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PREFACE

The present work is an attempt,—apparently the first of its kind,—to collect, analyse, and systematise as far as possible all the information contained in the genuine Ismaili literature concerning the history of the grand Shi'ite movement which brought about the foundation of the Fatimid caliphate in N. Africa in 297/909. This work is not intended either to establish or refute the truth of such tradition, or of the claims of the Fatimids, or anything similar. The information collected here has remained for many centuries a jealously guarded secret, and only the changing spirit of modern times has made it possible to obtain access to it. Although every possible effort has been made to render this collection as exhaustive as possible, it is beyond doubt that a certain number of references, some of them perhaps of interest, have remained unused, partly because the works in which they are found were not accessible, and partly because they are included (as it often happens in religious works) in the most unexpected contexts, where no one would reasonably search for them. It seems, however, almost certain that these would not alter the general picture in any essential way.

If this work should prove useful to students, this is entirely due to the most precious, admirable and unfailing co-operation and support of my Ismaili friends. Without their help nothing could ever have been achieved on these lines. It is a sorrow to me that I am not able to acknowledge here publicly my feelings of profound gratitude and indebtedness to each of them separately. Old prejudices are still by no means dead, and many of those who have proved their sincere sympathy with the cause, and have done very much to assist in these researches, would not wish to be associated with them in public.

I am immensely indebted to Mr. Ali Mahomed Mecklai, the President of the Islamic Research Association, with his Executive
Committee, for the publication of this work in their series; and to Mr. A. A. A. Fyzee, for his helpfulness in placing at my disposal his most valuable collection of Manuscripts. My profound gratitude is also due to Mr. J. A. B. Palmer for having kindly taken upon himself the dreary task of going through the English of this work.

W. IVANOW.

Bombay, July 1941.
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BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE

Research in any vast subject, especially pioneer work depending on the gradual discovery of new materials, always proceeds by periodical "advances", perfecting or amplifying what had been done earlier. Not rarely the discovery of new facts demands from the student a complete revision of his ideas on the subject, or even the undoing of the work of months, or years. Such periodical revisions are quite in the nature of things; in fact they are nothing but a welcome sign of the progress of research.

It is therefore regrettable to observe that very often the real position of one student remains unknown to other students working in the same field. Ideas or information of his, already rendered obsolete by later finds, are sometimes either taken as the basis of new theories, or disputed and refuted with much waste of energy and time. Such a situation arises not only through the absence of full information as to the other worker's publications, but also the lack of exact knowledge of the extent to which they have become superseded, or have lost their value.

For these reasons I would like to suggest that every publication on a subject of research ought to be furnished with a bibliographical note containing an up-to-date and complete list of all the author's relevant publications, together with a short indication as to the extent to which each of his works, in his own opinion, still preserves its value, and still reflects his views and ideas. Such a practice, if firmly established, would obviate many mistakes and misunderstandings.

Publications of W. Ivanow on Ismaili subjects:


2. Ismailitica, I and II. (Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, vol. viii, 1922, pp. 1—76.) The work was the first publication on Ismaili subjects, and therefore has become obsolete and unreliable to a large extent. In Part I the text is reliable, though some emendations may be introduced. Many comments are no longer good. In Part II information about Isma'ilis in Kerman is very valuable, as the conditions have lately undergone a great change. The list of the Imams has been superseded by nos. 13, 18 and 19.


6. An Ismailitic Work by Nasiru’d-din Tusi. (*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London, 1931, pp. 527–564.) Not quite reliable: it was published before proper acquaintance with Ismaili literature, and the comments are not always correct. I have in my possession now an old and correct copy of the same work, and hope to edit it.


9. A Guide to Ismaili Literature. (*Prize Publication Fund Series of the R.A.S.*, no. 13, London, 1933, pp. xii + 138.) Reliable, although in the course of the intervening years much new material has been found, and many minor details are to be corrected.


15. A Creed of the Fatimids. (Bombay, 1936, pp. viii + 82.) Reliable, although it differs in some points from the traditional interpretation of the present Ismaili specialists.


22. Istitaru’l-Imam and Sirat Ja’far al-Hajib. (Arabic text.) (*Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Egyptian University*, vol. IV (1939), Cairo, 1939, pp. 89–133.) Reliable.


INTRODUCTORY NOTE

There is quite a considerable literature concerning Ismailism, its origin, the history of the Fatimid caliphate, and other cognate matters. Numerous works, mediaeval and modern, are specially devoted to this subject. In fact, it would be no exaggeration to say that these matters are generally regarded as well-known, and as constituting no problem, not only in the eyes of educated Muhammadans, but also in those of many orientalists. It seems therefore to be not quite unnecessary to explain why a new publication on these subjects, which introduces to the student the original Ismaili tradition, may not be superfluous or useless.

The triumph of the Fatimid movement, and the brilliant career of the earlier Imams who built a great empire in N. Africa and Egypt, undoubtedly belong to the most momentous periods in the history of the Islamic nations, and of Muslim culture in general. Certain activities of the dynasty evoked far-reaching repercussions, not only within the wide limits of the Islamic world, but even affected the history of the far away Christian Europe, as in the case of the Crusades, for which the policy of some Fatimid caliphs was largely responsible. For all these reasons their history well deserves careful and critical study.

At the same time such a study presents almost unsurmountable difficulties. It is not scarcity of records,—which in fact are abundant,—but the absence of reliable guidance to the inner logic of the Fatimid activities which makes their history liable to misunderstanding. As seen by the eye of the outsider, uninitiated into the complex fabric of the religious base of their authority, their history appears as a fantastic mosaic, composed of the most contradictory, conflicting, and apparently incompatible elements. Periods of remarkable military triumphs, of unprecedented prosperity and security, unparalleled religious tolerance, patronage of learning, art, and other cultural activities, are chaotically
intermixed with periods of great national disasters, famines, internal unrest, armed revolts, terrible defeats, abject misery, outbursts of wild fanaticism and religious persecution, the unprecedented growth of superstition, extremist beliefs, and so forth. The bewildered historian, from whom the secret inner motives of many aspects of the Fatimid activities are hidden, is left entirely to his own efforts to make sense of the capricious and bizarre course of evolution of the Fatimid caliphate.

The mediaeval historian obviously could not be expected to realise that the Fatimid caliphs, in their position of semi-divine kings of the ideal theocratic state, were always under an obligation to comply in their actions with certain popular ideas and ideals, expectations and beliefs, following to a great extent traditional standards set for their activities, which they could alter only with great difficulty. Such hidden springs of their drama have up till now remained inaccessible to students. In the absence of anything better, the mediaeval historian had chiefly to rely upon so-called "thoroughly established facts, well known to every one", in other words on mere popular ideas of the matter, founded upon, and continuously reinforced, by the anti-Fatimid propaganda of the Baghdad caliphs and their supporters. In the course of the long process of such semi-spontaneous and collective accumulation of ideas, and their polishing and adjustment in the course of oral transmission, a consistent and comprehensive picture of Fatimid affairs was evolved. It well merits a special study, and its comparison with the original sectarian version, so far as the latter can be recovered, shows that in fact it was a kind of "negative" version as opposed to the authentic and logical, "positive" version. By a natural process of condensation of colours, under the pressure of religious sentiment, not only has the story become as a whole very dark, but, moreover, every "white" spot in the original has been replaced with a corresponding "black".

Comparing both these versions, we can draw long lists of such opposite parallels. Ismailism, beyond any doubt, was chiefly
based on, and animated by fervent religious sentiment, without which it could have never come into existence:—in the "negative" version it appears as a doctrine of atheism. It was, also quite undoubtedly, one of the most consistent monotheistic systems ever conceived by human mind:—the "negative" version declares that it was really a doctrine of dualism, the "religion of the Magians". The central and fundamental ideal of Ismailism, also common to various Shi‘ite sects, was the ultimate triumph of Islam as the sole religion of the world, the ultimate union of mankind in "one flock under one shepherd", i.e. the Imam from the house of the Prophet, who alone can guide long suffering humanity to a righteous and peaceful life, filling the earth with justice and equity even as much as it has always been filled with injustice, oppression, and bestiality:—in the "negative" version we find that Ismailism was "invented to blow up Islam from the inside". In the Shi‘ite doctrine the Alid descent of the Imam was one of the primary and indispensable dogmas:—the "negative" version "proves" that al-Mahdi and his successors were the descendants of a Persian heresiarch, or a Jew.

In its pure and complete form this version was probably never used by historians who found themselves too often confronted with facts which demonstrated its absurdity beyond dispute. On such occasions their remedy has been to suggest their own compromise version, or some conjectural explanation, through which gradually great confusion has been introduced, and now in fact reigns in the literature of the question. Modern researches, based on the same materials, applied the same method. This is why we learn that Ismailism, an essentially conservative movement, had a "revolutionary" nature, or was created by "Persian nationalistic aspirations", while in reality it was probably the most ruthlessly consistent development of the earliest principles of Islam.

The value of the original Ismaili tradition, even of those "crumbs" of it which alone can now be traced in available genuine Ismaili works, lies in its furnishing the background to the
non-Ismaili information, and yielding clues for the decipherment of many of the implications in a mass of material that had remained a chaos of popular ideas and individual, home-made theories and guesses, usually quite baseless and imaginary. Let there be no illusions about the Ismaili tradition itself: it is profoundly influenced and modified by religious theories, beliefs, superstitions, etc. But there is also no doubt that in the main it preserves a correct idea of the "skeleton" of events, however fragmentary such reminiscences may be. The present work is an attempt at collecting, systematising, and, as far as possible, elucidating the tradition. We are here concerned only with the history of the Fatimid movement before its final triumph manifested in the proclamation of al-Mahdi as caliph, in 297/909, in Raqqāda. The reason why this work is limited to this period alone is the difficulty of undertaking a revision of the entire history of the Fatimids. Strange to say, as far as it is possible to see without special study, Ismaili literature as it survives at present preserves relatively much more information concerning the earliest period than concerning the history of the caliphate. That this is not an illusion is clear from the 'Uyun al-akhbār of Sayyid-nā Idrīs who wrote in the middle of the ninth/fifteenth c. The remarkable meagreness of his information, his thorough dependence on general historical literature, prove beyond doubt that no detailed and genuine historical materials had been preserved in the Ismaili community, probably on account of the tragic end of the dynasty.

It may be added that long established tradition, grown out of the religious controversy, has introduced a certain standard scheme in all works dealing with Fatimid history, even the most modern ones. This scheme consists mainly in tracing the genealogy of the founder, al-Mahdi, and describing the impious doctrine, preached by the dynasty. The first item is not only due to the fact that for medieval authors the history of the state was the history of its kings. It seems that it also largely depends on the fact that such genealogy occupied a very prominent place
in the system and works of the Ismailis themselves, because the Alid descent of the Imam was one of the most important dogmas, while the dark period of "occultation" always evoked certain doubts, and demanded special explanations. In a critical study, quite obviously, the question whether al-Mahdī really descended from the Prophet or not, is hardly essential for the historian. It will never be solved beyond dispute, and such a solution is a matter of curiosity only. Even if the Fatimids really had nothing to do with the Prophet, they were at any rate universally recognised as his descendants by their followers, and were compelled to act according to those standards and religious ideals which they undoubtedly would have followed, had they been authentic Alids.

