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ABSTRACT

It has for long been recognized that the strength and the weakness of the Umayyad Empire arose from its Arab character; and, while the conquests of the armies of Islam expanded the frontiers with spectacular speed, the elements composing these armies still nurtured the rivalries and antagonisms brought with them from the Arabian Peninsula. Before Islam, this tribalism had never been able to manifest itself in a political rôle, and, indeed, many of the bases on which it was presumed to rest can be shown to be fictitious; however, once given an opportunity for political expression, it neutralized all the other organs of government and, in effect, imported the attitudes of the desert into the regions of Middle Eastern civilization.

The present study examines the origins of these tribes, and the distribution of their various groups, throughout the region. The tribes included in the first expansion are identified, and their earliest settlements in the conquered territories are described. Particular attention has been paid to their position in 'Iraq and Khurasan, for here we find that regional influences as much as tribal sentiments were operative as political forces. While to the Umayyad Caliph in Damascus political expediency demanded an identification
with one or another of the two main tribal groupings, 'Irāq and Khurāsān are shown to be developing regional personalities in despite of an incessant preoccupation with such tribal antipathies and rivalries. In dwelling upon this facet of Umayyad history, both the realities and the fictions of Arab tribalism are exposed, along with the contribution it made to the final debacle.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisors Professor W. Montgomery Watt and Mr. J.R. Walsh.

I am also greatly indebted to my family and my friends for their help.

My thanks are also due to the staff of Edinburgh University Library.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBREVIATIONS</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER I THE ARAB TRIBES, THEIR INTER-RELATION AND DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THROUGHOUT THE PENINSULA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER II THE CONQUESTS AND TRIBAL MIGRATION</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) The Tribes and Umayyad Caliphs</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The Conquest of ‘Irāq and settlement of the Tribes</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Kūfa and the settlement of the tribes</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) The distribution of the Tribes in Kūfa</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER III THE ARAB TRIBES IN BAṢRA</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) The struggle of the Tribes During ‘Alī’s Period</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Ziyād the governor of Baṣra</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The anarchy after Yazīd’s death</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Al-Mukhtār and the Tribes of Baṣra</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Muḥ‘ab in Baṣra</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER IV ‘IRAQ AS A UNITED PROVINCE</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) The Zubairite Period</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The governorship of al-Ḥajjāj</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The Revolt of Ibn al-Ash‘ath</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Yemen control ‘Irāq after al-Ḥajjāj’s death</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) The second period of Qaisite control ‘Iraq</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER V</td>
<td>THE ARAB TRIBES IN KHURĀSĀN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>The beginning of the Conquests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Qaisite domination of Khurāsān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Arab migration into Khurāsān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Khurāsān after Yazīd's death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>The resistance of Tamīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>The Umayyad Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>The Azdite Supremacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>The Revival of Qais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Azd return to power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>The Arab Tribes in Transoxiana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER VI</th>
<th>THE ARAB TRIBES AND THE COLLAPSE</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OF THE UMAYYAD</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>The Governorship of Naṣr b. Sayyār</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>The Arab Tribes in the last days of Umayyad Rule</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BIBLIOGRAPHY   |                                   | 202  |
| GENEALOGICAL TABLES |                                    |      |
ABBREVIATIONS
Al-A‘lāq, by Ibn Rusta.

Aghānī Kitāb al-Aghānī, by Abū 'l-Faraj al-İsfahānī.

Akhbār Akhbār al-“Abbās wa Wildih, (anonymous).

Ansāb Ansāb al-Asrāf, by al-Balādhurī.


Aṣnām Kitāb al-‘Aṣnām, by Ibn al-Kalbī.

Azdī Ta‘rīkh al-Muṣīl, by al-Azdī.


Bakrī Mu‘jam ma Ḣaṣ‘a‘jam, by al-Bakrī.

Bayān Al-Bayān wa ’l-Tabyūn, by al-Jāhiz.

Buldān Kitāb al-Buldān, by al-Ya‘qūbī.

Dīnawarī Al-Akhbār al-Tīwāl, by al-Dīnawarī.

E.I. The Encyclopaedia of Islam.


Fāqīh Kitāb al-Buldān, by Ibn al-Fāqīh.

Farazdaq Dīwān.

Fihrīst Kitab al-Fihrīst, by Ibn al-Nadīm.

Futūḥ Futūḥ al-Buldān, by al-Balādhurī.


Hadā‘iq Al-‘Uyūn wa ’l-Hadā‘iq, (anonymous).

Hadhīf Ḥadhīf min Nasab Quraish, by Mu‘arrāj al-Sadūsī.

‘Ibar Al-‘Ibar, by Ibn Khaldūn.

Ibn Khuradadhba Al-Masālik wa ’l-Mamālik, by Ibn Khuradadhba.

Iklīl Kitāb al-Iklīl, by al-Hamdānī.

Imāma Al-Imāma wa ’l-Siyāsā, by Ibn Qutaiba.
Inbāh  Al-Inbāh 'Alā Qabā’il al-Ruwh, by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr.

Iīd  Al-Iīd al-Farīd, by Ibn 'Abd Rabbīhi.

Irshād  Irshād al-Ārīb, by Yāqūt.

Ishtiqaq  Kitāb al-Ishtiqaq, by Ibn Duraíd.

Iṣṭakhrī  Masālik al-Mamālik, by al-Iṣṭakhrī.

Jahshiyārī  Al-Wuzara’ wa ’l-Kuttāb, by al-Jahshiyārī.

Jumharat  Jumharat Ansāb al-‘Arab, by Ibn Ḥazm.

Jumaḥī  Ṭabqaṭ Fuḥūl al-Shu'ara’, by al-Jumaḥī.

Kalbī  Jumharat al-Nasab, by Ibn al-Kalbī.

Kāmil  Al-Kāmil fī ’l-Tarīkh, by Ibn al-Athīr.


Kharāj  Kitāb al-Kharāj, by Abū Yusuf.

Khawārizmī  Mafāštih al-‘Ulm, by al-Khawārizmī.

Kūfī  Kitāb al-Futūḥ, by Ibn A’tham.

Lestrange  The land of the Eastern Caliphate, by Lestrange.

Lisān  Lisān al-‘Arab, by Ibn Manzūr.

Lubāb  Al-Lubāb fī Tahdīb al-Ansāb, by Ibn al-Athīr.

Lughda  Sifat Jazīrat al-‘Arab, by Lughda.

Ma‘ārif  Al-Ma‘ārif, by Ibn Qutaiba.

Maqdisī  Aḥsan al-Taqāsīm, by al-Maqdisī.


Masālik  Al-Masālik wa ’l-Mamālik, by Ibn Ḥawqal.

Mawāridī  Al-Aḥkām al-Ṣultāniya, by al-Mawāridī.

Mubarrad  Al-Kāmil fī ’l-Lughah, by al-Mubarrad.

Muḥabbār  Kitāb al-Muḥabbār, by Ibn Ḥabīb.

Mu‘jam  Mu‘jam al-Buldān, by Yāqūt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muntakhabat</th>
<th>Muntakhabāt fī Akhbār al-Yemen, by al-Ḥimyarī.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muqaddima</td>
<td>Al-Muqadima, by Ibn Khaldūn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murūj</td>
<td>Murūj al-Dhahab, by al-Mas‘udī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahj</td>
<td>Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha, by Ibn Abī 'l-Ḥadīd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naqā'īd</td>
<td>Naqā'īd Jarīr wa 'l-Farazdaq, by Abū Ubaida.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narshakhī</td>
<td>Ta‘rīkh Bukhāra, by al-Narshakhī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nujūm</td>
<td>Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira, by Ibn Tahgīberdī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaba‘īl</td>
<td>Mukhtalīf Qabā‘īl wa Muṭalifiḥā, by Ibn Ḥabīb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qalqashandī</td>
<td>Nihāyat al-Arāb fī Ma‘rifat Qabā‘īl al-ʿArāb, by al-Qalqashandī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabā‘ik</td>
<td>Sabā‘ik al-Dhahab fī Ma‘rifat Qabā‘īl al-ʿArāb, by al-Suwaydī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam‘ānī</td>
<td>Kitāb al-Ansāb, by al-Sam‘ānī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi‘r</td>
<td>Al-Shi‘r wa l-Shu‘arā‘, by Ibn Qutaiba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sifat</td>
<td>Sifat Jazīrat al-ʿArāb, by al-Ḥambānī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīḥāh</td>
<td>Kitāb al-Sīḥāh, by al-Jawḥārī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīra</td>
<td>Sīrat al-Nabī, by Ibn Ḥishām.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Kinship and Marriage, by Smith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subh</td>
<td>Subh al-ʿArūs, by al-Qalqashandī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suyūṭī</td>
<td>Ta‘rīkh al-Khulafā‘, by al-Suyūṭī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭabaqāt</td>
<td>Ṭabaqāt al-Kubra‘, by Ibn Sa‘d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭabarī</td>
<td>Ta‘rīkh al-Rusul wa 'l-Mulūk, by al-Ṭabarī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāj</td>
<td>Tāj al-ʿArūs, by al-Zabīdī.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tanbīh Al-Tanbīh wa 'l-Ishrāf, by al-Mas‘ūdī.

Turfat Turfat al-Ashāb, by Ibn Rasūl.

Wakī‘ Akhbar al-Qudāt, by Wakī‘.

Wāqidī Futūḥ al-Shām, by al-Wāqidī.

Wellhausen Arab Kingdom and its fall, by Wellhausen.

Wüstenfeld Register zu den genealogischen Tabellen der Arabischen stämme und Familien, by Wüstenfeld.

Ya‘qūbī Ta‘rīkh, by al-Ya‘qūbī.
INTRODUCTION

SURVEY OF THE SOURCES

The sources from which information on the Arab tribes can be collected are, in general, the familiar materials used for the study of Islamic history. In what follows here they will be treated in chronological order and described in terms of the contribution they make to the subject of tribal organisation and distribution.

Al-Minqarî, Naṣr b. Muẓahîm (d. 212/827), a well-known historian and contemporary of al-Wāqidî whose sources are from the same age as those of Abū Mikhnafl. Only one of the numerous works attributed to him has survived, the Kitâb Ṣiffin;2 of the rest all we know is that they were pro-Shî'a.

The Kitâb Ṣiffin gives very detailed information about the battle, and of the Arab tribes who were already settled in both Syria and 'Irāq, mentioning the feuds which existed between them and quoting verses which reflect the spirit of hostility. However, it rarely attempts to evaluate the reliability of the materials on which it drew, prominent among which are the accounts of Saif b. 'Omar and Abū Mikhnafl.

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/844), known also, as Kātib al-Wāqidî, is the author of the famous Tabaqât,3 which deals with the classes of the Companions and their successors down to his own time. Being the earliest work in Arabic of a biographical nature, it is, of course, of immense value as a source of

1. Pihrist, p. 137.
2. Ed. by 'Abd 'l-Salām Ḥārūn, Cairo, 1365.
information about the tribal backgrounds and alliances of
the individuals with whom it deals. Much, if not most, of
the material which he gives derives from al-Wāqidī,¹ and
in fact, Ibn Sa'd may be regarded as the continuator of a
work left incomplete at the time of the latter's death.

In the course of his biographies of the religious and
pious men of the early generations, he provides much inci-
dental information about the Arab settlers in Kūfa, Başra²
and Khurāsān.³ His work might be criticised for the absence
of any personal view-point or comment on the matters which
he treats, but such criticism could equally be directed
against most of the historical work of the period. And,
as with the latter, the reader should always be aware of the
atmosphere of intense religious polemic in which the work
was produced, and it cannot be supposed that its glorifi-
cation of the faith was not influenced by the raging
Shu'ūbiyya controversy.

Khalīfa b. Khayyāt (d. 240/854).⁴ One of the most
reliable of the early traditionists and historians. Little
is known about his life except that he was from Başra, and
that he wrote five books,⁵ only two of which have survived:
Ta'rīkh⁶ and Kitāb al-Tabaqāt.⁷ Khalīfa's Ta'rīkh is the
earliest to present its materials in the form of annals.

¹ Fihrist, p. 145.
² Ta'baqāt, III, ii, p. 21; IV, ii, pp. 77-78; V, ii, p. 101.
³ Ibid., V, ii, p. 33.
⁴ Nujūm, II, 303.
⁵ Fihrist, p. 324.
It begins with the first year of Hijra and ends in the year 230/844 (eight years before the death of the author). At the end of the reign of each Caliph he supplies a list of the governors of the Provinces, the qādis, the ḥājibs, the chiefs of the police, the heads of the dīwāns and of the Treasury. In dealing with the early conquests he uses both local information and the official Medinese accounts. His narrative is sometimes very detailed, as for example when he describes the revolt of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Ash'ath; but in other places he gives no more than a passing notice to events of importance, such as the revolt of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab. His authorities are Qatāda, 'Urwa b. al-Zubair, al-Zuhrī and Ibn Isḥāq. The work is an invaluable source of information about the tribes in 'Iraq and Khurāsān. In comparison with Tahārī, Khalīfa's work is very abridged. Although they frequently use different authorities, their accounts of many aspects of the early conquests are similar. Both take a very uncritical attitude towards their sources, but whereas Khalīfa usually contents himself with a single version of an event, Tahārī will report it through numerous informants.

Al-Balādhrī, Abū 'l-'Abbās Ahmad b. Yaḥya (d. 279/892). Little is known of the life of this great historian, the

2. Ibid., I, pp. 282, 289.
3. Ibid., I, pp. 5,13,80.
4. Ibid., I, 362.
author of the Futūḥ al-Buldān and the Ansāb al-Ashraf. 1 In the Futūḥ, 2 al-Baladhurī describes the Muslim conquest, beginning with the campaigns of the Prophet and continuing with the Wars of the ridda, the invasion of Syria, Jazīra, Armēnia, Egypt and the Maghrib, and the occupation of *Irāq and Persia. The book gives a vivid account of Arab military activity 3 and is of particular importance to the present study for the details it provides of their settlements in Kūfa and Basra, as well as their incursions into Khurasān and the other Persia Provinces. His sources are often identified, and include such names as Abū Mikhnat, Hīshām al-Kalbī, al-Waqīdatī and al-Madā'īnī. 4 He is not uncritical in his treatment of these materials, and for certain events he reports more than one version; 5 moreover, he also makes use of popular tradition in his narratives. 6

His Ansāb al-Ashrāf 7 is an extensive work on Arab genealogy, and one of the most important sources for the history of the tribes in *Irāq and Khurasān. It preserves valuable information about the views which the tribes held of one another, and describes their relations between them—

2. Ed. by Riḍwān Muḥammad, Cairo, 1932.
3. As for example, when he describes how *Irāq was subjugated after the battle of al-Gaddisiyya.
5. Ibid., p. 147.
6. Ibid., pp. 148, 308.
7. For the present study volumes 2, 3 and 4 of the 32 volume manuscript copy in the Institute of Higher Islamic Studies in Baghdād were used.
selves, as well as those they maintained with the government. Although al-Ansāb is arranged in the tabaqaṭ style of Ibn Saʿd, it introduces more historical events into the genealogical frame-work. Al-Balādhurī used the works of his predecessors in this field and often is to be seen combining information derived from Ibn Iṣḥāq and Ibn Saʿd. However, he uses his sources very intelligently, giving them in the original whenever possible, and it is for this reason that he enjoyed such a high reputation among subsequent scholars. Frequently, he sheds additional light on events passed over briefly by Ṭabarī.

Al-Dīnawarī, Abū Ḥanīfa Ahmad b. Dāwūd (d. 282/895), the philologist and naturalist. He was born in Dīnawar in Persia, and received his education in Khurāsān, Kūfa and Baṣra. Although he is said to have written more than ten books, only his al-Akḥābār al-Tiwal has survived in its entirety. Without mentioning his sources, he gives a detailed account of the conquest of ʿIrāq by the Arabs, with particular attention to important events, such as the battle of Qādisīyya and Ṣifṭīn. His remarks on the relations between the tribes and the Caliphs is very interesting. A detailed account is given of al-Mukhtār's

4. For example, pp. 326, 350, when he speaks about the relation between Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik and ʿYemenī tribes; also his report about Muḍar, Qais and Tamīm and their relations with the Caliph Marwūn b. Muhammad.
revolution and those who supported him during his struggle.¹ His description of the situation in Baṣra after the death of Yazīd I, is invaluable,² as is, also, his account of the relations between Tamīm and the governors of ‘Irāq.³ He gives precise information about the affairs of Muṣṭaḥ b. al-Zubair and the ‘Irāqī tribes,⁴ and elucidates many facts affecting the tribal feuds. He is impartial and balanced in the presentation of his facts, and displays no traces of a partisan spirit.

Al-Yaṣqūbī, Ahmad b. Abī Yaṣqūb (d. 284/895).⁵ The historian and geographer to whom more than four books are attributed, the most famous being al-Taʾrīkh and al-Buldān. The Taʾrīkh, arranged according to the reigns of the various Caliphs, is very concise in its information and rarely refers to the sources from which this is derived. Major events such as the Battle of Camel and Siffin, are treated in some detail,⁶ but usually the accounts are summary and unrelated to one another. In places, differing versions of the same incident are given, in certain cases

1. Dīnawarī, p. 299.
2. Ibid., p. 295.
3. Ibid., pp. 181, 282, 312.
4. Ibid., pp. 318-319.
6. E.g., his account of the tribes who supported ‘Alī gives valuable data on the tribes in this area. II, pp. 128, 133.
he is the unique source for events. Most interesting are the descriptions of the Caliphs and the provincial governors, and the information given on the administrative system. The reports on the Arab who settled in 'Irāq and Khurāsān and their feuds are of primary importance to the present study. In his presentation of historical materials, al-Ya'qūbī is similar to his contemporary al-Dīnawarī, both in respect of the sources which they used and the way in which they drew upon them.

Al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr (d. 310/923), historian and scholar, was born in 225/839 at Amul in Ṭabaristan. His most important work, the Taʾrīkh al-Rusul waʾl-Mulūk, begins with the creation and, continuing through the legendary history of the Prophets and the pre-Islamic dynasties, gains its greatest importance when it reaches the period of Muḥammad and the states formed by the Muslims down to 290/902.

He brings to his historical writing the technique of the Muḥaddithūn, setting side by side without comment all versions of each event which he could find and providing, thereby, a wealth of detail lacking in all the other histories.

1. E.g., his is the only surviving account of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān's efforts to dissuade his brother ‘Abd al-‘Azīz from claiming the Caliphate and to put his son al-Walīd next in line of succession, III, 21.
2. E.g. his treatment of Muʿāwiya and his governors, especially Amr b. al-Āṣ and Ziyād b. Abīnī, II, pp. 161,166.
4. Ibid., II, pp. 98-100; III, pp. 10,27,33.
The work is arranged in the form of annals for each year of Hijra, beginning with the era of the Prophet. His materials come from a wide range of authorities, such as Abū Mikhnaf, 'Omar b. Shabba, Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, al-Madā'i, Saif b. 'Omar, al-Waqīdī and Ibn al-Kalbī, some of whom only survive through his extensive quotation from their works.

Comparison of Ţabarī with Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Balādhurī, Ibn Aṭham and al-Azī shows how numerous and diverse were the materials on which he based his work, and the neutral position he took in relating events. Khalīfa's Ta'rikh, despite its value, is very brief, and uncritical in its information, and in this respect is totally different from that of Ţabarī.1 Balādhurī, however, often gives the same information as Ţabarī, some times more and some times less detailed.2 Ibn Aṭham contains much more information on certain aspects of the conquests and, especially, on their course in the regions of the East, and in this respect he is an invaluable supplement to Ţabarī. Thus, the campaigns in Khurāsān and the relations of the Arabs here among themselves and with the natives are treated more fully in the Futūḥ than in any other source.3 Al-Azī, although he does not acknowledge his dependence on Ţabarī, in large part merely repeats information to be found in the

1. Compare, for example, the account of the rebellion against the Caliph 'Uthmān in Khalīfa, Ta'rikh, I, 181, with that in Ţabarī, IV, 340.
2. See, Futūḥ, pp. 128, 178; Ţabarī, IV, pp. 70, 71; Ansāb, V, pp. 87, 138, 157; Ţabarī, VII, pp. 97, 189.
latter. However, he uses other works unknown to Tabari and draws on materials not utilized in any other sources.¹

As for virtually every other aspect of early Islamic history, for the subject here studied, also, Tabari's is the indispensable work, not only for the quantity of information it contains but, also, for the impartial way in which it is presented.

Ibn Aṭham al-Kufi, Abu Muhammad Ahmad b. ‘Alī. Little is known of his life, other than that he died about 314/926.² His Futuh begins with the Caliphate of ‘Uthman b. ‘Affān and continues down to the revolt of Babak in the reign of al-Mu’tasim (222/832), presenting wide and detailed information on all the events of which it treats. In this respect it is superior to Baladhuri as a source; and, while not so extensive as Tabari, it still provides a useful complement to the information provided therein. Covering the whole of the Umayyad period, Ibn Aṭham follows the migrations of the Arabs into ‘Irāq and Khurāsān, and dwells on the major events in which they were involved in these regions. In treating of the revolts which took place in ‘Irāq, he shows himself to be sympathetic to the tribes settled here, as might be expected from a man who was himself local.³ He provides one of the most interesting accounts of Qutaiba’s conquests in Transoxiana, and of all

¹ Azdī, II, 24.
³ Kufi, II, ff.64,68.
the sources he gives the most circumstantial information about the settlement of the Arabs here and in Khurāsān and of their relations with the natives. Indeed, as regards the Persian provinces, Ibn Aṭham can be regarded as a source superior to Ṭabarī.

Al-Azdī, Abū Zakariyya Yazīd b. Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim (d. 334/945), the author of the Taʻrīkh al-Mouṣil, is, also, hardly known apart from this one book. His successors, such as Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn Khaldūn, used his work extensively, but they too seem to have known little of his life. His work is one of the first attempts at regional history in Arabic, and must be regarded as a highly creditable achievement in this field, relating the local events to the general development of affairs in the Empire.

The work was in three volumes, of which only the second has survived, covering the period from 101/719 to 224/326. Apart from written sources such as Abū Mikhnaf, Abū ʻUbaida, Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ and Ṭabarī, al-Azdī also collected his materials from tradition and eye-witnesses; one can notice the influence of Ṭabarī in the style of writing and the method of presentation, and, indeed, he at times quotes directly from him. Its chief importance for the present study lies in the information it provides about the feuding between Qais and Kalb towards the end of the Umayyad Period, and no source more clearly presents the problems with which

the last Caliph, Marwān b. Muḥammad, was confronted.

Al-Masʿudī, Abū ’l-Hasan Ṭalī b. al-Ḥusain (d. 346/957), is one of the most famous of all Arab historians. According to his own statement, he was born in Baghdād,¹ so Ibn al-Nadīm’s description of him as a Maghribī must be discounted.² Of the five books which he is said to have written, only three have survived: Murūj al-Dhahab, al-Tanbīh wa ’l-Iṣḥāf, and a part of the Akhbār al-Zaman.

Unfortunately, the works which are lost contained his extensive accounts of the period treated, and both the Murūj and Tanbīh are avowedly no more than simplified condensations of these. In style, his works are similar to that of Yaʿqūbī, very concise and with only the major events being given any detailed attention. He does not always mention the name of the source upon which he drew, even when quoting verbatim. The Murūj is valuable in that it gives interesting data on the Arab tribes, and he seems to have had a particular interest in the affairs of ‘Irāq during the Umayyad period.³

---

¹. Irshād, VII, 148.
². Fihrist, p. 219.
³. Murūj, III, pp. 37,152.
CHAPTER I
THE ARAB TRIBES

Their inter-relation and distribution throughout the Peninsula.

Those problems which grew out of Arab tribalism in the conquered territories had their origins in the social organization of the home-land, where common genealogies and territorial proximity shaped the patterns of alliance and hostility that were to be brought by them into regions where they had neither meaning nor purpose. The frequent irrational behaviour of political groups in the provinces of the Umayyad Empire can be explained to some degree by memories of older loyalties and alliances, most of which were fictitious, but none the less of importance. The fact that the genealogies were transmitted orally greatly facilitated distortion, and created an obscurity wherein a variety of motives could operate. Moreover, the political rivalries of the Arab leaders during the early years of Islam and the conquests supplied an incentive for falsification even of such genealogical tradition that might have had some authenticity. ¹

The genealogists divide the Arabs into three categories: the extinct Arabs (bā'ida), the genuine Arabs (‘āriba) and the naturalised Arabs (musta‘riba), tracing the ultimate origins of the race to the two major branches: ¹

¹. Inbāh, p. 107.
Qaḥṭān in Yemen and *Adnān in Ḥijāz.\(^1\) Al-Maqdisī specifies this somewhat further, having the *Adnān branch include all those Arabs who were not of Qaḥṭān, and tracing their ancestry to the sons at Nizār, Muṣṭar and Rabī‘a.\(^2\) Ibn Ḥazm, however, claims that all Arabs go back to a single ancestor, except for the three people: Tanūkh, al-‘Itq, and Ghassān, each of which was a composite of various lines (butūn)\(^3\).

However he had earlier mentioned that all Arabs descend from the three individuals: ‘Adnān, Qaḥṭān and Quḍā‘a.\(^4\) Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr would have the Arabs descend in three lines from Nizār, Yemen and Quḍā‘a.\(^5\)

Such genealogical classification has already been called into question by European scholars such as Nöldeke and Goldziher, and it is obvious from the lack of consistency between the various accounts that much of it was of later invention. Nöldeke thought that it was created by the people of the Yemen in order that they might claim full participation in Islām, while Goldziher illustrates from pre-Islamic alliances and feuds the ways in which the premises of such classification are contradicted.\(^6\) Thus we find Jadīlā (of Qaḥṭān) and Shaibān (of ‘Adnān) allied together against ‘Abs (of ‘Adnān), cutting across the two-

---

1. A convenient summary of the statements of the genealogists can be found in Ṭāhā Ḥussain, Fi al-Adab al-Jāhilī, p. 82.
3. Jamharat, p. 431; This is the genealogy which is given by Ibn Khaldūn in al-‘Ibar, II, 521.
5. Inbān, p. 64.
part division laid down by the genealogies.\textsuperscript{1} Again, Aws and Khazraj are presented as being of the same descent, whereas all our information about them shows that they had always been enemies. Qais b. al-Khatīm (of Aws) urges his people to revenge the defeat they suffered at the hands of the Khazraj in the battles (ayyām) of Mudarris and Mu‘abbis,\textsuperscript{2} which would seem to indicate that they were of different tribal origins. Moreover, the same poet is found asking for help from the Quraish (who were of ‘Adnān) against the Khazraj, even though he himself, as a man of Aws, is presumed to be from Qahtān; and by the terms in which he speaks it would seem that he regarded the Quraish as of closer blood-relationship than the Khazraj.

Other contradictions in the conventional genealogical classification of the tribes can be demonstrated. Certain sources present Qudā‘a as descending from the ‘Adnān line, saying that he was born of Ma‘a‘d b. ‘Adnān and a woman from Saba’, and this can be attested in both the pre- and post-Jāhilīya Qudā‘ite poems.\textsuperscript{3} Others, however, claim that it is to the Yemen that he belongs, presenting his ancestry as: Qudā‘a b. Mālik b. ‘Amr b. Murra b. Zaid b. Mālik b. Himyar.\textsuperscript{4} This Yemen ancestry seems to be a later invention, dating from the period when the people of Qudā‘a

\textsuperscript{1} Goldziher, \textit{op.cit.}, I, 93.
\textsuperscript{3} Zubairī, p. 5; Bakrī, I, 19; Jamharat, p. 411; Smith, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{4} Kalbī,(ed. Caskel) II, 229; Jamharat, p. 440.
became associated with the Kalb in their wars with Qais. This was in the reign of the Umayyad Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, but before this time they were regarded as being descended from Ma‘add.1 The political motives underlying such claims to one or another ancestry in the early period most probably arose from the rivalries with which the throne itself was surrounded,2 but one must not exclude the possibility that the genealogists themselves may have had personal reasons for tampering with the lines of descent of friends or enemies.3 The confusion that this can give rise to may be seen in the case of the tribe of Bajīla: those of this tribe who settled in Syria and North Africa are regarded as descending from Anmār b. Nīzār,4 while the others were attributed to a Yemenī line.5 Similarly with the tribe of Khathām, some members of which are said to descend from ‘Adnān, but others presumed to be from the Yemen. Al-Mas‘ūdī accepts both Bajīla and Khathām as being of Nīzār, and asserts that it

1. Tāj, V, 470.
2. Inbāh, p. 107, mentions the efforts of the early Umayyads to collect about them the strongest of the tribal groups, and these presumably were provided with the most noble ancestries. In the Aghānī, VIII, 77, there is another reference to the dependency of the Umayyads on the Kalb at this time.
3. Iklīl, X, 30, complains that the genealogists of Syria and ‘Iraq abbreviate the lines of descent of Qahtān and Mālik b. Ḥīmyar so that they will not be longer than those of the northern Arabs, descended from Ismā‘īl.
4. Zubairī, p. 7; Murūj, II, 163.
was only out of enmity that they were said to be from the Yemen. Al-Ya‘qūbī tries to harmonize this by assuming that Anmār married a woman of the Yemen and that his sons Bajīla and Khath‘am are thus connected to the people of this region only through their mother’s line. Levi Della Vida explains the confusion by asserting that Khath‘am was not an ethnic unit, but rather a confederation of clans of different origins. Likewise, the tribe of ‘Akk is confused in its origins, those who settled in the East being derived from Azd; while those in the Yemen and other regions are given a descent from ‘Adnān. Ḥudād, too, is variously said to be descended from Kināna or from Ṭayy.

This confusion is further complicated by the appearance of the same clan name in different tribes. Thus, in four tribes of ‘Adnān, the clan name Asad is to be found: Asad b. ‘Abd al-‘Uzzā, Asad b. Khuzaima, Asad b. Rabī‘a and Asad b. Dāwūd. There is, also an Asad to be found in one of the tribes of Qaṭṭān.

