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I

Ismailism was rent, on two different occasions in its history as the religion of a state, by a violent dispute over the succession to the Imamate. While in other dynasties laying claim to the Caliphate, quarrels of this kind, by no means of rare occurrence, generally had no lasting effects and, once settled, were of interest to none but historians, both cases in Fatimid history where the inheritance of an Imam was disputed by rival factions were destined to have far-reaching consequences. Looking at these controversies from the outside and from such a distance of time, we are apt to minimize their importance and fail to do justice
to the passions aroused by differences over the rights of individuals of no great personal qualities. One ought not, however, to forget that the person of the Imam stood, for the Ismailis, in the very centre of their religious system; it was of overriding importance; on it depended the continuity of institutional religion as well as the personal salvation of the believer. "Whosoever dies without recognising the Imam of his time, dies a pagan's death" is one of the most often quoted maxims of Ismailism. The quarrel over the succession of al-Mustansir — the first of the two schisms mentioned above — may have been for some of the participants primarily a matter of political intrigue and of conflicting interests, a struggle for power between a dictatorial minister and a prince ousted by him; but for many the question who was the rightful Imam, al-Musta'li or Nizar, must have been one of paramount religious concern. It was, in effect, not so much the person of the claimant that weighed with his followers; they were not moved by any superior merits of Nizar as a ruler (this is, of course, obvious in the case of the infant al-Tayyib) — it was the divine right personified in the legitimate heir that counted.

During the thirty-five years or so of the reigns of al-Musta'li and al-Āmur this conflict between the Fatimid government and the Nizārīs was one of the main preoccupations of the Fatimid state and certainly dominated the Ismaili religious scene. There can be little doubt that this internal struggle played a large part in the ultimate ruin of the Ismaili cause. By a stroke of bad luck, the Nizārī crisis was to be followed, in less than four decades, by another, which alienated still more adherents of Ismailism from the cause of the Caliphs of Cairo, the crisis over the succession to al-Āmur.

The present essay has as its aim to elucidate, first, the issues involved in that crisis; secondly, the attitude of the Fatimid regime as it finally emerged; and, thirdly, the repercussions of the conflict in Yemen.

II

Al-Āmur was assassinated, probably by Nizārī emissaries, on the 2nd Dhu-l-qa'da, 524 A. H. (1130 A.D.) The events that followed have

---

1 See my article: The Epistle of the Fatimid Caliph al-Āmir (al-Hidāya al-Āmirīyya); its date and its purpose, in: J.R.A.S., 1950, p. 20 ff.
never formed the subject of a critical investigation based on the different sources available. To be sure, G. Wiet devoted to the problem a few penetrating pages in the *Matiériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptiönum Arabi- carum, Le Caire*, vol. II (Mémoires de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, LII, 1930), p. 83 ff., summarizing the data indicated by previous historians and adding to the list many valuable passages capable of clarifying obscurities. Important pieces of evidence can, however, still be added; moreover, Wiet — writing just before the discovery of the Ismaili literature of India — could take no account of these documents, indispensable for the real evaluation of the issues. On the other hand, scholars acquainted with Ismaili literature seem never to have taken up this matter for its own sake; when touching it *en passant*, they were content either to reproduce the version current in the tradition of the Yemenite-Indian *da'wa* ¹ or to rely merely on general impressions in criticising it ². It is, however, only a comparative treatment of Ismaili and of general historical sources that can shed light on what really happened.

From the point of view of our present investigation, the main lesson that we learn from our recently won acquaintance with the history of the Yemeni Ismailism and its Indian derivative, is the knowledge that these Ismailis were followers of the Imam al-Ṭayyib: they belonged to the "Ṭayyibi *da'wa*".

A characteristic symptom of our previous ignorance of even the name of al-Ṭayyib is the fact that E. Griffini, in his article on the two Ismaili manuscripts of the Ambrosian Library (*Z.D.M.G.*, 1915, p. 81, n. 3) could not understand the formula, which he was quoting from a Zaydite work, for the oath of the Ismailis: "(If I make a false oath, I deny) the allegiance due to al-Ṭayyib the son of al-Amir". Griffini reads "[Formula]", instead of the correct "(If I make a false oath, I deny) the allegiance due to al-Ṭayyib the son of al-Amir".

cf. below, p. 198). The *ʿUyūn al-akhbār* (VII, 313, in the manuscript at my disposal), like the Ṭayyibi tradition in general, gives the year as 526; it is difficult to say how the mistake arose. As to the day, the *ʿUyūn* has Tuesday the 3rd Dhu-l-qaʿda, as have, e.g., Ibn Khallikan, the *Mīrāt al-zamān* and al-Qalqashandi.

¹ So the various articles of H. F. Hamdani: *The Life and Times of Queen Sayyida Arwa the Sulayḥid of the Yemen* in: Journal of the Central Asian Society, 1931, p. 505 ff.; *The History of the Ismāʿīli Daʿwat and its Literature during the last phase of the Fatimid Empire*, J.R.A.S., 1932, p. 126 ff.; *Some unknown Ismāʿīli authors and their works*, J.R.A.S., 1933, p. 359 ff. Their merit lies precisely in acquainting Western scholars for the first time with the outlines of Ismaili history as it appears in the light of the literature of the Bohra.

² So the article Ismāʿīliyya (W. Ivanow) in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Supplement*. (To the author of this article, as well as to Hamdani, the pages of Wiet were evidently unknown.)
In their belief, al-Ṭayyib was a child of al-Āmir born a short time before his assassination; they assert — to quote the relevant article of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (see p. 195 n. 2) — that on the death of al-Āmir his “infant son and heir, al-Ṭayyib — whose existence is much doubted by historians" — was taken into concealment . . . The followers of the Fatimid tradition still believe that the Imams, successors of al-Ṭayyib, are living in great secrecy somewhere and are going to manifest themselves when the time comes”.

It must be stressed, in order to obviate possible misunderstandings, that the Ṭayyibi Ismailis do not believe that al-Ṭayyib is still alive: it is his successive descendants, living in concealment, that they hold to be their Imams. The Ṭayyibi authors dissociate themselves emphatically from the wāqifī Mahdiism of, say, the Twelver Imāmīs or the Kaysānīs.

As we see, some doubt is cast on the historical existence of al-Ṭayyib by the author of the article. What are we to think? To be sure, had we to rely solely upon the beliefs and assertions of the Ṭayyibi Ismailis, there would be good grounds, if not for actual rejection, at least for a guarded suspension of judgment. The ḍātīs, trained in the doctrine of the uninterrupted continuity of the holy lineage, were now faced with the fact, incredible to them, of the Imam dying without leaving a male offspring, and there would be no intrinsic difficulty in making their disappointment responsible for the phantom existence of an infant heir, appearing on the scene for a short while — as if only to satisfy the requirements of the dogma — and promptly disappearing again. But this is not the case: the historical reality of al-Ṭayyib is attested by unimpeachable entries in various Fatimid Annals.

a) The extracts that have come down to us from the Chronicle of Ibn al-Muyassar (d. 677) contain the following passage (*Annales d’Egypte*, ed. H. Massé, p. 72), going back, in all probability, to the lost chronicle of Ibn al-Muhannak (d. 549)²: “In Rabi‘ al-awwal (of the year 524 A.H.) a son named Abu-l-Qāsim al-Ṭayyib was born to al-Āmir; he was designated by the Caliph as his heir (walī ‘ahdih). Miṣr (i.e. Fustāt) and Cairo were decorated, music was played in the streets and at the gates of the palaces. New suits of clothes were issued to the troops and the

---

¹ This seems simply to be the author’s way of speaking; at least I do not know of any discussion of the historicity, or otherwise, of al-Ṭayyib, either by Arabic or modern historians. What is meant is, obviously: whose existence is open to reasonable doubts. — The same reservations about the existence of al-Ṭayyib are expressed by Ivanow also in *A Creed of the Fatimids*, p. VI: “the problematic infant son of al-Āmir, al-Ṭayyib”; *The Rise of the Fatimids*, p. 20: “Al-Ṭayyib . . . whose historical reality is highly questionable and whose existence is a matter of faith”.

palaces were decorated. Al-Āmir ordered that draperies, utensils, ornaments and gold and silver plate should be brought forth from the treasure-houses for purposes of decoration. The Great Hall (al-ʾiwān) 1 was hung with tapestries and arms. This continued for a fortnight; at the end of this period, the ram, which was to be slaughtered at the ʿaqīqa ceremony, was brought in, hung with embroidered trappings and silver necklaces, and was slaughtered in the presence of al-Āmir. Then the child was brought in, and the Chief Qadi Ibn al-Muyassar 2 was given the honour of holding it. Pieces of gold dinars were strewn over the heads of the people. Tables, too, were laid, and fruit had been ordered beforehand from the provinces of al-Fayyūm, al-Sharqiyya and al-Qalyūbiyya; the palace was filled with fruit and other sweets and the atmosphere was heavy with the fragrance of aloe and amber.”

Now, we have here, plainly, not the special pleading of a dogmatic theologian defending his doctrines, but the straightforward entry of an annalist recording, in the manner usual in such works, a great public occasion. He refers in a matter-of-fact way to events of public knowledge: the birth of an heir to the throne (no doubt officially proclaimed all over the country), public rejoicing in the capital, palace festivities attended by notable persons. One can see little grounds for impugning the evidence of such a text.

In these circumstances, we shall have to admit as authentic the sijill, preserved in Ismaili books 3 and in the unique manuscript of the History of Yemen by Umāra (H. C. Kay, Yaman, its early Mediaeval History, 1892, p. 100 ff.) 4, in which al-Āmir announces the birth of al-Ṭayyib to his vassal in Yemen, al-Malika al-Sayyida 5. There is the evidence of Ibn al-Muyassar for the proclamation of the infant prince

---

1 Cf. on the Great Hall al-Maqrizi, Khīlat, I, 388.
3 Quoted in the Majmūʿ al-tarbiya of Tāhir b. Muhannad (see Ivanow, Guide, p. 53); then in the ʿUyūn al-akhbār, VII, 315 ff.
4 See on this passage below, p. 218.
5 It seems that the name Sayyida Arwa given to the queen by Hamdani (in the article quoted above, p. 195, n. 1) is based solely on the corrupt passage in Umāra, Kay p. 22, where the word “Arwa” must be deleted. Arwa was the name of a daughter of the queen (Kay pp. 76, 160, 296). The queen is always named al-Sayyida, which is expressly stated to have been her personal name, Umāra, Kay p. 28: ismuhu <al- > Sayyida bint Aḥmad etc.; ʿUyūn al-akhbār, VII, 134: wa-zawwajahu (seil. al-Mukarram) abāhu al-hurra al-taqiyya al-Sayyida ibnati Aḥmad etc.; al-Malik al-Ashraf Ibn Rasūl: ʿUrfat al-ʾaṣḥāb fi marʾiṣat al-ansāb, ed. Zetterstēen, Damascus 1949, p. 117: al-Sayyida bint Aḥmad, wa-hiya al-Sayyida bint Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim b. Muṣaffar, wa-qilā nāṣ: b. Muḥammad au b. ʿAli wa-Allāh aʿlam. — About al-Sayyida as a proper name cf. C. A. Nallino, Raccolta di Scritti editi e inediti, vol. III, p. 433.
as the heir; it is but natural that this should have been announced by letters to the population of Egypt as well as to that of the dependent countries. In the text of the *sijill* itself there is nothing to arouse suspicion.

A few months after the birth of al-Ṭayyib, the Caliph was murdered; the power was seized by his cousin, ‘Abd al-Majīd, while the heir was pushed aside. What happened to him? Ibn al-Muyassar (Ibn al-Muḥannak) confines himself to the laconic remark (p. 74): “When al-Āmir was murdered, al-Ḥāfiz (‘Abd al-Majīd) concealed the existence (ʿamr) of the child that had been born to al-Āmir that year”.

b) Further details are given in a passage of a Syrian chronicle from the end of the VIth century A.H./XIIth cent. A.D., bearing the title *al-Bustān al-jāmi‘* (ed. Cl. Cahen in: Bulletin d’Études Orientales, Damascus, 1938, p. 121-2), which reads as follows: “In that year (scil. 524) al-Āmir was killed on Tuesday the 14th of Dhu-l-qa’d, in the Jazīra. His reign over Egypt lasted twenty-nine years. He had as on to whom he explicitly left the Caliphate (nāṣṣa ‘alayhi), named Abū Muḥammad (obviously a mistake for Abū-l-Qāsim). Al-Ḥāfiz ‘Abd al-Majīd conspired against him with a certain Nāṣir al-Laythī, master of the horse (rakkāb) of al-Āmir’s household, who took the child to his house. Up to this day, there is no information available about his fate, whether he died or what other fate overtook him. There is in Egypt a party which holds that he is alive and regards him as the Imam.”

This passage is by no means as free from doubt as that quoted above; it is not a record of what was matter of public knowledge, but relates what must be considered mere rumours. Whatever we may think, however, of the information it gives about the fate of the child, — the inference seems to be that he was quietly done away with by Nāṣir — the passage still further confirms the historical existence of al-Ṭayyib. Moreover, we learn from it that al-Ṭayyib had, at the time when the chronicler wrote, faithful adherents in Egypt.

c) A third passage is of even less objective authority as to the problem of al-Ṭayyib: it does not purport to be anything but a reproduction of the tenets of the Ṭayyibī Isma’ils. On the other hand, it is valuable as testifying to the presence of Ṭayyibīs in Syria, at the end of the sixth/twelfth century. The chronicler Ibn Abī Ṭayyī of Aleppo writes: “It is said that the people of Ṣan‘ā are of the opinion that al-Āmir had a child, named al-Ṭayyib. They are of the Āmirī persuasion; in Syria, too, there are some people belonging to the Āmiriyya.”

---

1 The passage from the lost chronicle of Ibn Abī Ṭayyī has been preserved by Ibn al-Furāt;
The Succession to the Fatimid Imam al-Amir

The tradition of the Ismailis of Yemen, supporters of al-Ṭayyib, gives a different version of his fate, which also contains interesting information about the measures taken by ‘Abd al-Majīd against the adherents of the infant prince. We shall, of course, be on our guard against taking on trust everything that they have to say; if we cut out certain legendary elements and a few easily recognizable tendentious features, there will still remain a considerable residue that can be accepted as reliable.

The following account is taken from the ‘Uyūn al-akhbār of Idrīs, who is, however, only reproducing the story as told by a very early authority, the dā‘ī Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥāmīdī, who was contemporary with the events he relates. (Died 557; cf. Ivanow, Guide, p. 52; see also below, p. 218, 220, 227-228.) The following is a translation of the story of Ibrāhīm al-Ḥamīdī, as far as it is textually quoted in the ‘Uyūn al-akhbār (see for the Arabic text Appendix no. I): “The dā‘ī Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥamīdī says: The most intimate associates of the Commander of the Faithful al-Āmir bi-ahkām Allah used to be Ibn Madyan, the ‘holder of the rank’ (sāhib al-рутба), Ibn Raslān, al-‘Azīzī, Qūnīṣ (?) and Naslān (?) 1. They belonged to the most eminent dā‘īs and were noted for their devotion to the Caliph and their intimacy with him. Ibn Madyan did not, usually, leave his own house, while the others were regular in attendance on al-Āmir, the position of Qūnīṣ being lower than that of the other three. The Imam al-Āmir used to say: ‘Nobody will fight for me except these four people”. — It was their custom, after listening to the utterances of the Imam, a great part of which remained unintelligible to them, to pay a visit on their way home to the ‘holder of the rank’, their shaykh, who used to give them the necessary explanations: You said this or that to our Lord, his answer was so and so and it contains a hidden allusion to this or that matter and is to be taken in this or that sense. — When the words of the Imam, “Nobody will fight for me except these four people”, proved too difficult for their comprehension, they went, according to their custom, to Ibn Madyan, the ‘holder of the rank’ and asked him about it. He answered: “The Imam will disappear by murder; the land will be torn by dissen- sion; Abū ‘Ali the son of al-Afdal will assume power; he will proclaim

1 These persons do not seem to be known from other sources; the pronunciation of the names of two of them is uncertain.
the religion of anti-Shiism (dīn al-naṣb) and kill the adherents of the Imam (al-auliyā') and send them into exile. When he feels strong enough, he will send for the four of you and will put before you the choice either of abjuring the Imam (viz. al-Ṭayyib) or of being killed. You will contend for the Imam and curse Satan. Naslān, al-ʿAzīzī and Rasilān will be killed; you, Qūnīṣ, will flee to Yemen, but will later return and meet your death. I shall go, al-ʿAzīzī, and hide in your house; they will arrest me the day after your execution and put before me the same choice as is offered to you; I shall not prefer this world to the next, and shall find a martyr's death'. They enquired: "Who will be Imam after the death of al-Manṣūr (i.e. al-Āmir) ?" He answered: "The seventh one, al-Ṭayyib — he will be hidden". They asked: "Who will be the ‘holder of the rank’ after you?" He answered: "My brother-in-law, Abū ʿAli. He will go into hiding together with his master and stay where he stays".

Idrīs continues by saying that it all happened as al-Āmir and Ibn Madyan had foretold. When al-Āmir was assassinated, the dāʿīs administered the oath of allegiance to al-Ṭayyib, Ibn Madyan and Abū ʿAlī being in charge of the daʿwa, while al-Āmir's cousin, ʿAbd al-Majīd took over the ‘guardianship of the palace’. When, however Abū ʿAlī, the son of al-Afdal, seized power, he showed his hostility to the Imams, proclaimed in Cairo the anti-Fatimid religion and persecuted the auliyā'. ʿAbd al-Majīd, too, showed signs of apostasy (nīfāq) and aspired to sovereignty. Abū ʿAlī b. al-Afdal, in concert with al-Ḥasan, the son of ʿAbd al-Majīd, arrested the auliyā' and persecuted the true believers, expelling even their womenfolk (six hundred of whom took refuge in the Maghrib). He threatened with death the four people mentioned above if they did not abjure al-Manṣūr and his son (i.e. al-Ṭayyib). Qūnīṣ escaped, the others were arrested and, remaining steadfast in their loyalty, were put to death, together with a great number of believers. Ibn Madyan, too, was arrested in the house of al-ʿAzīzī and was executed. Qūnīṣ fled to Yemen, but later returned and was killed. Abū ʿAlī went with the Imam into hiding.