The question of the "origin" of Ismailism, and its "founder" does not arise for the Ismaili: the founder is the Prophet, and the origin is the Divine Revelation of Islam. The mediaeval mentality had no ideas of evolution or the collective work of generations, and could not grasp the most complex process which formed the full-grown Ismaili doctrine. For mediaeval man religious doctrine was always eternal, unchangeable, even if founded by the supposed heretics. Therefore the malicious Ibn al-Qaddāḥ, who lived in the second/eighth c., must be made to invent the Ismaili doctrine of the fifth/eleventh c., and later. It is pathetic to study the learned discussions of critical, up-to-date scholars as to whether Ibn al-Qaddāḥ was, or was not, the "founder" of the doctrine.

With regard to the doctrine itself, and its evolution, the Ismaili tradition, quite naturally, does not give any direct indications; as far as possible while handling purely religious material, the matter is avoided in the present work. The question can only be treated by means of critical and thorough study of the earliest available Ismaili works. It may be noted, however, that the very facts of the history of the Fatimid movement were by no means something entirely unconnected with its religious evolution. There is not the slightest doubt that the evolution of
the doctrine was inseparably, as body and soul, connected with the development of the political successes of the movement, its expansion, its political aims, and so forth. And *vice versa*, ideological and political considerations were strongly influenced by the evolving system of dogma, both its theory and popular beliefs. This is particularly noticeable in such an important and cardinal point as the doctrine of the Imamat. Uncontrollable events in family life could alter the originally simple and consistent theories, while the theory itself could influence dynastic decisions.

In addition to this there is no doubt that an important process was silently and unostentatiously at work for a long time. The unprecedented successes of the Fatimids which placed them at the head of the whole Shi‘ite movement undoubtedly attracted to them a huge number of recruits from various decaying Shi‘ite schools. These people brought with them a great many ideas which had to be adjusted to, and amalgamated with, the standard Ismaili theory. In fact, it is possible to discern sometimes quite clearly that theories and logical consequence carried little weight even in purely theoretical speculations. Many theories appear which are indubitably introduced as compromises, explanations, or apologies to justify certain acts or changes in the system required by irrational events. All such alterations are carefully built up in the usual traditional style.

The value of the original Ismaili historical tradition is not limited only to the chance of a better understanding of the substratum of the doctrinal evolution, and the course of the events which determined the further destinies of the Fatimid movement under their caliphate. Reliable knowledge of the details of their experiment is of immense importance to the study of the major problem of Shi‘ism in general, because the Fatimid caliphate was the only known large scale instance of the realisation of the Shi‘ite dreams and theories concerning the Alid theocratic state.

Under the influence of the “negative” propaganda version not only mediaeval, but even modern historians acquiesce in the idea that Ismailism was something different from Islam. They
thus disregard the immensely important fact that in reality it was the leading and the most typical and developed school of Shi'ism. The latter itself, according to these ideas, was merely a "political" movement, or rather "ubiquitous Alid intrigue", a long series of risings on the part of the numerous Alid adventurers, impudently outraging that authority of the Omayyads and Abbasids which had been "established by law". Even in the most up-to-date researches we read that only after a long period of time did Shi'ism begin to develop its own religious doctrine, and even this took the form of absurd and fantastic sectarian beliefs. Views of this kind undoubtedly require thorough revision.

References to the original Shi'ite sources suggest that there was little material difference in the doctrine of the various Shi'ite schools (just as there was not much difference between Shi'ite and non-Shi'ite Islam) as far as concerns their real religious beliefs and forms of worship, apart of those abstruse theosophical speculations with which the rank and file of the community had nothing to do. Ismailism, under the most able guidance of the early Fatimids, achieved a great success, while all other sects, including the school to which later on was conceded recognition as the "orthodox" Shi'ite doctrine, the Ithna-'ashari, were disorganised and depleted, lost their influence, and in many cases entirely disappeared.

Ample material means, the position of a sovereign state, and especially the great enthusiasm of the masses, permitted Ismailism to develop its doctrine and create a large literature to the extent which no other branch of Shi'ism could have dreamt of producing at the time. In fact, Ismailism anticipated many advanced phases in the evolution of general Islamic thought, which were to appear centuries later. It was, above all, this precipitate advance which created the illusion of the "rupture" with the more backward circles of Islam. In reality it was a grave disservice to Ismailism because it furnished the pretext for
propaganda which misinterpreted their philosophy, and raised the
cry that the movement was "outside the pale of Islam".

From a purely critical point of view, Ismailism was undoubtably the most catholic and highly developed form of Shi‘ism, and is thus invaluable for the study and understanding of the Shi‘ite mind in general. The part of the latter in Islamic cultural progress was resolutely obscured by anti-Shi‘ite sources, and its real extent and implications are only now beginning to dawn upon us. There is no doubt that serious researches will inevitably bring to light much more material which will necessitate a thorough revision of existing ideas and theories, and, as a result, the rewriting of many pages in the history of the Islamic civilisation.
I. SOURCES.

It appears that every reference to the Ismailis found in general literature has already been brought to light, and no important and substantial materials remain unused. A complete bibliography was published in 1922 by L. Massignon, in his "Esquisse d'une Bibliographie Qarmate" (in the "Volume of Oriental Studies presented to Professor E. G. Browne", pp. 329-338). Additions to his list have of late been published periodically by A. A. A. Fyzee, in the JBBRAS, Bombay, in 1935, 1936 and 1940. These lists include the Ismaili and non-Ismaili Islamic works, and the studies by different orientalists.

Most probably all early non-sectarian authors, when writing about the origin of Ismailism and the Fatimid dynasty, when they do not offer their own theories, derive their information from a few original sources. And these themselves are ultimately based on a few Ismaili works, especially the Iftitahud-da'wa of Qadi Nu'man (cf. further on), or perhaps some other early authors whose names have not come down to us. The information derived from these early works was gradually adulterated by various additions, or perversions of the original statements, or "condensation", or intensification of the alleged hereticism. And finally, when numerous versions were in circulation, these were still further perverted under the influence of different theories, so that ultimately lost all historical value. To trace this process, and to extract and systematise all that hitherto has been made accessible to students in this matter, would be an exceedingly useful work. It would form a fascinating subject for a doctorate thesis, or the initial work of a serious research student, working somewhere within easy reach of a large and up-to-date library.

With genuine Ismaili sources remaining inaccessible, and general sources being much adulterated, fragmentary, and ofte
perfectly worthless, the works of different orientalists mostly were "movements in darkness". Except few they mostly preserve any value only as raw material,—in so far as they edit or translate original sources, either Ismaili or non-Ismaili. In their own conclusions and deductions different authors usually place too much confidence on the "contemporary testimony", despite the obvious fact that it is seriously corrupted by bitter religious and political jealousies and enmities. The result was that the same hostile attitude crept into, and continued at work, in what were intended as critical and perfectly impartial studies. Thus, in spite of more than a hundred years of research, and the publication of many interesting contributions, the problem remains as insoluble as it was in the beginning.

Genuine Ismaili works have been not entirely unknown in European libraries for many decades past. But, strangely, they never attracted the attention of the students to the extent which they really deserved.¹ And now that at last the way has been opened to direct acquaintance with Ismaili literature, we may take stock of what is generally available. It would be proper to say that genuine Ismaili literature, being entirely religious in its interests, completely ignored history. Its authors and readers most probably relied on the general historical works. As shown further on, there is, for the earlier period, strictly speaking, only one historical work,—Qāḍī Nu‘mān’s Iftīṭāhu’l-d-da’wa. The next group of works, which to some extent may yield historical information, is hagiological tradition. This group also contains very few works. The next, also very limited group, is that of works on controversy,—just a few that contain allusions to historical facts. Finally comes the material which forms the main contents of Ismaili literature, namely the esoteric speculations, ḥaqā‘iq. Here, in the mystic twilight, facts and things of this world lose their ordinary features and outlines, laws of logic and commonsense often disappear, and we enter the enchanted

¹ Cf. further on, the beg. of Chapter V.
realm of dreams, mirages, visions, symbols, and the most uncere-
monious twisting and falsification of history.

However, genuine historical information is so scarce in
Ismaili literature that we cannot afford to neglect or disregard
anything, and must do our best to avoid overlooking an interest-
ing indication merely on account of its being disguised in religious
garb.

There is an important matter to be noted about these
esoteric works, as about the exoteric and esoteric matters in
general. Every student of Ismailism must properly realise the
fact that the terms ẓāhir and bātîn, i.e. exoteric and esoteric, do
not completely coincide with the terms "plain" and "secret".
There are things which have nothing to do with esoteric matters,
and yet are kept secret, and there are many esoteric doctrines
which are not concealed.

The ẓāhir matters kept secret are mostly those which are
either unflattering to the Ismailis, or which do not fit in with
their religious theories, or which are suppressed because they
would stir up enmity in their opponents if they reached their
knowledge. Sometimes such ẓāhir matters thus kept secret
are really surprising, e.g. the names of different heresiarchs, or
of erring and heretical sects. Books are written to refute their
doctrines, but their names are omitted!

It would be better to understand the term ẓāhir as "general
Islamic", or simply "general", while the terms bātîn¹ and
ḥaqīq may be taken as meaning "specially Ismaili". There is
no special secret about elementary esoteric doctrines, although
generally everything in Ismaili doctrine and Ismaili literature is
regarded as secret: it should not be taken outside the community.
But real secrecy, even within the Ismaili community, is reserved
only for those books which require a considerable amount of
education and religious training to insure the reader against the

¹ The term bātîn is mostly used in genuine Ismaili works as a substant-
tive, in the sense of the inner meaning revealed by ta’wîl, or allegorical
interpretation. Apparently it is never applied to the works, or doctrines.
misfortune of being misled through misunderstanding them. A well-known example may suffice: the Encyclopaedia of the Ikhwānu'ṣ-ṣafā, copies of which one can buy in any bookshop, is regarded as "secret". ¹

There is another point to be made clear. It is generally believed that information preserved in esoteric works is more reliable than that in the zāhir works, because esoteric works are intended for the "chosen few", not for the "duped, fooled, and fleeced" masses. This would be perfectly logical; but in fact it is entirely erroneous, in so far as it refers to historical matters, not to religious. However surprising this may appear, the real case is the reverse of this.

Where we have an opportunity to compare the versions of one and the same event as found in the zāhir and in the haqā'iq works, we find very often that these versions differ considerably, not only as to the details, but as to the substance, and that the esoteric version for the most part is a favourite folk-lore motive, or simply a superstitious fiction, based on the mystical meaning of numbers, association of individual letters, etc. The best illustrations can be derived from two well-known works of one and the same highly authoritative author, Sayyid-nā Idrīs,—his zāhir work 'Uyunu'l-akhbār, and his esoteric treatise Zahru'l-ma'ānī. In the Chapter XVII of the latter there is given what may be called the "secret" and esoteric version of the history of the Imams, accounts of their real position, importance, etc. One typical example will suffice.

