānī mentions it along with Ayyān, al-Amashiyyah (where al-Hādī and al-Duʿām stopped one night but not mentioned in our text), etc. as being in the territory of Sufyān b. Arḥāb b. Bakī‘: Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 107,3,n.3,4,5., 161,1,n.2., 241,9ff. Also it is clear from the context in the Sīrat, that Madḥāb is not far from Asil (or Asīl) 2 mil S of Ṣa‘dah (see below, p. 194f n.13). The two men concerned belonged to B. al-Futaym (q.v. above, p. 87, n.) and Yursam. The latter were a mélangé of tribes and most were not of Khawlān descent.
apparently: see Hamdānī, Iklīlī, 294-5., cf. Jazīrat, 249,14f. For a
detailed account of the incident see Ābāsī, Sīrat, 128-9.

18. Thus our author passes, perfunctorily it might seem ( but see above, p.31, ) over events narrated quite dramatically in Ābāsī, Sīrat, 127, 129-145. The " disorders " in Najrān were instigated by a certain Ibn Bistām ( see below, n.26 ) aided by a group of Khaythāmīs ( see below, n.27 ), who were bent on provoking strife between Yām and B. al-Ḥārīth. Al-Ḥādī seems to have dealt with these disturbances with little difficulty and had the ring-leaders imprisoned at a village near Sa'dah.

The disorders in Khaywān were more serious however. A revolt by a band of B. Mi'ār quelled without bloodshed led to a more serious rebellion when Khaywān was attacked. A battle ensued on Sunday 15 Sha'ban in which the imam, his son Abū 'l-Qāsim, the Ṭabarīs ( see below, p.168f. n.75 ) and the men of B. Mi'ār loyal to the imam took part. The rebels were defeated but the following Saturday the dissident Mi'ārīyyūn again threatened an attack, but, thanks probably to the arrival of reinforcements of B. Rabī'ān and B. Ṣuraym from Uthāfit, the revolt was suppressed without loss of life: Ābāsī, Sīrat, 142, 143,1-7, and see above, p.112 , n.31,32.

A lacuna in the text of the Sīrat prevents us from having the full story of a night attack led by Ibn al-Daḥḥāk ( presumably Abū Ja'far Ahmad b. Muhammad whose ancestral seat was Khaywān: see below, p. 195 , n.17, and above, p. 107f. n .15 ) against Abū 'l-Qāsim in Khaywān after al-Ḥādī had apparently departed for Uthāfit. A battle at a place called, perhaps, al-Qushub ( cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 170, n.1 ) is related in Ābāsī, Sīrat, 143,8ff, in which al-Ḥādī fought valiantly on foot. The revolt seems to have been on a wide scale. The houses of the rebels were destroyed by al-Ḥādī's command as were the the vineyards of those who had actually taken part in the night attack against Khaywān. Ibn al-Daḥḥāk, however,
managed to get away, and is described pejoratively by the author of the Sirat: fa-innahu rahiba min al-Hādi wa-dhāllk bi-annahu kāna sabiyyan da'ifān lā caqī lahū.

19. Q.v. above, p. 96, n.12. The instigator of the revolt was again Ibn Bistām: see preceding note.

20. Q.v. above, p. 106, n.8. Ābdullāh had gone to the Hejaz and had returned, apparently at his brother's command: Ābbāsī, Sirat, 145.12ff.

21. The events alluded to here took place in the second half of Ramadān, i.e. before the battle of al-Qushub (see above, n.18) and the night attack on Khaywān. B. al-Hārith, aided by some B. Ābd al-Madān, attacked the house where Abū Muḥammad (scil. Ābdullāh b. al-Ḥusayn) and the governor of Najrān, Abū 'l-Ḥusayn Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Ālāwī, were living. A skirmish took place outside Mīnās (see following note) in which Abū Muḥammad was victorious and who then destroyed Ibn Bistām's fortress which was in the vicinity of Mīnās. See Ābbāsī, Sirat, 145-7.

22. Mushāsh is most probably a corruption for Mīnās of the Sirat although at this particular point in the narrative it is to his camp (mu'askarihi) that Abū Muḥammad moved after destroying Ibn Bistām's fortress (see preceding note). The Mīnān of Hamdānī, Jazārat, 318.6f, wa-bihī tahassanat Banū 'l-Hārith ān al-Ālāwī ..... would seem to be in fact Mīnās which name is preferred to Mīnān since it appears as such numerous times throughout the Sirat, and cf. Ābbāsī, Sirat, 348.19, where it fits the qāfiyah of the poem (cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 179.n.1). Later, Mīnās was to be completely destroyed on al-Hādi's orders: Ābbāsī, Sirat, 178.17.

It is clear from the account in the Sirat of al-Hādi's campaign in Najrān (Ābbāsī, Sirat, 159ff) that Mīnās is in the vicinity of al-Hādān (al-H-s-n in the Sirat but correctly pointed by Van Arendonk, q.v. Débuts.
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178, 181, n.2, passim; vide Ḥamzah, Ḥāṣrī, 184) and Qaryat al-Hajar, all three places being in Wadi Najrān.

23. For the subsequent exchange of poems between al-Hādī and his brother, see C Abbāsī, Sirāt, 147-155.

24. First al-Hādī went to Sa'dah sometime in Dhu 'l-Qa'dah, and left for Najrān on 2 Dhu 'l-Hijjah after an attempt by Ibn Ābd al-Ukayl (sic). Ahmad b. Ābdullāh b. Muḥammad: see above, p. 93ff., n.3; and Ḥamānī, Iklīl, 249) to prevent his departure: C Abbāsī, Sirāt, 155,6ff., 156-7. Apparently Ibn Ābd, Ibn Ḥumayd, Ibn Bistām and Ibn al-Danṭāī were linked together in a conspiracy, and what seems to be implied is that each one in his own region should attempt to incite a revolt with the aim of bringing down al-Hādī's rule: Sirāt, 155,14ff.


26. C Ābdullāh b. Bistām b. al-Ḥārith (q.v. C Abbāsī, Sirāt, 336,2ff., 337,11), head of B. Rabī'ah. The nisbah can hardly refer to B. al-Ḥārith, since, according to the Sirāt, it was he who originally sought to bring about discord between Yām and B. al-Ḥārith by giving the former money, which is inconceivable if in fact he belonged to the latter tribe. Thus, in the opinion of this writer, B. Rabī'ah is most unlikely to be identified with the Ḥārithī clan of Rabī'ah b. al-Ḥārith b. Ka'b: q.v. Qalqashandī, Nīḥāyat, 259.

C Abbāsī, Sirāt, 129,7ff, relates how Ibn Bistām has recourse to al-Duʿām b. Ibrāhīm who managed, without importunity it appears, to secure a safe-conduct for Ibn Bistām from al-Hādī, and at a later date, after the decisive defeat of B. al-Ḥārith (q.v. below, the text and n.29), Ibn Bistām again seeks al-Duʿām's intermediacy with al-Hādī for the same purpose: see C Abbāsī, Sirāt, 187,4ff. These two incidents suggest strongly that there existed tribal affinity between Ibn Bistām and al-Duʿām b. Ibrāhīm,
and it seems most probable that B. Rabf^ah are like al-Du'am descended from Arhab, or at least related to Arhab (see above, p. 89, n.2).

The most likely candidate would be B. Rabf^ah b. CAbd b. CAlayyan b. Arhab (al-Du'am b. Ibrâhîm's distant ancestor is CUmayrah b. CAbd).

A possibility, however, is B. Rabf^ah b. Murhibah (the brother of Arhab) b. al-Du'am b. Malik. The nisbah of al-Hârithî given to Ibn Bistâm by the author of the Strat would indicate a sub-clan of B. al-Rabf^ah, and it is to be observed that the name of al-Hârith is quite common among the descendants of al-Du'am b. Malik: vide Hamdânî, Iklîl, X, 188, 162, 177-8, 134, 136.

27. Ibn Bistâm set off for Shâkir territory not so much in flight but rather in order to get reinforcements from Shâkir (see above, p. 95, n.9), with whom he had an alliance (muhâlafah), and then from Madhhij, to whom B. al-Hârith probably belonged (see above, p. 96, n.12) and who had apparently given protection to his tribe (viz. B. Rabf^ah): see CAbbâsî, Strat, 167,15ff: and preceding note. Balad Skâkir, according to al-Hamdânî (q.v. Jazîrât, 241,11ff), seems to have covered an extensive area and lay to the E and SE of Sa'dah extending as far as Barat (q.v. above, p. 104f, n.1,2).

For details of the initial conflict (al-gitlah al-awvisî) see CAbbâsî, Strat, 159-168., 175-8. The culprits were B. al-Hârith (whom al-Hâdi forgave magnanimously and to whom he gave a safe-conduct) but the rebel leader seems to have been Ibn Humayd (see above, n.24), with Ibn Bistâm playing a minor role. He is al-Hârith b. Humayd with the nisbah of Khuthaymi according to CAbbâsî, Strat, 330,16, but more probably al-Khaythami, see Arendonk, Débuts, 180, n.4 and cf. Strat, 127,5, al-Khuthaymiyyûn. (Cf. B. Khaytham b. Tadûl and B. Khaythamah b. al-Hârith, both descended from Kahlân but not through Hamdân - the former ultimately from Tayy, brother of Madhhij, and the latter from Azd: vide Kahhâlah,}
Fierce fighting took place, early in Dhu 'l-Hijjah apparently, at the fortified village of Sawhān (or Sūnān) min awtān Bal-Hārith (Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 318.6) which seems to have been situated on the northern side of Wadi Najrān since the rebels from al-qaryah (presumably al-Hajar) and Mīnās had to cross the wadi to get to it: Abbāsī, Sīrat, 161.7ff, and see above, n.22. The event was referred to later in the Sīrat (175.4) as waq at Sawhān. After waq at Sawhān, apparently, and soon after the id (viz. al-adḥā, 10, Dhu 'l-Hijjah), Mīnās was destroyed at al-Hāḍī’s orders and it seems it was razed to the ground, amara 'l-Hāḍī bi-hadm Mīnās fa-hadamahu kullahu: Abbāsī, Sīrat, 177.17., 178.17. Thus the author of the Sīrat relates the destruction of Mīnās after his account of the final defeat of the Bal-Hārith (see below, n.29), even although the former event apparently took place before the latter: cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 186,n.6.

28. Or even perhaps, "and were bent on killing al-Hāḍī": cf. Zabīdī, Taj,IX, 35-8; Lane, Lexicon, VII, 2531a; Kazimirski, Dictionnaire,II, 748, tramer, comploter, méditer la mort de quelqu’un.

29. B. al-Hārith were joined by B. Rabī‘ah, Shākir and al-Madāniyyūn (sic. B. Ābd al-Madān). B. Rabī‘ah and Shākir had come back with Ibn Bistām from Shākir territory, and perhaps among the Madāniyyūn there were recruits from Madhhij—see above, n.27: cf. Nashwān, Muntakahābī, 38, Banū Ābd al-Madān min ashrāf Madhhij, but cf. Kahlālah, Muṣjam,lI, 734, Ābd al-Maddān (sic) b. al-Dayyān, batn min Banī 'l-Hārith b. Ka‘b (and Arendonk, Débuts, 142.3) but of course there need not be contradiction here.

Al-Hādī was supported by Yām, al-Ahlāf, Wādī āh, ahl al-Hadān viz. Thaqīf and some Shākir (the Sīrat has Ḥ-ṣ-n), al-Ahrā, a Hamdān clan from Tihamah, a group of Tabarīs and some men from Khawlān.

Fierce fighting took place in and around al-qaryah (probably qaryat al-Hajar
but al-Ḥadān cannot be discounted) in which al-Ḥadīf took a prominent role. Al-Ḥadīf forbad his men from pursuing the rebels. Indeed he forgave the latter along with their wounded.

Later that day, al-Ḥadīf came across a company of B. al-Ḥārith who were on the point of fleeing Najrān with spoil they had plundered. He drove them from al-ῼΙjīlā' (NE of al-Ukhdūd) out of the wadi in an easterly direction but, characteristically, allowed their women-folk with the camels and baggage to proceed under a safe-conduct.

Al-Ukhdūd is an area (today desolate and uninhabited), 8 km E of al-Ḥadān, in Wadi Najrān on the south side, where it is believed that the Yemenite king YSF 'SIR YT'R (Dhū Nuwās), who had embraced Judaism, massacred in 518 C.E. the Christian inhabitants of Najrān by having them burnt alive in trenches (ukhdūd) prepared for them, an event which led five years later to an Abyssinian invasion of the Yemen. This is al-qaryah al-qaddīmah mentioned by al-Hamdānī (Jazīrat, 318,10), as opposed to al-qaryah al-haddīthah which might be al-Hajar that figures prominently in the Sīrat. - see above, p.96f, n.1. It is a place of mounds and is not a mountain, unless the jabal of our text refers to that part of the mountain range immediately behind al-Ukhdūd to which there might be a reference in C Abbāṣī, Sīrat, 172,8, although in fact the whole of the southern side of Wadi Najrān is bordered by a mountain range. Akwa's seems to be correct in his reading of al-Ajdūd: q.v. Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 99,4,n.2, (cf. Müller's ed.1, 67,11, al-Ukhdūd), and in any case it is clearly a different place, min balad al-Ajdūd min Khawlān, and this has confused C Āshūr (Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn, Ghāyat, 176,n.1) and, to a certain extent, Zakkār (C Abbāṣī, Sīrat, 172,n.1).


31. Cf. *Abbāsī, Sīrāt*, 173,9f: *fa-turihat al-jiyaf fī bi’ār kharāb wa-hufar kānat khārijan min al-qaryah*. Again the *Sīrāt* has to be consulted for a full picture and more correct language.

32. This was when he urged B. al-Ḥārith to abandon Ibn Bīstām and the rebels, - but obviously in vain. Al-Ḥādī ended his threat dramatically thus: "Go wherever you wish and do ( you and them ) whatever you please ! ' You will remember what I say to you. I commit my affair to God ' ...... ' and you shall surely know its tiding after a while '. "


33. The *Sīrāt* mentions letters and gives the text of poems sent by al-Ḥādī after al-qitlah al- ūlā ( viz. the events of Dhū ’l-Hijjah, vide above, n.27 ), see *Abbāsī, Sīrāt*, 180-2.


This decisive victory over B. al-Ḥārith and their allies is not dated in the *Sīrāt*. There it is termed al-qitlah al-akhirah ( the second armed-encounter or conflict ), as opposed to al-qitlah al- ūlā ( q.v. above, n.27 ). Ibn Bīstām probably left Najrān for Ṣākīr soon after waqʿ at Sawhān, i.e. perhaps just before *idd al-adhā, and he might have travelled as far as Barat, SE of Sādah ( see above, n.27 ). Allowing for travelling time, there and back, and his campaign to get recruits from Ṣākīr and Madhhīj, it would have been towards the end of Dhū ’l-Hijjah at the earliest that Ibn Bīstām could have returned to Najrān with reinforcements ( see above, n.29 ).
However, the statement referred to above in the Sirat (abridged in our text) that al-Hāḍī remained in Najrān for two months after the cessation of all hostilities, suggests strongly that the final showdown with B. al-Ḥārith did not actually take place until well into the following year, viz. 287 / 900. Al-Hāḍī departed from Najrān at the end of Jumādā I 287 / c.1 June 900 (see following note). Thus, according to the Sirat, al-qīltah al-ākhirah will have taken place in Rābi‘ 287 / March 900.

Al-Hāḍī thus remained in Najrān for six months. Although five of those months belong to 287, the author of Ghāyat has included al-Hāḍī’s entire stay under the year 286.

35. On 26 Jumādā I 287 / 29 May 900, al-Hāḍī ordered his men to get ready to leave Najrān (amara `l-nās bi-‘l-uhbah), but since he apparently arrived at Sa’dah the following month, Jumādā II, it was probably not until the end of Jumādā I (or even early Jumādā II) that he actually departed from Najrān. The journey to Sa’dah will not have taken more than two days and the Sirat records no incidents on the way. See ʿAbbāsī, Sirat, 188,21., 189,ff; cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 187, al-Hāḍī partit le 26 Jumādā I 287.

Al-Hāḍī’s governor over Najrān, Abū ʾl-Ḥusayn Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-ʿAlawī, was relieved of his post at his own request. Muḥammad b. ʿUbaydullāh was at the time al-Hāḍī’s governor in Sa’dah. See ʿAbbāsī, Sirat, 188,11ff.
Year 287 [from 7 January 900]

In [this year] a group of Khawlānīs rebelled against al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) and set off to do battle with him (wa-qasadūhu bi-‘l-muhārabah). When al-Hādī made preparations to fight them, they sought the protection of their fortresses. Then he ordered their homes to be destroyed and their grape-vines to be cut down except those belonging to the weak and defenceless among them (illa ‘l-mustaḍafān minhum). When they engaged [al-Hādī] in combat, he defeated them, killing many of their number, whereupon they pleaded for a safe-conduct which [the imam] granted - except to ibn Ābbād [in whose case] he refused [adamantly]. [The latter] went off to Iraq to seek the aid of the Musawwidah, but, after staying there a whole year, [his requests] were [still] not granted so he returned in poor straits (āda dha‘īlan haqīran).

Annotations

1. The Sīrat has at this juncture as a title: khabar muḥālafat al-Ukayliyyīn wa kāfkat al-Rablī‘ah al-Hādī. B. Kulayb, al-Mahādir, al-‘Uwayrāt, al-Bahriyyūn were also involved as well as a section of B. Jumā‘ah: Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 189,5,6f. B. Ukayl were from Āl Rabī‘ah (see above, p. 93, n.3) as also were B. Kulayb, viz. the progeny of CUmayr b. Kulayb, who it appears took over from B. Ukayl, early in the 4/10th century, the dominant position among Āl Rabī‘ah: wa-hum al-yawm nāb al-Rablī‘ah wa-mīkhabūhā. Al-‘Uwayrāt were probably a sub-clan of B. Kulayb:  ‘Uwayr wa-‘l-‘Awāmir min Kulayb wa-qāsimuhā .... . B. Bahr was a clan of Āl Rabī‘ah (see above, p. 105, n.4), but B. Jumā‘ah
were descended from Hilāl b. Ḥāni‘ b. Khawlān. See Hamdānī, Iklīl, 287-8., 354., Jazīrat, 250. Al-Mahādhīr are described as cousins of B. Ukayl: Ābbāsī, Sirāt, 189,16f.

2. See Zabīdī, Taif, IX, 36.

3. According to Ābbāsī, Sirāt, 189,8, two fortresses. Firstly, Ālāf (cf. Ālāq in Zakkar’s edit.) in the wadi of the same name belonging to B. Kulayb: see above, n.1; and Ābbāsī, Sirāt, 157,5f, (and below, n.5) wa-kharaja (viz. Ibn Ābbād) ilā mawdī ālahum (viz. belonging to Abī Rabī‘ah of Khawlān, or in particular to B. Ukayl?) yuqālā ilahum Ālāf wa-huwa jabal yataḥassanūna Ǧī ḫī). Wadi Ālāf is described in glowing terms by al-Hamdānī as the most bountiful of all the wadis of Khawlān: Jazīrat, 249,10f., 164,2,n.1 (Ālāf and Īlāf), n.2; Nashwān, Muntakhabāt, 75 (Ālāf and Īlāf, but the former is more correct). Wadi Ālāf flows in a SE direction from S of B. Ma‘ād (W ofṢa‘dah in modern Nāhilat Suhār) and joins up with Wadi Āyūn: see YAR map, sheet 1643 B1.

The second fortress is al-Thawr al-Ālāf which probably is not in Wadi Ālāf since it is not mentioned at all in the detailed description of al-Hāfūz’s campaign (cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 188,n.11) but is perhaps situated in the territory of B. Thawr which is in the vicinity of Sarīm B. Sa‘d and Ḥadhbar, N ofṢa‘dah: see Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 166,1f., 165,n.4., 249,16., 582.

4. Cf. the Sirāt at this juncture: except the homes of widows and other defenceless women (.... illā manāzill ill-niswah du‘āfā‘ qāfī āfī fīm yakun lahunn rajul), and of those who had not taken part in the hostilities.

In fact all this occurred after several bitter skirmishes in Wadi Ālāf described in the Sirāt, and it is clear that B. Ukayl (see above, n.1) were the main opponents in the district aroundṢa‘dah to al-Hāfūz’s rule. The houses which were destroyed at al-Hāfūz’s command belonged to B. Ukayl.
B. Hiyy b. Khawlan (the eldest of Khawlan's sons and who apparently dominated the Khawlan tribes before this role passed to B. Sa'd b. Khawlan and in particular B. Sa'd b. Sa'd b. Khawlan - see above, p. 93, n.3), B. Yursam, the Hamdani and the Tabari took a prominent part in al-Haddi's campaign. See Abbasi, Sirat, 189, 8ff - 196; Hamdani, Alman, 201,n.2.

5. Because al-Haddi was convinced of his evil disposition and of his enmity towards him and Islam: wa-dhalik anna 'l-Haddi ana gada : arafa anna la khayr fihi wa-annahu la yansahahu wa-innana hammuhu anna yushawishu 'l-Islam wa-yatikuhu wa-yatlubu bihi dawar al-saw'. Abbasi, Sirat, 197,22f. This is Ahmad b. Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. Abbad (see above, p. 128, n.24). Al-Haddi, the previous year, had ordered Ahmad along with B. Ukayl (in the company of Al Rabih and B. Sa'd) to proceed with him to Najran, but he asked to be excused on the pretext that B. al-Harith were his relatives on his mother's side. After the subsequent skirmish, al-Haddi granted a safe-conduct to B. Ukayl but Ahmad refused to submit to al-Haddi and fled to Alfab (see above, n.3). Less than a fortnight later, apparently, Ibn Abbad again appeared in Sa'dah where his plan, on 10 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 286 / 17 December 899, to attack Muhammad b. Umayyad, al-Haddi's governor, came to nought. However, he managed by a stratagem to secure the escape of the rebels from Najran whom al-Haddi had had imprisoned at al-Ghayl just outside Sa'dah a few months previously (vide above, p. 126, n.18). See Abbasi, Sirat, 155-7., 163,7 - 164,6.

6. (See previous note). Likewise in Abbasi, Sirat, 198,1ff, and he perhaps set out in late Ramadan 287 / late September 900, but not much later because he must have spent most of 288 / 901 in Iraq, then returned to Sa'dah, then set out again, apparently, arriving in Baghdad perhaps in Jumada I 289 / April-May 902. See below, p. 189, n.24 On both outward and return journeys he travelled via Mecca.
Al-Musawwidah (pi.) is probably here a reference to the Abbasid army - cf. Dozy, Supplément, I, 700. In resorting to the caliph al-Mu’tadid bi-llāh, Ibn C. Abbād thus follows in the footsteps of his father C. Abdullāh who in 229 / 843-4 had sought help from al-Wāthiq, (see above, p. 93f, n. 3).

**********

Year 288 [from 26 December 900]

In al-Muḥarram [December 900 - January 901] of [this year], al-Hāḍr (upon whom be peace) asked his governor in Najran, the above-mentioned Muḥammad b. C. Ubaydullāh al-C. Alawī, to send him a body of troops, whereupon he dispatched his son, C. Alī b. Muḥammad b. C. Ubaydullāh, at the head of a sizeable force. Then a large group of Khawālij gathered around the imam and he went off with them to Khaywān, leaving in Sa’dah to govern in his stead Ahmād b. Muḥammad, a scion of al-C. Abbās b. C. Alī (may peace be upon him).

Al-Du’ām b. Ibrāhīm went with a number of Bakīl to al-C. Amashiyyah to meet the imam. When al-Hāḍr (upon whom be peace) reached a district in Hamdān [territory] called al-Hā’irah where some of the reckless elements (bd sufahā’ihim) had taken to waylaying pilgrims on the road, he (upon whom be peace) ordered that they be brought into his presence. When they arrived, he had them put into fetters and, with them under guard, he went on to Khaywān.

From there al-Hāḍr proceeded to Raydah [where] the people of that region were joyful at his arrival because of what they had heard of his justice and because of what they had suffered in the way of tyranny and oppression. He then exempted them from taxes which had been extorted from them and told the people to get ready to come with him.
having revealed to them that Abū 'l-ĆAtāhiyah had handed over to him the
territory which had been ruled by al-Duạm. [6] Then [ the imam ]
proceeded [7] to a place called Ḥadaqān [8] near Ṣanʿā'.

Now Abū 'l-ĆAtāhiyah was determined to hand over power to
al-Hādī ( upon whom be peace ), having been guided by God Almighty
( tawfīqan lahu mina 'llāh ta Ǧa ) [ in his decision ]. He was
apprehensive, however, of his cousins of Al Ṭarīf [9] and of the
non-Arab [ soldiery ] who [ were ] with him, the henchmen of Khufūm.[10]
Each one of [ Al Ṭarīf ] had taken control of a region in the Yemen imposing
upon it ( yada u alayhā ) [ whatever taxes ] he wished and tyrannizing
its inhabitants how he pleased.[11] [ For instance ], Ibrāhīm b. Khalaf [12]
had captured a certain town, [13] made slaves of the populace and had
taken some of them off to Mecca where he sold them. [ Al Ṭarīf ] openly
perpetrated crimes and drank intoxicating liquor.

As for al-Khafātīm, in the Strat al-Hādī ( upon whom be peace )
it is related [14] that a Ṣanʿānī had said that often one of Khufūm's men
would abduct a woman or a youth from the market-place for the purpose of
illicit-sex ( li- l-fujūr ), and that no one could do anything about it.
[ Al-Khafātīm ] would confiscate land ( amwāl al-nas ) [15] and treat the
populace in an arbitrary way ( wa- ġmalūhum bi-ghayri 'l-qiyās ).

When Abū 'l-ĆAtāhiyah saw what [ Al-Khafātīm ] were doing,
he corresponded with al-Hādī [16] and entreated [ the latter ], [ both ]
secretly and openly, to come to him - and [ so al-Hādī ] aided him
( wa-'stabdāhu sirran wa-jahran wa-amaddahu ). [17] Now when al-Hādī
reached Ḥadaqān, as we have related, Abū 'l-ĆAtāhiyah got Khufūm's men
to make for al-Sirr [18] and sent along with them ġAbdullāh b. Jarrāh [19]
leading a group of Al Ṭarīf. [ Then Abū 'l-ĆAtāhiyah ] declared
that he intended to go and fight al-Hādī and commanded [ the men ] to
prepare an ambush for [ the imam ] at al-Sirr, [ adding ] that they must
not leave their posts until they received [ fresh ] orders. They [ duly ]
carried out [his command], but [Abū 'l-Cätāhiyah] continued to work things out and plan how he was going to perfect his strategy.

Meanwhile, al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) prepared his men for battle - 700 men [altogether], including 150 horse. Then Abū 'l-Cätāhiyah emerged leading a force of his [own] followers (fi'nafar min ashābihī). and when the two armies came in sight of each other (fa-lamma tara'a 'l-jamān), Abū 'l-Cätāhiyah sent on a messenger to al-Hādī requesting [that the imam] meet him accompanied by some of his [the imam's] men (fi'nafar min ashābihī).

So [the imam went out] to meet him with about 30 of [his] cavalry, but, when Abū 'l-Cätāhiyah drew near to al-Hādī, he threw down his lance, bared his head and got down from his steed. Al-Hādī [likewise] dismounted as a token of respect (fa-tarajjala lahu). Then Abū 'l-Cätāhiyah kissed al-Hādī's hand and head and, kneeling before him, gave him allegiance and swore unreserved obedience (wa-bāya'ahu wa-halafa lahu 'ala sam wa-'l-tā'ah). Then al-Hādī commanded him to set about enjoining what was acceptable and forbidding what was reprehensible (fa-amarahu 'l-Hādī bi-'l-qiyam bi-'l-amr bi-'l-ma'ruf wa-'l-nahy an 'l-munkar).

Then al-Hādī led the late-afternoon prayer by Ghayl Hadaqān. Abū 'l-Cätāhiyah urged al-Hādī to make speedy his entry into Šan ā' because he feared that his cousins were [on the point of] seizing [the city]. Thus al-Hādī, accompanied by Abū 'l-Cätāhiyah, entered Šan ā' on Thursday evening, 22 al-Muharram, 15 January 901.

When [the news] of al-Hādī's entry into Šan ā' reached Khuftum's men and Abdullah b. Jarrah, they hastened towards [that city] and declared their abhorrence to Abū 'l-Cätāhiyah's having joined al-Hādī's ranks. On approaching Šan ā', they were told by Ibrāhīm b. Khalaf and a group of men who had seemingly displayed support for Abū 'l-Cätāhiyah,
but who were in reality against him: "When the populace are preoccupied with the Friday Prayer, stir up dissension" (athartumu 'l-fitnah). [28]

So at the time al-Hādf ascended the minbar, the gang began to loot and plunder and [the imam] was informed of what was happening while he was [still] on the minbar but he took no notice until he had completed the khutbah and had led the people in the prayer. Then [al-Hādf] donned his coat of mail (labisa lāmatahu), [29] got ready for an armed-encounter and went out to the rebels. He engaged them in fierce combat (fa-awqa' a bihim) [30] and drove them out of Sana'a after slaying three [of their number]. [31]

The following day, al-Hādf ordered a proclamation among the soldiery that they were to be given some pay (atā'). [As for] Abū 'l-Atahiyah, he handed over to [the imam] all that he possessed [illegally]. [After] having taken these [possessions] from him, al-Hādf wanted to let Abū 'l-Atahiyah retain some of his [former] authority (wa-arāda an yubqiya Abā 'l-Atahiyah ala ba'damalihī). [33] [but] he declined saying, "I do not wish that, Commander of the Faithful: I want only to be a servant by your side." Al-Hādf expressed his gratitude, [and] then Abū 'l-Atahiyah withdrew to one of his houses on an estate he owned, wearing woolen [clothes] and living an ascetic life.