The whole story is related in the unmistakable style of martyrrological legend. We will not discuss the story (so characteristic of Ismaili historiography, permeated with the spirit of hagiology from end to end) of the miraculous prophecy by al-Āmir, accompanied by the detailed exegesis of Ibn Madyan. The account given by Idrīs of the conditions prevailing after the death of al-Āmir is also inaccurate on many scores;

---

1 It is certain that the role attributed by Idrīs to al-Ḥasan the son of al-Ḥāfīẓ is due to a confusion with the events of the year 529 (see the chronicles under that year).
we shall see presently what actually happened. On the other hand, there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the facts concerning the persons of the entourage of al-Amir, mentioned by Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī. We have to admit that there was a persecution against some who remained loyal to the infant heir born only a few months before al-Amir’s death.

Finally, to summarize the contradictory information of our sources about the fate of the child, we note that Ibn al-Muyassar does not say anything definite on the point; the al-Bustān al-jāmi’ suggests that he was secretly killed at the instigation of ‘Abd al-Majīd, while the Ṭayyībīs assert that he was hidden by his faithful followers.

We shall see (p. 228) that Queen al-Sayyida is alleged to have bequeathed her personal belongings eight years later (in 532) to the Imam al-Ṭayyīb. — There is also a legend, widely known among the Ṭayyībīs, which presumes that al-Ṭayyīb lived in concealment in an inaccessible district of the Farthest West. I quote the legend from one of the ‘Epistles of Ramadān’ issued yearly by the present dā‘ī, Tahir Sayf al-dīn (no. 24 of the series, for the year 1359, entitled Dhūt al-baraka, p. 85; the whole series, privately printed, is available in the Bodleian Library). The story is related on the authority of ‘All b. Muh.ammad (b. al-Walīd). He was sitting, together with a man from the tribe of al-Ḥakam and the poet Asʿad b. Ḥasan in the khān of Zabīd. They were talking to a man who had recently arrived from the Maghrib, bringing a present to Sayf al-ʾĪlām (Tughtakin, brother of Salādīn, who ruled in Yemen 578-93). The conversation turned on the contemporary claimants of the Imāmate: ‘Abdallāh b. Ḥamza (the Zaydi Imām al-Mansūr; 593-614), the (Almohad) Caliphs of the family of ‘Abd al-Muʾmin, Muḥammad b. Ghassān (the Kharijī Imām) of Oman and the Abbāssid Caliph of Baghdad. The Maghribī said that none of them was the Imām; he knew the real one. Questioned by the others about the abode of the Imām, he told the following story. One of his Andalusian friends, a merchant and a follower of the Maliki madhhab, bought a crystal vessel on one of his voyages to Egypt. On returning to the Maghrib, he found that nobody wanted to buy it because of its high price. He had a friend who used to trade with people living in the Extreme West, behind high mountains, where there is little of civilization. On seeing the vessel in his friend’s hand, he told him he knew a customer who could afford to buy it. The merchant and his friend went to the market place of the Western district where the latter used to ply his trade; then they went through a mountain pass; there was there a guard which was unwilling to let pass the merchant who was unknown to it. So the other went on alone in order to obtain the necessary permit. As he returned the next day with the permit, they could proceed. Soon they came to an encampment; in the middle there was a sumptuous tent, where a great number of servants were to be seen, such as at the court of no other king. Before entering, the merchant was warned by his friend not to greet the prince with the greetings current among tyrannous rulers, but to say, instead: al-salām ʿalā amīr al-muʾminīn wa-raḥmat Allāh wa-barakātuh. They entered the tent; on seeing the prince, the heart of the merchant was instantly filled with reverence and love. The prince asked him for the news of Cairo and what remained of the palace. His questions showed that he was well acquainted with those places. He then told the merchant: “You have bought this vessel from an old man, named so and so”; giving his exact description. The merchant answered that this was correct. The prince said: “Give him our best regards and ask him about the remaining two vessels; buy them on my behalf”. He gave the merchant a great sum of money in order to buy those
and yet other vessels, of which he gave him exact descriptions. Before leaving, the merchant said that he wanted to enter into the allegiance of the prince. On this the prince administered to him, in a private audience, the 'ahd. The merchant left immediately for Egypt, met the old man and told him the story. The latter fell on his knees thanking God, touched the merchant with reverence and said in tears: Happy are you who have had this great privilege. The old man recounted that all those vessels had been given to him by al-Āmir who spoke to him as follows: if he should one day find himself in need and knew not where his Lord was staying, he was to sell one of the vessels; it would yearn for its master and find its way to him. The merchant bought all the vessels and also took a letter from the old man; and returned to the West to the prince. — It seems that the mention of the various ‘pretenders’ and especially that of the obscure Kharijite Imam of Oman Muḥammad b. Ghassān (about whom I could find no information in the sources accessible to me), proves the antiquity of the legend. — (Incidentally: another Kharijite Imam of Oman, a contemporary of al-Ḥākim and also apparently not known otherwise, is mentioned in the list of the ‘pretenders’ of his time by Ḥamīd al-dīn al-Kirmānī (Kitāb al-maṣāḥīḥ, fol. 84, 86, 91 of the copy in my possession); his name is ʿAmr al-Nazwānī, i.e. of Nazwa, the old stronghold of Kharijism in Oman.)

III

Power was assumed, immediately after the death of al-Āmir, by his cousin ʿAbd al-Majīd, or, to put it in a manner more corresponding to the real situation, by two favourites of the late Caliph who put him forward as the nominal ruler. What was the ideology by which they justified the new régime before the public? The article of the Encyclopaedia of Islam to which we have already referred has the following answer: “The last four Fatimid Caliphs of Egypt were not regarded as Imams even by themselves and the khutba was read in the name of al-Qāʿīm, the promised Imam who will come on the Last Day”. We shall see how far this view is from being correct, for al-Ḥāfīz and his successors did profess to be fully legitimate Imams. However, before al-Ḥāfīz eventually made this claim, a period was to pass in which the ideological foundations of government went through a series of most remarkable changes.

For the initial seizure of power by al-Ḥāfīz we have fortunately at our disposal a narrative setting forth in precise terms the official version by which his régime was justified.

There is a remarkable contrast between the precise information on such matters given by the good Egyptian sources, with their real understanding of the issues involved, and the nondescript and confused accounts by non-Egyptian chroniclers like Ibn al-Qalānī and Ibn al-Athīr.

The account is from the pen of one of the best authorities on Fatimid history, Ibn al-Ṭuwayr (525-617) 1: “When Hazārmard and Barghash

---

1 Quoted by Ibn Taghribirdī, ed. Popper, III, 4-5. Cahen, p. 10-11, has shown that Ibn Khal- dūn’s account, IV, 70 ff., is a condensation of that of Ibn al-Ṭuwayr. — For references to the other historians dealing with these events cf. Wiet’s pages quoted above, p. 195.
saw that there was nobody to take charge of the government, they chose the Emir Abu-l-Maymūn ‘Abd al-Majīd, who was the eldest member of the reigning family. They put about the story that the late Caliph had, a week before his death, prophesied what was going to happen. He had applied to himself the words: al-miskīn, al-maqṭūl bi-l-sīkkīn, “The poor man, who will be killed by a dagger”. He had announced that one of his wives was pregnant and that he had seen a dream according to which she was to give birth to a male child destined to become the Caliph under the tutorship of ‘Abd al-Majīd Abu-l-Maymūn, having as his vizier Hizābr al-mulūk (i.e. Hazārmard) and as his chamberlain and commander-in-chief the Emir Yānis... A sījill to this effect was read in the Great Hall with al-Hāfiz sitting in a lodge; the reading was done by the Chief Qadi from a minbar erected in the front of the lodge, in the presence of the chief men of the state.” Other historians, too, inform us that ‘Abd al-Majīd assumed the regency pending the expected delivery of the widow of the late Caliph 1.

1 It is obvious from the account of Ibn al-Tawāyir and the other chronicles that the notion of the ‘Uyūn al-akhbār about ‘Abd al-Majīd initially assuming the regency on behalf of al-Ṭayyib is completely false. The Ṭayyibī tradition puts the blame for the ousting of al-Ṭayyib squarely on Abū ‘All Kutayfāt. As a matter of fact, the claims of al-Ṭayyib were discounted from the very beginning of the regency of ‘Abd al-Majīd.
There remains one question to be answered, in connection with this proclamation of the government of ‘Abd al-Majīd and Hazārmard. We have seen that al-Ṭayyib had been proclaimed as the heir at his birth, several months before the death of his father; and that the news of this was broadcast urbi et orbi. Now we hear about the dream al-Āmir had a few weeks before his death concerning the expected posthumous birth of an heir, about the guardianship of ‘Abd al-Majīd for the unborn child, and so on! Now it was all very well for the government secretly to kill the little al-Ṭayyib, if that was indeed what happened—but still some explanation had to be given to the public of why effect was not given to the proclamation in his favour, made at the time of his birth. If we read between the lines of the declaration reported by Ibn al-Ṭuwayr, we shall find the aim of the story of al-Āmir’s dream to be in fact this: that by that dream the former appointment of al-Ṭayyib was abrogated and superseded by that of the child to be born. What was given out about the fate of al-Ṭayyib (whose existence the government could not, after all, simply deny), is not mentioned by Ibn al-Ṭuwayr; we may guess that it was asserted that he died, either before or after the death of al-Āmir. The only allusion to the official position of the then government in this matter is the cryptic phrase of Ibn al-Muyassar: “He (scil. ‘Abd al-Majīd) concealed the matter of the child that had been born to al-Āmir”.

The rule of Hazārmard proved, however, to be of short duration. Abū ‘All Ahmad (nick-named Kutayfāt), the son of al-Afdal, was raised to the vizierate by the army. We may assume that, for some time at least, the arrangements concerning the status of ‘Abd al-Majīd were continued as before.

It was probably at the moment when the expectations of the birth of a male heir proved false, that the new vizier made the radical change that affected the very foundations of the régime. By the extinction of the direct line a vacuum was created. We cannot appraise with certainty the share that religious convictions and political expediency had in forming the decision of Abū ‘Ali to fill the gap in the manner that he did. The Fatimid dynasty was declared deposed and the empire was placed under the sovereignty of the Expected Imam, the Mahdi.

---

1 According to Ibn al-Muyassar (p. 74) on Monday (or Thursday) the 16th of Dhu-l-qa‘da. “He arrested Abu-l-Maymūn (‘Abd al-Majīd) the morning after his bay‘a”. The last phrase is not quite clear; does it mean: the day after he, scil. the new vizier, had payed his allegiance to the regent, ‘Abd al-Majīd? or does bay‘a here mean simply: his appointment as vizier?

2 This seems to be confirmed by the fact that the khutba was read in the Yemen, as we shall see, in the name of al-Ṭayyib (this being due to the special position of the Yemenites), ‘Abd al-Majīd as regent and Abū ‘All as vizier.
of the Imamite Twelver Shia. (‘Abd al-Majid was, of course, removed from the regency and put into custody.)

One could, a priori, attempt to put a different construction on the procedure of Abu ‘Ali. As the direct Fatimid line became extinguished, he declared the sovereignty to devolve on the Mahdi-Qaim, the expected Messiah of the Ismailis, not of the Twelvers—i.e. a descendant of Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il, not the Mahdi of the Twelver line. Such an assumption has, however, no base whatsoever in our authorities, who say expressly that Abu ‘Ali adopted the Imamite creed. — When Wiet says: “... l’Imam Attendu, c’est à dire un hypothétique descendant de Nizār, fils de Mustansir” (p. 86; similarly also in Précis de l’Histoire d’Egypte, II, 191) he is, no doubt, mistaken.

This solution secured the maximum amount of power to Abu ‘Ali Kutayfāt, who ruled as a dictator responsible to no one either in theory or practice. To be sure, our sources assert that Abū ‘Ali was an Imamite by conviction, and his religious views may in fact have played an important part in his decision.

We have coins of the year 525 (struck in Cairo, Fustat and Alexandria) bearing the name of “The Imam Muḥammad Abū-l-Qāsim al-muntazir li-amri-llāh, Commander of the Faithful”. Other coins (Alexandria, 526) give greater prominence to the person of the regent; they read as follows: “Al-imām al-mahdī al-qā‘im bi-amri-llāh ḥujjat Allāh ‘ala-l-‘ālamīn”; furthermore: “Al-Afdal Abū ‘Ali ‘Aḥmad, his Representant (nā‘ib) and Lieutenant (khalīfa)’.

archy of the ḍāʾīs, Abū ‘All must have remained an Ismaili himself (cf. above, p. 205). This would be, however, a false conclusion. It was not impossible for a Fatimid vizier to be personally a non-Ismaili and yet to assume the customary title of the ‘director’ of the ḍāʾīs. So it is not so surprising that Abū ‘Ali, though he was personally a non-Ismaili and even ‘disestablished’ Ismailism as the religion of the State, still remained the titular head of the daʿwa.

All this meant, of course, the abolition of Ismailism as the state religion of Egypt. Nevertheless, Abū ‘Ali did not propose to outlaw it and even showed it a certain amount of consideration: in the college of qadis which he appointed and which consisted of four members, there sat an Ismaili, in addition to a Ḥanafi, a Shāfiʿi and an Imāmi (Ibn al-Muyassar, p. 74; cf. H. F. Amedroz, Office of Kadi, J.R.A.S., 1910, p. 786). Moreover, if the view put forward above is correct, Abū ‘Ali went so far as to become, after the practice followed by Fatimid viziers, titular head of the Ismaili daʿwa.

It was, no doubt, a vague reminiscence of the intermezzo of Abū ‘Ali, as it has been just described, when allegiance was paid to the ‘Expected Mahdi’, that induced Ivanow to postulate that during the reigns of the last four Fatimid Caliphs the ‘khutba was read in the name of al-Qāʿīm’ (cf. above, p. 202). The information concerning the coup d’état of Abū ‘Ali was erroneously referred to the reigns of al-Ḥāfiz and his successors.

If Abū ‘Ali hoped to establish his régime firmly as the ‘Lieutenant’ of an Imam whose appearance was to be expected in a conveniently distant future, he was quickly and cruelly deceived. His reign did not last more than a year. The Ismaili elements evidently did not relish the idea of being relegated to the status of a disestablished religious sect; the Emir Yānis organised resistance, and found a great response, especially among the soldiers of the Kutāmī jund, the hereditary mainstay of Fatimid rule. Abū ‘Ali was killed while riding outside the city and ‘Abd al-Majīd fetched from his prison (16th Muḥarram, 526). The event was commemorated annually, right to the end of the Fatimid dynasty, by the ‘īd al-naṣr held on that date; cf. al-Maqrīzī, Khīṭṭāt, I, 357, 490.

---

1 According to al-Rūḥī “he dropped the mention of the House of Ismā‘īl” (i.e. the Fatimids), asqaṭ dhikr al Ismā‘īl. The same information occurs also in Ibn al-Muyassar (p. 75) in an altered form: ‘He dropped the mention of Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far from whom the Ismā‘iliyya derive their name’. The person of Ismā‘īl does not play any special role in Ismaili ritual — so this form of the notice is obviously corrupted from that which it has in al-Rūḥī. — According to al-Rūḥī he abolished from the ḥadān the formula Muḥammad wa-ʿAli khayr al-bashar; Ibn al-Muyassar mentions, instead, the formula ḥayy ʿalā khayr al-ʿamal.

2 It is probable that the persecution of the staunchest adherents of al-Ṭayyib, mentioned in the passages of Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī, has nothing to do with the adoption of Imamism; it probably belongs to the preceding period and was due to their opposition to the regency of ‘Abd al-Majīd on behalf of the unborn child of al-ʿAmīr, instead of al-Ṭayyib.
The Succession to the Fatimid Imam al-Amir

At first this restoration meant a return to the status quo, 'Abd al-Majid bearing the title of Regent. This is expressly stated by al-Maqrizi (I, 357) and is confirmed by a coin struck in Alexandria in 526, bearing the old legend: Abu-l-Maymūn 'Abd al-Majid wali 'ahd al-muslimin (E. T. Rogers, Quelques pièces rares, in: Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte, 1882, p. 31 ff.). This was, of course, absurd; there was no legitimate heir for whom 'Abd al-Majid could act as regent. If Ismailism was to continue the basis of the régime, there was only one way open, to proclaim 'Abd al-Majid as Imam and to try to find some theological justification for the settlement of the Imamate upon him. Such justification was the more imperative as never before in Fatimid history had an Imam been succeeded by any one who was not his son; the situation of 'Abd al-Majid was, therefore, delicate enough and required careful handling.

On the 3rd of Rabiʿ II, a few months after his restoration as regent, 'Abd al-Majid was proclaimed Imam under the title of al-Hāfiz li-din Allāh. Ibn al-Muyassar, p. 75: “On the 3rd Rabiʿ al-akhir there was read a sijill containing the proclamation of 'Abd al-Majid as Imam. He rode in the attire of the Caliphs from the Gate of the Feast to the Golden Gate ... He ordered that the following khutba should be pronounced on the minbars: O God, bless the one through whom Thou hast fortified Thy religion, after Thy enemies tried to destroy it ... our Lord and Master, the Imam of our epoch and of our time, 'Abd al-Majid Abu-l-Maymūn etc.” (Cf. also Ibn Taghrībirīdī, III, 3.) “More than a year after the assassination of al-Āmir, as if nothing had occurred in the meantime, al-Hāfiz informed the people of Egypt of his predecessor’s death and made efforts to give a firm foundation in theory to his power as Imam. He had an ingenious idea of the way to achieve this: al-Āmir had transmitted the Caliphate to his cousin al-Hāfiz in the same way as Muhammad had once conferred the succession on his cousin ‘Ali, near the Pool of Khumm” (Wiet). There was, of course, as little mention of al-Ṭayyīb, as of the prophecy of al-Amir about the birth of the male heir and the regency of the Emir ‘Abd al-Majid till he should grow up and be able to succeed to his father is heritage and rule as Imam 1.