Every student of Ismailism knows the historical accounts of that fateful night when the aged al-Mustansīr unexpectedly died after a short and apparently not very serious illness, and the princes and other dependents were urgently summoned to the palace only to find that the all-powerful commander in chief had

¹ I have already sufficiently explained this in the introduction to my "Guide to Ismaili Literature", p. 19 sq., and during the years which have elapsed since its publication I have not found anything to make me alter my opinion.
already placed his own son-in-law, the youngest prince Musta‘lī, upon the throne, and required them to take the oath of allegiance to him. There are different versions of what had really happened, — quite naturally, indeed. But it is quite clear that the eldest prince, the original heir apparent, Nizār, under one pretext or other, escaped, and took refuge in Alexandria, claiming his rights. The events happened in the full light of history, and there is very little doubt as to their real trend.

But this is what we find in the esoteric version, reserved for the “trusted few” only, and withheld from the masses: when Mawlā-nā al-Mustansir died, his sons came together, and started to dispute as to their rights to succeed him. No decision could be reached. Then Dhū‘l-faqār (or Dhū‘l-faqār), the legendary sacred sword of ‘Ali, was produced (from the unseen?). All princes in turn tried their utmost to unsheath the sacred sword, but in vain. At last al-Musta‘lī made an attempt. And lo! The sword came out smoothly and easily. Thus it was clear to every one present that al-Musta‘lī had the right to succeed.¹

This popular motive of many fairy tales of different nations, should, according to the ideas mentioned above, be taken in preference to the zahir versions. And there are many similar cases. If any valuable information can be gathered from esoteric works, it can only be derived from careful analysis of different contradictory statements, lapses, passing references “out of the focus of attention”, etc. It must be made an elementary general rule never to trust esoteric and mystic authors, unless their statements are supported from other sources. The zahir version should always be preferred, where there is a conflict between the two.

Mystics, and believers in esoteric matters, live in a different world, of different values. Their logic and judgment are completely dominated by religious emotions, and if these clash with

¹ Cf. also the introduction to al-Hidayatu‘l-Āmiriya, ed. by A. A. A. Fyzece, pp. 14-15.
facts, the facts have to give way to the sentiment. Going through what may be called the esoteric interpretation of history, in general and individual cases, one finds in esoteric works falsification and twisting of facts to be a rule, to which there are but few exceptions. Facts are made to fit spurious prophecies, mystical theories about the symbolism of numbers, astrological predictions, religious ideas, and popular superstitions. The idea of conveying unvarnished truth to the chosen few, for whom such works are intended, is perfectly alien to the mystic mind; and there are no limits to the most unscrupulous falsification.

The earliest historical work in Ismaili literature, and apparently the only one which is almost completely free from religious adjustment of facts, is the *Iftitāhu’d-da’wa wa ibtidā’u’d-dawla*, completed in the beginning of 346/957, by the great jurist and theologian of the early Fatimids, “Qāḍī Nu’mān”, i.e. Abū Ḣanīfa an-Nu’mān b. Muḥammad at-Tamīmī (who died in 363/974), cf. Guide, no. 103. The author, a native of Qayrawān (near the present Tunis), entered the service of al-Mahdī in 313/925, i.e. about fifteen years after his enthronement. It is therefore quite natural to find in his work complete familiarity with local conditions.

His book was apparently intended for the general public as much as for the Ismailis, and probably was not kept secret in Fatimid times. The author does not enter in this work into the discussion of the religious aspect of the campaign of the founders of the dynasty, or their religious claims. It seems that all information about the conquest of N. Africa by the Fatimids, found in different works of general literature, is directly or indirectly derived from this source. It is very pleasant to hear that Dr. B. Lewis, as he twice mentions in his “Origins of Ismā’ʿīlism” (pp. 16 and 75), is preparing an edition of it. There are several copies of the work in Europe, and it really deserves a good edition.

The author takes matters from the point of view of a general historian; contrary to the habit of the great majority of Islamic
historians, he does not write a laudatory account of the events which centred round the subject of his glorification. His master, al-Mahdî, appears on the stage only in the last part of the book. For this reason, although the work is directly connected with our subject, i.e. the career of al-Mahdî, it gives very little information which can be used in the present study.

Apparently the influence and popularity of this early work was responsible for the appearance of other writings on historical subjects, and, beyond doubt, of the Istitâru’l-Imâm, compiled under al-‘Azîz (365–386/975–996) by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (or Ibrâhîm) an-Naysâbûrî (probably a Persian), cf. Guide, no. 112. He is the author of several well-known theological works: his Ithbâtu’l-Imâmât, and az-Zâhira fi ma’rifati’d-dârîl-âkhira (cf. Guide, 114 and 115) are very popular, while another of his works which seems to have been very interesting, al-Mâjizatu’l-kâfiya (Guide, 113), on the organisation of the Fatimid propaganda, is preserved only in the quotations in the Tuhfatu’l-gulûb.¹

There is no doubt that he knew the Iftitâh, as may be seen from the passage at the end of the work, in which he refers to the further journey of al-Mahdî, and his being looted by brigands near Tâhûna.² It is quite probable that his purpose was to supplement the Iftitâh with information which it did not contain, namely the antecedents of al-Mahdî before his experiences in Sijîlmûsa.

With the kind collaboration of my friends, Dr. P. Kraus, Dr. Kâmil ˙Huṣayn, and Mr. H. A’zamî, this work, together with the Sîra of Ja’far al-Ḥajîb, has been edited by me in the “Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts of the Egyptian University” (for 1936, issued in 1939, pp. 93–133). For technical reasons it was impossible to publish a translation and notes together with the text; therefore the English version is given further on in the present volume.

¹ A summary of this, and different details are offered in my paper, “The Organisation of the Fatimid Propaganda”, JB BrAS, 1939, pp. 1–35.
² Cf. Istitâr, text, p. 106.
It must be carefully noted that in all translations given here the beginnings of the corresponding pages of the original Arabic text are marked by heavy type figures. References in the index to such combined text-and-translation units are given in heavy type. In the case of the Istitār and Sīra the original Arabic text is that of the edition mentioned above.

There are works which produce an extremely good first impression, inspiring complete confidence as to their reliability and trustworthiness. This, however, completely evaporates at the first touch of critical analysis. Works which are in the reverse position are much rarer. And one of these seems to be the Istitār. Its author, as may be seen from its shortness and "sketchiness", apparently did not attach much importance to his work, and neither apparently did many generations of the Ismailis: it was a pleasant trifle, sufficiently religious in contents to be preserved in a thoroughly religious literature, but not serious enough to attract the unwelcome attention of falsifiers. It was this circumstance which protected and preserved it to this day.

The first impression of the Istitār, as every one can see for himself by reading its translation here without comments, is very poor,—it looks as if it had been written specially for entertainment, with no regard to historical truth. It seems to be rather superficial, sacrificing too much to dramatisation of the narrative, introducing many details which are closely reminiscent of the Arabian Nights. But all this vanishes when we study carefully what it contains beneath the outer entertaining form, by scrutinizing every statement, and collating it with available reliable sources.

Only then does it become clear that in the Istitār we have precious crumbs of information about a period which is a lost world in history, information which cannot be found anywhere else, and which was saved from inevitable oblivion by the desire of Sayyid-nād Aḥmad an-Naysābūrī to offer his readers an entertaining piece of reading. Legend occupies a prominent
part in his narrative, but this probably was all that he could find.

Taking the story of the events for which we have an excellent source of information, the Annals of Tabari, who was himself a contemporary, we must admit that not only does the version of the Istitār seem to be perfectly reliable, but, pieced together with what is found in Tabari, it permits us to reconstruct the picture of the time with rare completeness and convincing inner logic. Tabari's reports are substantial, but lack cohesion and inner correlation. When combined in one with the version found in the Istitār, things that are obscure and isolated in his Annals at once appear in their true light.

Scrutinizing details, it is easy to see that such small but rather important indications as references to local conditions, distances between places mentioned in the story, etc., leave no doubt as to the author's perfectly reliable knowledge of the country. The narrative itself, with different details which would not be very flattering to early Ismailism, such as the defection of the chief dā'ī, or the strange behaviour of some of al-Mahdī's associates, shows a sincere intention to give a true version, as far, indeed, as the religious mentality of the author permitted it. All this makes the reader change his attitude completely, and, what is very important, inspires a certain amount of confidence also in those portions of the story which refer to much earlier events,—that dark period which followed the death of Muhammad b. Ismā'īl.

As we shall see later on, all early Ismaili sources which are accessible now, refer with great obscurity to the intervening links between Muhammad b. Ismā'īl and al-Mahdī, the "three concealed Imams", without mentioning their names. Apparently it was a grave sin to mention their names. Anyhow, this was avoided. And although there probably were some early hagiographical works in which legends about these early Imams were collected,—the reports which are incorporated in the fourth
volume of the ‘Uyūnu’l-akhbār of Sayyid-nā Idrīs, — it is obvious that such information, for some obscure reasons, was not popularised amongst the masses. It seems probable, however, that this work was the only source of Sayyid-nā Idrīs for the information about the second half of the third/ninth c. In any case, he derives some stories from the Istitār, and has nothing to add from elsewhere. We shall refer to the contents of this work while discussing the Ismaili version of the genealogy of al-Mahdī.

Next comes the Sīra, or autobiography of Ja’far al-Ḥājib, which usually forms one small volume with the Istitār. It was, most probably, composed earlier than the latter, probably in the beginning of the reign of al-‘Aziz (365–386/975–996), by Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Yamānī. In any case it was composed after 346/957, the date of the completion of the Ištīḥā, to which it refers (p. 125 of the text) under the title of Kitāb fī ibtidā’i’d-da’wati’t-Ṭālibiyya (for some reason the author avoids the use of such terms as Fātimī, ‘Alawī, etc.).

The student may at first feel suspicious about this work. The figure of al-Mahdī, although historical beyond all doubt after his enthronement, is something like a phantom before this date,—nothing is certain about him, his career before he is proclaimed -caliph. And here we find a detailed story of his departure from Salamiyya, and different details of his experiences; it looks odd: he laughs, eats, has a haircut, buys slaves, etc. But, just as in the case of the Istitār, there is no doubt as to the genuineness of the work: it is too clever and sophisticated for a falsification. There are cases of falsification in Ismaili literature. To mention one,—the “autobiography” of Nāṣiri Khusraw in the Kalāmī Pīr. But the fact of falsification leaps to the eye from every word of it. In the Sīra of Ja’far there is too much exaggeration of the author’s own part; his personal matters block too much the vision of the events and the figure of his master. But this is

1 Cf. my “Ismailis and Qarmatians”, JBBRAS, 1940, pp. 43–85, where the story of Sayyid-nā Idrīs about Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl and his sons is translated.
exactly what we should expect: the work obviously was written to remind the old servant’s masters about his exceptional services. The point of view of the author of the opuscule, looking at his master and the events in which he participated from the position of an old intimate servant, and of the domestic occurrences, with which he was primarily concerned, is perfectly genuine. There is no sign of its being artificially introduced,—it seems sincere from the beginning to the end. It is also very interesting that on several occasions the author plainly confesses that he cannot remember correctly owing to remoteness of the events. Moreover, the compiler carefully notes all cases in which information was received not directly from Ja’far, but indirectly, through some one else. For all these reasons I do not think there can be any doubt as to the work being on the whole a genuine document of the time. It seems also that the text is quite well preserved, without any traces of attempts to interfere with it. In my edition I used several independent copies, and recently collated it with yet another copy, belonging to my friend A. A. A. Fyzee, and dated 1155/1742, finding no traces of real variants.