The same confusion exists in respect of the Banū Sa‘d from Tamīm and another Sa‘ad from Kilāb; and there

1. Murūj, II, 163; Tāj, VIII, 268.
3. E.I., II, 924, s.V. Khath‘am.
4. Zubairī, p. 5.
5. Qabā’il, p. 25.
7. Ḥamāsa, I, 57.
is a Jarm from Tayy and a Jarm from Quḍā‘a.¹ Similarly, one Muḥārib comes from ‘Abd al-Qais and another from Qais ‘Aīlān;² and we find Jusham b. Hamdān and Jusham b. al-Ḥārith from Qaḥṭān as well as Jusham b. Bakr from ‘Adnān.³ There is a Ghatafan from Yemen and a Ghatafan from ‘Adnān;⁴ as a Māzīn from Taim (Qaḥṭān) and Māzīn from Qais (‘Adnān).⁵ Confusion of this sort has made the study of tribal genealogy difficult even to the native specialists in the subject, as when Ibn Duraid says that al-Ribāb consists of: Taim, ‘Adī, ‘Ukl, Muzaina and Ḍabba,⁶ while according to al-Jawhari the clans were: Ḍabba, Thawr, ‘Ukl, Taim and Adī.⁷

We cannot know at what period the first efforts at systematizing the genealogical relations of the various tribes were made, but some impetus must certainly have been given to it by the Diwān drawn up by the Caliph ‘Omar b. al-Khattāb. Although this was primarily a register of those entitled to receive ṣaṭār,⁸ it was also the earliest

1. Ḥamāsa, I, 75; 293; Ṣubb, I, 316.
2. Ḥajj, III, 313.
3. Līsān, XIV, 367.
7. Sīhāh, I, 132; Qalqashandī, p. 133.
8. According to the Ibn Sa‘d, Tabagāt, III, i, 214, 219, everyone was included in ‘Omar’s diwān, even those who had no tribal or clan connections. He also implies that the diwān had regional divisions, and he mentions a diwān for Ḥīmyar (III, i, 215) and Ḥabashā and Khathām (III, ii, 167). When Bilāl, whose association was with Khathām, went to Syria, he asked that his name be recorded alongside that of his friend Abū Ruwayhā in the diwān of Ḥabash, and in

(Contd.)
example of a classification of society and could have stimulated similar attempts in respect of the older organization of the Arab people. Unfortunately, our knowledge of 'Omar's dīwān, too, is very scant, and the sources give us even less information as to what was the practice in respect of the 'ātā in the time of the Prophet and Abū Bakr.

The genealogists never make reference to the dīwān, which may merely mean that by the time of the earliest of these works it had already become inactive. Indeed, this must have happened in the mid-Umayyad period, when the revenues of the state were no longer adequate to support such a body of Pensioners, and the only advantage that remained to being included in the registers was the political association that could be claimed on this basis. But the more systematic efforts of the genealogists was to supplant this purpose, also, and by the time the earliest histories came to be written the dīwān of 'Omar is but a distant memory. In fact, with the passing of the Umayyads, genealogy itself begins to lose importance in the Eastern Islamic world and it is only in Spain that it continues to be pursued with any important purpose.

Contd.) agreeing to this 'Omar went even further and included the whole of the latter dīwān into that of Khath'am (Ibid., 167).

Mūwardī, p. 202, states that 'Omar designated the Yemenites and the Qaisites in Syria and Ḥiraq as distinct groups within the dīwān; and Ṭabarī, IV, 219, mentions similar classification for 'Akk and Himyar.

In the Umayyad Period individuals were incorporated in the dīwān of Quraish as a mark of special favour, Aghānī, XXI, 14.

Qaḥṭānite tribes

The southern Arabs are held to descend from Qaḥṭān, the main subdivisions of which are Ḥimyar and Kahlān. Ḥimyar.

It would appear that Ḥimyar consisted of a vast number of tribes in the Yemen, and that the eponymous Ḥimyar himself was also known as al-ʿAranj or al-ʿAranjaj. Ḥimyar was sub-divided into Wāʿil and Mālik, and stemming from the latter was the important branch of Qudāʾa which was given the descent: Qudāʾa b. ʿAmr b. Murra b. Zaid b. Mālik b. Ḥimyar. Certain historians would make this Qudāʾa one of the three original progenitors of all the Arabs, along with Nizār and Yemen. As a result of conflict between the brothers Wāʿil and Mālik, the latter left Yemen and went to al-Shihr. His son al-Hāfī, who is said to have ruled the Yemen after his father's death, had three sons: ʿAmr, ʿImrān and Aslum. The sub-divisions of the ʿImrān are: Taghlib al-Ghalba', Salīh, Rabbān, Tazīd and Ghushaim; and these were the first south Arabian emigrants to emigrate from

2. Qaḥṭān, p. 8.
7. Tāj, X, 94.
8. Ishtiqaq, p. 536; Ḳalār, II, 515.
Yemen to the north, where they settled in Mesopotamia - al-Jazīra al-Furatīya - and built the city of al-Ḥadr. According to al-Bakrī, they dwelt in a place called *Abqar; until the Persian King Shāpūr invaded the region and destroyed their city. The survivors fled to Syria and settled with their kinsmen, the Tanūkh. Ibn al-Kalbī also locates them in Ḥadr and mentions one of their kings, al-Ḍaizan. Yaʿqūbī states that Qudāʿa was the first tribe to enter Syria. It seems that as a result of feuds among the Qudāʿa, certain sections of them left Yemen, some going to Tihāma and others to Syria. Those who settled in Tihāma left there during their struggle with *Anaza and went to the Najd, from where the brothers Juhaina and Hudhaim split off from the main body and went to the desert, while other sections proceeded on to Bahrayn. Those were Taim al-Lāt and Tanūkh, but subsequently the latter led by their chief Malik b. Zuhairst left Bahrayn for *Irāq where they built the city of Hira.

The sub-groups of *Amr b. al-Ḥāfī were: Balī, BahRa", and Khawlān. Balī settled in the Shaghgb and Bada, places

1. Muʿjam, II, 72.
2. Bakrī, I, 22.
5. Yaʿqūbī, I, 178.
6. Ishtiqaq, 546; Bakrī, I, pp. 21, 30; Muʿjam, III, 368.
7. Jamharat, p. 453; see, Ḥamāsa, I, 239; Muʿjam, II, 375.
between Taimā' and Medina.\(^1\) The sub-divisions of Taghlib b. Ḫulwān were: Asad, al-Namir, Kalb, Taghlib and Bakr, all of them sons of Wabra b. Taghlib.\(^2\) The sub-divisions of Asad b. Wabra were: Fahm, Taim Allāh and ShaiʿAllāt.\(^3\) Tanūkh descends from Taim Allāh,\(^4\) while the Banū al-Qain descend from ShaiʿAllāt and they subsequently settled in Syria.\(^5\) The sub-divisions of al-Namir b. Wabra were: Taim, Jiʿithima, Khushain, Qutba and Ghādira.\(^6\) We only have information about the settlement of the Ghādira, of which Yaʿqūt says: Līna, a place in the al-Namir area, having fresh pure water, which belongs to Banū Ghādira.\(^7\) He also mentions them in connection with another watering-place called Maslūq.\(^8\)

The largest and most famous group of Quḍāʿa was Kalb b. Wabra b. Taghlib b. Ḫulwān b. ʿImrān b. al-Ḥāfī,\(^9\) which at first settled in Dumat al-Jandal,\(^10\) and then extended its influence over the area to the west of the Euphrates. Al-Hamdānī includes among their territories Palmyra, Salamīya, ʿĀsimīya, ʿHims, ʿHama, Shaizar and the

---

1. Bakrī, I, 22.
4. ʿHamāsa, I, 237.
5. Inbāḥ, p. 121.
7. Muʿjam, IV, 375.
8. Ibd., IV, 555.
10. Tabaqāt, I, i, 64. Tabarī, IV, 44.
lands extending to al-Samā'wa and the Euphrates. According to Yāqūt, they also occupied the area between Ba'labak, Ḥims and Damascus called Biqā' Kalb which contained many attractive villages with fresh and pure water. Many other places are mentioned as belonging to Kalb such as: Furāqīd, a watering-place in al-Samā'wa, Şuʾr, another watering-place near Kūfa, Ghurrab, a mountain in Syria. Al-Bakrī relates that Kalb at first settled in Najd, but, unable to resist the Nizārite tribes which occupied this district after their move from Tihāma, they were forced to migrate.

Aslum b. al-Ḥaṭṭī had one son called Sūd, from whom was born Ḥawtaka and Laith. The chief sub-divisions of Laith were: Saʿd Hudhaim, Nahd and Juhaina who were sons of Zaid b. Laith. Saʿd Hudhaim migrated to Najd and Nahd to Wādī al-Qurā, where they settled in a place named al-Ḥijr. Al-Hamdānī describes the territory of the Juhaina thus: the al-ʿĪs belonging to Juhaina, extends from Raḍwā and al-Ashʿar to the Red Sea. One section of Juhaina settled in Dhī al-Marwa and Faif while another was located

1. Šifat, p. 132, see Bakrī, I, 45.
3. Ibid., IV, 49.
4. Ibid., III, 431.
5. Ibid., III, 783. For other regions of Kalb, cf. Muʿjam, III, 587; IV, 522, 1024.
7. Qābaʾīl, p. 5; Sabaʾik, p. 25.
8. Ibid., III, pp. 374-375.
10. Ibid., I, 23.
11. Šifat, p. 131.
in Khaibar. Yaqūt mentions the Juhaina of a place in Khaibar called Laṣā. The chief sub-divisions of Sa‘d Hudhaim were: al-Ḥarīth and ‘Udhra. ‘Udhra emigrated from Yemen after a struggle with the other tribes and settled in al-Ḥijāz, where they made a confederation with the Jews. According to al-Ǧisfāhānī, the ‘Udhra were located in Taimā’, but Yaqūt also mentions another place belonging to them called Ashghab which lay between Medīna and Taimā’. 

Kahlān

The other main branch of Saba’ was Kahlān, the chief sub-divisions of which were Nabd and al-Khīyār. From Nabd derives the famous tribe of Azd.

Azd

The genealogy of this tribe is given as: Azd b. al-Ghawth b. Nabd b. Zaid b. Kahlān; and more than twenty-five sub-divisions are attributed to it. According to al-Jawhari, Azd is divided into three parts: Azd-Shanū’a, Azd-Sham‘a,

1. Bakrī, I, 38.
5. Aghānī, XIV, 161.
7. Inbāh, p.10; Muntakhabat, p. 94.
8. Ishtiqāq, p. 218; Ḥklīl, X, 1.
9. Muntakhabat, p. 3.
10. Inbāh, p. 106; Turfat, p. 6. Some historians hold that it is one of the major branches of Qaḥṭān, Inbāh, p. 106.
Azd-al-Sarat and Azd ‘Umān; to which a fourth Azd Ghassān is sometimes added, their names being taken from the places in which they were settled. Shanū’a and al-Sarat were located in the Yemen, the former being about forty-two miles from Sarā’. Al-Sarat, too, seems to have been among their settlements, for Yāqūt, in speaking of the al-‘Udaf, locates it in the territories of Azd.

It was probably feuds among the Azd in the Yemen that caused a section of them, led by Mālik b. Fahm, to migrate to al-Bahrain and ‘Umān, while others went to Syria and settled near a watering-place named Ghassān, even though all the sources agree in attributing these emigrations of the Azd and other Qaḥṭānī tribes to the bursting of the dam of Ma’rib. However, it is known that this latter event must have occurred between the years 543 A.D. and 570 A.D., while the genealogists place the emigrations in a period much more remote. The legendary quality of these attempts to connect the tribes of the north with the Yemen has long been recognized. Tāha Ḥusain is no doubt correct when he dismisses those accounts as the inventions

1. Sabā’ik, p. 33.
of story-tellers, and places the emigrations wholly in the Islamic period; their attribution to ancient times by the historians probably had a political motivation—the feuds between the Qahtanite and the ‘Adnanite tribes.

The most famous branch of Azd was Mazin, which included the four Ghasanite tribes settled in Syria: Malik, al-Harith, Jafna and Ka‘b; Bariq, which resided in the vicinity of Kufa; Aws and Khazraj (including Jusham) which lived in Yathrib, Salaman and Hawazin.

There is a problem about the origins of Khuza‘a, some of the genealogists connecting it to Azd in the line:


According to this version, Khuza‘a left Ma‘rib with other Azdite tribes until they reached Mecca, where it separated from them, settling in this region and in Mar al-Dahrān, while the others went to Syria.

Other genealogists state that the Khuza‘a descend from Mudar in the line: Khuza‘a b. ‘Amr b. Luḥay b. Qam‘a b. al-Yās b. Mudar. From ‘Amr b. Luḥay there comes firstly, Salul which is mentioned by Yaqūt as holding such watering-

1. Fi al-Adab al-Jahili, p. 94.
2. Jamharat, p. 331; Muntakhabat, p. 80; Mu‘jam, VI, 292.
3. Jamharat, p. 367; Bakrī, I, 221; Mu‘jam, II, 32.
5. Ikli, VIII, 278.
6. Ishtiqāq, p. 35.
10. Ikli, VIII, 278.

The second son of Ghwath is ‘Amr – brother of Azd – and the chief sub-divisions of Ghwath were Khathʿam and Bajīla. Khathʿam inhabited the districts to the south of Tāʾif, some of them settling in Tihāma and ‘Asīr, while others lived in the north of Hijāz. Al-Iṣfahānī mentions that they held an oasis called Maṭlūb somewhere between Medīna and Syria. Yāqūt makes reference to a place called Walīya in the Khathʿam area where Jarīr b. ‘Abdallāh al-Bajalī destroyed the idol called Dhū al-Khalāṣa. According to al-Bakrī, Khathʿam settled

---

2. Ibid., IV, 744.
3. Ibid., III, 259.
4. Ibid., IV, 418.
5. Ibid., IV, 442.
6. Qabā’il, p. 4.
8. ‘Īqd, III, 386; Nuwayrī, II, 312.
13. Mu‘jam, IV, 941, see Bakrī, IV, 508; Agnām, p. 36.
initially in the Sarāt mountains, but they were driven from there by Azd Shanū’a to a place between Bīsha and Turab, and it is from this time they allied themselves to the Qaḥṭānīte group, having previously been associated with the ʿAdnānites. Bajīla inhabited ʿArwāt, a valley between Yemen and Najd, and it was said to have originally been a single tribe. But as a result of wars with the Kalb, it became dispersed among other tribes under whose protection it lived until Jarīr b. ʿAbdallāh al-Bajalī was able to reunite them during the Islamic period. The most famous sub-divisions of Bajīla were Qaṣr and Jarm.

Hamdān was another of the important Yemenite tribes apparently from the eastern regions with a genealogy which runs: Hamdān b. Mālik b. Zaid b. Awsala b. Rabīʿa b. al-Khiyār b. Mālik b. Zaid b. Kahlān. The Ḥāshid and Bakīl were the founders of Hamdān.

The last section of Kahlān is Udad, with the genealogy:

Udad b. Zaid b. Yashjub b. ‘Arīb b. Zaid b. Kahlān, its chief sub-divisions were: ʿṬayy, Ashʿar, Madḥhij and Murra. One account relates that Ṭayy left Yemen because they felt isolated here after the emigration of the Azd, and they went to Ḥijʿāz and settled in Samīrā’ in the neighbourhood

1. Bakrī, I, 63.
5. Qaḥṭān, p. 33; Bad’, IV, 118.
6. Iklīl, VIII, 70; Sabāʾik, p. 32.
7. Iklīl, X, 28; Muntakhabāt, pp. 7, 53.
8. Turfat, p. 10; Līṣān, VI, 84.
of Banū Asad, and then they took possession of the area. Ibn Ṭabd al-Ḥaqq locates their territories: "Ṭayy dwell in the mountain regions of Aja' and Sulma, eleven days ("ten nights") by foot from Faid and al-Quraiyāt in the direction of Syria; three mīl from Medīna; two days ("one night") from Fadak; and six days ("five nights") from Khaibar. Others, however, extend their lands to the frontiers of Hīt. Descended from Ṭayy are the Banū Nabhān and Banū Sudūs.

The original home of Madhhij was Najrān, though Ibn Rusta places it in Saba'. A section of them seem to have left the Yemen for the Ḥijāz. The tribes of Sa'd-al-ʿAshīra, ʿAns, Jald and Murād are all held to derive from Madhhij. From Sa'd al-ʿAshīra arose Ju'fī, whose territories in the Yemen were about forty-two farsakh from Ṣanʿā'. ʿAns settled in Yemen in land which al-Yaʿqūbī locates as lying between Ḥalqain and Banū ʿĀmir on the route from Mecca. From Jald b. Madhhij comes Nakha'.

1. Aḥānī, X, 47; ʿIbar, II, 529; Muṣjam, I, 126-7.
4. Isḥiqaq, p. 394; ʿIqd, III, 349.
5. Yaʿqūbī, I, 177; Bakrī, I, 40.
6. Aʿlāq, p. 133.
9. ʿIqd, III, 393; Sabāʾik, p. 37.
10. Muṣjam, II, 88; IV, 439.
whose genealogy is Nakha' b. *Amr b. *Ulat b. Jald b. Madhhij,¹ and who dwelt in the Yemen in a region called Bīsha.²

From Murra (another significant branch of Uda'd) come the two lines, al-Ḥārith and Ruhm.³ The chief subdivisions of al-Ḥārith are: Khawlān b. *Amr b. Mālik b. al-Ḥārith, Judhām b. *Adī b. al-Ḥārith, and Lakhm b. *Adī b. al-Ḥārith.⁴ Judhām appears to have left the Yemen at some earlier time and settled in Syria, and al-Bakrī mentions Madyan as one of their dwelling-places and Ma'īn as among their watering-places.⁵ Ḥassān b. Thābit alludes to their regions held by them:⁶

"لاَمِـَّ يُمَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَـَ~

Another section of Judhām occupied the area between Ayla and Yanbu.⁷ From Judhām there comes Ghatafan.⁸ Lakhm lived in Syria and 'Irāq, their region being identified by al-Hamdānī as al-Maghār;⁹ and it was from 'Amam b. Numara b. Lakhm that the kings of Hīra descended.¹⁰ At times, Judhām and Lakhm are regarded as being the same.¹¹

---

4. Ishtiqāq, p. 380; Iqd, III, 404; Muntakhabat, pp. 75-76.
5. Bakrī, IV, 1201.
6. Ḥassān, Dīwān, p. 82. See Bakrī, IV, 1247.
7. *Ibar, II, 257.
9. Ṣifat, p. 130; See Lammens, E.I.¹; III, 2. S.V. Lakhm.
11. Futuh, p. 140; Ṭabarī, III, 107; Bad', IV, 184.
The other major South Arabian tribal grouping was Kinda, the descent of which is given as: Kinda b. ‘Ufair b. ‘Adī b. al-Ḥārith b. Murra b. Udad. They originated in the Yemen, from where they migrated to the Ḥaḍramawt; later, certain sections moved northward to Syria and al-Jazīra, and Yaqūt mentions a region called Sandawda’, lying between ‘Irāq and Syria, as belonging to them. As branches of Kinda, we find Sakāsik b. Ashras b. Kinda and al-Sakūn, and from the latter Tujaib traces its descent.

*Adnānite Tribes*

While all the tribes of this group derive their origins from ‘Adnān, we have very little positive knowledge about this eponym. In Ṭabarī there is an account of an invasion of the Arab lands by Nebuchadnezzar in the reign of Ma‘add b. ‘Adnān; but, as was pointed out by Jumaḥī, the name ‘Adnān is not met with in pre-Islāmic poetry, and only rarely in the early literature of Islām. Caskel interprets this to mean "that the name does not owe its place in the system to the conflict of parties in the Umayyad Period, like Nizār and Rabī‘a, but is of Pre-

2. Ṣifat, p. 86; Ḥklīl, VIII, 110.
3. Ishtīqāq, p. 363; Mu‘jam, III, 421.
5. Mu‘jam, III, 421.
8. Ṭabarī, II, 27; Brāu, E.I, III, 58; S.V. Ma‘add.
Islamic origin, although it does not spring from Bedouin tradition." The tribes of "Adnān settled in the region of Najd, and with the exception of Quraish, all of them were nomadic.

"Adnān is sub-divided into Mudār, Rabī‘a, Iyād and Anmār, all of whom were sons of Nizār b. Ma‘add; due to dissention among them, certain sections were forced to migrate from Najd and Tihāma. From two sons of Mudār, al-Yās and al-Nās, arise the groupings of Khindīf and Qais. "Aīlān respectively. Al-Yās is the ancestor of both Hudhail (b. Mudrika b. al-Yās) and Khuzaima. In general, Hudhail is shown as occupying Tihāma and the mountains of Sarūt; among the places identified with them being: al-Ḍajaran (a valley in Tihāma, two days distant from Mecca), Dakhīl, and al-‘Arj (a town near Tā‘if, regarded as the beginning of Tihāma). Al-Waqidī refers to Ḍajnān as a place about twenty-five mīl from Mecca belonging to Aslam, Hudhail and Ghāqira, while Ibn Khaldūn speaks of them in connection with places lying between Mecca and Medīna, such as al-Rajī’ and the Ma‘ūna well.

2. ‘Ībar, II, 298.
4. ‘Īqd, III, 337; ‘Ībar, II, 662; Saba’ik, p. 22.
8. Ibid., IV, 789.
10. Ibid., III, 465.
11. ‘Ībar, II, 319.
From Khuzaima derive: al-Hawn, Kināna and Asad.  

The territories of al-Hawn are not specified in the sources, although occasionally reference is made to its branches, *Aḍal and al-Qāra,* in Tihāma. At the time of the rise of Islam, Kināna is found in the regions around Mecca, bordering the lands of Hudhail in the south-west and of Asad to the north-east. It is from Kināna that Quraish traces its origins: Quraish b. Fihr b. Mālik b. al-Naḍr b. Kināna.  

Asad inhabited the vast region extending from Najd to Kūfa, and from there to Anbār. From the indications offered by Yaqūt, they would seem to have enjoyed a relatively prosperous existence, holding such places as Rimth, Qatān, Turaif, Buzakha, etc. In addition to these, we also find mentioned in connection with Asad the hills of Dhu Firgān and the watering-place of Ghāmr Marzūq. Rabī'ā b. Nizār had occupied an area extending over Tihāma, Ḥimā and Yamāma, with certain of its people settled, also, in Ḥīrāq and al-Jazīra. Ḥanaza b. Asad

---

2. Jamharat, p. 190; Inbāh, p. 73.  
4. Zubairī, p. 10; Sabā'ik, p. 62.  
5. Muʿjam, II, 91; IV, 170; 'Ibar, II, 622.  
6. Muʿjam, II, 816; IV, 139; III, 536; I, 601.  
7. Ḥamāsa, I, 289; Muʿjam, III, 882.  
10. 'Ibar, II, 300.
b. Rabī‘a migrated to ‘Irāq where he settled at ‘Ayn al-Tamr, later moving to Khaibar; while other members of the tribe passed on to the region of Rakiyat Luqmān in Bahrain.

Also from Rabī‘a descended the important group of ‘Abd al-Qais (b. Jadīla b. Asad b. Rabī‘a), which left Tihāma and went to Bahrāin, displacing the Iyād and driving them into ‘Irāq. Another group of ‘Abd al-Qais is said to have gone to Qatīf, where they had places under their control such as Khaṭ and ‘Ainān. Most of the clans of ‘Abd al-Qais claim descent from Lukaiz b. Afṣā b. ‘Abd al-Qais. Thus, Muḥārib b. ‘Amr b. Wadī‘a b. Lukaiz lived in Maghīthat al-Mawān, a place between Mecca and Medīna; while his brother Dil is spoken of as being in Tihāma. Also from ‘Amr b. Wadī‘a was descended the Banū Dhul. Two other large groups of Rabī‘a were Taghlib and Bakr, the sons of Wā’il b. Qasīt b. Hanb (brother of ‘Abd al-Qais) b. Afṣā b. Du‘mī b. Jadīla b. Asad b. Rabī‘a.

1. ‘Ibar, II, 300.
4. Bakrī, I, 80; Aghānī, XIII, 56, XV, 44; ‘Ibar, II, 300; Mu‘jam, III, 541.
8. Jamharat, p. 469; Lisan, XIII, 270.
Originally Taghhib lived with the other tribes of Rabīʿa in Najd, Ḥijāz and Tihāma, but as a result of tribal feuding it was obliged to migrate to al-Jazīra al-Furāṭiyah (between the lands at Bakr and Qudāʿa), centering in particular around Sinjār and Naṣībīn, which became known as Dīyār Rabīʿa. Al-Bakrī makes the interesting suggestion that their migration from Tihāma was due to drought, as well as to tribal feuding. According to al-Hamdānī they occupied the area extending between Yamāma and Bahrain, between Sīf and Kāzīma, and thence to the Sawād, Ubilla up to Hit.

From Bakr descend Yashkur and ‘Alī, the latter being the progenitor of the Banū Ḥanīfa, who were settled in Yamāma, as well as the Banū Shaibān who occupied the region from Yamāma to Baṣra, with some branches settled to the east of the Tigris near Mousil. The Banū Sadūs in Yamāma, is given a descent from Shaibān. The last branch of ‘Abd al-Qais is the Namir b. Qāsīt which was at

1. Bakrī, I, 86.
2. Ṣīfat, p. 170; Bakrī, IV, pp. 1175-1176.
3. ḫIbar, II, 302.
4. Bakrī, III, pp. 1042-1043; See, Ṣīfat, p.163; Aghānī, XI, 42; Muḥjam, II, 209.
5. Ṣīfat, p. 169; See, Bakrī, I, 86.
7. Dīnawārī, p. 18; Bakrī, I, pp. 83-84; ḫIbar, II, 302.
9. ḫIbar, II, 302.
10. Ibid., II, 303.
12. Isḥiqāq, p. 211; Līsān, VII, 410.
first located in Yamāma, but later moved to al-Jazīra and occupied the western district of Takrīt. Qais

The other son of Muḍar was al-Nās, called also 'Ailān or Qais 'Ailān. The tribe at Qais was for the most part located in Tihāma, especially the districts near Medīna, with some of them living in Medīna itself, and in the Ṭaliya. The market of 'Ukāq was in the middle of their lands. According to al-Bakrī, Qais moved from Tihāma to the Najd as a result of feuds with Khindif; and some went further on to Sinjār in 'Irāq.

The largest branch of Qais was Ghatafan, who occupied the area extending from Ḫumain to the north of Medīna and the lands of Ṭayy. From Ghatafan comes Ashja, who were settled in Medīna, as well as 'Abs and Dhubiān, who were living to the east of the city. Lughda mentions Ghabawa and Jafr in the Wādī al-Rumma as belonging to them. Fazāra, too, traces its descent from Ghatafan,

2. Ibid., II, 373.
3. Lisān, VIII, 71; See Şihāh, II, 975.
4. Inbāh, p. 81; For the origin of the name, Qais 'Ailān, cf. Isḥtiqāq, p. 162; Hamāsa, I, 125.
5. Buldān, p. 312.
6. Aghanī, XV, 347.
7. Iklīl, VIII, 184.
11. 'Ibar, II, 305.
12. Lughda, f. 10.
with the genealogy: Fazīra b. Dhubiān b. Baghīd b. al-Raith b. Ḥaṭafān. Fazīra were found in the Wādī al-Qurā, where Yaṣūṭ mentions Ḥadhwar, Yara'a and 'Abāqir as belonging to them. The two mountains of Ḥarszin, were also in the lands of Fazīra.

Other branches descended from Qais, through his son Saʿd are: Bāhila b. Aʿṣur b. Saʿd b. Qais, which settled in Yamāma, and Ghani b. Aʿṣur b. Saʿd b. Qais, which settled in Najd.

From Khāṣafa b. Qais come Salāmān and Sulaim, both of whom settled in the region of Medīna and Wādī al-'Aqīq, and Hawāzīn. The Hawāzīn was scattered throughout Najd and the eastern Hijāz around Mecca, their lands including part of Tihāma, Bīsha, Taʾif, Dhū al-Majāz, Ḥunain and Awtās. From Hawāzīn the important clan of Thaqīf, settled in Taʾif, and also that of 'Āmir b.
Sa'asa'a b. Mu'awiya b. Bakr,\(^1\) which occupied the area from eastern Medīna to the Najd border.\(^2\) From 'Āmir b. Sa'asa'a came Banū Numair, settled partly in Najd and partly in Yamāma; Banū Hilāl, whose territories lay between Mecca and Baṣra, or, as some say, between Mecca and Medīna;\(^3\) Banū 'Uqail, settled in Najd;\(^4\) and Banū Qushair and Banū Ja'da settled in Wādī 'Inān (in the lands of Banū 'Āmir), Ja'da holding its northern part while Qushair held the southern.\(^5\)

From Banū 'Uqail, were descended al-Muntāfiq,\(^6\) which was settled in 'Irāq between Baṣra and Kūfa,\(^7\) and Khafāja, living in 'Irāq and of Jazīra.\(^8\) Other clans of the 'Āmir b. Sa'asa'a line are: Kilāb,\(^9\) settled in Najd,\(^10\) and Ka'b, probably dwelling in the same region. 'Amr b. Qais has two branches: Fahm and 'Adwān, settled in Tā'if originally, but moving from here to Tihāma after the arrival of Thaqīf.\(^11\)

**Tamīm**

This tribe is the last major branch of Muḍar descended from Udd b. Tābikha b. al-Yās b. Muḍar. The most

\(^{1}\) Jamharat, p. 269; "Ibar, II, 310.

\(^{2}\) Tabaqāt, II, i, 37; Tabarī, III, 34.

\(^{3}\) Mu'jam, IV, 479; Wüstenfeld, p. 84.

\(^{4}\) Hamāsa, I, 415; Mu'jam, IV, 157.

\(^{5}\) Mu'jam, III, 734, IV, 157.

\(^{6}\) Jamharat, p. 290.

\(^{7}\) "Ibar, II, 647.

\(^{8}\) Jamharat, p. 291; "Ibar, II, 648.

\(^{9}\) Jamharat, p. 288; see Ishtīqāq, p. 178.

\(^{10}\) Mu'jam, III, 706; Lughda, f. 12.

\(^{11}\) Jamharat, p. 243.
important sub-divisions of Udd are ḏabbā and Murr. ḏabbā lived in Yamāma, where Yāqūt mentions two oases as belonging to them: Silla and Bakra. Some, too, lived in Najd, while others were found in Dahna. From Murr comes Tamīm, the largest tribe of Muṣar, occupying extensive territories from Najd and Yamāma to Ḥajar in Bahrāin. The major important divisions of Tamīm are: Banū al-‘Anbar, settled in Yamāma, Dahna’ and Dhat al-Shuqiq al-Ḥabitāt and Banū Ḥanzala. Ḥanzala is sub-divided into Barājim, Mujāshi and Nahshal.

It will be apparent from this description of the genealogies of the tribes and their distribution throughout the Arabian Peninsula, Syria and ‘Irāq, that no concern for probability or even self-consistency was felt by the historians who treated the subject. Disregard for the chronology of the settlement of the various regions they ascribe to one or another of the tribes would indicate that they, too, felt that the information at their disposal was largely fictitious - because the dating of events is the

3. Ibid., I, 705.
4. Ibid., IV, 672.
5. Ibid., IV, 424.
central purpose of history as they conceived it. Thus, a region such as Tihāma, Najd and Yamāma would have been swarming with tribal groups of the most diverse and antipathetic origins if all the settlements mentioned in the sources actually occurred, and the economic resources of the region, in terms of the number of oases, would never have sustained even a small portion of all the tribes purported to live there.