1 The following account of the accession of al-Ḥāfiz by Ibn Ḥammād (548-628) — which he received orally from the qadi Abu-l-Makārim Hibat-Allāh al-Misrī — though it is rather confused, deserves to be quoted (ed. Vonderheyden, p. 60). “Al-Ḥāfiz was of the family of the Caliphs, but was not the son of a Caliph, while it was part of their law and doctrine (read: wa-ḥān min rasmihim wa-madhhabihim allā yuwallū ... instead of wa-ḥāna-bna raʿisihim wa-madhhabhīm ... ?) not to entrust the Caliphate to any but the son of a Caliph. Al-Āmir died childless, but it was thought that he left one of his wives pregnant”. The next words are, no doubt, corrupt: wa-ṭalālika bi-l-Ḥāfiz. “As no child was born, ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Ḥāfiz said to his dāʿī — this is how they name the
The siji’il proclaiming ‘Abd al-Majid as Imam has luckily been pre-
served by al-Qalqashandi. It begins with the full protocol in the usual
Fatimid style; in addition, it asserts emphatically, in the very preamble,
that the inheritance of his forefathers the Imams has, indeed, devolved
on al-Hāfiz. Coming to the body of the siji’il, al-Hāfiz leads up to his
argument by a discreet allusion to the previous troubles: “The moon of
truth, even if it is hidden for a time, will appear in the end in the fulness
of its light” etc., and reaffirms the main doctrine of Ismailism: that
“God does not leave the Moslem Community without an Imam to lead
them on the right path”, that “the earth, when it is darkened by the
loss of an Imam, will immediately regain its brightness by the accession
of another”. Al-Āmir, who was, like his ancestor ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib, as-
sassinated by criminals, “often mentioned, some times explicitly, some
times obscurely, that he was well aware of the rights of the Commander
of the Faithful (i.e. al-Hāfiz); till at the end he expressed this in un-
mistakable terms ... He did so because of his knowledge that he (al-
Hāfiz) was the noblest branch on the trunk of Prophecy and that his
father, the Emir Abu-l-Qāsim ... had been named by al-Mustansir
wali ‘ahd al-muslimīn; this title is found in the text of the endorsements
and grants (taswīghāt) addressed to the Chancery offices, in inscriptions
on buildings and in documents of sale and purchase, as is of common
knowledge”. As Abu-l-Qāsim never came to reign, his appointment as
wali ‘ahd al-muslimīn might appear purposeless; it has, however — so

1 Subh al-‘aṣkhā, IX, 291 ff. A few corrections in the text: p. 294, last line: instead of

2 This is confirmed by the declarations made in the anti-Nizārī demonstration of 516 A. H.

and the corresponding passage of the al-Hiddya al-Āmīriyya. The argument was there used
to prove the superiority of al-Musta’īl, that he bore the title of wali ‘ahd al-muslimīn, while his
brothers (among whom is Abu-l-Qāsim, the father of al-Hāfiz) had to content themselves with
the inferior status of wali ‘ahd al-muslimīn (see the article quoted above p. 194, n. 1, p. 23).
the sijill asserts — an inner meaning (*fi ḍimm dhālika bāḥīn lā ya‘qiluhū illa-l-‘ālimūn*): in fact, it envisaged Abu-l-Qāsim’s son, al-Ḥāfiz. It is in this way that al-Ḥāfiz claims for his accession the naṣṣ or appointment by the preceding Imam, a *conditio sine qua non* in Ismaili theory. But how could one justify the transfer of the Imamate from cousin to cousin, an event without precedent in the history of the dynasty, where, up to that time, sons had invariably succeeded to fathers? There are, however, in the opinion of al-Ḥāfiz, events in history which serve as precedents for his accession, nay, even more, which are to be taken as foreshadowing it ‘typologically’. (‘For events turn out similar in all respects, preceding events support the succeeding ones, and are to be taken as *types* — indication, *ramz* — of them.’) At Ghadir Khumm Muhammad had appointed ‘Alī as his successor; the latter’s father had been present at the time of that event. In the same way al-Āmīr appointed his cousin al-Ḥāfiz, although his uncles were alive: “thus he was following the example of the Prophet”. There was another ‘type’: al-Ḥākim had, as was well known, appointed his cousin ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Ilyās as his heir. Now, this appointment had no practical consequences, as al-Ḥākim was succeeded not by him, but, as was right, by his own son. Does that mean that the appointment of his cousin by al-Ḥākim had been in vain? By no means: “there is in that appointment a subtle and deep meaning and a secret hidden from the eyes of the common crowd”. Al-Ḥākim knew perfectly well that, having a son, there was no point in making a cousin his heir; the succession of cousin to cousin is to operate only in the case of an Imam who dies without heir. Al-Ḥākim, in making that appointment, had no other purpose than to constitute a precedent, or type, for the case of al-Ḥāfiz. When al-Manṣūr Abū ‘Alī al-Āmīr bi-ahkām Allāh — whose names and *laqab* corresponded with those of al-Ḥākim — died without heir, “the hidden secret appeared and the allusion became manifest ... He followed the example of the Prophet ... and made clear the implicit meaning of al-Ḥākim ... He (al-Āmīr) used to give him (al-Ḥāfiz) ...” In the seating arrangements at table, the same precedence that he had himself ... and used to depute him to pray over deceased of rank who were worth to be prayed over by the Imam ... As this matter is now perfectly clear ... and everybody, foe and friend, understands that God has given the Commander of the Faithful the Imamate” and has favoured him with the support of the vizier Yānis, “it is your duty to pay allegiance to the Commander of the Faithful” etc.

The document summarized above is of great importance; indeed, it constitutes the charter on which the whole Fatimid rule was based
during the forty or so years which were to remain to it. We see that there can be no question of al-Ḥāfīz and his successors "not being regarded as Imams even by themselves". The arguments employed in it may, or may not, sound casuistical and unconvincing; that is beside the point. What matters is that the proclamation clearly shows that al-Ḥāfīz claimed the rights of the Imamate; by publishing, in his sijill, an elaborate apology of his position, he aimed at making people forget the uncertain hesitations which marked his first steps and conveying the idea that his succession had come about in a straightforward way without any complications.

The régime never ceased from that time to assert its legitimacy. Let us take, for example, the inscription from the very year 526 — the inscription whose interpretation gave Wiet occasion to write those paragraphs which we have mentioned repeatedly (Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, Le Caire, II, no. 566, p. 81 ff.)¹. The Caliph is here called according to the usual Fatimid protocol: "The servant of God and His beloved our Lord and Master the Imam al-Ḥāfīz li-dīn Allāh (‘abd Allāh wa-walīyyuhū maulānā wa-sayyidūnā al-Imām al-Ḥāfīz li-dīn Allāh)". In addition, the Qādi Sirāj al-dīn Abu-l-Thurayya mentioned in the inscription bears, among various ordinary titles, some that seem to have a special stress: "[pillar] of the prophetic dynasty, support of the ‘Alid and Ḥāfīzite Caliphate" ([... ] al-daula al-nabawiyya, ‘imād al-khilāfa al-‘alawiyya al-ḥāfiziyya)².

It would be very easy to multiply examples of the titles of Imamate employed by al-Ḥāfīz and his successors on coins, in documents etc.; this would, however, be superfluous. It is evident that the later Fatimids (al-Ḥāfīz, al-Ẓāfīr, al-Fāʾīz and al-‘Āḍīd) considered themselves fully legitimate Imams and bore the appropriate titles.

The Ismaili traditions, too, were no doubt kept up under these Caliphs. We can compile an almost complete list of the Chief Daʾīs who held office under them ³. The literary activity of the Ismaili theologians can

¹ In the inscription, instead of al-qāḍī al-muʿayyad al-amīr Sirāj al-dīn, as Wiet, read: al-qāḍī al-muʿayyad al-amīn S.

² Al-daula al-ḥāfiziyya and al-imāma al-ḥāfiziyya occurs also in documents emanating from the Chancery (cf. al-Qalqashandi, VI, 450, VI, 108; VIII, 344 — quoted by Wiet, who seems, however, to read too much into this usage).

³ Sirāj al-dīn Abu-l-Thurayya Najm b. Jaʿfar, qāḍī al-qaḍāʾ and dāʾī al-duʿāʾī, appointed in 526 (Ibn al-Muyassar, 768°); Abu-l-Ẓāhir Ismāʿīl b. Salama, in office in 543 (idem, 88°, cf. 73°); Abu-l-Ẓahr b. Ismāʿīl b. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār, in office in 549 (idem, 93°-14°); al-jalis b. ‘Abd al-Qawwāl, before and during the times of Shirkhūr (al-Maqrīzī, Khišāf, I, 391; according to this passage, during the last times of the Fatimid dynasty the Chief Dāʾīship was hereditary among the Banū ‘Abd al-Qawwāl).
be assumed to have continued. If we have no specimens of their products, this is easily explained: "Ḥāfīzi" Ismailism, as we may call this branch, did not long survive the fall of the Fatimid dynasty and there was nobody to preserve its literature in the manner that "Ṭayyibi" literature was preserved in Yemen and India.

To be sure, Ismailism in Egypt did not disappear immediately after Saladin put an end to Fatimid rule. P. Casanova has collected the evidence about the various Fatimid pretenders, genuine or otherwise, who tried to restore the fallen dynasty (Les derniers Fatimides, in: Mémoires publiées par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française, vol. VI, 1893, p. 415 ff. 1). For particulars it is enough to refer to this interesting paper; here we shall quote only the passage in which Casanova summarizes the results of his investigations (p. 444): "The partisans of the Fatimids kept up their agitation for a long time. The main conspiracies were, in Cairo, that of the poet 'Umāra 2 in 568 A.H., and in Upper Egypt that of the general Kanz al-daula (569-70). Salāḥ al-dīn discovered the former; his brother al-Malik al-ʿĀdil combatted and annihilated the latter conspiracy . . . So the partisans of the Fatimids renounced the idea of an open contest. — We know also the names of several pretenders, viz.: a person, probably in Cairo, who took the title al-Imam al-Musta'sim bi-llāh, and whose name, Abu-l-'Abbās Ẓāhir leads me to consider him a cousin of al-ʿĀdīd (the last Fatimid Imam); a self-styled son of al-ʿĀdīd, called Dāwūd, in 572 A.H. in the town of Qīfṭ; a grand-son, possible genuine, of al-Ḥāfīz in the year 588, in Cairo; finally, in Fez, a grand-son of al-ʿĀdīd". To this list we may add another pretender who appeared as late as 1298: Dāwūd b. Sulaymān b. Dāwūd, grandson of the Dāwūd mentioned above (Ibn Ḥajar, al-Durar al-kāmina, III, 13; quoted by A. N. Poliak, Dibre yemē ha-'Arābīm, Jerusalem 1945, p. 155). Moreover, an isolated community of Ismailis is mentioned in 1327 by a geographer as existing in the village of Uṣfūn; we may assume that there were other similar Ismaili remnants in other parts of Egypt, too.

A. N. Poliak in: J.R.A.S., 1939, p. 429 (quoting, for the Ismailis in Uṣfūn and in two other villages of the neighbourhood, al-Dimashqī, ed. Meheren, p. 233). The use made by Poliak of these data is somewhat fanciful. Moreover, the information about the Ismailis contained in the special oath devised by the Mameluk chancery for their use, reproduced by Ibn Faḍlallāh and al-Qalqashandi, and especially those to be found in the comments of the latter on the formula — must not be accepted at its face value. The oath itself looks more like a

---

1 About the pretender in Fes (executed in 600) and his son (610 or 612) cf. also R. Brunschvig, in: Mélanges Gaufrey-Demombynes, p. 156, note 1.

2 More correctly: in which the poet 'Umāra, too, was implicated.
product of erudite fancy than a form actually in use, while many of the comments of al-Qalqashandi are evidently spun out of the text and are not based on an independent tradition. — The formula has been translated by B. Lewis, Isma‘ili Notes, B.S.O.S., 1948, 597-8, who, however, says that it “may, on the whole, be relied upon as giving the approved formula for the numerous Ismailis still to be found in the Mamluk dominions”.

We have seen (above, p. 197) that besides the official “Ḥāfiẓī” Ismailism there were in Egypt adherents of al-Ṭayyib, too; they are recorded even in Syria. The party was known in these countries as “al-Āmriyya”. They seem to have played no great role; at least they left no traces except in the meagre passages of the two chroniclers quoted above. It was the Yemen that was to become the home of “Ṭayyibi” Ismailism.

IV.

While in Egypt Ismailism succumbed soon after the end of the Fatimid dynasty, it has survived in Yemen — even if in very restricted dimensions — down to the present day; moreover, Yemeni Ismailism founded a thriving colony in India. The Ismailism of Yemen and India is, however, exclusively of the Ṭayyibi persuasion. To be sure, this was not the case from the very beginning. We may anticipate the results of the following investigation by stating that, after the death of al-Āmir, both the Ḥāfiẓī and Ṭayyibi parties found adherents in Yemen.

On the history of Ismailism in that country before and after the schism we have at our disposal evidence emanating from both factions. We must undertake the detailed analysis of these texts, even at the peril of unduly prolonging this chapter.

On the official Fatimid side, we have the History of Yemen by ‘Umāra. The author’s own religious convictions are anomalous enough: he seems to have managed to reconcile his Shafi‘ī Sunnismn with an ardent attachment to the Fatimids. This attachment was by no means confined to a mere political loyalty to the powers that be; his books bear witness

---

1 Published by H. C. Kay, London 1892. In the only manuscript known the book bears the title Ta’rikh al-Yaman. So also in Abu-l-Fidā‘, Cairo 1325, I, 3 (Introduction); II, 24 (s.a. 203); II, 153 (s.a. 412); III, 35 (s.a. 554). In Ibn Khallikān, s.v. ‘Umāra (ed. Wüstenfeld V, 104), and s.v. ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Ṣulayḥi (V, 91) it is called Akhbār al-Yaman. Other sources call it Kitāb al-Mufid fi akhbār Zabīd: al-Janadi, in: Derenbourg, ‘Oumara du Yemen, II, 547; op. cit. 544 has: Mufid ‘Umāra, in order to distinguish it from another book of the same title, the K. al-M. fi a. Z. of Jayyāsh; op. cit. 542, 631, 633, 637, 649: al-Mufid; Al-Sakhāwī, I‘lām al-tanbih, p. 127: al-Mufid fi akhbār Zabīd; Idris, ‘Uyūn al-akhbār, passim: al-Mufid. The history of Zabīd does, in fact, occupy a prominent place in the History of ‘Umāra; nevertheless, the second part of the title: “... fi akhbār Zabīd” does not seem to be altogether justified.

that he assimilated to a great extent the Ismaili point of view; and it is
well known that after the fall of the dynasty he paid with his life for his
continued advocacy of the Fatimid cause. His history was written
in the year 563 for al-Qādi al-Fādil al-Baysānī, at that time Chancellor
and Chief Secretary to the Caliph al-ʿĀdid. In it ʿUmāra recapitulates
the earlier history of the contemporary Yemeni dynasties, treats in
greater detail of the events of the hundred years or so preceding his
own epoch and also gives an account of contemporary events. For the
periods treated in detail by ʿUmāra, his History remained the standard
work, which all later historians used as a quarry. Unfortunately, the
book has come down to us in a single manuscript only 1.

1 Brit. Mus., Or. 3265 (Rieu, Supplement, p. 374-8). The manuscript is very faulty; nor is Kay's
treatment of the text satisfactory. (His merit lies in the rich material brought together by him
for the historical commentary.) Some emendations have been proposed by W. Robertson-Smith
material, in the form of quotations from the book, has become available, so that a much better
text could now be produced. — As an illustration of the state of the text, I wish to dwell at some
length on one particular passage that has already exercised the minds of several scholars. On p. 58
ʿUmāra tells a story about the generosity of the ḍāʿi ʿImrān b. ʿUmmām the Zurayīfīd. He
(ʿUmāra) owed the prince the amount of three thousand dinars; but on returning to his court
from Egypt, gave him a letter from the Fatimid vizier al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ (Talāḥī b. Ruzzīk) de-
manding that ʿUmāra should be allowed to pay back the money by instalments. (That is the
meaning of the term taqṣīt, cf. Dozy, II, 344; it is misunderstood by the translator.) “What is the
purport of al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ’s letter” asked the ḍāʿī. Al-Qāḍī al-Rashīd, who was also present,
answered: taqṣīt. The ḍāʿī answered: بل يقَدَّمَ بَيْنَ يَقَدَّمْ عَلَى الْعَاثِفِ فِي نَفْسَهَ Kay ‘emends’
(note 2): يُقَدَّمُ عَلَى الْعَاثِفِ فِي نَفْسَهَ and translates: “Let ʿUmāra offer us two lines of verse,
in which he shall strictly observe the laws of rhyme, and the account shall be regulated.” W.
Robertson Smith, in: J.R.A.S., 1893, p. 206-7, after a suggestion about the meaning of taqṣīt
(which is, however, wrong), remarks: “The first h-i, seems to be a dittography. “Let him
first produce two verses on the subject rhyming in qāf.” The prince prescribes the rhyme to secure
an impromptu.” H. Deroenbourg (Oumara du Yemen, II, 111) is not much nearer to the point:
“Let ʿUmāra recite, exclaimed the ḍāʿī, two verses ending in the letter qāf preceded by sin”. In
a note, Deroenbourg adds: “The command of the ḍāʿī, about the rhyme in sin qāf, results from the
form in which the passage of ʿUmāra is quoted in Bā Makhrama, Taʾrīkh, fol. 93vo. [The text as it is
quoted by Bā Makhrama — whom Deroenbourg adds to support his interpretation — bears
out mine; see ed. Lōŋgren, vol. II (1950), p. 184.] Sin precedes qāf in the verb saqata, ‘to fall’, which
I suppose must be read wherever Kay printed qasa.ta ... cf. Kay, Yaman, p. 58 note 2. In the
translation, p. 78, certain details are open to doubt, but the passage as a whole is clear.” — The
correct interpretation of the passage is, no doubt, as follows. Read: 
(1 and 2 represent, of course, the same skeleton: Ṣ). Translate: “Let the sin
of the word .pagination pass into sin (‘it shall be paid by instalments’) be made to precede the qāf of the same
word, so that it (becomes) sin (‘it — scil. the debt — shall be waived’).
Of the historical sources of the Ţayyibis, I have been able — in addition to some pages of a contemporary polemical treatise by al-Khaṭṭāb — to make use of the following: a) A chapter from a book of the ḍā'ī Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī (the son of the Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī, mentioned above as an authority on the persecution of the followers of al-Ţayyib), bearing the title Tuhfat al-qulūb wa-ṣfarat al-kurūb (Ivanow, Guide, p. 55) 1. This passage gives a short review of the earlier Isma’ili ḍāʾīs of the Yemen and adds a detailed list of the contemporary dignitaries of the daʿwa. We have here an important primary source. b) The well known compilation of Idrīs ʿImād al-dīn: ʿUyun al-akhbār. The final paragraphs of this book (vol. VII, p. 325 ff.) deal with the “troubles that arose after the death of al-ʿĀmir”. Idrīs has preserved for us a few original documents that will prove of use; on the other hand, he is a compiler, working with materials of various origins. He had before him ʿUmāra’s book 2 and the writings of various Ṭayyibi authors; his account will be seen to be an attempt to harmonize the Ṭayyibi point of view with the data given by ʿUmāra.