The work contains many interesting details, and, if we have to admit its genuineness, it means that together with this we have to admit the genuineness of the account of the hero,—al-Mahdî. A complete translation of the original is given further on, and an analysis of its contents, in so far as al-Mahdî is concerned, is given in the chapter dealing with his genealogy.

It may be added here that although the Sirâ of Ja’far never mentions Ustâdh Jawdhar, and his Sirâ, just as the latter never refers to the former, there must be some connection between both these works. It is difficult to discover who originated the idea of compiling such a work, whether al-Mansûr al-Jawdharî, the secretary of Jawdhar, or the compiler of the Sirâ of Ja’far.

---

1 Cf. pages 120, 123, 127.
2 Cf. pages 124, 125, 127.
3 The different readings are given in the footnotes to the corresponding places of the translation, and the copy is called F.
Ustādh Jawdhar, a court slave, one of the ṣagāliba at Raqqāda, entered the service of al-Mahdī after his triumph over the Aghlabids. He was apparently a sort of an accountant or secretary. Later in his life he occupied position of trust, and held high rank in the service of the Imams. As may be seen on many occasions, his religious position was quite exceptional.\(^1\) His Sīra, dictated by himself to his secretary, is much bigger than that of Ja'far. But while the latter reads like the scenario of a high class historical film, the Sīra of Jawdhar is intolerably boring: the elements of self advertisement and of emphasis on his own importance are incomparably more prominent here than in Ja'far's memoirs. It contains nothing which is of use to us in our present research, because during the reign of al-Mahdī, the author was too young, and originally had no connection with Ismailism; he only came in touch with political life at a much later period. The only redeeming feature of his work is the large number of quotations from the original papers of the Fatimids connected with their financial and administrative policy; although mercilessly abridged, they may well deserve a careful investigation by students of the internal policy of the early Fatimids.

Passing from historical and biographical works to those on Ismaili religious tradition, we must first of all mention a most important compendium produced by the same Qādī Nu'mān,—the Shahrul-akhbār. As may be seen from references scattered in the text, it was one of the latest works of the learned Qādī. In any case it was composed after the Iṣṭīḥā, Da‘ī‘īmu’l-Islām, and al-Majālis wa‘l-musāyarāt, which are referred to. Thus it was probably completed some time between 350/961 and 360/971.

This is one of the earliest compendia of Shi‘ite tradition, obviously based on a number of early works subsequently lost. It therefore deserves the most careful study. Some of its sec-

\(^1\) Cf. further on, in the extracts from the Zahrul-ma‘ānī by Sayyid-nā Idris, when he deals with the biographies of al-Mahdī and al-Qā‘im. The story is of unique interest.
tions, especially those dealing with early Shi‘ite movements, deserve special notice.\textsuperscript{1} It forms two bulky volumes of about a thousand pages or more altogether, and is divided into sixteen parts (\textit{juz‘}). We are here concerned chiefly with parts 14 and 15. The first deals with tradition concerning the Imams, from Ja‘far aś-Šādiq to al-Mahdī. Part 15 contains prophecies and supernatural signs proving the high mission of al-Mahdī; the first half of this part contains an interesting collection of early popular beliefs and expectations connected with the Shi‘ite dream; the second half consists of paraphrases of the corresponding portions of the \textit{Ijtīhād}, repeating the story of the mission of Ibn Ḥawshab, i.e. Manṣūru‘l-Yaman, with his extraordinary successes, and their continuation by the other dā‘ī, Abū ‘Abdī’l-lāh ash-Shi‘ī, in the Maghrib. Only one passage, edited in original Arabic further on (Texts, pp. 31–34), is concerned with our present research. The further possibility may be mentioned that casual references to the same matters of some interest may be gathered from a careful examination of other works of Qādī Nu‘mān,— such as \textit{al-Majālis wa‘l-musāyarāt}, or \textit{al-Manāqib li-ahl bayt Rasūlī’l-lāh} (cf. \textit{Guide}, nos. 100, 102), although the information yielded by the examination of these bulky works may be very small.\textsuperscript{2}

The next item to mention is the ‘\textit{Uyūnu‘l-akhbār} of Sayyid-nā Idris (‘Imādu‘l-dīn Idrīs b. al-Ḥasan, the 19th dā‘ī of the Yaman, d. 872/1468, cf. \textit{Guide}, no. 258). The work is in seven large volumes, and the portion with which we are here concerned is the end of the fourth vol. (completed in 842/1438), and the beginning of the fifth. Compared with a brilliant mind such as that of Qādī Nu‘mān, we have to deal here with a much inferior intellect. The author’s narrow Yamanite outlook, his super-

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. my paper “Early Shi‘ite Movements”, JBBRAS, 1941, pp. 1–23.
\textsuperscript{2} Qādī Nu‘mān composed a work specially devoted to the religious aspects of the career of al-Mahdī,— the \textit{Ma‘ālimu‘l-Mahdī} (cf. \textit{Guide}, 101). Unfortunately, it is lost; therefore it is difficult to decide whether the corresponding pages of the \textit{Sharhī‘l-akhbār} are based on it (as other parts are based on various other earlier works of the author); or whether, perhaps, what is now treated as a separate book, is in reality an extract from the \textit{Sharhī‘l-akhbār}. 

\textit{Sharhī‘l-akhbār}. 

\textit{Guide}. 

\textit{Guide}. 

stitiousness, his irritating method of never mentioning the sources, either Ismaili or non-Ismaili, which he freely uses, his readiness to pass at a moment’s notice from historical narrative to the preaching of elementary and well-known religious matters, make his work extremely disappointing. On fuller analysis this impression gains strength. The first four volumes are almost completely copied from the *Sharḥu’l-akḥbār*, with occasional patches borrowed from other works. The account of al-Mahdī is a *verbatim* copy of the *Istīḥ*ḥ. His concealment of his sources is very treacherous: it is impossible to be certain on many occasions whether the source is Ismaili, or anti-Ismaili. In any case, his work must be handled with special caution.

This list really exhausts the historical works in Ismaili literature concerned with our period. The bulky *sixth* vol. of the well-known *Kitābu’l-azhār* (*Guide*, 275), by a highly talented Indian Ismaili, Ḥasan b. Nūḥ b. Yūsuf b. Muḥammad of Bharūch (Broach) (d. 939/1533), dealing with the historical matters, yields nothing new. It is very lengthy (over 1350 pages), and is a collection of quotations from the ‘*Uyūnu’l-akḥbār*. Another modern work, also by an Indian, Shaykh Ḥuṭb Burhānpuṛī, who flourished towards the end of the XIIth/XVIIIth c. (cf. *Guide*, no. 335),—*Muntaza’u’l-akḥbār*, is merely an epitome of the ‘*Uyūnu’l-akḥbār*, to which, as a second volume, is added a concise history of the post-Fatimid period, based on different sources. This later part seems to be of more value, for its particular subject.

To pass from works on religious tradition to esoteric works is like passing from a religious school to the temple itself. In tradition there may be something new, some acquisition of fresh information. In esoteric and dogmatic works one has to deal with things eternal, revealed by God, unchangeable and not to be criticised. The purpose of the authors of the different works is not to convey new knowledge, but to explain and present in a more attractive, convincing and clearer form those eternal truths, which are already well known to the adherents of the sect. This
is the sphere of religious art, in which the question of "how" is everything, because "what" is already known. Every author vies with the other in the invention of novel ways to prove what has been already proved differently a hundred times. As usual in such matters, the earliest works are invariably the more original and attractive by reason of their freshness and sincerity. Gradually, in the course of time, these writings become more and more overgrown with habitual associations, routine, and imitation; they become stereotyped, pedantic, petty minded, soulless. In Ismaili esoteric literature it is only in the earliest period that one finds erudite works such as those of Abū Ḥātim Rāzī and Ḥamīdu'd-dīn Kirmānī, full of real philosophic effort. Later on the spirit evaporates, and the speculations degenerate into manipulation of ready made ideas and sentences. Still later, in the provincial surroundings of the Yaman and the stagnant atmosphere of the middle ages, crude superstition spreads very widely. From the earliest simple and clear works one passes by degrees to ponderous volumes which claim to be the most secret revelations of extraordinary mysteries. A good example is the Shumūsu'z-zāhira by Sayyid-nā Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm (d. 596/1199), cf. Guide, no. 205. Here, side by side with the most abstruse speculations on the system of emanations, and on the mysteries of the creation of the universe, one meets the most learned and ponderous discussions of such important questions as why, according to the words of Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq, the Jinn do not like the proximity of a bath-house (hammām), and flee from the place in which one is built?¹

In esoteric speculations connected with the subject of our research several matters should be noted. The most important is what may be called the symbolical parallelism of events. Whatever the true history of the Imams, their genealogy, succession, etc., these had to be nothing but a complete parallel and

¹ As is known, Fatimid Ismailism regards the ideas of the Jinn and angels as abstractions, denoting certain natural and cosmic energies. The whole matter is therefore a highly abstruse speculation.
repetition of the events connected with the precursors of the Imams and Prophets. Generations of learned Ismailis, including a man as really clever as Qādī Nu'mān, wasted their time and energy with amazing persistence in tracing such parallelism in the legends of the great prophets of ancient times. If the Founder of Islam left as his successor ʻAli, according to the Shiʻite doctrine, it was because his remote ancestor Abraham had done this or that with his son Ismā'il, etc. The idea is traced through the legends of all the prophets, from Adam onwards, and huge efforts are expended in forcing these into uniform terms. It may be noted that such reference to precedents in religious history is a prominent feature of the Koran itself; the Ismailis only carried the method to its extreme. In such speculations all difference between the historic case and its legendary prototype gradually disappears, and the sense of reality is often lost: is the author referring to Ismā'il b. Jaʻfar, the Ismaili Imam, or to Ismā'il son of Abraham? All this seriously affects the reliability of historical information, because, consciously or unconsciously, the authors of the esoteric works force the real events to resemble as much as possible the circumstances in the legend. Sometimes historical personages are referred to under the names of their Biblical prototypes. A quotation (Texts, p. 81–106) from one of such taʻwil works, by Jaʻfar b. Mansūrīl-Yaman, is offered; it clearly shows how much confusion can be introduced by enthusiastic practitioners of this method.