As for al-Hādf (upon whom be peace), when he had established [his rule] in Sana'a, he sent his governors (ummālahu) [35] to the provinces (al-makhālīf). [36] Then, together with Abū 'l-Atahiyah, he went to Shibām [37] [where] he likewise despatched his governors to the surrounding districts, exhorting them to fear God and to enjoin what was acceptable and forbid what was reprehensible. [Furthermore, al-Hādf charged them] to free the populace from all extortionate exaction (wa-rafa'an al-nās jamī' 'l-maṣālim) [38] and commanded that only
what God had imposed upon them should be taken from them. Then he returned to Ṣanʿā', having appointed his son, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥāḍīr as his deputy over Shibām with a garrison ( ṣaḥābi min al-jund ).

When [ the imam ] arrived in Ṣanʿā', he made preparations for setting off for the south ( ila' alfāḥ al-yamānīyyah ), so, [ after ] designating his brother Abdūrāhām b. al-Ḥusayn as his deputy over Ṣanʿā', he left [ the city ], Abū 'l-Qāṭā′īyyah accompanying him. [ First the imam ] went to Bi'r al-Khawālah, then [ on ] to Yaklā, then to Simh, then [ he continued ] to Dhamār, where he stayed several days. [ While there ], people from the surrounding countryside came to him and he [ in turn ] counselled them in religious matters ( fa-wa azahum ) and instructed them in their [ religious ] obligations. Then he departed, having appointed over Dhamār someone who would govern its affairs, and travelled in the territory of Ans after which he returned to Ṣanʿā'.

[ From there ], he sent someone [ to bring ] his family ( arsala li-ahlihi ) [ from the Hejaz ], while [ he himself ] set out for Shibām having left Ṣanʿā' in the charge of his paternal cousin Alī b. Sulaymān. [ Al-Ḥāḍīr ] stayed [ in Shibām ] several days, then despatched his son, Muḥammad, to Hamdān territory.

When Āl Yūfīr and Āl Tarīf saw that the number of al-Ḥāḍīr's troops had decreased, an ambition to regain power seized them ( khamarahum al-tam rujū al-amr ilayhim ) and they set forth for Jabal Dhukhār. On receiving news of this, al-Ḥāḍīr went [ out to fight ] them [ after ] he [ had ] entrusted Shibām to a body [ of his men ]. When [ the insurgents ] had made certain that [ al-Ḥāḍīr ] had gone out from [ the town ] they took over Shibām in his stead ( khalafuhu ala Shibām ). They entered [ the town ], made for the prison and set free all Khūṭūm's men who were there.

[ On hearing about this ], al-Ḥāḍīr commanded a group...
of his troops to go down [the mountain] with Abū 'l-Atāhiyah and Muḥammad b. al-Duammer and fight the enemy. So they descended to Shibām and expelled [the rebels] from [the town] after they had killed a number of them.

As an outcome [of these events], Ibn Mahfūz in Šan’a rebelled, attacked the prison, set free whom he wished and expelled al-Hādī’s governor [over Šan’a]. The populace of the provinces became rebellious (wa-tashawwasha ahl al-makhāṣṣa li-l-khilāf), and a band of Šan’anis went off to Ibn Yu’fīrij who was imprisoned at Zāhr and brought him back to Šan’a, where once again the khutbah was pronounced in the name of the Abbasid [caliph] al-Mu’tadid [bi-‘Ilāh]. When al-Hādī heard what the Šan’anis had done, he decided to travel with his family and household (bi-ahlihi wa-athqalihi) to the region of al-Zahir. [Before leaving Shibām, however,]

he summoned [together] all [the members] of the [families] of Āl Yu’fīrij and Āl Ṭarīf who were in prison and [then] reproaching them, he reminded them of how previously they had petitioned him to come [to their aid]. Then he granted them their freedom.

After [the imam] had left Shibām, the people [of the town] wanted to kill him but [the imam], accompanied by Abū ‘l-Atāhiyah, turned back and attacked them (fa-atafa alayhim) and threw them into disarray (fa-farraga jamahum): many were killed. Then [al-Hādī] proceeded to al-Bawn [where] the populace barred his way, [but] he fought them and [then] spent the night at Raydah. [In the morning] he went on to Bayt Zawd [where] he directed that his family be moved to [the security] of Darb Banū Suraym.

The imam then returned to Raydah, after which two of Āl Ṭarīf’s chief henchmen, Abū Ziyād and Sa’ādah, at the head of a great force, set off to confront him (fa-gasadahu). but
none of al-Hāḍī's men realized [they were even in the vicinity] until they were [actually] attacked. [The insurgents] entered Raydah and several of al-Hāḍī's men fled, but [the imam] leading his best troops (ṣbaqiyyat ashabīni) held his ground. Then [al-Hāḍī] sallied forth to confront [the assailants] and with God's assistance defeated and dispersed them. The latter took refuge in a village called al-Ghayl, but [al-Hāḍī] pursued them there and engaged them in fierce combat after which he went back to Raydah sending on the heads of the slain [from among the enemy] to Sa'dah.

Then Abū 'l-Atāḥiyah arrived with a body of Hamdānī troops whereupon [the imam] travelled to the town of Madar where he remained a number of days before his brother Ābūdallāh b. al-Ḥusayn came [back] from the Hejaz. After this, al-Hāḍī set off for Ṣan'a', whereupon Al Yu'fur and Al Tārif came out from Ṣan'a', Shibām and Zahr to do battle with him in al-Rahabah. [They were a force] of 500 horse and 2000 foot, whereas there were gathered around al-Hāḍī [only] 100 horse and 600 foot.

When [the armies] approached each other, al-Hāḍī prepared his men for [combat] putting Abū 'l-Atāḥiyah in command of the left flank, assigning the Ṭabarīs to the centre, with [himself] on the right flank leading [a body] of 30 horse. Then both sides clashed together (wa-itahama 'l-qital) and the cavalry of the enemy attacked Abū 'l-Atāḥiyah, but al-Hāḍī came to his aid and God Almighty supported [the imam] with His succour, and thus charging the enemy relentlessly, [al-Hāḍī] routed them, falling upon them with the sword (wa-hakama ṣhim al-sayf) and slaying many of their leaders. At this [the enemy] turned and fled, but Abū 'l-Atāḥiyah pursued them and chased them into the clefts of the mountains (fi 'l-shī'ab). Al-Hāḍī's foot-soldiers went in pursuit of those of the enemy. They slew many of them and took their weapons.
The [ imam’s ] men, one after another, rejoined [ al-Hādī ] ( wa-talāhāqa bihi ashabuhu ). [78] and with them he entered Ṣanʿāʾ on Friday 27 Rajab [ 17 July 901 ], [79] reciting the words of the Almighty, "Many a little company has beaten a numerous company with God’s permission." [80] When [ al-Hādī ] entered Ṣanʿāʾ, the inhabitants were apprehensive of him because of their having previously ousted his governor CAlī b. Sulaymān, but [ the imam ] did not pursue this matter ( fa-lam yakshif an dhalik ); indeed he granted them [ all ] safe conduct.

After [ these events ] . al-Hādī sent Abu ʿl-ʿAtahiyah with cavalry and foot-soldiers to Ghaymān [81] where Āl Yūfīr and Āl Ṭawāf had their camp. When he drew near to them, they sallied forth and fighting broke out between them. [ The enemy ] sought the help of Ibrāhīm b. Khalaf [ who ] was at Bayt Baws. [82] The two sides engaged in combat at a place called Wuraqah [83] and fought each other fiercely. When [ the enemy ] became too great a number for Abū ʿl-ʿAtahiyah and his men, they withdrew to Nuqum. [84] They sent a message to al-Hādī [ who ] himself set off for CAlab [85] [ where ] he led an attack upon the rebels, defeated them and slew several of their leaders. [ Al-Hādī ] went on pursuing them to a place known as al-Jūr [86] in the vicinity of Bayt Baws where fierce fighting ensued and [ even ] the brave were fatigued ( fa-ʿshtadda hunālika ʿl-qital wa-kallati ʿl-abtal ).

Then al-Hādī with his men returned in the direction of Ṣanʿāʾ, but when he was half-way across the Qāc [87] the enemy came after him so he turned back and attacked them ( fa-atafa Cālayhim ) killing some of them. [ after which ] he entered Ṣanʿāʾ. [ The enemy ], after this, reassembled on the lower slopes ( saḥf ) [88] of Nuqum where they were joined by all who backed their cause. Their number increased until it reached 12,000, - cavalry and foot-soldiers together. Al-Hādī [ however ] went to engage them at the head of 500 [ men ] and [ the two sides ] approached each other for the assault. Al-Hādī subjected [ the enemy ]
to deadly attacks, forcing them to break their ranks (ḥattā azālahum maṣāffihim). At which he fell upon them with the sword, killing a great many. Of al-Hādī's men who were slain, there was a group of Ṭabarūs - may God Almighty have mercy upon them. However, some of the enemy held their positions on Nuqum and some of them did so in Bayt Baws but al-Hādī went back to Ṣanʿa'.

After a short time, the enemy regrouped from every direction and made for the localities where the first skirmishes had taken place. When a band of enemy troops entered Darb al-Qaṭīf, al-Hādī despatched his son, Muḥammad, with some men to fight them and ordered another group to set out from Darb al-Jabbanah while he himself followed close behind. Both sides joined in combat and al-Hādī drove them decisively out of al-Qaryah and forced them back to Nuqum. Fighting continued until almost nightfall, then al-Hādī slew several of the enemy and each side returned to its own camp. Fighting now ceased for the remainder of Ramadan of this year.

On the day of the Festival (l-Id) of al-Īftar, al-Hādī went outside the walls of Ṣanʿa' to the special place for prayers, while the enemy, hoping now to be able to regain control of the city (fa-tami'a fihā l-aduww), repaired to Bāb Ṣanʿa' with their cavalry. Abu 'l-Atahiyah sallied forth to fight them and was able to drive them off.

On Friday, the second day of the Festival of al-Īftar, al-Hādī went out from the city with all his troops and ordered a section of them to go to (Jabal) Nuqum to attack the enemy positions there. Thus al-Hādī's troops fought the enemy until they had been expelled from Nuqum. Many of the enemy were killed, others were taken prisoner and their possessions confiscated.
[Then] al-Hādī went with his cavalry and the rest of his troops to Alab where he fought those who were from the camp of Bayt Baws, returning after that to Sana‘. On Monday 5 Shawwāl [21 September 901], al-Hādī commanded Abū 'l-Atāhiyah to proceed with a body of troops to the fortress at Alab which he did, and spent the night there. The following day, there arrived a band of enemy cavalry to attack al-Hādī’s men, but Abū 'l-Atāhiyah fell upon them, killing some of them and routing the remainder who withdrew to the safety of Zibr Haddayn.

[At this] Abū 'l-Atāhiyah sent a messenger back to tell him what had happened. Al-Hādī set out with his entire army, Abū 'l-Atāhiyah came down from the fortress with all who were with him and they all moved off in the direction of the enemy after al-Hādī had got his men into battle array. [Then al-Hādī] led an onslaught on to the left flank of the enemy, and put them to flight slaying many of them.

Defeated, the enemy turned back to their camp but Abū Sulaymān pursued them until he had penetrated their ranks. He was wounded and fell from his horse, whereupon Abū 'l-Atāhiyah and those with him charged and rescued him. [Then] they took him back on his steed to Sana‘ where he died a glorious martyr, may Almighty God have mercy upon them. Meanwhile, Abū 'l-Atāhiyah had been struck by an arrow from which he died a martyr, may Almighty God have mercy upon him. During that battle, the enemy turned upon the cavalry opposite them on the left flank of al-Hādī’s men and slew a sharīf from the progeny of al-Ḥusayn b. C. Alī (upon whom be peace). [The enemy] maintained their positions on al-Zibr until nightfall [when] each army returned to its own encampment.

As for al-Hādī, he remained in Sana‘.

Then Ail Yuṣfir and Abū 'l-Ghashshām b. Ṭarfī set
off from Shibam to Cāqūdān [108] [where] they stayed several days with their army. [From there] they proceeded to Maydān Ṣan‘ā’ī. [109] Then al-Hādī went out to confront them, and routed them back to their camp.

[At this time], al-Rābi‘ ibn al-Ruwayyah [110] arrived with reinforcements for al-Hādī (wa-wasala ...... mumiddan li-1-Hādī), [111] and there reached the enemy also reinforcements (māddah) [111] of horse and foot.

On Wednesday 12 Dhū 'l-Qa‘dah [28 October 901], the enemy moved off to Nuqum at which al-Hādī despatched a body of his troops to Darb al-Jabbānah, [while] he himself went out from Darb al-Qat‘ and those of [the enemy] who [had penetrated] into al-Qaryah [112] issued forth. [Both sides] were locked together in fierce fighting (fa-talāzama 'l-qītal wa-'ishtadda 'l-nīzāl) until the time of evening [prayer]. [113] Then several of the enemy were slain and both sides returned to their [respective] camps.

Al-Hādī remained in Ṣan‘ā’ until the month of Dhū 'l-Hijjah [16 November - 15 December 901], of that year. Then he heard that Āl Yu‘fir and Āl Ṭarfī had mustered up their troops and sent out [envoys] to all the districts and provinces [under their control] who deluded (wa-awhamū) [114] the people into [thinking] that [the Yu‘fīrīds] had come to a peace-agreement with al-Hādī on the basis that he would let them have Ṣan‘ā’, while he [himself] would set up his capital in Ḥamdān territory. 20,000 [men] rallied around [the envoys], and when [this force] drew near to Ṣan‘ā’, [115] [the Yu‘fīrīds] sent forward a large army to al-Sirār [116] [whereupon] al-Hādī sallied forth, having got his men into battle array.

[Al-Hādī] ordered a body [of his troops] to fight those who were at al-Sirār [which then] drove [the latter] back to where they had entered [the city]. Al-Hādī went in their pursuit, they joined in combat and the fighting became intense (wa-hamīya 'l-wafis), [117] but [eventually] the enemy troops were routed as far as al-Zibr. [118] It was a day
witnessed by the angels ( wa-kāna yāwman māshhūdan )\textsuperscript{[119]} a battle
[ worthy of ] esteem by the Muslims ( wa-maqāman fī 'l-Islām
mahmūdan ).\textsuperscript{[120]}

Afterwards, al-Hāḍī returned to Sa‘dah, but armed conflict
was to follow in Haddah\textsuperscript{[121]} and Bayt Baws [ but ] the enemy suffered
humiliation and chastisement ( wa-waqā‘a fī 'l-a‘dā‘ al-nakāl wa-‘l-bu’ūs ).

Annotations

1. This is Abū 'l-Husayn al-'Alawī, formerly governor of Najrān:
see above, p. 127, n. 21. According to the Sīrat, al-Hāḍī had left Sa‘dah
at the pressing request of Abū 'l-Atāhiyah who urged him to come to
Sa‘dah, apparently so that he could give the imam allegiance and hand over
to him the reins of government. Abū 'l-Atāhiyah's intentions were known
only to the imam, and the entire matter remained a secret until the two men
met at Ḥadagan: fa-khara‘a Abū ’l-Atāhiyah wa-lā yu‘lamu mā yurūdu
ḥattā laqiya 'l-Hāḍī .... bi-Ḥadagan fa-sallama ilayhi mā kāna fī yadihi
jam‘ān. ( see below, n. 6 and pp. 138-9 ). According to the Sīrat, al-Hāḍī's
force consisted not only of Khawlānīs but also of men from Hamdān and
B. al-Hārith who had been sent from Najrān. See C Abbāsī, Sīrat, 17,15-19.,
cf. 202,11-16.

It will be observed that much of this information has been gleaned
from the introductory chapter of the Sīrat ( pp. 17-20 ) which precedes the
Sīrat proper. This chapter introduces the imam and his genealogy and
after mentioning briefly the setting up of al-Hāḍī's imamate in the Yemen,
it goes on to provide what is in fact a succinct summary of the events of
288 / 901.
2. Al-Hamdānī has al-Amashiyah or al-Amshiyyah and another reading is al-Umshiyyah. Abbāsī, Sīrat MS, f. 79a,19, has al-m-shiyyah. It was a staging-post on the Pilgrimage road between Khaywān and Sādah, 17 ( Arab ) miles from the former and 22 from the latter. More specifically, it is situated between Ayyān and Asal ( q.v. Sīrat, 127,11ff ) and is an uninhabited desolate region with one small well. Al-Maqdisī has al-Amashiyyah, and Ibn al-Mujawir mentions al-m-y-shah on the pre-Islamic Sanā'-Sādah road. See Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 161,2.n.3., 241,10., 339,6ff., Jazīrat, ( ed. Müller ),I, 82,11, 82; Abbāsī, Sīrat, 202,18ff., 203,1; Maqdisī, Taqāsīm, 111,n.g; Ibn al-Mujawir, Mustabsir, 203; Waysī, Yaman, 85, 111, 112; Map 1, B4.

3. Al-Hā'irah, and thus in Abbāsī, Sīrat, 203,2, and in Sīrat MS, f. 79a,21, where it is hā' deliberately and the hamzah is actually there under the line with a kasrah beneath it. I have not been able to locate the place, but from the context it is clearly in the northernmost part of Zāhir Hamdān ( q.v. below, n.61 ), N or W of Khaywān.


5. Situated in the lower part of al-Bawn al-Asfal, it was the first staging-post on the Pilgrimage road proceeding from Sanā', 20 ( Arab ) miles from the latter and 16 south of Uthāfit. It is the markaz for the Hāshid tribe of Khārīf, and the author of Tāj mentions its grapes and springs. See Map 1, B3, 2, A4; above, p.109 , n.21; Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 339,4f; Maqdisī, Taqāsīm, 111; Zabīdī, Tāj,VIII, 130; Waysī, Yaman, 81; Akwā, Yaman, 77.

6. See above, p. 89 , n.2. Cf. Abbāsī, Sīrat, 204,3ff: in particular al-Bawn and al-Mashriq, where the implication from the context is that these two areas were among those which had been wrested from al-Du'am ( also borne out by the Ghayat abridgement of events ), whereas Van Arendonk
interprets the passage to mean that al-Bawn and al-Mashriq were part of Abū ʾl-ʿAtahiyah’s actual domains (q.v. Arendonk, Débuts, 211).

Al-Mashriq might be Mashriq Khawlān, the Mikhlaf Khawlān of al-Hamdānī (q.v. Jazār, 235,1f.), the region which lies to the east of Ṣanʿāʾ and extends as far as Mārib (approx. 120 km E of Ṣanʿāʾ, see Wilson, “Interpretation”, map facing p.48). Probably, however, al-Mashriq refers to the area E of al-Bawn and al-Khashab, q.v. Hamdamī, Jazār, 278,14, where al-Mashriq in the context is a designation given to the eastern part of najd balad Hamdānī, scil. Zāhir Hamdān (vide below, n.61). Elsewhere, (Jazār, 245,4), al-Hamdānī speaks of mashriq ..., Zāhir Hamdān, in which Madar and Jurfah (see following note) are described as being situated.

Abū ʾl-ʿAtahiyah had decided to cede all his domains to al-Hādī, presumably Ṣanʿāʾ and its surrounding provinces (cf. ʿAbbāsī, Sīrat, 110,5: he was wālī Ṣanʿāʾ wa-makhālīfahā) but this was a secret between himself and al-Hādi, wa-kāna fī dhālik baynahumā amr lam yatāllī ṣaylayhīmā ahad min al-nāṣ (Sīrat, 204,7f, cf. 17,17f). See above, n.1.

7. According to ʿAbbāsī, Sīrat, 204,9-14, al-Hādī made eastwards across al-Bawn to Madar (see Map 2, B3 and below, n. 72, p.168), and then southwards to Ḥadadqān (q.v. following note) via Jurfah. The Sīrat (Zakkār’s edit.) has Kharfah, but the Sīrat MS, f. 80a,2 has, distinctly, Kh-r-qah. This place is most probably the Jurfah of Hamdānī, Jazār, 245,3. Akwa ʿC., in his footnote (p.245, n.2), allows the ʾim a dammāh or a kasrah, and does not specifically mention the ʾā’ as having a shaddah, the shaddah only appearing in the actual text (cf. Wilson, “Investigation”, 497, Jurrafah). Akwa ʿC. adds that the place is now in ruins, but he does not indicate its location. However, from the context it is clearly in Arhab territory, in a region described by al-Hamdānī as mashriq Zāhir Hamdān (Jazār, 245,4).

8. It is marked on Werdecker, “Contribution”, map, some 28 km N, slightly E, of Ṣanʿāʾ in Wadi Khārid, and is 1 km distant from Ḥuṣn (sic) al-Ghūrāb which is presumably the Khaṭm (Khuṭm) al-Ghūrāb of al-Hamdānī,
known today, apparently, as Daqm al-Ghurab and situated on the southern fringe of Arḥab territory, - see JazTrat, 239,1f,n.2. Ḥadaqān does not appear on the YAR map, but its position on Werdecker’s map would fit in well with al-Hāḍr’s itinerary ( see preceding note ), and so, provisionally, it has been indicated on Map 2 ( B2 ) according to its actual position on the Werdecker map, viz. just over 15° 37’ N and just under 44° 14½ E, - cf. his map ref. ( p. 129 ), 15° 37’ / 44° 15’. Ḥadaqān is described by Akwā ( lkīl,VIII, 149,n.1 ) as being a place, NE ( sic ) of Ṣanṭā, in the northern limits of al-Rahabah ( q.v. below, n.74 ) and at the entrance to Arḥab territory. Cf. Wilson, “ Investigation ”, 229.

9. B. Ṭarīf b. Thābit: descended from Yazīd b. ṬAmr Ḥū Kūbār, ( see Hamdānī, JazTrat, 97,n.5, for the dammah on the kāf ), whose ancestor is Kathīr b. Mālik b. Jusham b. Ḥāshid. Their hometown was Uṭhāfit and they are described by al-Hamdānī as being the “ the [ champion ] horsemens of the Yemen and its spur “ ( fūrsān al-Yaman wa-shawkatuhā ). They were loyal clients ( mawāʾil ) of the Yūfīrids, one of their leaders being Abū Mihjān, and most probably Abū ʿI-ʿAbdālāhiya himself also belonged to this family ( see above, pp. 120-2, n.1 ). Āl Ḥū Kubār, like Āl Ḥū Laswah ( see below, n.67 ), were one of the aqyāl families of pre-Islamic Yemen. See lkīl,X, 40-1., 50-1.

10. Ashāb Khuftum, cf. jund Khuftum in the Sīrat where they are described as fussāqan zalāmah: ṬAbbāsī, Sīrat, 204,16f. See above, p. 88, n.1.

11. Cf. Dozy, Supplément,II, 816, - wadāʾa ala: imposer un tribut. ṬAbbāsī, Sīrat, 204,18f, has at this juncture: ... fa-innahum qad kāna ʿqtataʾa kull rajul minhum balaḍan min al-Yaman yaʾkuluhu jawran wa-zulman wa-fisqan.

12. He is Ibrāhīm b. Khalaf b. Ṭarīf, and is known as al-Waqāf. His brother was Yūsuf, known as al-Hārūn. See Hamdānī, lkīl,X, 51.

13. ʿBaṣd al-qūrā, by which is meant the town of Jayshān, for the Sīrat has at this point in the narrative: .... annahu dakhala ilā balad tusammā Jayshān, ( ṬAbbāsī, Sīrat, 205,1f ). Jayshān was on the Pilgrimage road from
15. Cf. CAbbāsī, Sīrat. 205,8f: wa-kānu ya'khudhūna amwāl al-nās anwātan.

16. This occurred when al-Hāḍī was still in Sa'dah. ( CAbbāsī, Sīrat. 205,12 ). Ābū 'l- Āṭahiyah wrote to al-Hāḍī prompted by motives of piety, for he realized that he himself bore ultimate responsibility for what Āl Ṭarīf and Khūftum's soldiery were perpetrating, in territory of which he was, at any rate nominally, the ruler, ( 205,10-12 ).

17. Cf. CAbbāsī, Sīrat. 16,15: fa-'āstādā Abū 'l- Āṭahiyah al-Hāḍī.... fa-sa'ālahu 'l-nuhud illā Sanā'ā'. However, according to the Sīrat, the communications between Ābū 'l- Āṭahiyah and al-Hāḍī were not known to anyone and this would therefore contradict our text: cf. 17,17f - wa- Ābū 'l- Āṭahiyah ff dhalik lā yuzhiru ma baynahu wa-bayna 'l-Hāḍī.... wa-lā yubayyin shay'ān min amrihi; and 17,18f - see above, n.1; and cf. also 204,6-8 ( see above, n.6 ), although apparently al-Hāḍī did disclose that Ābū 'l- Āṭahiyah had surrendered to him al-Du'ām's former territories ( 204,3-5 ). - what was manifestly a secret was Ābū 'l- Āṭahiyah's plan ' to abdicate ' and hand over Sanā'ā' to al-Hāḍī.

The words sirran wa-jahran of our text are usually used in the context of prayer. It is noteworthy that the reading of MS Khalis wa-da'ahu ( cf. MSS Ayn and Bā': wa-'āstādāhu ). If wa-da'ahu is taken as the more correct reading, might not an alternative interpretation be that the pro-nominal suffix refers to God, not to al-Hāḍī, and that, consequently, God is the subject of wa-amaddahu? Wa-amaddahu ( with God as its subject ) appears in that passage in the Sīrat ( 205,11f ) referred to above ( n.16 ), which passage our author perhaps had in mind, viz. .... afkara [ scil. Ābū 'l- Āṭahiyah ] if nafsihi wa-a anahu 'llāh ff dhalik bi-tawfīqihi limā alima min takhallusihī mim-mā huwa fihī fa-amaddahu.
bi-husnī "l-ma'ūnah fa-kataba 'llā 'l-Hāḍir .... On the basis of this interpretation, the translation of our text would then run: ".... and he [Abū 'l-Atāḥiyah] invoked [God] both in his heart and aloud, and He came to his aid." For amadda (imād), cf. Zāblīdīr, Tāj IX, 161.

18. Wādī al-Sīr, some 21-31 km NE of Ṣanţā, known also as Sīr Ibn Ruwayyah, presumably because Āl al-Ruwayyah (see below, n.110) possessed property there. With its numerous springs and wells, it was considered by al-Hamdānī to be one of the fairest wadis of the whole Yemen - wahwā min uyun awdiyyat al-Yaman, (i.e. min khīyār awdiyyatiha).

See Hamdānī, JazTrat, 236.1-4; Wāyṣī, Yaman, 71; Rathjens & Wissman, Landeskundliche, Fig. 40; above, p. 85, n.3.

19. Perhaps he is the son of Jarrāḥ b. Bishr who is the brother of Abū 'l-Atāḥiyah. Ābū 'l-Atāḥiyah clearly belongs to Āl Ṭārīf, to which family Abū 'l-Atāḥiyah most probably belongs, and the Sīrat is more specific, .... wa-nafaran ma'ahum min Āl Ṭārīf fīhim Ābū 'l-Atāḥiyah b. Jarrāḥ, (Abbāsī, Sīrat, 205.15). See above, pp. 120-2, n.1.2. Ābū 'l-Atāḥiyah b. Jarrāḥ and Ḥusayn b. Jarrāḥ (for whom see below, p.227f, n.3) are perhaps brothers.

20. Nafar is the word used. In classical usage, nafar appears to be restricted to a group of not less than three, and not more than ten, persons: Zāblīdīr, Tāj IV, 267, but see Dozy, Supplément II, 699 for the development in its use. The author of the Ghāyat also speaks of Abū 'l-Atāḥiyah's much larger army (q.v. below, n.22) as nafar min ashābihi. In the Sīrat, both the latter army and that of al-Hāḍir's are spoken of more appropriately (classically) as askār: Abbāsī, Sīrat, 206, - many examples.

21. Cf. Abbāsī, Sīrat, 205.20. - some (shibhan min) 150 horse and some 600 foot.

22. 400 horse and 10,000 foot: Abbāsī Sīrat, 206.9.

23. See Zāblīdīr, Tāj XX, 468 - wa-'l-jamā' al-jaysh.
24. See Dozy, Supplément, I. 514. *...en l’honneur de quelqu’un*. - but not of course in our text as a token of submission.