Let us begin with ʿUmāra. His book cannot be called well constructed; its various chapters are strung together without much internal cohesion. That on the Ṣulayḥids ends abruptly with the mention al-Ḥalika al-Sayyida’s affliction over the arrest of the ḍāʾī Ibn Najīb al-duʿala (p. 48). (It is, indeed, sufficiently puzzling why ʿUmāra is silent about the further history of the queen.) There follows the chapter about the Banū Zurayʿī, in which ʿUmāra goes back to the beginnings of the family fortunes. When Sabaʾ b. ʿAlī is first introduced (p. 49), the title ḍāʾī is attached to his name; on p. 55, in a passage which will command our attention in the latter part of this chapter, it is explicitly stated that he was in charge of the daʿwa of al-Ḥāfiẓ. There is, however, no account given in the main body of the book of the events that led to the transfer of the ḍāʾīship to the Zurayʿīds.

This matter is dealt with in the last paragraph of the book, a kind of appendix, which bears the inscription: “Chapter in which are enumerated the persons who had held the office of ḍāʾī in Yemen for the Fatimids” (p. 100-2). ʿUmāra mentions there: ʿAlī b. Muḥammad, the founder of the Ṣulayḥīd house; his son al-Mukarram Aḥmad — both of whom

1 Ivanow gave further details about the treatise in: Journal of Bombay Branch of R.A.S., 1939, p. 1 ff. I have no manuscript of the book at my disposal; the passage in question is reproduced from the extract in the Kitāb al-azhār. See Appendix no. II.

2 The History of ʿUmāra, quoted under the name of al-Mufid (cf. above note 52) is one of the main sources of vol. VII.
combined sovereign power with the *dā'īship*; Sulaymān al-Zawāḥī 1; the Qadi [Yaḥyā b. Lamak] 2 b. Mālik; and, finally, ‘Ali b. Ibrāhīm b. Najīb al-daula 3. — From a chance remark of ‘Umāra in another part of his book (p. 45) we learn that a certain ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Abdallāh (so ed.; the ‘*Uyun al-akhbār*, which quotes the whole chapter in question — VII, 301 ff. — has ‘Ali b. ‘Abdallāh, which is perhaps preferable), a Şulayḥid, “exercised the functions of *dā‘ī* after Ibn Najīb al-daula”. The text goes on to recount the notification received by al-Malika al-Sayyida of the birth of al-Ṭayyib and his appointment as heir; the *sijill* announcing this event is given *in extenso*. It is related that al-Ḥāfīz, in the first year of his rule, styled himself *wali ‘ahd al-muslimn*. The Queen then appointed as *dā‘ī* Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn al-Ḥāmīdī. “She transferred the office of *dā‘ī* on behalf of the Caliph al-Ḥāfīz to the family of Zuray‘. «Sufficient», said the Queen, «for the Banū al-Šulayḥī is that which they know respecting our Lord al-Ṭayyib»”. Then the office was held by Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmīdī, “down to our time”. “It was transferred under the reign of al-Ḥāfīz to the family of Zuray‘.” The first *dā‘ī* of that house was Saba‘ b. Abi-l-Su‘ūd; he was succeeded by Muḥammad b. Saba‘.

If we want to paraphrase the passage as it stands and interpret its force, we shall have to say something like the following. Al-Malika al-Sayyida remained convinced of the rights of al-Ṭayyib; she took care to have his *da‘wa* preached by Ibrāhīm (followed by his son Ḥātim). On the other hand, she was obliged — by political necessities, we may safely suppose — to appoint *dā‘īs* on behalf of al-Ḥāfīz, too. But, in

---

1 Sulaymān b. ‘Āmir, of the eminent Isma‘ili family of al-Zawāḥī, half-brother of al-Malika al-Sayyida; his appointment as *dā‘ī* is mentioned also in the body of ‘Umāra’s book, where it is added that he was subsequently poisoned by the Queen’s minister, al-Muṣafḍāl (p. 28; cf. also p. 34).

2 There is a lacuna in the manuscript between the words *qādī* and b. Mālik; there is, however, not the slightest doubt that we have to supply: Yaḥyā b. Lamak. On him see Ivanow, *Guide*, p. 50, and below in the present study, p. 219.

S. M. Stern

doing so, she was yielding to force majeure; in her heart she remained true to al-Ţayyib, the rightful Imam: “Sufficient for the Baniu al-Şulayḥī is that which they know respecting our Lord al-Ţayyib”.

To paraphrase the passage, is to lay bare its difficulties. In fact, it does not seem to me easy to believe that it was written by ‘Umāra. It is not that there are intrinsic reasons for declaring that the events could not have happened in the way described; indeed, we shall come to the conclusion that they actually did happen in approximately that way. But, admitted that the passage relates what is historically true, it is still impossible to believe that ‘Umāra described them in this way. This sounds paradoxical; but we must recall the ideological premisses of the post-Ḥāfiẓī Caliphate of the Fatimids and ‘Umāra’s attitude towards that Caliphate. We have seen that the book in which this passage is supposed to have stood, was dedicated to a high dignitary of the Caliph, a grand-son of al-Ḥāfiẓ. Is it, then, conceivable that ‘Umāra should say, in so many words, that the true heir of al-Āmir was al-Ţayyib; that al-Ḥāfiẓ and his descendants are — by implication — usurpers; that the Zuray‘īds, his patrons, whom, in all his writings, he never ceases to praise, are ‘second class’ dā‘īs, owing their appointment to a merely outward compliance with political pressure, while the real dā‘īs of the real Imam are the Ḥāmidīs? On internal grounds the conclusion seems, then, inevitable that the passage has been tampered with. This is borne out by external evidence, too.

We have mentioned that late historians use ‘Umāra’s book extensively; among them is al-Janadī. Now, in a passage, clearly based on the paragraph we are dealing with, he writes as follows 1: “When Ibn Najib al-daula departed, as will be related hereafter, the queen appointed in his place the dā‘ī Ibrāḥīm b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥāmidī. When she received tidings of the death of al-Āmir and of the accession of his successor al-Ḥāfiẓ in Egypt, she transferred the office of dā‘ī to the family of Zuray‘, as will hereafter be clearly explained. «Sufficient », she said, « for the family of al-Şulayḥī is what they have done in the cause of our Lords, upon whom be the blessings of God ». This occurred after the death of the dā‘ī Ibrāḥīm, and the first of the family of Zuray‘ to be invested with the dignity was Saba’ son of Abu-l-Su‘ūd”. Further on, according to Kay, after relating the end of Ibn Najib al-daula’s career

1 See Kay, note 102, p. 297-300. — Kay has seen some of the difficulties of the text of ‘Umāra. He points out, very pertinently, that “the unsatisfactory manner in which the edict of the Khalifa al-Āmir is introduced and interrupts the subject of the chapter, is in itself suspicious”. Kay will not be blamed if some of the further suggestions in the note miss their mark; the background of these events was, of course, quite obscure at the time.
in Yemen, al-Janadi repeats the statement in almost the same words, but adds that Ibrāhim al-Ḥāmīdī did not long survive his appointment and that at about the time he died there came news of the death of the reigning Caliph in Cairo, on the receipt of which the Queen transferred the office of dāʿī to the Zurayʿites.

It is probable that al-Janadi has preserved for us the actual wording of the sentence put by ‘Umāra into the mouth of the Queen. “Sufficient for the family of al-Ṣulayḥī is what they have done in the cause of our Lord, upon whom the blessings of God”. That is to say: the time of the Ṣulayḥīs is past; the Fatimid daʿwa is in need of fresh forces — hence the appointment of the Zurayʿīds. This is a good justification of the position of the Zurayʿīds and is, as a matter of fact, the way one expects ‘Umāra to speak. It may be suggested that by a slight yet ingenious change (ʿalimū instead of ʿamilū and our Lord al-Ṭayyīb instead of our Lords) a Ṭayyībī hand produced out of the passage, originally a vindication of the Ḫāfīzī dāʿīs of the house of Zurayʿ, support for the Ṭayyībī cause. The same hand added the sentence about Ḥātim’s succession to his father; by a somewhat awkward repetition (It was transferred . . . Zurayʿ) he connected the interpolated sentence with the end of the original text. It was again the same interpolator who inserted the passage about the birth of al-Ṭayyīb, the text of the sijill and the note about the original style of al-Ḥāfīz as a mere regent ¹.

In the following translation of the paragraph adopted, with corrections, from Kay, what is to be considered the original text of ‘Umāra is printed in italics, while the assumed Ṭayyībī interpolations are in smaller type.

CHAPTER IN WHICH ARE ENUMERATED THE PERSONS WHO HELD THE OFFICE OF DĀʿĪ IN YEMEN FOR THE FATIMIDS

Of their number was the dāʿī ʿAlī b. Muhammad the Ṣulayḥī, who combined the office of dāʿī with the supreme power as temporal sovereign. Next was his son al-Mukarram Aḥmad the Ṣulayḥī, who likewise combined both offices. After him the Sultan Ṣulaymān al-Zawāḥī exercised the functions of dāʿī, but did not hold sovereign rule. Then the Qādī [Yaḥyā b. Lamak] b. Mālik al-Ḥāmīdī combined the office of dāʿī and qādī, but did not exer-

¹ As the British Museum manuscript of ‘Umāra can have hardly belonged to Ismailis, we must, the hypothesis of an interpolation admitted, assume that the archetype from which it was copied passed through Ismaili hands. One takes recourse to the assumption of so far reaching an interpolation with diffidence — but I cannot see how one can escape the force of both the internal and external evidence.
cise sovereign rule. Next ‘Ali b. Ibrāḥīm al-Muwaffaq ji-l-dīn, son of Najib al-daula, held the office of dāʾi and exercised sovereign rule, under the authority of the Lady Queen al-Sayyida, over part of her dominions.

Then, when the official notification was received from our Lord the Imam al-Āmīr bi-aḥkām Allāh, Commander of the faithful, bringing to the Queen, his hujja in the province (jazira) of Yemen 1, the glad tidings of his son, our Lord the Imam al-Tayyib Abu-l-Qāsim, and the new-born Prince’s designation as successor to the Imamate, (it was) conceived in the following terms 2:

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Gracious.

From the servant of God and His beloved, al-Mansur Abu ‘All, al-Amir bi-ahkam Allah Commander of the Faithful, unto the Lady the Queen, the highly esteemed, the pure, the stainless, the matchless of her age, sovereign lady of the kings of Yemen, the pillar, the true friend of the Imam, treasure of the Faith, support of the true Believers, refuge to the mustajibs, protectress of the truly directed, favourite of the Commander of the Faithful, Guardian of his blessed servants 3. Etc. etc. Soon afterwards our Lord al-Āmīr died and al-Ḥafiz succeeded. The first edict that reached the queen from him purported to proceed from wali ‘ahd al-muslimin.

In the second year of the Commander of the Faithful the Queen appointed the noble dāʾi Ibrāḥīm b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥāmidī.

She next transferred the office of dāʾi on behalf of the Caliph al-Ḥāfīz to the family of Zurayj. “Sufficient”, she said, “for the family of al-Ṣulayhi is what they have done in the cause of our Lords, upon whom the blessings of God”. [This occurred after the death of the dāʾi Ibrāḥīm.] 4

1 Note the discrepancy; while in the first paragraph it is implied that al-Sayyida did not exercise a spiritual function, here she is called hujja. It is suggested that the difference is between the genuine ‘Umāra, who does not know of al-Sayyida as a spiritual authority, and the Tayyibi tradition which does (confer below p. 221, 223, 224, n. 3).

2 The text of the sijill can be corrected with the help of the version contained in the ‘Uyūn al-akhbār (cf. p. 197, n. 3). P. 100 l. 17 read khaṣṣat al-Imām instead of khāṣṣat al-Imām. L. 18 al-mustajibīn is, of course, correct, al-mustanłđīn a mistaken alteration. L. 21 after yahmadu add ilayka. P. 101 l. 2 muhtadīn, ‘Uyūn: al-mahdiyyin, probably correctly; l. 4 after inqaḍa add minḥā; l. 5 a’qabahā read -ḥū; l. 8 after zakīyyan add radīyyan; l. 11 ʿizatiqi read ghurratīhī; l. 12 al-maṣāṭīl read al-faḍā’il; l. 14 after qadāḥa add biḥ; l. 21 ‘Uyūn reads, more correctly: wa-ghautan li-l-mustariḥīn wa-ghaythān li-l-muntajītīn instead of wa-as’ānān li-l-muṭdirīn wa-ghautān li-l-muntajītīn. P. 102 l. 2 after mahallikī add ʿindaḥā; imtana’a, ‘Uyūn reads irtaja’ā; l. 6 minḥā read minhum; l. 7 minhu wa-l-ḥudār read fi-l-bādīn wa-l-ḥudār; wa-l-sāmī read wa-l-malī. There are small divergences in the final formulas.

3 This protocol of the Queen recurs also in the khutba quoted below and in the documents preserved in the collection of al-Mustansir’s sijillāt (cf. B.S.O.S., 1933, p. 307 ff.) and in the ‘Uyūn al-akhbār.

4 The information given in this passage about Ibrāḥīm is one of the main difficulties in the whole problem. According to Tayyibi sources (cf. below and Ivanow, Guide, p. 52) he was ap-
The Succession to the Fatimid Imam al-Amir

The first of them was the matchless Emir Saba' b. Abi-l-Su'ud b. Zurai b. al-'Abbds al-Yami, who combined the office of dā'ī with sovereign rule. He was succeeded by his son, the great, the crowned, the powerful dā'ī, dā'ī of the Commander of the Faithful, Muḥammad b. Saba', in whose hands likewise the functions of dā'ī and the royal office were combined.

The text of 'Umāra as here reconstructed clearly aims at claiming the "apostolic succession" for the dā'īship of the Zurai'ids who are represented as appointed by al-Malika al-Sayyida, the last of the line of the Sulayḥids who had played such an outstanding role in Yemenite Isma'ilism. We learn little, however, about the actual circumstances of the crisis which led to the emergence of the Zurai'ids.

The passage of the dā'ī Ḥātim b. Ibrāhim (see Appendix no. II) also leaves our curiosity unsatisfied on this point; it contains, however, valuable information about the dā'īs, complementing the data furnished by 'Umāra.

We can leave aside the beginning of the passage, dealing with the earliest period of the Ismaili da'wa in Yemen, which does not concern us here. The figure who holds, in the epoch of the Sulayḥids, the main interest of Ḥātim, is the qadi Lamak b. Mālik. He was sent by 'Ali b. Muḥammad the Sulayḥid as his envoy to Cairo, where he stayed until 'Ali's death. There he enjoyed the teaching of the great Ismaili scholar of the period, al-Mu'ayyad fi-l-dīn, who held the office of Chief Dā'ī. On the accession of 'Ali's son Ahmad al-Mukarram, Lamak returned to Yemen. Ḥātim defines his position as follows: "He was the dignitary of the pen (sāhib rūbat al-qalam), by the side of the two excellent dā'īs, the dignitaries of the sword, al-Ajall al-Auhad (i.e. 'Ali b. Muḥammad) and his son al-Mukarram". Lamak was succeeded by his son Yahya. Yahyā, jointly with al-Malika al-Sayyida, appointed various hudūd, i.e. subordinate dā'īs. The most distinguished among them was al-Dhu'ayb b. Mūsā (cf. Ivanow, Guide, p. 52; died 546), whom Yahyā appointed as his successor. Al-Dhu'ayb appointed as his assistant al-Khaṭṭāb (cf. Appendix no. III); "the two of them were in charge of the jazīra and appointed its hudūd ... both during the life-time of the hujja and the dā'ī and after their death".

After the death of al-Khaṭṭāb (533) al-Dhu'ayb appointed the writer's
father Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥāmīdī in his stead. After the death of al-Dhu‘ayb Ibrāhīm succeeded to his office.

Ibrāhīm, in his turn, adopted as his assistants ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Walid (cf. Guide, p. 53) and Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir (cf. Guide, p. 53; died 584). On Ibrāhīm’s death (557, according to Ismaili tradition), the author, his son, succeeded him. His two assistants were Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir and ‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. al-Walid (cf. Guide, p. 56). For our present purpose there is no need to go into the other details, interesting as they are, which the author gives about the organization of the da‘wa under his own da‘īship.

The discrepancies between the accounts of Ḥātim and ‘Umbāra, due to the different points of view of the two authors, will appear from the following table, confronting the lists of the leaders of the da‘wa in Yemen as given by them.
The Succession to the Fatimid Imam al-Amir

The first difference is that Ḥātim has, in contrast to ʿUmāra, two parallel lines of succession. This, however, does not yet involve a real contradiction. Ḥātim himself stresses that, while Lamak and his successors were regarded as the leaders of the daʿwa in spiritual things, the first place in it belonged to the Sulayhids. It is true, that for Ḥātim the line of Lamak has a very special significance; it provides the foundations for the ‘apostolic succession’ of the dāʿīs, the actual heads of the Yemeni daʿwa, when, after the ‘concealment’ of al-Ṭayyib, it became autocephalous. In the period of ‘khashf’, the members of this line had occupied the second rank, under the chiefs of the daʿwa (being, at the same time, the spiritual leaders of the movement); when, at the beginning of the period of ‘satr’, the office of those chiefs falls into abeyance, they, the successors of Lamak, are left as the highest dignitaries of the daʿwa. Al-Dhuʿayb is a specially important link, bridging in his person the two periods and assuring, over the critical moment of the ‘disappearance of the Imam’, the continuity of the line. So it is not surprising that Ḥātim makes much of Lamak and his successors; nor does, of course, ʿUmāra’s silence imply much: he does not mention them because they were not the heads of the daʿwa — and it is those that he wanted to enumerate in the paragraph in question.