The second important point is the superstitious belief in the mystical implications of numbers. The belief is obviously of immense antiquity, based on one of the most fundamental properties of the human mind. Rhythm, the sense of symmetry and dissymmetry, obviously is one of the most primitive elements of our spatial perception. It is quite natural that its projection upon the perception of the universe should have worked at all times as a powerful stimulus to human curiosity. Pythagoras with his numerous successors was one of many early sages to take up the matter very seriously. The middle ages, with their
cabbalistic speculations, had a firm faith in the reality of such a rhythm of things in the visible world. In the esoteric Ismaili doctrine this idea is an indisputable assumption. Hence springs the “Sevenership” of the Ismailis; and all their doctrines of seven Nāţīqs, seven Īmāms, etc.¹ The force of these superstitious ideas was immense, and historical facts were bent and twisted mercilessly to fit them. Astrological speculations, to some extent also connected with such numerical periodism, also contributed very much to the falsification of history, as de Goeje has already carefully elucidated it in his “Mémoire” (pp. 69–73). I am giving an extract from the late esoteric work, Zahrul-ma’ānî,² by Sayyid-nā Idrīs, which is a typical example of this mentality. There was another form of the same numerical mysticism in the speculations regarding the number values of different names found in the system of the Druzes. In the Ismaili system it seems that they were not so popular.

Apparently the earliest esoteric work which contains some information useful for our purposes is a mystic work of Sayyid-nā Ja‘far b. Mansūri‘l-Yaman, the famous author of highly valued

¹ However strange this may sound, the early beliefs in the cycle of Seven Imam, and that the expected Messiah would be the Seventh of them, were shared by the Ithna‘-asharis. The great compendium of the Shi‘ite tradition, the Biḥārul-amwār of Majlisī (vol. XIII), in dealing with the ḫadīths and akhbār predicting the advent of the Mahdī, quotes several prophecies in which he is expected to be “the son of six” (ībn sitta). The author tries to offer his own explanations, which are not in the least convincing.

² Usually the title is pronounced Zahrul-ma’ānî (with a in Zahr). But Dr. Zahid Ali, Professor of Arabic in the Nizam College, Haydarabād, himself a Bohora, has kindly explained to me that all learned Bohorās pronounce it Zuhr, with u, because the word is the Plural from ashar, “brilliant, shining, beautiful”. To me this seems sensible, because the work deals with many subjects, practically covering the whole field of Ismaili dogmatics. Therefore the title such as “(Many) beautiful ideas” (or subjects) would appear to be more appropriate than “A flower of ideas”, in case we read Zahrul-ma’ānî. But there is no doubt that there are no rules or logical grounds in the choice of florid titles of works in Arabic. In addition to this, there is a general tendency in India to pronounce Arabic words mostly with a: nasrat (= nasrat), hazar Īmām (ḥādīr Īmām), etc. Anyhow, as this is rather immaterial, and as other learned Ismailis whom I consulted prefer the reading Zahr, I leave it as is it pronounced by the majority.
esoteric writings, a contemporary of Qādi Nu'mān,—the Aṣrāru‘n-nuṭaqa‘ (cf. Guide, no. 43). The son, or, most probably, grand-son, of the conqueror of the Yaman, he, as often happens, had not inherited the qualities of his ancestor. Probably having had a good start as the relative of such a celebrity, he could never rise above pretentious mystic speculations, which as far as can be seen, are heavy and unoriginal.

The Aṣrāru‘n-nuṭaqa‘ is closely connected with his other work, the Sarā‘iru‘n-nuṭaqa‘, being apparently a revised and amplified version of the latter. The Sarā‘iru‘n-nuṭaqa‘ deals summarily with the mystical symbolism of the Coranic legends regarding the earliest great prophets, Ādam, Nūḥ, and Ibrāhīm, and ends with two different explanations of the CXIth sūra of the Coran (tabbat yadā Abī Lahab).

The Aṣrāru‘n-nuṭaqa‘, which was composed about 380/990, is apparently a new version of the preceding work. The first fifty pages or so are taken from the earlier book, and, from the story of Ibrāhīm onwards, the version has been considerably amplified. At the end there are some very interesting references to Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far which I shall set out without any attempt to condense the story, so that this extract may serve at the same time as a good specimen of this kind of works. The main subject of the book is the story of Ibrāhīm, and the proofs of the right of Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far to the Imamat. It contains a strong controversial element, directed against the Ithna-‘asharis. In this

---

1 I am much indebted to Mr. A. A. A. Fyzee for his having kindly lent to me a precious copy from his collection, an old Yamanite manuscript, dated the 8th Dhi‘l-Qa‘da 742/15 Apr. 1342.

2 This may be inferred from the words of the author that 120 years have passed since the “disappearance” of the last Imam of the Twelvers in 260/874. But we need not take this figure as perfectly accurate,—it is obviously approximate, and the date of the work would, most probably, be a little earlier. Therefore it seems to me clear that the author was not the son, but most probably a grand-son of Ibn Ḥawshab. If the latter was an adult in 286/880, who could be entrusted with such a responsible mission as his campaign in the Yaman, it is difficult to believe that his son could be flourishing in 380/990, i.e. 120 years later. So far I have not been able to trace the full name of this Ja‘far b. Mansūr. It is quite possible that here ibn has the meaning of a “descendant”, not son.
respect it is very interesting as one of the earliest controversies on the doctrine of the Imamat. The stories of Jesus and Muḥammad are very concise. Although I have not collated the works, it seems that the Aṣrārū’n-nuḥaqā’ may possibly be an “answer” to Qāḍī Nu’mān’s famous Asāsu’l-ta’wil (cf. Guide, no. 71), which deals with precisely the same matters, but without a clear controversial tendency.\(^1\)

The next important “witness in the case”, as far as I have been able to ascertain, is the brilliant Sayyid-nā Ḥamīdu’d-dīn Ahmad b. ‘Abdīl-lāh al-Kirmānī, the chief dā’ī of “both the ʿIrāqs”, i.e. of W. Persia and Mesopotamia, who flourished towards the end of the fourth and in the beginning of the fifth/eleventh c., and died probably towards the end of the reign of al-Ḥākim (386–411/996–1021) whom he devoutly defends in many of his writings.

As a correction to the account of his works given in the Guide (pp. 43–46) it may be mentioned that the most probable sequence of his main works was this: the Rāḥatu’l-ʿaqīd (no. 117), a bulky philosophical work, and one of the most fundamental in Isma’ili esoteric literature, often quoted, paraphrased, etc., was apparently one of the earliest amongst his writings. Amongst his later works, all to a large extent controversial in spirit, are: al-Maṣābīḥ fi ithbātī’l-Imāmat (116), Mabāsimu’l-mubāsharāt (133), al-Kāfiya (135), and Tanbihu’l-hādī wa’l-mustahdī (118), which is one of the latest of all. There is also al-Ḥāwiya (132). All these contain historical allusions, especially the Kāfiya, Tanbihu’l-hādī, Mabāsimu’l-mubāsharāt, and Maṣābīḥ.

A Syrian dā’ī, Abūl-Fawāris Ahmad b. Yaʿqūb, who wrote under al-Ḥākim, left an interesting treatise, ar-Risāla fi’l-Imāmat, divided into 16 questions (Guide, 148). It is preserved in the second volume of that most valuable chrestomathy, Majmūʿu’t-tarbiyat, of Sayyid-nā Muḥammad b. Tāhir al-Ḥārithi (d. 584/1188).

\(^1\) Although there is no doubt that this work was composed long after Qāḍī Nu’mān’s death (in 393/974), there are no references to him in the Aṣrārū’n-nuḥaqā’.
1188), cf. Guide, 195. Though it does not mention names, it obviously refers to the anti-Ismaili polemics.

Next in chronological order comes the strange Ghāyatu’l-mawālíd, ascribed to Sayyid-nā al-Khaṭṭāb (d. 533/1138; cf. Guide, 184). A quotation, from an incorrect copy, has been published by B. Lewis in his “Origins of Ismā’īlism”, p. 109. The purpose of the work is to prove the genuineness of the Imamat of at-Ṭayyib, the son of al-Āmir (495-524/1101-1130), the last Imam of the Musta’lian line, whose historical reality is highly questionable, and whose existence is a matter of faith. Many works in post-Fatimid Ismaili literature touch on this subject, and there would be nothing particular to notice about it, if it did not contain one most amazing statement, namely a revelation that al-Mahdī was not an Imam, and the father of al-Qā’im, and that there was a fourth concealed Imam, of whose existence apparently no other work knows anything, and who is to fill the vacant place. This is so extraordinary that it is worth while to examine the case in detail.

The work is divided into five bābs, each subdivided into faṣls: 1. ithbātul-ḥujaj fi’l-jazā’ir al-ithnā-‘ashar; 2. an-nāsūtul-muttaḥid bi’l-lāhūt; 3. hadhihi’l-hādithat wa ithbātu’s-saḥīḥ min-hā, etc.; 4. ithbātul-imāmat bi’l-Imām at-Ṭayyib; and 5. al-lāfā’īf wa ghāyatu-hā wa’l-ḥujubul-khamṣa wa zuhūru-hā bi-hudūdi-hā wa zuhūrul-maqām bi-jam‘ihā wa taqallib al-Ghayb bi-hā. It begins with the usual speculations about the necessity of guidance for the people which God, in His mercy, never refuses, always keeping in the “12 islands of the earth” His “proofs”.1 One

---

1 The bujjas of the twelve faṣils are very often referred to in different esoteric works, whenever they touch on the rather frequently discussed subject of the buḍudud-dīn. But the names of these jazā’ir are never mentioned in this connection,—presumably because this is a matter of general knowledge. Such presumption, however, seems to be too optimistic: on enquiry from very many learned Ismailis, I was only able to elicit their confession that they have no knowledge of this, and even that they were unable to name the work in which I can find information. But at last, quite incidentally, I discovered this, in an esoteric treatise, Risālatul-Basmala, by Sayyid-nā ‘Ali b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Walid, the cousin of the fifth Yamanite dā’i, who flourished towards the end of the
of such proofs, for the Yaman, is the petty local princess, al-
-Ḥurratu'īl-Malika. There follows a lengthy discussion of the
question whether a woman can be such a ḥuṣjat, or not, which
is decided in the affirmative. Then follow esoteric speculations
about the manifestation of Divine wisdom in man, about the
question of the satr of Imām ʿAl-Ṭayyib, and satr in general,
about succession of Imams. In the fourth bāb are discussed the
questions of the genealogy of ʿAl-Ṭayyib, and of his being a
legitimate successor of his ancestors, and the belief that he is
not dead. Ultimately the matter is again transferred to the
sphere of abstract speculations, and of proofs by numerical values
of letters, etc. On the whole the question can be easily summed
up in the author's own statement: such is our belief, and the
belief of our ancestors.