However, there was an important purpose underlying this attempt by the genealogists to give a descent and location to the men of tribal background who figured in the political life of their own periods. This was, in effect, an assertion of the nobility of such men within a society of parvenues, and the patent of their rights to leadership. It was the Arab who had preached Islām throughout the world, and whosoever could claim descent from this race was, by this very fact, pre-eminent among men. The converts to Islām were often Mawālī who assimilated to their own names the names of the tribal group or families to which they were clients, and it was felt important that they should not be allowed to usurp their distinction, too, as they had so much else.
CHAPTER II

THE CONQUESTS AND TRIBAL MIGRATION

The expansion of the Arabs out of their Peninsula into the civilized regions of the north coincided with the exhaustion of the Byzantine and Sasanid Empires as a result of years of profitless war. With Islam serving as a solvent for their natural disunity, the Arabs were at last of a strength capable of testing the defences of their northern neighbours, and when these were found to be weak, continuous attacks were mounted against them under which they finally collapsed.

It would probably be an over simplification to regard the campaigns of Mu'ta\(^1\) in the year 9/630, and Usáma\(^2\) of 11/632 as attempts to capture 'Irāq and Syria, but a new situation arose after the death of the Prophet which was to give a fresh impetus to activities in this direction. During the caliphate of Abū Bakr (11/632 - 13/634) the problem which most immediately confronted the young state was the revolt of the formerly submissive tribes against Medīna, known in history as the Ridda;\(^3\)

---

2. Ibid., IV, 327.
but after this had been suppressed and peace restored, Medīna was faced with the serious problem of providing objectives for the large number of troops it had amassed, and which were a potential source of trouble if left in idleness. *Iràq and Syria were attractive areas for further operations, and in addition to the Medīnese troops who were sent thither, Abū Bakr later used the occasion to rid the Peninsula of those tribes that had fought against the Muslims by allowing them, too, to assist in the campaigns.

At first, however, he seemed reluctant to have these former enemies in the Medīnese army, and in a letter to the *ummāl al-ridda he enjoined them never to seek the help of an apostate (murrtad) in fighting their enemies. In a subsequent letter he modifies this position by saying that only former apostates of whom he approved could be so employed, indicating that the scope of the campaigns was beginning to exceed early expectations and needed this additional manpower. That the wealth of Syria and *Iràq attracted the Arabs is clearly attested in the address delivered by Khālid b. al-Walīd to his

---

1. Wāqidī, I, 41.
2. Tabarī, III, 276.
troops after the battle of Salāsil: "Do you not see food in abundance? Even though our efforts are in the cause of God, yet would we have still fought for our sustenance because of our poverty".¹ Conversations between al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba and the Persian leaders were in the same vein when he explained that it was the poverty of the Arabian Peninsula which spurred the Arabs to invade the fruitful regions of the north.² Al-Balādhurī records that Abū Bakr wrote letters to all quarters, persuading the tribes to join the armies of Islām by describing the rich booty that was to be taken from the Byzantines; and the historians mention that not all those who participated in the campaigns were motivated by thoughts of reward in the hereafter.³

The economic factors which influenced the expansion of the Arabs to leave the Peninsula were certainly as strong as the religious zeal of their leaders, though, of course,= later historians chose to stress the latter as the primary motive force.⁴ Alongside such heroes of the Holy War as al-Nu‘mān b. Mugarrin, who figured conspicuously at the

1. Ṭabarī, IV, 9.
2. Kharāj, p. 33; Dīnawarī, p. 121.
3. Futūḥ, p. 128.
battle of Nihāwand,¹ there must have been the other more secular leaders who, for instance, made no effort to stimulate conversion in the treaties they drew up with the conquered peoples.

In many respects the expansion was really a migration of the tribes to the more prosperous regions of the north, and they came there as tribes under the rule of their own Shaikhs rather than as contingents in the army of Islam. The ḍīwān of ʿOmar gives the erroneous impression of a coherent military establishment, the existence of which would have been utterly impossible in the conditions of the time.

Long before the birth of Islam, tribes from the Peninsula had migrated into Syria,² and it was their presence here that made the area familiar to those who came with the invasions. Al-Waqqādī mentions that, in response to the appeal of Abū Bakr, the tribes of Ḥimyar, Madīḥīj, Ṭayy, Azd, Kināna, Kīlāb, Ḥawāzin and Thaqīf joined in the conquest of Syria,³ and Ṭabarī records that most Arabs preferred this region to ʿIrāq. The Caliph ʿOmar asked Kināna and Azd which land they wanted to occupy, and both answered, Shām, the home of our ancestors for generations.⁴ In the army of Khālid b. al-Walīd at

---

¹ Futūḥ, p. 300. He refused to act as a collector of spoils (jābī), and chose to remain merely a (ghāzī).
² Muḥjām, II, 72.
³ Waqqādī, I, 3.
⁴ Ṭabarī, IV, pp. 72-73.
the battle of Yarmūk the tribesmen of Lakhm and Judhām were represented, both of whom could claim long association with the region; indeed, it was only after the conquest that Qais was to come here.

The tribal division of Syria as given by Yaʿqūbī shows a predominance of Yemenī stock: the ancient city of Ḥamāt was held by Bahrāʾ and Tanūkh; Ḥumṣ by Ṭayy, Kinda, Ḥimyar, Kalb and Hamdān; Shaizar and Uṭum, for the most part, by Kinda; and Jabala by Hamdān and Qais.

The Tribes and the Umayyad Caliphs

The Umayyad dynasty came into being only with the consent of the tribes of Syria and it survived because the foundations laid by Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān (40/660 - 60/679) were in accordance with the mentality of the Bedouin which he so well understood. The sources dwell on the tact (ḥilm) he used in dealing with the tribal chiefs, and he, also, made use of the revenues of the state

2. Futūḥ, p. 178.
3. Buldān, pp. 324-327. In locating these tribes in cites, Yağūbī, of course, means the regions of which these were the centres.
4. Ṭabarī, VI, 172; Murūj, III, 95.
5. Mubarrad, I, 311.
6. Mubarrad, Kamīl, I, 61, relates that on one occasion Ḥanaf b. Qais and certain individuals of the Saʿd of Tamīm, used insulting words to Muʿāwiya. When his daughter asked (Contd.
to purchase their loyalty and support. It was this favourable disposition of the local tribes that was his most important and valuable legacy to his son and successor, Yazīd. While he was still alive we hear of an Azdite who declared in presence, "You are Amīr al-Mu'minin, and if you die Yazīd will succeed you. If anyone tries to prevent it he will receive this, — indicating his sword."²

However, neither Ashja' nor Aslam recognized the accession of Yazīd; and even when he was still merely his father's nominee for the succession, Qais refused him the (bay'ā), saying: "By God, we shall not pay homage to

Contd.) why he tolerated this, he replied, "Muḍar is the backbone of the Arabs, Tamīm is the backbone of Muḍar, and Sa'd is the backbone of Tamīm. These men are from Sa'd."

In another incident (Kāmil, I, 311), Mu‘awiya is said to have accused a Bedouin of lying; when the latter replied that it was Mu‘awiya himself who was the liar, he placated him by pretending that he had spoken in haste.

1. For example, he paid Aḥnaf b. Qais, Jāriya b. Qudāma, Jawn al-‘Abshamī and al-Ḥutāt b. Yazīd — all chiefs of Tamīm — one hundred thousand dirhams each. Ṭabarī, VI, 135.


4. Ansāb, V, 87.
the son of a Kalbite woman". It is from his time, we are told, that the hostility between Qais and the Umayyads began. Although in the early period of the dynasty Mu‘āwiya had made particular efforts to retain the support of Mudar, as they grew weak and the Yemenis strong, it was with the latter that he saw his interests best served.

During the reign of Mu‘āwiya and Yazīd, there was a state of comparative harmony among the tribes in Syria. However, the region was then under menace from both ‘Irāq and the Hijāz, and it was but self-interest that dictated that they should remain united and present a solid front. Moreover, sufficient revenues were flowing into the country from the young empire to assure that each could enjoy a prosperity hitherto unknown. However, after the death at Yazīd in 64/683 and the abdication of his son Mu‘āwiya II a month or so after his accession, the problem as to who should receive the role of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn set the tribes against one another. ‘Abdallāh b. al-Zubair in the Hijāz saw himself as a possible claimant and in this he enjoyed the support of Zufar b. al-Ḥarīth the leader of the Qais in Syria. However, most

1. Ḥamāsā, I, 319.
of the tribes in Syria, which were of Yemeni origin — Kalb, Sakāsik, Sakūn, Ṭayy, Ghassān, Tanūkh¹ and ‘Udhra² — supported the claim of the Umayyad, Marwān b. al-Hakam, and they had the support of a few tribes of northern descent, too, notably, Taghlib³ and Muḥārib.⁴ The victory of Kalb over Qais in the battle of Marj Rāḥiṭ in 64/683 established Marwān on the throne, but it had the negative effect of making it henceforth impossible for the two confederations to co-operate in any venture or to forget their differences for the sake of political ideas or purposes.⁵ In the battle no fewer than eighty of the most eminent chiefs — who were receiving the sharaf al-‘aṭā — were slain.⁶

Later ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān (65/684 — 86/705) tried to re-unite the tribes by a policy of reconciliation,⁷

1. Ḥamūsa, I, 317; Ansāb, V, 138; Murūj, III, 96; Kāmil, IV, 63.
2. Aghanī, XVII, 112.
4. Ṭabarī, VII, 4.
5. Ansāb, V, 157. The verses quoted here show how deep and bitter was the cleavage between the two after this battle.
6. ‘Iqd, IV, 397. The status of a chief was indicated by the size of the stipend he received from the treasury — the maximum amount being described as sharaf al-‘aṭā.
7. Ṭabarī, VII, 189. He seems to have tried to achieve this by marriage alliances, for two of his sons, al-Walīd and Sulaimān, were born of Qaisite women. Kāmil, V, 41.
but he lacked the skill of Mu‘awiya which might have been able to bring this about, and the hostility felt towards him by Mu‘ādar and Qais was, if anything, even deeper, both of them openly siding with Ibn al-Zubair.1

He even managed to lose the enthusiastic support of the Kalb in Syria by this show of impartiality.2 Probably, he did not want to place himself under too great an obligation to them and allow the impression that his survival as head of state was in their hands.

The situation changes during the reign of his sons al-Walīd (86/705 – 96/714) and Sulaimān (96/714 – 99/717), both of whom had Qaisite mothers.3 While al-Walīd was wholly committed to Qais and favoured its tribes above all others, Sulaimān was more ambivalent in his attitudes. Qais still retained its dominant position in the kingdom, and Tamīm was allowed a prominent place in affairs, but he also fostered good relations with the tribes of

1. Aghānī, VIII, 66; Jumahī, Ṭabaqāt, pp. 357, 437, reports that ‘Abd al-Malik would not allow Qaisite poets into his court, because they all supported Ibn al-Zubair.

2. Ḥamāsa, I, 437.

3. Ansāb, V, 311. Walīd’s mother was from the tribe of ‘Abs, while Sulaimān was raised by his uncles of the same tribe. Naqā’īd, I, 384; Bad’, VI, 4; Aghānī, XI, 90.
southern origin. Thus, important preferments were given to men of Sakāsik,\(^1\) and his relations with Muhallabites of Azd were especially close. Because of his connections with the Banū Arqam,\(^2\) he was on good terms with Kinda, also.

In his pre-occupation with the religious aspects of sovereignty, 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz (99/717 - 101/719) broke with familiar Umayyad practices in his dealings with the tribes. The individuals in whom he confided, and the ones who received privileges, were usually men of piety and good life, and little regard was paid to their tribal associations. It is difficult, therefore, to see a pattern in the fluctuating fortunes of the various groups in this short reign, but with the accession of Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik (101/719 - 105/723) we return again to the former policies, and find him basing his rule on Qais, which resulted directly from his marriage into the Banū Murra from the same tribe.\(^3\)

Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik (105/723 - 125/742) was unable to control the tribal feuding which, by now, was threatening the very existence of the state. He depended

---

1. For example, Yazīd b. Abī Kabsha was appointed governor of Sind in 96/714. Futūḥ, p. 428.


3. Aghanī, XII, pp. 63, 264.
for his support on the Banū Makhzūm, the tribe of his mother, to the exclusion of the other branches of Quraish, and this would appear to be the only concession he made to tribal alignments. He was on particularly bad terms with Rabī‘a, Thaqīf and Yemen, the first two of northern and the last of southern origin.

His successor, al-Walīd b. Yazīd (125/742 - 126/743), also, relied on Qais, despite the fact that the tribes of the south were predominant in Damascus. But events now took on a more sinister aspect for the destiny of the state, for members of the Umayyad family tried to exploit these tribal antagonisms in pursuance of their own ambitions. Thus, we find Yazīd b. al-Walīd leading Qūḍā‘a and Sakūn in a rebellion against his cousin the Caliph, killing him and seizing control for himself; in response to which, Marwān b. Muḥammad (127/744 - 132/749), at the head of Muḍar, Qais and Kināna, in his turn rebelled and seized power.

It is generally accepted by contemporary Islamic historians that the collapse of the Umayyad state is

1. Isḥīqāq, p. 82.
2. Tabarī, VIII, 258; See Dīnawārī, p. 327.
5. Tabarī, IX, 3; Aghānī, VII, pp. 80, 83.
uniquely attributable to the inability of its rulers to establish a policy towards the tribes which would allow them to cooperate within the new order which they themselves had brought into being. For, in fact, they did not regard it as a new order, but rather as a projection of the attitudes and practices of the Peninsula into a region where the rewards for dominating their old rivals were greater than ever before. That this situation was allowed to persist, and even encouraged, by members of the Umayyad house in their ambitions for power, is indicative of how oblivious of these stresses within the state those charged with its direction had become. It is in the provinces, rather than in Syria, that one can see the inadequacy of the system of government – a legacy of the desert tribal council – by which the Umayyad Caliphate sought to control the Empire.

The Conquest of 'Irāq and the Settlement of the Tribes

The condition of those tribes who emigrated into 'Irāq in the course of the Conquests was significantly different from those who located themselves in Syria, a difference that presents itself in the first instance in the very nature of the regions. Under the Sāsānids very few urban centres developed, and in 'Irāq, in particular, the lack of a city culture deprived the indigenous Arab tribes of the civilizing influences which the tribes of Syria, with its numerous great cities, had for long enjoyed.
When, as Muslims, they penetrated into the latter region they were immediately subjected to all the imperceptible restraints that life there would impose upon them; whereas in 'Irāq they could lead the same kind of life they had previously known, but in more congenial natural conditions. In Syria, no new cities were built to accommodate the newcomers, and it can be assumed that those already in existence were permitted to exercise their influence over these as they had over the tribes already present there; but in 'Irāq, one of the first problems to present itself was the construction of centres where the tribes flowing into the area could accommodate themselves in sufficient numbers to present a strong military presence to the indigenous inhabitants. It would be wrong to regard these camps (amsār) as being established on the model of any existing cities in the area, and it was only with the passage of time and the influx of a diversified population that they assume the features of urban settlement. The Arabs who migrated into these centres brought with them the mentality and attitudes of their desert background which was, if anything, hostile and destructive to all that urban life implied.

Khālid b. al-Walīd at the head of an army of ten thousand warriors, crossed into the Sawād in the year 12/633, reaching Ubilla, which was to be the site of the city of Baṣra.¹ Two thousand of these troops had accompanied him from Medīna since the beginning of his campaign, while the other eight thousand were men from Rabī‘a and Muḍar, who joined in the course of his advance across the Peninsula. Shortly after his arrival in ‘Irāq a further eight thousand, among whom only the name of the Banū Shaibān is mentioned, augmented this army, with which Khālid attacked and routed the Persian troops under the command of Hurmuz in the vicinity of Hīra.²

The expedition was of the nature of a reconnaissance, and a testing of the defenses of the Sāsānids. In the Caliphate of Abū Bakr, one of the leaders of the Banū Shaibān, a certain Muthanna b. Ḥaritha, received a promise that the Muslims would assist him in his raids into southern ‘Irāq, and Khālid’s campaign is mentioned as the

---

1. Ṭabarī, III, 356. According to Wāqidī, however, Khālid did not proceed on to Baṣra, at this time. After subjecting Yamāma and Baḥrain, he returned to Medīna; and it was from there that he set out for ‘Irāq, following the route of Faid and Tha‘labiyya to Hīra. Futūḥ, p. 336.

2. Ṭabarī, IV, pp. 4-5.

honouring of this Promise.\footnote{1} In fact, however, it proved to be the beginning of a movement of migration and settlement. Although Khālid was soon to leave here for Syria, the Caliph ‘Omar continued to supply reinforcements to the troops he had left there; but these were not nearly so numerous as the other Arabs who moved into the area seeking new lands in which to live, rather than as military conquerors. This lack of warlike spirit may explain why the second engagement fought against the Sāsānīds at Jīsr in 13/634 ended in defeat for the Muslims; more probably the blame is to be laid on ‘Omar for putting at the head of the army Abū ‘Ubaid b. Mas‘ūd al-Thaqafī instead of the experienced local chief, al-Muthanna b. Ḥāritha.\footnote{2}

This defeat at Jīsr came as a shock to the leaders in Medīna, for, indeed, in this single battle most of the Muslim army was lost, and the only way they could redeem this loss was to mobilize the tribes of Peninsula into a

\footnote{1}{Futūḥ, p.242. Ṭabarī, III, 444 reports from Saif that Khālid had received instructions from Abū Bakr to enter ‘Irāq at its southernmost part and proceed northwards, which would apparently imply that the conquest of the whole region was contemplated from the earliest days of the campaigns.}

\footnote{2}{Waqīdī, Futūḥ al-‘Irāq, I, f.4; Ṭabarī, III, 454.}

\footnote{3}{Futūḥ, p. 129. Abū ‘Ubaid was blamed for attacking the Persians with inadequate forces, instead of waiting for reinforcements from the Caliph.}
new force. The greatest response to this appeal for fighting men came from Bajīla, which supplied fully a quarter of the new recruits; and by virtue of this numerical superiority, one of their chiefs, Jarīr b. 'Abdallāh al-Bajalī, was given the leadership of this contingent. Because of the readiness of their response, Bajīla was, also, promised a quarter of whatever lands should be conquered in the Sawād. However, shortly afterwards, 'Omar appointed Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās to the command of all the troops in 'Iraq, assigning two thousand Yemenī soldiers and a further two thousand Najdīs to his personal command. 2

To the troops Sa'd now had at his disposal in 'Iraq there came a further three thousand men from Tamīm, another thousand from Ribāb, and three thousand from Asad;

1. The other tribes which contributed troops, according to the various sources, were: Azd, Tamīm, Ṭayy, Ḍabba and Namir b. Qāsiṭ, (Dīnawarī, p. 114); Ribāb, Jusham, Khath'ām, and Taḫhlib (Ṭabarī, IV, 73); Banū 'Ijil (Futūḥ, p. 242); Madḥḥij, Ṣudā', and Qais (Kāmil, II, 189). All the sources are agreed that the greatest response came from Bajīla, but apart from this, their information about the composition of this new army is highly selective. What is clear, however, is that all the tribes mentioned were soon to become prominent in the conquests, whether or not they formed the army collected by 'Omar.

2. Futūḥ, pp. 253, 267; from where it is repeated in Ṭabarī, IV, pp. 71-72, and Murūj, II, 318.
to which, of course should be added the survivors of the army (mainly from Rabī‘a and Bakr) of al-Muthanna b. Ḫāritha.\(^1\) It seems clear that Medīna wished to keep the control of the invasion of this region in its own hands, rather than allowing it to become a tribal enterprise; and it was for this reason that men such as Abū ‘Ubayd, Jarīr and Sa‘d were placed in command of the armies rather than men of greater local experience.

At the battle of Qādisīya (14/635), those Arab troops were said to number thirty thousand.\(^2\) At about the same time as this engagement, the southern regions of ‘Irāq were being overrun by the tribe of Bakr, led by ‘Uţba b. Qatāda al-Dhuḥlī;\(^3\) and Medīna asserted its authority here, also, by sending a contingent under ‘Uţba b. Ghazwān to participate in these conquests. It was ‘Uţba who founded the city of Bāṣra in the year 14/635.\(^4\) After the victory of Qādisīya, Sa‘d was left

---

1. Ṭabarī, IV, 86; Dīnawarī, p. 119. It would appear that these new contingents from Tamīm and Rībāb were additional to those which had earlier joined the army of Jarīr.
2. Ṭabarī, IV, 87. According to Abū Wa‘il, the army was only about seven or eight thousand! Cf. Khalīfa, I, 119.
3. Futūḥ, p. 335.
the most powerful military leader in the region, and he is said to have founded Kūfa in the year 17/636.

Kūfa and the Settlement of the Tribes

On the instructions of 'Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, Sa'īd distributed the lands in the vicinity of Kūfa among the tribes. Among those that acquired land at this time were: Sulaim, Thaqīf, Hamdān, Bajīla, Taim al-Lat, Taghlib, Asad, Nakha', Kinda, Azd, Muzaina, Tamīm, Muhārib, 'Amir, Jadīla, Juhaina. To this list Yaʿqūbī adds 'Abs, Qais, Bakr, Ṭayy and Ashja'. According to al-Shaʿbī, one of the sources of Baladhurī and Ṭabarī, the population of Kūfa at the time of its foundation numbered twenty thousand; and of these twelve thousand were from Yemen and the rest from Nizar. However, Ṭabarī says it numbered one hundred thousand, probably misinterpreting a statement made by the Caliph 'Omar

3. Futūḥ, p. 274.
4. Ṭabarī, IV, 192.
when he sent al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba as governor in the year 21/641.\textsuperscript{1}

From the beginning some attempt was made to organize these tribes; we first hear of them being divided into a'शाहर "tens", the precise meaning of which remains obscure, and shortly afterwards into asbā' "sevens". Under the latter, the tribes were classified into seven groups, and to the leadership of each was appointed a person with the title of Amīr (or Ra'īs al-
Sub*) who acted as an intermediary between his group and the governor.\textsuperscript{2} ̈Ta'barī, reporting from Saif, supplies

---

1. The words of *Omar are: 

\textquoteleft What could be worse than a hundred thousand men who will not accept a governor - Amīr - and he will not accept them\textquoteright. ̈Ta'barī, IV, 262.

Here the numeral 100,000 is probably intended as a noun of magnitude, and should not be understood as expressing an exact amount. The same interpretation should probably be given, also, to Mu'āwiya's use of 100,000 when he advises his son Yazīd, "Give them (the people of Kūfa) what they ask, for this is better than having 100,000 swords directed against you". ̈Anṣāb al-Ashrāf, III, f.143.

2. ̈Iqd, IV, 162. It is unlikely, however, that at this period the title Amīr would have been recognized to such subordinates, and Ra'īs seems more a probable designation.
the names and composition of these divisions, though, in fact, he lists only six: (1) Kinda and its allies, along with Jadīla; (2) Quḍā‘a, Bajīla, Khath‘am, Ḥaḍramawt and Azd; (3) Madhḥij, Ḥimyar and Hamdān, with their allies; (4) Temīm, Ribāb and Hawāzin; (5) Asad, Ḥaṭṭafān, Muḥārib, Namir, Dubai‘a and Taghlib; (6) Iyāḍ, ‘Akk, ‘Abd al-Qais, the Hajarites and the Ḥamrā’ (the local, non-Arab people). The group omitted here was very likely Tayy, reference to which is made by Ya‘qūbī in the same connection.

When Ziyād b. Abīhi became governor of Kūfa in 50/670 these "sevens" were reduced to four (arbā‘): (1) Tamīm and Hamdān; (2) Rabī‘a and Kinda; (3) Madhḥij and Asad; (4) Ahl al-Medīna. The apparent aim of this reduction in the number of tribal units was to achieve administrative simplicity, but at the same time it lessened the centres from which dissent against the central government might rise. It is notable, too, that, apart from ahl al-Medīna, each group consists of tribal units of differing origins which were presumably antipathetic to one another, whereby it would be

1. Ṭabarī, IV, 194.
2. Buldān, pp. 310-311.
3. Ṭabarī, V, 268.
difficult for them to speak with a single voice in matters affecting relations with the governors. By this time the population of Kūfa is said to have risen to sixty thousand fighting men; their families and dependants numbered an additional one hundred and twenty thousand.1

The Distribution of the Tribes in Kūfa

In respect of its tribal composition, Kūfa presents a wholly different picture from Baṣra, and this difference was made even more prominent when the city became for a short while the capital of the Muslims during the Caliphate of *Alī. This transference of the central power from Medīna was understood by the Kūfans as placing themselves in the privileged position which the Medīnese had held since the rise of Islām, and their partisanship for *Alī must have arisen from the new

1. *Iqd, V, 8. These numbers should, of course, be treated with reserve; as, in fact, should the term "city" itself. That an urban establishment capable of accommodation for such a population could have developed so shortly within a quarter of a century is impossible to accept, given the circumstances of the period and the nature of the people involved.
status which he hereby conferred upon them. Here, their own self-interest inspired them to support him in his struggle with Mu'awiya - which was, in effect, a contest between 'Iraq and Syria - and the name given to their political party, the shi'at 'Ali, was later to become the designation of a religious sect. At this period, Shi'ism was the allegiance in which the peoples of divergent tribal backgrounds could submerge their differences and act in unity; In Basra on the other hand there was no such centre about which to rally, and the tribes were in constant hostility with one another. There is little evidence to support the opinion that an innate religious predisposition influenced Kufan Arabs to espouse Shi'ism, and even less to allow the assumption that 'Ali held a sacerdotal position among them at this time.

1. *Iqd, VI, 248.
2. Tabarî, IV, 375.
3. W.M. Watt, for example, argues, "Since in period of stress men tend to revert to a primitive level at which they have experienced security, those men from South Arabia looked round for a superhuman leader. South Arabia had a tradition of many centuries of prosperity under divine kings". Islamic Political Thought, p. 44. The Southern Arabs had no overwhelming superiority in numbers in Kufa, al-Sha'bi giving the proportion between South and North as twelve thousand to eight thousand. Futûh, p. 276.
The historical tradition attempts to establish a special relationship between ʿAlī and the Yemen, the story running that the Prophet sent him there in the year 9/630 in order to invite the people to Islam.\(^1\) In his presence all the tribes of Hamdān are reported to have accepted conversion in one day;\(^2\) and when later he became Caliph the Yemenites were among the first to offer him homage.\(^3\) However, we need not dwell too long on the historicity or otherwise of this account in order to explain the support that ʿAlī received from this quarter during the events that led up to the assassination of ʿUthmān; Medīna had been trying to maintain the new movement as a Ḥiǧāzī enterprise, excluding other Arabs from the central direction and discriminating against them in the division of the fruits of the conquests. ʿAlī’s rivalry with ʿUthmān for the Caliphate made him the leader of an opposition from whom they might expect different treatment if he came to power through their support.

Other incidents are recorded to explain the adherence to ʿAlī of individual groups and tribes. Ibn Aṯṭam finds it significant to report how ʿAlī once

\(^1\) Ṭabarī, III, 132.

\(^2\) Ṭabarī, III, 159.

\(^3\) Kūfī, I, f.37.
gave protection to a messenger from Kūfa whom ‘Uthman was abusing, and thereby gained the gratitude of the people of the city.¹ Others were devoted to ‘Alī because of his piety,² and his reputation as a valiant warrior was of especial appeal to the tribal Arabs. The tribe of Hamdān, which was very numerous in Kūfa, was deeply attached to him;³ Asad, Tayy and Bakr supported him against the rebels Ṭalḥa and Zubair;⁴ and Rabī‘a were reckoned to be among his most loyal and valiant adherents.⁵

To the latter Alī had said: "O Rabī‘a, you are the most devoted allies who responded to my appeal, and of all the Arabs the most trustworthy".⁶ It should be

2. Iklīl, X, 66.
3. Kūfī, I, f. 31 and Naṣr, Sīffīn, p. 290, both speak of the prominence of Hamdān in the city, and the latter, also, mentions their loyalty to ‘Alī. Al-Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, III, 93, on the other hand, mentions how deep was the affection in which ‘Alī held the men of this tribe.
5. Murūj, III, 57.
noted that Rabî'îa was located exclusively in 'Irāq with no territory whatsoever in Syria; however, most of the other tribes which are mentioned as supporting him are divided between the two provinces and are, moreover almost equally made up of Northern and Southern Arab. These are: Madhḥij, Kinda, Bajīla, Qais, 'Abd al-Qais, Tamīm, Dabba, Ribāb, Quraish, Khīna, Khath'am, Khuzā'īa, Quḍā'a and Ash'ār. Unfortunately our source does not explain which of these tribal groups had come into the territory with the Islamic expansion and which had been settled longer there, which would shed light on the regional aspects of the war between 'Alī and Mu'awiya.

The later religious devotion to 'Alī among the Shi'îtes is, of course, referred back to this period in their literature, in which emphasis is laid on his saintly qualities and the response these evoked from his associates. Even Ṭabarī contributes to the legendary history: at the Battle of the Camel a man of Dhuhl encourages his brother with the words "Our cause is just....for we are associated with the family of the Prophet."^2

---
1. Šîfîn, index.
2. Ṭabarī, IV, 522.
After the assassination of 'Allī, the Caliphate, with the political and economic power which it embodied, passed to Damascus, leaving Kūfa no more than a provincial city. The revenues which the Umayyads drew from 'Irāq were regarded by the tribes settled there as the exactions of a victor from the conquered, and the spirit of revolt which was to be so characteristic of Kūfa throughout its early history was probably born of a desire to revenge and redress this humiliation. Despite the rôle they had played in the murder of 'Allī, the Khawārij were most representative of this spirit. It is significant that they presented their own cause as the cause of Islām.¹

Muʿawiyah attempted to deal with this hostility by bribes and intimidation,² but chiefly by creating discord among the tribes in the region and preventing them from maintaining a united opposition. Thus, he was able to move groups from here to other territories and replace them by men from Syria on whose loyalty he felt he could rely. The policy of Nawaqil,³ and the

---

1. Wellhausen, p. 60; "The cause of the province became also the cause of Islām. God and the right took the field against force; the opposition united with the faith".
2. Śiffin, p. 139.
3. Tabarī, III, 240.
dispersion of Khārijite sentiments throughout the Islamic world can be seen as commencing even from this time, several years before the purges of Ziyād and al-Ḥajjāj.

The first governor appointed to Kūfah by Muʿāwiya, al-Mughīra b. Shuʿba of Thaqīf (41/661 – 50/670), displayed a notable degree of independence towards his master and did not interfere in the fluctuations of the political life of the city. The impression is given that he regarded this appointment as an attempt to remove his presence from the centre of activity in the Ḥijāz, and to exploit his prestige among the people who had formerly supported ʿAlī. However, his successor, Ziyād b. Abīhī initiated a new policy of coercion in order to rid the region of those dissidents who might support the latent tendencies to revolt there. Until the year 50/670 he had been governor of Baṣra, but after the death of al-Mughīra, Kūfah too, was included under his authority.