How far the hierarchy of the daʿwa in Yemen was systematized and if we can assume that the actual heads of the daʿwa were called ḥujja, and those of the next degree dāʿī muṭlaq, cannot be decided with certainty. ʿUmāra always uses the word dāʿī for what according to the system should be called ḥujja; and even Ḥātim, while he once employs the term zujja, usually calls the Sulayhids dāʿīs. In general, the organization of the Fatimid daʿwa, and the system of its hierarchy, which can be shown to have undergone some changes, is in need of further investigation.

The other difference, however, is not any more one of emphasis but one of fact, and a reconciliation of the two accounts is impossible. From ʿUmāra’s list it clearly follows that al-Malika al-Sayyida “did not exercise the functions of a dāʿī”, evidently because of her sex. Therefore, while she kept secular sovereignty, the office of dāʿī was entrusted to other persons. Ḥātim regards her as being also the spiritual head of the daʿwa. In this he follows earlier Ṭayyibi authorities; already al-Khaṭṭāb undertook, as we shall see, to prove that a woman could be a ḥujja and that al-Malika al-Sayyida was a ḥujja. For this reason, Ḥātim also eliminates the whole series of dāʿīs, from Sulaymān to ʿAli b. ʿAbdallāh, who according to ʿUmāra filled that position under the reign of al-Sayyida. The very Yahyā b. Lamak is transferred from the line of the heads of the daʿwa (where he figures in ʿUmāra) to that of the “spiritual leaders”. It seems obvious that ʿUmāra’s account represents historical
reality better than that of Ḥātim. Of the schism after the death of al-Āmir, there is no mention; Ḥātim's interest lies in the uninterrupted chain of the legitimate daʿwa and passes over the adversaries with a disdainful silence.

The case is quite different with Idrīs in the ʿUyūn al-akhbār; he is very eager to tell the story of the schism and to explain it in terms of the Ṭayyībī daʿwa. He has before him ʿUmāra's History; and he feels called upon to make the facts there recorded palatable for Ṭayyībī-Ismailī taste. His solution lies in a harmonization, not unlike that which the interpolator of ʿUmāra resorted to. Al-Malīka al-Sayyīda remained faithful to the Imam al-Ṭayyīb to the end of her days; she saw herself constrained to conform, outwardly, to the de facto power of al-Ḥāfīz and to appoint the Zurayʿīd Sabaʿ b. Abī-l-Sufūd as the latter's daʿī. Now, there would be, theoretically, two ways open for Idrīs in characterizing the Zurayʿīds; he could depict them in dark colours as traitors, blackguards, munājīqūn, in the familiar manner of sectarian historians of his kind, or he could represent them as true believers who, in acting contrary to their convictions, were merely practising taqīyya. It was the second alternative that Idrīs chose. (Is it because he was unconsciously influenced by the panegyrics on the Zurayʿīds which he read in ʿUmāra?)

After this lengthy but indispensable analysis of our sources, we may proceed and try to reconstruct the actual history of the daʿwa in Yemen during that critical period. It should be understood, however, that the following attempt is made with the greatest reserve. Not only does the lack of evidence constrain us to leave many gaps in the narrative; many points where a positive solution is attempted are conjectural, many others too obscure even to admit conjecture. There is, however, a hope that the picture presented here may, in the future, be completed, clarified and revised. The writer of this article has not at his disposal the whole of the relevant literature; writings by the contemporary Yemenite authors — some of which will be more particularly mentioned below — and historical books like the Nuzhat al-afkār by Idrīs, dealing with the history of the daʿwa in Yemen after the schism, may well yield further material.

The restorer of Ismailī power in Yemen, ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Ṣulayḥī, was also the head of the daʿwa; he “combined the office of daʿī with the supreme power as temporal sovereign”, to use the expression of ʿUmāra. After his death in 459 (1066-7 A.D.), his son, ʿAbd al-Mukarrram, succeeded him in both capacities. As is well known, soon after his accession al-Mukarram retired from affairs, and the effective power remained in
the hands of his wife, al-Malika al-Sayyida. The nominal sovereignty and also the dāʾiʿship remained, however, in the possession of al-Mukarram. The real leader of the daʿwa, as far as spiritual matters were concerned, was, however, Lamak b. Mālik and not the Ṣulayhid princes, whose strength lay, no doubt, in their arms rather than in theological studies. After the death of al-Mukarram (484 A.H. 1091 A.D.), al-Malika al-Sayyida continued as temporal ruler of the Ṣulayhid state; but, evidently, it was not considered as suitable to have a woman as the spiritual head of the daʿwa, and a relative of hers, Sulaymān al-Zawāḥi, was appointed as dāʾiʿ. He was succeeded first by Yaḥyā b. Lamak and then by Ibn Najib al-daula, who came to Yemen in 513 (1120-21 A.D.).

After the fall of Najib al-daula (519 A.H. 1125-26 A.D.) we hear of the dāʾiʿ ‘Ali (ʿAbdallāh) b. ʿAbdallāh. It seems permissible to assume that al-Dhuʿayb played in this period the same role as Lamak b. Mālik a generation before: he was the leading theologian of the daʿwa, but not its official head.

We have seen above that ʿUmāra ignores al-Dhuʿayb; this is hardly due to his hostility to one who had become the leader of the Tayyibīs, enemies of the Egyptian Fatimids (he does mention Ibrāhim al-Ḥamidī); the reason is, more likely, that al-Dhuʿayb has never been the head of the daʿwa before the schism. On the other hand Ḥātim passes in silence the dāʾis mentioned by ʿUmāra because of his assertion that al-Malika al-Sayyida served, in spite of her sex, as the head of the daʿwa.

We do not know how long ʿAli (ʿAbdallāh) b. ʿAbdallāh remained in office, whether he was directly followed by Ibrāhim (this seems the more likely alternative) or there was another dāʾiʿ between them — as ʿUmāra is silent on this point.

The ordinary course of the daʿwa is interrupted by the news of the events following each other swiftly in Cairo. There arrives from the court the sijill announcing the birth of the heir, al-Ṭayyib. We have the testimony of al-Khaṭṭāb b. Abi Ḥifāẓ about the receipt of the sijill in the court of al-Malika al-Sayyida (Ghāyat al-mawāliʿ, extract in Ivanow, Rise of the Fatimids, Arabic texts, p. 37). “When al-Āmir was about to die, he made the appointment by naṣṣ and ordered it to be announced in all the jazīras. Sijills containing his high commands and endorsed by autograph signs of his exalted hand were addressed to his ḥujja and waliyya, appointed in our jazīra by his fathers the pure Imams, God's blessings upon them. We were in her presence when the sijills arrived and heard with our own ears when they were read out. She explained them to us and attested their authenticity; she also adduced as proofs for the correctness (of al-Ṭayyib’s appointment) the stories quoted above. He (al-Āmir) appointed as a trustee his cousin, wali ʿaḥd al-muslimīn,
in the same way as his forefathers had made similar arrangements; he deposited with him (the Imamate) for his son, whom he placed under his care . . ." From a passage of the ‘Uyūn al-akhbār we learn that the name of the messenger who carried the sijill of al-Āmir was Muḥammad b. Ḥaydara.

Then comes confusing news: al-Āmir assassinated, ‘Abd al-Majīd regent, Abū ‘Alī Kutayfāt b. al-Afḍal seizing power. In Cairo, it was comparatively easy for the government of ‘Abd al-Majīd to make away with the infant heir, spread a version of the late Caliph’s utterances tacitly denying his rights and, in general, be silent about him. But Yemen was far away, the local adherents of the Fatimid cause either were insufficiently informed of what has happened in Cairo, or were unwilling to follow suit in abandoning the infant who had the naṣṣ of his father, the deceased Imam. So we have the curious fact that the khutba pronounced on the occasion of the commemoration (‘azā) of the murdered Imam by the Egyptian envoy, Muḥammad b. Ḥaydara, mentioned above, reads as follows — if we can rely on the credibility of the Ṭayyibi tradition, ‘Uyūn al-akhbār, VII, 320 ff. 1:“ . . . (His loss) is compensated by the accession, in his stead, of his son, appointed by his naṣṣ . . . our Lord al-Imam al-Ṭayyib Abu-l-Qāsim, the Commander of the Faithful . . . O God, support by Thy spirit the Imam that Thou hast appointed . . . prosper his guardian (i.e. ‘Abd al-Majīd), who is the regent (walī al-‘ahd) on his behalf, being as he is of the same pure flesh and blood. Strengthen his pure ‘Alid dynasty (daulatahu-l-‘alawiyya-l-tāhira) by giving Thy assistance to the vizier of his realm, who by his words and acts directs affairs from behind the throne of his Caliphate, al-sayyid al-ajall al-afḍal amīr al-juyūsh sayf al-Imām nāṣir al-islām hāfil quḍāt al-muslimīn wa-mu‘addid du‘āt al-mu’minīn 2 Abū ‘Alī Aḥmad, the servant of our Lord, God’s blessings upon him. O God, make his sword reach his enemies . . . as he received his high position in the service of Thy Friend (wali; i.e. the Imam al-Ṭayyib) from his father (i.e. al-Afḍal) and his grandfather (i.e. Amīr al-juyūsh Badr). O God, cover with the blessings of Thy providence the ħujja of Thy Friend, and the ħujja of his fathers, in this jazīra 3 . . . our Mistress and Sovereign the Lady the Queen al-Sayyida

1 The authenticity of the text is not above suspicion— cf. the following notes. The reasons for doubt are, however, not decisive and a final judgement will become possible only if and when sources as yet unused yield more materials on which to base our criticism.

2 This is a much less elaborate protocol than that adopted by Abū ‘Alī Kutayfāt later, after his coup d’État, and tallies well with the practice of the preceding viziers.

3 If this title of ħujja is more than a formality and implies that al-Malika al-Sayyida stands at the head of the da’wa, there arises the difficulty that, as we have seen, Umāra’s list proves that
The Succession to the Fatimid Imam al-Amir

al-raḍiyya al-lāhīra al-zakiyya wahīdat al-zaman sayyīdat mulūk al-Yaman ‘umdat al-islām khāliṣat al-Imām dhakhīrat al-dīn ‘umdat al-mu’-minīn ‘īṣmat al-mustashfīdīn kahf al-mustajibīn waliyyat Amīr al-mu’-minīn wa-kāfilat auliya’ihi-l-mayāmin.’ The time of the khutba can be fixed; it must have been pronounced shortly after the accession of Abū ‘Alī. It is extremely strange to see coupled together the names of al-Ṭayyib, ‘Abd al-Majīd and Abū ‘Alī. The distant province of the Yemen was, in fact, lagging behind the quickly changing developments in the metropolis and trimmed up the confused and controversial problems of the constitution in its own fashion.

The attachment to al-Ṭayyib is also apparent in the long dirge on al-Āmir, composed by the same Muhammad b. Haydara and preserved in the ‘Uyūn al-akhbār (vol. VII, p. 323 ff.). We find there lines like the following: “You (viz. al-Āmir) have left a son who guides us in righteousness; it is in vain that misled people think it will diminish by your death. How can a fire kindled by God be extinguished through the talk of those who deny your rights ... He (viz. al-Ṭayyib) is the Imām; it is Gabriel that has undertaken to nourish him, by the command of God who watches over him. Though he is a mere suckling, he speaks in righteousness and puts its cloak on his shoulders ... If al-Manṣūr (al-Āmir) has passed away, we say: Here is his son!” Or in another similar piece: “The heart is consoled by the thought that their light passes from one person to another. If a noble father disappears from them, the light shines in the person of a noble son. This was, in truth, warranted by al-Manṣūr; when he died, he made good his promise.”

It is probable that the interregnum of al-Afdal junior and his defection from Ismailism did not greatly affect the Yemen; his rule lasted only a short time and he probably had not much occasion to interfere with the affairs of the province. We may assume that the allegiance of the Yemen continued in the form which we have just noted: al-Ṭayyib Imam, ‘Abd al-Majīd regent, Abū ‘Alī al-Afdal vizier. That this was in striking contrast with political realities, probably troubled them little.

the Queen was not holding the office of dādī. A conjecture that at some time the objections to her sex were overcome and the Queen was appointed as dādī is perhaps not impossible, although im probable (after Ibn Najib al-daula’s fall, there followed as dādī ‘Alī b. ‘Abdallāh — and this leaves little space for al-Sayyida as dādī); at least there seems to be no evidence to confirm it. All these points (cf. also above, p. 221, 223) can only be cleared up after an examination of al-Khaṭṭāb’s Ghāyat al-mawālīd.

1 One is tempted to doubt the authenticity of the khutba also on the score of the mention of al-Ṭayyib. On the other hand, the mention of Abū ‘Alī may speak for its genuineness. The explanation of the situation as given in the text will perhaps be found acceptable.

Oriens IV
The crisis came to a head only at the accession of ‘Abd al-Majid al-Ḥāfiz to the Imamate in 526. It was but natural that he should endeavour to make the Yemen acknowledge his pretensions; and that his self-determined advancement should meet with resistance.

As a matter of fact, the alleged exclamation of al-Malika al-Sayyida on receiving the news of the proclamation of al-Ḥāfiz rings true enough; the story is from the ‘Uyun al-akhbār (vol. VII, p. 333)¹. “He (viz. ‘Abd al-Majid) formerly used to prefix to his letters to al-Malika al-Sayyida the formula: From the wali ‘ahd of the Moslems and the cousin of the Commander of the Faithful. Then he wrote: From the Commander of the Faithful. At this she said: I am the daughter of Ahmad (today, as I was yesterday). Yesterday he was the wali ‘ahd of the Moslems and today he is the Commander of the Faithful! He is entering a field that is not his and usurping a station from which he is remote!”

We may well imagine that a bitter fight ensued, at the court of the Queen as well as all over the country, between the staunch adherents of al-Ṭayyib and those who were ready to acknowledge the new Imam al-Ḥāfiz. It is easy to understand the points of view of both parties. In favour of al-Ṭayyib spoke the dogma of the lineal descent of the Imams and of the unchangeable character of the nass — and al-Ṭayyib had been, in effect, appointed by a nass. The idea of an Imam disappearing “into concealment”, too, was by no means a novelty in Isma'ilism which had already had its “Concealed Imams”. On the other hand, al-Ḥāfiz was the de facto ruler; he had made out, as we have seen, a tolerable case to justify his succession according to Isma'ili doctrine; and for many it may have seemed in accordance with the best interests of the movement to rally behind the dynasty reigning in Egypt.

Unfortunately, owing to the lack of evidence, the particulars of the course taken by this dispute escape us almost completely. It is only the outcome that we recognize: the Isma'ili movement in the Yemen split into two rival factions.

¹ The original reads: "..."
a) The party of al-Ḥāfiz was led by the family of the Zuray'īds. What were the exact circumstances of their accession to the office of da'ī, we do not know. 'Umāra, who can be considered, in view of his long association with the princes of that family, as their semi-official mouth-piece, asserts that the office was vested in them by al-Malika al-Sayyida. It is significant that Idris does not contradict this statement quoted by him; he either has no different tradition on this point, or has a tradition in accordance with it.

b) The leaders of the "legitimists" adhering to al-Ṭayyib were al-Dhu'ayb, al-Khaṭṭāb and Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī. We still have some specimens of the apologetic and polemic literature composed at this epoch, as for example the Ghāyat al-mawālīd of al-Khaṭṭāb, that has acquired a certain notoriety in another connection ¹. "It begins with the usual speculations about the necessity of guidance for the people which God, in his mercy, never refuses, always keeping in the 'twelve islands of the earth' His 'proofs'. One of such proofs, for the Yemen, is the petty local princess, al-Hurra al-Malika (al-Sayyida). There follows a lengthy discussion of the question whether a woman can be such a hujja, or not, which is decided in the affirmative. Then follow esoteric speculations about the manifestation of divine wisdom in man, about the question of the satr (or concealment) of Imam al-Ṭayyib, and satr in general, about succession of Imams. In the fourth bāb are discussed the questions of the genealogy of al-Ṭayyib, and of his being a legitimate successor of his ancestors, and the belief that he is not dead." (Ivanow, Rise, p. 20-21.)

The account of al-Khaṭṭāb about the arrival of the sijīl appointing al-Ṭayyib as crown-prince has been quoted above, p. 223. — Ivanow doubts the authenticity of the book; in my opinion, however, its contents, as given by Ivanow, are the best indication of its genuineness. It is not clear for what reasons Ivanow impeaches the authenticity of book and states that "the whole matter seems from the beginning to the end to be extremely suspicious" (p. 21). Admittedly, the doctrine of the book about the descent of al-Mahdī is "extraordinary" and needs explanation; yet to say that this, together with the fact "that one of the religious leaders of the community, just a few years after the calamity [of the disappearance of al-Ṭayyib] writing in a purely abstract and academic manner, basing his speculations on the vaguest and most abstract principles, confines himself, in short, to the bare assertion that we must believe him to be alive" makes it "almost obvious that the work belongs to a much later period" — is clearly a non sequitur. Nor is the suggestion that "perhaps it was composed by Sayyidnā Idrīs himself" sufficiently warranted by the single fact that traces of a similar view about the origin of al-Mahdī are to be found in the works of Idrīs. — The book seems to be, in effect, by al-Khaṭṭāb, and a closer study of it is an urgent desideratum. The passage printed by Ivanow (Arabic texts, p. 35-9) aims at showing that the Emir Abu-l-Qāsim

¹ According to it al-Mahdī, the first Fatimid Caliph, was not a lineal descendant of Muhammad b. Ismā'īl; cf. B. Lewis, Origins of Ismā'īlism, p. 109; W. Ivanow, Rise of the Fatimids, p. 20-23.
('Abd al-Majid al-Hāfiẓ) wali ʾahd al-muslimin was appointed only as a trustee, mustardā', for al-Tayyib. For this purpose he quotes a long series of historical precedents — beginning with the personages of Biblical history, who, as well known, are fitted in by the Ismaiils into their peculiar historical system, and ending with Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya and al-Mahdi, the last two being trustees for al-Ḥusayn and al-Qāʾim, respectively. The implication is, of course, that the Emir, assuming the office of Imam, was guilty of an impious usurpation. — Ivanow has evidently taken for the ideology of al-Hāfiẓ what is in fact an argument of his adversaries; and combining this alleged 'trustee' Imamship of al-Hāfiẓ (as his Imamship ought to have been according to his adversaries) with the alleged khatba recited by al-Hāfiẓ for the Expected Mahdi (which is based on an error, cf. above, p. 206) reached his theory about the character of the later Fatimid Imamate, that has been criticised in the second chapter of this study.