The whole matter seems from beginning to the end to be
extremely suspicious. We can visualize the situation. The
assassination of al-Āmir took place in 524/1130,—the Mustaʿlians
make it two years later, 526/1132. In this year, according to the
tradition, the infant heir apparent, for some unknown reason,
“disappeared” without leaving any trace. As Sayyid-nā al-
-Khaṭṭāb died in 533/1138, the treatise cannot have been written
later than only nine years after this extraordinary event. Imagine

sixth/twelfth c. (Guide, 192). It is included in that valuable chrestomathy,
the Majmuʿuʿt-tarbiyat (cf. Guide, 195). In this treatise there is a table,
showing the theosophic scheme of the position of the Imam in the Universe.
In this are included the titles of the twelve ḥuṣjate. I consulted three
copies (all modern), but in one of them the table was omitted. The other
two agreed completely, except that in one of these one name was missing.
It appears that in this sense jazīra does not mean the “island”, as it
usually means, but is taken here in its basic sense, from the root j-x-r = to
cut off, and therefore means “a slice, cutting”, or a part, a section. There-
fore the expression “12 jazīrāʾ” should be translated as the “12 sections
of the world’s population”. They are: Arabs, Turks, Berbers, Negroes,
Abyssinians, Khazars, China, Daylam (obviously for Persia in general),
Rūm (= Byzantium and Europe in general), India (Hind = Eastern
Afghanistan), Sind (= India in general), and Ṣaqqālih (Slavs,—often
confounded with Sicily). Thus this classification is partly based on geo-
 graphical, and partly on ethnographical principle, and plainly belongs to
the fourth/tenth c. (cf. the names: Khazars, Daylam, Ṣaqqālih. Cf. also
further on). Expressions such as are found in the Iskātār, e.g. the jazīra
of Ḥarrān, of Syria, etc., obviously mean the province or district.
that the heir apparent of a first class power suddenly disappears without leaving any trace; but at-Ṭayyib was for the Ismailis incomparably more important than any ordinary prince,—he was all in all for their religious life. Then we find that one of the religious leaders of the community, just a few years after the calamity, writing in a purely abstract and academic manner, basing his speculations on the vaguest and most abstract principles, confines himself, in short, to the bare assertion that we must believe him to be alive. Together with such discussions comes the statement that al-Mahdī was not an Imam, and that his place belongs to a mysterious fourth concealed Imam whom for some reason the Ismailis for over two hundred years had concealed with such extraordinary jealousy. It is impossible to ascertain without exhaustive study of Ismaili literature whether similar revelations are found in other works also. So far I have found traces of these only in the Zahrul’-ma‘ānī of Sayyid-nā Idrīs. As may be seen from the translation of the original passage further on, he alludes to this theory clearly enough for those who have read the Ghayatu’l-mawālid, but not clearly enough to pin him to his word.

Learned Ismailis usually accept without any reservation the tradition which attributes certain works to different well-known authors, though in some cases it appears very suspicious. In this case the situation is the same. There are no indications as to the name of the author in the work itself. The reasons for which it is attributed to al-Khaṭṭāb are unknown. But it seems almost obvious that the work belongs to a much later period. Perhaps it was composed by Sayyid-nā Idrīs himself? Obviously under what may be in a way called the “pressure of public opinion”, he boldly incorporates the myth of Ibn al-Qaddāḥ in his Zahrul’-ma‘ānī. With his “diplomatic sense”, he apparently arrives at the way of reasoning which comes to a compromise: since every one thinks that al-Mahdī was a descendant of al-Qaddāḥ, he must let it be so. But, nevertheless, he shall reveal the “truth”, a great mystery: al-Mahdī was not the father of
the ancestor of at-Tayyib, al-Qāʾīm. The latter’s real father was a super-mysterious Imam ‘Alī, who died on his way to the Maghrib, leaving his son al-Qāʾīm in charge of al-Mahdī.

All this is highly suspicious, and apparently no allusion to this is found in earlier sources. Strangely, the author of the Fihristu’l-Majdū, so well informed, omits the Ghāyatu’l-mawālid from his list, perhaps feeling certain doubts regarding it. I tried my best to ascertain from certain experts in Ismaili literature whether the work is quoted or referred to in any recognised esoteric treatises, but I was unable to elicit any definite information. This is not strange, because many esoteric authors rarely refer to their authorities by name. It would be necessary to read all the esoteric works in order to be certain. We shall return to these matters further on.

The next, chronologically, is the collection of the Majālis, i.e. lectures or discourses, of Sayyid-nā Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī, who was the third Yamanite dāʾī, and died in 596/1199. Only nos. 77–133 of his lectures are in existence (Guide, 216). We are here only concerned with a portion of the 117th majlis, the supposed prophecy of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalib himself, obviously compiled in the beginning of the fifth/eleventh c., in the reign either of az-Zāhir (411–427/1021–1036), or al-Mustanṣir. It refers to the Imams not under their names, but under serial numbers. This, as also the confusion of dates, is apparently a crude device to give verisimilitude to the “prophecy”. Although of no particular importance, the extract seems worth quoting, because it contains interesting allusions, and reflects the spirit of probably influential circles (Texts, pp. 107–113).

The latest esoteric work of importance which should be quoted here, the Zahru’l-ma’ānī by Sayyid-nā Idrīs (Guide, 260), has been already referred to. It covers, as usual, the whole field of the subjects of esoteric theosophy, and in the 17th chapter gives a systematic review of the whole list of 21 Imams, describing their esoteric position, and explaining the religious character of their activity. An extract, covering the biographies of the Imams
from Ismā'īl b. Ja'far to al-Qā'im, is offered further on, with a complete translation (Texts, pp. 47–80).

With regard to the quotations and translations from the original works, offered here, several points may be noted. As a rule, there are practically no genuine variants in the Isma'ili manuscripts preserved in the Bohora community in India. Most probably they have been copied from one single early copy brought from the Yaman; or, possibly, even in the Yaman itself, as a general rule, careful copying from a single original edition, and respect for the works themselves, safeguarded the copies from inexactitudes. If any differences between copies exist, they are almost invariably due to mistakes of the scribes, arising partly from imperfect knowledge of Arabic, and partly from illegibility of the original. In a great majority of cases they can be easily rectified. Therefore, in order not to burden the edition with often quite unnecessary notes, only the most important are here given in footnotes to the translation. Another reason for adopting this course is that except in very few cases all copies at my disposal were quite recent, and only there were one or two of each work. It should be therefore carefully noted that the editing of all texts in this volume is only tentative, and without any claim to finality and complete reliability.

As the present texts have an auxiliary character, and, I hope, may be in the future rendered unnecessary by complete editions of the whole works, I have not cared to expend time on scrutinizing every word in them. I shall be obliged to those who care to suggest emendations, wherever necessary.

With regard to translations it should be noted that I considered it inexpedient to lay down any rigid rule as to whether a translation of the extracts should be given in the text of the analysis, or in the separate section of translations. In order to economise space, I have thought it permissible not to edit original quotations from works which do not raise any doubts as to the meaning of the terms, such as extracts from the 'Uyūnu'l-akhbār, or the first volume of al-Azhār. But those texts, which either
claim special importance, or may offer ground for doubt as to the implications of the original expressions, are given here in the original Arabic. All translations, both in the special section, and in the text of the analysis, are as literal as practicable. But certain portions, of secondary importance, are either briefly summarized, or simply omitted in translation. Such are the invocations of blessings after the names of the saints, except in cases where they present something out of the ordinary. Whole passages have been omitted when they contained statements which would be resented by other sects of Islam, and when they presented nothing of importance for the trend of the narrative. Also omitted are the boring and stereotyped excursions into Biblical parallels, when they are of no importance (except in the extract from the Asrāru'un-nuṭaqā', in which they form the main part of the argument). On some occasions the extracts in original Arabic are edited, but left without a translation, because intended for reference only, as in the case of the Ghāyatul-mawālīd.

(In order to make it easier to follow the argument, I would recommend the readers, before proceeding further, to read my paper, "Ismailis and Qarmatians", in the JBBRAS, 1940, pp. 43–85, and pieces 1 and 2 in the Chapter VI further on.)
II. AL-MAHDI, HIS ANCESTORS AND FAMILY.

1. The Genealogy of al-Mahdi, and his Family.

Many students of the history of Ismailism have remarked the strange fact that the Fatimids, despite what may be called "very strong provocation", never made a public proclamation and official announcement of the genealogy which they claimed, and which was so much disputed. Their own version was apparently known only either through various renegades or other people for some reason closely connected with the sect, such as, e.g., Akhū Muḥsin, and others. It is referred to fragmentarily, and, as far as I know, there is no indication of its being incorporated in any official document, and refuted by their enemies in toto. The Abbasid proclamations of 402/1011 or 444/1052 are vague, and do not quote it. So strange a silence is taken (as by de Goeje, p. 6), as one of the proofs that their genealogy is not genuine. This idea is rather naïve: with the resources at their disposal the Fatimids could easily have had the most reliable genealogy prepared by the best specialists, and have bought the testimony of the greatest authorities, in case an official version, true or falsified, as the case might be, had really been required from their point of view. It may be safely presumed that such shrewd politicians and men of such brilliance generally as were the first Fatimid caliphs, realised perfectly well the dangers of the situation; there are many proofs that hostile propaganda, trying to compromise the Fatimids, striking at the root of their authority,— their Alīd descent,— reached its destination, sometimes sowing grave doubts in the different Ismaili communities.¹ But notwithstanding all this, nothing was done, although there are traces in esoteric Ismaili works of

¹ The epistle of al-Muʾizz biʾl-lāh to his ādāʾ in Sindh, quoted in the 'Uyunuʾl-akhbār, sufficiently proves this. Cf. my paper "Ismailis and Qarmatians", JBBRAS, 1940, pp. 74-75.
the time, indicating that religious authorities were by no means blind to the consequences of such apparent inactivity.

It is remarkable that the names of the three concealed Imams, the links between al-Mahdī and the ancestor to whom he laid claim, Muḥammad b. Iṣmāʿīl b. Jaʿfar, are not mentioned even in the Ismaili books of the time: Abū Ḫātim ar-Rāzī, Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān, in his numerous works, Jaʿfar b. Mašūrīl-Yaman, and other authors of the fourth/tenth c., never mention these names. The first, towards the end of this period, to break silence was the author of the Istimār, analysed above. And later on such references appear in the later works of Sayyid-nā Ḥamīduʾd-dīn al-Kirmānī, the great philosopher and high official, obviously in view of the great pressure of the hostile propaganda. They appear in his controversial works, apparently intended for perusal within the community.\(^1\)

Thus we may safely infer that there was a very strong religious prejudice directed against “uncovering those whom God has veiled”, or inspired by some similar idea. It was probably regarded as a great sin, and it was felt that any inconvenience should be endured rather than that such an offence should be committed. Such psychology is by no means strange in the Ismaili surroundings; it always persisted, and even now still persists in certain circles. To keep secret everything connected with their religion, however remotely, is one of the most important principles in Ismaili life. It is quite obvious that in the conditions of that remote time, and the heated atmosphere of religious fanaticism amongst the masses, such a precautionary measure was most stringently enforced. Most probably, this so got into the “blood” of the community, that even after the situation had changed, and the Fatimid power was able to secure the safety of its subjects, the taboo for a long time was not relaxed.