The first effort to solve the unrest of lower

---

1. He was already an old man at the time of his appointment, more concerned with leading a quiet and self-indulgent life than with war and politics, and this may have been another reason behind his selection as governor. Ṭabārī, V, 234; Aghānī, XVI, 86, 155.
"Iraq was made by him in 51/671, when he moved fifty thousand of the Arab population, chosen equally from Basra and Kufa, to Khurasan. The matter is very inadequately treated in Tabari (VI, 160, 128) and Baladhuri (Futuh, 400), but the consequences of such a massive emigration could not but have had important consequences for both Khurasan and 'Iraq.

However, if Ziyad had thought to pacify his territories by such measures he was soon to be undeceived. In that same year, the pious and respected Hujr b. 'Adi led a protest against the Umayyads, centering his attack on the official policy of cursing 'Ali b. Abi Talib. He had expected to receive the support of the Yemenite tribes — in particular from Kinda — and, indeed, Ziyad, too, thought that they might rally around him. There was a danger that if he attempted to suppress Hujr, who was from Kinda, with

1. It is probably for this reason that it has attracted such scant attention among European scholars. Wellhausen, for example, merely comments that it was a political move and makes no effort to interpret its significance. The Arab Kingdom, p. 125; see H. Lammens, Études sur le siecle des Omayyades, p. 132.
2. Tabaqat, VI, 151, 153.
any of the northern tribes, a civil war might break out. Therefore he entrusted MadhhiJ and Hamdān with this task and did not involve any of the 'Adnānites. In the event, Kinda did not lend its support to Ḥujr, apparently intimidated by Ziyād.¹

Ziyād was successful in exploiting the hostility which existed between Kinda and Asad in this affair.² However, he was unable to influence Ṭayy to withdraw this support from 'Abdallāh b. Khalīfa al-Ṭāʾiy who was a follower of Ḥujr. From this may be inferred that Ṭayy was strong relative to the other tribes in Kūfa, and was prepared to defy the governor openly. The weaker tribes were forced into making secret alliances with one another, and contributed to the conspiratorial atmosphere in which revolutionary groups such as the Khwārij and the Shiʿa were able to develop.³ But these alliances and compacts proved to be very unstable, as can be seen from the way in which the promised support for Ḥusain b. 'Alī failed to materialise when he was deceived into going to Kūfa to head a new

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 146; Aghānī, XVI, pp. 4-5.
2. Ṭabarī, VI, 151. Rabīʿa, which was the ally of Kinda, also became disaffected with Ziyād because of the way he had manipulated events to his own advantage. Ṭabarī, VI, 151.
3. Ḥadāʾiq, III, 108.
government. The poet al-Farazdaq was well aware of the inconstancy of the Kūfanū, and he warned Ḥusain that even if their sentiments favoured him they would still use their swords against him, presumably in return for Umayyad money.

The revolt of al-Mukhtār in the year 66/685 produced a more positive response from the Kūfanū, and showed the way in which the tribes had been polarized in the period since Ziyād. Those who are mentioned as his adherents are Hamdān, Madhīḥij, Asad, Rabīʿa, Nahd, Kinda, Khath́am, Bāhila, Banū Sulaim and Banū ‘Ugail, but it must not be supposed that all of these joined the revolt out of the same motives. Rabīʿa, the inveterate enemy of Muṣār, to which most of the Umayyad governors belonged, was a predictable adherent; yet even some of

---

1. Dīnawarī, pp. 243–244; Ṭabarī, VI, 962. In the letters which had been sent to him at Medīna asking him to come here and form a new caliphate, he was promised the support of forty thousand men.


3. Most of these are shown as supporting al-Mukhtār in the account of the revolt given by Dīnawarī, pp. 299–300; the Ansāb, speaks of the participation of Asad (V, 234) and Khath́am (V, 260).
its sections remained neutral. Echoes of the struggle between 'Uthmān and 'Alī were to be heard, particularly among Bajīla, which had never abandoned its 'Alīd inclinations.

The local opposition to al-Mukhtār included Azd 'Umān, 'Abs, Dhubyān and, especially, the powerful Tamīm, all of whom felt antipathy towards any man from Thaqīf. But, when it became apparent that al-Mukhtār was using the power he had gained for his own personal ends rather than to advance the cause of the Banū Hāshim, certain of his former supporters passed into opposition. Notable among these were Yemenī tribes such as Kinda, Azd and Nakha. Certain other tribes objected to the favour which he showed to non-Arab mawālī, treating them as equals and according them the same privileges.

2. Ansāb, V, pp. 232-233, where the verses of a poet from Bajīla are quoted in which the words anā 'alā dīnī 'Alī are used. The tribe appears to have been alienated by the financial exactions 'Uthmān had made on the people of Kūfa. Tabarī, VI, 66.
3. Ansāb, V, 236, 245. The important position held by Tamīm in Kūfa is variously attested; cf. Ansāb, V, 289; Faqīh, p. 83; Ṣifīn, p. 248.
4. Tabarī, VI, 94. Mubarrad, Kāmil, I, 44, reports that the mawālī regarded al-Mukhtār as their deliverer.
In fact, the revolt of al-Mukhtār split the Yemenī tribes into two factions; the one supporting him because he had avenged the death of ʿUṣāin b. ʿAlī, and the other disaffected by the equality he was conferring on the mawālī. Of course, all the tribes loyal to the Umayyads were ranged against him, and it was they who provided the nucleus around which the others could rally.\(^1\) A delegation from the tribes hostile to al-Mukhtār went to Basra to solicit the help of the governor Muṣʿab b. al-Zubair, and in the year 67/686 he led his Basrān troops against the rebel and captured Kūfa. Al-Mukhtār lost his life in the fighting.\(^2\)

\(^{1}\) Dinawarī, p. 292.

\(^{2}\) Ṭabarī, VI, 108.
CHAPTER III

ARAB TRIBES IN BASRA

Although the situation in Basra might have been expected to have much the same features as that of Kūfa, in fact what we find is significantly different. There was no general anti-Umayyad feeling to give political direction to the activities of the people, and this may be due to the fact that very few of the prominent figures of the original Islamic establishment settled here. For example, while seventy who had fought alongside the Prophet at the Battle of Badr had lived in Kūfa, only one, *Utba b. Ghazwān, was associated with Basra. What political sentiment existed was variable and usually connected with self-interest and defensive policies of the three important tribes which dominated the region: Tamīm, Bakr and Azd.

Tamīm

Basra was founded by *Utba b. Ghazwān in the territories of Tamīm and Bakr, and of these two, the

1. Faqīh, p. 66.
former was by far the largest and most influential, and consequently able to impose its will on the new city.1 Among the mawālī who were attracted to seek protection of Tamīm were the Persian Asāwira, and others given such names as Zutt and Sayābija.2 There can be no doubt as to the predominant position of the Tamīm in Baṣra during the Umayyad Period, and this, of course, was bound to give rise to fanciful legends about its heroic past.3 Throughout the period in which Baṣra was establishing itself as one of the important centres of the new Islamic state, Tamīm was under the leadership of Ḥmnaf b. Qais (d. 70/689).4

1. Ibn al-Faqīh, pp. 166,189, speaks of Tamīm as being among the first occupants of the city; and earlier, p. 33, he had related a story describing the strength of the tribe in his region. Other sources, such as Ibn al-Kalbī, I, f.95 and Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha, III, 425, agree on its wealth and nobility. The Aghānī, VIII, 58, contains a poem by Jarīr which mentions the four famous families of Tamīm as being: Ribāb, Saʿd, ʿAmr, and Ḥanẓala.

2. Futūḥ, p. 367; Murūj, III, 34.

3. For example, the Ḥad, III, 332, speaks of its prominence in the Jāhiliyya: the men of Tamīm were the Jamājim al-ʿArab, "the head and source of the nation". Bayān, I, 53, describes the language spoken by them as being the purest ʿArabiṣ, even winning the admiration of the Prophet.

His policy of co-operation with the Umayyad governors who were sent here assured his people of the favour of the Caliphs which was denied to rebellious Kūfa, and was in line with the neutral position he had already adopted in the struggle between ‘Alī and Zubair. This reluctance to commit himself to affairs outside his own territories and become involved in the fluctuating politics of the Umayyads gave a stability to the life of the city that contrasted markedly with its neighbour. But Tamīm was too large to be wholly monolithic in its sentiments, and we find important sections of it giving support to ‘Alī, to Ṭalḥa and Zubair,¹ and also to Mu‘āwiya.² Moreover, most of the leaders of the Khawārij were from this tribe.³

Azd

Tamīm had as its most serious and bitter rival in Baṣra, the powerful tribe of Azd, which had first come

1. Ṭabarī, V, pp. 200-206; Nahj, III, 425. The two sources show sections of Tamīm as fighting both in support and against ‘Alī in his conflict with Ṭalḥa and Zubair.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 136.

3. The impression given by Ansāb, IV, ii, p.101; and Murūj, III, 200 is that the leadership and the following of the Kharijites were predominantly from Tamīm.
here from ‘Uman under the leadership of ‘Uthmān b. Sa‘īd b. Abī al-‘Āṣ al-Thaqafī during the reign of ‘Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. This led to a continuous migration northwards, which ultimately produced a great concentration of its people in Southern ‘Irāq. Abū ‘Ubdāl said of Azd: "They are the best fighters of Yemen." 

Hostility between Azd and Tamīm was deep-rooted, and influenced the political life of the city. An amusing story told by Ibn Qutaiba illustrates the depth of feeling which may have existed between the two tribes: A man of Azd was observed in Mecca praying for his father. When asked, why do you not pray for your mother, too?" he replied,"Because she was from Tamīm." 

2. A’lag, p. 207; Aghānī, XIV, 300.
3. 'Iqd, III, 334. The Al Muhallab was the leading family of Azd in Baṣra (Ṣifat, p. 401; Faqīh, p. 190) and according to both Mubarrad (Nasab ‘Adnān wa Qaḥṭān, p. 21) and Hamdānī (Ṣifat, p. 401) was of the clan of ‘Atīk. The Aghānī, XIV, 300, says that the family was of Persian origin; Abū Ṣufra, the father of Muhallab, had emigrated to ‘Uman and joined Azd, and came north with them under ‘Uthmān b. Abī al-‘Āṣ to Baṣra. Cf. also A’lag, p. 207.
Bakr

The third largest of the tribes settled in Başra was Bakr. As compared with the other two it was said to be more obedient and tractable to those under whose authority it lived.¹ Unlike the others, they can be described as native to Southern 'Irāq, having dwelt in this region before the rise of Islām. Their presence in Başra dates from the time when their leader, Suwaid b. Quṭba, allied himself to 'Utba b. Ghażwān, and they can thus be regarded as among the founders of the city.²

Four other tribes were prominently represented in Başra, about only one of which do we have any information as to origins: 'Abd al-Qais, which had migrated here from Bahrain along with Azd, as part of the army of 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Aṣ.³ The famous family of al-Jārūd was of this tribe.⁴ Of Qais, Rabī'a and al-‘Aliya we know little before they began to play a role in the affairs of the city.⁵

---

1. Murūj, III, 34.
2. Futūḥ, p. 337.
4. Faqīh, pp. 170, 190.
5. Ibn Sa‘d, unfortunately, does not indicate the tribal associations of the men whom he lists in this region, giving personal names. Tabaqāt, index. Al-‘Aliya was not really a tribe, but rather a designation of the people who had settled in the vicinity of ‘Aliyat al-Ḥijāz. Mubarrad, I, 116.
The relationship of these tribes during the early years of the city would seem to have been peaceful, for indeed the place was little more than a base for operations connected with the conquests and had not yet developed a constant population with an individual life of its own. This harmony was to be broken here, as in other parts of the Islamic territories, by the murder of the Caliph 'Uthmān in 35/655; men of Baṣra under the leadership of Ḥukaim b. Jabala of Rabī‘a had gone to Medīna and participated in the insurrection which culminated in this assassination.¹ There now developed a polarization of the tribal elements in the city: Azd and Ḍabba supported the Medinese Party led by Ṭalḥa, Zubair and 'Ā'isha which sought revenge for the murder, while Rabī‘a, 'Abd al-Qais and Bakr associated themselves with the supporters of 'Allī.

In these events Tamīm remained uncommitted and neutral,² apart from a few groups who had sided with

---

1. Murūj, II, 206; all sources, e.g. Ishtiqaq, p. 332, identify his tribe as Rabī‘a.

2. Tabarī, V, 180, explains this neutrality as being due to the harsh treatment a man of the Sa‘d branch of Tamīm had received at the hands of Ṭalḥa and Zubair.
Talha and Zubair at the Battle of the Camel. \(^1\) Indeed, similar exceptions could be found in most tribes: Bakr which, on the whole, supported ‘Alī also had some of its men present at this battle in the ranks of Talha and Zubair. \(^2\)

The Azd of Başra supported the Medinese Party against ‘Alī presumably because the Azd of Syria had taken the side of Mu‘awiyah. At the Battle of the Camel, ‘Ā‘ishah exhorts the men of Azd: "Oh Āl Ghassān, remember today that bravery of yours of which we have heard so much!", and this association of the tribe with the pre-Islamic Arabs of Syria must have a special significance for these warriors who had come north from ‘Uman into these strange lands. \(^3\)

It was clearly Mu‘awiyah’s intention to foment disunity among the tribes which could be exploited in his own interest. In 37/657 he sent ‘Abdallāh b. al-Ḥaḍramī to Başra to win support against ‘Alī, with instructions to cultivate Mudar and Azd, but to avoid Rabī‘a, who were wholly committed to the cause of ‘Alī. \(^4\)

---

2. Kāmil, III, 106.
3. Ibid., III, pp. 105-106.
In these loyalties Muṣār and Rabī‘a were merely projecting into Islam the traditional hostility which had always characterized their relations. The saying had become current that Rabī‘a was angry at God for having selected the Prophet from Muṣār. Also, recorded as an example of the ‘āšabiyya of Rabī‘a were the words of one apostate who said: "I testify that Muḥammad in the true Prophet and Musailima is false; but a false prophet from Rabī‘a is preferable to a true one from Muṣār."2

The susceptibility of the Bedouin to bribery was also exploited by Mu‘āwiya; whereas ‘Alī would only pay them what was their due as Muslims out of the bayt al-Māl, the Umayyad policy was to lavish money on whomsoever could be of use. In this way the tribes of Baṣra, and in particular Tamīm, were won over.3 Ziyād b. Abīhi wrote to ‘Alī from Baṣra: "Ibn al-Ḥaḍramī has come here from Syria and dwells among Tamīm. Announcing the murder of ‘Uthmān, he has called the people to arms; and Tamīm and most of the other Baṣrans have responded."4

2. Ṭabarī, III, 286.
3. Ibid., VI, 18.
4. Ibid., VI, 64.
A certain Ḥammad b. Sulaimān said of Baṣra; "It is a Piece of Syria amongst us".¹

After the Battle of the Camel, the tribes of Baṣra became very inconstant in their allegiance, and in general what support they were prepared to give to either of the two contestants for the Caliphate was very much subordinate to the pursuit of their own self-interest. The first Umayyad governor, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Āmir (41/661 – 44/664), was unable to control the tribes, nor was his successor al-Ḥārith b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Azdī any more successful. The latter held office only a few months, in fact. The first serious effort to make Baṣra responsive to the will of the central government came with the appointment of Ziyād b. Abī Ḥiṣn as a governor in 45/665.² He had long experience of the city, going back to the period when he kept the army accounts for the governor, Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī (17/638 – 29/649).³ He showed his resourcefulness when, during the reign of ‘Alī, he contrived to win the support of Azd in suppressing the revolt of Tamīm which had been

1. Ṭabaqāt, VI, 232.
2. Ṭabarī, VI, 123; Khalīfa, I, 241.
instigated by Ibn al-Hadramī.¹

The famous addresses of Ziyād to the people of Baṣra emphasize the way in which tribal rivalries were damaging the life of the city: "You are putting tribal loyalties before religion.... You are excusing and sheltering criminals from amongst you, and tearing down the protecting laws sanctified by Islām...."² It is to Ziyād's credit that he, a man of unknown origins, could so influence a city which was composed of groups organized along traditional tribal lines. It may well be that the very obscurity of his birth made it possible for him to appear in a position of neutrality amidst the tribal rivalries, and we are told that his administration won the general approval of the people.³

Ziyād b. Samura al-Fazārī of Qais acted as his deputy when he had to leave the city,⁴ and he showed his trust

¹. Ţabarī, V, 110. Azd had hitherto been supporting Mu‘awiya against ‘Alī, and it was an act of clever diplomacy to win them over at this time. However, there was a long-standing rivalry between Azd and Tamīm, and the growing power of the latter must have excited envy and apprehension.


³. Ibid., II, 65.

⁴. Ţabarī, VI, 166.
in Azd by moving the bayt al-māl into their quarter. 1

When a man of Azd, Nāfī‘ b. Khālid, who had been Ziyād’s a’amil in Bushanj, stole a sum of money, he escaped punishment for his crime through the intercession of his fellow-tribesmen. 2 Tamīm, too, found it expedient to fall in with the wishes of the governor.

Ziyād organized the tribes of Başra into five groups - aškus: Ahl al-‘Āliya, Tamīm, Bakr, Azd and Kinda, and ‘Abd al-Qais, with chiefs of each tribe responsible for the behaviour of its members. 3 In order to be in a position to influence these tribes and assure their loyalty, he formed a private guard of five hundred men - the ḥaras - under his sole command. 4 The affairs of the treasury were left in the hands of the mawālī, for to place the disposal of money in the hands of any of the Arabs would have immediately excited suspicion and envy among the others. 5

That he met with opposition, too, cannot be doubted; and the mass movement of Arabs from Başra to Khurāsān and

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 127.
3. Khawārizmī, p. 73.
4. Ṭabarī, VI, 127.
other places may have been his way of dealing with large-scale dissent.\footnote{In 51/671, twenty-five thousand men were sent from here and another twenty-five from Kūfa, to serve under the new governor of Khurāsān, al-Rabī‘a b. Ziyād al-Ḥārithī.  \textit{Tabarî}, VI, 128, 160-161. This balance between men from the rival cities may have been intended to assure that they would never unite against him. Mention is made, also, of sections of Qais being transferred to Jazīra.  \textit{Isḥiqāq}, p. 272.} Ziyād enjoyed the confidence and support of his Umayyad masters in the course he followed, and his area of authority was enlarged to include Sistān, Fārs, Sind and India.\footnote{\textit{Tabarî}, VI, 134.} His ambitions, too, were large. He wrote to Mu‘āwiya: "I hold ’Irāq in my right hand, but still my left is empty", whereupon he was granted the governorship of the Hijāz.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, V, 289.} However, he died before he could take up this responsibility.

His successor in Baṣra, ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Amr b. Ghailān, was merely a temporary appointment until a man of greater abilities could be found to take control of the Province, and this in fact was to be Ziyād’s son, ‘Ubaidallāh. Mu‘āwiya does not appear to have had the confidence in the latter that he had in Ziyād, and the appointment seems to have been made only in response...
to the importuning of 'Ubaidallāh. ¹

But it was to become clear that the son had not his father's skill in manipulating the tribes. Being related through marriage with Qais,² he was able to maintain their loyalty, but it took the intervention of Mu'āwiya to improve relations between him and Ahnaf b. Qais, the chief of Tamīm.³ However, his main reliance rested on a body of about two thousand non-Arab slave troops which he had brought back with him from Bukhārā,⁴ and for a while he was able to control his province with this support. But in 64/683, when the news arrived of the death of Yazīd I, it was the signal for a general uprising against the Umayyads by the tribes of Baṣra.

‘Ubaidallāh was at a loss to know how he could win the confidence of the tribesmen; he professed to share their hatred of Yazīd, and even tried to have them

1. 'Iqd, IV, 87. Ṭabarī, V, 296, describes how ‘Ubaidallāh pleaded with Mu’āwiya to receive this appointment, addressing him as "my uncle" on the basis of the fictitious relationship between him and Ziyād.

2. Ansāb, IV, ii, pp. 82-83.

3. Ṭabarī, V, pp. 316-317. Subsequent events also indicate that he retained the support of Azd which his father had enjoyed.

4. Ṭabarī, V, 298; Narshakhi, p. 37.
declare the bay'a to him, but as governor of the territory, not as Caliph. This only excited the ridicule of the people; after touching hands with him in the Dâr al-Imâra as an act of homage, they came out and rubbed their hands on the walls, saying: "Does Ibn Murjâna think we would entrust him with our affairs at a time of disunity?" Even Azd, who had been so loyal to his father, refused at first to help him; its leader, Mas'ûd b. 'Amr, was reluctant to take a stand against all the other tribes, and he felt, too, that the rewards which had been received for the loyalty shown to Ziyâd were not great enough. Some understanding was arrived at, however, and Azd gave protection to 'Ubaidallah when he left Başra for Syria, happy to have escaped with his life.

The narrative of events in the city are so confused that it is not possible to present a clear picture of the tribal alliances and factions at this time. The

2. Tabarî, V, 507.
3. Ibid., V, 510.
4. Dînawarî, p.277, describes his passage through the territories of the Banû Sulaim and the Banû Nâjiya, while al-Kûfî, I, f.421, mentions that he left his mother and wife behind in Başra.
position of Tamīm is ambiguous: they were prepared to allow 'Ubaidallāh to remain in Baṣra until order was restored, but no sooner had he escaped than they paid homage to 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥarīth al-Ḥāshimi, without having consulted Azd and Bakr. Ibn al-Ḥarīth was to be the instrument of Tamīm in gaining control of the city; being from Muḍar, he could be expected to have the loyalty of all the tribes of this stock, including Azd and Bakr. These two had a long-standing alliance, and the influx of Azdī tribes towards the end of Mu‘awiya's reign was to greatly strengthen their political power in the region. Although it had been proposed that Tamīm should try to win these newcomers over to their side, it was feared that if they made the first move towards such an alliance it would place them in a subordinate position; and,

1. The self-contradiction of sources such as the Ansāb al-Ashraf and the Naqā'id in dealing with these events is characteristic of the confused views of the later historians. The alliance between Azd and Bakr in the Jahiliyya, however, is well attested, cf. Naqā'id, II, 730; 'Iqd, III, 392; and this was further strengthened by the friendship between the Banū Dhuḥl b. Tha‘labā b. Bakr and Thu‘al b. 'Amr b. al-Ghawth b. Ṭayy; cf. Ṭabarī, VII, 27, where the migration of Azd into Baṣra at this time are noted also. Where they came from is not made clear.
consequently the way was left open for the union of Azd with Bakr.¹

This account, of course, ignores the long-standing hostility shared by Azd and Bakr against Tamīm, which would have made alliance with the latter unfeasible in any circumstances.² It was this common traditional enemy that brought the two together, and the alliance was renewed by Mālik b. Misma', the chief of Bakr, at this time.³ Abū 'Ubaida mentions that this move was made on the recommendation of 'Ubaidallāh b. Ziyād, who wanted to strengthen the support against Tamīm which he was receiving from Azd.⁴ He is said to have paid more than two hundred thousand dirhams to them to achieve this alliance, the overall leadership of which was given to Mas'ūd b. 'Amr of Azd.⁵ 'Ubaidallāh is presented as wishing Mas'ūd to assume responsibility for Baṣra until

1. Such as the simplified explanation of Abū 'Ubaida, Ṭabarī, VII, 27.
2. Ṭabarī, II, 132. In the Ḥaḍ, IV, 302, the verse of the poet al-Ṭirimmāḥ is quoted to show the hostility of Azd and Tamīm:

３．Ṭabarī, VII, 27.
5. Ṭabarī, VII, 25; Naqāʾiḍ, II, 729.
affairs had become more settled, and he recommended that homage be paid to him rather than to himself. Naturally, Tamīm would not accept such a situation, and they had support in their opposition from their fellow Muḍarites of Qais.

Masʿūd went to the mosque and stationed himself at the pulpit to receive the homage of the people, but before an hour had passed he was murdered. The sources are in disagreement as to the authors of this deed. Dīnawarī attributes it to the Khārijites, and is supported by Baladhurī who adds that they did it on the instigation of Ahnaf b. Qais. In Taḥārī two contradictory versions of the event are given: the first, from Isḥāq b. Yazīd, places the responsibility on Tamīm; while the second, from Isḥāq b. Suwad al-ʿAdawī, relates that Tamīm attempted to make an attack on Masʿūd but they were

1. Khalīfa, I, 325. The improbability of such a voluntary surrender of authority is, of course, apparent; but the account is interesting as an illustration of how later historians tried to give order to the confusion of events.

2. Dīnawarī, p.281; Ansāb, IV, ii, 98. It is probably because the Khārijites were a name associated with political assassination that they are made responsible.

3. Taḥārī, V, 520.
prevented by Āḥnaf b. Qais. Ibn A’tham merely says that the people of Basra killed him because he was supporting ‘Ubaidallāh. Whatever may have been the motives for the murder of Mas‘ūd, it must have had as its ultimate cause the rivalry between the tribes over the domination of Basra and its region. Indeed, Balādhurī’s account of the complicity of Āḥnaf (of Tamīm) in the murder reflects suspicions current among Azd; while Dīnawarī, having already involved the Khārijites, reports, also, this feeling: None other than Tamīm has killed him, so let us slay their lord, Āḥnaf b. Qais.

The leadership of Azd now passed to Ziyād b. ‘Amr al-‘Atakī, and he formed a pact with Mālik b. Misma of Bakr against Tamīm and Qais, forcing them to sue for peace. The speech in which Āḥnaf capitulated is not only of extreme eloquence, but it shows how regional interests were beginning to over-ride old tribal loyalties:

"Oh men of Azd and Rabī‘a, you are our brothers in faith, our partners in friendship and descent, and our neighbours in abode. We are united against

1. Ṭabarī, V, 518.
2. Kūfī, I, f.422.
3. Ansāb, IV, ii, 98.
5. ‘Iqd, IV,134.
the enemy. By God, the Azd of Basra are dearer to us than the Tamīm of Kūfā, and the Azd of Kūfā dearer than the Tamīm of Syria".

Nevertheless, Azd and Bakr took advantage of their superiority to impose strict conditions on Tamīm: either they should go to the desert (bādiya) and leave Basra to the victors; or, they should pay a ten-fold blood-wit for Mas‘ūd’s murder and the usual amount for all others killed in fighting against them, foregoing any recompense for their own dead. The Tamīm chose to remain in Basra; but, not having sufficient funds to meet the blood-price demanded, Annaf had to travel to Yabrīn in Bahrain to collect money from the tribes of Tamīm in that region.

These problems, which according to Abū ‘Ubaida lasted eight or nine months, were the result of Tamīm’s having neither wealth nor power. The sources make no mention of the fortunes of Qais during this period, and we do not know if its members, also, had to pay blood-money. The truce which had been arrived at did not bring peace to the city; there was no leader strong enough to stand up to the tribal chiefs, and the latter were

1. Ansāb, IV, ii, 122; Dīnawarī, p. 281.
3. Ansāb, IV, ii, p. 115.
unable to inspire confidence in the people. As no internal solution to this disquiet seemed possible, the inhabitants of Basra began to look elsewhere for deliverance—to the "political" parties who supported the cause of either the Umayyads or the Hashimites; the one represented in the city by Qais b. al-Haitham al-Sulami and the other by al-Nu‘mān b. Ṣuhbān al-Rāsibī. These two agreed on a mutually acceptable person to govern the city, 'Abdallah b. al-Ḥārith b. Nawfal (known affectionately as Babba). ¹

Ṭabarī [without mentioning a source] gives a different account of this selection, omitting all reference to Umayyad and Hashimite factionalism, and relating it in terms of tribal conflict. Thus, Mudar wanted al-‘Abbās b. al-Aswad b. ‘Awf al-Zuhrī, while it was Yemen that wanted ‘Abdallāh b. al-Ḥārith. When these two could not agree, it was decided to let al-Nu‘mān b. Ṣuhbān and Qais b. al-Haitham make the selection, and only then was the post given to ‘Abdallāh b. al-Ḥārith. ²

Another account in Ṭabarī (relating from ‘Awāna) has it that after the assassination of Mas‘ūd the people of Basra selected ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Āmir as

---

1. Ansāb, IV, ii, pp. 119-120; Ṭabarī, V, 512.
2. Ṭabarī, V, 512.
their leader; after one month he was succeeded by the above 'Abdallāḥ b. al-Ḥārith, who lasted only two months in office. Next came 'Omar b. 'Ubaidallāḥ b. Maʿmar as a representative of 'Abdallāḥ b. al-Zubair, but he held office for only one month, being replaced by al-Ḥārith b. 'Abdallāḥ b. Abī Rabīʿa, who was also a representative of 'Abdallāḥ b. al-Zubair. ¹ A third account (from 'Omar b. Shabba, probably taken by Ţabarī from al-Balūḏhurī) tells that 'Abdallāḥ b. al-Ḥārith was obliged to retire from office because he could not control the hostility between Muṣṣar, Rabīʿa and Azd, which was threatening to break out into open warfare. The people of Baṣra wrote to Ibn al-Zubair asking that he nominate a governor; he responded by sending Anas b. Mālik to investigate the situation, and forty days later 'Omar b. 'Ubaidallāḥ b. Maʿmar arrived. ²

The Zubairite party was at this time engaged in spreading its propaganda, and in Baṣra Salama b. Dhuʿaib of Tamīm was acting as its agent; and it would appear that his activities had begun even before 'Ubaidallāḥ b. Ziyād left the city. ³ The most trifling

¹. Ţabarī, V, 527.
². Ansāb, V, 188; Ţabarī, V, 528.
³. Ţabarī, V, 507.
excuse was sufficient for hostility to break out between 
Muḍar, Rabī‘a and Azd, and even the leader of these 
tribes proved unable to control the situation. Azd, 
for example, deposed their chief, Ashyam b. Shaqīq when 
he ordered them to behave more peacefully, and appointed 
Mālik b. Misma‘ in his place. The authority of the 
governors, as was to be expected under such circumstances, 
became very feeble, and their ability to maintain a 
discipline among the tribes was negligible. They had 
become so accustomed to hostilities that it seemed the 
normal condition, and none of them was willing to sacrifice 
any portion of its independence for the sake of the 
tranquility of the state. The governors themselves were 
men of weak character, more concerned with Personal Profit 
and advantage than with the common good. ‘Abdallāh b. 
al-Ḥārith b. Nawfal, for example, soon became wealthy 
from the fruits of his dishonesty. Even al-Ḥārith b. 
‘Abdallāh, whom Isfahānī speaks of as a noble and pious 
dignitary of the Quraish, was unable to bring any influence 
to bear on the tumultuous elements of Baṣra.