There is one thing which seems to give a hint about some of the events that happened during that obscure period. 'Umāra seems to suggest that in 526 (1131-2 A.D.), before the rise of the Zuray'ids, al-Malika al-Sayyida appointed Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmīdī as dāʾī. On the other hand, we know from Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm that Ibrāhīm became the assistant of al-Dhu'ayb after the death of al-Khaṭṭāb (533/1138-9 A.D.) and succeeded al-Dhu'ayb on the latter's death (546/1151-2 A.D.). One is tempted to assume that during the conflict Ibrāhīm lost his office owing to his Tayyibi sympathies and was supplanted by the Zuray'ids; and that he then joined the Tayyibi party, but played there at the beginning a more subordinate role under al-Dhu’ayb and al-Khaṭṭāb till their death left him the leader of the party.

What was al-Malika al-Sayyida's own position in the conflict? From the contents of the Ghāyat al-mawālīd, as cited above, it seems to follow that the Tayyibis claimed her as of their own party. Moreover her will, quoted in the 'Uyiṭn al-akhbār (vol. VII, p. 342) — if the text is authentic — shows that she never ceased in her heart to remain faithful to al-Tayyib, whatever she had been prevailed upon to do in public. In the preamble of the will, containing a long confession of faith, there are enumerated all the Imams; the list ends with al-Tayyib. The text goes on to give a detailed description of the Queen's jewellery (11 pages) ¹, which is said to have been brought from the treasury for the inspection of the persons attesting the will; all the jewellery is bequeathed, as a qurbān, to the Commander of the Faithful al-Imām al-Tayyib Abu-l-Qāsim. Al-sulṭān al-ajall Aḥmad b. Abi-l-Ḥusayn b. Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Sulayḥī is appointed as executor; his duty is to deliver the jewels, after the Queen's death, "at the Gate of the Friend of God" (bāb wali Allāh), "to the person that will be appointed by the order of

¹ The enumeration of the jewellery, although not very rich in technical terms, has some archaeological interest.
the Imam to receive them”. Ahmad should also obtain a receipt signed by the Imam (al-khāṭṭ al-sharīʿ al-imāmī).

On the other hand, al-Malika al-Sayyida is reported to have appointed the Zuray’īds who were subsequently at the head of the Ḥāfizī party in Yemen. It seems that the management of affairs slipped away from the hands of the old princess and she was constrained to take a course contrary to her personal inclinations. Lack of evidence prevents us from going beyond this general — and also conjectural — statement. The events of the last years of al-Malika al-Sayyida (526-32 / 1131/2-1137/8 A.D.) remain altogether obscure.

ʿUmāra does not speak of the last years of the Queen; is that because he does not want to touch on delicate affairs? The somewhat melancholy tone of the words attributed to the Queen on ‘transferring’ the daʿwa to the Zuray’īds (“It is sufficient etc.”) and the decline of the Sulayhid dynasty after her death, seem to show that there was a serious conflict between the Sulayḥīds and the Egyptian party. The person and the memory of the old princess were, however, spared even by those whom she favoured less, and her prestige was invoked by both the opposing parties. — I think that such an interpretation of the events would render the greatest justice to our sources.

The influence of the Sulayḥīd house was eclipsed; and after the death of the princess, those members of the Sulayḥīd dynasty of whom we hear at all, are no more than local barons. It remains to say a few words about the later history of the rival leaders of the Egyptian-Fatimid and the Ṭâyyībī parties, who now occupy the scene instead of the Sulayḥīds.

The local dynasty of Aden, the Zuray’īds 1, who became the chief supporters of the cause of the Egyptian Fatimids, had come into prominence during the reigns of the Sulayḥīds ‘Alī b. Muḥammad and al-Mukarram. In recompense of their services they received Aden and the surrounding region. One can read in ʿUmāra the fluctuations of the internal struggles between the members of the family and their bickerings with the Sulayḥīds over financial arrangements. It was Saba’ b. Abī-l-Suʿūd the Zuray’īd who took up the cause of al-Ḥāfiz in Yemen and received — under very obscure circumstances, as we have seen — the title of dāʾī, or, in full: “The matchless, the victorious, glory of the Empire, honour of the Caliphate, right arm of the Realm, sword of the Imam, crown and chief of the Arabs, dāʾī of the Commander of the

1 The main source for the history of the Zuray’īds is ʿUmāra, p. 50-59. The text is very faulty, but can be corrected from Ibn Mujawir, ed. Löögren, Texte zur Geschichte der Stadt Aden im Mittelalter, I, 40 ff., where the whole chapter of ʿUmāra is cited in a more correct form. (Encyclopaedia of Islam, s.v. Karam (Banu ʿI’), by R. Strothmann, merely resumes ʿUmāra.)
Faithful” (al-dā'ī al-auḍūd al-muẓaffar majd al-mulk sharaf al-khīlāf ḍaḍūd al-daula sayf al-Imâm tāj al-ʻarab wa-muqaddamuha dā'ī Amīr al-muʿminīn) (ʻUmārā, p. 50). After his death (533/1138-9 A.D.) his two sons, ʻAli and Muḥammad, fought over the succession; it was the younger, Muḥammad, who prevailed in the struggle. “The Upright Qādī (al-Qādī al-Rashīd) Aḥmad b. al-Zubayr had started from the Holy Gates (i.e. the court of the Imam in Cairo) in 534/1139-40 A.D. with a charter investing al-Aʻazz al-Murtaḍa ‘Ali b. Saba’ with the management of the Majidi da’wa (al-da’wa al-majīdiyya); on his arrival he found that ‘Ali was dead, so he invested Muḥammad b. Saba’, giving him the titles: the honoured, the crowned, the mighty (al-mu‘azzam al-mutazwiṣj al-maktīn)” (ʻUmārā, p. 55). Muḥammad died in 548 /1153-4 A.D.) and was succeeded by his son ‘Imrān. Like his father, he is always called by ʻUmārā — who enjoyed the hospitality of both — by the title of dā'ī. We have also coins of ‘Imrān. Struck in Aden in the year 556, they bear the name of the Imam al-‘Āṣid on one side, and the name of ‘Imrān on the other: auḥad mulūk al-zaman, malik al-ʻarab wa-l-Yaman, ‘Imrān b. Muḥammad. On his death in 561 (1165-6 A.D.) he left three small

---

1 For him see Wiet in: Journal Asiatique, 1921, II, p. 115. If Idrīs makes al-Qādī al-Rashīd responsible for the defection of Yemen from the Tayyībī cause (p. 334; cf. also the passage quoted in Appendix no. IV: “When al-Q. al-R. came to Yemen and religion was confused”) he has, no doubt, this passage of ʻUmārā in mind and is putting a false construction on it.

2 Kay inadvertently translates: “the noble office of dā'ī”, as if there stood in the text al-da'wa al-majīda.

3 St. Lane-Pool, Catalogue of the Oriental Coins in the British Museum, vol. V, no. 358, p. 121. (Cf. the remarks of P. Casanova in: Revue Numismatique, 1894, p. 216-18; E. Zambau, Nouvelles Contributions à la Numismatique Orientale, in: Numismatische Zeitschrift, 1915, p. 172.) The coinage is described by ʻUmārā, p. 27. — It is remarkable that, according to the passage of ʻUmārā just quoted, the Mālikī dinars introduced by al-Mukarram the Sulayḥīd continued to be struck until ‘Imrān introduced the new inscription. Has this any bearing on the history of the da’wa?

4 The stone erected to his memory in Mecca is still extant. It has been published, from notes by Hassan Hawary and Zaky Hassan, in the Répertoire Chronologique d’Épigraphie arabe, no. 3267 (s.a. 561, vol. IX, p. 44-5), but without any comments. The text of the inscription reads:

---

(Qur’an, LV, 26-27)
children; the kingdom was administered on their behalf by the vizier Yāṣir b. Bilāl.

The Hamdānid rulers of Ṣanʿā, of the house of Hishām b. Qubbayt, also owed allegiance to al-Ḥāfiẓ. When they were succeeded by another Hamdānid family, the descendants of ʿImrān b. Faḍl, governor of Ṣanʿā under the Sulayhids, the new dynasty also continued to be vassals of the Fatimids (see Appendix no. IV).

So far as the leaders of the Ṭayyibi party are concerned, it is enough to refer to the account of Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm, quoted above. It is to be added, however, that a piece of information preserved in Yemenite chronicles shows us Ḥātim also as a warrior (cf. Appendix IV, p. 249).

The news of the fall of the Fatimid dynasty at the hands of Saladdin was, of course, received by the Ṭayyibis with satisfaction; they considered it as a divine punishment meted out to the usurpers. The ʿUyūn al-akhbār (vol. VII, p. 384; see Appendix no. V) quotes some verses by the dāʾi Muhammad b. Ṭāhir al-Ḥārithī on this subject; turning to the "Majīdī faction" (al-jirqa al-majidiyya), i.e. the adherents of the Fatimids in Yemen, the dāʾi addresses them as follows: "Where are those that spread falsehood among mankind, bearing lying and imbecile witness; who turned on their heels and followed the command of a rascally tyrant? A sickness of the soul has undone them; they deny the covenant of the Friend (of God; ʿahd al-walī), and are unbelieving traitors. Rebellion (nifdq) has made them stumble; all of them are off the road of guidance. They know nothing about the hidden meaning of things and are contravening the open nasṣ and what has been arranged by al-Āmir. They are keeping back from Ḥātim (b. Ibrāhīm) and his preaching. Curses upon them; is it not Ḥātim who is the skilled physician, the dāʾi of the jazīra, the son of its dāʾi, by whose light mihāṣ and minbars are shining? It is he who manifests the true essence of the science of Muhammad's..."
family and their secret knowledge. He is the hujja of God, present amongst us; a true witness who says nothing untoward.”

The conquest of Yemen by the Ayyubids put an end to the rule of the Zuray'ids and the Hamdânids, and with it, to the 'Majidi' party in Yemen. Some isolated remnants seem to have lingered on a few years more. 'Ali b. Muhammad b. al-Walid composed, probably in the last quarter of the sixth/twelfth century, polemical treatises against them. One of these, bearing the title Tuḥfat al-murtād wa-ghuṣṣat al-āddād, is still extant. (Published by R. Strothmann, Gnosis-Texte der Ismailiten; arabische Handschrift Ambrosiana H 75, in: Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 1943, p. 159 ff. The argument of the treatise is of no direct relevance here.) The co-religionist, to whom the pamphlet is dedicated, had some disputations “with a person belonging to the majidiyya, who play in our time the role of 'adversaries’ (āddād’); 'Ali, who, as he says, had already written other treatises against the Majidian heresy (he enumerates these treatises, which have not, however, come down to us), undertakes to prove the Imamate of al-Ṭayyib.

APPENDIX No. I. (Cf. above, p. 199 ff.)

IbRĀHĪM AL-HĀMIDĪ ON THE PERSECUTION OF THE LOYALISTS AFTER THE DEATH OF AL-ĀMIR

‘Uyūn al-akhbār, VII, 330 ff. (copied in Kitāb al-azhrār, II, 10 ff.).

قال الداعی إبراهیم بن الحسین الحمادی اعلی الله قدسه: وكان اختصاص امير المؤمنین الآمر باحكام الله عم لا ابن مدين صاحب الرتیة وابن رسالان والغيریه وقنونش ونسان وکانوا من افضل دعاته واهل الاخلاص والاختصاص وكان ابن مدين صاحب الرتیة لا يزال في منزله وهؤلاء اصحابه لا يزالون بين يديه وقونص دون الثلاثة في المنزلة وكان الامام عم يقول هؤلاء الأربعة لا ينافیون عن غيرهم وکانوا إذا سمعوا فعله عم لا ينفیون كثيرا منه ولا يروحون منازم حتى يدخلون على شيخهم صاحب الرتیة فنقل قلم منوله وقال لكم اثوانه الکدا وكذا ومعناه كذا وكان ذلك دابهم على مرور الزمن فلما خنى عنهم فعله عم لا ينافیون عن غير هؤلاء الأربعة تقدموا الي ابن مدين صاحب الرتیة فسالوه عن ذلك فقال ان الامام يظهر الغيبة

1 About the resistance offered to the armies of Saladdin by the last Zuray'ids and Hamdanis cf. Kay, notes 63 (p. 274 ff.) and 101 (p. 294 ff.).
The Succession to the Fatimid Imam al-Amir

The following passage, recounting how the prophecy of al-Amir, as exposed by Ibn Madyan, came true, is not a quotation from İbrâhîm al-Ḥâmidî, but gives the gist of the story in the own words of Idrîs (cf. above p. 200).

APPENDIX No. II. (Cf. above, p. 214, 219 ff.)

HÄTIM B. İBRÄHİM ON THE HISTORY OF THE DA'WA IN YEMEN

(From his Tuḥfat al-qulūb)


وأعلم ابيا للخ بانه لما كانت المرائب في الدعوة الهادية سلام الله على صاحبها محتوية مبرعة بالفاتحين بها المنامين فيها من قبل اولباء انها واجبة دينه ملكه على علم في جميع الجزائر وكانت جزيرة الين من اخت الإنجازات عند الموالي سلام الله عليه فضلا عليه سائر الإنجازات بالمنصوب المکرم، والبيت العتيق المعمد، كما أوصى ذلك مولانا الامام صل في بعض سجلاته الشريعة يقول: "واما كانت جزيرة الين من الاحفاز التي يراعي أمير المؤمنين جميع امورها، ويوثر إصلاح كبير احياها وصغيرها، اذ كانت من مهجر المسلمين من أول الزمان، وجعل أهل الامام، منذ اشتدت فاعة الإسلام الان، ولم نخل من ابناء الدعوة الناطجة، وأولباء الدولة العلويه" هذا قوله صلى الله عليه وسلم.
لا ينتقل منم متنقل إلا من بعد أن يقيم واحدا مقامه، يختص لدين الله نظامه،
الي أئمة، انتهى امرهم إلى سيدنا منصور الين، على الله قدسه، إذ كان قدومه إلى الين
مهاجراً عن أمر مولانا المحسن بن أحمد آخر ثلاثة مستمرين صلى جمعين، فاقوم برهة
بدعه الى أن ورد عليه الامر بالدعوة إلى مولانا المهدى صلى ووصله الداعي أبو
عبد الله النجيفي مهاجراً عن أمر مولاه فتوى سيدنا منصور الين تريبيته، ورفع في منزل
العلم درجه، ونُك من بين بدينه مهاجرا إلى المغرب وسر سيدنا منصور الين داعياً
بأمر مولاه من أولاد الداعي الذي كان فيه بالين إلى الهند والسند فذلك صار أمر
هذين الصنفين مصروفًا إلى صاحب جزيرة الين، وكان من أمره في الين ما قصه
صاحب كتب افتتاح الدعوة ثم اتصلت الدعوة بعد فين أقم من الدعاء (الدعا)
واحداً بعد واحد إلى أن انتهى إلى الداعي سلاني بن عبد الله الرواحي فقام سيدنا
الداعي الاجل الواحد على بن محمد الصليبي اعى أنه قدسم جميعاً وكان من سفرته
لحاله السلطان أحمد بن المظهر قدس الله ارواحه إلى مولانا المستنصر صلع ليستاذ
له بالقيام بالسيف ثم ما راه من الرؤى التي تتحرك بها لاحز حسن مسار ما هو مذكور
في كتاب سيرته فقام بالسيف واستولى على الجزيرة بأسراها ثم هو بالنضاش ال
العرائس والهجرة إلى الأبواب الطاهرة فلم بإنه سفر سيدنا فاضي قصة الين وهادى
دعاؤها لما يكون ماك اعلى أنه قدسه وواصل روحه بطل له النسج 2 من مولانا
المستنصر بأنه صلى وعليه وابناته الطاهرات بما يستشهدهم امر العالى من ما هو اعلى
الين، فقدم القدسة المذكر في جمعة من، وجوه الأولباء، ان ورد الدبار
الطاهرة وسلم ما استودع الاجل الواحد بعد اداء فرض السلام ونزل في دار سيدنا
موبد أعلى أنه قدسه جميعا وجعل ناجي الحضر، الحضر، النبوية، سلام الله عليهما بالنمص
للداعي المذكر فلما جابه لا بالقول كيف تستاذن وقد آن وقت الفتاه فأقام منه
وهو في خلص ذلك يتعلم من سيدنا المؤيد أعله قدسه، وكتب ما افاده وإفاته
الله إلى أن ينفي الفتاه ثم يعود المطالعة فلا يجاب إلا بالجواب الأول فاستشفخ

1 From here the text is also reproduced in the ʻUyūn al-akhbār, VII, 166 ff.
2 This is the word used by Ḥātim for the venia docendi of a dāʿī.
بسيدنا المؤيد في استنجال حوارته فلم يجب سيدنا المؤيد إلا بالجواب الأول إلى أن
مضى له خمس سنين في الديار الظاهرية وهو مقيم على ذلك كله طالع في ذلك لم
جب إلا ما اجتبأ وذكر ذلك يوم سيدنا المؤيد على الله قدسه يا سيدنا ما
نقول في هذا الجواب وقد مضى شتاء وشتاء والجواب في كل مطالعه هذا الجواب
فقال له اعلم أن الكلام الحادي على نظرنا وباطن وحقيقة لبعلم ذلك لا اعترال وم
ع وفي مقاومة الكافر إلى الجواب لا يفوق سيدنا المؤيد على الله قدسه يا [بل
و] لئلا يدعه يسأله ويأخذ عليه ويكتب ما استفاده منه إلى أن استوعب ما عنه ثم
كتب إليه في آخر الأمر سنة وعشرين سنة يطلب جوابا منه فقال له ما جواب
هذا لا من مولانا فين بين وبينه حائل ولا مانع فتقدم بالسمايل إلى مولانا
المستنصر صل فاجاه عليها بسعة وعشرين جوابا وكساء عند كل جواب قيصر اعتبار
منه صعب إلى رفعه له وإعلانه بسعة وعشرين درجة من درج العلم والمحارف فلما كان
ذات يوم ورد الأمر على سيدنا المؤيد وسيدنا لوك اعلم الله قدسه يا من يدى
مولانا عم فلما ذهب بين يديه قال للقاضي احسن الله عزاك في داعيك لما ردبان
تقد في هذه الساعة فتكون الفاسق تذكرة ذلك الوقت فكان الوقت الذي استشهد فيه
الاجل الأول قدس الله روحه لم يتقدم ولا يتاخر وقد كان في جواب مولانا وسيدنا
المؤيد حين شرع بالنسج السابق ذكره قد من وقت القتال يا مؤيد وسوى بروح
سفارة جديدة وأمر جديد فقام العزا إلى سيدنا ذلك قدس الله روحه [في خضرة
خمسة أشهر من اهل النواحي والامصار ثم ان اثام صنع اقام
سيدنا الداعي المكرم قدس الله روحه وسحر بذلك سيدنا لوك اعلم الله قدسه يا
السفاارة الجديدة والامام الجديد الذي رمز له جد اولاه ثم قال مولانا المستنصر
صل سيدنا لوك قدس الله روحه انا لما نظروا ان العمر لذلك الداعي قد اضطه
إنه شهد اختصار قد قرب وودنا رابنا ان نوقفك لنا يقتل الداعي المكرم في غير
جذيره [الجزيرة التي فيها ملكه
[Uyun] لئلا يكون بقاء الداعي المكرم خليفة لا يبه قدس الله ارواحهم جميعا لم يصبح
من حقائق علمه إلا بالشي القريب للداعي المكرم والخيرة الملكة واحمد بن قاسم بن
I have no further information about this person.