25. Ghayl: a permanent course of flowing water, q.v. Zabīdī, lāj, (Khayarliyyah), VIII. 53; Rossi, L’Arabo, 197, under canals: Landberg, Daīmos, III. 2389; Smith, Ayyubids, II. 126. For Ḥadāqān - see above, n. 8.

26. Cf. ābbāṣī, Sīrat, 207, 13: ābū ‘l-’Alāhīyah says, *limā uthādiruhu min baṭī ṣammī ḍalā ṣān Ǧā*. It seems to have been al-Ḫadī’s original intention to enter ṣān Ǧā’ the next day (Friday) in time for the Friday Prayer, - see following note. However, when al-Ḫadī suggests to ābū ‘l-’Alāhīyah (al-Ghayl Ḥadāqān presumably) that they should spend the night there, ābū ‘l-’Alāhīyah persuades the imam to continue the journey to ṣān Ǧā’; see Sīrat, 207, 10-13.

27. Ceddes has, incorrectly, "In the evening of Friday 22 Muharram" ("yu’firīd", 79), and Van Arendonk makes a similar error, "le soir du vendredi". (Débuts, 212), for Laylat al-jumū’ah can, linguistically, only mean Thursday evening (or Thursday night). Also, Friday evening cannot be reconciled with the detailed narrative provided by the Sīrat.

According to ābbāṣī, Sīrat, 206, 3f, al-Ḫadī promises two of his followers, on the day ābū ‘l-’Alāhīyah gives him allegiance, that the following day they will enter ṣān Ǧā’ and pray the Friday Prayer there: *wa-anlum dākhīšna ghadan ṣān Ǧā’ in šu’ā ‘l-lāh wa-musallūna ḩīnā ‘l-jumū’ah bi-hawli ‘l-lāh wa-quwwatihi* (see preceding note). It is evident that the entry into ṣān Ǧā’ and the praying of the Friday Prayer were to be two actions closely connected with each other in time. The Arabic cannot bear the interpretation that almost a week would separate the two actions (and such is, necessarily, the interpretation if it is thought that al-Ḫadī expected that they would enter ṣān Ǧā’ on Friday evening, or on Saturday, for instance). Therefore, ābū ‘l-’Alāhīyah must have given his allegiance to al-Ḫadī on a Thursday, and thus it was Thursday evening when al-Ḫadī arrived in ṣān Ǧā’.
After his arrival, he went to Abu 'I-\textsuperscript{1}ʿAlāhiyah's house where he spent the night. ( \textit{Strat}, 207.14-16 ). The Friday Prayer (described also in our text) took place the following day: \textit{Strat}, 207.17 - 208.4.

Concerning the actual date, our text has at this juncture, \textit{li-sab} \textsuperscript{C} bāqīn min al-Muharram (see Arabic text, p.33, and cf. \textit{Strat}, 207.14f. \textit{fi sab} \textsuperscript{C} layāl bāqīn ...... ), which can be interpreted, of course, as 22 or 23 al-Muharram, according to whether the month has 29 or 30 days in it. However, 16 January 901 is a Friday and corresponds to 22 al-Muharram 288, which actually commenced at sunset on Thursday evening. In the introductory chapter of the \textit{Strat} (q.v. above, n.1), the date is given as: \textit{ihdā wa-\textsuperscript{C}ishrīn laylah khalat min al-Muharram} (18,1f) which means literally, "21 nights of al-Muharram being passed". This dating could be applied thus to the daylight hours of the Thursday or even (as in this case) to the Thursday evening, when the 22\textsuperscript{nd} night of al-Muharram cannot be said to have actually passed. There would appear to be, therefore, no necessary contradiction between the two \textit{Strat} datings. Cf. Wright, Grammar, II. 248-9.

Cf. Idrīs, Kanz, f. 177b.28 where it is narrated that al-Hādī made his entry into Śan\textsuperscript{C}a\textsuperscript{C} fī ākhir al-Muharram. There is no actual mention of the Friday Prayer. The words which follow soon afterwards \textit{fa-da\textsuperscript{C} 'I-Hādī lī\textsuperscript{C} nafsihi}, do not specifically refer to the \textit{khutbah} of the Friday Prayer as Geddes supposed (cf. "Yu\textsuperscript{C}firid", 80.n.14). They are more general in implication and mean that al-Hādī asserted himself as Amīr al-Mu'minīn and, consequently, demanded the allegiance of the people, (see below, n.34).

Of course, both Geddes and Van Arendonk date the Friday Prayer, incorrectly, as having occurred the week after al-Hādī's arrival in Śan\textsuperscript{C}a\textsuperscript{C}.


31. Four in all: three foot apparently, and the fourth was a horseman.

32. The Sīrat makes the meaning clear: wa-sallama Abū l- ṣīlah

33. There would appear to be a difference in meaning here between

34. The latter has, wa-sayyara Abū l- ṣīlah

35. Concerning our text, wa-arāda an yubqiyah (instead of wa-sayyara) would seem to preclude the latter interpretation.
34. **Amīr al-mu‘minīn.** This is significant for no Yū fīrid nor indeed any previous Yemenite ruler would have been addressed thus. Idrīs, Kanz, f. 177b,28, fa-da‘ā ‘l-Hādī īlā nafsihi fa-bāyā‘ āhu ‘l-nās, shows clearly that al-Hādī regarded himself, and was so regarded by his followers, as the sole legitimate Islamic ruler in the Yemen and that, subsequently, the Abbasid caliph in Baghdad had no rightful jurisdiction over them. See above, introduction p. 35-6.

35. **Ummāl, sing. āmil.** The Yemenites use the term to mean governor, representative or deputy of a ruler. (Gochenour, "Penetration", 154., 217,n.17, likes the word 'agent' but this could be misleading.) In Ghāyat (see below, Arabic text p. 75), the terms āmil al-Qaramītah and āmil al-Hādī appear in the same sentence. It is synonymous with wālī.

The Sirat gives the text of the instructions given by al-Hādī to his wulāh (Abbāsī, Sirat, 44-9) and the verb generally used meaning to appoint an āmil is wāllā (see Sirat, 212-15, many examples). Sometimes khallafa is used. The author of Ghāyat likes istakhlafa.

As his Ummāl, al-Hādī would appoint close relatives (his own son Abū ’l-Qāsim Muḥammad for instance), other members of Ahl al-Bayt, descendants of al-Abbās b. Ālī and members of trusted tribes, particularly Fudaymīs and Yarsumīs from Sa’dah.

The duties of an āmil are set out in the instructions referred to above. There, and elsewhere, it is clear that his main task is al-amr bi-’l-ma‘ruf wa-’l-nahy ān al-munkar. Also he must teach the people their religious duties, especially the ritual prayers, the fundamental doctrines of Islam (usūl), and the merit attached to jiḥād, and he must teach them the obligation of allegiance wilāyah to the imam from the Prophet’s pure progeny, wa-’l-wilāyah li-man amara ‘l-lāh ta‘āla bi-wilāyatihi min ahl bayt nabiyyihi al-tāhirīn (45,6f). Also, he must supervise meticulously the collecting of the zakāh.
Sing. mikhlāf. The word traditionally employed by Yemenites to signify province, district, a number of contiguous villages, equivalent to the terms, iqīlim, kūrah, rustāq and nāhiyah. C Umārah puts it succinctly: a mikhlāf is an extensive district ( qutr wasī ).

Al-Maqdisī says that the Yemen is characterised by its having makhālif and lists over a hundred of them. In the list, the name by which a particular mikhlāf is known, is sometimes its principal city or town ( like al-Janad, Zabīd, Dhamār, RadaC ), its predominant tribe ( Shākir, Yām, Khawālīn ), or even a geographical area ( Sāhil Ghaflīqah, Sāhil al-Mandab, al-Sarāh ) or the latter plus the tribe ( Jawf Hamdān, Jawf Murād ). Yāqūt mentions over thirty makhālif, and so does al-Hamdānī.

Ibn al-Mujāwir sees a mikhlāf as equivalent to an āmāl ( administrative district governed by an āmil; see preceding note ). He repeats C Umārah's definition but differs with al-Maqdisī ( and Yāqūt and al-Hamdānī ) in that he confines a mikhlāf to the mountainous regions of the Yemen. Ibn al-Mujāwir associates a mikhlāf in particular with a fortress hisn ( cf. Dozy, Supplément, I, 398, al-C arab tusammāl 'l-hisn mikhlāfan ) scil. mikhlāf al-TaCkar, mikhlāf JāC far, so the mikhlāf becomes the sum total of the towns / villages and farms around the fortress or ( the sum total ) of its āmāl.

See Maqdisī, Taqāsīm, 88; C Umārah, Yaman, Arabic text,3; Ibn al-Mujāwir, Mustabsir, 169f; Hamdānī, Jazārat, 533f; Yāqūt, MuC jam, I, 67-70; C Aqūfī, Min tārīkh, Part I, Vol. 1, 3.

One of four different places mentioned by al-Hamdānī in Jazārat possessing this name. It had 30 mosques in his day and was inhabited by B. Fahd b. Ḥimyar. It was the capital of the YuC firid dynasty and is situated at the foot of Jabal Dhukhār and the fortress of Kawkabān ( Ibn al-Mujāwir seems to have been confused between the mountain and the city: Mustabsir, 184 ); cf. BakrI, MuC jam, III, 778, jabal li-Hamdān bi-'l-Yaman.
Shibām is known by four different names: Shibām Aqyan, Shibām Yahbus, Shibām Yūfir and Shibām Kawkaban and is at a distance of 38 km NW of Šan`ā', (cf. Werdecker, "Contribution", map, about 33 km). See Map 1, B3., Map 2, A2; Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 172.4., 173; Waysī, Yaman, 64-5; Akwā, Yaman, 79.

38. The Sīrat narrative at this juncture makes it clear that this is the meaning of māzhālim (sing. māzhālimah) in our text, and not just injustice, wrong or oppression in a general sense: cf. Lane, Lexicon, V, 1923a; Dozy, Supplément, II, 85, mālūtē, exaction, perception d'un droit qui n'est pas dû, qui n'est pas légal; Kazimirski, Dictionnaire, II, 141, chose arrachée injustement, extorquée. The Sīrat specifically mentions taṣ'am (grain crops, corn, or perhaps, especially, sorghum, q.v. Landberg, Hadramout, 295-6; Zabīdī, Tāj (Khayriyyah), VIII, 378), and taxes (gharāmah, q.v. Dozy, Supplément, II, 209; and darā'ib): [al-Hādi told the people in the khutbah] an alladhī kāna yu`khadhu minhum min al-taṣ'am wa-l-gharāmah wa-l-darā'ib lā yajibu alayhim wa-annahu qad rafā`a dhālika kullahu anhum ......., C Abbāsī, Sīrat, 211.8ff. For rafā`a, cf. Lane, Lexicon. III, 1122c; Dozy, Supplément, I, 541.

39. Q.v. above, pp. 94-5, n.5.

40. Mentioned in Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 407, 7,3, (min abur al-Khawlānī). Presumably it is situated SE of Šan`ā' in Mikhlāf Dhū Jurrah and Yaklā which, apparently, is equivalent to present-day Sanhan and Bilād al-Rūs: see Jazīrat, 149,1f,n.2, and following note. Dhū Jurrah is probably identical with present-day Sanhan.

41. Perhaps it is a region rather than a place (see preceding note) and, if so, it is probably to be identified with the present-day Bilād al-Rūs, south of Sanhan, whose main town Wa`lān (YAR MB 222663 [1544 C4] - Wa`lān, and see Map 1, B3) is 31 km S of Šan`ā'. See Waysī, Yaman, 77-8. The latter marks a kasrah for Wu`lān, i.e. Wi`lān, but Akwa (Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 154,n.1) specifically mentions that the waw has a dammah.
Glaser, *Reise*, map 3 (42°45'-14°50') marks a Djlā far to the NE of Dhamār. Al-Hādī appointed a pious Ṭabarī (unnamed) as āmil before proceeding on his journey: Ābbāṣī, *Ṣrāt*, 212,4.

42. The author of *Ghayat*, quite arbitrarily, omits mention of Al-Hādī's stay at Simh, where a woman sought justice from him concerning an estate (day̱ āḥ) seized from her by Abū 'l-Atāhiyāh's father. See Arabic text, p.35, and Ābbāṣī, *Ṣrāt*, 212,5ff, Simh. The place appears as Simh on YAR MB 154343 (1444 A.H.) and today is a small town in modern Nāhiyat Dāwrān. It is Simh in Hamdānī, *Ṣrāt* (ed. Müller), 105,4., 135,7., and *Ṣrāt* (ed. AkwaC), 227,7., but cf. 227,n.6 where AkwaC implies that al-Samh is the modern rendering. It is 33 km NW of Dhamār (q.v. following note): see Map 1, B2.

Al-Hādī appointed a Futaymī, Ṣayd b. Ḥabīb as his āmil: Ābbāṣī, *Ṣrāt*, 212,5ff.


It is a city about 90 km S, slightly E. of ṢanCā': see Map 1, B2, (cf. 16 farsakh from ṢanCā', Maqdisī, *Ṭaqāṣīm*, 112). In al-Hamdānī's day it was inhabited by Ḥimyar and a number (nafar) of Abnā' (the descendants of Persian settlers). The great 8/14th century Zaydī imam, al-Mu'ayyad Yahyā b. Ḥamzah is buried in the JāmiC al-Kabīr. Before the 1962 revolution, the city was known as kūrṣ al-Zaydiyyah because of its indefectable attachment to Zaydī Shi'ism: and because of the many ulema who dwelt there. See Hamdānī, *Ṣrāt*, 79,8f,n.5; Waysī, *Yaman*, 54.

Ibn al-Mujāwir (*Mustabsir*, 190-1) relates the remarkable sulphureous properties of the soil around Dhamār, which was apparently exported to all parts of the Yemen to be used to rid the inhabitants of pests like snakes and scorpions! - see Smith, "Ibn al-Mujāwir's", 114-5.
44. A Fuṭaymī, Ibrāhīm b. Jaʿfar was appointed as ʿAamil: Ṣabbāsī, Ṣirāt, 213,2f.

45. N of Rādā, and NE of Dhamār: see Map 1, B2.C2. It is a tribal region deriving its name from Ans b. Mālik (Madhhij) b. Udad: Wāṣfī, Yaman, 185; Kahhālah, Muʿjam, II, 847. The author of Ghāyat is referring to al-Hādī's visit to That (also known as Thāh) some 10 km W of Rādā (Qaysī & Shukrī, Dirāṣah, 78), and to Bushār (Bishār? see Glaser, Reise, map 2, 44°55′-14°40′) NE of Dhamār, both of which places are mentioned in the detailed narrative of Ṣabbāsī, Ṣirāt, 210, (and see also, Hamdānī, Jazārāt, 188 and n.6., 271,7,n.2). Neither does our author mention al-Hādī's excursions to al-Aḥṭūt (Akhtūt? see Hamdānī, Jazārāt, 105,3,n.4), Mankāth (q.v. below, p. 215, n.30), and Jayshān. Two Yarṣumūs were appointed ʿAamilīs over That and Bushār respectively, and from the latter place al-Hādī returned, via Yāklā, to Ṣānāʾ: Ṣabbāsī, Ṣirāt, 213-15. At Mankāth, al-Hādī had apparently been given allegiance by Abū ʿl-ʿAshārīn Ibn al-Rūwayyah: Ṣabbāsī, Ṣirāt, 18,9f, and see below, n.110, and 228f, n.8.

46. This refers to al-Hādī's sending his brother ʿAbdūlāh (q.v. above, p. 106, n.8) to his mashāyikh (scil. those from his family, and others, who had instructed him in usūl, hadīth, grammar, syntax etc. ) and women folk in the Hejaz to bring them to Yemen: Ṣabbāsī, Ṣirāt, 215,10f. Geddes suggests that he was sent principally to bring additional men for posts [to be ʿummāl, q.v. above, n.35] outside the region of Ṣānāʾ: "Yūṭīrid", 82.


49. Thus our author deals with an important episode for details of which the Ṣirāt should be consulted: Ṣabbāsī, Ṣirāt, 216-18. It concerns the
rebellion in Qudum and al-Masāni territory instigated by the two sons of the Yufirid Abū '1-khayr, apparently the kunyah of Ahmad b. Yūfir, and thus the two sons concerned would be Ḥasan and Uthmān since the third, Ābd al-Qāhir, was still imprisoned: see below, n.57; Geddes, " Yufirid ", 166 ( Appendix B, Table 3 ); Arendonk, Débuts, 218, n.2,3., 200, n.1.

The revolt was joined by Sa'ād b. Ja'far ( see below, n.67 ), he having broken his oath of allegiance to al-Hādī. The subject of the verb in fa-kharaju ila Jabal Dhukhār in our text, is not Āl Yūfir and Āl Ṭarī, most of whom were still in prison at the time, but the Insurgents.

Jabal Dhukhār ( known today as Jabal al-Qula ) is the great mountain overlooking Shibām on which is situated the fortress of Kawkabān ( Waysī, Yaman, 64; and Map 2, A2 ). The rebels wanted to ascend Jabal Dhukhār presumably to take Kawkabān, and thus be able to harass al-Hādī's army below in Shibām: see Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 217,13f.

50. Clearly al-Hādī thought the rebels were going to ascend the mountain by a different route otherwise he would not have left Shibām with merely a small garrison of Sa'ādīns to guard it and have taken two of his principal military men with him ( viz. Abū '1-Č-Atāhiyah and Muḥammad b. al-Dū ām ). Probably al-Hādī wanted to do battle with them as they were approaching Kawkabān across the mountain plateau above: see Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 218,1f,15f.

51. Surprisingly, our author does not mention the slaying by the rebels of Muḥammad b. Abī Ābbād whom al-Hādī had left in charge of the garrison in Shibām ( see preceding note ), and for whom he had obviously much affection. Al-Hādī himself took charge of his burial, and the Sīrat records his moving words: wadhadtu annī kuntu ma'ak fa-slashhidu razzāqī 'llāh mā razagak. Muḥammad b. Abī Ābbād's death took place apparently on Sunday morning 13 Jumādā II 288 / 4 June 901 ( a Thursday in Freeman-Grenville, Muslim ). See Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 217,12,20., 218,2ff., 219,2ff.
The Sīrat specifically mentions Abū Ziyād (for whom, see below, n.66) as having been imprisoned, viz. Abū Ziyād wa-jamāʿah min al-Khafāṭim. (C Abbāsī, Sīrat, 218,10).

52. Al-Hādhāf had ascended Jabal Dhukhār: see Abbāsī, Sīrat, 218,15.

53. Brother of Arḥab (see above, p. 112f. n.34) and another of al-Duʿām b. Ibrāhīm’s six sons: see Hamdānī, Ikhlās, X, 185.

54. Aḥmad b. Māḥṣūz, a vile, uncouth man (rajul khasīṣ danīs [sic]), at the head of a band of profligates (ṣufāhāʾ, but cf. above, n.4) and rabble-like gang (cf. fa-sāḥa bi-shubḥah min al-ghawghāʾ); see Abbāsī, Sīrat, 19,10f., 220,11ff.

55. C Alī b. Sulaymān: Abbāsī, Sīrat, 220,13ff; Idrīsī, Kanz, f. 178a,3: above, n.47. Geddes, ("Yuṭfirīd ", 84, n.26), says that according to Idrīsī, Ibn Sulaymān (sic) was captured, which is incorrect: see Idrīsī, Kanz, 178a,5. fa-akhrājūhu (cf. our text, wa-tarada C ʿāmil al-Hādhāf, and Sīrat, 221,1. qad ukhrija [i.e. C Alī b. Sulaymān] min Sanʿāʾ). Tabarī (Tārīkh, IV, 2204), relates that a son of [al-Hādhāf] was captured and then escaped with 50 men.

56. Tashawwashā = tāhawwashā: see Zaḥītī, Tāj, XVII, 240., 469, (wa) tāhawwashu (C alayhi: ʿītamāfū). Ibn Yuṭfirī, likewise in Abbāsī, Sīrat, 220,18. The Sīrat (220,19) makes it clear that it was he who restored Yuṭfirīd rule to Sanʿāʾ adding: wa-qāma maʾahu akthar al-Qaṣkar alladhi kāna maʾa C Alī b. Sulaymān.

Elsewhere in the Sīrat (19,12), this Yuṭfirīd is identified as C Abd al-Qāhir b. Aḥmad b. Nuʿaym (sic) but correctly it seems in Idrīsī, Kanz, 178a,5, as C Abd al-Qāhir b. Abd ʿl-Khayr [sic]. Aḥmad, see above, n.49) b. Yuṭfirī, and also in Ibn C Abd al-Majīd, Bahjat, 37, (Istanbul MS), but the editor (37, n.2) wrongly considers b. Abd ʿl-Khayr to be a corruption and prefers the reading of the Cairo MS, scil. C Abd al-Qāhir b. Abd ʿl-Husayn b. Yuṭfirī.
Nu'aym in the Štrat seems to be an error, unless it is a corruption of Abu 'l-Nu'aym and thus perhaps a kunyah of Yu'fir (Abu 'l-Khayr's father)?

58. Wadi Zahr, about 14 km NW of Šan'a': YAR MC 0607 / 0707 (1544 C): and see Map 2, B1. It is considered by al-Hamdanī (Jazirat, 234,3f) as being one of the "two paradises of the Yemen" (jannatā 'l-Yaman), the other being Dila' (Dula'), q.v. below, p.185f.n.12.

Most probably Zahr is correct, rather than Dahr. Zahr is a geographical term: mā ghaluza min al-ard wa-'rtafa', Zabdīf, Tāj,XII, 481, but on p. 410 (under Dhr), ... wa-mawdī ma'rūf bi-Dahr, which is probably the toponym of our text. Al-Zabdīf here distinguishes between Dahr and a mountain, also in the Yemen, called al-Dahr which, significantly, was apparently called al-Zahr originally.

Although Hamdanī, Ikilī, VIII, 119 has Dahr, viz. wa-minhā Dahr bi-'l-dād, and it is Dahr (or Wadi Dahr) throughout Jazirat (136,12., 156,1., 226,2., etc.), there is, however, a statement in Ikilī,II, that suggests most strongly that in al-Hamdanī's time, (first-half of 4th 10th century), the place was usually pronounced Zahr. On p. 51 of the latter work, al-Hamdanī clearly seems to be saying: "... then Sā'd b. Urayb begat Dahr b. Sā'd, and it is from him [that it is believed the name of] Wadi Šahr [Dahr in the printed text] in the region of Šan'a' is [ultimately] derived (wa-ḥaybi yunsabu) [i.e. despite the fact that the wadi was generally pronounced thus, scil. Šahr, in al-Hamdanī's day], and so [this is surely the strength of the fa' in fa-yuqalū] some people maintain [that it is] Wadi Dahr, with a dād."

"Dahr (in the region of Šan'a')" of the Ikilī text should be attributed, this writer believes, to a scribal error due to the widespread confusion between  Šā and dād and their interchangeable character (see below). Had Šahr not been substituted for Dahr in this particular instance, as has been done above, al-Hamdanī's meaning becomes abstruse, and I do
not believe this to be the case. Wilson ("Investigation", 341), who insists that the correct version of the toponym is "almost certainly" Dahr, believes al-Hamdānī’s statement to be unclear, but his argument is unconvincing.

C.abbāsī, Sīrat (both the MS and printed edit.), has Zahr (in the former, f. 86a.14,15, without points., 86a.17,18,20. pointed.), and Waytī (Yaman, 75,76.) mentions Wadi Zahr. Glaser, Reise, map 3, has Dahr, but map 2 has Dhahr, and the latter is given by Rathjens & Wissman, Landeskundliche, fig 40 and " Sanaa ", map 5, and also Scott, High, map 4, facing p.142. Cf. Werdecker, "Contribution", map: Dahr. This discrepancy is understandable. The present writer can testify to the interchangeability, in practice, of spoken ḍhāl, ẓā' and ḏād (and even in writing between ẓā’ and ḏād), from Ṣan‘a’ to al-Ta’if in the Hejaz.

See Landberg, Datīnois,III, 2243-5; Smith, "Review", 151-2. 59. Reigned 279-89 / 892-901,2. Tabarī mentions the event: Tārīkh,IV, 2133, 2206, 2204, and see above, n.34. 60. Household in the widest sense is probably implied here by athqāl (sing. ṭaqāl), viz. household-goods, utensils, servants etc., and even arms perhaps: see Zabīdī, Tāj (Khayriyyah), V, 245, matā al-musāfir wa-hashamuhu; cf. Lane, Lexicon, I, 344b. Cf. C. abbāsī, Sīrat, 221,21: al-Hādī ordered ḥāmī mā kāna lahu min athāth wa-silāh. 61. Al-Hādī had his family sent to Darb Banī Ṣuraym (see C. abbāsī, Sīrat, 222,15f, and text below) in the uplands or highlands (ẓāhīr) of Hamdān, an area which is thus known also as Ṣā‘īr Hamdān (see Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 157,3., 278,15). Ṣā‘īr Hamdān seems to be applied principally to the area stretching from the north of Raydah to Dhī Bīn (q.v. Map 2, B4), and perhaps somewhat beyond. Darb Banī Ṣuraym would thus be situated to the western side of Ṣā‘īr Hamdān, as opposed to mashriq Ṣā‘īr Hamdān where Madar and Jurfah are situated, (see above, n.6,7).
Wilson ("Investigation", 346) believes al-Zāhir extends as far as Ḥūth (see Map 1, B4), and perhaps a little beyond.


63. C Abbāsī, Sīrat, 222,3, specifically mentions Asād b. Abī Yūfir and Ibrāhīm b. Khalaf (q.v. see above, n.12). The former is Asād b. Ibrahīm who will figure prominently in future events: see above, pp. 89-90, n.3; and below, p. 194, n. 11. Asād is the first cousin once-removed of CAbd al-Qāhir, discussed above in n.57.

64. Q.v. Zabdī Tāj.XXIV, 166, (wa) ātāfa (ālāyhi); ay (hamala wa-karra).

65. See above, n.61 and pp. 114-5, n.42.

66. Nothing more is known about his name. He and Ibrāhīm b. Khalaf were together when al-Hādī occupied Sa`ā'ā' in al-Muḥarram of this year. There seems little doubt that he was one of Khufūtum’s men (see above, text, p. 114f., and n.51), and most probably he was the leader of the Khafātim faction, while Ibrāhīm b. Khalaf headed Al Ṭarfī. (see C Abbāsī, Sīrat, 208,12f., 19ff).

67. This is Sa`a Sa`d b. Ja`far, who in 285 / 898 had given allegiance to al-Hādī and had taken control of part of al-Dū‘ām b. Ibrāhīm’s territory in al-Hādī’s name (q.v. C Abbāsī, Sīrat, 95,2-6), but had subsequently rebelled (see above, n.49). Al-Hamdānī gives him a special mention, ..... alladhī ḥāraba ʿl-C Alawī Yāhūd b. al-Husayn wa-hāraba ʿl-Dū‘ām. (Iklīf.X, 118).

Sa`a Sa`d is from Āl Salm from B. Hi Cān (Hiffān?), who are descended from Āl Dhī La C wah and thus, ultimately, from Hamdān via Rabī C ah b. Bakṭī. Āl Dhī La C wah were one of the aqyāl of pre-Islamic Yemen, and after the advent of Islam they became virtually lords of Raydah and the Bakṭī tribes thereabouts. The Sīrat (95,3) mentions Sa`a Sa`d’s fortified
palace in Raydah (see above, n.5). See Hamdānī, Ḥikīā, X, 118ff., VIII, 89,n.47; Gochenour, "Penetration", 36ff.

68. Cf. above, text p. 119.

69. Q.v. Lane, *Lexicon*, I, 238c, cf. ālū baqiyyatin. This translation rather than simply "leading his troops that remained", is supported by the *Ṣīrat* which says that most of al-Hādī’s men fled, (see Ṣābī, *Ṣīrat*, 223,5-7.

70. It is related that al-Hādī on that occasion was using Dhū ‘l-Faqār, the sword of Āl b. Abī Tālib: Ṣābī, *Ṣīrat*, 223,14-224,4, the poem is set out on p. 2 (Arabic section of this thesis), and its translation, p.9, (above). See also, Arendonk, *Débuts*, 221,n.8.

71. The *Ṣīrat* describes the place as a fortified stronghold (ḥisn hasīn) in al-Bawn, and the context suggests that the place is near Raydah since it is related that al-Hādī fought the rebels until evening set in (ḥattā āmsā ʿalayhi) and that he returned to Raydah where he spent the night: see Ṣābī, *Ṣīrat*, 224,5-9. Thus the village of al-Ghayl some 32 km due S of Raydah, (see Map 2, A2, and below, p.195f, n.18), would seem to be too distant for al-Ghayl of our text.