1. Ansāb, IV, ii, pp. 105-107; Tabarī, V, 515. 
2. Tabarī, V, 529. 
3. Cf. Tabarī, VI, 10; the statement of al-Isfahānī 
appears in Aghanī, I, 66. Other references to al- 
Ḥārith b. ‘Abdallāh are in accord regarding his good 
character; cf. Bayān, I, 196; Shi‘r, II, 330; Ansāb, 
IV, ii, 100; Mubarrad, III, 1093.
Al-Mukhtar and the Tribes of Basra

It was during the governorship of al-Ḥārith b. ʿAbdallāh (app. 65-66 a.h.), that al-Mukhtar made a bid to gain control of Kūfa and Baṣra. He was at this time in the former city, from where he sent al-Muthanna b. Mukharriba al-ʿAbdī of the tribe of ʿAbd al-Qais to stir up trouble and discontent in Baṣra. When al-Mukhtar seized control of Kūfa, al-Muthanna proclaimed the revolt in Baṣra, too; his first act being to occupy the Dār al-Rizq where the food supplies of the city were held. He thus hoped to gain the power of life and death over the people, by menacing them with starvation. However, his move was premature, and the governor al-Ḥārith b. ʿAbdallāh was able to frustrate his purposes. Assisted by Tamīm, he was prepared to give battle to ʿAbd al-Qais; but he was opposed in this by both Azd and Bakr. The leader of Azd, Ziyād b. ʿAmr al-ʿAtakī, warned him that if he persisted in his intention of fighting ʿAbd al-Qais, he would have them against him, also; Bakr associated themselves with this warning. Their opposition, born out of hostility to Tamīm, allowed al-Muthanna and his supporters to return to Kūfa unscathed.

1. Al-Muthanna had participated in the famous battle of ʿAyn al-Warda on the side of the Tawābīn.
2. Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 67-68.
Although the sources are not clear on the point, it would seem from the above that an alliance of sorts came into existence at this time between ‘Abd al-Qais on the one hand and Bakr and Azd on the other. The support he might expect from these two tribes encouraged al-Mukhtar in his ambition to gain power in Başra. He sent a letter to their respective leaders, Ziyād b. ‘Amr (Azd) and Mālik b. Mīsma‘ (Bakr), which read in part:

"If you heed my words and follow my summons, I shall endow you with all you wish of this world and guarantee the hereafter for you".

On reading this letter, Mālik said to Ziyād: "Abū Ishaq (i.e. al-Mukhtar) has been very lavish in his promises, granting us both this world and the next". Ziyād replied: "I do not fight for promises. I fight for whoever pays in cash". Al-Mukhtar clearly understood the venality of these tribal chiefs, and how easily their loyalty could be purchased. He also knew how to menace them, and in a letter to Aḥnaf b. Qais, the chief of Tamīm, he warned him of the dangers to himself and his followers if they ventured to oppose him.²

1. Ţabarī, VI, 68.
2. Imāma, II, 15; Ţabarī, VI, 93; Kūfī, II, f.444.
As the grip of al-Ḥarīth b. ʿAbdallāh on the affairs of Baṣra was seen to grow steadily weaker, ʿAbdallāh b. al-Zubair began to fear that the city would be lost to him just as Kūfa had been. Consequently, he sent his brother Muṣʿab to replace him, and charged him with two objectives: to coerce the tribal leaders in Baṣra into submission, and to put an end to al-Mukhtār's rule in Kūfa.\(^1\) In his first address to the people of Baṣra, Muṣʿab is reported to have said: "O people of Baṣra, I have heard that you are accustomed to giving nicknames to your governors. Well, I have named myself The Butcher (al-Jazzār)."\(^2\)

He was welcomed and supported by Tamīm, ʿAḥnaf b. Qais becoming one of his closest confidants;\(^3\) and ʿAbbād b. al-Ḥuṣain al-Ḥabatī occupying a position of great influence during his governorship. The tribe of ʿAbd al-Qais was hesitant in its response to his appeal; some supported him, while others chose to be defiant. When these latter realized that they were not strong enough to give battle to him they moved from the city and went

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 93.
2. Imāma, II, 15.
Azd appears to have remained hostile to Mus'ab, no doubt due to their supposed tribal relations with the Umayyads, though it is also stated that 'Abdallāh b. al-Ẓubair had been mean in his treatment of them.\(^2\) To overcome their opposition Mus'ab summoned their supreme leader al-Muhallab b. Abī Șufra from Fārs, and eventually, after much correspondence, he agreed to come. He knew that he was to be used as a tool with the object of bringing his tribesmen to obedience, but also in the war that was to be waged against al-Mukhtar. He was finally persuaded to come when Muhammad b. al-Ash'ath the chief of Kinda and the opponent to al-Mukhtar in Kūfa, arrived with a letter from Mus'ab. Al-Muhallab greeted him with these words: "Does a man such as you come as a messenger? Could Mus'ab find no one else to carry his letter?" Muhammad explained that the real problem was not connected with Mus'ab, but rather with the need for driving al-Mukhtar from Kūfa: "By God, I am no man's messenger! But our wives, our children and our serving girls (ḥuram) have been taken from us by slaves and (mawālī)."\(^3\) The two leaders – both of whom were of

1. Ansāb, (M.S. of the higher Islamic studies Institute, Baghdad) VI, f.204.
2. Ansāb, IV, ii, 28.
3. Tabarī, VI, 94; see Dīnawarī, pp. 295-296.
Yemenī origin -- reached an understanding, and when Muhallab arrived in Basra his tribesmen in the area immediately submitted to his orders.

Having achieved this agreement, Muṣʿab advanced on Kūfa accompanied by the Akhmās, i.e., the five most prominent tribal leaders of Basra: Mālik b. Mīsma' who was chief of the Khums of Bakr; Mālik b. al-Mundhir of 'Abd al-Qais; Ḥnaf b. Qais of Tamīm; Ziyād b. ‘Amr of Azd; and Qais b. al-Haitham of Ahl al-‘Alīya. Abū Mikhnaf relates that the tribes of Kūfa who were opposed to al-Mukhtār urged Muṣʿab to bring his rule over the city to an end.1 In Dīnawarī it is said that more than ten thousand people, led by Muḥammad b. al-Ash‘ath, fled from Kūfa to join the forces of Muṣʿab, and encouraged him to drive out al-Mukhtār.2

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 95.
2. Dīnawarī, p. 310.
CHAPTER IV

IRAQ AS A UNITED PROVINCE

The Zubairite Period

The sources go into detail on the bitterly-fought battle that took place between al-Mukhtar and Muṣʿab, and the victory of the latter was seen by the Kūfans as a subjection by Başrans. This bred a feeling of hostility that was to persist for a long time, and exacerbate the rivalry between the two cities. Muṣʿab was now the governor of the whole of ‘Irāq,¹ and almost at once distrust grew up between himself and his nominal master ‘Abdallāh b. Al-Zubair. The historians of the period, in explanation of this breach in relations, speak of the contrast in the personalities of the two, Muṣʿab being presented as generous and open-handed while ‘Abdallāh b. al-Zubair is said to have been of a miserly nature.² According to al-Shaʿbī, Muṣʿab used to pay the ‘āťā twice a year, once in winter and once in summer.³

1. By ‘Irāq is meant, at this time, the southern part of the present national state; Kūfa and Başra are sometimes referred to as ‘Irāqain.
2. Ansāb, IV, ii, 28; ‘Iqd, IV, 412.
3. Kūfī, II, f.97. The ‘āťā at this time was the payment made to the tribesmen who served in the army and previously it was paid only once a year.
In 67/686, 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair removed Muṣ‘ab from his post and appointed his own son Ḥamza in his place. In doing this 'Abdallāh was careful not to alienate so capable a man, and the reasons he advanced for his action were deliberately ambiguous. This proved to be prudent, for Ḥamza, being young and inexperienced, was unable to impose his authority over the unruly inhabitants of the region, and it was not long before Aḥnaf b. Qais was writing to 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair urging him to reinstate Muṣ‘ab. The following year, therefore, found the latter again back in Basra still holding his former position as governor of 'Iraq.¹

His arrival here caused the Umayyad ruler in Damascus, 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, to fear that his own position could be endangered by the type of strong government Muṣ‘ab had shown himself capable of forming. He warned the members of his family and his followers: "Having killed al-Mukhtar and occupied 'Iraq and other lands, Muṣ‘ab b. al-Zubair will, I believe, invade your country. When a people's home is invaded that is the end of them".² No doubt, the chief reason for 'Abd al-Malik's concern was his fear that the revenues which

1. Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 117-119.
2. Dīnawarī, p. 301.
had been coming from 'Iraq would be withheld; and this could mean a serious loss to the treasury. From the Sawād alone, it is reported, one hundred and twenty million dirhams were received every year as Kharāj, and besides this there were the considerable amounts paid as Jizya, and in the form of the gifts known as nawrūz and mihrajān.

'Abd al-Malik sought to create difficulties for Mu'ṣab in Baṣra and Kūfa, hoping that in this way he might be able to cause his downfall without recourse to military measures, the outcome of which was always uncertain. He chose a certain Khālid b. 'Abdallāh b. Asīd to act as his agent in Baṣra, with instructions to foment revolt which, once under way, would be supported by a large Umayyad army. Al-Balādhuri relates that in order to prepare the way for Khālid, 'Abd al-Malik sent letters to the people of Baṣra (most probably to their leaders), promising them great rewards if they would support his cause; and all responded favourably to this appeal, with the exception of al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra.

2. Yaʿqūbī, II, 158.
3. Ṭabarī, VI, 152.
In Ibn A’tham more details are given of this event: ‘Abd al-Malik wrote to his own party (li-shī'atī-hi) ordering them to rise against Muṣ‘ab and take control of Baṣra; and it is mentioned that at this the people of the city were to be divided into two parties, the Zubairite and the Marwānid.\(^1\) When Khālid arrived there, he stayed with ‘Amr b. Aṣma’ al-Bāhilī of Qais, and began to make contact with his supporters, presumably the leaders of the Marwānid faction.\(^2\)

Khālid was joined by Bakr, under the leadership of Mālik b. Mīsma’, and by Azd, under that of Ziyād b. ‘Amr al-‘Atakī. The Muhallabī family of Azd, however, refused to participate.\(^3\) According to ‘Awāna, it was the Banū Yashkur that first rallied to his summons.\(^4\) Tamīm split on the issue: some, under the leadership of Sa’ṣa’a b. Mu‘āwiya, the uncle of Aḥnaf b. Qais, gave their support, but the majority, including Aḥnaf himself, refused to do

---

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 152, has as its source for this event ‘Omar b. Shabba, who reports from ‘Alī b. Muḥammad, that the name of his host was ‘Amr b. Aṣma’, and from Abū al-Ḥasan that it was ‘Alī b. Aṣma’.
3. Ansāb, IV, ii, 156.
4. Ibid., IV, ii, 160.
Why any section of Tamīm should enter into an alliance which included the traditional enemy Azd is difficult to understand; it may be that there was expectation of great profit for themselves in such a move. 'Abd al-Qais, too, joined in the revolt.

At this time Muş'ab was in Kūfa; however, his deputy 'Ubaidallah b. Ma'mar, aided by the Zubairites, was able to suppress the insurrection. Details of the elements composing the Zubairite forces are lacking. It may be assumed that Qais was among them, for it is mentioned that Qais b. al-Haitham al-Sulami was hiring men to fight alongside him in favour of Muş'ab. According to 'Omar b. Shabba, the fighting went on for twenty four days. When defeated, the rebels were given safe conduct out of Baṣra, and because of this pledge, when Muş'ab returned here from Kūfa he is said to have been unable to exact any revenge from them. However the reason why he did not proceed against them is probably because he feared an imminent invasion from Syria and had to keep his forces intact.²

---

1. Al-Farazdaq refers to this association of a section of Tamīm with their old enemies of Azd in the verses:

2. Tabarl, VI, 152.
After settling his affairs in Syria, 'Abd al-Malik marched on 'Irāq, and in a battle which took place at Maskin in 71/690\(^1\) Muṣ'ab proved unable to resist the united strength of the Umayyads with the heterogeneous forces he had to rely on. These forces contained elements of Tamīm, Qais, Bakr, 'Abd al-Qais, Kinda, Madhḥij and Azd from both Baṣra and Kūfa, and the rivalry between the two cities was such that even an identity of tribal connection could not produce a feeling of unity. The Kūfans still recalled with rancour the defeat Muṣ'ab and his Baṣran troops had inflicted on them in 67/686; and many of the tribes of Baṣra were coerced into his service. Only a few months previously Azd and Bakr had been in revolt against him.

Defections occurred in the field: 'Omar b. Shabba relates that when Muṣ'ab asked Qaṭan b. 'Abdallāh al-Ḥarīthī, the leader of Madḥij, to face up to the enemy he refused, saying, "Why should I have Madḥij blood shed?"\(^2\) Dāwūd b. Qahdham, the leader of the Bakr tribe in Kūfa, deserted the battlefield, followed by several other tribes.\(^3\) Muṣ'ab was also betrayed by Tamīm.\(^4\)

---

1. According to Mas'udī, the battle took place in 72/691. Murūj, III, 307.
2. Ansāb, XI, 7; Tabarī, VI, 158; Kūfī, II, f.100.
3. Ansāb, V, 334.
The bravery of Muṣ'ab in this hopeless battle is highly praised. 'Abd al-Malik, because of their former friendship, urged him to surrender and save his life; but Muṣ'ab, recalling the steadfastness of al-Ḥusain b. 'Alī at Karbalā’, refused and chose to perish on the battlefield. The 'Iraqi tribes were not ready to fight on Muṣ'ab's side. Wellhausen observes: "The men of 'Iraq had no desire for battle, they had never been used to discipline and obedience, and the frightful party-struggle of the last years had not improved them; political and military loyalty were absolutely unknown to them".

When 'Abd al-Malik was invading 'Iraq from Bājumaira they refused Muṣ'ab's appeals to advance against him, showing the same indifference and unrelia-

1. Ansāb, V, 345; no doubt, 'Abd al-Malik also wished to weaken 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair's prestige by having it seen that his own brother had forsaken him.

2. Ansāb, V, 344.

3. Wellhausen, p. 195; Cf. Murūj, III, 112, where the attitude of these tribes is described in much the same terms.


5. Ya'qūbī, III, 140.
were prepared to fight to keep 'Iraq independent of Syria. Thus, Qais b. al-Haitham, when he felt that Muṣ'ab was losing the support of the people, appealed to their self-interest: "Do not let those Syrians invade your lands, for by God if you once let them taste your wealth, they will not stop until they have stripped you of everything".¹

The earlier struggle between 'Alī and al-Zubair had left a feeling of bitterness against the latter's house among the Kūfans, and they were also displeased by the way Ibn al-Zubair was removing the wealth of the country to Ḥijāz, as had all the Caliphs, with the exception of 'Alī.² If Muṣ'ab was able for a while to command their loyalty, it was only because of their fear of the Syrians and the attitudes they had formed during the troubles with al-Mukhtār;³ but even before the battle Suwaid b. Manjūf al-Sadūsī had warned Muṣ'ab of the unreliability of the Kūfans.⁴ Basra,

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 157.
2. Ibid., VI, 11.
3. Of course, there were Kūfans who had supported al-Mukhtār, and these were hostile to Muṣ'ab because of the defeat he had inflicted upon them.
4. Ansāb, XI, 12.
too, was not disposed to give much support to Muṣʿab; Rabīʿa had revolted unsuccessfully only a year earlier. Azd, under the leadership of Ziyād b. ʿAmr al-ʿAtākī, was prepared to support the Syrians, despite the warning given him by Aḥnaf b. Qais: "I fear you are bringing great ruin and destruction upon us. You will inflict the Syrian on us, who will kill us and occupy our lands. Beware!" Ziyād replied to this that he felt that Muṣʿab was hostile to him, in pretending that they would be ready to co-operate personally. The position taken by Azd was to influence many of the smaller tribes of Baṣra to adopt the same attitude. After the death of Aḥnaf b. Qais 70/689, Tamīm, too, defected from allegiance to Muṣʿab and refused to participate actively in the battle at Maskin.

In the course of the battle Muṣʿab was killed by a thrust of lance of Ziyād b. Qudāma al-Thaqafī, who cried out: Ya li-thārātī ʿl-Mukhtār - "Vengeance for al-Mukhtār". But such consideration of tribal honour and loyalty were probably not so influential as the bribes and promises of ʿAbd al-Malik in determining the

1. Ansāb, V, 332.
2. Ansāb, VI, f.435.
attitudes of the tribes towards Muṣʿab. 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair had a reputation for meanness which was at odds with the Arab conception of true nobility, while 'Abd al-Malik was lavish in his promises of largesse to come. The story is told that Muṣʿab went to his brother 'Abdallāh in Mecca with a party of the leading men of 'Irāq for whom he asked certain sums of money. 'Abdallāh refused, calling these men the dregs of 'Irāq, and saying: "I will not give God's money to such as these". Because of this refusal, it is said, the tribal leaders of 'Irāq wrote to 'Abd al-Malik offering their services, each of them requesting the governorship of Iṣbahān. Surprised at this, 'Abd al-Malik, exclaimed, "What is this Iṣbahān? Does it grow gold and silver? I have received forty letters about it!" Nevertheless, he promised its governorship to every one who asked, including Ḥajjār b. Abjar, Chaḍbān al-Qabaṭharī, 'Attāb b. Warqā', Qaṭan b. 'Abdallāh al-Ḥārithī and Muḥammad b. 'Umair. Moreover, he wrote to Aḥnaf b. Qais promising him

1. ʻImāma, II, 23.
2. ʻImāma, II, 20; ʻIqd, III, 98.
3. Ansāb, V, 337.
4. Ibid., VI, 438.
a governorship in Syria, but this was refused with disdain: Ḥnaf said: "How strange that Ibn al-Zarqa',¹ should ask me to befriend the Syrians and himself, when all I have ever wanted is that we should be separated by an impenetrable sea of fire. By God, I would rather die than see 'Irāq betrayed".² A letter was sent, also, to Ibrāhīm b. al-Ashtar, Muṣʿab's best general and most faithful friend, offering him the lands watered by the Euphrates if he would come with his followers over to his side.³ Ibrāhīm took the letter unopened to Muṣʿab, warning him that many other tribal chiefs had received similar inducements and urging that he intimidate them into loyalty to himself. This Muṣʿab was reluctant to do, for fear that these men would be supported by their tribes. Ibrāhīm then suggested that they be expelled to the Ḥijāz where Muṣʿab's brother could keep them under control;⁴ but this, too, was rejected because it was feared that by so doing he might give his brother the impression that he was unable to control the 'Irāqīs. Ibn Aṯham explained the loyalty of Ibrāhīm to Muṣʿab as arising out of his desire to keep 'Irāq in the hands

1. Ibn al-Zarqa', "the son of the strumpet", was a particularly bad form of abuse.
2. Ansāb, V, 88.
4. Ansāb, VI, 436; see, Imāma, II, 23.
of the tribes who first settled here, and because of
the hostility he felt for Umayyads¹ - his father
having been poisoned by Muʿāwiya.

Muṣʿab’s deputy in Kūfa, ʿAmr b. Ḥuraith al-
Makhzumī, on the other hand, showed no loyalty what-
ever. He was in secret correspondence with ʿAbd al-
Malik, and came out of Kūfa with his troops to welcome
him after Muṣʿab had been defeated and slain. It is
clear that the Zubairids’ course had not been well
received by the tribes of ʿIrāq, who could see no
benefit to themselves in participating in what was
basically a struggle between the Quraish of the Ḥijāz
and the Quraish of Syria.

The Governorship of al-Ḥajjāj

Although the Umayyads now had possession of ʿIrāq,
the transfer of power did nothing to solve the problems
which had bedevilled it since the death of ʿAlī. ʿAbd
al-Malik was aware of this, and fully realized that the
attitude adopted by the tribes during his war with Muṣʿab
did not indicate friendship for himself so much as

¹. Kūfī, II, f.65.
indifference towards both participants. In fact, there was a natural feeling of hostility towards Damascus in Kufa, born of the resentment felt at having been displaced as the capital city of Islam. Bakr, from the federation of Rabi‘a, nourished the traditional enmity towards Muqar, and besides was virtually indigenous to lower ‘Iraq long before the expansions began.

‘Abd al-Malik sought to overcome this antipathy and indifference by suborning the prominent tribal leaders with lavish subsidies of money, and he left it to them to assure the compliance of their followers. Thus, when Dāwūd b. Qaḥdham, the leader of Bakr, noticed a lack of enthusiasm among his people for the Caliph, he brought two hundred from among them to Damascus to make a public profession of loyalty. After they had left, "‘Abd al-Malik remarked that "None of these scoundrels would have paid me homage but for the example of their chief". The support of Bakr was, of course, critical to his position in ‘Iraq, and at this juncture it was being aided by Azd. The fear of

1. ‘Iqd, IV, 410.
2. Ṭabarī, VII, 189.  
3. Ishtiqāq, p. 359.
growing Syrian influence showed these two tribes the advantage of presenting a united front.

After the situation in 'Irāq had been stabilized, 'Abd al-Malik lost no time in transferring a large section of Azd northwards to Mouṣil where his brother, Muḥammad b. Marwān, was governor.¹ Another brother, Bishr b. Marwān, was appointed governor of Kūfa in 73/692; and some time later, when Khālid b. 'Abdallāh b. Asīd was dismissed from Baṣra, this too was included in his authority.² However, his period of office was not successful, mainly because he failed to understand the true nature of the situation he found himself in, and had not the resolution to deal firmly with the tribes. During his time the quarters (arba‘) of Kūfa were re-distributed; one was assigned to Medīna (ahl al-Medīna), another to Tamīm and Hamdān; a third to Kinda and Rabī‘a; and the last to Madhlij and Asad.³ The reason behind this grouping together of northern and southern tribes is not clear; it may be that he wished to locate in one place groups that had traditional hostility towards one another which would prevent them from uniting

¹ Ya‘qūbī, III, 18.
² Ansāh, IV, ii, 159.
³ Tabarī, VI, 197.
against himself.

Only the cities of Basra and Kūfa were really under any form of effective control at this time, and here the tribes were always a potential menace; in the countryside, it was the Khārijites who held power.¹ And this was the situation that al-Ḥajjāj, the most famous of all Umayyad viceroys, was sent to cope with in 75/694. His letter of appointment from *Abd al-Malik concludes with the words: "I have made Kūfa a present to you; stamp on it so hard that Basra will tremble. Don’t think you can behave as you did in the Ḥijāz; there the people talk a lot but do nothing".² Thus he arrived here with virtually unlimited powers, and he was prepared to use these to the full to secure the territory firmly for his masters. The fact that such unlimited powers were conferred on a governor must be taken as an indication of the anxiety felt by Damascus about the situation in ‘Irāq, and it was fortunate that such a faithful and able servant as

2. *Ansāb*, VI, 240; *Ya‘qūbī*, III, 116.
al-%Hajjāj% was% on% hand% to% represent% its% interest% here.1

The famous% story% of% al-%Hajjāj% 's% address% to% the
people% of% Kūfa% from% the% pulpit% of% the% mosque% is,% of
course,% part% of% the% fiction% which% invariably% attaches
to% men% of% extraordinary% ability% in% Islamic% history,
and% should% be% regarded% as% an% attempt% to% refer% his
subsequent% activities% to% the% very% beginning% of% his
governorship.2% What% seems% most% likely% is% that% he% took
advantage% of% the% tribal% hostilities% which% were% rife
at% the% time% of% his% arrival% to% prevent% any% united
opposition% to% himself,% at% the% same% time% playing% on
their% fears% of% the% Khārijites% in% the% vicinity% so% that
they% would% look% to% him% for% their% security.3% Although
the% repression% of% the% Khawārij% is% accounted% among% the
greatest% of% al-%Hajjāj% 's% successes,% it% should% be% noted
that% it% was% this% threat% to% the% two% cities% that% gave% the
new% governor% an% immediate% political% objective% in% which

1. This% is% the% reputation% of% al-%Hajjāj% that% passed% into
the% traditional% histories;% cf. for% example,% Murūj,%
III,% 206.

2. The% account% is% found% in% Ṭabarī,% VI,% 202,% where% the
chain% of% narration% goes% back% to% ʿOmar% b.% Shabba.

3. Examples% of% the% terrorism% of% certain% of% the% Khawārij
at% this% time% are% numerous% in% the% sources;% Cf.% Ṭabarī,%
VI,% pp.% 196,% 240;% Aghānī,% VI,% 142. A% summary% of
the% situation% is% to% be% found% in% Murūj,% III,% 133,% and
Dīnawarī,% pp.% 279-284.
the tribes could share and identify their own interests with those of their rulers. Moreover, the warfare against this menace gave him a pretext for moving much of the tribal strength out of the cities.

His first encounter with tribal intractibility came when ‘Umair b. Ḍabī’ of Tamīm refused to join al-Muhallah in a campaign against the Khawārij because of his advanced age. This ‘Umair was one of the party that had murdered ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān, which would have been a further reason for al-Ḥajjāj’s hostility towards him. He suffered death for this refusal. This, however, is the only instance of disobedience recorded for the year 75/694, the other tribes apparently being prepared to co-operate despite their previous attitudes of resistance to authority. For example Madḥīj sent four thousand men to al-Muhallab’s army.2

The next measure of punishment he meted out came when he visited the always-turbulent city of Basra, and the occasion for it was very much the same as in Kūfa. Sharīk b. ‘Amr al-Yashkūrī, of Bakr, refused to go out

1. AḥānĪ, XIV, 245; Bad’, VI, 31.
2. Ṭabārī, VI, 207. Madḥīj had not only been prominent in the support of ‘Alī, but being of southern origin it could not have looked with favour on its northern governor.
to fight the Azāriqa (the Khārijites of Baṣra), making the excuse that he was suffering from a rupture; he met the same end as 'Umair b. Dābi'.

By these killings al-Ḥajjāj alienated some of the most powerful tribes in each of the two cities, and this was to hinder the exercise of his authority as governor of the East. He further angered the Baṣrans by reducing the 'ajā' from the amount it had been under Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubair and Bishr b. Marwān, and refused to listen when they protested against this. And so in 76/695 the tribes of the city joined together in a revolt which broke out in Rustaqabādh under the leadership of 'Abdallāh b. al-Jārūd, a leader of 'Abd al-Qais, and in this Tamīm, led by al-Hudhail b. 'Imrān al-Burjumī and 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥakam al-Mujāshi'I participated. The object of the revolt was to get rid of al-Ḥajjāj and the severe measures he had been using against them, but it also seems that personal grievances were held against him by the leaders. The Bakr tribes of Kūfa, led by Ghaḍbān al-Qaba'ṭharī al-Shaibānī, 5

1. Kamīl, IV, 158.
2. Ansāb, XI, 281; Kamīl, IV, 158.
4. Ibid., XI, 281.
5. The only sources to mention Ghaḍbān al-Qaba'ṭharī as the leader of the Bakr of Kūfa at this time is al-Jumahlī, Tābaqāt, p. 401; the name occurs in other sources, but only as a prominent individual in al-Jumahlī.
joined in the revolt with their fellow-tribesmen of Baṣra, who were nominally under the leadership of Manjūf al-Sadūsī; whether the latter himself was involved in the uprising is not clear.

Ibn al-Jārūd gained all but complete control of Baṣra, and al-Ḥajjāj was contemplating fleeing to Syria. One of his wives had been kidnapped by the Yemenites, and another by the Muḍarites. He was refused help by ʿUbaidallāh b. Kaʿb al-Numairī, the leader of Ahl al-ʿĀlīya, while the only comfort Ziyād b. ʿAmr al-ʿAtakī of Azd, who tried to maintain a neutral position, could offer was to suggest that al-Ḥajjāj should allow him to seek a safe-conduct from the revolutionaries so that he could leave ʿIrāq. This was characteristic of Ziyād, who is always found favouring whichever side happened to be the strongest in a given conflict; and now he clearly wanted to retain the good-will of both al-Ḥajjāj and the rebels. ² In this case, however, he deceived himself, for al-Ḥajjāj refused his offer to mediate and denounced his

---

1. Ansāb, XI, 282.

2. The Ansāb, XI, pp. 281–286, is the chief source for these events, and has been followed by Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, IV, 159. Tabarī, VI, 210 and Ibn Qutaiba, Maʿārīf, p. 115, treat the situation very summarily.
unwillingness to commit himself.

How al-Ḥajjāj was able to overcome these difficulties and restore his position is very inadequately explained by the sources. It is clear that he did have some local support: 'Uthmān b. Qaṭān al-Ḥārithī urged him to fight the rebels, and it would seem that certain sections of Qais, too, took his side.1 The al-Ḫabiṭāt of Tamīn, who were in conflict with other members of their tribe, came over to his side under the leadership of 'Abbād b. al-Ḥuṣain al-Ḫabaṭī. Later, Azd found it prudent to offer their support for they feared for their own position at the hands of Rabī‘a if al-Ḥajjāj were expelled.2 Qutaiba b. Muslim al-Bāhilī, the head of the clan of A‘ṣur of Qais, remained loyal because al-Ḥajjāj was from Thaqīf, another clan of Qais, and both nourished hostility against ‘Abd al-Qais of Rabī‘a.3 In the battle which took place between the two factions, Ibn al-Jārūd was killed by an arrow, whereupon the troops which had been supporting him dispersed, giving the victory to al-Ḥajjāj. This took place in

1. Kāmil, IV, 150.
3. Ibid., XI, 287.
the year 76/695, and was the first of the crises which al-Hajjāj had to surmount.¹

The Revolt of Ibn al-Ash‘ath

The ‘Irāqīs submitted to the vigorous control exercised over them by al-Hajjāj until 82/701, when a revolt of unprecedented size again broke out. It was led by ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ash‘ath, who, according to Abū Mikhnaf, had been governor of Sīstān. While there, he was ordered by al-Hajjāj to launch a campaign against Rutbīl, the ruler of Zabulistan to the east, in retaliation for a defeat he had previously inflicted on the Arabs.²

Ibn A‘tham reports that Ibn al-Ash‘ath’s predecessor in Sīstān, Umayya b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Khālid b. Asīd, had been ordered by al-Hajjāj to lead a raid on Kābul, however he met with such determined resistance from Rutbīl that he was obliged to sue for peace. Because of this failure al-Hajjāj dismissed him from his governorship of the region, appointing in his place

¹. This is the date found in the sources deriving from the Ansāb al-Ashraf, XI, 282, e.g., Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, IV, 160; however, Khālīfa, Ta‘rīkh, I, 347, places it in 75/694, and he is followed by Ṭabarī, VI,

². Ṭabarī, VI, 327.
fUbayd-allaḥ b. Abī Bakra, who was instructed to launch another attack on Kabul. This was no more successful than the previous one; he sent out 10,000 Kūfans under the leadership of Shuraiḥ b. Hānī al-Ḥārithī, and in the engagement with Rutbīl this army was destroyed and Shuraiḥ himself slain. It was now that Ibn al-Ashʿath was sent to Sīstān, and he was specifically charged to exact vengeance for the losses which Rutbīl had inflicted on the Arabs.\textsuperscript{1}

Ibn Khayyāṭ places the appointment of fUbayd-allaḥ b. Abī Bakra in the year 78/697, and says that it was the latter's son, Abū Bardaʿa, who lead the disastrous campaign against Rutbīl mentioned above.\textsuperscript{2} In the account of Abū Mikhnaf, Ibn al-Ashʿath had first been sent to Kirman to quell the rebellion of its governor, Himyān b. Adī al-Sadūsī; and when fUbaydallāḥ b. Abī Bakra died, he was transferred from here to Sīstān.\textsuperscript{3}

The affairs of the East were always of deep concern to al-Ḥajjāj; and after the defeat of Shuraiḥ's Kūfans, he immediately collected a new army of 40,000 men from Kūfa and Baṣra, upon the equipping of which

\textsuperscript{1} Kūfī, II, ff.126-128.
\textsuperscript{2} Khalīfa, I, 356.
\textsuperscript{3} Tabarī, VI, 329.
he spent so much money that it was known as the Army of Peacock (Jaish al-tawāwīs). To the leadership of this army he appointed Ibn al-Ash'ath who, despite the account of Abū Mikhnaf mentioned above, seems to have been in Ḥiraq at this time. The army moved into Sīstān, but apparently it did not show the energy in attacking Rutbīl which al-Hajjāj had wished and expected, and his reaction was characteristically direct and blunt. In a letter to Ibn al-Ash'ath, who had been writing to him about the need for patience and circumspection in such a dangerous enterprise, he said: "Your letter is that of a sluggard, anxious for his peace and ease. Get on with the task you were charged with and invade the enemies' lands! Otherwise, your brother Ishāq b. Muḥammad will replace you as governor".