Here ends the quotation in the "Uyun al-akhbār."
انتقلت السيدة الْمُؤِنَبَتُ إلى دار الكِرَمَة الله وجعل رضواني وقد كان تحت بعده
منصورًا جعل قبل نقلته أمرهم مصروفًا إلى الوالي، يعني من الحرف، ووقع في
مكانه من استحقاق التوقف، وعزل من تنفيض المكينة عزبة، وينبغي في جميع ما
توجهه سياسة الدينية من الأمر عند وله، فقام في الجزيرة قبلاً من تقدمه ونسب
الحدود بإلزام الكتيب وقطع مقالات الغلابة وискيم وطمس اعتقادهم وآلى زرع
المكينة ونشر بالمعارف صور أولي الطاعة وعمهم بجزيل النعمة منه يامه، وطول لبه
فيهم ومقامه، وكان من أفضل من نصب من الحدود الفضلاء الإبرار، والإنسانية
الأخيار، الشيخ الأجل العام العنيف، الظاهر الشريف، على بن أحمد بن الوَلد
قدس الله روحه فعلم الأولياء، وارقى مراتب أهل الصفاء، مثل الشيخ الفاضل، السيد
الكامل، محمد بن طاهر شريف العناصر، مبدأ العلم البواير، فقام هذان الحدان
الشريفان في أهل الحق مقاماً صموداً، وكان العلم بالنفصل في إياهم بها موجودًا،
فساعد ببسطتها الانتباه، وشبى بخالتهما الاستقامة، ان تنقل الشيخ الأجل على
ابن أحمد ابن الله قدمه إلى دار الكرامة الله فقام الشيخ الأجل محمد بن طاهر في
الأولياء مقامه، وحفظ بعض من الدين نظامه، وعجب الوالي بأفه الله قدسه جميع اصقاع
الجزيرة بنصب حدود فاضلة، أهل معارف كاملة، فإن دانت نقلته، وأتى إلى محل
رضوان الله رحمةه، فسح لمولوك آل محمد الإطهار عم رفاه، وطريقهم صدقاً، وجعله
خليفة له وقاصًا عنه فكان قائماً به من أمر الجزيرة وانتقل إلى دار الكرامة الله
وصحب قدسه، وياوى أولياءه وحَلَّ أنه، نجى مولوك آل محمد عم النسوح لم اعتبر
بذلك واطاع، وافتُقد احوال كل منسوح له في جميع الإصقاع، بعضاً بالمكانية لم
المراسلة، وبعضاً بالمنافهة والواصلة، فعلم الراغب، وأفاد الطالب، ونفى مجهود اعتقاد
اللغو والتناخ من اعتناق به، وألزم الحجة الوسطي المجانينة للغلو والتقصير من النزم
(sic MS) بسبي، وشرع في معونته الشعران الإبلان محمد بن طاهر وعلى بن أبي
محمد بن الوَلد رفع الله طرجها، واجعل من الخُبرات إفادتها، وطمسا بنشر علومهما
باهل، ونفنا بقواعده حجمهما الناك المائل، وأوريا ببراههما الباهرة زناد الحق،
وانتفا بدلائهم في النيرة الزاهرة السر الصدق، ووازر الكل بماله، وحبيب افعاله
وجزيل افضلاته، السلطان السيد الافضل أحمد بن هشام فغر الابویا بالاحسان،
وعمهم بالجود والامتثال، فكان هؤلاء السادة الفضلاء جمالاً لاهل الدنيا والدين،
وزين الرسول والمؤمنين، يثبتوا الى جبيل الفعلاء، وكريم خصالهم، من عرفهم من ولة
صداق، وقضแนวทาง، فجهزوا محسن سيرهم في الدين، وبلغ عباراتهم للملجدين، الى
امتحن كثيرا من الناس، واخروحهم من الذك والانباس، وقد كان الشيخ الاجل,
السيد الافضل على القدر والعلم، على بن محمد بن الوليد ذو الدين الأبد، والعلم
المجيد، رفع الله في الدارين درجه، وعلى في الدين والدنيا منزلته، في اول منفاءه
درس على علم الشيخ الرشيد، الموافق السعيد، على بن الحسين بن الوليد اعلى الله
قدسه في ايم حبيته وافتيه من علومه الكماله، وأفنى سيرته المجيدة النافذة، فلا
انتقل الشيخ الاجل الرأبه، قدرة الصالحين من الابویا العابد، الى الاستنادة من
الشيخ الاجل محمي بن طاهر، حبيب المصاعب والمئر، فاترى من نبار عنه، وافتداه به
فضله وحله، حتى استنفر وعان، وسواه في بنده وضاهه، ثم انتقل الشيخ الاجل
المذكور الى رحمة الله تعالى ورضوانه، وحل قدسه وجانبه، فانتهت له ما امله فيه
واللهٰٰ ۴ من الاستخفاف له في حياته وبعد وفاته، وذالك لما غرفه منه واختيره به من
عنته وسمكة وظهارة، وورعه وحبته وصدقه ولايته، وعله وإماتته، وإخلاصه وحسن
سيرته، وشاقه نفظه وعهابه، واحترائه على جميع حواله الذرف والمعروف، وان جميع
الفضل فيه وعنون مؤتنع، واطلق له شريف النمس والإلاق، وصرفت الاه في
جميع الجزيرة اخذ العهد والمنثبت، والنسج لن استحق ذلك من اهل الدين والوفاق،
وجعلت الاه امر من كان معه منس، نفى فسح يقدمر منهم العالم الفاضل، ويعزل منهم المخاقد
عن سيرة اهل الحق المائل، فاعفهم ما ذكره ذلك فيه ابیا السائل وبه تتوسل، وعلى
عنه فاجعل المعول، وقد كنت نصبت وافيت قوما من فضلاء الإخوان، انتقلوا الى
رحمة الله والرضوان، ثم انما اختبرت الولد العزيز لدى وقفت على بن حام بن
ابرهمٌ ۵ تولا الله توفيقه وتسديده في امر دينه ودنياه فوجده نزه السيرة، صاف البصيرة،

1 Obscure.
منبر الصورة، كامل في الأمور، سجينة لكل معدور، فسجت له باخذ العهد والمنهاق، والتعليم، لاهل الوفاق، والنشابة عن فى كتب متوليه من جميع الانتفاع بالفوق، واتنهى مفاجا حسبها اقتضا له موجب الاستحقاق، فانه تعالى يتولى معونته وكلاهيه، وتوفيته ورعايته. بحق النبي محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم جميع.

فصل
فاما استنهاما إبنا الفدح فناضل رتب حدود الجزيرة ونحتها ومواصلها وإبانة السابق منها ونحت في حمل الله الخير وجعل من الله بانه لما كان كل حد في الجزيرة فاهم برتبة من رتب الدين من داع فلا دونه كان سيدنا ذوينيم على الله فقسه في وقته العالى على جميعهم وسيدنا اختطاب دونه في نفسه أنه محدوده إلى أين انتقل سيدنا اختطاب وصار والد الجبيح على الله قدسها جميعا قاما قاما سيدنا اختطاب في خزى رزقه فلا انتقل سيدنا ذوينيم بعد اقامته للوالد الجبيح مقامه ضار الفنخ الاجل على بن الحسين سع ووالد الجبيح باراء سيدنا اختطاب مع سيدنا ذوينيم فاما انتقل الفنخ الاجل المذكور قام الفنخ الاجل محمد بن طاهر مع والد الجبيح في مقام الفنخ الاجل على بن الحسين على الله قدسها جميعا فاما ضار الامر إلى احبك كان الفنخ الاجل محمد بن طاهر معك كما كان مع أبيه فاما انتقل الفنخ المذكور إلى دار كرامه أن الله فام الفنخ الاجل سيدنا على بن محمد بن الويلد مع احبك مقام المالك محمد بن طاهر والملك على بن حسن (؟حسين) مع أبيه وسيدنا اختطاب مع داعيه وهو لا اهل السبق الذين سار من بني منهم في منزل دعائه وحائيتنا الرتبة فاما المحدود في وقتنا هذا فاما اذكر لك اهل السبق منهم والزيادة في الفنخ وقد ذكرت لك اقامتي للوليد العزيز لدى عهده في مقايا فهو اول حدوت الجزيرة والسابق لم ثم يتولى في الفنخ والرتبة من قدمته ذكره في رسالته هذه بأنه اعل حدوت هذه الجزيرة في وقتنا هذه وأفاضل، وعلم وأعاف واكل، الشيخ الاجل المالك على بن محمد بن الويلد فاعرف فضله وتمييزه على قدره وشرف فعله ولا تقدم عليه غيره فقد نстве به كل من في برك فضح منه وخليطه تحت يده وذكرت ذلك في فضح كل واحد منهم وذلك لفضله وكاله وجلبه وعنته وطهارت وادبه.
ورجحته ويتلوها في الفضل السلطان الأجل الملك أحمد بن هنام لعبته وسقبه، وذله لماه ثم يتلوهم في الفضل الشيخ الأجل محمد بن أحمد الأحورى وذلك لولائيته ووريته ونسكه وعبادته ويتلوم السلطانان الأجلان منيف بن هنام العلوى وزريعت بن اسعد (الشاباي) (الشريائ) ومنيف المقدم لفضله وسقبه وشربه ويتلوم الشيخ الأجل السيد الأفضل عبد الله بن عبد الله تولى الله توفته، وثبى إلى الهدى طرقيه، ويتلوم الولد الأجل حنظلة بن قاسم ثم يتلو هؤلاء الفضاء الأجلاء السادات على بن حنظلة ابن أبي سالم. ثم مسعود بن عبد الله ثم محمد بن علي ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل جابر بن يعلى البادي. ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل عبد الله بن محمد الإسحاق ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل سعد بن محمد بن سليمان بن حارث ثم يتلوهم الفئاظ الأجل محمد بن اسعد ابن عمران ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل معرض بن غطوة النبى ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل رافع ابن أحمد بن منصور بن هران ويتلوم الشيخ الأجل السيد على بن الحسين بن علي ابن مالك. تولى الله توفته، وثبى إلى الهدى طرقيه، ثم يتلوم الشريف الأجل جوهر ابن موسى ثم يتلوم الشيخ الأجل أحمد بن علي بن إبراهيم ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل موسى ابن زهرة الباهي ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل عاز بن سرحيل (سرجيل) ثم يتلوهم السلطان الأجل جهل بن علي ثم يتلوهم السلطان الأجل الوشاح بن عمران ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل عاز بن حسن ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل حام بن مدافع ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل عبد علي بن محمد ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل عمرو بن بغي ثم يتلوهم السلطان على بن محمد بن أبي السمر السواد ثم يتلوم الفئاظ الأجل بخي بن عبد الحسين ثم يتلوهم الشيخ الأجل إبراهيم ابن سعيد بن أحمد بن بعين ثم يتلوهم الفئاظ الأجل حسن بن علي بن جليل الشرق فهؤلاء المحدود في الجزيرة اليمنية، ذات البركات السنية، تولى الله رعايته وكلاههم وإمامهم بمولي النذوره وأبدوه، ويسارى نظرته الرحبية ارتفهم زناا لديه وأصعدهم: وجعل هذه الجزيرة مساعد الدين معمورة، وبظارات ولاة أمره الرحبية منظورة، بنته وكرمه

1 Cf. Guide, p. 59. He later became the chief of the da'wa and died in 626.
2 Repeated by mistake? Or is some part of the name to be changed?
الإجابة على هذا التوضيح على حسب نظم منزلة الأحداث ودرجته وتاليم في فضلههم فيعلم ذلك من وقف عليه وتحقته ويعمل بحسه وانه يتولى توقيق الجمع برحمه عز وجل
واعلم ابيا الادب بان هؤلاء الأحداث اعتبار الديانة ونور بصائره قد صار كل واحد منهم في صنع من انتقاص الجزيرة المذكورة وهو نائب من أحد الفان الذي هو اخوه ومنهم من لا يدرس له ولا يرغب في العلم عنه وإنما دعت الضرورة إلى إقامة وجعل في صنعه سدا من عوز سد به نغز ذلك الصنع حين لم يوجد فيه اصل منه وربما يسأل عن منزلة فلا يجد له جوابا لفلا تنكره وفهبه ورغبته فذا قد عدم ذلك وكان عنه فصل من الكلفة قد حصل له بهدوء ومؤتمن وآبان مغلفة على كتبته في حين ان يطلب السائل على عجزه عن الجواب ويوم عند السائل ان لديه من العلم ما لا يفيه السائل فلا يزال يقبل التولى حتى يضطره الحاج السائل إلى كذلك الكلفة لم لا يستحقها فيكنها له ويعتدي الجنر في ذلك ولم يعط بكل قول النبي عليه وله السلام: "اربع في شتء المطابقة البهين حتى يضمن لكان مليا لا يرتج العبد الا ذه وربما لا ذه انا لا يستحقه انا اذا يعلم ولا العالم اذا مثله لا يقول انا يقول لا اعلم" ويقول امير المؤمنين صلح: "نصف العالم لم لا يعلم ان يقول انا اعلم" وقد ذكرناه في صدر هذ الرسالة كثيرا مما هذا سبيله وما يجري من افتراض المفترنين وتعنت السائلين النازرين لابد الدين ويشبعهم ردا في ذلك قول مولانا الحسين بن علي صلى الله عليه وسلم يا مولاي هل افترض الله تعالى علينا سؤالكم فقال نعم قال السائل ابن ذلك قال وفي قوله تعالى: "فاستيلوا اهل الذكر ان كتم لا تعلمون" قال السائل فهل افترض عليكم اجابتنا قال عم كلا بل ذلك البينا ان شئنا اعتبان وإن شئنا منننا قال السائل ابن ذلك قال في قول الله تعالى: "هذا عظامنا فامنوا ام إسكت بغير حساب" وإنما اعذرب عهدنا لما نريد إيضاحه من تخريم الكلام بالحقيقه في سائر الجزيرة لا على من ينت ذكرهم كما بعد وللحج ابيا الإخ على كتبان سر أولاء الله أكثر من ان يصح، وإن عم ما ان يستغفره، ويكشف من ذلك ما قاله مولانا الصادق صل الله المذيع لسرنا كلا الشاهر شفنا في وجوهنا وما
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قال إبصارا صلوات الله علیه وآله وآله وآل‌ه المبارکة: "من اذاع سرنا أهل البيت إذاً أنه برد الحدید"، وملف ذلك قال مولانا المعرّف صلوات الله علیه وآله وآله وآل‌ه المبارکة: "لو صدق الدعاة البنا فيا أضرم بالله ما تخالف عن أتبعنا أننا لا والله ولا واحد"، وله تعالى يقول "إلا لو استقاموا على الطريقة لإنتجوا ماء غزفا"، فهما ذكر فاعل ذلك ما شرط عليه في العهد الكرم بقوله "إذاً تكلم ما سمعته من تأويل القرآن"، إنما الشرط وإن من أعظم البذعة أن يفترج المستجيب على المكاسر اطلاعه على ما لا يستحقه بل الواجب عليه سواء له وخضوع ونضرعه إليه الفائدة فإن شاء إعطاء وإن شاء منعه حسبما توجيه الحكمة الالهي، وتتضفيه السياسة الربانية، وكذلك ليس جائز للمكاسر أن يفترج على المطلق ولا للطفيان ان يفترج على الداعي ولا للداعي ان يفترج على الحجة ولا للحجة ان يفترج على الباب ولا للباب ان يفترج على الامام ولا للامام ان يفترج على الوصي ولا للوصي ان يفترج على النبي ولا للنبي ان يفترج على الخيال ولا للخيلان ان يفترج على الفنح ولا للفنحان ان يفترج على الجد ولا للجدان ان يفترج على التال ولا للئال ان يفترج على السباق ولا للسابق ان يفترج على غيب الغيب بل كل من فوقه مربوب، وكليمهم عن غيب ذي العزة مجحب، صحب مقربون وعباد مكرمون، لا سبيلونه بالنقول، ومهم بآمره يعملون.

إبصارا إثنا هذا الفصل تأديب مني لمن وقف عليه من الأخوان كنهره، والله وأهله واعلام مله بأنه يجب على كل محدود تلقى فوائد منه بغير تكبير ولا اقتراح، ولا نعاه بولا إمداد، بل يرضى ما وصله به وإفاده، ويقبل ما أنعم به عليه بإعطاء، ويتهي إنا نهاء، ويشكر على ما من له عليه وحياه، والآن فليعلم كل من وقف على رسالتى هذه من كافة الأخوان أن قد حرمت الكلام والفادحة بالحقيقة والمذكرة فيها وطلبه في جمع الجزيرة إلا من خمسة حدود فโน بلاد حراز وما وإلا فلا يكون ذلك إلا من الولد العزيز على بن حام أو من رضي له إفاده ذلك وفضح له فيه وف بلاد همدان وما وإلا لا يكون ذلك إلا من الشيخ إجل السيد الفاضل الكامل على بن محمد أو من أمره بذلك وارتداء له وفضح له بالمذكرة فيه وفي عدن ابن ولحمة وما وله إلا ذلك من المواقع فلا يكون ذلك إلا من الشيخ إجل.
Perhaps a member of the great Ismaili family of al-Zawāḥī, who played a very prominent part in the history of the sect in Yemen. — The great interest of the passage is evident; I shall comment upon it in another connexion. [The MS has — من فح له — being a correction above the line.]