The place called al-Ghayl mentioned by al-Hamdānī (Jazārī, 244, 5f,n.3) as being in the territory of B. ʿAlayyān b. Arḥab is more possible, since it is placed by Akwa in al-Bawn al-Ṣaghīr (= al-Bawn al-Asfal) and thus is situated in the direction of Dhī Bīn (see Map 2, B4), and so is much nearer to Raydah than the aforementioned al-Ghayl. According to the actual context of the *Ṣīrat* (see 223,10-12., 224,5f), al-Ghayl could be in any direction from Raydah, and not necessarily to the S, cf. Wilson, "Investigation", 391. It is possible, however, that al-Ghayl of our text (and of the *Ṣīrat*) remains as yet unidentified.
72. 21 km E. slightly S. of Raydah: see Map 2, B3.

Al-HamdanT said that no place in the whole of Hamdān (after Naṣiḥ) had more fortresses or more remarkable features (ma'āthir, cf. Forrer, Sudarabien, 97, Merkwürdigkeiten). In al-HamdanT's time, there were fourteen palaces there, both inhabited and in ruins. Madar is in Arhab territory. See HamdānT, IkhtI, VIII, 164-5., JazTrat, 158,2,n.3; WaysT, Yaman, 73-4; AkwaC, Yaman, 55; YAR MC 176436 (1544 A1).

73. According to the Sīrat, it seems that ābūl-Husayn did not go with his brother to San'a', (he probably returned to Sa'dah to rejoin his family). Also ābūl-Husayn is not mentioned in the account of the subsequent battle: AbbāsT, Sīrat, 224,14ff., 225,4ff.

74. Cf. fa-laqiyahu juyūsh Al YuCfir bi-'l-Rahabah: Idrīs, Kanz, f. 178a,7, and likewise in IbnC Ābd al-Mājid, Bahjat, 37, (except, fa-laqiyathu, bi-'l-Ruhbah). It is probably al-Rahabah (but cf. al-Rahbah in HamdānT, JazTrat, 243,1,5., JazTrat (ed. Müller),1, 111,8,12.).

WaysT describes al-Rahabah as the extensive plain (qāμ faslīn) to the N of San'a'. Al-HamdanT says that al-Jirāf (see Map 3, A3) is located in al-Rahabah, the former being the name of a village and district stretching between Sha'Cūb and Dhahbān, so al-Rahabah commences about 5 km N of San'a' and would extend beyond al-Rawdah (see Map 3, B3) and the modern airport as far as, (according to al-HamdanT), Hadaqān (see Map 2, B2), and Khatm (Khuṭm) Ghurāb in the beginning (according to AkwaC), of Arhab territory. See WaysT, Yaman, 169,74; HamdānT, JazTrat, 243,1, n.1,2., 156,1f., 155,1,n.2; Rathjens & Wissman, "Sanaa", map 5.

75. These were Zaydī ShīC'īs from Šanbarīstān, the populous province on the southern shores of the Caspian between Daylamān and Gurgān.

A Zaydī state had been set up there by al-DāCīlā'ī al-Hāqq, al-Ḥasan b. Zayd (from the progeny of Zayd b. al-Ḥasan b. Ṣalīh) in 250 / 864. About 50
Tabarîs had arrived in Sa'dah after the Pilgrimage of 285 / end of December 898: C Abbâsî, Sîrat, 116,14f. Geddes ("Yu'firid", 80,n.12) suggests that either they had been sent from Tabaristan, or they had come after hearing of al-Hâdî's campaigns while they were performing the Pilgrimage. It seems unlikely that they had been sent by Muhammad b. Zayd or, at this stage, by al-Nâṣir al-Utrush - see above, introduction p. 76, n.105 and pp. 38-9. For detailed information concerning the Zaydfs in Tabaristan see: Madelung, "The minor", 206-9., "Abû Ishâq", 28ff; Mu'ayyadî, Tuhaf, 59-62., 70-3; Subhî, Zaydiyyah, 214-17., 228-30; Ahmad b. Yahyâ, Bahr.I, 228; ed. Madelung, Arabic texts, 85-101.

76. The 30 horse were from Mu'dar, according to C Abbâsî, Sîrat, 225,9. He was the ancestor of the dominant C Adnânî tribal grouping in the Hejaz, and the government of Mecca was in their hands. Quraysh were a Mu'darî tribe. These men from Mu'dar may have been loyal Zaydfs who arrived with al-Hâdî's brother C Abdullah from the Hejaz (see above, text p. 143), and, in any case, the term is used here to distinguish them from the majority of al-Hâdî's men who were from Kahlan. (the common ancestor of Hamdân, Madhîj, Hâshid and Bakî, and Arhab etc.), and thus were Qahtânî Arabs: see Kahhâlah, Mu'jam,III, 1107; C Abbâsî, Sîrat, 224,14-16.

77. Q.v. Dozy, Supplément.I, 309, tomber dans ou sur, if... .

78. Q.v. Dozy, Supplément.II, 520, ... se joindre successivement à...

79. The original text (see Arabic text, p. 41) does not read naturally without the date, and the Sîrat at this point sounds very strange, with Friday + the year! The following Friday is 5 Sha'ibân, and in the introductory chapter before the Sîrat proper (see above, p. 148 infra), al-Hâdî entered Şan'a' on Friday il-ayyâm baglyat min Rajab: see C Abbâsî, Sîrat, 226,18., 228,5f., 227,5., 20,8f; Arendonk, Débuts, 222,n.4.

80. Qur'ân, al-Baqarah, 249: words spoken by the loyal followers of Tâlît (Saul) when about to face the army of Jâlît (Goliath).
The Sīrat (20.6) records that Ibn Abī Ṭalib had already left Ṣan`a'. This is the Yu'fīrid, ʿAbd al-Qāhir b. Ahmad b. Yu'fīr (for whom see above, n.57). Cf. Sīrat (20.4 and MS f.3b.6f), ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm b. Ahmad b. Yu'fīr which is manifestly an error and, in any case, Ahmad b. Yu'fīr had no son by that name. (see above, n.49).

81. See Map 3, C1. It is a fortress, now in ruins, on the valley of the same name, 17 km SE of Ṣan`a'. There the Himyaritic king Asīd Tubba ʿAbū Karīb is buried and, according to Asīd, many of his ancestors as well (see the verses in Ikīl.VIII): Ḥamānī, Ikīl.VIII, 134,138., Ikīl.II, 394f,n.4., Jazīrat, 153,2,n.2; Qaysī & ʿUshrī, Dirāsah, 59-61; Waysī, Yaman, 187. Cf. Scott, High, map facing 142; Glaser, Reise, maps 1,2,3; Rathjens & Wissman, Landeskundliche, fig. 64. On the YAR map (MB 305886 - 1544 C2), Ghaymān is shown as a large settlement, fairly scattered.

82. See Map 3, A1, and YAR MB 144885 (1544 C1), 9 km due S of Ṣan`a'. (Van Arendonk is of course incorrect when he says it is on Jabal Āyban (see Map 2, B1), which is 9 km W., slightly N. of Bayt Baws: Début, 223,n.8). Bayt Baws is the name of a village, fortress and valley and is celebrated in Yemeni history. It is said to have derived its name from Dhū Baws b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Zayd b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān II b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān ʿAbd al-Rahmān II b. Marāthid b. Ḍhī Ṣaḥṣīr: Nashwān, Mūlūk, 159., cf. Muntakhabāt, 10. Cf. Waysī, Yaman, 164; Rathjens & Wissman, Landeskundliche, fig. 64.

"Sanaa ", map 5: Scott, High, 145-6, photos 89-92, and map facing 142.

83. See above, introduction p.53.

Wurāqū might be the same place as Waraqa (sic) mentioned in Tritton, Rise, 141 (index, but cf. 89, Waraqā), as Wilson has suggested ("Investigation ", 128, 277), but cf. Waraqah, 11 km E of Dhamār on the YAR map (sheet, 1444 B3). The place of our text could hardly be Waraqa.
(Mādī, Anfānge, 27,n.118) which is the name of a mountain with its farms and abandoned villages, known today as al-Miqra'nah in the district of Utumah in the territory of Ānis, some distance S of Bayt Baws: see Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 215.2,n.2., 146.4,n.6.

84. Jabal Nuqum, 4 km due E of Ṣanā‘: see Map 3, B2: and YAR MB 1997 (1544 C1). Correctly it is Nuqum, not Nuqūm as on the YAR map (1980 English edit. but Nuqum in the 1987 Arabic edit.) and, inter alia, Rathjens & Wissman, Landeskundliche, fig. 40: for Nuqum see, for instance, Waysī, Yaman, 67: Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 154.3., 265,16.

85. Wilson ("Investigation", 379) identifies the place as a small conical hill on the eastern side of the Ṣanā‘ plain, a short distance to the S of Ṣanā‘ but unfortunately he does not specify exactly how far. Al-Ṣabab on Gochenour's map ("Penetration", facing 150), about 8 km SE of Ṣanā‘, and thus near Wūğqah (q.v. above, n.83), would fit the context, more than Ḥumr (?) al-Ṣabab 5 km S of Ṣanā‘ (see Waysī, Yaman, 183).

86. Ābbāsī, Sīrat MS, f. 89b,15 has al-Ḥ-w-z (cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 223, al-Ḥ-w-r), which thus substantially agrees with the Ghayat MSS viz. al-J-w-r and al-Ḥ-w-r. The Sīrat (ed. Zakkār) has al-J-w-d (228,10), but I suspect a misreading on the part of Zakkār. The latter, for instance, reads al-Surād (cf. al-Sirār of the Sīrat MS - see below, n.116), and Bayt Dh-w-d (cf. Bayt Z-w-d of the MS - see above, p. 108f., n.20) consistently throughout his edition of the Sīrat.
just as Māḏī ( upon whom Wilson relies ) misread al-Ḥ-w-d for al-Ḥ-w-r ( q.v. Anfange, 27 ). Rāʾ as written usually by Yemeni scribes, might easily be mistaken by the unwaried for dāl, and, likewise, ṭāʾ may be misread for a dhaʾī.

Apparently today there is no trace of a place called al-J-w-r, or al-Jūr, - see Wilson, "Investigation", 217. According to the Sīrat (228, 10 ), it is situated to the S of Bayt Baws ( taḥta Bayt Baws ).

87. The plain S of Sanʿāʾ, mentioned in, ed. Serjeant & Lewcock. Sanʿāʾ, 91.


89. 5 TabarTs were killed according to Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 229, 3f.

90. Darb here probably means district ( possibly fortress or wall ), see Landberg, Daṭīnois, I, 742-3, quartier, and above, p. 114, n. 42. This is al-Qatī al-C district of Sanʿāʾ, in the SE of the walled-city ( ifūʾ)-jihah al-sharqiyyah al-C adaniyyah ), where the Mūsā mosque is now situated, a district known formerly, according to Ḥajarī, as hārat al-Qatī. It lies roughly between Bāb al-Yaman and the Qasr ( see Rathjens & Wissman, " Sanaa ", map 6 ). See also, Ḥajarī, Masājid, 121; Rāzī, Tārīkh, 111; ed. Serjeant & Lewcock, Sanʿāʾ, 124-5, 129-30.

91. Probably meaning, the quarter or district of al-Jabbānah ( cf. preceding note ), and it derives its name from the special prayer-enclosure for the two Īds ( referred to below, in the text, as al-musallā ), which, so it is believed, was established there while the Prophet Muḥammad was alive. Later, according to Rāzī, fine, elegant mansions were erected in its vicinity. Darb al-Jabbānah is situated in the NE of the city. See Rāzī.
The *Sirat* has at the same point in the narrative, fa-wajadahu mulâhiman li-’l-qawm (.... and he [al-Hâdî] found him [Abû ’l-Qâsim] joined in battle with the enemy): *Al-Abbâsî, Sirat*, 229,10f. This clearly prompted our author in his choice of vocabulary, although his account differs in detail from the older one.

93. Lit. the Village, the Town, the City, - the place is called thus in the *Sirat* also. It has been suggested that it was situated on the high ground (now called Zahr al-Hîmâr) between the present-day Qasr al-Silân and Nuqum: q.v. ed. Serjeant & Lewcock, *Sanâ‘i*, 129.

94. Usually known as al-Fi’îr, and thus it is in *Al-Abbâsî, Sirat*, 232,1.

95. Scil. al-Jabbânah (q.v. above, n.91).

96. It is clear from Râzi, *Tarikh*, 79,80,203, that this is the name of an actual gate to the N of the city, and the editors (554) identify it with the gate now known as Bâb Sha’ûb (see Rathjens & Wissman, "Sanaa", map 6, Bab esch Schoub - which might be the Bâb Dimashq of Ibn al-Mujâwir, q.v. Mustabsir, 179). However this is unlikely, and the suggestion that Bâb Sanâ‘i was situated somewhere on the NE edge of the market area seems more probable: ed. Serjeant & Lewcock, *Sanâ‘i*, 131.


98. Khazrajî uses mahattah (and the verb hatt) frequently. Often it has the meaning of a camp which is set up outside a town in order to besiege it (see *Uqud*, IV, 339,4., V, 21,13), and is tantamount to hisâr. Sometimes, however, in *Uqud* it indicates a non-permanent camp (IV, 229,5., V, 129,8,16), and an interesting example of that is
IV. 229,17f): thumma tala a mahattat al-amīr .... fi askar al-Yaman ilā San'ā'. Al-Khazrajī seems to use mahattah as opposed to rubbah, a permanent post or garrison (see Ugud. IV, 50,6., V, 214,20; cf. Dozy, Supplément, I, 507, garnison), but in our text, however, mahattah bears more the meaning of the latter. Cf. also: Kazimirski, Dictionnaire, I, 451, camp, campement; Dozy, Supplément, II, 301, position in a military sense.

99. 5 Shawwāl 288 is a Tuesday (according to Freeman-Grenville and Tabellen). Van Arendonk in his actual narrative says: Le mardi 5 Shawwāl l'imam envoya ...., but there seems to be no sufficient justification on his part for rejecting the carefully chronicled (at this juncture) Sīrat account, which the author of the Ghāyat is manifestly following, and substituting Tuesday for Monday - see Débuts, 224 and n.6. There need be no contradiction here. According to the calendar, estimated in advance, 1 Shawwāl 288 was a Friday, but according to the sighting by witnesses of the new moon (on which the actual celebration of the ṭīd is based), it was a Thursday and thus strictly (according to the Shari'ah) 1 Shawwāl, for the Friday is described in the Sīrat as the second day of the ṭīd (thānī 'l-Fitr, scil. 2 Shawwāl, according to the Shari'ah). On this basis, the author of the Sīrat naturally describes the following Monday as 5 Shawwāl. See Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 232,3,9. This Monday corresponds to 21 September 901.

Such an apparent discrepancy in dates occurs even today in countries, like Saudi Arabia, where the actual ṭīd al-Fitr need not necessarily coincide with 1 Shawwāl of the official taqwīm, (known as "Umm al-Qurā").

100. or, possibly, Ḍibr Ḥaddayn (see below). Ābbāsī, Sīrat, at this juncture has simply Ḥaddayn (232,18) which also occurs twice shortly before (232,13,15), and, a little later, where our text has al-Ẓibr (see above, p. 147), the Sīrat again has Ḥaddayn (see below, n.106).

The Sīrat narrative suggests a place close to Ṣan'ā' and not far from Alab,
(see 232, 10ff and above, n.86). The pyramidal twin-peaked mountain of Ḥaddayn (q.v. WaysT, Yaman, 78), known also, popularly, as Jabal al-Nahdayn (see Map 3, A1, B1), 6 km due S of Ṣanʿā', would fit ideally the context, and Ḥaddayn is clearly on elevated ground, wa-talaʿu Ḥaddayn (Ṣīrat, 232,15). The YAR map (1544 C1) indicates the two peaks at 150910 and 158914, (MB), respectively. A little later in our text, (p. 146 infra), we again find al-Ẓibr where the Śīrat MS also has al-Ẓ-b-r but cf. Zakkar's edit. (234,17), al-Ṣ-b-r.

Our author clearly considers both al-Ẓ-b-r (al-Ṣ-b-r), and Ḥaddayn of the Śīrat to be one and the same place, but it will be observed that in calling it here Ẓibr Ḥaddayn, he uses a toponym not found in the Śīrat. Much later in the Ghayat, our author mentions on two occasions, under the years 722/1322 and 910/1504-5 respectively, a place called Ṣ-b-r Ḥaddayn: on the first occasion, however, MS C Ayn, f. 69a,36 has Ḍibr Ḥaddayn (cf. Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn, Ghayat, I, 497, Ṣ-b-r Ḥaddayn), and on the second occasion, MS Khālīf, f. 95b, 10 has Ṣibr with a kasrah clearly marked.

As Wilson has suggested, it would seem probable that Ṣ-b-r Ḥaddayn, (Ḍ-b-r Ḥaddayn), Ẓibr Ḥaddayn and al-Ẓibr of our text, and Ḥaddayn (by implication) and al-Ẓibr of the Śīrat, all refer to the same place, and that Ṣ-b-r is, correctly, Ḍ-b-r or Ẓ-b-r. (As has been seen above, a variant for the Śīrat MS al-Ẓ-b-r is al-Ṣ-b-r.) However, Wilson would suggest for its location a place some 25 km S of Ṣanʿā', maintaining that the second of the later passages of the Ghayat where Ṣ-b-r Ḥaddayn occurs, implies a location at the southern end of al-Qāṣ (q.v. above, n.87), whereas the text simply says: fa-lamma wasala [scil. C ʿAmmār b. C Ṣabd al-Wahlāb] Qāṣ Ṣanʿā' (i.e. the southern end, the northern end, or any other part of al-Qāṣ), hatta awwalan fī Ḍ-b-r Ḥaddayn thumma zahafa C alāʿ 'l-madīnah [scil. Ṣanʿā'] wa-nasaba C alayhā ........ (MS C Ayn, f. 92a,15f). Indeed it might be argued that ʿAmmār set up camp (hatta), in the first instance, as closely as
he could safely get to San‘ā‘ without fear of surprise attack in order to carry out reconnaissance operations, plan the siege, and perhaps even (may it not also be reasonably conjectured?) leave part of the mahattah in the security of Dibr (Zibr) Haddayn until he had successfully got the siege of San‘ā‘ under way. (see MS Ayn, f. 92a,16ff).

Jibāl Ḥaddayn / Jabal al-Nahdayn (referred to above), with their proximity to San‘ā‘, would have been a most suitable place for Amir’s initial HQ. See Wilson, "Investigation", 131-3.

ZBR appears not to be a classical root, but see above:

p. 112, n.29.


104. In the Medieval period in the Yemen, any descendant of the Prophet through either al-Ḥasan or al-Ḥusayn was called a Sharīf, and I have been informed by one of the Yemeni ulema that it was Gāḍīr Sa‘d al-Dīn b. al-Ḥusayn al-Miswarī (d. 1031 / 1621-2) who initiated the practice of styling the Sharīfs, Sayyids, and that this was a political move vis-à-vis the Turkish invaders and had nothing to do with nasab. In Zaydī areas of the Yemen, there has never been a distinction in style between the descendants of the imams al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn and so even in the present-day, the Ḥusaynid minority, like the families of Ḫushaysh in San‘ā‘ and al-Ḫādi in al-Uhnūm, are "Sayyids" just like the Ḥasanid majority: see Zabārah, Nayl, 164,198.

Gochenour’s final statement in "Penetration", 218, n.29; is unsubstantiated. See following note.
105. The Sīrat does not mention his name either, but perhaps he was one of the Ṭabarīs and a relative of the Husaynid imam, al-ṽāṣir al-ṽṭūsh; see above, n.75; and ed. Madelung. Arabic texts, 85.

106. C Abbāsī. Sīrat, 233.4f. has at this juncture: wa-wagafa 'l-gawm illā às! Haddayn hattā janna 'l-īlayl. See above, n.100.

107. Nothing more is known about his name. He, along with several members of Āl Yuṯfir, had been set free from the prison at Ṣahr as an outcome of the killing of Ibn Abī C Abbād: q.v. above, n.51, and see C Abbāsī. Sīrat, 219,13-15. Abū 'l-Ghashshām is perhaps the correct form: cf. Ibn Manẓūr. Līsān,XII, 438, where Ghashshām is mentioned as a (personal) name. However, see Arendonk. Débuts, 219,n.1. (cf. Zābirī, Tāj (Khayriyyah),VIII, 398. C Usāmah, (personal) name).

108. C Abbāsī. Sīrat, 233.10 also has C Adudān at this juncture in the narrative but Sīrat MS, f. 92a.6 has, clearly,  C  s-r, which reading is followed by Van Arendonk (see Débuts, 225, C Asr). However, when the place occurs again in the Sīrat, it is once more as C Adudān (Zakkār’s ediz. 239,16) but C Adādān in MS, f. 94b,11: see below, p. 187, n.17.

The more detailed Sīrat account (233,10ff) relates that the rebels left C Adudān (or C Asr) on the Tuesday and that they arrived, the same day apparently, at Maydān Ṣan C āl (see following note) some time before one of the obligatory prayers, after which an armed encounter between the two sides took place. The Sīrat does not say which prayer it was, but it was probably the noon one since it is related that al-Hādi’s cavalry routed the rebels back to their camp and then were able to return, the same day presumably, to Ṣan C āl. Also, as no mention is made of nightfall in the Sīrat account, the implication is that the events described took place in daylight hours. The Sīrat does not mention the location of the rebels’ camp but the context suggests that it was probably C Adudān (or C Asr), and also hattā C askarū bi-C Adudān la-aqāmū ayyāman (233,9f) implies that the place took on the character of a mu C askar and that it was not simply a
stopping-place between Shibam and San'a'. Moreover, when Adudan features again later in the Strat (see below), it is portrayed as a fortress and thus would have been a most suitable location for a military HQ.

A place not too distant from San'a' is therefore suggested by the Strat narrative. Adudan figures in Yaqut, Mufjam, IV, 129 where it is described as one of the fortresses of San'a' (qal'ah min qilā' San'a') on the left of the road for a traveller coming from Tihamah. In the Strat (239,16 - 240,1), Adudan is described five times as the fortress (al-qal'ah), so the Adudan of Yaqut is probably the same place. Wilson ("Investigation", 375) identifies Adudan with present-day Ittan, a small village a short distance to the SW of San'a', but he does not mention any remains of a fort there.

Asr appears on the YAR map as Asr al-Asfal and Asr al-A'la, the former NE of the latter and 6 km W of San'a' - see Map 3, A2. Both Adudan and Asr (or Asir? - see "Investigation", 373) would thus fit equally well into the context of our text.

On Tuesday, 14 Shawwal / 21 September 902: Abbāsi. Strat. 233,10f.

Maydān San'a' is the open area in the SE of the city, immediately to the W of Qaṣr al-Silāh, by which are situated (at the present), the Abzar mosque and Hammām al-Maydān: see Ḥajarī, Masājid, 3, and ed. Serjeant & Lewcock, San'a', 140-1 - map.

He is al-Rabi' b. Muḥammad ibn al-Ruwayyah al-Madhhijf, the brother of Abū 'l-C Ashīrah (see below, p. 188, n.19). His father was probably Muḥammad b. Ḥāmid ibn al-Ruwayyah who, betraying al-Du'ām b. Ibrāhim who had wrested San'a' from the Yu'firids, was instrumental in getting the Abbasid caliph to send Khūftum to the Yemen to restore Yu'firid rule: see Hamdānī, Ikhlā, 181, and above, p. 89, n.2.
The reinforcements were from Jaʿfar b. Ibrāhīm al-Manākhīr (ruler of al-Kūlā ṣ: capital, al-Mudhaykhirah – see below, p. 212, n. 18), who perhaps feared that his former adversary would defeat al-Ḥādī. Jaʿfar’s kingdom comprised much of what is today Liwā’ Ibb like al-ʿUdayn, Dhū Ṣulā and Jabal Ḥubaysh. See Ābuatī, Siifat, 240,10ff; Geddes, “Yuʾfīrīd”, 86; Hamdānī, Iklīl, ll, 93-4.

Āl al-Ruwayyah were from Ālīf (today known as Āl Ufāf), and Hādhān in the upper reaches of Wādī al-Sirr: see above, n.18; Hamdānī, Jaṣfrat, 236.3f.n.3: cf. Gochenour, "Penetration", 106-7.

111. See Zabīdī, Tāj, IX, 161-2.

112. See Ābuatī, Siifat, 233.18.


115. The Ghāyat is confusing concerning this incident (see Arabic text, pp. 48-9) and the Ābuatī, Siifat account is much clearer (234,1-6). The subsequent fighting between Al-Ḥādī and Al Yuʾfīr and Al Ṣarīf took place apparently on Cīḍ al-Nahar (scil. Cīḍ al-Aḍḥā), 10 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 288 / 26 November 901. Al Yuʾfīr and Al Ṣarīf had told their envoys to bring men (a fighting force presumably) back with them to Ṣanʿa’ – where they would all pray the special Cīḍ prayers together, fa-ʾl-yuḥdīrūhūm wa-ʾl-yuṣallū maʾahūm al-Cīḍ bi-Ṣanʿa’. These are the 20,000 mentioned in our text and they arrived at Maydān Ṣanʿa’ (q.v. above, n.109) apparently on the very morning of the Cīḍ, wa-sāru ff laylatihim ḥattā asbābū fī Maydān Ṣanʿa’ (234,5f).

It seems that the Yuʾfīrīds badly needed recruits for their cause and that the only way to get them was to resort to this subterfuge of a deal with al-Ḥādī. Having arrived in Ṣanʿa’, they would have been told that al-Ḥādī
had broken his word! It is possible, however, that the Yu firids simply wanted to put up a show of strength, and that they hoped that al-Hādf, on seeing such a huge force, would flee San'a without much of a fight.

116. Al-Sirār is probably the correct vowelling: note, for instance, the kasrah in Rāzī, Tārīkh, 181, 198, and al-Sirār in, Ed. Serjeant & Lewcock, San'a', 195, 127. Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 234, 6, has al-Surād (but see above, n.86). whereas Sīrat MS f. 92b, 2 has, clearly, al-S-rār. MS Āyn, f. 18a. 20 has al-Surār. (MSS Khā' and Bā' do not indicate the vowel).

See Zābdīr, Tāj, XII, 12. 6. 10. 8, sarār, pl. asirrah (synonymous with sarārah, surrah, sirr): the most fertile part of a wadi, cf. sarār, wadi bed, in Bakrī, Muṣāma, III, 731. The kasrah, however, in al-Sirār is noteworthy and sirār is not listed as a plural of sarār or of any of its synonyms, but cf. sirār - a rare plural of sirr. Also, cf. Beeston et al., Sābā, 128, s'r, pl. 'sIRR (SIRR I). (Sirār, without the article, is the name of a locality in the Hejaz and the name of a pool near al-Yamāmah: Tāj, XII, 8f).

Al-Sirār is the valley that traversed San'a and might correspond with al-Sā'īlah of today that cuts through the city from south to north. Also it was the name of the district to the west of the city controlled by B. Shihāb (q.v. below, p. 220, n. 14). See Rāzī, Tārīkh, 565, 198; Rathjens & Wissman, "Sanaa ", map 5; Ed. Serjeant & Leycock, San'a', 124-5.

117. See Zābdīr, Tāj, XVII, 13f. (ay, ishtaddati 'l-harb) wa-jaddat.

118. See above, n.100.


120. maqām: see Dozy, Supplément II, 427, combat.

121. The village and mountains about 9 km SW of San'a, (the Djebel Hatte of Rathjens & Wissman, "Sanaa", map 5), and described by Ways
as one of the "picnic-spots" (mutanazzahāt) of the Ṣan`ānīs:

YAR MB 1090 (1544 C1); Map 3, A1; Waysī, Yaman, 68; Scott, High, 145, plates 87, 88, and map facing 142; Smith, Ayyubids, II, 154.

It should not be confused with al-Ḥaddā which is described by Waysī (Yaman, 68, and see his map of Liwā’ Ṣan`ā’ etc. facing p. 50) as a ḥāhirā, 50 km SE of Ṣan`ā’, whose chief town is Zirājah, nor (as has been done by CĀshūr in, Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn, Ghāyat, 184, n. 2) with al-Ḥaddah described by Yāqūt, which is in or near Mikhlāf Al Dhī Ru`ayn, SE of Yarīm: Yāqūt, Mu`jam, II, 229; Hamdānī, Jazārat, 215, 8f., Iklīl, II, 335, n. 2.

See below, text p. 183 where Ḥaddah is mentioned along with Ṣan`ā’.

**********

Year 289 [from 16 December 901]

In [this year],[1] a reinforcement of Ṭabarīs arrived for al-Ḥāḍī (upon whom be peace). In the month of Ṣafar [January - February] of this year, al-Ḥāḍī despatched his brother ǦAbdullāh to a place called Ǧubul [2] [where] he stayed several days until al-Ḥāḍī followed him with another force—as far as Ǧabwah [3] where there were some enemy troops. [Al-Ḥāḍī] launched an attack against them, slaying many of their number and seizing their possessions, [whereupon] the enemy set out from Bayt Baws with their cavalry. Then there ensued between [the enemy] and al-Ḥāḍī’s men, who were at Ǧabwah, a fierce combat in which was killed Sharīf Abū `l-Qāsim al-Ĵarīf [who was descended] from Ja`far b. Abī Ṭalib.[4]

Al-Ḥāḍī now advanced with his men and drove the enemy back to their fortress.[5] [Then] the vanguard of al-Ḥāḍī’s men returned
to Ṣan'ā' at which the enemy assaulted the rearguard of [his] army.\[6\] but [the imam] himself together with the remnants of his force swung round to attack them (fa-ṣatala fa-alayhim bi-nafsihi ...).\[7\] [but] his horse was hit and dropped [to the ground]. Al-Hadī was wounded in the head and [fell] unconscious.\[8\] The enemy rushed forward to kill him, but his son Muḥammad turned upon them (fa-ṣatala fa-alayhim), killing many of their number. [But] a group of Tabarīs held their ground and continued to fight around [Al-Hadī] until they were all slain to the last man (may God Almighty have mercy upon them).