Abū Mikhnaf presents this as the immediate cause of the revolt of Ibn al-Ash'ath, but it is clear that there were deep underlying forces in Ḥiraq itself which brought about the situation, most notably the struggle for supremacy between the two large confederations of Muḍar and Yemen.

1. Tabarī, VI, 327.
2. Ibid., VI, pp. 334-5.
Although the Yemenites could boast of a long history of settled civilization in the south of Arabia and considered themselves superior to the nomadic Muḍar, it was from the latter that the chief posts of government had been filled ever since the emergence of Islam. The Muḍar claimed this privilege because it was from among them that the Prophet had come, and since then it had been accepted that his successors, too, should be from Quraish. The Muḍarite Khālid b. Ṣafwān expresses this sentiment in the words: "The Prophet is from us, the Book is among us, and the Caliph will be from us". There was a saying current: "The Jāhilīya is the Yemen's, Islām belongs to Muḍar". Despite these pretensions in the amšār, the Qaḥtānite tribes were able to challenge the supremacy of Muḍar; and the various governors of ‘Irāq had been of both origins, depending on the policies of Damascus. There, the Caliph was forced to maintain a certain ambivalence in order to hold together the two elements on which his power had to be based, but his governors in ‘Irāq had until this


2. Thus, *ʿAbd al-Malik, al-Walīd and Sulaimān all had the loyalty of Āl-al-Muhallab, of Yemen; this family provided the local leadership against the Khawārij in ‘Irāq. Maʿārif, p. 137; Dīnawarī, p. 286.
time been exclusively from Muḍar and were free to favour their own kinsmen so long as this proved effective in keeping the province peaceful.

The revolt of Ibn al-Ash'ath can be seen as a massive effort on the part of Yemeni's to break this Muḍarite domination in 'Irāq; and, indeed, they formed the majority of the Arabs in the territory. It was not only against al-Ḥajjāj that the revolt was directed, but against Syria and the Caliph himself. Thus, Ibn al-Ash'ath assumed the title Nāṣir al-Mu'minīn, and presented himself as the leader who would save the Qaḥṭanites and restore their ancient Kingdom.¹

The regional feelings involved were epitomized in the position taken by Rabīʿa; led by Bistām b. Maṣqala b. Hubaira al-Shaibānī, it joined Ibn al-Ash'ath out of its long-standing enmity towards the Arabs of Syria in general and towards Muḍar in particular.² And there were, also, those who resented the rule of a man such as al-Ḥajjāj who, compared to Ibn al-Ash'ath, was of mean and inglorious origins and who was seen as

¹ Tanbīḥ, p. 272; Badʾ, VI, 35. Not to be outdone by Muḍar, the Yemenites, too, claimed to have produced many Prophets; although this does not figure in the polemic which occurred at this time. Cf. Iklīl, VIII, pp. 158-160.

² Ṭabarī, VI, 359.
the hireling of the tyrants in Damascus and a reproach against the ancient glories of Kinda.\(^1\) Others, it would appear, resented domination by the men of Thaqīf whom al-Ḥajjāj was placing in positions of power,\(^2\) whereas 'Iraqīs were being conscripted into the armies that were being sent to distant frontier territories and kept there apart from their families.\(^3\) ‘Abd al-Mu‘min b. Shabath b. Rib‘Ī, whose father had formerly opposed al-Mukhtār in Kūfa, is reported to have warned the troops stationed in Sīstān that if they remained loyal to al-Ḥajjāj they would be left there until they died, and they would never see their loved ones again.\(^4\)

The pious people ('ūbbād, zuhād and qurrah' are the terms used), also, were alienated from al-Ḥajjāj by the violence of his nature, and their support was

1. Aghānī, VI, 46, where A’shā Hamdān compares the qualities of al-Ḥajjāj and Ibn al-Ash‘ath.

2. When Qutaiba b. Muslim asked Bištām b. Masqala to help al-Ḥajjāj in this struggle against the rebels, he received the answer, "I would rather die with the 'Iraqīs than live with the Syrians". Ṭabarī, VI, 359.

3. Mubarrad, II, 430. The term for such conscription was tajmīr.

lent to Ibn al-Ash‘ath,¹ one report stating that the latter’s army contained eight thousand such men who believed they were actually participating in a *jihād!*² They occupied the foremost ranks of the army in the battle, angered that the Sunna had been murdered, the law had been desecrated, and the lives of the people taken wholesale.

Personal animosity between Ibn al-Ash‘ath and al-Ḥajjāj is, also, said to have brought about the revolution. Dīnawarī reports that al-Ḥajjāj used the words: "I have never seen Ibn al-Ash‘ath without wanting to kill him";³ and Ibn Qutaiba states that the only reason Ibn al-Ash‘ath was placed in command of the army of Sīstān was to test his loyalty.⁴ To Ibn Ash‘ath, also, is attributed a similar aversion and vindictiveness; apparently he felt that the governorship of “Iraq should have been his.⁵

1. Tabarī, VI, 343; Murūj, III, 152.
2. Kūfī, II, f.142; the support given by the pietists is, also, alluded to in Murūj, III, 152, and Bad‘, VI, 35.
4. As against this statement by Ibn Qutaiba, Ibn A‘tham relates that al-Ḥajjāj actually had great confidence in Ibn al-Ash‘ath, and when even the latter’s brothers warned him that he was disloyal, he refused to believe them. Kūfī, II, f.128.
Abū Mikhnaf numbers the army of Ibn Ash'ath's supporters at over one hundred thousand,¹ and other fictions of the type common to such events are, also, dragged in: Ibn al-Ash'ath forged a letter purported to be from al-Ḥajjāj to himself, in which he was instructed to kill all the leaders of the army. He showed this letter to the generals in question, and as a consequence they, too, became the enemies of al-Ḥajjāj.² With his army Ibn al-Ash'ath marched towards Ḥiraq.

‘Abd al-Malik was now confronted with a dangerous problem, nothing less than the mass defection of the army on which his power rested in the East. So distracted was he that al-Isfahānī says he even forgot to appoint an amīr al-ḥaj for that year,³ while Ibn A'ṭham had him suffering from nightmares which left him sleepless.⁴

He sent emissaries to negotiate with the rebels, and showed himself prepared to sacrifice al-Ḥajjāj if this could bring about peace in the region. Furthermore he engaged to withdraw all the Syrian troops and promised

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 347.
2. Kūfī, II, f.129.
3. Aghānī, III, 104.
that never again would a Syrian be appointed governor. His attempts at conciliation were rejected and the war continued.¹

To oppose the rebels, large numbers of troops were collected from Syria and al-Jazīra — amounting to seventy thousand we are told by Ibn A‘tham — and after eighty encounters more or less preliminary in nature, the final and decisive battle was fought at Dair al-Jamājim in 82/701.² Ibn al-Ash‘ath was defeated, mainly because he was deserted by his Baṣra contingents who, once they had arrived in their city, went off to join their wives and children and refused to remain with the army. Ibn ‘Awān, an eyewitness, relates that he saw Ibn al-Ash‘ath in Baṣra threatening those who had defected.³ The second, and probably the most important, reason for his defeat was the superiority in numbers of the Syrian army, but since all the figures supplied in the sources are doubtful, this must remain an assumption.

In consequence of this abortive revolt, the Umayyad military grip on ‘Irāq was strengthened. In

2. Kūfī, II, 6141.
the year 83/702, al-Ḥajjāj built Wāsit as a garrison city for his Syrian troops, \(^1\) where they would be kept separate from local influences. No one was allowed to enter it without his permission. \(^2\)

\[\text{Yemenite control of 'Irāq after the death of al-Ḥajjāj}\]

With the death of al-Ḥajjāj in 95/713, the domination of Qais through the branch of Thaqīf came to an end. It had lasted for twenty years, supported by both 'Abd al-Malik (66/685 – 86/705) and his son al-Walīd (86/705 – 96/714). However, when Sulaiman b. 'Abd al-Malik (96/714 – 99/717) came to the throne, circumstances in 'Irāq changed completely; he had achieved power with the assistance of the Yemenīs and now he had to reward them for their support. He himself, like his brother al-Walīd, had a Qaisite mother, \(^3\) and presumably would have shared the same feeling of preference towards them; however, when it became apparent that al-Walīd was seeking, with the consent of the

\[\begin{align*}
1. & \text{Ṭabarī, VII, pp. 36-37; Kāmil, IV, pp. 205-205.} \\
2. & \text{Aghānī, VIII, 75.} \\
3. & \text{Naḡā'īd, I, 384; Kāmil, V, 15. Sulaiman's mother was from 'Abs.}
\end{align*}\]
Qaisites to have his own son 'Abd al-‘Azīz designated to succeed himself and thereby deprive Sulaimān from the throne, the latter was forced to look elsewhere for support. Al-Ḥajjāj, apparently, favoured al-Walīd in these arrangements. He was trying to make in regard to the succession, and consequently was regarded by Sulaimān as an adversary. The story goes that al-Ḥajjāj was fearful for his own safety should Sulaimān ever attain the Caliphate, and that he prayed that he might die before such a day came.

Al-Ḥajjāj's successor was Yazīd b. Abī Muslim, but in 96/714, shortly after Sulaimān came to the throne, he was replaced by the Yemenite Yazīd b. al-Muhallab.¹ Now the men of al-Muhallab, who were the foremost family of Azd, supplanted Thaqīf in the administration of 'Irāq. A close friendship is said to have existed between Sulaimān and Yazīd b. al-Muhallab,² and the latter, too, is presented as being hostile to al-Ḥajjāj due to certain acts of injustice he had suffered at his hands.³

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 497.
2. Ya‘qūbī, III, 33; Jahshiyārī, p. 49.
3. Jahshiyārī, p. 50; Apparently each gave preference to the other in seating arrangements!
4. Ṭabarī, VI, 448; Kāmil, IV, 207.
But the fact is that there was no more respected family of Yemeni descent in 'Iraq than that of al-Muhallab, and as Sulaiman had committed himself to these tribes in his struggle for the throne, it was natural that it was to them he would turn once he had achieved power. His selection was, also, welcomed by the people of the province, for Yazid b. al-Muhallab was regarded as a man who took their interests to heart. For example, when Sulaiman designated his powers as governor as being both financial and military - i.e. he was to collect the Kharaj as well as maintain the peace - he refused to accept the first of these duties. He argued that al-Ḥajjāj had made such exactions on the people that they could not continue to pay at the rate he used to demand; to force them to do so would be to excite their hatred and discontent.¹

Yazid appointed Sufyān b. 'Abdallāh al-Kindi governor of Baṣra; Ḥarmala b. 'Umair al-Laithi of Kūfa, to be replaced later by Bashir b. Ḥassān al-Nahdī; and al-Jarrāh b. 'Abdallāh al-Ḥakamī (from Sa'd al-‘Ashīra) of Wāsīṭ.² Despite the affection he seems to

1. Tabarî, VI, 523; Jahshiyārî, p. 49.
2. These appointments are mentioned in Tabarî, VI, pp. 522, 529; for al-Jarrāh's connection with Sa'd al-‘Ashīra, Cf. Ishtiqāq, p. 405.
have had for ‘Irāq and its people, Yazīd himself felt more at home in Khurāsān, where he had spent many years of his life; and in 98/716 Sulaiman appointed him governor of this region, as well as ‘Irāq.¹

The influence of the Muhallabites lasted only as long as Sulaimān held the Caliphate; when he was succeeded in 99/717 by ‘Omar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, their fortunes went into a gradual decline. The usual stories of personal enmity between the new Caliph and Yazīd are to be found in the sources; among others that Yazīd had previously written in a letter to Sulaimān about the vast sums of money he had collected in Khurāsān. ‘Omar got possession of this letter and demanded that this wealth be sent to the treasury; Yazīd protested that he was merely boasting and did not really have money in such amounts. ‘Omar refused to believe this, and had Yazīd recalled to Damascus where he was thrown into prison.²

Yazīd contrived to escape from prison, either towards the end of ‘Omar’s life, according to Abū Mikhnaf,³ or after his death in 101/719, according to al-Wāqīdī.⁴ The former account is supported by al-Azdī

1. Jahshiyārī, p. 49.
2. Tabarī, VI, 557; cf. also, Kūfī, II, f.188.
3. Tabarī, VI, 564; Murūj, III, 210.
4. Tabarī, VI, 565; Bad’i, IV, 47.
who relates that Yazīd wrote a letter to the Caliph after his escape in which he explains that he would not have fled his captivity if he could have been certain that ʿOmar would survive his illness. However, he was greatly afraid of what would happen to himself when Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik succeeded to the Caliphate.

The hostility between Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik and Yazīd b. al-Muhallab went back to the time when the Caliph Sulaimān appointed Ibn al-Muhallab to punish the Banū ʿUqail of Thaqīf, the family of al-Hajjāj, to whom Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik was related by marriage. The latter pleaded for mercy to be shown to the Banū ʿUqail, but Ibn al-Muhallab refused to listen to intercession. And so Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik swore vengeance on Ibn al-Muhallab should the opportunity ever present itself. Such is the story supplied to account for the events which were to take place in ʿIrāq. 2

Yazīd Ibn al-Muhallab went to Baṣra where his own tribe of Azd and their ally Rabīʿa held the dominant position; and among these tribes no family was more

1. Azdī, II, 3.
2. Khalīfa, II, 3; Ṭabarī, VI, 564.
prominent than that of al-Muhallab. Al-Hamdānī mentions it among the four illustrious families of Basra, to which Kūfa could show nothing similar, while the poet Ḥammād ʿAjrad writes:

Marwān is the family of Syria, without a rival, 
And al-Muhallab is the family of the ʿirāqīs. Yazīd himself used to vaunt the fact that he was of Azd and Rabīʿa were their allies.

In 102/719, Yazīd b. al-Muhallab revolted in ʿIrāq seizing Basra and placing its Qaisite governor ʿAdī b. Arṭāt al-Fazarī under arrest. In response to the oath of allegiance (bayʿa) given to him by the tribes, he promised that he would rule by the Qurʾān and Sunna of the Prophet, and would strive to free the land from occupation by the troops of the enemy (i.e. the Syrians), and from the government of evil men such as al-Ḥajjāj. There was, also, an economic motive behind his revolt, as becomes clear from the address he made to the people after capturing Wāsiṭ: "Our country is a nourishing morsel for the Syrian mouth; the only way we can recover it is by violence against

1. Faqīh, p. 190.
2. Wākī, II, 169.
3. ʿUyūn, I, 291.
5. Taabarī, VI, 592.
them". Ever since the time of 'Ali b. Abi Ṭalib, it had been the wish of the 'Irāqīs to escape the economic exploitation of Syria, and the support received now by Yazīd was but another manifestation of this. And there was the ever-present wish of the Yemenīs to exclude Qaisite influence from a region which they had been defending from such menaces as the Khawārij.

The response to Yazīd's revolt in Baṣra was mixed: not all the branches of Rabī‘a supported him, despite the traditional alliance of this tribe with Azd. During the revolt, they did not as a whole rally to his side, and certain sections refused to play any part until they had received presents and bribes in excess of what the Umayyad governor of Baṣra, ‘Adī b. Artāt al-Fazārī, had given them. Sections of Azd, also, withheld their support: a group led by al-Mughīra b. Ziyād b. ‘Amr al-‘Atakī had a long-standing feud with the family of al-Muhallab, but in addition al-Mughīra had recently been appointed by the governor as a head of the Khums of Azd and was virtually an Umayyad employee. Like

2. Ansāb, V, 426. Mention is made of a certain Azdite who even went so far as to address Yazīd as Amīr al-Mu‘minīn. Cf. Hamāsa, I, 179.
3. Tabaḥrī, VI, 581; Aghānī, XIV, 280, where Thābit Qutna of Azd satirized Rabī‘a in verse.
his father before him, he seems to have been motivated more by self-interest than by tribal or political loyalty.

Most of Tamīm and Qais, joined together under the leadership of Muḥriz b. Ḥumrān al-Saʿdī from the Minqar branch of the former tribe, were against Yazīd; while the Banū Mujāshi referred to him as an enemy because he had killed al-Khiyar b. Sabra al-Mujāshi, the governor of `Umrān. A section of Bakr, under ‘Imrān b. ‘Āmir b. Misma’ came over to Yazīd for the selfish reason that one of his cousins had been appointed to the leadership of the tribe by Ḍā‘ī b. Arṣāt instead of himself. The section of Bakr which opposed Yazīd was presumably less numerous than ‘Imrān’s faction, in as much as the sources fail to mention its composition and leadership.

Yazīd was also opposed by ‘Abd al-Qais, led at this time by Mālik b. al-Mundhir b. al-Jārūd, and it was joined in this opposition by Ahl al-‘Alīya (including Quraish, Kināna, Bajāla, Khath‘am and the whole of Qais ‘Aylān) under the leadership of ‘Abd al-A‘lā b. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Āmir al-Quraishī. These alliances

1. Tabarlī, VI, 579.
3. Tabarlī, VI, 580.
for and against Yazīd b. al-Muhallab were for the most part prompted by the personal jealousies and rivalries of the leaders, and opposition to him should not be taken to indicate any sympathy for the Syrians.

In Kūfa the support for Ibn al-Muhallab was, by contrast, whole-hearted and total, the revolt affording the people of the city to renew their open hostility to the Syrians. The severe repressive measures taken against the Kūfans, by successive Umayyad governors, and their exclusion from the administration of what they regarded as their own province, kept alive the feelings of hatred and the desire for revenge. All quarters of the city rallied to the support of the rebel cause: the quarter of Ahl al-Medīna, led by 'Abdallah b. Sufyān al-Azdi; the quarter of Madhhij, led by al-Nu‘mān b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Ashtar al-Nakha‘ī; the quarter of Rabī‘a, led by Muḥammad b. Ishaq b. Muḥammad b. al-Ash‘ath; and the quarter of Tamīm and Hamdān, led by Hanzala b. ‘Attāb b. Warqā’ al-Tamīmī. All these tribal leaders were the descendants of men who in their day, too, had resisted the Umayyad occupation of ‘Irāq.

The personal animosity between Yazīd b. al-Muhallab and the Caliph Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik did not

1. Ansāb, V, pp. 240-241; Bad‘, VI, 5.
go unnoticed in the province. The pious al-Ḥasan al-
Basrī warned the people of Baṣra who were supporting
the rebel about becoming involved in a struggle which
did not really concern them: "Only yesterday, Ibn al-
Muhallab was himself killing the people of Ḥiraq in
order to please the Banū Marwān".\(^1\) This should be
borne in mind when we find Yazīd claiming that he was
fighting for the purity of the religion, and that in
this respect jihād against the Syrians would have greater
reward in the hereafter than war with the Daylamites
and the Turks.\(^2\)

Baṣra fell to Yazīd after a brief attempt at
resistance; Kūfa welcomed him wholeheartedly and was
followed in this by Wāsiṭ. He sent governors out to
take over the administration of Ahwāz, Fārs and
Kirmān.\(^3\) He, also, wished to send his brother Mudrik
to Khurāsān in the same capacity, but the Tamīm of
that province prevented this, and it is said that they
were encouraged in their resistance by the governor,
‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Nu‘aim al-Azdī, who did not want to
lose his own position.\(^4\)

---

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 581; Azdī, II, 9.
3. Ṭabarī, VI, 585.
4. Azdī, II, 8. Certain of the Azd in the province
favoured the arrival of Mudrik, but they were afraid
that his presence would stir up trouble with the
local Tamīm, so they urged him to return and wait
until his brother held undisputed control of Ḥiraq.
Despite the importance of this revolt and its implications for Umayyad influence in the province, the information given in the sources is scant and lacking in clarity. It is reasonable to assume that it was the unstable character of most Arab tribal alliances that accounts for Yazid's failure; given the reluctance which Basra showed towards his appeal, it must be recognized that he did not lead a united province. The large army sent from Syria under the command of Maslama b. *Abd al-Malik, on the other hand, was a united force. Moreover, the half-heartedness of many of Yazid's supporters made them receptive to the promises and cajolements of the Umayyad leaders.¹

After the victory of the Syrians at the battle of al-'Aqr (102/720), *Iraq was again brought under strict Umayyad control, and the rebellious Yemeni tribes in the province - and in particular Azd - were severely punished. The Muhallabite family was singled out for persecution; those of them who fled were pursued

1. Murūj, III, 210; Aghānī, XIV, 278; Shi'r, II, 613. All three quote the verses of Thabit Qu'na in explanation of Yazid's failure:

كلّ القبائل بابعوك على الذّي تدعو إليه، وتابعوك وصاروا حتّى إذا حفي الوعي وجعلتهُم نصبّ الاستّة، أسلموك وطراوا، إنّ بقتلك فانّ تتكلك لم يكن عارا عليك وبعض فقل عمار.
and brought to Damascus to receive their deserts.

These acts of repression further embittered the "Irāqīs against the Syrians. The saying ran: The Banū Ḥarb sacrificed the religion on the Day of Karbala' when they killed al-Ḥusain b. ʿAlī; and the Banū Marwān sacrificed decency (murū'a) on the Day of al-ʿAqr, when Yazīd b. al-Muhallab was slain.

The Second Period of Qaisīte Control in "Iraq

The retaliatory measures taken by the Umayyads once they had re-established themselves in "Iraq were not confined to Yemenī tribes. Those of Muḍar, also, suffered their reprisals, and in particular Tamīm, despite the fact that certain groups of the latter had been very reluctant in support they gave to the rebellion, and had even defected on the day of battle.¹

Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik was appointed governor of "Iraq, but was deposed in less than a year because he was not forwarding the revenues of the province to Damascus.² He was succeeded by ʿOmar b. Hubaira al-Fazārī (103/721 - 105/723), a fanatical Qaisite who so

1. Tabarī, VIII, pp. 156-160.
persecuted the Yemenis, and in particular the Azdites, that even Mudar were moved to protest.\(^1\) What the region needed was a spirit of conciliation, and his measures were only exacerbating latent grievances.

The death of the Caliph Yazid b. 'Abd al-Malik in 105/723, and the accession of Hisham b. 'Abd al-Malik (105/723 - 125/742) brought an end to Qaisite domination in 'Iraq, and efforts were made to placate Yemeni sentiment. 'Omar b. Hubaira was replaced as a governor by the Yemenite Khālid b. 'Abdallāh al-Qasrī (105/723 - 120/737).\(^2\) It was Hisham's purpose to restore the economic stability of the Empire, and this clearly could not be done if the provinces were seething with discontent and resentment.

Khālid did not allow his Yemenite origin to influence his treatment of the other tribes, either because of Hisham's policy of conciliation or because his own particular tribe was not strong enough in 'Iraq

\(^1\) The verses of al-Farazdaq (Shi'r, I, 24; Jumahī, p. 289; Aghānī, XIX, 17; etc.) describe him satirically:

\[
\text{ крайам لبس باللّبع الخريص}\\
\text{أولىّت العراق ورافدة}\\
\text{لم يك تبلها رعي مضراع}\\
\text{وعلّم ألهه أكل الخديس}
\]

\(^2\) Ṭabarī, VII, 26; Azdī, II, 25.
to allow him to challenge others. In fact, most of the people in the region were now anxious for a period of peace in order to allow them to recover economically from the long and continuous state of war in which they had been embroiled. Kūfa no longer had either the will or the strength to rebel, and its people now turned to political means in their opposition to the Umayyad, in the meanwhile restoring the agriculture of the region. By this time the early signs of the movement which was to lead to ‘Abbāsid revolution were being noticed in ‘Irāq, and it was probably felt that the region would soon be able to challenge the Umayyads as part of an empire-wide alliance rather than by itself.

Disagreements with Hishām over the financial operations in the province finally brought about Khālid’s dismissal from office, and he was replaced by a Qaisite fanatic, Yūsuf b. ‘Omar (120/737 – 126/743), who was to preside over the last insurrection to take place in ‘Irāq under the Umayyads. In 122/739, Zaid b. ‘Alī, in Kūfa, led what was in effect a coalition of all the tribes in

2. Ṭabarī, VII, 143; Jahshiyārī, p. 49.
3. Akhbār, f.334.
4. Ṭabarī, VIII, pp. 250, 255.
'Iraq against their Syrian masters, and its failure – due to the instability of many alliances amongst the tribal Arab, and to the superior military strength of the Umayyads – marked the last attempt by the province to win its independence.¹

¹ The revolution of Zaid b. ‘Alî has already been studied in detail in my The Revolution of Zaid b. ‘Alî (Najaf, 1966), and will not, therefore, be gone into here. It should be noted, however, that his effort gained no support from the factions that were supporting the ‘Abbâsid cause, even though both were anti-Umayyad in purpose.
CHAPTER V

ARAB TRIBES IN KHURĀSĀN

The beginning of the conquest

The battle of Nihāwand in the year 21/641 put an end to Sasanid domination in ‘Iraq and opened the way for the Muslim armies to sweep eastwards. 1 Khalīfa b. Khayyāt relates that most of the soldiers who took part in this battle were Kūfans. 2 Beginning in the period of the governorship of al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba in Baṣra (15/636–17/638), Persia had been entered through al-Ahwāz on various occasions, the most important of which was the campaign ordered by the Caliph ‘Omar in the year 17/638, when Abū Mūsa al-Ash‘arī was governor. 3 As a result of this invasion, al-Ahwāz, Jundīshāpūr, and Sūs in Khuzistān were overrun, and an advance was made on Tustar. 4 The sources do not specify the tribal composition of this army, Ṭabarī mentioning only Kūfans

1. Khalīfa, V, 143; Ṭabarī, IV, 115. According to Saif b. ‘Omar the battle of Nihāwand took place in the year 18/639.
and Başrans, while Ibn Khayyāt mentions contingents sent by ‘Omar from Medīna.

There was no attempt made at this time to occupy these districts; the Arabs had to keep their armies intact for further penetrations into Sasanid territory. The usual practice, therefore, was to conclude a peace treaty with the natives and leave only a token garrison behind to signify their subjection. When resistance was shown, or when a rebellion broke out, it was repressed severely, as in the case of Rāmhurmuz in 29/649. The sources give no indication of the number of troops which took part in such expeditions. Saif b. ‘Omar records that thirty thousand men took part in the battle at Nihāwand, but, like the other chroniclers, he does not identify the tribes to which they belonged. In 21/641, the Caliph ‘Omar is said to have issued instructions that the tribes of Başra should be responsible for the conquest of Fārs, Kirmān and Iṣbahān, while the Kūfans were assigned to Adharbaijān, Rayy and Iṣbahān(†), and this would appear to be the

1. Ṭabarī, IV, 84.
2. Khalīfa, I, 139.
4. Ṭabarī, IV, 136.
5. Ṭabarī, IV, 137. According to Saif b. ‘Omar this order was given in the year 18/639. Iṣbahān was, in fact, conquered by the Kūfans and the Başrans came later as reinforcements. Ṭabarī, IV, 161.
first attempt to designate conquered territories to specific tribal groupings.

‘Uthmān b. Abī al-‘Āṣ al-Thaqafi, the governor of Bahriyn, occupied the island of Abarkāwān off the coast of Fārs, from where he proceeded against and captured Tawwaj. His forces contained men from ‘Abd al-Qais, Azd, Tamīm and Banū Najīya, and some of these he settled in this region.¹ Tawwaj was used as a base for his further operations, and it was from here that he set out against Shāpūr and Shīrāz in 23/643, after which subjection, he ultimately took Iṣṭakhr.² It would also seem that he got control of Dārābjird, although Saif b. ‘Omar credits Sāriya b. Zunaim al-Duʿalī with reducing this city in 23/643, adding that Fārs, too, was among his conquests.³ In any case, all of Fārs come under Arab domination during the Caliphate of ‘Omar.

After the battle of Nihāwand in 20/640, the province of Jībāl fell to the Arabs.⁴ In 22/642, Hamadān was occupied by a force under the leadership of Nuʿaim b. Muqarran, according to Saif b. ‘Omar;⁵

2. Futūḥ, p. 380; Ţabarī, IV, 177.
3. Ţabarī, IV, 178.
5. Ţabarī, IV, 147.
however, Baladhurī put the event in 23/643, and mentions Jarīr b. 'Abdallāh al-Bajalī as the leader who was sent on this mission by the governor of Kūfa, al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba.¹ Ya‘qūbī put it in the same year as Saif, but ascribes the leadership to 'Abdallāh b. Budail al-Khuza‘ī.² The southern parts of the Jibāl district fell to the Arabs with the taking of Dīnawar, Māsbadhān, Mihrajānjadhaq and Saimara by Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī.³ In the Mu‘jam, Yaqūt speaks of Nihāwand as being a conquest of the Kūfans, and Dīnawar one of the Basrān victories.⁴ Isfahānī speaks of the tribe of Madhḥij as being settled in parts of this area, having come here with 'Amr b. Ma‘d Yakrib; they located themselves in Rūdha, a rustaq in Rayy.⁵

Qum was taken by Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī from his base in al-Ahwāz some time after the victory of Nihāwand, and on his orders Ahnaf b. Qais subjugated Qāshān;⁶ both of these places were in the east of the Jibāl district.⁷

1. Futūh, p. 306.
2. Ya‘qūbī, II, 134.
3. Futūh, p. 304.
5. Aghanī, XV, 224.
6. Futūh, p. 308.
7. Lestrange, pp. 243-244.
About this time Tamīm appears to have entered these regions and made settlements there, ultimately coming to regard them as their own special territories.