For this reason those who were for any reason interested in the descent of the Fatimids were left to their own ingenuity in

\(^1\) See further on, p. 46 sq.
case they did not trust the version expressed by the Fatimids' own claims. The variety of genealogies suggested by various parties and historical writers must really constitute a record — these amount to several hundreds. With their predominantly hostile tendency, each author vies with the others in inventing something more humiliating and scandalous for the dynasty. The most "effective" (and at the same time apparently the most absurd) version, according to which the Fatimids were descended from a certain heretic, 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāh, has won general approval. It has become a sort of an "official and generally recognised" version in non-Ismaili circles, has been treated quite seriously, and even now evokes attempts at repair by ingenious theories. We are going to study it further, and it will suffice here only to mention that it has vitiated to a considerable extent a great deal of non-sectarian testimony which would otherwise be really valuable.

We do not know whether there were any attempts in Ismaili literature to sum up available historical information about the ancestors of al-Mahdī before the 'Uyūnu'l-akhbār of Sayyid-nā Idrīs. But by far the best and most succinct account is found in the first volume of the Kitābu'l-azhār, the chrestomathy by the eminent Indian Ismaili, Ḥasan b. Nūḥ of Broach, as mentioned above, in the chapter on sources. We may offer here a translation of the relevant portions, omitting superfluous details.

... "The fifth Imam was Mawlā-nā Ja'far b. Muḥammad, Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh, surnamed aš-Ṣādiq. The period of his Imamat was 34 years and seven months; he died in the month of Shawwāl 148/Nov.-Dec. 765, being 68 or 69 years old. He was buried in the Baqī' cemetery (in Medina), next to the graves of his father and grand-father, of Imam Ḥasan b. 'Ali, and Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet..."
The sixth Imam was Mawlā-nā Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far, Abū Muḥammad, surnamed al-Wafī. He died during the lifetime of his father, but not before the latter had appointed him as his successor. (It is stated in history that his grave is in the Baqī‘ cemetery. I visited it in 904/1498-9; it was situated within the city walls, near the Baqī‘ gate). He bequeathed his position to his son, Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, with the consent of his father, transferring to him the office of the Imamat by his father’s, Imam Ja‘far’s order, and in his presence. Imam Ja‘far communicated this only to the heads of the Shi‘ite community, out of fear of exposing his heir to danger, in pursuance of the policy of concealment; thus only a few knew of this, those privileged ones who knew for certain that the designation of the Imam is irrevocable, and that the Imamat can be transferred only from one person to one, from the parent to the son.

The seventh Imam was Mawlā-nā Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, Abū ‘Abdī‘l-lāh, surnamed ash-Shākir. He bequeathed his rank to his son ‘Abdu‘l-lāh b. Muḥammad... His grave was in a place called Farghāna (some say Naysābūr). It is narrated that the Imams of the period of zuhūr (i.e. the Fatimid caliphs) have removed the ashes of the concealed Imams to Cairo, but God alone knows whether this is true.

Now comes the second heptade of the Imams, who are called khulafā‘, or “successors”.

The first of them is ‘Abdu‘l-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far, Abū Muḥammad, surnamed ar-Raḍī, or, as some say, Nāṣir. He died in Salamiyya, and was buried there, but his ashes were afterwards transferred to Cairo.

1 Cf. my “Ismailis and Qarmatians”, JBBRAS, 1940, p. 63. In June 1937, while on a visit to Cairo, I did my best to discover traces of Fatimid tombs. With the help of Prof. Kamil Hussain, of the Egyptian University, references in some mediaeval works, dealing with the Qarafa, have been verified on the spot, and local inhabitants were questioned. But nothing could be elicited. It would be an interesting subject to collect references in mediaeval authors to these graves, as also the tombs of the Fatimids in Mahdiyya. It is obvious that all of them have been destroyed since the fall of the dynasty.
The second of them was Ahmad b. ‘Abdi’l-lāh, Abu’l-Ḥusayn, surnamed at-Taqi, or, as some say, al-Khayr. He died in Salamiyya, but his ashes, as in the case of his father, were later on transferred to Cairo.

The third of them was Mawlā-nā Imām al-Ḥusayn b. Ahmad, Abu ‘Abdi’l-lāh, surnamed az-Zākī. He died in ‘Askar Mukram (in Khūzistān), and his burial place was concealed.

The fourth of them was Mawlā-nā al-Imām ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. al-Ḥusayn, Abu Muḥammad, surnamed al-Mahdi bi’l-lāh, Amīru’l-mu’minīn. He was the first of the Imams of the period of zuhūr (i.e. possession of secular authority), the dawn of the Light, the one who brought about the alleviation of the lot of the faithful. He was born in ‘Askar Mukram in Khūzistān, on the night on Monday the 12th of Shawwāl 260/30-vii-874, or, as some say, 259/11-8-873 (if the day of the week mentioned here is true, the later date is perfectly correct,— the day really was a Sunday).

His father returned with him to Salamiyya, where he was brought up by his uncle Abu ‘Ali al-Ḥakīm (i.e. Muḥammad b. Ahmad ?), surnamed Sa’īdu’l-Khayr, in whose charge his father left him. It was this Sa’īdu’l-Khayr who sent the dā‘ī Abu’l-Qāsim Ḥasan b. Farah Ibn Ḥawshab, surnamed Manṣūr, to the Yaman. His father died when he was eight years of age.1 His uncle Abu ‘Ali al-Ḥakīm married him to his own daughter, and Abu’l-Qāsim al-Qā’im bi-amri’l-lāh was the issue of this marriage. Imam al-Ḥusayn b. Ahmad (obviously Abu ‘Ali al-Ḥakīm, who is really meant here) died a short time after the marriage. The duration of the Imamat of al-Mahdi, since the day on which he left Salamiyya to his death, was 38 years, five months, and three days.2 Propaganda in his favour has spread everywhere, in the

---

1 This is obviously based on the Iṣtiṣār, 95, where it is said that al-Mahdi was at that time a child (fi ḥāti’l-tufālīyya) and Sirat Ja’far al-Ḥājib, 109.

2 This falls upon the 12-th of Ramaḍān 283/23-10-896. Al-Mahdi must certainly have left Salamiyya several years later, before the invasion of Syria by the sons of Zakrūya. Most probably in reality this date refers
Yaman and Maghrib, but nobody knew either his name or place of residence. He died in Mahdiyya on the night of Tuesday in the middle of Rab. I 322/4-3-934, being 61 years, five months and three days old. He was buried in Mahdiyya.

The fifth of them was Mawlā-nā al-Imām Muḥammad b. ‘Abdī’l-lāh, Abū’l-Qāsim, surnamed al-Qā’im bi-amrī’l-lāh, Amīrū’l-mu’minīn. He succeeded his father at the age of 47, and his reign lasted 12 years, six months and 27 days. He died on the 14th Shawwāl 334/19-5-946, at the age of 59 years, six months and 27 days. He was buried in Mahdiyya.”

It may be added that the same information is repeated in the first volume of al-Azhār in tabular form.

It is not necessary to take all these precise calculations of the age of al-Mahdī and al-Qā’im as quite reliable. In fact, it seems certain that al-Mahdī was born either in 259 or in 260 A.H., although some authors mention 266/879 (Ibn Khallikān, II, 77) as well, probably wrongly. But about the date of the birth of al-Qā’im there is greater discord: usually the date is given as 280/893, approximately, of course. The same Ibn Khallikān gives three alternative dates: 277/890, 280/893 and 282/895, and it seems that the last one is nearer to the truth. The statement that al-Qā’im succeeded his father, al-Mahdī, at the age of 47, implies his being born when al-Mahdī was only 15-16 years old, perhaps less. It is most probably taken from the fifth volume of the ‘Uyūnu’l-akhbār, and seems to be too early. Wüstenfeld (88) says that at the date of his death he was 55 years old, and this again means that he was born about 280/893.1

In my previous paper, “Ismailis and Qarmatians”, JBBRAS, 1940, pp. 60–67, I have already given the contents of the passages, referring to Ismā‘il and Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il, found at the end of the fourth volume of the ‘Uyūnu’l-akhbār of Sayyid-nā Idris; to the death of his guardian, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, as we may see further on.

1 Cf. interesting references in the Sirat of Ja‘far where it is repeatedly mentioned that at the time of the emigration al-Qā’im still was a small child.
and we may here add what may be gathered about the three "concealed" Imams. Sayyid-nā Idrīs has derived his information, as may be seen, from the Sharḥu’l-akhbār of Qāḍī Nu’mān (very little, indeed), Istitār, the portion of the lost Sīra of Mānṣūru’l-Yaman, quoted in the beginning of the Iṣṭīḥāṣu’d-ṣa‘wā, and some other few sources which cannot be identified. His information is very meagre, and he makes up for this in the biography of Imam Āḥmad b. ‘Abdi’l-lāh by inserting a lengthy account of the Rasā’il Ikhwāni’s-ṣafā, which are supposed to have been composed by this Imam. Here is a translation of relevant passages:

"Then the Imamat went to Imam ar-Raḍī ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl, after his father’s death. He returned to Nihāwand, where he married a daughter of Hamdān, son of (or son of the uncle of) Mānṣūr b. Jawshan, who was from Kāzirūn. The issue of this marriage was a son, ‘Ālī b. ‘Abdi’l-lāh, surnamed al-Layth, and a daughter, Fāṭima. The Imam’s brothers also married, and had posterity.

When ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Muḥammad became the Imam, the Abbasids intensified their search for him everywhere. For this reason he left his son (‘Ālī?) as his lieutenant, and himself went into concealment, so that none of his agents or ordinary followers knew his whereabouts. (Before leaving them) he instructed his dā’īs in the knowledge of the religion, his own and of his holy ancestors, and the dā’īs were strictly carrying out their instructions." (Here follows the story of the heresy of Āḥmad ibn al-Kayyāl, already translated and discussed in the previous paper, JBBRAS, pp. 64-5.) On p. 65 of the same paper a translation is also given of the passage, describing the further movements of the Imam: he again hides himself, this time in Daylam, accompanied by 32 trusted dā’īs. Here another son, Āḥmad, his successor in the future, is born, by an Alid wife whom he took at Ashnāsh. After this follows a lengthy story of al-Ma’mūn’s strange plan of abdicating in favour of ‘Ālī ar-Riḍā, son of Mūsā al-Kāzim, and the latter’s death. On pp. 65–67 the reader will
find the details of the Imam’s appointing as his deputy his own brother al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad, his being proclaimed an Imam, the tragic death of ‘Alī al-Layth (the son or the brother?), the journey of al-Ḥusayn to Khwārizm, to his brother Ahmad, and the death of all members of the family, ambushed by enemies.

“When the Imam received news of all this, and of the misfortunes that befell his brothers and his son, he left Ahwāz, and went to Sāmarrah, where he stayed for a time, with his son Ahmād. He wrote to his dā’īs, informing them that he was in safety. Then he travelled to Syria, disguised as a merchant. He ultimately settled in Salamiyya, where he built a house, still continuing to play his part of a merchant. There were living many Hashimites, some of whom were related to the Abbasids. So he pretended to be one of these, and was regarded as one of their number. He was respected for his great piety and virtue, which were the proofs of his high position. He kept in strict secret his own real name, and the name of his son.