I give in the following a few extracts from the 'Uyūn al-akhbār concerning al-Khaṭṭāb b. Al-Ḥasan b. Abī-l-Ḥifāẓ. This important author (see for his works Ivanow, Guide, p. 51 and above p. 227) is shown in them as one of the warring barons of the Yemen, fighting for the Fatimid cause with the sword as well as with books.


More details about the genealogy of the family and the early history of al-Khaṭṭāb are yielded by the introduction of al-Khaṭṭāb’s diwan, an extract of which is quoted in the ‘Uyūn al-akhbār (VII, 366).

1 For Jurayb in the country of Ḥājur see al-Hamdānī, Jazirat al-ʿArab, p. 113.
2 In the text to be quoted presently: Ḥārif (?) b. Sharaḥbīl. The Jurayb quoted by Kay, note 76, has hardly anything to do with the family we are dealing with. According to the same note, al-Khazraji reads in our passage: al-Ḥārif.
4 This piece of information provides an important link in the history of the ʿZaydīte Sulaymānī Imams, which can now be reconstructed as follows. (Kay, note 88, has, as usual, some good sug-
gestions; Zambaur, Manuel de Généalogie, p. 115, and Table A, is very incorrect.) Ḥamza b. Wahhās had a long struggle with Abū Hāshim, the ancestor of the Hawāshī sharifs, over the sovereignty of Mecca, about the year 450. (Cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, I, 62-3 and Genealogical Table I, no. 36.) When the Hawāshī succeeded in gaining the supremacy in Mecca, the family of Ḥamza transferred its seat to the Yemen. Yaḥyā, the son of Ḥamza, ruled in ʿAthṭar; at the time of the invasion of the Ghuzz (about the end of the XIth cent.; cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, I, 64) he was carried off to Iraq. In his absence, his brother, ʿĪsā, ruled instead of Yaḥyā; but the latter, on his return to the Yemen, managed to kill ʿĪsā (al-Janadī, in: Derobern, Oumara du Yémen, II, 580). In our text we find ʿAll, the son of Yaḥyā, as the ruler of al-Sāʿīd (cf. al-Ḥamdānī, Jasirat al-ʿArab, p. 54, 119) in the beginning of the VIth/XIIth century. We are well acquainted, from ʿUmārā and elsewhere (cf. Kay, Index, p. 355), with Ghanīm b. Yaḥyā. This was a brother of our ʿAll; al-Ḥazraji (in: Kay) gives his lineage as Gh. b. Y. b. Ḥamza b. Wahhās. (Zambaur, loc. cit., says he was expelled from Mecca in the year 450 — confusing him with his grand-father!) Other members of the family are the following. 1) ʿAll b. ʿĪsā, (d. 556); ʿUmārā in: Cīmad al-dīn, Kharidat al-qasr, in Derenbourg, II, 564-5 (cf. I, 50); Ismāʿīl b. Muḥammad, Simt al-laʿālī, MS Leiden 1970, fol. 56v ff. Ismāʿīl quotes ʿUmārā — but erroneously describes the book dealing with the poet as al-Mufd fi akhbār Zabīd (adding: bal Akhbār al-Yaman! cf. above p. 212 n. 1), while in reality the quotation comes from the book on the poets of Yemen; he has also additional information. ʿAll was an important leader of the Zaydiyya. He lived in Mecca, where he exchanged verses (quoted by Ismāʿīl) with al-Zamakhsharī. 2) Dahmash b. Wahhās, ʿImād al-dīn, op. cit., in Derenbourg I, 565); d. “67” (as he was a contemporary of ʿImād al-dīn, this does not, of course, mean 467 — so Derenbourg — but 567). 3) Ḥāshim b. Ghanīm, mentioned by Ibn Abī Ṭayyī, in: Abū Shāma, Kitāb al-raʿūdatayn, I, 217 (cf. Derenbourg, op. cit., I, 50; idem, Vie d'Oussama, p. 424). — Genealogical details about the later Sulaymānī sherifs, descendants of Ghanīm b. Yaḥyā, are contained in Ṭuraj al-ašāb fi maʿrījat al-ansāb of al-Malik al-Ashraf Ibn Rasūl, ed. K. W. Zetterstéen (Damascus 1949), p. 108-110. (In the genealogy of Ghanīm there occurs, between Ḥamza and Wahhās, the name Sulaymān, not mentioned by the other sources — also not in the genealogy given by the Simt al-laʿālī.) According to Ibn Rasūl, Ghanīm had six sons: Wahhās, Ḥāshim, Badr, Abūmad, al-ʿQāsim, Fāṭik. Descendants of them ruled in various towns: Jāzān, Baghta, Baysh. The genealogical tree of the family is, then:

Dāwūd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wahhās</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Ibn Rasūl adds here Sulaymān
| Ḥamza |

| ʿĪsā |
| Yahuya |

| ʿAlī |
| Ghanīm |

| Wahhās |
| Hāshim |
| Badr |
| Abūmad |
| al-ʿQāsim |
| Fāṭik |

Dahmash

1 See for them Kay, Index. (It is only Abū Muḥammad Masrūr who does not seem to be mentioned by ʿUmārā; we have probably to read: Abū Muḥ. Surūr.)
An allusion to the same events is to be found in a passage of ʿUmāra’s lost history of Yemenite poets, quoted in the ʿUyun al-akhbār and ʿImād al-dīn’s Kharīdat al-qāṣr.

Extract from ʿUmāra in the Kharīdat al-qāṣr (MS Paris), published by H. Derenbourg, Oumara du Yémen, II, 580:

ومن شعراء اليمن سليمان بن أبي الخفاظ صاحب مدينة الجرشف له:

كم تمون رجاء ان تهيب لكم
من النسيم ولو يومين تنصل
فجعلكم مثل ما هند به هبلت
من العين التي عاد بها هلكه

أخوه الخفاظ بن أبي الخفاظ من الشعراء المجيدين وكان قد اخرج آخاه سليمان من مدينة الجرشف إلى زبيد ثم كتب إليه يطلب به فمن شعره وليس من جيد شعره - قال - أنا في اللى اتفق حضورها وكتب بها الى سليمان وهو يريد

ومن شعراء اليمن المجيدين الخفاظ بن الحسن بن أبي الخفاظ وكان قد اخرج اخاه سليمان من مدينة الجرشف إلى زبيد ثم كتب إليه يطلب به فمن شعره وليس من جيد شعره - قال - فكما في اللى اتفق حضورها وكتب بها الى سليمان وهو يريد
The Succession to the Fatimid Imam al-ʾAmīr

The religious background of his wars is well brought out in a poem of his quoted in the ʿUyūn al-akhbār (VII, 370). He fights in the service of al-Manṣūr (al-ʾĀmīr) (line 4; daʿwa ʾĀmīriyya, l. 26) the I바dīs, the Sunnīs and the Zaydis (l. 16); pronounces the ḫuṭba and mints the coinage in the name of the Fatimids (l. 14). The main object of the poem is to sollicit the help of al-Malika al-Sayyida.

وقال : ينصب بالفرحة الملكة وبذكر ما أقام من الدعوة الى الآلام الأسر بحكم

الله وإقامته الخطبة له وباجه وضع السكة حيث يقول [شعر]:

يلم بقينى بعد طول نفار
حلم على النوم غير غرار
وعل على نفس السلو إلى مدى
وأظهر ظلال الهدى مستبيرة
انال به حتى ودرك ثاري
إفادة اقمار لها ودراري
مولوبة في مسكي وفراري
وأكملها جهرا بغير سرار
أتمل يلهبه فيلهمو بلذة
وأرضي بما يرضى به من معيشة

Four other verses extant in the manuscript have been left out by the editor, as he remarks in a note.)
Some anecdotes about him are quoted (‘Uyūn al-akhbār, VII, 367 ff.) from a book by ‘Umrārā bearing the title Unmūdaj mulūk al-Yaman (which does not seem to be known otherwise).

قال عارة في كتابه المعروف بغوانج ملوك اليمن:

وما يوصف من احكام السلطان الخطاب بن الدمان ساحب مدينة الجربيب انه كان يشرف من طاف ليشتر الداخليين ال سوق الجربيب اثناء رجل وهو يصيح انها بانه وبعثوه الخطاب فقال له ما شاءك فقال انى بعث ثورا لى لا املك غيره وإرتدت
APPENDIX No. IV (Cf. p. 231)

THE DYNASTY OF İMİRÂN B. AL-FA'DL

The ‘Uyûn al-Akhbâr contains valuable information about this family. We knew already from ‘Umâra (p. 30 = ‘Uyûn al-akhbâr, VII, 198) that İmîrân b. al-Fa‘îl, 1 of the sub-tribe of Yâm and of the tribe of Ḥamdân, was appointed (together with As‘îd b. Shihâb) as a deputy of al-Mukarram in Şan‘â. From the ‘Uyûn al-Akhbâr we learn that, owing to resentment over what he considered as a slight to his person, İmîrân fell out with his overlord. This is what the ‘Uyûn al-akhbâr says (VII, 203):

---

To be sure, in another passage the 'Uyun al-Akhbār attributes the estrangement between Imrān and the Sulayhids to the dismissal of Imrān from the governorship of San‘a; but this can be also taken as the consequence, not the cause, of the estrangement. Vol. VII, p. 377:

It is evident, however, from the verses quoted subsequently that he remained loyal to the Fatimids.
According to the information given by al-Khazraji (see Kay, note 42, p. 257) Ḥātim b. al-Ghashīm severed Ṣan‘ā and the surrounding country from the Ṣulayḥīd kingdom; whether this is correct or not, Ṣan‘ā soon returned to the Fatimid allegiance. Ḥātim died in 502 and was succeeded by his sons: ‘Abdallāḥ, who died of poison after a reign of two years and subsequently Ma‘n, who was deposed in 510. From that year to 533 another Ḥamḍānid family reigned in the town: Hīsām b. Qubbayt, Ḥīmās b. Qubbayt and Ḥātim b. Ḥīmās. As stated by Idrīs, they were adherents of al-Ḥāfīz. In 533 Ḥamīd al-daula Ḥātim b. Aḥmad b. ‘Imrān b. al-Faḍl — grandson, therefore, of the governor appointed by the Ṣulayḥīd al-Mukarram — acquired the town. He was attacked in 545 by the Zaydi Imam al-Mutawakkil Ahmad, but was able, eventually, to defend himself. Ḥātim died in 556 and was succeeded by his son ‘Alī. ‘Alī took the leading part in an alliance, formed in the first half of 569 against ‘Abd al-Nābi, son of ‘Alī b. al-Mahdī. He was the reigning prince of Ṣan‘ā when, six months after his campaign against

---

1 It is true that he does not know — or does not mention — that there has been a change of dynasty.

The *Uyūn al-Akhbār* contains the record of an interesting episod in the fighting between Ḥātim and the Zaydite Imam al-Mutawakkil, shedding light on the Ismaili convictions of the former (vol. VII. p. 372 ff.): he restored the inscription containing the names of the Fatimid Imams, which had been erased by the Zaydite.

*وكانت* وفاتها (scil. of Queen Sayyida) قُدِسَتُ الله روحها في شهر شعبان من شهور سنة اثنين وثمانين وخمسة ودفنت في جامع ذي لجنة ايبر القبلة في منزل متصل بالمسجد امجاع وقد ذكر ان بعض المتغلين من ملوك اليمن اراد ان يخرج جنتها الشريفة عن قبرها حين انكر المتغلين كونها فيه، وإنها من الشهداء بما يبطله الحق ونبيها، ففتحوا عن قبرها حتى انتهوا الى التأويل فوجدوا فيه فصلا فحول عنه فاصابوا فيه كثبا بإحكاما نشهد انها استنفت فيه ذلك المنزل عن المسجد ابنها فيه ومجدى بذلك علامات القضاة والاحكام، وشهدت الشهود الثابتة عند الحكام، فردونا فيها على ما كان عليه، وردوناُ بنتها وحغارتها عليه، وقبرها في اليوم يزوره جميع فرق الإسلام، ويعترف بفضلها ودعاءها الخاص والعام، وباقي الى قبرها قبض بظلم أو جائحة أو علة في بدنها أو ليلة فتبهلها بها، ويعتذرون الى الله تعالى في كفيف ما اصابها بنضالها، فكل من اخليص لديها البنية، وسأله تعالى متسلا بها صحيح الطوبة، ازال الله بيركها ما عرّاه، وفرج عنه بفضلها ما اصابها وإجابته ما به دعاها، وذلك مشهور معروف، ظاهر موصوف

والمسجد المجاع بذى جلالة المذكور هي التي تولت عازره بقمها، وهبات موضع قبرها فيه في أيامها، وجامع صنعاء فهي الى وصعته، وصحبت عازره وزيتها، وامرت ان تكتب فيه اسماء جميع السبع من على بن أبي طالب عم الى امام عصرها، عام فانبت ذلك في الخانات القبلة من المسجد المجاع بأمرها، ثم كنت في أيام احد بن
The restoration of the inscription by Ḥātim shows conclusively that he was an Ismaili. Moreover, there seems to be evidence to show that his dynasty belonged to the adherents of the Egyptian Fatimids — although Idris is silent on this point. We have information about wars waged by his son ‘Ali against Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm, the leader of the Ṭayyi-bis; this seems to imply different party allegiance.

The following extract is taken from the *Kifāya* of al-Khazraji, MS Leiden, Or. 302, p. 67. (This seems to be the only mention of Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm in a non-Ismaili chronicle, excepting the interpolated passage in ‘Umāra.)

[The substance of the account can also be found in Kay, p. 299 and Redhouse, p. 17, both of whom used al-Khazraji.]
APPENDIX No. V (Cf. p. 231)

Poems by Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir on the Fall of the Fatimids
and Against the Majīdīs

ʿUyūn al-akhbār, VII, 384.

فَالَدَاعِي الأَجَلِ مُحَمَّدٌ بْنُ طَاهِرِ الْخَارِجِيَّ، حِينَ بَلَغَهُ انتِفَاعُ امْرِ الْعَادِيَّ [شَعْرَ]

إنْهَدَ مَا شَادَا وَبَدَنْ مَأْرَعَ
وَالنَّافِرُ الزَّوْمِ الْعَلِيِّ كَالْهِـ
وَالعَاضِدُ بْنُ الحَمَّامِ الْعَدْوِ الْخَكَّارِ
فِيَ دَوَارَتِ بِالْحَكَالِ دِيْرَةَ

وَيَقُولُ نِيَاكَطَبُ الْفُرْقَةِ الْمُجَدِّيةِ [شَعْرَ]

ابْنُ الْمُهْوَّلِ زُورٌ فِي الْوَرَى
وَالنَّافِرُ زِيَادًا عَلَى الْعَانِمِ
وُلِدَ بِهِمْ مَرَضُ النَّفْسِ وَفَجَاحٌ
فَالْكَلِّ فِي نَصَبِ الْهُدْيَةِ جَائِرِ
نَصُوبُ الْمُؤْنَى وَمَا مَتَاهُ الْآمَرِ
فَغَلِفَنَا عَنَّاهُ وَدُعَاهُ
تَيْبُهُ وَهُوَ اسْتَمْلَحُ الْمَأْهَرِ
شَرَقَتْ مَحَلِّبَةُ لَهُ وَمَنَاَبِرُ
مَبْقِيَ حَفَايْقُ عَلَمٍ آَلٍ مُحَمَّدٍ
هُوَجَّةُ اَللّهِ فِي نِيَا شَاهِدٍ

ADDITIONAL NOTES

1. To p. 209: “At Ghadir Khumm Muḥammad had appointed ‘Ali as his successor ... In the same way al-Āmīr appointed his cousin al-Ḥāfīz.”

Cf. the lines of the poet Ẓāfīr al-Haddād (Brockelmann, I, 303; Suppl. I, 461) in a panegyric on al-Ḥāfīz (MS. Vatican Ar. 1171, fol. 61v):

حَقُّ اِخْلَاصَ مَنْ صَعْبَهَا
فُجَرَ قَيْسُ وَلَانِقَفَ مِنْ شَيْبَهَا
وَرَثَ بْنِي عُمَّدٍ مَنْ بَعْلَهَا
I had the opportunity of collating the text from the Kitāb al-Azhār (taken from a private copy put at my disposal) with the manuscript in the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London (no. 25849; cf. BSOS, vol. VIII, p. 38), fol. 119r ff. I give the variants relevant to the constitution of the text, leaving aside obvious errors of the scribe.

P. 234 l. 6: 'lisānān: omit. L; l. 12: 'alā al-'ulā: also L; l. 14: 'adār: also L; l. 16: 'alā: also L; l. 18: 'alā: also L; l. 20: 'adār: also L.

P. 235 l. 1: 'lisānān: also L; l. 7: 'alā: also L; l. 12: 'alā: also L; l. 15: 'alā: also L.

P. 236 l. 4: 'alā: also L; l. 8: 'alā: also L; l. 16: 'alā: also L.

P. 237 l. 10: 'alā: also L; l. 15: 'alā: also L; l. 17: 'alā: also L; l. 20: 'alā: also L.

P. 238 l. 7: 'alā: also L; l. 13: 'alā: also L; l. 14: 'alā: also L.

P. 239 l. 1: 'alā: also L; l. 3: 'alā: also L; l. 13: 'alā: also L; l. 17: 'alā: also L; l. 22: 'alā: also L.

P. 240 l. 1: 'alā: also L; l. 5: 'alā: also L; l. 9: 'alā: also L; l. 10: 'alā: also L; l. 15: 'alā: also L; l. 17: 'alā: also L; l. 19: 'alā: also L.

P. 241 l. 25: 'alā: also L; l. 11: 'alā: also L; l. 12: 'alā: also L.

P. 242 l. 9: 'alā: also L; l. 17: 'alā: also L.

P. 243 l. 15: 'alā: also L; l. 20: 'alā: also L.

3. To p. 198 and 245: Ibn Abī Ṭayyī. The correct form of the name is, perhaps, Ibn Abī Ṭayyā.