On the conquest of ʿIsbahān, the last of the great cities of Jībāl, the historians are in disagreement. Some state that the Kūfans, led by ʿAbdallāh b. Budail al-Khuzāʿī, took it,1 while others give the credit to the Baṣrans, under the leadership of Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī.2 There is an attempt at harmonizing these two accounts by having ʿAbdallāh b. Budail sent against ʿIsbahān by the Caliph ʿOmar in 23/643, but being joined by Abū Mūsā and Aḥnaf b. Qais while still on his way there.3 Rayy and Dailam were Kūfans conquests, but there is dispute about the leadership of the victorious army; Saʿīf b. ʿOmar names the general as Zaid al-Khail; al-Wāqīḍī as Qarāţa b. Kaʿb.4 One account mentions Kathīr b. Shihāb al-Ḥarithī as the conqueror of Dailam.5 All these places in Jībāl and the rest of Persia at this time were secured by the type of peace-treaty already

---

1. Ṭabarī, IV, 139.
3. Futūḥ, p. 310.
5. Futūḥ, p. 314.
mentioned, and in many of these districts, rebellions broke out requiring repression. ¹

There is no clarity in the various accounts of the conquest of Adharbaijān. Ṭabarī relates that it was taken by Bukair b. 'Abdallāh after the fall of Rayy, and that in his wake came Simāk b. Kharasha al-Anšārī and 'Utba b. Farqad as reinforcements. The two latter were said to have brought back to Kūfa immense wealth in booty.² According to Balādhorī Adharbaijān was conquered after Nihāwand by Ḫudhaifa b. al-Yammān, approaching here by way of Ardabīl.³ Madā'īnī relates that, after Nihāwand, the Kūfans, led by Ḫudhaifa raided here, and that this took place in 22/642.⁴ After the region had been garrisoned, the natives began to show resistance, and this obliged al-Walīd b. 'Uqba, the governor of Kūfa (26/646-30/650) to send reinforcements to its military governor, al-Ash'ath b. Qais. More important, the men he sent were instructed to settle here and to encourage the natives to accept Islām. As to what tribes these settlers belonged the sources

¹ Futūh, pp. 304, 306.
³ Futūh, p. 321.
⁴ Futūh, pp. 322-323; Ṭabarī, IV, 155; Kāmil, III, 34.
give no information, other than that they came from Kūfa. It was, apparently, a congenial region for settlement, for we hear of others migrating here, not only from Kūfa and Baṣra, but also from Syria. Some of these bought land from the owners; and to others the owners actually surrendered their lands and became tenant farmers, on the condition that the Arabs would protect it for them.¹

Jurjān was said to be in the hands of the Arabs as early as 22/642, with certain men of Kūfa under the leadership of Suwaid b. Muqarran as the occupying force; but another account — by Madā‘īnī — places its conquest in the year 30/650 without referring to the commander.² Al-Balādhurī credits the capture of Ṭabaristān to Sa‘id b. al-‘As, saying that he held a force of Kūfans here in 29/649;³ against this comes the statement from an unknown source found in Ṭabarī, placing the event in 22/642.⁴

The contradiction in these various accounts, probably arises from the fact that after the first Arab

¹ Futūh, pp. 324-325; Faqīh, p. 284.
² Ṭabarī, IV, 152.
³ Futūh, p. 330.
⁴ Ṭabarī, IV, 153.
penetration, revolts took place among the natives which required that further expeditions be sent in order to reclaim the territories. It is difficult to accept Ibn al-Athīr's statement that there was no invasion of Ṭabaristān before Sa‘īd b. al-‘Ās.¹

Kirmān, according to Saif b. ʿOmar, was taken by an army from Kūfa, led by Suḥail b. ʿAbdī and Ṭābdallāh b. ʿItbān, from which Madāʾinī dissents, saying that it was led by ʿAbdallāh b. Budail al-Khuzaʿī.² In 23/643, Makrān was subjugated by al-Ḥakam b. ʿAmr ʿAlṭaghlibī, and Sīstān by ʿĀṣim b. ʿAmr;³ although Baladhurī places these two conquests in 30/650, mentioning that ʿAbdallāh b. ʿĀmir, the governor of Baṣra, sent al-Rabl b. Ziyād al-Ḥarīthī there from Kirmān, and that the latter eventually siezed Zaranj the capital of Sīstān.⁴ Another version of the event holds that towards the end of the reign ¹

1. Kāmil, III, 45.
2. Tabarī, IV, 180. It is important to note the names of these leaders, for the troops they led were certainly of their own tribes, and this allows certain inferences about their distribution in the conquered lands.
3. Tabarī, IV, 182.
of the Caliph 'Uthmān b. 'Affān, Umar b. Ahmar al-Yashkurī was appointed governor of this region and came here at the head of his tribe. 'Alī, too, seems to have appointed a governor, but he was murdered by certain sections of Tamīm, referred to as Ḥabībāt and Yarbū', who were partisans of the 'Uthmān faction. In 36/656, 'Alī sent an army here under the command of Rib'ī b. al-Kās and al-Ḥuṣain b. Abī al-Ḥur, both of whom were from the Banū al-‘Anbar of Tamīm, and they put down this insurrection.¹

The most important of all the provinces in the East was Khurāsān, which was to become the chief region for tribal occupation and the base from which they would launch their attacks further eastward. It was first invaded in 18/639 by troops under the leadership of Aḥnaf b. Qais, entering the region from Ṭabasain. After taking Herāt, one of its chief cities, and placing there a garrison under the command of Ṣuḥār al-‘Abdī, he advanced on Marw al-Shāhjān.² When this, too, fell to him, he took up residence there, and sent al-Ḥarīth b. Ḥassan to secure the western territories

1. Futūḥ, p. 387; Kāmil, III, pp. 113-114.
Reinforcements were sent to Aḥnaf from Kūfa, and these he organized into four groups under individual leaders: Ṭalqama b. al-Nadr al-Nadrī, Ribʿī b. Ṭāmir al-Tamīmī, Aḥdallāh b. Abl Ṭāqil and Ibn Umm Ghazāla al-Hamdānī. These leaders provide a clue to the tribes that came into this area from Kūfa, and it was due to such men and their followers that Marw al-Rūḍh and Balkh received a Kūfan orientation. Eventually the whole of Khurāsān, from Ṭukhāristān in the East to Nīshāpūr in the West, was conquered, and it would seem that this occurred during the Caliphate of Ṣadīq. In as much as these operations were carried out by military forces, it can be inferred that there was still no thought of permanent settlement or of annexation of new territories, and each new conquest was a consequence of the impetus of victory which drove the Arab armies ever onward after Nihāwānd.

In al-Yaʿ[qūbī we read that Aḥdallāh b. Ṭāmir, the governor of Baṣra, advanced into Khurāsān, and after

1. Ṭabarī, IV, 167.
2. Ibid., IV, 168.
putting down all local resistance, divided the region into quarters (arbāʿ) over each of which he designated a leader. These four were: Qais b. al-Haitham al-Sulamī, Rāshid b. Ḥārām al-Judaidī, ‘Imrān b. al-Fuḍail al-Burjumī and ‘Amr b. Mālik al-Khuza‘ī.\footnote{1} If one were to accept this as true, it would mean that settlement of a sort did occur as early as the time of ‘Uthmān’s Caliphate; but al-Balādhurī states quite clearly that the first Arab settlement in Khurāsān (specifically, Marw) was made in the time of Umair b. Aḥmar who was appointed to command of the region by Ziyād b. Abī Ḥi the governor of Baṣra between 45/665 and 50/670.\footnote{2} If the latter is to be accepted, the earliest settlement would have been made by Baṣrans; but the arbāʿ-style of administrative division was peculiarly Kūfī; it is probably safest to assume that elements from both cities participated in the settlement. Yaʿqūbī identifies the four administrative regions as Nīshāpūr, Herāt, Marw and Marw al-Rūdān.\footnote{3}

1. Yaʿqūbī, II, 117.
2. Futūḥ, p. 400.
3. According to Ṭabarī, V, 224, Ziyād b. Abī Ḥi divided Khurāsān into four regions, each under a governor: Marw, Abrashahr (i.e. Nīshāpūr), Marw al-Rūdāh (including Fāryāb and Ṭālīqān) and Herāt (including Bādghīs, Qādis and Bushanj).
Adharbayjan and Rayy were, from the beginning, Kūfan conquests and they were looked upon as maghāzī, "seats of war", from which booty could be obtained. Abū Mikhnaf speaks of the regions in this vein, and says that in the first district there were six thousand men and in the second, four thousand. In Kūfa a total army of forty thousand went on periodic plundering raids in these two frontier regions (thagrain); and in this way, he suggests, each man was able to take part in the expeditions once every four years.¹

In any case, the western section of what is today Persia would at first have been chiefly under the control of Yemenī tribes, since they formed the majority in Kūfa. But during the period of the governorship of al-Walīd b. ʿUqba (25/645-30/650) in Kūfa, Qais began to dominate the area. Salmān b. Rabīʿa al-Bāhilī is at this time said to have conquered the lands lying between Adharbayjan and Bāb al-Abwāb (Darband) and to have advanced to Balanjar where he met his death.²

After the murder of ʿUthmān, and during the struggle between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya, the situation in the

¹. Tabarī, IV, 246.

². Maʿārif, p.149; Tabarī, IV, 247; Bakrī, I, 276. Salmān, one of the Companions of the Prophet, was appointed qādī of Kūfa by ʿOmar. Isḥiqāq, p. 273.
East becomes obscure. The troops in these regions seem to have withdrawn into strategic places, where they were reinforced from time to time. Thus, we are told, 'Allī sent four thousand warriors to Dailam to lend support to the garrison there, even though he needed them for his own needs in 'Iraq.¹

Qaisite Domination of Khurāsān

Mu‘āwiya, once established in power, showed a close interest in the East, and he added this concern to the responsibilities of the governor of Baṣra, at that time 'Abdallāh b. ‘Āmir. He, in turn, appointed one of his kinsmen, Qais b. al-Haitham al-Qaisī (41/661-43/663), as governor of Khurāsān.² Qais took advantage of this relationship and did not send the taxes he collected to Baṣra,³ so consequently he was replaced by another Qaisite, ‘Abdallāh b. Khāzim al-Sulamī.

Mention has already been made of the division of Khurāsān in 45/665 into four quarters by Ziyād b. Abīhi,

---

1. Futūh, p. 381.
2. Tabarī, V, 172.
and there seems to be evidence that his predecessor, Ibn 'Amir, too, made some such partition. In fact, both may have merely continued a previous Sasanian administrative practice.¹ Early in his governorship, Ziyād appointed as commander of Marw, Umair b. Aḥmar, from the powerful tribe of Bakr, who was to remain in this position until his death in 51/671.² He appointed in the same year (i.e. 45) al-Ḥakam b. 'Amr al-Ghifārī, a Companion of the Prophet, governor of Khurāsān.³ The first signs of the hostility between Muṣar and Rabīʿa in Khurāsān appeared in the time of Anas b. Abī Unās, whom al-Ḥakam himself had appointed to be his successor before he died in 51. Ziyād refused to confirm this appointment, and sent there as governor Khulaid b. 'Abdallāh al-Ḥanafī of Rabīʿa, thereby angering Muṣar to which Anas belonged.⁴

1. Lestrangé, p. 424.
2. Taḥbīr, V, 225.
3. Futūḥ, p. 400.
Arab Migration into Khurāsān

This Khulaid was replaced after a few days by al-Rabī‘ b. Ziyād al-Ḥārithī, who was to play an important rôle in the settlement of the Arabs in Khurāsān. Al-Madāʾinī relates that when Ziyād appointed him to governorship in 51/671, many other people whom he wanted to be rid of were sent there with him along with their families. According to al-Balādhurī, these latter numbered fifty thousand; and another report attributed to al-Madāʾinī has this number divided exactly between Kūfans and Başrans, twenty-five thousand being sent from each city, with al-Rabī‘ b. Ziyād leading the Başrans and ʾAbdallāh b. Abī Ṭaqīl leading the Kūfans. If we accept this statement, Arabs from both cities would have been equally represented in Khurāsān. A modern attempt to establish the composition of the Arab settlers in Khurāsān, however, reaches the conclusion that Kūfans were only one-sixth of the number; this deduction being made from analogy with the akhmās administration system which the author thinks was introduced here from Başra, and which would leave Kūfans as one-sixth of the

1. Ṭabarī, V, 286.
2. Futūḥ, p. 400.
There is, however, no clear evidence that the relationship between Basra and Khurāsān was any different from that of Kūfā; certainly, Ziyād treated both the same, when it came to collecting troops for campaigns.

During his governorship of ‘Irāq, Arab movement into Khurāsān was continuous. In 56/675 Mu‘awiya is said to have appointed Sa‘īd b. ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān to administer the province, and that he received from Ziyād b. Abīhi men and materials collected in Basra. Also, from Basra, were the men who accompanied al-Ḥakam b. ‘Amr al-Ghifārī whom Ziyād himself appointed governor in 45/665. However, neither of these expeditions should be taken as establishing a special relationship between this city and Khurāsān, any more than that of al-Muhallab in 65/684. In fact, at this period the population of both Kūfā and Basra were

---

1. Al-‘Alī, "Istīṭān al-‘Arab fī Khurāsān" Majallat Kuliyyat al-Ādāb, Baghdad, 1958, pp. 75
2. Khalīfa, I, 268; Ṭabarī, V, 305.
3. Ansāb, V, pp. 117-118; Kūfī, I, f.299. There is an obvious confusion here; Ziyād died in 53/672! No doubt it is his son ‘Ubaidallāh who is intended. Yet Balādhurī uses the words – ‘ammi-ka Ziyād in his narration!
5. Futūḥ, p. 421.
largely the same in tribal composition, and little might be revealed of the nature of the settlement of Khurāsān by dwelling upon the city from which the various migrations or campaigns originated. The rivalry between the two, which might affect the province in this respect, did not exist at this time in the bitterness it was later to assume.

The sons of Ziyād b. Abīhi proved the most loyal of the Umayyad agents in the administration of the provinces: *Ubaidallāh as governor of Baṣra (including Khurāsān), 'Abbād in Sistān and 'Abd al-Raḥmān as his local representative in Khurāsān.¹ Thus, duplication of responsibilities between *Ubaidallāh and 'Abd al-Raḥmān should be taken as an indication of how loose the administration of the provinces still was at this time. In 61/680 the Caliph Yazīd b. Muʿawiya appointed another of Ziyād's sons, Salm to replace 'Abd al-Raḥmān in Khurāsān, and he wrote to *Ubaidallāh b. Ziyād, who had become governor of *Irāq after the death of his father in 55/674, to send six thousand warriors with him to the province. In accordance with this order, six thousand (others say two thousand) warriors were chosen from Baṣra [Kūfa is not mentioned], and such notable men as *Imrān b. al-Fuḍail al-Burjumī, al-Muhallab b.

¹. Ṭabarī, V, 317.
Abī Ṣufra, ‘Abdallāh b. Khāzim and others were appointed to accompany them.¹ This is the last detailed information we have on the movement of Arabs from ‘Irāq to Khurāsān until the year 65/684 when large-scale migration resumed again.

Khurāsān after the Death of Yazīd

By the time Khurāsān came under the government of Salm, it was more or less completely submissive to Arab power and, consequently enjoyed the peace and security which would attract colonists from the perpetual troubles of ‘Irāq. However, this increase in migration ultimately meant merely a shift in the locale of these troubles further to the East. For at their base was the insuperable jealousy and suspicion with which the tribal Arab looked on any activity of others of his sort. Yazīd’s death served as a signal for this latent incompatibility to flame into open hostility, and produce in Khurāsān the disorder which had become endemic in ‘Irāq. In fact, Salm seems to have anticipated that the situation he was trying to control would respond, as it had done, to any external

¹. Tabarī, V, pp. 471-472; Kāmil, IV, 42.
influence, and he tried unsuccessfully to suppress the news of Yazīd's death. When he found that he could not do so, he appealed to the people for loyalty to himself; and although this was given for a short while, in the end he found he could no longer govern in security and he left Khurāsān for Syria.¹

His departure, more or less, implied the relaxation of Umayyad control of Khurāsān, and opened the way to ambitious adventurers, prepared to exploit the ḥašabiyya of the tribes. Before he left, Salm wanted to leave control in the hands of al-Muhallab b. Abī Sufrā, a celebrated member of Azd, but Sulaimān b. Marthad of Rabī’ī persuading him that he himself should receive this appointment. Thus, Sulaimān was given control of Marw al-Rūdī, Fāryāb, Tāliqān and Juzjān, while Aws b. Tha’laba was named governor of Herāt.² Salm, of course, must have known that such appointments had no value, and that the control of these regions was going to be taken by whoever could muster the power to seize it. When Salm arrived at Nīshāpūr on his return to Syria, he met ‘Abdallāh b. Khāzīm al-Sulāmī of Qais who criticized him for dividing Khurāsān between Bakr and Yemen, and excluding Qais. Thereupon, Salm appointed

¹ Ṭabarī, V, 545.
² Kamīl, IV, 65.
him governor of Khurāsān, and gave him one hundred thousand dirhams to meet his expenses. Ibn Khāzīm was already strong enough in the province not to require any official appointment from a man such as Salm.

Khurāsān was now opened to the intrigues and hostilities that had bedevilled Arab occupation in every region. Here Qais, Bakr and Tāmīm were prepared to assert their domination, Azd having withdrawn from the contest when al-Muhallab left Marw. Ibn Khāzīm soon put an end to the opposition of Tāmīm in Marw, and was left facing the power of Bakr, represented by Sulaimān b. Marthad, the governor of Marw, and his brother 'Amr b. Marthad, the governor of Tāliqān. He was able to drive them from here to Herāt, where apparently Ibn Khāzīm did not dare to pursue; it may

1. Futūḥ, p. 44; Kāmil, IV, 66. Ibn Aˈtham (I, f.423) claims that Ibn Khāzīm forced Salm to give him half the money he was carrying, and that he held the government of Khurāsān on behalf of 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair, the anti-Caliph in Mecca. Ibn Khayyāt (I, 178) says that Ibn Khāzīm had held power in Khurāsān since 33/653, when he repelled the attacks of the Turks from the province, and that 'Abdallāh b. 'Āmir, the governor of Baṣra, had made him the local ruler; he retained this position until the murder of 'Uthmān.

2. Tabarī, V, 546.
be that the situation he would leave in his rear was so insecure that it required his constant presence.¹

Therefore, the sections of Bakr united in Herāt under the leadership of Aws b. Tha‘labā, with the declared object of driving Muḍar from Khurāsān. Later, when Ibn Khāzīm advanced on Herāt he was supported by Tamīm who felt themselves threatened by Bakr.²

According to al-Ḍabībī, negotiations between Ibn Khāzīm and Bakr, seeking a peaceful solution of their differences, were on the point of a successful conclusion, when the Banū Ṣuḥaib intervened, insisting that Ibn Khāzīm should virtually accept a tolerated position for Muḍar in Khurāsān under the domination of Bakr. The words used were: "Either every last Muḍarite will be driven from Khurāsān, or you will be allowed to settle there on the condition that you surrender to us all your property, weapons, gold and silver".³ In the face of such an impossible ultimatum, the negotiations were broken off; but, in fact, Ibn Khāzīm realized that there was very little chance that Qais and Bakr could ever overcome their deep-seated hostility peacefully, recalling the words:

1. Ṭabarī, V, 547; Kāmil, IV, 66.
2. Ṭabarī, V, 547; Kāmil, IV, 66.
3. Ṭabarī, V, 547.
"Rabī‘a have been angry with God ever since He sent the Prophet from Mudar".\(^1\) It was only at the insistence of Tamīm that he had first begun to negotiate; they were afraid for their own position if either Qais or Bakr attained complete supremacy.

In the battle which ensued, Ibn Khāzim was victorious, and Bakr suffered more than eight thousand casualties, either killed or wounded. All the men of Bakr who were taken prisoner on the battle-field were put to the sword.\(^2\) Aws b. Tha‘labā fled to Sistān, and Ibn Khāzim appointed his own son Muḥammad governor of Herāt, with a man from Tamīm, Bukair b. Wishāḥ, to assist him as head of security.\(^3\) He himself returned to Marw, and Khurāsān is regarded as coming completely under the domination of Qais in the year 64/683.\(^4\)

---

1. Ṭabarī, V, 548; Kāmil, IV, 66.
2. Ṭabarī, V, 551. The Poet al-Mughīra b. Ḥabnā‘ describes the defeat of Bakr as a massacre.
3. Ṭabarī, V, 623.
The Resistance of Tamīm

The reputation of Ibn Khāzim for bravery was won by the resolution he showed in the face of the numerous threats to his power that he was constantly being confronted with in Khurāsān. In the words of al-Zubairī, "It was no shame for even a brave man to flee before two heroes; Ibn Khāzim and Qaṭari b. al-Fuṭu’ā [the Khārijite]."¹ However, this did not deter Tamīm from attempting to free themselves from his rule. Not being strong enough at first to attack him in Marw, they assaulted and captured Herāt, killing his son.² With this as their base, they now ventured against Marw. The fighting went on for over two years, but eventually Tamīm was overcome and forced to disperse in small groups throughout the territory; there Ibn Khāzim was able to destroy them piecemeal. The leaders of Tamīm shut themselves up in a fortified position called Fortanā near Marw al-Rūdh, but after they were induced to surrender they were all put to death, despite Ibn Khāzim's wish to spare them. His son Mūsā, thirsty for revenge for his brother's death, actually threatened to kill even his

¹ 'Uyūn, I, 175; Ma‘arif, 144; Mubarrad, II, 423.
² Tabari, V, 623; Kāmil, IV, pp. 86-88.
father if he had been one of the murderers. This took place in 66/685, and left Ibn Khāzim in control of a peaceful province for a while.

However, in 72/691, Tamīm again returned to the offensive, lead by Baḥīr b. Warqā’ al-Ṣuraimī, who had also participated in the earlier insurrection. While engaged on this new challenge, Ibn Khāzim received a message from the Caliph ‘Abd al-Malik asking for his oath of loyalty, in return for which he would confirm him in his position. Ibn Khāzim refused and even forced the messenger to eat the letter. According to Ibn Khayyāt this messenger was a man of Tamīm named Sawra b. Abjar al-Dūrimī; but Tabarī is probably correct in identifying him as Sinān b. Mukammil al-Ghanawī of Qais, and he adds that Ibn Khāzim said to him: "‘Abd al-Malik sent you because he knows I will never kill a Qaisite. However, eat the letter!' In Balādhrūl we find Ibn Khāzim writing to ‘Abd al-Malik: "How can I face God if I am disloyal to one of His Prophet’s disciples (Ibn al-Zubair)?", while al-
Maqdisī attributes to him the statement: "Alive, I live for Ibn al-Zubair; and in death, too, I will charge my soul to follow him".¹

It is not possible to discover in the sources the origins of this relationship between Ibn Khāzim and Ibn al-Zubair, but probably it represents the alignments taken up after the battle of Marj Rāhiṭ, with Kalb supporting the Marwānids and Qais supporting Ibn al-Zubair. However, in Khurāsān the usual tribal groupings were not always possible, mainly because many of the tribes were very weakly represented here. The ones that were strong, such as Tamīm, attempted to assert themselves even against fellow Muḍarites; while we find weakened sections of Rabī‘a rallying to the support of Ibn Khāzim. It should be remembered that all the Arabs were in a minority to the natives of the region, and their only security rested in some form of co-operation, if not unity.

The Umayyad Restoration

After "Iraq had been pacified by the murder of Mus‘ab b. al-Zubair, ‘Abd al-Malik turned his attention

¹. Bad’, VI, 23.
to Khurāsān. His object here was to stir up trouble for Ibn Khāzīm among the tribes, by offering them bribes of money.¹ To Bukair b. Wīsḥ, Ibn Khāzīm’s deputy in Marw, he promised the governorship of the entire territory if he would kill or expel his master. Bukair accepted this offer, and summoned the tribes to pay homage of ‘Abd al-Malik, and the position became so dangerous that Ibn Khāzīm thought it best to flee to his son Mūsā in Tirmidh. He was pursued by men of Tamīm led by Bahīr b. Wārqā’ al-Ṣuraimī, and put to death in a village called Shāhmīghd (?) about eight farsakh from Marw.² The person who killed him is named as Wākī’ b. ‘Omair al-Qurā’ī, Ibn al-Dawragya.³ This marks the end of Qais’ ten year domination of Khurāsān under Ibn Khāzīm.⁴

However, it was now the turn of Tamīm to take control of the province, under the governorship of Bahīr b. Wārqā’. But the fragile unity they had shown in opposition disappeared once they held power, and before

---

1. Khalīfa, I, 386; Futūḥ, p. 405.
2. Ṭabarī, VI, 176. Ibn A‘tham incorrectly states that Bahīr b. Wārqā’ was Ibn Khāzīm’s cousin, and that he killed Bukair b. Wīsḥ as revenge for Ibn Khāzīm’s murder. Kūfī, II, f.64.
long we find them divided against themselves. Al-Butūn
and Muqā'is sided with Bahrīr, while 'Auf and Abnā' supported Bukair, both alliances being in accordance
with tribal affinities. Muqā'is and al-Butūn favored
Bahrīr because he was descended from Ṣarīm b. Muqā'is b.
on the other hand, had the support of his clan, Banū
'Auf b. Ka'b b. Sa'd b. Zaid-Manāt, who were known as
al-Abnā'.

The small tribal groups were forced to participate,
willingly or not, in this internecine struggle among
Tamīm, and ultimately they asked 'Abd al-Malik to find
a solution to the troubles. He responded by appointing
Umayya b. 'Abdallāh b. Khalid b. Asād (74/693-78/697)
governor of Khurāsān. He was a man of Quraish against
whom none of the parties in the territory could have any
hostility; and, moreover, he is presented as being
unwarlike and slow to feel enmity. Bakr, eager to free
themselves of Tamīmī domination, welcomed him.

1. Al-Butūn were descended through 'Amr b. Ka'b b. Sa'd b.
   Zaid-Manāt.
   account of these events is by far more detailed than
   that of Ṭabarī.
4. 'iqd, I, pp. 142-143; ʿUyun, I, pp. 166, 171.
5. Ṭabarī, VI, 201.
Bukair b. Wishāḥ wanted to be given the governorship of Tukhāristān, and at first Umayya was prepared to grant him this wish. However, warned that he might prove disloyal, he changed his mind and charged him with making preparations for an invasion of Transoxiana. This displeased Bukair and aroused his hostility to the new governor; however, another section of Tamīm, led by Bahīr b. Warqa', already at odds with the faction under Bukair, took Umayya’s side.¹

Transoxiana was a source of worry to the governor of Khurāsān, for the natives were defaulting on the tribute they were obliged to pay under the terms of the treaty they made with the Arabs; for example, the Khāṭūn of Bukhārā had taken advantage of the dissension among the tribes to withhold the jizya of that region.² Umayya led a force against her in order to re-assert his control; but while still on the march, Bukair left the army and returned to Marw, taking the city into his own power. In this he had the support of the Banū al-‘Anbar section of Tamīm.³

The resentment felt by Tamīm toward the way the affairs of the province were being conducted at this

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 312; Narshakhī, pp. 65-66.
3. Ṭabarī, VI, 313; Kūfī, II, f. 64; Kāmil, IV, 185.
time is expressed in a conversation between a member of the tribe and Bukair, in which he complained: "We fought hard and suffered many casualties in order to take Khurāsān. When we asked that a man of Quraish be sent here as governor to settle our affairs, we were given one who treats us as his play things and slaves."\(^1\)

Umayya was obliged to return at once from Bukhārā, and try to overcome this display of disobedience in Marw. The matter was settled by negotiation, and a formal compact drawn up in which the rights and prerogatives of Tamīm were recognized. This document was sent to Syria, where it was ratified by 'Abd al-Malik himself. However, this did not prevent Bukair from revolting again in 77/696; this time, however, his disobedience cost him his life, and with his death the power of Tamīm in Khurāsān was diminished for a while.\(^2\)

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 312.
2. Futūḥ, p. 407; Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 115-117.
The Azdite Supremacy in Khurāsān

Azd had been present in Khurāsān from the time of the expedition led here by 'Uthmān b. Abī al-ʿĀṣ, and their migration here continued under al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra, who invaded Multān and Kābul during the reign of Muʿāwiya. It is recorded that during the governorship of al-Ḥārith b. ʿAbdallāh in Baṣra, al-Muhallab came here from Khurāsān and selected twenty thousand warriors whose names were entered in the dīwān, eight thousand of them from Azd. With this force he entered al-Ahwāz to combat Khārijite activity in the area.¹

In Khurāsān, Azd tried at first to maintain a neutral position in the tribal conflicts, but under the threat of Tamīmī domination, they cast in their lot with Ibn Khāzīm. Previously, in Baṣra, they were found in alliance with Rabīʿa against Tamīm; and now, here too, they allied themselves with Qais for the same reason. The unusual aspect of this is that, in Baṣra, Qais and Tamīm (both of whom were from Muṣār) were allies; but here the overwhelming attitude of the latter alienated its former friends. After the murder of Ibn Khāzīm, this fear of Tamīm became general among the tribes.²

In 78/697,³ Umayya was replaced by al-Muhallab as

---

1. Futūḥ, p. 421; Muʿjam, I, 747.
3. According to Ibn Khayyāṭ, the appointment was made in 79/698.
governor of Khurāsān. At this time a man of Azd is reported as saying to al-Muhallab: "You have been in Khurāsān many times already, and have held power here. Thus, you know that Tamīm is the most powerful tribe in the territory, with twenty-four thousand fighting men. They control the treasury, and enjoy the support of the administration. If they ever become fully united, that will be the end of all of us. We should divide and weaken them". This specification of the strength of Tamīm allows us to infer the approximate strength of the Arabs in the area at this date. Madā'īnī says that in 96/714, Tamīm numbered only ten thousand, which, if both these figures are accepted as correct, would give an indication of the cost in human life of the various campaigns and the internecine strife among the Arabs. This wastage in manpower was compensated for by large injections of troops into the area, some of them newly appointed governors bringing with them contingents from their own tribes. After the rebellion of Bukair b. Wishāh, ‘Abd al-Malik sent an army here to support Umayya b. ‘Abdallāh, his governor. This influx of Arabs in Khurāsān continued throughout

2. Tabari, VI, 512; Kāmil, V, 6.
3. Tabari, VI, 316.
the Umayyad period, but unfortunately the sources do not, as a rule, give clear indication of the tribal background of those migrants.

Under al-Muhallab and his son Yazīd, Azd and Rabī‘a re-established the alliance in Khurāsān they had maintained in Baṣra, an expression of their mutual hostility towards the domination of Muḍar. Rabī‘a never forgot how they had suffered at the hands of the Qaisite Ibn Khāzim; and, despite their Yemenite propensities, the Muḥallabites always behaved with generosity towards them and treated their enemies of Muḍar with extreme suspicion.