[Someone] cried out: "Al-Hadī has been killed!"

Whereupon a number of [the imam's] men came and rescued him setting him upon his horse. His son, Muḥammad, followed right behind, while men on horseback belonging to [Muḥammad] fought to the right and to the left. Then Al-Hadī halted and summoned a number of his troops whose steadfastness in the straits of conflict was well known (yurafu thabāṭuhum fi mawāṭin al-qitāl). [These] then [fought] resolutely around him and he [in turn] resisted [the onslaufhs] of the enemy (wataraḍada ala 'l-qawm) to the extent that he [was able] to ward them off from his men and [thus] continued in their wake, covered by the blood from his wound, until he entered Ṣan'ā'.\[9\] [There] he was smitten by [such] a great pain (alam shādīd),\[10\] that it was noised abroad that he had died, but God Almighty restored him to health knowing how beneficial his survival would be for the Muslims (limā ya'lamūhu min al-maslahah al-ṣāmmah bi-baqā'ihī).

After several days, Al-Hadī sent some of his men to Ṭila'\[12\] to fight those who were opposed to Islam. There fierce fighting broke out, the enemy were defeated and many were slain [after which] their heads were severed. Then Ibn Al-Ḥusayn set out [from Ṣan'ā'] to Ẓahr and in Wādi Ushar\[13\] fought vehemently those...
Al-Hādī [then] learnt that there was a gang at al-Rahhab waylaying travellers, so he despatched a band of his men to deal with them. After this, Al-Hādī ordered an army to go down to Subut. Reinforcements were sent out from Bayt Baws for their co-factionaries (li-hizbihi), but Al-Hādī's men held their ground and fought tenaciously (wa-ṣadaqā i-qītal) until the enemy were driven back to Tan'īm.

Meanwhile fighting broke out at Zabwah. Afterwards Al-Hādī despatched his brother and son to Ḥaddah and San'a'. Whereupon the enemy came out from their bases and rallied together. Then the two sides engaged in combat and Al-Hādī's soldiers routed the enemy, slaying a number of them. Later more fighting took place between Ibn al-Ruwayyah, who was one of Al-Hādī's henchmen, and the people of Bayt Baws, but Ibn al-Ruwayyah was defeated.

Al-Hādī was, at that time, in the midst of an illness. He had no more money left to pay his men, so he asked the San'ātis for a loan. They, however, lent him nothing, so the situation became so difficult to bear that Al-Hādī decided to go back to Sa'dah. Thus he departed with his men from San'a' and when he arrived at Warwar he was met by Al-Du'ām. Al-Hādī requested assistance (ighāthah) from him and asked him to come with him and fight the enemy with his men and tribesmen. Al-Du'ām, however, made some excuse, so Al-Hādī carried on to Sa'dah which he reached towards the end of the month of Jumādā II of this year (scil. early June 902).

In this year also, Ahmad b. 'Abdullah ibn 'Abbad left Yemen for Iraq in order to ask the Abbasid caliph al-Mu'ābid to help him militarily against Al-Hādī. When he arrived however, al-Mu'ābid had died and allegiance had been given to al-Muktaff.
[the latter] of his plan, whereupon al-Muktaff ordered that a large force be got ready [to go back] with the aforementioned Ahmad b. Abdullāh. At this [though] there arrived a letter from Abū Muhammad Ujj b. Sāj.[25] the governor over the two Holy Cities, telling [the caliph] that al-Ḥādi had [already] left Ṣanʿā'. Al-Muktaff gave up interest in despatching [an army] to the Yemen. He became preoccupied with fighting the Qarāmītah in Syria where Abū 'l-Qasim (al-Qarmatī) [26] one of the ḍū ʿādh of Ubaydullāh al-Mahdī, ruler of North Africa, [was instigating a rebellion].[27]

Annotations


2. See above, introduction pp. 60-2.

   According to ĞAbbāṣī, Šīrāz, 236,9, the enemy were positioned at Ghaymān (q.v. above, p. 170, n.81). Šubul is mentioned again during the course of this year, where it is clearly not far from Ṣanʿā' (q.v. below, n.15, and cf. Arabic text, p. 54, and Šīrāz, 239,4-6). When Šubul occurs yet again, in year 290 (see below, p. 196, n.19), the detailed Šīrāz account makes it clear that Šubul is also not far from Bayt ʿUqab (see Map 2, Ci),
   - some 5 km SW of Ṣanʿā'. All three places are in Mashriq Khawfān (q.v. above, p. 150, n.6). This information would tend to support Van Arendonk's suggestion that Šabul (sic) is the same place as Šabal, described as ruins on Halévy's map and situated a little to the SE of Ṣanʿā'm (Débuts, 226, and n.1; and see Wilson, "Investigation", 131). Wilson suggests that Šubul might in fact be the same place as Ṣ-b-r, mentioned by al-Hamdānī as one of the wadis of Wadi al-Tanā'im.

3. See above, introduction p. 63.

Zabwah appears in Hamdānī, Jazīrāt, 153,3 and 238,9, as a settlement.
and a wadi, and once in the Sfrat it is Jabal Zabwah (see below, n.16).

Akwa C (Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 153, n.2) says that it is a small town / settlement (baldah) and wadi in the uplands (zāhir) of Mikhlāf Dhib Jurrah (scil. Bilād Sanhān), the region just to the south of Šan Cā'. On the YAR map, MB 216874 (1544 C2), a place called Ḏabwah is indicated and this would seem to be the Ḏabwah referred to by Akwa C. There is little doubt that this is the locality of our text, for it suits admirably the context, situated as it is almost half-way between Bayt Baws and Ghayman, but slightly nearer the former: see Map 3, B1. Ḏabwah, according to Akwa C, is where Ghayl al-Barmakī has its source, (but cf. CAmrī, "A document", 30, who states that the ghayl's source is near Bayt C Uqab and Ghayman, the former, see preceding note, is about 16 km NE of Ḏabwah).

Wilson ("Investigation", 348,) says that he was unable to locate Ḏabwah, (the relevant YAR sheet appeared 2 years after his thesis). However, his supposition that the place lay to the SE of Ḥizyaz, was clearly somewhat off the mark.

4. He perhaps can be identified with Idrīs b. Ahmad who was a member of that small band that accompanied al-Hādī on his second journey from the Hejaz to Ša Cā'dah, and who is also described as a scion of Ja ṯar b. Abī Ṭālib, (i.e. Ja ṯar al-Ḥajjār, first cousin of the Prophet, whose descendants are through his son CAbdullāh al-Akbar al-Jawād): CAbbāstå, Sfrat, 38,18f; Ibn C Inabah, C Umdat, 55.

5. CAbbāstå, Sfrat, 236,16 does not identify the hisn, but it is Bayt Baws or perhaps the gaš Cāh at C Addān (cf. below, n.16).

6. These were a body of ill-equipped Tabarīs (laysa ma C ahum rāmin wa-lā sayyāf) who initially engaged in combat against the advice of al-Hādī: CAbbāstå, Sfrat, 236,19 - 237,1f.

7. See above, p. 166, n.64.

8. Cf. CAbbāstå, Sfrat, 237,9, where it is related that al-Hādī was struck on the head by a stone at close range.


10. See CAbbāstå, Sfrat, 238,2-11.

11. CAbbāstå, Sfrat, has, perhaps more appropriately, C illah.

12. See Map 2, B1 and, above, p. 164, n.58. It is Ḍūlā C on the YAR map, MC 0302 (1544 C1), but perhaps Ḍīlā C is the older pronunciation: cf. Hamdānī, Jazīrat (ed. Müller), 1, 107,16. It is the fertile wadi 13 km NW of Šan Cā'. Cf. "Dhulla": Rathjens & Wissman, "Sanaa", 334 and map 5;
186

Werdecker, "Contribution", map, "Dulāg": Forrer, Südarabien, 178,n.5; Waysī, Yaman, 75.

13. Cf. Āsir in Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 238,19 and Ās-r (where the sīn is deliberate) in MS, f. 94a,19. Wadi Ās-r of our text cannot be identified with Āsr (or Āsir), q.v. above, p. 177f n.108, (even although, apparently, there is a Wadi Āsr there - see Wilson, "Investigation", 373), not only since the sād of Āsr is difficult to accommodate with the shin of the text but, moreover, because the context suggests a wadi near Ṣahr: Ābdullāh is more likely to have gone in a north-westerly direction from Ṣan'ā' than due west.

The place is most probably to be identified with Ās-r mentioned along with al-Rāḥbah, Dhaḥbān and Ālumān north of Ṣan'ā' in Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 243,1., cf. 253,10 (ed. Müller, II, 119, Āshar). (Cf. Āshar arbitrarily, in Forrer, Südarabien, 187, but, 200, Āshar.) Wilson, (372), was informed that Āshar was an area, formerly cultivated, at the lower end of Wadi Ṣahr on its northern side.


Mufsidūn: literally corrupters and it can mean perpetrators of havoc, looters, brigands, pillagers but here it would signify rather rebels: cf. Kazimirski, Dictionnaire, II, 593, qui ...... détruit l'ordre, and Lane, Lexicon, VI, 2396c under afsada. The Sīrat speaks of āskar Ṣahr and these would seem to be an organized section of the rebels belonging to the Āl Yūʿfir - Āl Ṣaḥīf faction. The Sīrat also speaks of muḥāskar al-qawm in the vicinity of Ḍila and it seems that there was also a muḥāskar at Āḍudān (see above, p 177f, n.108, and below, n.17) but their principal garrison appears to have been at Bāḥlāns. See Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 238,15ff.

15. Along with Tān āmah, probably the al-Tān ā of al-Hamdānī (see Jazīrat, 237,1,n.3; and Wilson, "Investigation", 199). Tān ā is spelt
thus on the YAR map - MC 379009 (1544 C2) and it is 5 1/2 km NE of Bayt C-Uqab (see Map 2, C1) in Khawlan al-C-Āliyah in B. Sahām territory. See Hamdānī, Ikīlī I, 347.n.4., Ikīlī II, 383.n.4; Forrer, Südarabien, 181.n.1; cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 226. "Tan-C'um ". Cf. Glaser, Reise, map 2, 44°33'-15°16', " Ten-C'im, (incorrectly) SE of San-C ā', about 6 km NE of Ghaymān, but (more correctly) map 1, E of San-C ā', and also Rathjens & Wissman, Landeskundliche, Fig. 64.

16. See above, n.3. It is Jabal Čabwah at this point in the Sīrat narrative. Fierce fighting took place there between a rebel force and al-Hāḍī's men led by his brother and son (see following note). The rebels were defeated. See Ḫubbāsī, Sīrat, 239.13-16.

17. Al-Hāḍī's troops were again led by his brother Č-Abdullāh and his son Abū ɇ-Qāsim Muḥammad (see preceding note, and Č-Abbāsī, Sīrat, 240.6f). Our author, however, omits even a mention of an interesting episode concerning the fortress of Č-Aqūdān (q.v. above, pp. 177-8, n.108) which belonged apparently to a military commander of the rebels. A plot to ambush al-Hāḍī's troops, commanded by Č-Abdullāh and Abū ɇ-Qāsim was foiled. See Sīrat, 239,16 - 240.5.

18. For a discussion of Sanā-C and S-n-C see above, introduction p. 62. On the YAR map it appears today as a scattered settlement some 8 km S, slightly W, of San-C ā': Sana-C (sic), MB 1190 (1544 C1). It has been described as one of the gardens (makḥārif) of San-C ā'. See Map 3, A1; Hamdānī, Ikīlī II, 285.n.1; and Wilson, "Investigation", 305.

At a much later date in the Ghāyat (see MS Č-Ayn f. 62b.29) under the year 672/1273-4, Ḥaddāh (q.v. above, pp. 180-1, n.121) and Sanā-C are again linked together, and there it is related that both places were reduced to utter ruin (fa-akhrabahum ā kharāban mujhīfān) and their trees cut down by the Rasulid al-Muẓaffar Yūṣuf b. Č-Umar.
19. This was on a Wednesday in Jumādā 2 / May-June 902. Abū 'l-'^Ashīrah b. al-Ruwayyāh and also, apparently, his brother al-Rabī ( see above, p. 178, n.110 ) were defeated. The former had arrived with reinforcements ( called al-Jaифir in the Sirāt ) from al-Jaificar ( scil. Jaifar al-Manākhī - see below, p. 212, n.20 ). Our author omits to mention the fierce battle, which took place two days previously, between al-Hādī's men and the rebels as a result of which the rebels were routed by a body of horse commanded by al-Hādī's brother and son, ( CAbdullāh and Abū 'l-Qāsim ). For the complete story, see CAbbasī, Sirāt, 240,10 - 241,8.

20. The unstable and sorry situation in Ṣanā' and the countryside round about from the beginning of the year and perhaps ever since al-Hādī re-entered Ṣanā' in Rajab of the preceding year / July 901, is summed up succinctly in Idrīs, Kanz. f. 178a,8f: fa-aqāmat al-harb baynahum ( scil. Al Yu^fir and al-Hādī ) sijālan muddah wa-'l-nās ff dfq min al-aysh wa-'inqitā ff 'l-turuq.

21. A Thursday, presumably not the day after Abū 'l-'^Ashīrah's defeat ( see above, n.19 ) but the Thursday of the following week. Al-Hādī left Ṣanā' borne on a palanquin ( Cammariyyah - q.v. Dozy, Supplément II, 171-2 ) predicting, in stirring language, what would befall its inhabitants especially the womenfolk because of their treatment of him, ending with the Qur'ānic words: ".... and those who do wrong shall surely know by what overturning they will be overturned ", ( al-Shu^ara', 227 - Arberry's interpretation ). See CAbbasī, Sirāt, 241,8 - 242,3.

22. See Map 2, B4. The name of a wadi ( and a ravine and mountain according to Akwa C ) in the Upper Jawf, 23 km E of Khamir ( not SE as Waysī maintains ) and about 5 km NE of Dhī Bīn. On the YAR map, Wadi Warwar is just to the E of Zafār, (q.v. MC 098685 ~1544 A1 ), and cf. sheet 1644 C3. Cf. Werdecker. " Contribution ", map, where W. Warwar, Khamir ( " Hamr " )
and Dhī Bīn are placed much too far to the north. See Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 241.1.n.1; and Waysī, Yaman, 82.


24. Thus, according to the Ghāyat, Ibn Ėbād went to Iraq twice: see above, text p. 134, and p. 136, n.6. Chronologically speaking, both visits are feasible. The Sīrat mentions the first occasion but not the second. Al-Hamdānī, who relates the history of Ibn Ėbād's family, only mentions one visit which corresponds closely to the wording of the second visit in our text: cf. Hamdānī, Iklīl, 249-53., and see 261.

Al-Muṭṭādī died in Rabī' II 289 / March-April 902. Ibn Ėbād will not have stayed long in Iraq after the accession of al-Muktāfī, for by the end of Ramadān 289 (i.e. before 7 September 902) he had returned to the Yemen and was organizing another revolt against al-Hādī, (see below, p. 192, n.1).


27. See Tabārī, Tarīkh, IV, 2217-20; and Kennedy, Caliphates, 186., 287-9., 315-6.

*********
In al-Muharram of [this year] [December 902 - January 903] lawlessness (baḍd fasād) broke out in the region of Sa'dah at which al-Hādī despatched [a force] against those [responsible] and fighting took place on the outskirts of the town [scil. al-Hādī'iq].

Then al-Hādī's men seized the fortress of CAlāf. They cut down the vines and destroyed the dwellings of its inhabitants whereupon [the latter] asked al-Hādī for a safe-conduct, to which he agreed.

After [these events] there occurred disturbances (baḍd Ikhtilāl) in [the district] of Wā'ilah, so al-Hādī set out in person to [deal with the offenders]. He took control of Kitāf [which was] where the brigands (mufsīdan) came from, and [there] his soldiers pillaged anything they came across and cut down the vines.

Al-Hādī then set out for a place called al-Mītla and did there likewise. Whereupon Wā'ilah came requesting safe-conduct and [this the imam] granted them. [After this, al-Hādī] returned to Sa'dah taking [with him] a group of their worst [offenders].

Meanwhile, dissension (ikhtilāf) had broken out between the Yu'firids and their clients (mawā'ilīm), the two sons of Yu'fir sending a message to al-Dū'ām b. ibrāhīm. [In it] they requested that he write to al-Hādī urging him to come to [their aid] on the basis that they would hand over to [the imam] their territory and would join him in fighting [Al Tarīf].

Al-Dū'ām communicated to al-Hādī what the two had said, although he added that the populace could not be trusted. [However] when al-Dū'ām kept on receiving letters [from the Yu'firids], he resolved to go personally to al-Hādī. He then disposed [the latter] (thumma hayya'ahu) to set out for the south (al-Yaman).
So al-Hādī left Sa'īdah on Sunday, 3 Jumādā 1 (4 April 903) staying on the way at Khaywān and afterwards continuing on to Raydah. Meanwhile, the two Yu'fīrids had come to al-Bawn to meet al-Duqm. 

Then in the vicinity of Subul, there took place a battle between al-Hādī and Ibn Khalaf. Afterwards al-Hādī journeyed to Māṭiráh and from there proceeded to Madar where some of his men, some Khawālīmīs and those who came from Najrān asked leave to return home and thus only a few men remained with him.

When Al-Ta'if got to hear of al-Hādī's men returning home, they started out to meet him with a large force until they set up camp near to his. Al-Hādī, however, moved to a location called Itwāh and then he summoned Hamdān Himyar to come to his aid but no one responded, for they were siding with Al-Ta'if.

On Tuesday the first of Rajab (31 May 903), a fierce battle took place in which many of al-Hādī's men were killed and his son Muḥammad and others were taken captive. Muḥammad was made to enter San'a' on a mule, and there they paraded him around the markets. Al-Hādī meanwhile journeyed to Warwar. 

Then came the news that Khufūm had arrived in the Yemen for the second time, that is in Shawwāl (August-September 903) of this year. He remained in Artūl in the region of Sanhān for six days while he waited for an opportune moment to enter San'a' (yataraqqabu 'l-dukhul ila San'a'), but he was not allowed to proceed into the city. Indeed all the Sanhānīs came out to him and took him captive along with his son and nephew and imprisoned them in Bayt Baws.

Then Khufūm's followers asked his captors for a safe-conduct and with him entered San'a'. They wanted to back him
in his attempt to seize power (fa-arāda ashābuhu 'l-qiyām ma ẓāhu) but
As'ad ibn Abī Yufr and his cousin C Uthmān engaged them in conflict and
slew Khustum [at which time] the populace [began] to side with
the Yufrīds. [32]

As for Muḥammad ibn al-Hāḍī, he was imprisoned at
Bayt Baws [33] then he was transferred to Shibām and after a few days
he was released. [34]

Annotations

1. According to the Sīrat, a revolt had actually broken out in late
Ramadan of the preceding year (i.e. first week of September 902), led by
Ibn C Abbād (for whom see above, p. 136, n.5) and apparently instigated by
Abī Ṭarīf and backed by an Ibn al-Ḥakamī. (could this have been
Ibrāhīm b. C Ālī or al-Ghitrī? - see below, p. 205, n.4,5). The rebels set
up their base at C Alaf (see above, p. 135, n.3) and started plundering and
killing in the surrounding districts.

Previous to this, the Sīrat mentions a clash between Yām and
B. al-Ḥārith and an outbreak of lawlessness and then al-Hāḍī's subsequent
imprisonment of a group of tribesmen (100 in all) from Yām, B. al-Ḥārith and
Wādi C aḥ. This perhaps took place in Rajab 289 / June-July 902.
Ibn C Abbād, however, does not seem to have had a hand in these troubles:
see above, p. 189, n.24.

For the above events, see C Abbāsī, Sīrat, 243,1-18.

2. To a place called al-Hadā'iq. Van Arendonk (Débuts, 192,n.3) thinks it is west of Ṣan C ā but cf. Forrer, Südarabien, 120,n.2. - a two
hours' journey N of Ṣa C dah. From the Sīrat context, it is perhaps only a few
hours from Ṣa C dah and certainly not more than a day's journey and would seem
indeed to lie to the west: see CAbbāst, Ṣīrat, 243,20 - 244,3. AkwaC describes it as being still a place of gardens: Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 164,2,n.1.

3. The Ghāyat text as it stood, wa-waqaC a taraf qitāl, did not make much sense, ( see Arabic text, p.57 ). A scribal error seems to have occurred for our author apparently had the Ṣīrat narrative in mind which has at this point: fa-Cabba'a ( scil. al-Hādī ) Caskarahu Calā atāf al-balad ( scil. al-Ḥāda'īq ) wa-waqaC a 'l-qitāl min jawānib al-balad ( CAbbāst, Ṣīrat, 244,1 ).

4. Q.v. above, p. 135 , n.3.

5. See Kazimirski, Dictionnaire,l, 609.

6. Batn min Shākir [ b. RabīCah ]; CAbbāst, Ṣīrat, 244,10; and see above, p. 95 , n.9, and Hamdānī, Iklīl.X, 237 - Wā'ilah b. Shākir. Their territory lies east of Sa'dah: WaysT, Yaman, 196., and cf. map facing 111.

7. See above, introduction p. 60.

Kitāf ( with kasrah ), 39 km E, slightly N, of Sa'dah on TPC map: see Map 1, B5 ( cf. WaysT, Yaman, 116, and map facing 111 ).

Kitāf is apparently the Aktaf of Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 160,5, and n.4., 241,12., ( cf. ed. Muller,ll, 82 ); cf. also, Forrer, Südarabien, 116,n.12, SE of Sa'dah; and Arendonk, Débuts, 193, Kutāf. See also, Hamdānī, Iklīl.X, 237,132-3, where Kitāf ( sic ) is the first cousin once-removed of Shākir. ( for whom see above, p. 95 , n.9 ), viz. Kitāf b. Karīm b. al-DuCām al-Akbar b. Mālik b. MuCāwiyyah. Kitāf and Wā'ilah are thus second cousins: see above, n.6. Cf. Jazīrat, 316,3f, and 165,2f, Kitāf: one of the wadis of Wā'ilah.

8. CAbbāst, Ṣīrat, 244,10f says that Wā'ilah qad ahdathū ff tarīq Najrān ahdāthan. This suggests brigandage and highway-robbery and further on ( 244,18 ), the Ṣīrat says that al-Hādī's troops pillaged what they found ( in Kitāf ) min māl wa-ghayrihi. Cf. above, p. 186 n.14.

This is not necessarily the same place as Talāḥ as Van Arendonk (Débuts, 193.n.1) thinks likely (cf. his Ṭulāḥ, Ṭulaᶜ). Talāḥ (with a fathāh) is a mountain adjacent to Barat (q.v. above, p. 104f., n.1) and is clearly in Duhmah territory: Hamdānī, Jazīrat (ed. Müller) II, 82: and Forrer, Südarabien, 116.n.10.

10. To wit, Āl Tarīf: likewise in the Sīrat not mentioned by name at this juncture, but called ābīd (meant as an insult of course for they were a noble family of aqwāl origin - see above, p. 151, n.9), but further on one reads concerning ibn al-Ḍahlāk (see below, n.28) that at that time he was māʾīlan mawl Āl Tarīf; Ābāsī, Sīrat, 245,5,17., 246,1.

11. The Sīrat also does not identify them (cf. rajulayn min Āl Yuᶜ fir - Ābāsī, Sīrat, 216,7, and see above, p. 161f., n.49). Here, however, the "two sons" are most probably Ĕ Uthmān b. Ṭahmād and his first cousin once-removed, Ās ē ad b. Ḳibrāhīm, called respectively by Īdrīs. Kanz, f. 178a,12f. Ĕ Uthmān (a reading to be preferred to Ĕ Umar even though the thāʾ is not clearly indicated, see the same page of Kanz, line 17, Ĕ Uthmān, clearly,)

b. Ābī 'I-Khayr and Ās ē ad ibn Ābī Yuᶜ fir

The author of the Kanz says that Ĕ Ujj [b. Ḥājj] (see above, p. 189, n.25), who seems to have been given responsibility by al-Muktaff for Yemeni affairs in addition to his remaining governor of Mecca, renewed the sovereignty of the two Yuᶜ firids (tajīdī wilāyatithimā) over the Yemen on behalf of the Ė Abbasids; see f. 178a,12f; Arendonk, Débuts, 228,n.4; cf. Ibn Ė Abd al-Majīd. Bahjat, 37, N-j-h b. Najāh instead of 'Ujj.

12. The Arabic text (see p. 58) has at this juncture: al-mawahī. 

13. Cf. Kazimirski. Dictionnaire II, 1463, .... disposer; and cf. also, Zābīdī, Tāj, 519, (1st. form of verb) ḥāʾa ilayhi yahāʾu ...... ishīq. Al-Duᶜ am met al-Ḥādī at Asal (or Asil) two (Arab) miles from

14. See above, pp. 94-5, n.5.


16. A Monday (Freeman-Grenville). However, Abbāsī, Sīrat, 245,14 has at this point, 2 Jumādā I, which is thus 3 April - a Sunday.

17. Al-Hādī refused to destroy the house and property of Ibn al-Dahhāk (cf. above, n.10). The latter, one of the prominent shaykhs of Ḥāshid, was Abū Ja'far Ahmad b. Muhammad b. al-Dahhāk (not Muhammad b. al-Dahhāk as Ryckmans assumed: Arendonk, Débuts, 170,1 bis), descended from Abū Mu'ād and extolled by al-Hamdānī as sayyid. See above, pp. 94-5, n.5.

18. See Arabic text, p. 59. The Sīrat has at this juncture: wa-kataba 'l-Du'ām ilā bna' Yu'fir an yalqayahu ilā 'l-Bawn fa-fa'ilā wa-kharaja ff ilqā'ilhimā hattā 'Itaqaw bi-'l-Ghayl, (Abbāsī, Sīrat, 246,3f). Thus the (two) sons of Yu'fir went to al-Bawn to meet al-Du'ām, not al-Hādī as would be assumed by an unsuspecting reader of the Ghāyat text on the basis of the pronoun suffix of the verb, wa-laqahu (sic).

Wilson, ("Investigation", 129-30), in his detailed discussion of this incident and what follows.(see below, n.20), therefore translates the Ghāyat: "...... Then he [al-Hādī] advanced to Raydah and the two sons [sic] of Yu'fir met him in the Bawn". Although he often refers to the Sīrat, Wilson, strangely, does not point out the inaccuracy of the Ghāyat at this juncture.

The Sīrat, (quoted above), makes it doubly clear that two Yu'firids were involved (presumably Uthmān and Asād - see above, n.11), while our text (MSS Ayn and Khā'ī) has simply 'bnā, which, of course, can be interpreted either as ibnā or abnā' since both scribes habitually omit the hamzah after the all of prolongation, (cf. abnā in MS Bā'). Āshūr, (whose text Wilson is translating), in recording, confidently without comment, ibnā Yu'fir, is manifestly relying on the dual forms that precede this incident - see Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn, Ghāvat, I, 188.

Al-Ghayl is probably the village of that name 32 km due S of Raydah (see Map 2, A2), and not al-Ghayl which has already occurred in our text, (see above, text p. 143, and p. 167, n.71). The Yu'firids had probably retreated to Shibām, their traditional stronghold, after their rupture with
Al Ţarfī, and so al-Ghayl, about 16 km to the E of Shibām, would have been most suitable as a place for a meeting with al-Du‘ām. It is presumably the same village as al-Ghayl which occurs later in the Sīrat (274,6f.), where it is clearly a place on the way from Shibām to Raydah. It could be described as being situated in the southern limits of al-Bawn al-‘A‘lā (see above, p. 109, n.21), and on the YAR map it is marked as a scattered settlement some 5 km E, slightly N, of Ḥāz: LC 9816 (1544 A3).

Al-Hādī sent his trusted henchman, the Yarsumī Muhammad b. Sa‘īd (for whom see Arendonk, Débuts, 160 and n.2 bis), with al-Du‘ām to extract from the two Yu‘irids their sworn pledges that they were his allies against Al Ţarfī. Al-Hādī and al-Du‘ām were to proceed to San‘ā‘, and the Yu‘irids were apparently to return to Shibām until they were needed. See Sīrat, 246,4-7.

19. Our text jumps abruptly from al-Bawn to Subul in Mashriq Khawlān, east of San‘ā‘, (see above, p. 184, n.2). In his over-hasty abridgement of the Sīrat at this point, (see C.Abbāsī, Sīrat, 246,10f.), our author omits to mention that al-Hādī travelled east to Madar (q.v. above, p. 168, n.72), and then proceeded south, across the eastern side of Zāhir Hamdān, presumably. Probably al-Hādī had taken a similar route two years previously (see above, text p. 143) when he travelled from Madar to San‘ā‘, and he had also gone that way to Hadaqaqān (see above, pp. 150-1, n.7,8).

20. The Sīrat should be consulted for details of the events at Subul and in the region close by, (C.Abbāsī, Sīrat, 246,11 - 247,4). The gist of the Sīrat account is as follows:- Al-Hādī set up his camp at Subul. Then, learning that Ibn Khalaf had set up his at Bayt Uqab (see above, p. 184, n.2), he feared for [the safety] of his men (fa-hadhara ʿala ʾaskarīhi). not "he warned his force" as in Wilson's word for word translation of part of this passage, ("Investigation", 129: cf. Kazimirski, Dictionnaire, I, 396, craindre, avoir peur..... and Lane, Lexicon, II, 534a,b; and it would seem that hadhara ʿala has the force of the modern colloquial
khāfa ʿalā). So, leaving apparently most of his men behind at Ṣubul, al-Hādī moved to Bayt Ḥādir, 5 km W, slightly S, of Bayt ʿUqab and 13 km E, slightly S, of Ṣanʿā (see Map 3, C2 and YAR MB 287965 - sheet 1544 C2), where he awaited reinforcements from Jaʿfar al-Manākīh, and al-Rabīʿ ibn al-Ruwayyah and his brother Abū ʿl-ʿAshīrah (see above, p.178f, n.110 and cf. p.188, n.19). The reinforcement troops, however, tarried and lost interest (fa-lābibū ʿalayhi wa-thaquū). Meanwhile at Ṣubul, presumably, supplies had become scarce (wa-qalla ʿl-marfiq/mirfiq), so many of al-Hādī's men deserted him. At this, a force set out from Ṣanʿā, (probably belonging to Āl Ṭārif), and attacked the camp at Ṣubul (fa-taʿaraud li-ahl Ṣubul, - not, "to within reach of ....." as in "Investigation", 129: cf. Lane, Lexicon, V, 2005b, and Kazimirski, Dictionnaire II, 208, combattre) and fighting ensued.

Then two bouts of heavy fighting occurred (apparently in the vicinity of Bayt Ḥādir) between a force led personally by al-Hādī and Ibn Khalaf's troops and on both occasions the latter were driven back to their fortress. The fortress is unspecified, but both Ālab (q.v. above, p.171, n.85) and Zubr Ḥaddayn (q.v. above, pp. 174-6, n.100) would suit the context well, and both are also on elevated ground. (cf. ..... hattā atla ʿumum ilā qalʿatīhim - Strat, 247,1).

According to Idrīs, Kanz, f. 178a,9-11, Ṣanʿā had reverted to Yūfirid rule soon after al-Hādī's exit from the city (see above, text p. 183). Then Ibrāhīm b. Khalaf (Ibn Khalaf of our text, who was a member of Āl Ṭārif - see above, p.151,n.12), had taken control of Ṣanʿā (initially, presumably, on behalf of the Yūfirids) having come to an agreement with Abū ʿl-ʿAshīrah ibn al-Ruwayyah, whom al-Hādī may have appointed in charge of the city before his return to Ṣaʿdā, that makhālīf Madhjadi if jamīʿī ʿl-Yaman ilayhi.

However, this last statement is probably not to be taken literally: perhaps
Abū 'I- Ashīrah was given the territory of Ans, (east of Dhamār as far as Rada'), where his family had settled: see Hamdān, Jazārat, 187,10f., 188-9.

21. Presumably not far from Wadi Shar (N of Wadi al-Sirr: see Glaser, Reise, map 3, 41°50'-15°35', W. Sīra') since the latter, along with Maṭirah, belong to Udar b. Sa'd b. Asbā'ā: Hamdān, Jazārat, 239.12; Forrer, Südarabien, 183; cf. Gochenour, "Penetration", map facing 273, Udar Maṭira (sic) due E of Raydāh: cf. however, Jazārat, 154.4., 155.1.1, where Maṭirah would seem to be closer to Wadi al-Sirr than to Wadi Shar, since it is mentioned along with Jabal Dhabāb which is in the higher reaches of Wadi al-Sirr to the north: see Rathjens & Wissman, Landeskundliche, fig. 40, Dj. Dhabāb; and Wadi al-Sirr on Map 2, C2.

22. Q.v. above, p. 168, n.72.


24. It is indicated as a small settlement on the YAR map about 4½ km NE of Madar, in modern Nāḥiyat Arḥab: MC 222453 (1544 A2). See Map 2, C3, and Hamdān, Jazārat, 158.2, n.3.

25. Al-Hāḍī sent șawārikh to the towns and villages (the Sirāt has Hamdān, not Hamdān Himyar), but to no avail, for they all declared their support for Al Tarīf. See C Abbāsī, Sirāt, 247,11-14: and Landberg, Dattnois,III, 2125: sārikh, criant au secours.


It was Ibn al-Dahhāk (see above, n.17) who, although described by al-Hamdān (Ikīl.X, 67) as Muḥammad's captor and, although he was fighting
on the side of Al Tarīf, in fact saved Muhammad’s life. The latter was on a colt which was too weak to go any further. Subsequently he was struck on the head by a stone and fell to the ground unconscious. fa-lahiqahu (scil. Muhammad) ;'l-qawm fa-tama bi-isābatihi .... fa-hāla (scil. Ibn al-Dahhāk) bayn al-qawm wa-bayn isābatihi. After that, Muhammad was handed over as a captive to Ibn Khalaf.

Ibn al-Dahhāk’s chivalry was never forgotten by Muhammad nor by his brother Ahmad. A trusted friendship was established between them, and Ibn al-Dahhāk kāna lahuma ni'ma 'l-sāhibu wa-'l-wazīru ġalā umūrīhimā:

Hamdānī, Ikīlī, X, 67.

27. See above, p. 188f., n.22. Again al-Hādf called Hamdān to come to his aid, and he also wrote to Ja'far al-Manākī (for whom see p. 179, n.110) for financial help, but in vain. Then al-Hādf returned to Sa'dah.

See ġAbbāsī, Sirat, 250,2-13.


29. Artul, according to ġAbbāsī, Sirat MS, f. 107b,3, (where there is clearly a fathah over a hamzah and a dālmaḥ over the tāʾ, but cf. Zakkar’s edit. 253,2, Artul), and as this might very well reflect the older pronunciation, I have preferred Artul to Artil. Artil is manifestly the modern pronunciation: cf. the YAR map, and Wilson, "Investigation", 175. On the YAR map the place is indicated just over 2 km due S of Bayt Baws: MB 146861 (1544 C1).

See Map 3, A1, and also Arendonk, Débuts, 231 (Artul) and n.7.

Idrīs, Kanz, f. 178a,14, does not give the name of the place but speaks of a qaryah min hawz (at? - this word is difficult to make out) Banī Shihāb, cf. Ibn ġAbd al-Majīd, Bahjat, 38. Ya’zii qaryah min qurā Banī Shihāb.

Cf. however, hāzat Banī Shihāb, west of San ġa': Hamdānī, Ikīlī, I, 413,n.1.

See also below, p. 220, n.14.

Sanḥān, in our text, is the name of the region immediately to the south of San ġa': see Waysī, Yaman, 77-8.
30. Idrīs, Kanz, f. 178a.14-15 only mentions Ḥ-rāḥ (Jarrah or Haraj? - cf. Geddes, "Yuṭ firid", 91.n.44) and Ibrāhīm b. Khalaf, and adds: 

ka-'l-musallimayn alayhi wa-'l-musallimayn li-‘l-umāra[’] lahu. In Abbāsī, Strat. 270.12ff, Jar(r)ah, (the same man presumably), abandoned Ibn Khalaf and joined up with the Yuṭ firids. Perhaps he is brother of Abū 'l-Atāhiyāḥ, or it is possible that Ibn has dropped out of the Strat and Kanz narratives (since Jarrah by itself seems odd in the context). I.e. he is in fact Ibn Jarrah. In the latter case, he might be 'Abdullāh b. Jarrah, or Husayn b. Jarrah: cf. above, p. 153 n.19 and below, p.227f, n.3.

31. Cf. Idrīs, Kanz, 178a.16 where it is narrated that Khufutum got out of Zahr, (to where he had been moved from Bayt Baws), by a ruse. According to the Strat, he was met on his arrival in San'āʾ by the Yuṭ firid(s) (perhaps by As'ad and Uthmān) which suggests that they had a hand in his escape. Shortly before Khufutum's arrival, Ibrāhīm b. Khalaf (see above, p. 197 et infra) fled San'āʾ for Tihāmah. See Abbāsī, Strat, 272,13-16, n.4. These events occurred it seems at the end of Safar of the following year (291), viz. mid-January 904: see Strat, 270,16.

32. Concerning this struggle for power, the Strat is silent. In fact only in passing does it mention that Khufutum was killed: Abbāsī, Strat, 273,9.

According to the Kanz, Khufutum at first asked As'ad and Uthmān to hand power over to him but when they procrastinated he attacked them unawares, wa-kabasa alayhima. They tried to flee (San'āʾ, presumably,) but were prevented. In the fighting which followed, in which the Yuṭ firids were backed up by their clients and a section of the San'āʾīs, Khufutum was killed. Then the army went over to the Yuṭ firid side: fa-mala 'l-Jaysh ilayhima, (presumably a reference to the troops that Khufutum had brought with him).

33. According to the Sīrat, he was imprisoned first of all in Ṣanʿā', along with Muhammad b. Saʿd (see above, p. 196, n.35), during the months of Rajab, Sha'bān, Ramāḍān and the first ten days of Shawwāl 290 (i.e. 31 May - 6 September 903, and apparently they were joined for a time by Ḥašāb b. al-Muʿāwān al-Yāfī - see below, p. 216, n. 35). Then the imam's son and his companion were moved to Bayt Baws. See ʿAbbasī, Sīrat, 252,16-20.

On 7 Shawwāl / 3 September 903, Khufūm, his son and his nephew had also been imprisoned at Bayt Baws but, subsequently, Khufūm and the Yuʾfirids Ibn Abī ʿl-Khayr, (presumably ʿAbd al-Qāhir - see above, p. 161f., n.49), were transferred to Zahr: see Sīrat, 253,3-14.

For the poems that Muḥammad wrote while in prison, see Sīrat, 253-70.

34. Muḥammad had not been imprisoned at Shibām. He was set free from Bayt Baws (see preceding note) as a result of a raid on the fortress carried out by the Yuʾfirids ʿAbd ad and ʿUthmān, and al-Yāfī: for details of the incident see ʿAbbasī, Sīrat, 271,6 - 272,10. It seems that Bayt Baws was not raided specifically in order to release Muḥammad. Indeed it is possible that ʿAbd ad and ʿUthmān were not even aware that Muḥammad had been moved from Ṣanʿā' to Bayt Baws, especially since he had been taken there at night, and in a palanquin: see Sīrat, 252,19f. Muḥammad was almost killed (by one of the Yuʾfirid force apparently), after he and Muḥammad b. Saʿd had been stripped of all their clothes! Eventually they met up with ʿAbd ad, who proceeded to treat Muḥammad with the utmost deference, and personally helped free him from his fetters. This was on Sunday, 25 Șafar 291 / 17 January 904, a Tuesday (Freeman-Grenville) - cf. Sīrat, 270,16., 271,6.

Muḥammad stayed in Shibām while the Yuʾfirids, his hosts, could ensure his safe journey back to Saʿdah, for they obviously feared he might be waylaid by the ʿAl Ṭarīf faction or even by supporters of Khufūm, (who was killed while Muḥammad was at Shibām - see above, n.32). The relationship
between the Yu'firids and al-Hādī and his sons was a curious one. Clearly there was rivalry between the two families as to who could rule the Yemen effectively, and indeed the Yu'firids had recently been encouraged in their ambitions by the Abbasid caliph when he renewed their wilāyah (see above, n.11). However, there was also it appears a recognition on the part of the Yu'firids of that charisma which al-Hādī and his sons undoubtedly possessed. Perhaps As'ad and Uthmān, in particular, were torn between political ambition and sincere religious attachment to Ahl al-Bayt. The remarkable incident referred to above is indicative of such attachment. When engaged in freeing Muhammad, As'ad dismissed his servants' offer to take over from him declaring: "In truth, I regard contact [with the body] of this scion of the Apostle of God as a means of obtaining a blessing" (innamā ana atabāraku bi-massī 'bni rasūli 'llāh), - see Sīrat, 272,6-9.

Before Muhammad left Shibām, As'ad and Uthmān sent him their apologies for the delay in his departure, along with horses (probably), garments and a sword: Sīrat, 274,2f.

**********

Year 291 [from 24 November 903]

In this [year], Muḥammad ibn al-Hādī was released from the prison at Shibām [1] and then was reunited with his father (fānahṣā bi-abīhi) in Sa'dah. [2]

him, and the two [ Ḥakāmīs ] sent solemn pledges ( al-ʿuhūd al-ghalīzah ) in this respect. [6]

Letters continued [ reaching the imam ] in a similar vein, so al-Ḥādī summoned the Khawlān tribes and led them [ down ] into Tiḥāmah [ where ] they alighted at a place called al-S-r-r. [7] Then a large body of men from Ḥajūr [8] joined them after which they went on to a locality known as al-ʿAnbarah. [9] [ There ] a message reached [ the imam ] from al-Ḥakāmā asking him to come to a place called Ṭartār. [10]

So [ al-Ḥādī ] set off thither and was met by men from al-Ḥakāmā [ offering him ] hospitality and [ giving him ] fodder [ for his ] horses. Now al-Ḥakāmā had seized [ the fodder ] from the people under his rule and when al-Ḥādī learnt of this, he had sent back to the local populace what had been taken from them [ by force ] saying: " It is not lawful for us to take it! " He [ also ] sent back the men who had come from al-Ḥakāmā.

[ The latter ] was amazed at al-Ḥādī's conduct, regretting that he had ever petitioned him to come to [ his land ]. He abandoned his intention to give allegiance to [ the imam ] despite [ all ] the solemn pledges ( al-ʿuhūd al-akhīdah ) and then, getting together a large force, he set off with them to engage al-Ḥādī in combat. [ The imam ], however, fiercely set upon them ( fa-awqaʿa bi-him ) [11] and al-Ḥakāmā was routed, but al-Ḥādī went off in his pursuit and slew a large number of his men. [12]
Annotations

1. But see above, p. 201, n.34.

2. He journeyed via al-Ghayl, Raydah, Warwar and Ghurag (q.v. below, p. 223 n.22). He had met up with al-Du'am after he had left Warwar apparently, but from Ghurag to Sa'dah he was accompanied by al-Du'am's son Muḥammad: see Abbāsī, Sīrat, 274.6-10.

3. Our author is most probably incorrect in his chronology at this juncture. Al-Hādī received messages from Ibrāhīm b. ʿAlī and al-Ghiṭrif (see following two notes) in Dhū 'l-Qa'dah 292/September-October 905 according to the sequence of events in the Sīrat, after he had returned to Sa'dah from Najran where he had crushed another revolt: see below, text p. 208., and p. 211, n.12,13,16. There would seem to be no cogent reason for not preferring the Sīrat chronology especially since the latter fits in admirably with other events in the Yemen at that time (viz. 292/November 904 - October 905 in general, and the end of 292 and the beginning of 293, i.e. October - early November 905, in particular).

The Sīrat relates that before al-Hādī set out for Tiḥāmah, he despatched his son Muḥammad to Khaywān telling him that he must be ready to proceed to Ṣanʿā' to fight the Qaramiṭah (sic) if instructed to do so: see Abbāsī, Sīrat, 295.15-17. Clearly al-Hādī believed that a Fatimid attack on Ṣanʿā' was imminent, or at least a possibility. No such attack was likely in 291/November 903 - November 904. It is only after ʿAlī b. Faḍl had killed Jaʿfar al-Manakhl and had occupied all Jaʿfar's former territories (see below, text pp. 208-9), probably in Shābān 292/June-July 906, that the Fatimids posed a serious threat to Ṣanʿā'.

According to the Ghayat, ʿAlī b. Faḍl sacked Ṣanʿā' on 10 al-Muḥarram 293/11 November 905, (but cf. below, pp. 220-2, n.16). Allowing for al-Hādī's procrastination in coming to the aid of the Ḥakīmīs
and his sending trusted followers down to Tihamah in order to ascertain the veracity of their intentions. (see STRat, 295.9-13). Al-Hādī may have left Sa'dah in Dhu 'l-Hijjah 292 / October 905. Perhaps, however, (as is suggested by Van Arendonk. - see Débuts, 234). Al-Hādī's departure took place early in al-Muḥarram 293, (early November 905). The STRat (389.20) records that C Alī b. Faḍl began his march north on 1 al-Muḥarram 293 / 2 November 905, and it would then have been obvious to all that his intention was to capture Ṣanʿā' (but cf. below, p. 216, n.35).

4. Al-Ḥakamī, (cf. C Abbāsī, STRat, 295.8 where Ibrāhhim b. Ālī and al-Ghiṭrīf are called al-Ḥakamīyyayn). It seems to be a possibility that Ibrāhhim was the ruler of Zabīd - Map 1, A2. (see below, p. 213, n.22; and cf. STRat, 295.15 where al-Hādī tells his son to expect his letters to reach him from Zabīd). If so, then it is he who provided Jaʿfar al-Manāḳhī with a sizeable army, (albeit to no avail) - see below, text p. 208. It would have been the fear of a second Fatimid onslaught into Tihamah that induced Ibrāhhim to contact al-Hādī with the apparent intention of offering him allegiance.

5. Most probably al-Ghiṭrīf b. Muhammad al-Ashaj(j) (but C Abbāsī. STRat, MS, f. 135b, 16 does not easily bear this reading. - Arendonk, Débuts. 234, n.6 suggests, tentatively, Abajj), cousin of C Abdullah b. al-Khaṭṭāb al-Ḥakamī, since the former is described as a profligate, a tyrant, a hater of the truth and those who follow it (wa-kāna rajulan fāsiqan zāliman mubghidan li-l-ḥaqq wa-ahlīhi). Also, he is given a curse by the author of the STRat, and all this would fit in with what he did in the way of breaking his pledges to al-Hādī, and then fighting him.

See STRat, 335, 9-12.
6. Al-Hādī, however, was clearly hesitant in accepting them: see above. n.3 (final paragraph).

7. Abbasī, Sirat, has at this juncture al-Sh-r-s (MS, f. 117,19) and al-Sharis (Zakkār’s edit. 296,3). Both the Sirat and Ghayat clearly indicate a specific place (fa-nazala / wa-nazala bl-mawdi ṣuqā’u lahu ....), and also indicate that it is in Tihāmah. Also the article should be noted.

These two latter factors would seem to disqualify the place of our text being identified with Sharis which, according to Akwa, is an inhabited locality, (on a wadi of the same name), on the way from Sānī to Hajjah (NW of Jabal Maswar – see Map 1, B3) possessing a flourishing Sunday market: see Hamdānī, JazTrat, 111,2,n.2, and cf. Werdecker, "Contribution", map, "Šeres", about 8 km NE of Hajjah. The fact that Sharis exists as a locality as well as a wadi seems to have escaped Van Arendonk (Détails, 235,n.2) and Wilson ("Investigation", 316). Wadi Sharis flows north of Jabal Maswar in a NW direction, and then eventually flows along the southern borders of Sharafayn, the mountainous region NW of Hajjah, beyond Hajūr (q.v. following note): see Waysī, Yaman, 104, 106.

Thus I have represented the place as al-S-r-r in the translated text, hoping that further research will reveal the name of a locality in Tihāmah by that name (or, possibly, al-Sh-r-s).

8. The mountainous region (overlooking Tihāmah), NW of Hajjah, and NE of al-Luḥayyah (on the coast) – beyond Wadi Mawr: see Waysī, Yaman, 99 and map facing 111.

9. A town on the coast clearly in the vicinity of al-Qurashiyyah, (along with which it is mentioned by Ibn al-Mujāwir), the latter place being one farsakh NW of Zabīd (see Map 1, A2) on the way to Ghulāfiqah (the modern Ghulayfiqah): see Mustabsir, 238-9; cf. Zabīdī, Taj,XVII, 329, al-Qurashiyyah qaryah .... min a’māl Zabīd, XIII, 149, al-‘Anbarah .... bl-sawāhil Zabīd.
10. If al-\textsuperscript{C}Anbarah has been identified correctly (see preceding note), al-Had\textsuperscript{F} will have cut across Tih\textsuperscript{M}mah from beneath Haj\textsuperscript{R} in a SW direction. He would hardly have retraced his steps, so it seems that Tart\textsuperscript{R} would have been E or SE of al-\textsuperscript{C}Anbarah. Also, Ibn al-Muj\textsuperscript{W}ir does not mention the place, so it is unlikely to have been on the coast. Hamd\textsuperscript{N}T. Jaz\textsuperscript{R}at. 330.6 mentions in passing that there is a Tart\textsuperscript{R} in Hakam territory.

11. See above, p. 156, n.30.

12. Almost 200. The S\textsuperscript{F}rat account ends thus: \textit{wa-ar\ddot{a}d\ddot{u} la\ddot{u}q al-Hakam\textsuperscript{T} il\ddot{a} qaryatih\textsuperscript{i}}, \textsuperscript{C}Abb\textsuperscript{S}T. S\textsuperscript{F}rat. 297,14f. Then there is a lacuna in all the known MSS: see Arendonk, D\textsuperscript{B}euts. 235,n.7. Might not the qaryah have been Zab\textsuperscript{T}d?
In al-Muharram [November-December 904] of this year, Ibrahīm b. Khalaf set out from al-Kadra' making for Jabal Dhukhar. When he reached the side of the mountain (taraf al-jabal) he was confronted by a slave of Adnān who ruled the mountain. [The man] slew Ibrahīm, putting his men to flight, and despatched his head to his lord.

In this year, there took place a conspiracy (tawātu') between Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Ā'jam and ʿUthmān b. ʿAḥmad to seize Kawkabān. After ʿUthmān had taken the town, Asād ibn ʿAbd al-Yūfīr set off from Saʿdah to fight him sending on an army ahead which ascended the mountain from a place called Bayt Khuyām while he himself followed in the rear.

Asād then invested Kawkabān until he was able to take it. After arresting ʿUthmān b. ʿAḥmad, he stayed in Shibām for a few days before returning to Saʿdah.

Also in this year, Banū l-Fāhrīth in Najrān rebelled against al-Ḥadīr and fighting ensued between them and al-Ḥadīr's governor. Then, al-Ḥadīr set out from Saʿdah to fight the rebels. He besieged them, and his men pillaged (wa-stabaha) their land and cut down their palm-trees. At this they asked al-Ḥadīr for a safe-conduct which he granted, after which he went back to Saʿdah. This year also, ʿAlī b. Faḍl advanced on al-Mudhaykhirah for the second time. This time he took [the city] and captured the fortress of al-Taḵar.

Jaʿfar al-Manākhi was driven down to Tiḥmah [where] the ruler of Zabīd supplied him with a substantial military force. On his way back to regain al-Mudhaykhirah, there took place a great battle.
between him and ʿAbd b. Faḍl in Wadi Ṯakhlah. In that battle on the hill of Ṯawalah, Jaʿfar al-Manākhi was slain along with his cousin ʿAbd al-Futūḥ.

Thus the might of Ibn Faḍl grew apace. He took possession of the territories which al-Manākhi had ruled over and there set up his capital. Then he made for the province of Yaḥṣib, captured Mankath and razed it to the ground. After this, he proceeded to Dhamār but at Hirran encountered a huge force loyal to the Ťiwāl. However, he sent messages to the commander of the Hirran [garrison] and tried to win him over to his side until eventually the governor gave him allegiance (wa-stamālahu hattā wālāhu).

Annotations

1. The city in Tihamah, today in ruins, 6 miles SE of present-day al-Marawi, (which is 30 km E of al-Hudaydah - see Map 1, A2: Ways, Yaman, 92), was situated on the banks of the Wadi Sahām: Hamdānī, Jazrāṭ, 74,2, n.3. Cf. Glaser, Reise, map 2 ("Kedra", due E of "Hodeida"), and cf. Ibn al-Mujawrī, Mustabsir, 90. - al-Kadrāʾ; Yāqūt, Muʾjam, IV, 441. - Kadrāʾ; Maqdisī, Taqāṣīm, 69. - Kadrah; and Akwāʾ (Jazrāṭ, 74,n.3), prefers al-Kadrāʾ, with an alif maqṣūrah. See also Smith, Ayyubids, II, 168.

2. See above, p. 162, n.49.

3. Taraf probably means näḥiyah here (Zabīdī, Tāʾ, XXIV, 79), but it might be tarf: pointe d'une montagne (Dozy, Supplément, II, 37): viz. "when he reached a high-spot in the hill-country [below] the mountain [i.e. Dhukhār]." ʿAbbāsī, Sīrāṭ, 388,18, identifies the place as Ḥarrānī, fa-iimmā sāra ff taraf (tarf) al-jabal ff mawdiyyu lahu Ḥarrānī, and Sīrāṭ MS, f. 158b,1 has Ḥarālī. Arendonk, Débuts, 236 and n.6 gives Jurābāʾ.
and Geddes, " Yufirid ", 92 has Juraih. The place is most probably Jurabiz, one of the hills of the Sarat al-Masani to which Jabal Dhukhr belongs. It is near the town of Qayhamah: see Hamdani, Jazirat, 110,1, n.1,2., 123,5,11, n.3; Forrer, Suddarabien, 71; Wastes, Yaman, 61. Cf. Goenour, " Penetration ", 60: Ibn Khalaf was murdered in Haqur.


5. On behalf of the Yufirids Asad and Uthman, the rulers of San'a', since Khuftum's death (see above, text p. 192).

6. Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Zurayq (cf. Abbast, Srat MS, f. 3a,1 where Zurayq seems to have been altered, at a later date, to Ruzayq) al-Ajam (cf. Srat, ed. Zakkir, 18,5: al-Ajam), a client (mawla) of the Abbasid caliphs, had been appointed chief judge by al-Hadi when he took San'a' for the first time and he was similarly appointed by the Yufirids, Uthman and Asad. See Srat, 18,4f., 389,1. Cf. Arendonk, Debuts, 214 (Ruzaiq), 236.

No conspiracy is mentioned in the Srat account. Cf. the Srat at this juncture (389,1): wa-waqa at baynahuma (manifestly between Uthman and Asad - see preceding verb in the Srat) mushajarah, viz. strife occurred between them.


8. See above, p. 162, n.49.

9. Contrary to Arendonk, Debuts, 236,n.9, the place is mentioned also in Abbast, Srat, 389,4 (Bayt Khayam). Akwa insists it is Khuyam with the kha' having a dammah: Hamdani, Jazirat, 233,2f.n.2. Bayt Khuyam is a town in Wadi al-Ahjur beneath Kawkaban. Cf. Jazirat (ed. Muller), 107,11.
where the khāʾ is unwovelled: Sirat MS, f. 158b,5. ḥ-ŷām: Forrer.
Sudarabien, 178. Khayyām; Arendonk, Débuts, 236 and Geddes.
" Yuʿrifid ", 93. Khivām.

10. This event is referred to in Idrīṣ, Kanz, f. 178a,19.

11. Idrīṣ, Kanz, f. 178a,20 and Ibn ʿAbd al-Majīd, Bahjat, 38 continue:
wa-ʾstabadda bi-ʾl-amr ( and he [ Asʿad ] gathered to himself all power ) ʾilā
sanat thalāth wa-tisṭin wa-maʿṭayn.

   The revolt was instigated by Ibn Ḥumayd ( see p. 129f, n.27 ), and on
   this occasion Ibn Bīstām ( see p. 128f, n.26 ) played an ambiguous role.
   See Sirat, 275-290; and cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 194-5. The troubles began
   in Jumādā I March-April 905: Sirat, 275,3.


14. These were the palm-trees of Ibn Ḥumayd which al-Ḥāḍī ordered to be
   cut down after he had heard that the rebel leader was planning a fresh revolt
   with Yām ( the nomadic part of the tribe, a ʿrab min Yām ) and
   B. al-Ḥārith: ʿAbbāṣī, Sirat, 294,1ff.

15. Except to Ibn Ḥumayd ( even though he had sent his sons on his
   behalf ) unless he presented himself personally ( ʾilā an yatala bisatī );
   ʿAbbāṣī, Sirat, 294,21.

16. Where he arrived on 8 or 9 Dhūʾl-Qaʿdah / 11 or 12 September 905:
   ʿAbbāṣī, Sirat, 295,3-7. Ihdā wa-tisṭin instead of ithnatayn wa-tisṭin is
   undoubtedly a scribal error: see above, n.12,13; and Arendonk, Débuts,
   197,n.1.