The Revival of Qais in Khurāsān

After al-Ḥajjāj had secured his position in ‘Irāq, he decided to replace the Muḥallabites in Khurāsān with Qais, his own tribe. To achieve this he had to find some reason that would be acceptable to ‘Abd al-Malik, for naturally the Caliph would not want to lose the services of such valuable men. Consequently, he accused them of having given support to Ibn al-Zubair; but to

1. Aghānī, XIV, 290.
2. Ṭabarī, VI, 326.
this charge, 'Abd al-Malik replied: "I see nothing wrong in the allegiance of the Muhallabites to Ibn al-Zubair; the fact that they were so faithful to them convinces me that they will serve me with equal loyalty". 

However, al-Ḥajjāj persisted in his accusations, playing on the fears of the Caliph, and finally he succeeded in having his own way and Yazīd b. al-Muhallab was dismissed as governor of Khurasān. 

There was some trace of envy in al-Ḥajjāj's attitude, for the Muhallabites enjoyed a wide popularity in both 'Irāq and Khurasān, in contrast to the general hatred shown towards himself.

Qutaiba b. Muslim al-Bāhibī was sent here by al-Ḥajjāj as successor to Yazīd in the year 85/704, and he was to remain as governor until 96/714. 

The clan of Bāhila was relatively weak and insignificant, which meant that Qutaiba had no people of his own to look to for support, and this probably, was very satisfying to al-Ḥajjāj, for it would compel his governor to look only to himself for support. In Khurasān Qutaiba formed a special relationship with the al-ʿAliya of Qais, and thanks to this they prospered and were able to win control.

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 395; Kāmil, IV, 207.
2. Khalīfa, I, 396; Ṭabarī, VI, 395.
3. Farazdaq, II, 42.
4. According to Ibn Khayyāt the appointment was made in the year 86; I, 381.
of Samarkand which hitherto had been in the hands of
the Yemenites. However, when a serious challenge was
made to the authority of Qutaiba, this decade-long
alliance faded away and he received scant help from
Qais.

When Sulaimān b. ʿAbd al-Malik assumed the
Caliphate in 96/714, he was naturally hostile to the
faction of al-Ḥajjāj who had attempted to block his
succession. In the sources we are given to understand
that Qutaiba revolted in anticipation of the kind of
treatment he should expect from Sulaimān, but as usual
the reasons advanced are tenuous and in this case even
the place where the revolt is supposed to have taken
place is not clearly specified. However, in connection
with this event, al-Madāʾinī supplies valuable information
about the distribution of the tribes in the East.
According to him the total Arab fighting force numbered
46,000 divided as follows: from Baṣra, the al-ʿĀliya
(9,000), Bakr (7,000), both under al-Ḥudain b. al-Mundhir;

3. Ṭabarī (VI, 520) merely mentions Khurāsān, but goes on
to quote a verse from Farazdaq which shows that it
occurred in Farghāna:

ومن الدار سل السفون وشامها عشيقة بأن النهر من فرغان

4. Al-Balāḍhurī (Futūḥ, pp. 412-413) gives the figure
40,000.
Tamīm (10,000) under Dirār b. Ḥuṣain al-Ḍabbī; ‘Abd al-Qais (4,000) under ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Ulwān; Azd (10,000) under ‘Abdallāh b. Ḥawdān. From Kūfa, only 7,000 men under the leadership of Jahm b. Zaḥr are mentioned, and a further 7,000 mawālī under Ḥayyān al-Nabaṭī are added at the end without indication as to which city they belonged.¹

Ya‘qūbī reports the event in such a way that it would seem that Qutaiba was actually intending a secession of Khurāsān from the Empire, and he thought that in this he would have general support, both Yemenite and Nizārite.² He presented his case as anti-Syrian, and resolved not to pay the land-revenues (fay’) to the delegate from the Caliph, nor to receive Syrian troops into the province.³ In letters to Sulaimān, Qutaiba, while congratulating him on his accession, warned that if he should attempt to replace him as governor of Khurāsān he would not hesitate to withdraw his loyalty.⁴ Sulaimān replied ambiguously, urging Qutaiba not to spoil his good record by acts of insubordination; if it should be necessary to relieve him of

1. Tsabarī, VI, 512.
4. Ṭabarī, VI, 507.
Khurāsān, he could be confident of receiving another governorship. Therefore, he should come to him in Damascus with his brother and his friends in order to discuss the matter. Qutaiba was not deceived by this, and realized that the issue was now either victory or death for himself.

The support given to him by the tribes was not what he had counted on. From the very beginning Azd were opposed to him, but al-Ḥudain b. al-Mundhir, thought it prudent not to manifest this, "reasoning that Tamīm, the largest tribe in Khurāsān, would support Qutaiba out of 'asabiyya if challenged by any Yemenī group, even though they themselves did not like him". Any governor given authority over such fiercely independent and jealous people such as the tribal Arabs could not avoid creating hostility towards himself, and in the event it was the Muḍarite Tamīm who proved most active against him. Their leader in this was Wakī' b. Abī Sūd, who had nourished a hatred for Qutaiba ever since he replaced him by Dirār b. Ḥūṣain al-Ḍabbī as a head of Tamīm.

2. Ṭabarī, VI, 511.
3. Ṭabarī, VI, 512; 'Uyun, I, 111, gives the reason why Qutaiba dismissed Wakī' from the leadership of Tamīm, presumably because he was too self-important and given to rash behaviour.
Another grievance held by Tamīm against Qutaiba was the way he had treated the Banū al-Ahtam. This took place at the time of Qutaiba's advance against Bukhāra, when 'Abdallāh b. 'Abdallāh b. al-Ahtam was left as his deputy in Marw. The latter tried to stir up trouble by reporting to al-Ḥajjāj the large amounts of booty and money Qutaiba had come into possession of. Al-Ḥajjāj sent this letter to Qutaiba, but before he could do anything about it, 'Abdallāh fled to Syria. However, his sons and cousins were captured and slain. Although this incident might have influenced the attitude of Tamīn, it is difficult to understand how it could have affected Azd and Bakr. The sources get around this by having Qutaiba speak insultingly to the leaders of these two tribes, and others, at the time of the revolution. Actually, he seems always to have had some feeling of tribal hostility against them. It is, however, almost impossible to reach any reasonable explanations of the alliances in Khurāsān at this time on the basis of the information which has come down to us — even a section of his own clan of Qais, the Banū 'Āmir, sided with his enemies, because, we are told, he

neglected them during his period of power.¹

Azd returns to Power

After the murder of Qutaiba and the assumption of power by Waki‘, the attitude of the tribes showed a curious reversal, and now they are fired with a burning desire for vengeance on those responsible for the deed. When we read of the revolt of Qutaiba, we should probably interpret it rather as the revolt of the local tribes against him, or, better, the revolt of Tamīm against Qais; and indeed the Caliph Sulaimān sent orders to his new governor Yazīd b. al-Muhallab that if Qais could prove that Qutaiba did not rebel he should punish the men who killed him.² As a result, Waki‘ and his friends were imprisoned and deprived of their possessions.³

With the advent of the Muhallabites the power of Tamīm in Khurāsān was once again curtailed, and we find Yazīd seeking to propitiate the Azd of Marw, reminding them of the favourable treatment they had received in the past from his father.⁴ Profiting from the experiences

². Kāmil, V, 10.
³. Futūh, p. 414; Kāmil, V, 10.
of Qutaiba, who was powerless once abandoned by Qais, he wanted to assure the undeviating support of his own tribal elements. He did, in fact, put them into a dominant position in the region; and even after ‘Omar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz replaced him as governor by al-Jarrāḥ b. ‘Abdallāh al-Ḥakamī, another Yemenite from the Sa’d al-‘Ashīra clan of Madhīḥīj,¹ the Yemenī tribes, including Azd, enjoyed a period of prosperity.

It was the excessive favouritism shown by al-Jarrāḥ to the Yemenites that led to his dismissal after about a year and a half;² but his replacement was another Yemenite, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Nu‘aim of Azd.³ This Yemenite superiority in the province was to persist down to the year 102/702, when Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik became governor of ‘Irāq. He appointed Sa‘īd b. ‘Abd al-Azīz b. Abī al-‘Āṣ, known as Sa‘īd Khudhaina, as governor of Khūrāsān, and under his rule Tamīm regained some of their former importance. In particular, he enjoyed the support of Sawrā b. al-Ḥur of Dārīm, through whose influence with the governor Shu‘ba b. Ḍuḥair al-Nahshabī was appointed governor of Samarqand in 102/720.⁴

2. Futūḥ, p. 415.
3. Ṭabarī, VI, 561; Jamharat, p. 378.
4. Ṭabarī, VI, pp. 605-606.
As a result of the rebellion of the Muhallabites in 'Irāq, the policy of the Caliphate became markedly hostile towards Azd and this was manifested in Khurāsān also. Any pretext was sufficient to allow this hostility to be put into action—some members of Azd even being accused of stealing money. But, of course, the most effective way of pursuing such a policy was to favour Tamīm, the traditional enemies of Azd. In 102/720, Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik replaced Sa'id Khudhaina as governor of Khurāsān by Sa'id b. 'Amr al-Ḥarashī from the "Āmir b. Şa'sa'a'adan of Qais; and he was followed by another Qaisite, Muslim b. Sa'id, in 104/722. At this same time Kirmān was under the rule of Jabala b. 'Abd al-Rahmān of the Bāhila section of Qais.

---

1. Ṭabarī, VI, 606.
2. According to Ṭabarī (VI, 619), 'Omar b. Hubaira who succeeded Maslama, as a governor of 'Irāq, in 103/720, made this appointment.
4. Ṭabarī, VII, 18.
The Arab Tribes in Transoxiana

The Arabs first came into Transoxiana in 54/673 when 'Ubaidallah b. Ziyad was governor of Khurāsān. There was some hesitancy about crossing the Oxus, the traditional border between Irān and Turan, and penetrating into a region of the unknown. However, in this period, Transoxiana (Māwarā' al-Nahr) was an area of quite definite attraction, divided into five regions: Sughd, centred about the great cities of Samarqand and Bukhārā, the last described by Istakhri (p. 472) as "the fairest city of all Islām". West of Sughd was Khwarizm, and to its south-east Saghāniyān and Khuttal. To the east was the region centred about Farghāna, which Ya'qūbī calls "a noble and majestic city". To the north and west was Shāsh (Ṭāshqand), in which the Turkish peoples of Central Asia were most numerous, and which was to become the chief source of resistance to Arab penetration.

According to Balādhurī, 'Ubaidallah b. Ziyad was accompanied on his campaign by 24,000 men and he

1. Tabarī, V, pp. 296-297.
2. It was, also, known as Bilād al-Hayātīla. Cf. Maqdisī, p. 361.
3. Istakhri, II, 463. "It is one of the most fruitful parts of the world and the best to live in".
4. Buldān, p. 75; Cf., also, Istakhri, p. 513 ("No part of Transoxiana contains more settled places"), and Maqdisī, p. 362.
proceeded as far as Ṣaghānīyān to the east of Bukhārā. The queen (khatūn) of Bukhārā sued for peace, and the army returned to Khurāsān with a large number of slaves.¹ We do not know the tribal composition of this army, nor indeed the purpose of the campaign itself, but it is certain that it was not intended to secure more lands for settlement, and that it represented the initiative of the local Arabs rather than caliphal policy.

The first crossing of the Oxus which was based on government policy was made during the governorship of 'Ubaydallāh's successor, Saʿīd b. 'Uthmān b. 'Affān, as a result of which the region as far as Samarkand was brought into a closer relation with Khurāsān, the treaty concluded with the Khatūn being renewed.² However, it was under the Muhallabite governorship that the first attempts at a real incorporation of Māwarāʾ al-Nahr were made; al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra himself remained there for two years. This was not to prove successful; his manpower was too small to be effective in such a large area and in a terrain not suitable to Arab methods of warfare.³ His attitude was expressed when, on being urged to advance against Sughd, he replied, "My one hope from this expedition is that the army may return

¹ Futūḥ, p. 401.
² Futūḥ, p. 401; YaʿqūbĪ, II, 172.
³ TabarĪ, VI, pp. 323, 326; Kāmil, IV, 187.
safely to Marw". It would seem at this time the Arabs regarded Transoxiana primarily as a region for summer raiding from their base in Marw. Such raids, moreover, left the region in a state of unsettlement, preventing the various native elements from coming together and presenting a united front, and ultimately preparing them to seek capitulation rather than confrontation.

Arab settlement of Transoxiana came with Qutaiba b. Muslim; in effect it was a garrisoning of the region. He had some local co-operation in this; Balādhurī records. "The dihqān of Balkh and the ruler of Ṣaghāniyān helped the Arabs and invited them to settle in this land, because of their hostility to the ruler of Ākhrūn and Shūmān". He entered here in 87/705, following the route used by previous expeditions: Marw, Marw al-Rūdh, Āmul, Zamm; the Oxus was crossed at Baykand. This latter city surrendered to him after a determined resistance, and he appointed Warqād b. Naṣr al-Bāhilī to administer it. The conquest of Baykand, also, provided the Arabs with a great quantity of weapons, the city obviously having been a fortress for the protection of the ford at this point of the river.

1. Ṭabari, VI, 327.
2. Futūḥ, p. 409. See Khalīfa, I, 381.
3. Khalīfa, I, 397; Tabari, VI, pp. 430, 432; Narshakhī, p. 70.
Qutaiba met was sporadic and un-coordinated; Dinawari reports, "The King of Șaghāniyān fled and left all his kingdom to the Arab conquerors".¹

Qutaiba initiated the policy of recruiting natives into Arab armies, and we are told, for instance, that in 94/712, he forced the people of Bukhārā, Kish, Nasaf, and Khwārizm to provide him with twenty thousand men to serve in his campaign against Șughd.² Meanwhile, Arabs from other provinces, notably Sind, were moving northward to join his army, and in 96/714, we find Qutaiba actually settling Arab families in Samarqand.³

This settlement could not have been on a large scale, for we do not find Transoxiana played any significant rôle in the political affairs of the Caliphate as would have been the case if Arabs were present here in the number they were in the other provinces. The Jayḥūn was to remain the boundary between Arab and Turkish hegemony throughout the remainder of the Umayyad period.

---

1. Tabari, VI, 483.
2. Tabari, VI, 500; Kāmil, V, 2.
3. Tabari, VI, 500.
CHAPTER VI

THE ARAB TRIBES AND THE COLLAPSE OF THE UMAYYADS

In the Caliphate of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik (105/723-125/742), the power wielded by the Arab tribes throughout the lands of Islām began to show signs of decline, with the consequent weakening of Umayyad authority which was based on them. The most serious manifestations of Arab intransigence took place in Khurāsān, and already at the beginning of his reign we read of a struggle between Muṣar and Yemen in Brūqān near Balkh, which took place in 106/724, when 'Amr b. Muslim al-Bāhilī, the brother of Qutaiba, revolted against the governor of Khurāsān, Muslim b. Sa‘īd. The latter appointed Naṣr b. Sayyār, the chief of Muṣar, to suppress this revolt, and under his leadership were Tamīm and Asad. 'Amr enjoyed the support of Azd and Rabī‘a (including Taghlib and Bakr). The rebels were unsuccessful, and had to accept defeat at the hands of Naṣr.1 The rebellion is said to have arisen from the objections of these tribes to being sent to Transoxiana, where raiding was no longer so profitable as in the past;

1. Ṭabarī, VII, 30; Kāmil, V, 51.
and, no doubt, these Yemenī tribes felt that the Muḍarite governor was trying to get rid of them. In Transoxiana, too, the district under the control of Naṣr b. Sayyār, a revolt took place which had to be put down by the sword.¹

In Balkh, a Yemenī governor, Asad b. ‘Abd allāh al-Qasrī, the brother of Khālid al-Qasrī, the governor of ‘Irāq, was so flagrantly partial to the southern Arabs that the Caliph had to dismiss him.² It was reported that he had the heads of his Muḍarite lieutenants shaven to disgrace them for their lack of success against the Turks and Șughd.³ He was replaced by Ashras b. ʿAbdallāh al-Sulamlī of Qais in 109/727. It was the policy of Hishām here, as elsewhere, to favour no particular tribe in his appointments, thereby hoping to present an appearance of impartiality.

Ashras could not avoid alienating the natives of the region, being forced to carry out policies imposed on him by the central Caliphate; and in Transoxiana the Arabs, too, resented the way in which he carried out his duties.⁴ He was dismissed from

---

1. Futūḥ, p. 417.
2. Ṭabarī, VII, 49; Kāmil, V, 56.
4. Ṭabarī, VII, 55.
office, in 111/729 according to al-Madāʾinī or in 112/730 according to al-Balādhurī,1 and Ibn Aʾtham specifies that it was his lack of success in the wars against the Turks that led to his removal. 2 He was succeeded by al-Junaid b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Murrī who maintained a totally Muṭarīte bias in his government of the region, members of no other tribes being given a share in the administration. Qaṭān b. Qutaiba was appointed governor of Bukhārā, al-Walīd b. al-Qaʿqāʾ al-ʿAbsī of Herāt; Muslim b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Bāhīlī of Balkh; and Shaddād b. Khālid al-Bāhīlī was designated ʿāmil al-Khārāj in Samarqand, and through these offices the power of Muṭar was re-established in the important centres of the East. 3

Migration of Arabs into Khurāsān continued throughout al-Junaid's governorship, and one account

1. Futūḥ, p. 418; Tabarī, VII.
2. Kūfī, II, f.274.
3. Tabarī, VII, 69. Al-Dīnawarī, p.321, incorrectly states that al-Junaid was from Yemen, probably tracing his descent from the Banū Murra of Yemen. In fact, his lineage derives from the Banū Murra b. ʿAwf b. Saʿd b. Dhubiān of Qais. Jamhārt, p. 252. He, also, seems to have thought that it was al-Junaid and not his successor Asad b. ʿAbdallāh al-Qasrī who in 117/735 was addressed by Sulaimān b. Kathīr as a fellow Yemenite. Tabarī, VII, 108.
mentions that ten thousand men of Kūfa and the same number from Dašra were sent here by the Caliph at his request. With such reinforcements al-Junaid was able to maintain the security of the region; but when he died in 116/734 and was succeeded by ‘Āšim b. ‘Abdallāh b. Yazīd al-Ḥarīthī this fragile peace was shattered. Al-Ḥarīth b. Suraīj of Tamīm, supported by Azd and the native landowners (dahāqīn), led a revolution which soon snatched control of Khurāsān from the hands of its Umayyad governor. ‘Āšim appealed to Damascus, but even the Syrian troops which were sent in response to this plea could not effectively break the power of Tamīm until 128/745. Realizing his inability to cope with the situation, ‘Āšim asked to be relieved of his office in 117/735, and recommended that henceforth the affairs of Khurāsān should be given overall direction from ‘Irāq rather than Damascus, so that help when needed could be sent more speedily.

When Asad b. ‘Abdallāh al-Qasrī was returned to Khurāsān as governor in 117/735, only Marv and

1. Futūḥ, p. 418.
3. Ṭabarī, VII, 330; Kāmil, V, 123.
4. Ṭabarī, VII, 99; Kāmil, V, 73.
Abrasahr (Nishāpūr) remained under Umayyad control. His pro-Yemenī attitude, which had previously caused his dismissal from this office, again manifested itself, and again caused a violent reaction. Al-Madāʾīnī mentions that he released the Qaisite officials (ʿummāl) who had been imprisoned by ʿĀṣim, but this did nothing to alleviate the resentment felt towards him by the Northmen Arabs in the province.

The Governorship of Naṣr b. Sayyār

After the death of Asad in 120/737, Hishām appointed Naṣr b. Sayyār governor of Khurāsān, against the advice of men such as Yūsuf b. ʿOmar, who wished to see a Qaisite in this position. We really do not know what were the reasons that persuaded the Caliph that Naṣr would be the best person for this post. In one place, Ṭabarī indicates that he had no strong tribal connections in Khurāsān, the Caliph being made to say "I will be his clan!"; while in another place he speaks

1. Ṭabarī, VII, 105.
2. Ibid., VII, 104.
3. Ṭabarī, VII, 156; see, Yaʿqūbī, III, pp. 57-58.
4. Dinawarī, p. 343; Ṭabarī, VII, 156.
of him as the leader of Muḍar in the province. He is presented as brave, honest and intelligent, and well-versed in politics; but despite this he was still a fanatic in his tribal loyalties.

He divided Khurāsān up among the tribes of Muḍar: Muslim b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muslim was given control of Balkh; Wishāh b. Bukair b. Wishah of Marw al-Rūdh; al-Ḥārith b. 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥashraj of Herāt; Ziyād b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Qushairī of Abrashahr (Nīshāpūr); Abū Ḥafṣ b. 'Alī of Khwarizm; and Qaṭān b. Qutaiba of Sughd. On the other hand, he persecuted the tribes of Rabī‘a and Yemen.

When a Yemenite complained to him that the province had never before known such persecution, Naṣr's reply was that the Yemenite domination under Asad was fierce in its partisanship.

During the first four years of his governorship Naṣr did not employ anyone from outside Muḍar in the important posts, and he seems to have been motivated

1. Šabarī, VII, 155.
2. Ibid., VII, 156.
6. Ibid., VII, 158.
by a desire to exact vengeance on Rabī‘a and Yemen. But Naṣr had his enemies among Qais, also, notably Yūsuf b. ‘Omar, the governor of ‘Irāq. It was he, we are told, who instigated Maghra‘ b. Ḥāmār al-Qaisī to speak against Naṣr in the Caliph’s presence. Nor was this the only time that Yūsuf sought to have the governorship taken from him; but on each occasion the Caliph refused to be persuaded. We are not told the reason why Quraish so disliked Naṣr.¹

Naṣr’s greatest difficulties came with the accession of the Yazīd b. al-Walīd in 126/743. The new Caliph appointed Manṣūr b. Ḫumhūr governor of ‘Irāq and Khurāsān, and the latter, in turn, made his brother Manṣūr his representative in the east. Naṣr simply refused to recognize his authority, and continued to rule the province as previously. When Azd tried to take advantage of this situation by asserting its own claims to preference – for, after all, Yazīd had come to the Caliphate by Yemeni support and his governor in ‘Irāq, too, was from Yemen – they were warned that anyone who sought to provoke trouble would lose his head.² Undaunted, Judai‘ b. Alī al-Kirmānī, the chief of Azd, attempted

¹. Taḥbārī, VII, 226.
². Ibid., VII, 278.
to restore Khurāsān to Yemeni control, but found that Muḍar was too strong for him to challenge. Consequently, he entered into an alliance with Rabī’ā; and Dīnawarī (p. 336) relates that a messenger was sent to Kūfa to bring back a copy of the treaty which had been concluded between the two in pre-Islamic times so that the same conditions could be again applied.

Naṣr reacted to this challenge by throwing Judār into prison; and after Azd and Rabī’ā had forcibly released him, the hostilities between themselves and Muḍar were brought out into the open. About this time (127/744), al-Ḥārith b. Surajj of Tamlīm, who had been living among the Turks since his unsuccessful rebellion in 116/734, was allowed to return to Khurāsān. Thus, the city of Marw was divided among four groups, each hungry for power: Azd and Rabī’ā under the leadership of Judār, Muḍar led by Naṣr, Tamlīm led by al-Ḥārith and Bakr led by Shaibān b. Salama. The latter, however, was unable to compete with the other three, so it soon abandoned the contest and moved away to Sarakhs.

At first Naṣr tried to set the other two against each other; but when this did not succeed he sought to

---

deal with them individually. When he was gaining supremacy over Tamīm, al-Hārīth turned to Azd for assistance, and together they forced Naṣr to flee to Abrashahr. As Azd was stronger than Tamīm, the power in Marw fell into the hands of Judai‘; and when al-Hārīth attempted to alter this situation by leading a revolt of Tamīm, he was defeated and lost his life.

In 129/746, Abū Muslim al-Khurāsānī, taking advantage of these disorders among the Arabs, proclaimed his revolt against the Umayyad in a place called Bushanj, and, with his followers, marched against Marw. This new threat persuaded Naṣr and Judai‘ to compose their own differences and present a united front; but Naṣr had hardly returned to Marw than he succeeded in having Judai‘ assassinated, thus taking the control of the city into his hands. By now the Arabs were so weakened by their internal dissensions that it was clear that they would not be able to oppose Abū Muslim; so, when the latter approached the city, they withdrew and in the course of their retreat, Naṣr died. In 130/747, the flag

4. Ibid., II, 419.
of the Umayyads was taken down from the walls of Marw.
The advice given to Abū Muslim by the 'Abbāsid leader, Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī, reveals the tribal situation in Khurāsān at this time: "As for the Yemenites, respect them and stay with them, for it is through them that God's work will be done; as for the Rabīʿites, you must be wary of them; and as for the Mudarites, they are enemies".1

Conclusion: The Arab Tribes in the last days of Umayyad Rule

The political abilities of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik2 and his recognition of the problems facing the Empire, contrived to stay the collapse that had been threatening ever since the death of al-Walīd b. 'Abd al-Malik, but after his own death there was no successor capable of dealing with an ever more rapidly deteriorating situation. Al-Walīd b. Yazīd sought to maintain his own position by temporizing with the Arab tribes, and ended by alienating the Yemenīs in Syria on whom his power really depended.3 The malaise afflicting the state is

1. Yaʿqūbī, III, 35; Ṭabarī, VII, 344; Azdī, II, 62.
2. Muruj, III, 123.
3. Ṭabarī, VII, 231.
reflected in the sources by incidents trivial in themselves, but even these lead to the conclusion that the very basis upon which Umayyad authority rested had become eroded beyond recovery.

When Yazīd b. al-Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik led the southern tribes of Quḍā‘a and Sakūn in a revolt against his cousin, the Caliph al-Walīd, the Qaisite supporters of the latter were unable to save his life or their own brief period of domination. When Yazīd himself became Caliph, the atmosphere of Syria was poisoned by the extreme hostility between the two Arab groups. The poet Ibn Dhu‘āla al-Kalbī expresses the arrogance of the Yemenites in these lines:

Who will tell Qais and Khindif, and the leaders of ‘Abd Shams and Ḥāshims,

(That) we have killed the Caliph in revenge for Khalid, and have sold his children for money.

1. Such as the account in Dīnawarī (p. 322) of al-Walīd’s treatment of Khalid b. ‘Abdallāh al-Qasrī; after which he is reported as writing a poem proclaiming his reliance on the Nīzārite. Other versions of the incident are to be found in Tābarī, VII, 234 and Azdī, II, 52. Ya‘qūbī, III, 62, makes it clear that al-Walīd had lost popular support in Syria.


3. Azdī, II, 55; Aghānī, VII, 81.
All the chief offices of state and positions of power were now divided among men of Yemeni origin, the court of the Caliph being dominated by Yazid b. Khālid al-Qasrī, and the governorship of Egypt being given to Ḥafs b. al-Walīd al-Ḥadramī. The Caliph Yazid died within a year of acceding to the throne, and was succeeded by his brother Ibrāhīm, of whom Masʿūdī says: "His reign was remarkable for confusion and disorder; opinions were in conflict and no one respected the Caliph". Al-Azdī records that Ibrāhīm was sometimes referred to as amīr rather than Khalīfa.

In 127/744, when Marwān b. Muḥammad, at the head of a confederation of Mudar tribes, including Tamīm, Qais and Kināna, marched on Damascus and put an end to Ibrāhīm's reign, the situation underwent the predictable reversal, with the Yemeni tribes now out of both favour and office, but with the same brooding atmosphere of hatred and resentment unchanged.

In 'Irāq, the polarization of the Arabs was, if anything, worse than in Syria. The Caliph Walīd's anti-Yemenite sentiments prompted him to maintain as governor

1. Yaʿqūbī, III, 63.
of the province Yūsuf b. 'Omar al-Thaqafī, and he sought to satisfy his master by behaving with extreme severity towards the southern Arabs under his jurisdiction. Of course, the accession of Yazīd b. al-Walīd to the Caliphate had the same consequences here as in Syria; with the difference that the man named to succeed Yūsuf b. 'Omar in 126/743 as governor of 'Irāq was Ma'nūs b. Jumhūr,¹ the Kalbite-fanatic who was among the six murderers of the Caliph al-Walīd.² This could only exacerbate an already dangerous situation, and there is probably truth in the account given in Ṭabarī (VII, 284) that Yazīd thought it best to replace him in 126/743 by 'Abdallāh b. 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz who enjoyed the respect of most of the inhabitants.³ Even he could do nothing, however; the Syrians who had established themselves in the province refused to give up the lands that had been granted to them, and the inter-tribal hostility received a new dimension in economic rivalry.

The active feuding started between Kūfans and Syrians; when 'Abdallāh b. Mu‘āwiya b. Ja‘far sought

1. Ṭabarī, VII, pp. 254, 266, 277.
2. Ishtiqaq, p. 541.
3. Ya‘qūbī, (III, 66) says that Yūsuf b. 'Omar remained as governor throughout the whole of Yazīd’s reign.
to lead a revolt in Kūfa in 127/744, Rabī‘a and Yemen were among his supporters. His efforts were unsuccessful, and he had to flee to Jibāl for refuge. But no sooner was this problem dealt with than ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Omar found himself being challenged for the office of governor by al-Naḍr b. Sa‘īd al-Ḥarashī, the appointee of the new Caliph Marwān. The latter was supported by the local Nizārites, while ‘Abdallāh had to depend on the Yemenī factions. A third element of menace in his situation was the growing activities of the Kharijites, and Marwān sought to remedy the situation by appointing a new governor whom he thought might win popular acceptance, Yazīd b. ‘Omar b. Ḥubairā. But the affairs of ‘Irāq had now reached a point where no palliative solution was possible, and the arrival of the ‘Abbāsid armies from Khurāsān which brought an end to Umayyad power met no resistance from a people who had exhausted their energies in fighting among themselves.

There can be no question about the causes that contributed to the collapse of the Umayyad state, and

1. Tabarī, VII, 303; Azdī, II, 107; Kāmil, V, 131.
the central rôle played by Arab tribalism. However, it must be recognized that much of this tribal antagonism was, in reality, an expression of regionalism, and that no Caliph resident in Damascus could ever hope to win the acceptance of Kūfā and Baṣra, whatever his tribal support. Outside of Syria itself, where the antipathy of Muḍar to Yemen was elevated to what in modern terms might be called a "two party system", tribal feeling is always moderated by local considerations. In fact, much of the tribal antagonism in 'Irāq and Khurāsān was fomented by the Caliphs themselves in appointing governors who brought with them to these provinces their Syrian attitudes, and whose only experience of the exercise of power was through tribal intrigue. In terms of its Arab population, Khurāsān was but a projection of 'Irāq, and the revolt which originated there can be regarded as the final protest of the 'Irāqīs to Syria domination. It is above all significant that the 'Abbāsid armies that overthrew the Umayyads were of mixed tribal composition, and that with the establishment of the new state the incessant dwelling upon tribal motivation in explanation of events gradually disappears from the history.

---
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