17. For the career of ʿAlī b. Faḍl up to this point and that of his
   colleague in the Fatimid daʾwah, Abū ʿl-Qāsim ʿMansūr al-Yaman ", see:-

18. See Map 1, B1. It is indicated 20 km W, slightly S, of Dhū Jiblah and 32 km NW of al-Janad: YAR LA 8835 (1343 B2).

It was the capital of the territory ruled over by Jaʿfar b. ʿIbrāhīm al-Manākhī. See Kay, Yaman, 222–3 (notes); Ibn Ḥawqal, Sūrat, 37; Forrer, Sudarabien, 65,n.2; Hamdānī, Ikīlī, 93,5; Waysī, Yaman, 44f.

Aqwā describes it as a place of springs, meadows and orchards: Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 102f,n.1.

19. Abbāsī, Sīrat, 389,13f implies this took place mid-Rabiʿ I / about 25 January 905, but al-Khazrajī in Al-ṣajjad al-masbūk (ed. Zakkar, Akhbar, 420), specifically says that al-Mudhaykhirah was captured, along with al-Tāʾkar (by implication), on 14 ʿAḍal / 26 December 904. Arendonk, Débuts, 126 gives the latter date without denoting clearly his authority. (Idrīṣ, Kanz, 179a,18 does not mention any date). Cf. Geddes, "Apostasy", 81 where the date 291 is clearly an error.


This ancient fortress, said to have been built 3500 years ago, is now apparently the habitat of owls and crows: Jazīrat, 103f,n.1.

20. Jaʿfar b. ʿIbrāhīm b. Muḥammad Dhī al-Muthlah who ruled the territory of al-Kulā C for almost 50 years: see Hamdānī, Ikīlī, 93–5; and below, n.27 and above, n.18.
21. To a place called al-Qurtub (according to ْٰبَسُ, ْٰةِ, 389,15), an outer suburb of Zabīd (see Map 1, A2) and the name of its southern gate: Ḥamdānī, ْٰةِ, 120,n.3; ¼ farsakh [south] of Zabīd, - Ibn al-Mujāwir, Mustabsir, 236.

22. ْٰبَسُ, ْٰةِ, 389,15f names him as ٰبِحُم مَعَمَد ٰلْبِ. Who exactly the ruler of Zabīd was at that time (viz. after the death of ٰبِحُم مَعَمَد ٰبِ in 289 / 901-2) is not clear from the sources available, and Van Arendonk is justifiably hesitant: see Débuts, 126., 241,n.4. Al-Khazrajī (ed. Zakkār, ْٰكَبَر, 420) also has ٰشِب زابّ, but cf. Ḣdrīs, ْٰلَنَب, f. 179a,18f; and ْٰمَدِّي, ْٰشَف (ed. ْٰتَر). 30, which both have ٰشِب تِحَام. Geddes ("Yufrīd", 111,n.48) gives the name as in the ْٰةِ account, adding that he possibly belongs to ْٰلْبِ and is not a Ziyadid. Perhaps the ٰبِحُم of the ْٰةِ was in fact ٰبِحُم ٰلْبِ ْٰل ٍةَكَم. (see above, text p.202, and p. 205, n.4) and that there is a confusion in the ْٰةِ between the latter name and that of the Ziyadid mentioned above.

For Zabīd, see Map 1, A2. The various ingenious derivations of the name itself are recorded by Ibn al-Mujāwir in Mustabsir, 70 (translated by Smith, "Ibn al-Mujāwir's", 115). See also Smith, Ayyubids.II, 216.

23. ْٰبَسُ, ْٰةِ, 389,15f says that he refused to help al-Manākhī, but our text tallies with Ḣdrīs, ْٰلَنَب, 179a,19; ْٰمَدِّي, ْٰشَف (ed. ْٰتَر ), 30; and al-Khazrajī (ed. Zakkār, ْٰكَبَر, 420).

24. ْٰشُرُ’s footnote is useless: ْٰحَا ٰبِ ٰالْعَسُن, ْٰطَف, 195,n.3.

The wadi originates in the province around Ta’app (19 km SW of al-Janad, see Map 1, B1) and according to Akwaُ, al-Hamdānī's description of it remains unchanged. In this lush wadi are grown bananas, sugar cane (muddār) and the henna plant: ْٰةِ, 131,n.1; and see Waysī, Yaman, 31,88.

Al-Hamdānī specifically mentions Ḥisn Jawālah ( thus vocalized by Akwā ) where Ja'far b. Ibrāhīm al-Manākhi was slain, but Akwā also mentions a village in Wadi Nakhlah called al-Ḥ-wālah and a mountain in the vicinity called Kh-wālah: Jazārat, 131,3,n.3. The author of the Kashf mentions neither hill nor fortress, viz. wa-qatala Ja'faran ff 'I-Ḥ-wālah bi-Nakhlah.

Van Arendonk maintains it is ( Ḥisn ) Khawālah ( Déserts, 126 ), and likewise Geddes, " Yu fiqir ", 111 and Forrer, Sudarabien, 91. Jazārat ( ed. Müller II ), 27.41 ( index ), specifically mentions that Kh-wālah is the correct version.

- but cf. ( ed. Müller I ), 75.9 ( in text ): J-wālah. Cf. Ibn al-Dayba, Qurrat MS, f. 11a.2 - bi-akamat Kh-wālah. Neither the Strat nor the Kanz mentions the name.

In the face of such a wealth of conflicting readings and interpretations, Hawālah ( as in our transliteration ) can only be regarded therefore as tentative since, clearly, one cannot be at all certain what the correct form of this toponym actually is.


Al-Khazrajī ( ed. Zakkār, Akhbār, 421. ), gives precise dates. The battle took place on Friday the last day of Rajab, and Alī b. Fadl's army returned to al-Mudhaykhirah the next day Saturday, 1 Sha'ān / 8 June 905. ( Cf. Hamdānī, Ikhn,II, 94 where this event is dated 291 or 292; and Ibn al-Dayba, Qurrat, 1, 193. - Rajab, 291 ).

27. The balad al-Kušā, the mountainous territory in the upper reaches of Wadi Zabīd comprising Mikhlāf Ja'far, balad al-Ma'affir and Mikhlāf al-Janad.
It contained such places as al-\textsuperscript{2}Udayn, Dhū \textsuperscript{1}Sufāl, Hubaysh and Ibb, so it would be equivalent approximately to Mikhlāf al-Sahāl and present-day Liwā'. Ibb, " Al-Liwā' al-Akhḍār ". ( Ibb is about 7 km NE of Dhū Jiblāh - see Map 1, B1 ). See Arendonk, Débuts, 124; and Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 101,5., 102,n.1., 210,6ff.n.7., Iklīl, 128,n.1. Waysī, Yaman, 41-6.

28. Scil. al-Mudhaykhirah, - see above, n.18.

According to Geddes ( " Apostasy ", 81 ), CAb b. Faḍl succeeded in ruling over most of southern Yemen from his fortress of al-Mudhaykhirah by the end of 291 / 904. This date, however, manifestly contradicts his own chronology of events in " Yu\textsuperscript{2}firid ", 111-112, where, for instance, 30 Rajab 292 is given as the date for the battle at Khawālā ( sic ). Cf. above, n.26.

29. In Maqdisī, Agālīm, 53,70,113, it is a town in the Yemen highlands, one day's journey south of Dhamār. Yaḥṣīb is also a region, Yaḥṣīb al-Sufī and Yaḥṣīb al-\textsuperscript{1}Ulwā, the boundary between the two parts being apparently the Samārah pass just to the north of Ibb: Hamdānī, Iklīl, 193,n.7., 199f,n.3., Jazīrat, 214,8ff., 215,4ff ( cf. ed. Mūller I, 101. - al-Yahdībān, Yahṣīb ).

Perhaps Yuḥṣīb is the older pronunciation: see Jazīrat, 214,n.4 ( Yuḥṣīb, on the pattern " Yu\textsuperscript{2}fir "), but cf. Zabīdī, Tāji, 288, Mikhlāf Yaḥṣīb; and Smith, Ayyūbids, 214.

30. A thriving town up to the 8th / 14th century and now isolated, but still inhabited. It lies about 20 km S of Yarīm ( which is 28 km due S of Dhamār - see Map 1, B2 ) and E of Ḥaqī Yahṣīb Qatāb: Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 79,7,n.4; ( cf. " Munkat ", 4 miles S of Yarīm in Harris, Journey, map ).

31. Cf. Ḥammādī, Kāshī ( ed. Aṭṭār ), 31, and Idrīsī, Kanz, f. 179a,20; " and burnt it [ to the ground ] " ( fa-ahrāqaha ).

32. See above, p. 160, n.43.

33. Jabal Hirrān is marked on YAR map and a building / ruin is indicated there ( MB 345113 - sheet 1444 A4 ), about 3 km N, slightly W, of the centre of Dhamār ( see Map 1, B2 ). This is most probably the fortress,
which is still standing according to Akwa*. See Hamdānī, Jazārat, 149,2.n.2; Forrer, Sudarāqīn, 104,n.12; Harris, Journey, 272-80; Waysī, Yaman, 54.

34. Meaning the Yūfīrīd, Asʿad ibn Abī Yūfīr: see above, text p. 208, and n.10,11. There were 500 horse: Hammādī, Kashf (ed. ʿAṭṭār), 32.

35. This and what follows, to the end of 292, tallies with the account in Hammādī, Kashf (ed. ʿAṭṭār), 32; Idrīsī, Kanz, f. 179a,20-1; and al-Khazrajī (ed. Zakkar, Akhbar), 421. The Sīrat account is more detailed and differs considerably. Hirrān is not mentioned. The Yūfīrīd governor is in Dhamār and is identified as ʿĪsā b. al-Mūʾān al-Yāffī (for whom see above, p. 201, n.33). ʿĪsā’s son (unnamed) is the first to negotiate with ʿAlī b. Faḍl. Also, in the Sīrat these events occurred in al-Muharram 293 / November 905. See ʿAbbāsī, Sīrat, 389.20 - 390.5.

As will be seen, our author (differing apparently from all his authorities), presumes that ʿAlī b. Faḍl, after he had gained the allegiance of the governor of Hirrān, returned to the south and set out again to capture Ṣanʿā’ on 1 al-Muharram of the following year (293) / 2 November 905.

Our author blends aspects of the Ḥammādī / Idrīsī / Khazrajī tradition. That tradition precludes two expeditions and suggests that ʿAlī b. Faḍl set out from al-Mudhaykhirah in late Dhū ʿIl-Hijjah 292 / late October 905. See also Arendonk, Débuts, 237 and n.5; and Geddes, "Yuʿfīrid", 116-18.

36. Hammādī, Kashf (ed. ʿAṭṭār), 32: wa-dakhala fī millatihi wa-Qarmatatihi; i.e. he embraced the Fatimid madhhab, but the author of the Kashf means that he apostatized from Islam! (see above, p. 90, n.4 and introduction p. 70, n.2).

**********
Year 293 [ from 2 November 905 ]


Ibn Faḍl and his troops of Qarāmīṭah [9] remained encamped on the lower slopes of Nuqum ( fi’ṣafh Nuqum ) for three days. Then on Friday [11] they began ] to deploy at which Ibn Abī Yūfīr advanced on them, [ but ] they did not move out from their positions [ so ] Ibn Abī Yūfīr returned to San’a’. [ However ], [ that ] night [12]

Ibn Faḍl set out at the head of 5,000 men to attack him and, through the machinations ( si’ayat ) of Muhallab al-Shihābī, entered San’a’ by the Shihāb quarter.

He made for Ghumdān [15] and [ then ] the Great Mosque, these events [ occurring ] on the tenth of the month of Muharram of this year [ 11 November 905 ]. As’ad ibn Abī Yūfīr put up a fight until the late afternoon of that day [16] but then abandoned San’a’. [17] It was a day hard to endure ( wa-kāna yawmān āṣīban ) [18] in which the San’ānTs experienced fear, fright, terror and defeat, those that could, leaving with their wives and children. [ Thus ] the Qarāmīṭah
ravaged ( istabāna ) Sanā‘, killing, taking captives and looting. Sacred taboos were violated and outrages were perpetrated ( wa-hutikati ‘l-mahārim wa-fu‘ilati ‘l-ażā‘im ). [19]

Ibn Abī Yu‘fir, however, made off for Shibām, but the Qarmātī[20] who was on Jabal Dhukhār moved [ down ] to fight him. At this Ibn Abī Yu‘fir with his kinsfolk and household ( athqāl ) [21] left Shibām for the territory of al-Du‘ūm. [22]

Regard indeed the marvels of Fortune and the noble qualities of the beloved People of the House ( Ahl al-Bayt ), peace be upon them. Did not Al Yu‘mir and their confederates make war against the imam of the right way, profuse in generosity ( bahr al-nadā ), [23] the guide to the manifest truth, Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn? - the blessings of God be upon him. [ Did they not ] oust him and his family from Shibām? Thus God allowed this heretical Qarmātī sect to overpower them and [ so ] He [ duly ] recompensed them after the briefest passage of time for [ what they had ] done against [ the imam ]. [24]

Annotations

1. The city, now a small hamlet 19 km NE of Ta‘izz, believed in tradition to have been founded by Mu‘ād b. Jabal, and the principal city of the region before the development of hisn Ta‘izz under the Rasulids. The mosque and minaret remain to this day. See Map 1, B1; and YAR MA 098112 ( 1344 A3 ). See also, Costa, ”Mosque”, 43-67; Ibn al-Mujāwir, Mustabsir, 161-7; Hamdānī, Jazā‘rat, 77.n.3: Waysī, Yaman, 36; Akwa‘, Yaman, 81.
2. As opposed to al-Yaman al-Asfal: cf. above, p. 95, n.5.

3. Qasim b. al-Mu'ayn al-Yafi'i. (see above, p. 201, n.33). He is described in CAbbāsī, Sīrat, 252.16 as being a noble from Yāfi (min khiyar Yāfi).

4. Concerning these events, see above, p. 215, n.35.

5. See above, p. 194, n.3.

6. Cf. CAbbāsī, Sīrat, 390.7f: qītalān shahihān, scil. "(he put up) a poor fight". Probably the Sīrat description is the more accurate.

7. Geddes ("Yu'firid", 118, n.8) thinks that the 400 slain were Ibn Faḍl's men and the wording of CAbbāsī, Sīrat, 390.7f would tend to suggest that, (but see preceding note). However, the Ghayat (see Arabic text, p. 66) would seem to suggest that they were As'ad's.

8. According to CAbbāsī, Sīrat, 390.7 the battle between As'ad and al-Fadl b. Faḍl took place on Tuesday, 6 al-Muharram / 7 November 905 - but see below, n.16.

9. See above, p. 90, n.4.

10. See above, p. 172, n.88 and p. 171, n.84.

11. See Arabic text, p. 66. This is most probably 7 al-Muharram / 8 November 905. (9 al-Muharram according to the Sīrat narrative, by implication): see below, n.16.

12. CAbbāsī, Sīrat, 390.11: laylat al-sabt, scil. Friday night and not Saturday night as Van Arendonk and Geddes have wrongly assumed. - see Arendonk, Débuts, 235, n.3 and Geddes, "Yu'firid", 119. Cf. above, p. 154, n.27.

14. That is through the Sirār district in the west of Sanʿa' (see above, p. 190, n.116). According to al-Hamdānī, the origin of the B. Shihāb is disputed, viz. whether they are descended from Ḥimyar or from Kahlan but the Tūr Fat gives a genealogy from the latter, saying that they came originally from the Ḥaḍramawt. Al-Hamdānī says they came from Saʿdah. B. Shihāb settled in the region to the west of Sanʿa' during the century before Islam (6th century C.E.), having come to the aid of Sayf b. Dhī Yazan when strife had arisen between him and his cousins. See Hamdānī, Ikīlī, 413 and n.1: Ibn Rasūl, Turfāt, 125-6; ed. Serjeant / Lewcock, Sanʿa', 124-6.

15. The fortress of Ghumdān (pronounced Ghamdān by the SanʿanTs) was considered by al-Jāhiz to be one of the 30 wonders of the ancient world. Long since obliterated, part of it occupied, according to al-Hamdānī, the mound directly to the east of the Great Mosque. On that mound, says al-Hamdānī, Ibn Faḍl fortified himself the day he took Sanʿa': Ikīlī, VIII, 47-8.

For details concerning its history and the legends that have evolved around it see: Hamdānī, Ikīlī, VIII, 33-64; Ibn al-Mujawir, Mustabsir, 180-2; Akwā Yaman, 285-9; Waysī Yaman, 67,186; ed. Serjeant / Lewcock, Sanʿa', 122-3, 130-1.

16. This was a Saturday (ʿAbbāsī, Sīrat, 390,16) and Yawm ʿAshūra' (390,14), viz. 10 al-Muharram. The first day of al-Muharram 293 fell on a Saturday (cf. Freeman-Grenville, Muslim and Arendonk, Débuts, 238,n.3), so one would have expected this Saturday to have been 8 al-Muharram.

According to the Sīrat (389,20f.), ʿAlī b. Faḍl left the south (al-Mudhaykhirah, not al-Janad, is implied in the Sīrat narrative) on 1st. (mustahall) of al-Muharram. On the assumption that this day was a Saturday, the sequence of events in the Sīrat narrative suggests that ʿAlī b. Faḍl gained control of Sanʿa' on the second Saturday of the month. There are four marāhil between al-Thujjah (scil. Ibb, about 7 km NE of Dhū Jiblāh
- see Map 1, B1) and Ṣanʿā': see Maqdisī, Agāfīm, 113; Hamdānī, Jazīrat.

79, n.5. The Strat (390.6f) implies that Ibn Faḍl camped Monday night at Ṣabwah (some 11 km S of Ṣanʿā'), and the following day (dated 6 al-Muharram - 390.7) a battle took place (see above, n.8), so the march would have taken only three days which is perhaps feasible, (but see below). On Tuesday night Ibn Faḍl moved from Ṣabwah to Nuqum where he spent three days: Strat (390.9f) and our text. How can the date Saturday, 8 al-Muharram be reconciled with Yawm ʿAshūrā' (in reality, it would seem, a Monday) given in both the Strat and the Ghayat accounts, and Tuesday, 6 al-Muharram (in the Strat) with what was in fact Tuesday 4 al-Muharram?

Geddes obviously sensed a problem here. Not only does he say that the Fatimids entered Ṣanʿā' on Saturday night (see above, n.12) but he then goes on to assert, also quite fancifully, that it was the following Monday that they occupied the Great Mosque which proves, according to him, that there must have been opposition to Ibn Faḍl's occupation of the city! ("Yuʾririd", 119). It is quite clear, however, from the Strat account (390.13-16) that the Fatimids completed their occupation of Ṣanʿā' (including Ghumdan and the Great Mosque) in one day and that that day was a Saturday. (And cf. Hamdānī, Iklīl, VIII, 48, wa-tī tallihi - viz. on the mound of Ghumdan -

tahassana 'bn Faḍl al-Qarmatī (sic) yawma dakhala Ṣanʿā' wa-wālā 'l-masjid wa-malaka Ṣanʿā' wa-angada ʿalā sultānīhā wa-ahlihā.)

I cannot believe that dating the Saturday Yawm ʿAshūrā' was an act of carelessness on the part of the compiler of the Strat (the text of which at this juncture is manifestly being followed by our author). It seems to this writer that he had the tragedy of Karbala' in mind (an event ever present in the Shiʿī consciousness when the Prophet's grandson, al-Ḥusayn, and 21 members of B. Ḥāshim were massacred), and even though the actual Yawm ʿAshūrā' was two days away, he could not resist applying it to the day Ṣanʿā' was ransacked and pillaged seeing in that catastrophe Ṣanʿā' s
"Karbala', so to speak. He, or perhaps a later redactor, then dated the battle of the preceding Tuesday to fit in with this (viz. 6 al-Muḥarram).

Our author thought that Yawm Āshūrā meant literally 10 al-Muḥarram and thus wrote the latter in his text.

Cf. Geddes, "Apostasy", 82 where the date given for the capture of Ṣan ā is now 15 Muḥarram 292 (sic) / 16 November 905. Assuming that 292 (for 293) was unintentional, this date is certainly a possibility for it seems more reasonable to suppose that Āl b. Fadl took a fortnight, rather than a week, to get from al-Mudhaykhirah (or al-Janad) to Ṣan ā, bearing in mind the distance, the considerable size of his force and the military encounters at Dhamār. However, even if it is thus suggested that Ibn Fadl occupied Ṣan ā on Saturday 15 al-Muḥarram (i.e. five days later than the actual Yawm Āshūrā'), the same argument (outlined above) as to why the author of the Sirāt should have named the day Yawm Āshūrā', would still hold good.


19. Ābbāsī, Sirāt, 390.19 adds however that Ibn Fadl’s men [eventually] stopped the killing, and that only a few people had [actually] been slain.

20. Cf. Ābbāsī, Sirāt, 391.1: al-Qarmāṭī al-Kūfī. This refers to Abū ’l-Qāsim ibn Hawshab. "Mansūr al-Yaman", who was a native of Kufa and who had arrived on Jabal Dhukhār from Maswar - initially probably to meet Āl b. Fadl. See Ḥammādī, Kashf (ed. Āṭṭār), 32: ed. Zakkar. Akhbār, 422. Geddes ("Yūfīrīd", 122) says that at Asnad’s approaching [Shibām], Abū ’l-Qāsim withdrew towards Maswar "to prevent Asnad from
entering Balad Hamdân". This is clearly a misunderstanding: cf. Strat.
391,1f. As Abū I-Qāsim was coming down the mountain to fight him, he feared for himself and his family and fled. Our text is more explicit: fa-taharraka alayhi .... (see p. 68).


22. To Ghuraq and its district: Abbāsī, Strat, 391,3f. Akwa would seem to be correct when he identifies Ghuraq with Sūq al-Dū'ām (known today as Sūq Du'am) in the upper Jawf. Akwa suggests that Sūq Dū'ām was named after al-Dū'ām b. Ibrāhīm (of our text). See Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 161.n.6; above, p. 89, n.2; Map 1, B4; YAR MD 432054 (1644 C2) - Sūq Dū'ām (sic). Cf. Glaser, Reise, map 3, 42°40′-16°05′ - "Da'ām", east of Hirrān, not west (cf. Forrer, Südarabien, 117,n.14). Ghuraq, along with Warwar and Raydah, were the three great commercial centres for Bakkī:

Jazīrat, 242,7f.

As Abū I-Qāsim went to Ghuraq accompanied by his cousin Uthmān whom he had released from prison (Geddes says he had been imprisoned by Abū I-Qāsim [ibn Hawshab] - "Yu'firid", 122): see Strat, 391,2f and above, p. 210, n.7.


24. Until the end of this year (293), our author deals exclusively with the activities of Abū I-Qāsim ibn Hawshab, his two raids into Tiḥāmah (against the advice of the latter), his sacking of Zabīd and the alleged slaying of the "virgins" on his return to al-Mudhaykhirah. Concerning these happenings see: Idrīs, Kanz, f. 179a.22 - 179b.11; Ḥammādī, Kashī (ed. Aṭṭār), 32-3; ed. Zakkar, Akhbār, 421-3;
Year 294 [ from 22 October 906 ]

In [ this year ], the inhabitants of Ṣan'a' entreated al-Hādī ( upon whom be peace ) to come to them from Ṣa'dah to which he agreed and [ then ] set off. When he reached Ṣan'a', he despatched his son, Muhammad, to Dhamar and the districts round about ( makhlūfiyya ) and sent out [ his ] governors. But the Qaramitah were bent on fighting [ Muhammad ], whereupon he rejoined his father ( fa-ṣāda ilā hadrat abīhi ) in Ṣan'a'. [1]


[ but the imam ] returned back from [ the city ] to Ṣa'dah [ whereupon ] Asʿad ibn ʿAbd al-Yūfir took possession of Ṣan'a' [5] and set up his rule there.

Praise be to God! How slight is the loyalty of mankind and how noble is the character of this imam in that he did everything in his power to protect the people of this land, even though he realized that their enmity to him and their partiality towards his enemies was enough to warrant God’s withholding rain from them. But he, upon whom be peace, followed the path of his illustrious ancestors (salafihi l-kirām) in his rising up to the aid of Islam, opposing tyranny and renewing the teachings (sunnah) of his forefather, the lord of the messengers (may God’s blessings be upon him and his progeny), even although those who love dissension eschewed him (wa-in jafahu ahl al-shiqaq), and those in whose hearts hypocrisy had taken root abandoned him (a rada anhu). [11]

May God, for Islam and the Muslims, give him as satisfaction, the best requital of the righteous (fa-jazahu ‘llahu ‘l-islam wa-l-Muslimin afdala jazā’i ‘l-muhsinin). [12]

When al-Hādī received the plea for help to which we have referred, he despatched Ǧalī b. Ja’far al-Ǧawrī and al-Dumām b. Ǧibrāhīm at the head of a band of his men getting his son, Muḥammad, to follow later. When they got near to Ǧarāma, the Qarāmītah vacated [the city] whereupon Muḥammad ibn al-Hādī and his men entered it and established themselves there until the Qarāmītah arrived with [a force] against which they were powerless (bi-mā lā qibala lahum bihi). [14]

Those bent on doing battle with them were Ǧalī b. Faḍl and Dhū ’l-Tawk al-Ǧawrī. When he [Ǧalī b. Faḍl] drew near to Ǧarāma, As’Sad ibn Abī Yuṯir [went out] to confront him [17] and slew 80 of his men. [But] Ibn Faḍl’s troops proved too many for him.

In Ǧarāma, the populace realized that they were powerless to resist [Ǧalī b. Faḍl] so those who could leave, did so. [But] some of them took refuge in the houses of the Ǧalawiyūn. [18] So Ǧalī b. Faḍl entered...
San'a with his army on the first day of Rajab of this year [17 April 907]. [19] They sacked [the city] and slew anyone they came upon. [then] they made for the houses of the Alawiyyun and brought out all who had sought protection there (fa-akhraju man fihā mina 'l-mutajawwirīn) and met them with a humbling chastisement (bi-'l-ṣadāb al-muhmīn). [20]

For three years [21] the Qaramitah remained in San'a and the region round about doing corruption in the land and setting not things aright (yufsiduna fī 'l-ard wa-la yuslihuna) [22] until God subjected them to torment (hattā ramāhumu 'llāh bi-'l-ālām) [23] and hastened [His] revenge upon them. An innumerable number of them [the Qaramitah] perished. [Eventually] their despot Ibn Faḍl proceeded with the rest of his men to al-Mudhaykhirah.

In this year the Qaramitah made an appearance in Najran. Banū 'l-Hārith started to rebel and oppress [the populace] so al-Hādī went to confront them, killing several of their number and taking others prisoner. [Afterwards, al-Hādī] returned to Sa'dah. [24]

Annotations

1. In what has preceded (under year 294) and in much of what will follow, our author keeps closely to the narrative in the Kanz and al-Khazrajī's al-ṣAsjad al-masābk (q.v. above, introduction p. 31), and consequently his account is often at variance with the detailed Siurat narrative, (the Kashf and the Bahjat do not report these events). The Siurat at this point contains important information unfortunately omitted by our author, and specifically attributes these happenings to the year 293 and not 294 as in the Kanz and the ṣAsjad accounts.
Soon after the capture of Ṣan'ā', according to the Sīrat, Ibn Kabālah (see following note) abandoned Asʿad and joined ʿAlī b. Faḍl. Subsequently, however, in Rabīʿ II 293 / February 906 he switched loyalties again, returned to Ṣan'ā' and sought aid from a Ḥasanī sharīf and together they expelled, in the name of al-Hāḍī, Ibn Faḍl's agents from Ṣan'ā'. Then at their bidding, al-Ḥusayn (al-Duwām's son) arrived in Ṣan'ā', followed soon afterwards by Muḥammad (al-Hāḍī's son) sometime in Jumādā I / March 906. Then, the Sīrat continues, a group of Ṣan'ānis went to Sa'dah to petition al-Hāḍī to return to Ṣan'ā' with them, and this is where our author commences his narrative. See Ābāsī, Sīrat, 390,20 - 391,22.

According to the Sīrat (391,21f.), al-Hāḍī arrived in Ṣan'ā' on 4 Jumādā II 293 / 2 April 906. He was accompanied by ʿAlī Yuʿfir (presumably Asʿad, ʿUthmān and other relatives), al-Duwām and his son(s), al-Rabīʿ and Abū ʿl-ʿAshīrah - sons of Muḥammad ibn al-Ruwayyah (see above, p. 178 n.110), the son(s) of the former ruler of al-Mudhaykhirah (see above, p. 212 n.18) and other notables. Al-Hāḍī’s son, Muḥammad, was ousted from Dhamār by ʿIsā al-Yāfī (see above, p. 215 n.35) now fighting for ʿAlī b. Faḍl. See Sīrat, 391,22 - 392,2.; 392,13-16.

2. See above, introduction p. 59.

He first appears in the Sīrat after the fall of Ṣan'ā' to ʿAlī b. Faḍl, when he contacts the latter from Ḥahr asking for a safe-conduct: Ābāsī, Sīrat, 390,20 - 391,1. In Ḥammādī, Kashf (ed. Āṭṭār), 27 he is mentioned as being one of the Yuʿfirid military commanders and their governor over Ṣan'ā'. The date given for that in the Kashf appears to be 290, but Geddes thinks it should be closer to 292 - "Yuʿfirid", 122.n.17.

3. Likewise in Idrīs, Kanz, f. 179b,14 and ed. Zakkār, Akhbar, 423, but in Ābāsī, Sīrat, 393,6f he is Jarrāḥ b. Bishr and thus named he could be the brother of Abū ʿl-ʿĀṭāhiyah b. Bishr (see above, p. 122 n.2).
However it is tempting to consider Ibn Jarrah as in fact being al-Ḥusayn b. Jarrah mentioned in Ḥammādī, Kashf (ed. C. Āṭṭār). 27. (also in that context he is twice named: Ibn Jarrah). He was the Yuʿṭirid governor of Dīla C Shibām (presumably the fortress of Kawkabān — see p. 162, n.49: in Idrīs, Kanz, f. 178b.20f he is not named but is described as being mustahfīzan C ala hisn al-Dīla C). then allied himself with the Fatimid da C Abū ʿl-Qāsim ibn Hawshab, but then returned to his former allegiance and got Ibn Kabālah (see preceding note) to help him fight Abū ʿl-Qāsim. This might have been the beginning of a close political relationship between the two men. This suggestion need not contradict the name given in the Sīrat, since Ibn might have dropped from the latter (scil. Ibn Jarrah b. Bishr) in which case (i.e. al-Ḥusayn b. Jarrah b. Bishr), he could be the nephew of Abū ʿl-ʿAbdīniyāḥ — cf. p. 200, n.30.

4. According to C Abbāsī, Sīrat, 393,3f. the revolt led by Ibn Kabālah (Ibn Jarrah is not mentioned until after al-Ḥādiʾs return to Sa ḍah) broke out on Yawm ʿAshūrāʾ [scil. 10th] al-Muharram 294 / 31 October 906.

5. According to C Abbāsī. Sīrat, 393,3. As ʿad had gone back to balad Hamdān (to Warwar, in the upper Jawf — q.v. above, p. 188f, n.22) after his return to Sa ḍah 7 months previously. See above, n.1 and p. 223, n.22.


8. Thus in the Kanz and al-Khazrajī but in C Abbāsī, Sīrat, 392,17: to Thāt (q.v. above, p. 161, n.45) and Rada C, and according to Sīrat, 392,19 it was at the former place that Abū ʿl-ʿAshūrāh was slain.
Radāc is 50 km E, slightly S, of Dhamār: Map 1, C2 and YAR MA
8293 / 8393 (1444 D2). See Akwa, Yaman, 79-80: Ways, Yaman, 48-9: Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 80.2f.n.2; Arendonk, Débuts, 242, and n.2.

9. See preceding note, and Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 188.n.4. According to Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 392.19 - 393.2, the mosque at Thāt was burnt to the ground and there was a general slaughter of the inhabitants, this event taking place on 9 Dhū 'l-Hijjah 293 / 1 October 906. Thus in the Sīrat narrative, it precedes Ibn Kabālah's revolt and the departure of al-Hādī for Sa'ādah.

10. According to the narrative in the Kanz and al-Khazrajī, Dhū 'l-Tawq was confronted on his way to Sa'ā' by As'ad. In the Kanz, the place is identified as being to the west of Sa'ā'. It is unpointed in the MS, but it is probably to be read as Mahyab (see below). A battle took place, 300 of As'ad's own troops and many others fighting alongside them were killed after which Dhū 'l-Tawq went on to capture Sa'ā'. It was then that the Sa'āns appealed again to al-Hādī to come to their aid. See Idrīsī, Kanz, f. 179b.17-19; ed. Zakkar, Akhbār, 424.

This event has no exact parallel in the Sīrat, but the latter records an incident (Ābbāsī, Sīrat, 393.10-13) after al-Hādī had returned to Sa'ādah and As'ad had been reinstalled in Sa'ā', when Dhū 'l-Tawq and Īsā al-Yāfī set out to the west (of Sa'ā', manifestly) and set up camp at Mujīb (most probably to be understood as Mahyab, cf. Mankath in Sīrat MS, f. 160a.21) and Masyab. [Ibn] Jarraḥ and Ibn Kabālah went out from Sa'ā' to fight them. In this incident though the Fatimids were driven off and As'ad's commanders returned to Sa'ā', although 400 of the latter's men were slain. Subsequently to this incident, the Sīrat records (393.14-16) that Ibn Dhū 'l-Tawq killed Īsā al-Yāfī and a body of his men, treacherously. Presumably this happened at Mahyab or Masyab (cf. Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 156.n.1) Mahyab and Masyab (see Map 2, A1) are mentioned together twice in Jazīrat (155.4 and 234.3), and cf. Wilson, "Investigation", 449.435.
11. Cf. Zabīdī, Tāj, xviii, 409: (wa) aʿrada (ṣanhu) fī ṭādān; (ṣadda) 
wa-wallāhu zahrāhu.

12. i.e. "for the sake of Islam ....". Cf. Qur’ān, al-Baqarah, 48: ...
la-ta`jzū nafsun; an nafsīn shay`īn; and Wright, Grammar, II, 139f.

13. This is most probably an error for ʿAlī ibn Ḥaḍīr (sic).
Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Ḥubaydullāh al-ʿAbbāsī al-ʿAlāwī, the author of 
Ṣrāṭ al-Ḥāḍīr. See following note, and ʿAbbāsī, Sfrāṭ, 395.2ff., 16.6.

14. The Sfrāṭ does not mention any restoration of Zaydī rule to Ṣāhīf a in 
294. Since this alleged incident gives such a significant role to the author 
of the Sfrāṭ and, what is perhaps more worthy of note, to Abū ʿl-Qāsim 
Muḥammad (al-Ḥāḍīr's son) whose activities throughout the Sfrāṭ are given 
much prominence, it is inconceivable that a major event like this should have 
been left out of the Sfrāṭ had it ever in fact occurred.

It seems that this incident rather belongs to 297 for the similarity 
with ʿAbbāsī, Sfrāṭ, 395.2-20 which describes in detail events which happened 
then, is striking. Indeed the parallel passages (undated) in the Kanz and 
al-Khazraji respectively, commencing from the appeal of the Ṣāhīf a to 
al-Ḥāḍīr, which closely resemble our text, also are more appropriate for 297 
since both the Kanz and al-Khazraji relate that soon after al-Ḥāḍīr's followers 
returned to Ṣa`dah after the evacuation of Ṣāhīf a, al-Ḥāḍīr died.

As will be seen, however, our author also mentions the happenings of 
297 (according to the Sfrāṭ chronicling of events) under that year, but in a 
perfunctory and inaccurate form. See above, introduction p. 57, and below, 
text p. 237, and p. 238f., n.4.

15. That it is ʿAlī b. Faḍl is clear from the Sfrāṭ. Towards the end of 
Jumādā II 294 (i.e. in the second week of April 907), he had set out from 
al-Mudhaykhirah: ʿAbbāsī, Sfrāṭ, 393.16f. (The Sfrāṭ simply says ṣīl ākhir 
Jumādā, but the month is evident from the context).
From here our author abandons the Kanz / Khazrajī narrative and returns to that of the Sīrat which he follows closely until the end of 294 (according to the Sīrat chronicling of events).


17. At a place called H-r-y-r: CAbbasī, Sīrat, 393,17. (cf. Sīrat.MS. f. 160b.5. H-r-y-d - the yāʾ is unpointed). It is most probably Ḣisyāz, some 14 km S. slightly E. of Ṣanʿā': see Map 3, B1, and YAR MB 198837 (1544 C4). Cf. Rayhānī, Mulūk.l. 119-20 - an hour or so away by mule; (from Ṣanʿā'); and Rashid. Yemen enters, 166. - 17 miles! It is there that, in 1948, Yahyā b. Muḥammad Ḥamīd al-Dīn was assassinated, along with ĈAbdullāh b. al-Ḥusayn al- Āmrī. See Shamāḥī, Yamān, 226; and Hamdānī, Jazīrat, 153,3,n.3.

18. It is suggested that the Dūr al-CAlawiyyīn possibly formed a distinct part of the al-Qātī quarter of Ṣanʿā': ed. Serjeant / Lewcock. Ṣanʿā'. 130: and see above, p. 172. n.90.

The nisbah of al-CAlawi in Zaydī Yemen is used in modern times exclusively for the descendants of ĈAlī b. Abī Tālib through offspring other than al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, meaning, in effect, the descendants of Abū ʿI-Fāḍl al-CAbbās b. ĈAlī, (see al-sādah al-CAlawiyyīn in Zabārah. "Navi," 208).

This had not, it appears, been always the case. In the Sīrat, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. ĈUbaydullāh (descended from al-CAbbās b. ĈAlī) is given the nisbah of al-CAlawi, while Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn (a relative of al-Ḥadī presumably) is called al-Ḥasanī. Yet elsewhere in the Sīrat when Abū Jaʿfar’s son is describing a battle line-up saying that in the gaʿil there were with al-Ḥadī the Ṭabarīs and the ĈAlawīs, he continues: wa-kana maṣ′ahu mina ʿI-CAlawiyyīn. Then the author names specifically al-Ḥadī’s brother, ĈAbdullāh, al-Ḥadī’s two sons and two sons of his uncle Muḥammad - all
of course, descended from al-Hasan b. 'Alī. Then the author goes on to name himself, his brother al-Qāsim and others, just pointing out that these were from the progeny of al-ČAbbās b. ČAlī b. ČAbī Talib. See ČAbbāsī, Sīrāt, 370.3., 391.13., 247.18 - 248.1: above, n.13.

So it would seem that Dūr al- ČAlawīyyīn were those houses in which there lived the descendants of ČAlī b. ČAbī Talib, be they from the line of al-Hasan ( probably the majority, - as is still the case in the Yemen today ), or from al-Ḥusayn or al- ČAbbās. Geddes has missed the point when he talks of " the houses of the Zaydfūs " ( " Yuṭ firid ", 128 ): ČAlawī concerns nasab not madhhīb. The Zaydfūs in the Yemen have never called themselves ČAlawīs, nor have they been termed such by their opponents.

Cf. the use in Ḥadramawt and southern Arabia where the ČAlawīyyīn are the descendants of the Ḥusaynid, ČAlawī b. ČUbaydullāh b. Āḥmad al-Muḥājir, d. 412 / 1021: ČAlawī, Ḥadramawt, I. 374-5; cf. Serjeant, Saiyids, 10ff ).

19. Ās ad and his men seem to have put up no resistance and probably escaped before the Fatimid army sacked the city. Ās ad and Ibn Kabālah set out for Ḥalad Qudum ( cf. above, p. 161f , n.49 ) and [ Ibn ] Jārāḥ made for Ăthtar in Tiḥāmah: ĂAbbāsī, Sīrāt, 394.4f, but cf. Sīrāt, MS. f. 160.12, Ă-y-r ( the āl' having points ); cf. Arendonk, Débuts, 243.n.3. For a useful discussion concerning Ăthtar, see Āqūlī, Muṣjam, I, 154-9.

20. The two words are linked together 14 times in the Qur'ān ( including twice with the article, but they are never preceded by the preposition bi.


22. Qur'ān, al-Shū'ārā', 152., and al-Naml, 48. The interpretation is after Arberry's.

23. For ālam, cf. Dozy, Supplément, I, 34.
24. These events are described in detail in Abbât, Strät, 330-347.

As in previous disturbances in Najrân, the chief instigators were the B. al-Hârith and on this occasion they were backed up by Yam. In this revolt, al-Hârith b. Humayd al-Khaythamî (see above, p. 129f., n.27) and Câlîb b. al-Rabî'î C al-Madânî (cf. above, p. 130, n.29) played major roles.

The revolt of the tribesmen was probably independent of the Fatimid campaign in the Yemen. They had revolted several times in the past against al-Hâdi's purist Islamic rule, although they were no doubt encouraged by the Fatimid recapturing of San'â' (see above, text p. 225f.) to extirpate once and for all Zaydî control over Najrân. However, later in the Strät narrative (340,10 - 341,3) al-Hâdi orders his governor to arrest the Qaramîtah and a certain man from Hâshid, Husayn b. Husayn is mentioned as their dâ'î and another, also a Hâshidî, is described as being from kibâr al-Qaramîtah wa-du'â' al-Thim. This language suggests strongly a missionary activity on the part of the Fatimids in Najrân, but who sent these dâ'îs, whether it was Câlîb b. Faḍî or Abû 'l-Qâsim ibn Hawshab, one does not know. These missionaries clearly had had some success and there is an implication that even a number of Ibn Bistam's (for whom see above, p. 128f., n.26) relatives and clients in Minâs had embraced the Fatimid cause (341,2).

Al-Hâdi who had arrived in Najrân on 23 Rajab 294 / 9 May 907, accompanied by Câdullâh b. al-Khattab al-Hakami - cousin of al-Ghitrîf (see above, p. 205, n.5), returned to Sa'dâh on 3 Ramadan / 17 June 907: see Strät, 335,13f., 341,12.

************
Year 295 [ from 12 October 907 ]

In this year Banū 'l-Ḥārith in Najrān rebelled and planned to kill Muhammad b. ʿUbaydullāh, al-Hādī's governor over their territory. At this al-Hādī, upon whom be peace, went to confront them; he fought them, plundered their property and razed to the ground their habitations.

[ Then ] he went back to Sa'dah, leaving a body of men with the governor [ just ] mentioned. [1]

Annotation

1. The dramatic events in Najrān are described in detail in ʿAbbāsī, Strat. 347-362.

The occasion for the revolt of B. al-Ḥārith in alliance with Yām and organized by Ibn Bistām and Ibn Ḥumayd ( see above, pp. 128-30, n.26,27 ), was the news of the expected arrival in Sa'dah of an Abbasid envoy ( musawwid - cf. above, p. 122, n.5 ) called Najāḥ in Strat. 347,8, ( cf. Strat.MS, f. 140b.13, - no points, and Arendonk, Débuts, 199f.n.2 ). It seems that the envoy was prepared to back the rebels militarily against al-Hādī, but only on condition that they proved their resolve by first of all capturing Muhammad b. ʿUbaydullāh who could be ransomed for ʿAlī b. al-Rabīʿ ( see above, p. 233, n.24 ) now in prison, and then killing the āmil's sons, relatives and men, thus getting possession of their horses and arms, ( 347,14 - 348,7 ).

The envoy later, however, apparently changed his plans and lost interest in the project ( 351,17 - 352,2 ).

Matters came to a head when B. al-Ḥārith, alone of all the inhabitants of Najrān, refused with violent threats to hand over to the āmil half their grape harvest to help pay the salaries of al-Hādī's soldiery ( 352,16f ).
Al-Hādī arrived personally in Najrān, presumably in mid-Shawwāl / mid-July 908 (354.2-11). He had ġAlī b. al-Rabī' killed when he got to hear of the plot to abduct Muḥammad b. ġUbaydullāh and hold him to ransom (357.17 - 358.3). Finally, Ibn Bistām himself was murdered at the hands of men from Yam and al-Aḥlāf (q.v. above, p. 96, n.11) who had become incensed at Ibn Bistām's increasing influence with al-Hādī (358.8 - 359.8).

Al-Hādī was manifestly distressed on account of this deed. The Sīrat relates poignantly (359.10f): wa-kharaja 'l-Hādī fa-waqafa ġalā ra'sī 'bn Bistām wa-huwa yalī anu man qatalahu aw amara bi-qatlihi. (cf. also, 360.12f.19f).

Al-Hādī returned to Sa'dah early in Dhū 'l-Ḥijjah / early September 908 (362.12-14). Muḥammad b. ġUbaydullāh, although he realized that his life was now in considerable danger (362.4f.), remained loyally behind in Najrān with his family. Al-Hādī had left him with a garrison of 23 horse and 55 foot (362.14f).

***********

Year 296 [from 30 September 908]

In [this year] Banū 'l-Ḥarith once again rose in revolt and made for the house of Muḥammad b. ġUbaydullāh. Then they went inside [and] after a bitter combat killed him and all his men. [1]
1. The author of the Ghāyat, anxious to chronicle the successes of the Zaydī imams not their disasters (see above, introduction p. 31), thus in a perfunctory few words alludes to events portrayed so vividly in the Sīrat (362-384) which is perhaps the best writing in the book. These events, however, seem to belong to Dhū 'l-Ḥijjah of the previous year (scil. 295) / September 908.

The revolt in Najrān and the death of his loyal henchman, Muḥammad b. ʿUbaydullāh, were a tragic ending to the career of al-Ḥāḍir.

The co-organizer of the previous rebellion Ibn Ḥumayd (see above, p. 234, n.1 and p. 233, n.24) now became, from his base at Sawhān (q.v. p. 130, n.27), the principal instigator of a revolt among the B. al-Khāṣṣah (thus Arendonk, Debuts, 177 and n.2; cf. ʿAbbāsī, Sīrat, 367, B. al-Ḥās and likewise Hamḍānī, Jazīrat, 186,1 and Forrer, Sudarabien, 143, Ḥimās) which spread to the rest of the B. al-Ḥārith, then to B. Rābī (q.v. above, p. 128, n.26) and eventually lead to the treachery of the B. ʿAbd al-Madīn. Yām, al-Aḥlāf and Wādi ʿah excused themselves from coming to the assistance of al-Ḥāḍir's ʿamīl, and one suspects a tacit complicity to the revolt. Of the Hamḍānī tribes, only Shākir and Thaqīf remained loyal to al-Ḥāḍir's cause (Sīrat, 367,16-18, and cf. above, p. 130, n.29).

Despite repeated calls for help, no reinforcements arrived from Ṣaḥdah. Muḥammad b. ʿUbaydullāh along with his men (14 are named specifically in the Sīrat) were slain, apparently on Friday 23 Dhū 'l-Ḥijjah 295 / 23 September 908 (369,14., 370,5). If reinforcements arrived at all, they arrived too late. The Sīrat is silent on this point.

Sīrat, 384 refers to a military expedition to Najrān in which al-Ḥāḍir took no active part since he was suffering from the illness from which he later died. The author does not date this incident but it could have occurred at any time during the years 296-298, but more likely after Jumāda II 297 / February-March 910 (see below, p. 238, n.2, since ʿAlī b. Muḥammad
b. Ībāyuddālah apparently was not present in the expedition nor Abū 'l-Qāsim Muḥammad.

It would have been in the nature of al-Hādī to have retaliated immediately to what was a virtual massacre of some of his most loyal followers. That he did not do so can be either attributed to his being too ill at the time, even to accompany his men, or because he did not have a large enough army at his disposal to subdue Najrān where it was clear most of the tribes had either actively rebelled or had shown their acquiescence in what had occurred.

**********

Year 297 (from 20 September 909)

During this year al-Hādī (upon whom be peace) despatched Ālī b. Muḥammad al-Ṭāḥīrī [1] to Ṣān'ā' and wrote to al-Duṣmām [telling him] to accompany him. So they went to Ṣān'ā' and entered [the city], [2] ousting the governor of the Qarāmītah [3] from it. It was not long however before al-Hādī's governor and al-Duṣmām returned to Sa'dah, fearing that the Qarāmītah would return and fight them (khashyatān min awd al-Qarāmitah alayhim). [4]

After they had departed from Ṣān'ā', the Qarāmītah in Shibām came and took [the city] and stayed there fourteen days. [5]
Annotations

1. See above, introduction p. 57.

CAlî's father had been al-Hâdî's Āmil in Najrân where he had been killed in Dhū 'l-Hijjah 295 / September 908. (see above, p. 236, n.1).

2. On Thursday 19 Rajab / 3 April 910 - a Tuesday (according to Freeman-Grenville): ĀbbâsT, Sīrat, 395.6.

3. Described in ĀbbâsT, Sīrat, 395.5 as sahib li-'l-Qaramit (sic) and having an army at his disposal, he was probably (Ibn) Dhî 'l-'Tawq (see above, text p. 224) who seems to have been in charge of Īsā' on CAlî b. Faḍl's behalf during the previous three years: see Idrīs, Kanz, f. 179b.18; ed. Zakkâr, Akhbâr, 424; cf. Sīrat, 394.9.


The Sīrat relates that after CAlî b. Muḥammad and al-Ḍū ām had occupied Īsā', al-Hâdî despatched his son Abū 'l-Qāsim [Muḥammad] with a force of Khawālīns and Hamdānīs and that they arrived in Īsā' on Monday 10 Ṣā'ān 297 / 24 April 910 (a Tuesday - Freeman-Grenville).

Abū 'l-Qāsim's exit from the city was on the orders of al-Hâdî who was concerned about the approaching army under Ibn Kabâlah (for whom see above, p. 227, n.2), anxious to restore Yuṭīrid rule over the city. Always a pragmatist, al-Hâdî realized that his son could not fight Ibn Kabâlah and ward off the Fatimids at the same time. Abû 'l-Qāsim (with all the inhabitants!) abandoned Īsā' on Saturday 12 Shawwāl / 24 June 910 (a Sunday - Freeman-Grenville). See ĀbbâsT, Sīrat, 395.2-20.

Idrīs, Kanz, f. 179b.19-21 and the parallel passage in, ed. Zakkâr, Akhbâr, 424, although both are undated, clearly belong to this year. Both texts say that al-Hâdî was at Warwar (q.v. above, p. 188f, n.22) to meet his men, whereas the Sīrat (395.20f) just relates that Abû 'l-Qāsim returned.
to Sa'dah via Warwar.


**********

Year 298 [ from 9 September 910 ]

In [ this year ] the Imam al-Hādī ila 'l-Haqq al-Mubīn died: 

Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm - may the blessings of God be upon them all.

His death took place in the sacred month of Dhū 'l-Ḥijjah at the close of the year. He was buried in Sa'dah.

After [ his death ], his son the Imam al-Murtada, Muḥammad ibn al-Hādī ( may peace be upon both of them ) took over the imamate and the leadership of the community ( wa-qāma ba'dahu bi-amr al-imāmah wa-'l-īrāsah al-ṭāmīmah ), his father having indicated his wish [ in this respect ] ( bi-wasiyyah min abīhi ).

Annotations

1. Poisoned according to Ḥārīm. Simt. ll, f. 135, margin; and Ibn Abī l-Najm, Durar, 202, - qīl ..... annahu saqiya summan.

3. The following day Monday, before noon ( Ḍāʾīʾ, Sīrat, 397,5f ). to the south of the Jāmi Mosque. Ḍāʾīʾ, Sīrat, 397,5f

4. He was given allegiance on Thursday, 1 al-Muḥarram 299 / 29 August 911: Ḍāʾīʾ, Sīrat, 397,6f

5. A Zaydī imam is permitted to indicate whom he considers a fitting successor although this is not binding on the community. He cannot however designate his successor ( ṭansīs ), which is the Jaʿfarī and Fatimid doctrine.
APPENDIX (A)
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Genealogical Table 1

Ał Yūfīr

(See above, introduction, p. 68 and pp. 89-90, n.3).

Any kunyah is shown between brackets and a ruler is asterisked.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Yūfīr*} \\
\text{Muḥammad*} \\
\text{Ibrāhīm* (Aḥū Yūfīr)} \\
\text{Aḥmad (Aḥū 'l-Khayr)} \\
\text{Ḥasan} \\
\text{Cuthmān*} \\
\text{Aḥmad al-Qāhir*} \\
\text{Aṣ'ad*}
\end{array}
\]
GENEALOGICAL TABLE 3

IMAM AL-QASIM B. MUHAMMAD:
HIS DESCENT FROM AL-HADI
AND SOME OF HIS IMMEDIATE DESCENDANTS

(see above, introduction p. 69)

An asterisk indicates a Zaydf imam.

YAHYA (al-Hadr ila 'l-Haq)

AHMAD (al-Nasir)

YAHYA (al-Manṣūr)

YUSUF (al-Dāʿir)

AL-QASIM

YUSUF AL-ASHALL

MUHAMMAD

YAHYA

CALI

AL-HUSAYN

AHMAD

AL-RASHID

CALI

MUHAMMAD

CALI

MUHAMMAD

AL-QASIM (al-Manṣūr bi-'l-Ilān)

MUHAMMAD* (al-Muʿayyad)

AL-ḤASAN

AL-HUSAYN

ISMAʿIL* (al-Mutawakkil)

MUHAMMAD* (al-Muʿayyad)

AL-QASIM* (al-Manṣūr)

AL-HUSAYN (al-Mansūr)

YAHYA

IBRAHIM

YUSUF

MUHAMMAD AHMAD* AL-HUSAYN

AL-HUSAYN

MUHAMMAD* (al-Mahdi)

(4 generations)

Hamid al-Din imams
MANUSCRIPTS AND UNPUBLISHED THESES ETC.

al-ABBĀSī, al-ʿAlawī, ʿAlī b. Muhammad b. Ubaydullāh
Sirat al-Hādī, British Library MS, Or. 3901.

ʿAMIR B. MUḤAMMAD, b. ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAmīr b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. al-Rashīd

ibn al-DAYBAʾ, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAlī

GEDDES, Charles L.

GOCHENOUR, D.T.

al-HĀDĪ, Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥusayn
Kitāb Tathbīṭ al-imāmah, British Library MS, Or. 3727, ff. 163b - 166b.

al-ḤASAN B. BADR AL-DĪN, Muhammad b. Yaḥyā

Anwār al-yaqīn ff qaḍāʾī Amīr al-Muʾminīn wa-Sayyid al-Wāṣiyīn, British Library MS, Or. 3868.

IDRĪS, (Abū Muḥammad) b. CAlī b. CAbdullāh

Kitāb Kanz al-akhāyr ff maṣūfat al-siyar wa-l-akhbār, British Library MS, Or. 4581.

al-CISMĀʾ, CAbd al-Malīk b. Ḥusayn b. CAbd al-Malīk


ISMĀʾIL B. MUḤammad, b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad

Simt al-laʾāl ff shīr al-ʾĀl, British Library MS, Or. 3969.

KAZĪ, Abdul Khaliq


al-MUḤALLĪ, Abū CAbdullāh Ḥumayd b. Ahmad b. Muḥammad

al-Hādāʾiq al-wardiyyah ff manāqib aʾīmmat al-Zaydiyyah, British Library MS, Or. 3786.

MUḤammad B. CABDULLĀH, ibn CĪzz al-Dīn

MUHAMMAD B. MĀLIK


ibn al-WAZĪR, ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-ʿllāh

WILSON, R. T. O.

"The investigation, collection and evaluation of geographical material in
Yemeni texts for the mapping of historical north-west Yemen." Ph.D. thesis
of the University of Cambridge. 1980.

YAHYĀ B. AL-ḤUSAYN, b. al-Muʿayyad bi-ʿllāh Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim
Kitāb Aqūlat al-dīman al-mukhtāṣar min Anbāʾ al-zaman fī akhbār al-Yaman,
(1) ʿAlī Amīrī Library MS, 2375.
(2) Khudā Bakhsh Oriental Public Library MS, 2315.

**************

Kitāb Anbāʾ al-zaman fī akhbār al-Yaman, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer
Kulturbesitz, Berlin, MS (Orientabteilung), or. fol. 1304.

YŪSUF B. YAHYĀ, b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Muʿayyad
Nasamat al-saḥār li-dhīkr man tashayyaʿa wa-shaʿara. Cambridge University
Library MS, Browne C.13.
ARTICLES ETC.

al- AMRĪ, Husayn b. Abdullāh


ANAWATI, G. C.


de BLOIS, François


***************


COSTA, Paolo M.


GEDDES, C. L.


HAMDĀNī, Abbās

al-JASIR, Hamad

Vol. 4 - Part 12, Riyadh, Jumâdâ II, 1390 / September 1970, 1124-35.

************


al-MADÂJ, ^Abd al-Muhsin Madaj


MADELUNG, Wilferd


************

"The minor dynasties of Iran ", The Cambridge history of Iran, IV.
Cambridge, 1975, 198-249.

MÜLLER, Walter W.


RATHJENS, Carl / von WISSMANN, Hermann


SERJEANT, R. B.

SMITH, G. Rex
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************


STROTHMANN, R.

"Die Literatur der Zaiditen ". Der Islam, I. Strassburg, 1910. 354-68.

WERDECKER, Josef


WILSON, Robert T. O.


ZABĀRAH, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā

"Nayl al-husnayayn bi-ansāb man bi-ʾl-Yaman min buyūt ġitrat al-Hasanayn ". al-ʿAnbāʾ ʾan dawlat Balqis wa-Saba etc. Cairo, 1376 / 1956-7, 85-211.
PRINTED WORKS


ed. C ABBĀS, Iḥṣān

al-ABBĀSī. al-Ālāwī. Alī b. Muḥammad b. Ubaydullāh

ibn-ABBĀS. ibn-ABBĀS. Alī b. Muhammad b. Ubaydullāh

C ABD AL-JABBĀR, b. Ahmad

ibn-ABD AL-MAJID. al-Yamanī. Tāq al-Dīn C Abd al-Baqī

ibn-ABL-NAJM. al-Sa'd, C Abdullāh b. Muḥammad b. Ḥamzah

AHMAD B. YAHYA. b. al-Murtaḍā

**************