His dā’īs have completely lost trace of him. Then they arranged a search, sending out their deputies to look for the Imam. Amongst these notable dā’īs were a certain Hurmuz, with his son Mahdī,1 and Surẖāf b. Rustam,2 with his son ‘Imrān. This Mahdī had collected four thousand dinārs in cash, from the donations of the faithful. He took the sum with him, and

1 In my paper, “Ismailis and Qarmatians”, p. 85, I have already raised the question as to this Mahdī b. Hurmuz being the father of Abū Zakariyā Yahyā b. al-Mahdī at-Ṭamāmī or as-Ṣamāmī, killed by Abū Saʿīd in Bahrayn soon after 281/894. Dr. Lewis, in his work “The Origins of Ismāʿīlism” (Cambridge, 1940), p. 78 sq., collects several forms in which this name is met with in historical reports, conjecturing that these imply one and the same person. May we go a step further, and suggest that this Mahdī was also the father of another prominent Ismailī dāʿī, Zakrūya b. Mahdūya, the father of the invaders of Syria? If this Mahdī was a young man in the beginning of the third/ninth c., Zakariyā, or Zakrūya, the father of the “Qarmatian” brothers, could have been his son. Such considerations are merely a guess, based on the indubitable tendency, noticeable in the history of early Ismailism, for high offices to become hereditary in certain privileged families.

2 The strange name Surẖāf is apparently a later Yamanite Arabization of the original Persian Suhrāb, as is obviously suggested by the combination of the names: Suhrāb b. Rustam.
started on his tour in search of the Imam. He bought some cosmetics, hiding money in his wares, making inquiries about the Imam whose description he mentioned to the people. At last when he came to Salamiyya, he was directed to the house of his master. He asked the servants to be admitted in the presence of the Imam, explaining his being a dāʿī. Then he was admitted, and saw the Imam, to his great joy, and handed over to him the money which he had brought. Later on he returned to his country, and organised the daʿwat there.¹

The Imam remained in Salamiyya to the end of his life. He appointed as his successor his son Āḥmad b. ‘Abdiʾl-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, and circulated his will to his dāʿīs. Then he died, and was buried in Salamiyya.

After the death of his father, Āḥmad b. ‘Abdiʾl-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl became the Imam. He sent his dāʿīs from Salamiyya to different provinces. His dāʿīs rallied around him (ittāṣala bī-hi), preaching in his favour, but preserving the utmost secrecy as to his residence and his real name. He married, and had a son, al-Ḥusayn, who was his eldest son, and ultimately succeeded him after his death.” Then the author proceeds with the story of Imam Āḥmad’s compiling the Encyclopaedia of Ikhwānuʾṣ-ṣafā, the purpose of which was to counteract the heretical and anti-Islamic innovations which began to spread with the connivance of al-Maʾmūn. A detailed account of the contents of all the 52 risālas is here given.²

¹ This story differs slightly from that of the Istīlār, p. 93 sq. No Mahdi is mentioned there, although he may be referred to, in reality, under his kunya.

² Cf. Guide, 13–15. Ismaili tradition usually regards the “abbreviations” of this work, ar-Risālatuʾl-Jāmiʿa and Jāmiʿatuʾl-Jāmiʿa, as later compositions of the author and of his son, al-Ḥusayn b. Āḥmad. Apparently there existed also other abbreviated versions. On perusal, these secret works, which are supposed to reveal deep mysteries, easily seem to contain nothing but a skeleton of the main work. It is therefore a tempting suggestion that one of these “abbreviations” may really be a very early original version, perhaps going as far back as the third/ninth c. (judging from the well-known archaisms of the ideas in the R. Ikhwānuʾṣ-ṣafā). And perhaps the story of the “learned society”, spontaneously founded for the compilation of such an encyclopaedia, may really contain a nucleus of truth in the fact that at a later time, in the fourth/tenth c., under the
The Imam then gave orders to distribute copies of the new Encyclopædia in mosques, for the guidance of the people. This was reported to al-Ma’mūn, who, not unnaturally, became very interested to find the source of this new form of propaganda. Follows the touching story of the devout and brilliant dā‘ī who comes to al-Ma’mūn, participates in the disputes with theologians of different schools, comes out victorious, is asked to show the real Imam to whom the caliph swears to hand over the supreme authority, then ultimately confesses himself to be the Imam, and is beheaded. All this is taken from the 14th juz’ of the Sharḥu’l-akhbār.¹

The Imam died in Salamiyya, and was buried there. Now comes the section which is the most interesting for our inquiry.

"His son, al-Ḥusayn, surnamed az-Zakī, succeeded him as the Imam. He organised the propaganda, spread it further afield, broadcasted instruction to his followers (bāḥthu’l-‘ulūm li-shī‘atī-hī), making it manifest (ażhara-hā); he established proofs, explained the risālas (apparently the Encyclopædia of the Ikhwānu’s-ṣafā),² and despatched his dā‘īs everywhere. He thus made the true religion visible to those who were in search of it. His propaganda was spread widely by his dā‘īs, proselytes became numerous, and different signs began to appear foretelling the advent of the Mahdī, and its near approach. The agents of the Imams promised relief to the people, under the law of Islam, and its injunctions.

The Abbasids intensified their search for him, but were unable to locate him. They apprehended undesirable consequences to themselves from his widely spreading propaganda,

¹ The account given in the Asrārū’n-nuṣṣāqā of Ja‘far b. Maṣūrīl-Yaman, in the extract translated further on, goes much further than these, almost admitting sincerity in the "conversion" of al-Ma’mūn.

² Cf. the note 2 on p. 35. Apparently his Jāmt’atu’l-Jāmt’a is here implicitly referred to.

Fatimids, a number of specialists, including even non-members of the sect, were engaged to compile detailed treatises on different subjects which formed parts of the whole work. The matter is still obscure, and requires thorough investigation. Perhaps this hypothesis may to some extent offer a more promising line of research.
watching the rising might of the movement. His ṭāʾīs kept his name secret, avoiding to give any indication of his whereabouts, revealing this only to the most trusted followers. The time of the advent of al-Mahdī was approaching, and the Great Date was due.

The Imam al-Ḥusayn, desirous of promoting his propaganda, and organising his ṭāʾīs, in furtherance of what God Himself wished in the way of the manifestation of His Light, travelled to Kūfah, on pilgrimage to the tombs of his ancestors, ʿAlī and his son, Ḥusayn. Here he met with Abūl-Qāsim b. al-Faraḥ Ibn Ḥawshab, later on the great ṭāʾī, the conqueror of the Yaman.”

(Follows an extract from the Sīra of this saint, preserved in the Iṣṭīḥār al-daʾwa of Qādī Nuʿmān, and already edited by Quatremère, JA, 1836).

The Imam continued to live in Salamiyya, associating with the local Hashimites, and posing as one of them. Wealth of all kinds was coming to him from all sides from his ṭāʾīs. (Follows an extract from the Sīra of Jaʿfar about the underground passage, and the mysterious hoarding cave, the local Sesame of the Arabian Nights.) The Imam kept on the best of terms with the local governors, giving them rich presents, so that they complied with all his demands. He kept an open table for the Hashimites and others.

“When the departure of Imam al-Ḥusayn approached, he entrusted his son, al-Mahdī, to his own brother, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, surnamed Saʿīdul-Khayr, as guardian and as trustee of the Imamat which belonged to his son, al-Mahdī, at that time merely a child, who had to be put in charge of someone until his attainment of his majority. [I omit Biblical parallels, referred to here.] The trustee wished to keep the Imamat for his own son, depriving al-Mahdī of it. But every one amongst his sons, whom he made the Imam-designate, died, until no more sons remained to him.¹ Meantime God had given victory to Abūl-

¹ This is taken from the Iṣṭīḥār, p. 95.
-Qāsim Ibn Ḥawšab in the Yaman, and he prepared the clothes
(thīyāb,—covers for the Ka‘ba?), writing on these the name
of al-Mahdī bi‘l-lāh. This is what Imam al-Mustanṣīr bi‘l-lāh
has revealed in his sermons about the story of his ancestor, al-
-Mahdī bi‘l-lāh.1

The grave of Imam al-Ḥusayn was in ʿAskar Mukram,
because he travelled to that place not long before the rising of
the “Qarmatians”; when their impious movement had arisen
they occupied Syria. He left his place and his people secretly,
because of the vigilance of the Abbasids, and went to ʿAskar
Mukram, where he died. His brother, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad,
surnamed Sa‘īdu‘l-Khayr, died in Salamiyya, and was buried
there. Thus the Imamat ultimately went to al-Mahdī.”

It is interesting that the names and dates in the account
given in the Kitābu‘l-aẓhār sometimes do not coincide with those
given by Sayyid-nā Idrīs. Therefore it seems there were also
other sources, which were accessible to Ḥasan b. Nūḥ; and it
would be interesting to know why they were not used by the
author of the ‘Uyūnu‘l-akhbār. In order to systematise the
material, we may trace here the genealogical tree, beginning
with Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl. Information about him and his
descendants, as available in all these sources, raises many
questions. Our sources are the ‘Uyūnu‘l-akhbār (as in my paper,
“Ismailis and Qarmatians”, in the JBBRAS, 1940; for brevity
we shall refer to it under “I.Q.”); the Sīra (“S.”); and the
Istitār (“Ist.”).

Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl had two sons who were apparently
born to him before his migration to the East,—Ismā‘īl and
Ja‘far. They seem to be quite historical (cf. ‘Umdatū‘l-Ṭālib,
209), left large posterity, are very rarely referred to in Isma'ili
works, and apparently played no part in sectarian life. It is
impossible to ascertain whether “Ismā‘īl (II)” who appears as

---

1 It is not clear whether al-Mustanṣīr refers here to the sins of Muḥammad b. Aḥmad in trying to usurp the office for his own sons, or only the reference to Ibn Ḥawšab belongs to him.
the successor of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl in the Druze genealogy of the Fatimids, has anything to do with this Ismāʿīl, or is a mere fiction.

In Persia one of his sons was ‘Abdu’l-lāh, his successor as the Imam; he is apparently the same as ‘Abdu’r-Raḥmān of the Dastūrū’l-munajjimīn (de Goeje, 203). Tabari (III, 2218) is not certain about his historical reality; but the fact that he raises the question leaves it beyond doubt that already in the second half of the III/IXth c., i.e. about 100 years after the events, he was recognised as the successor of Imam Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl in sectarian circles (I.Q., 60–63).

Three other sons were: Aḥmad, al-Ḥusayn, and ‘Alī “surnamed al-Layth”, in full agreement with the Dastūrū’l-munajjimīn.

‘Alī al-Layth is apparently confounded with another ‘Alī, who is said to be a son of ‘Abdu’l-lāh. He was murdered by Abbasid emissaries (I.Q., 66). His son Aḥmad avenged his death (ibid.).

Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl (I.Q., 66) emigrated to Khwārizm. We do not know what happened to him.

Al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl was appointed to act on behalf of his (elder) brother, ‘Abdu’l-lāh, travelled to Mekka in disguise, returned to Ahwāz, was proclaimed the Imam (I.Q., 65) by some dāʾīs, against his will, as is stated, started for Khwārizm, to join his brother Aḥmad, was ambushed, and murdered with all his relatives (I.Q., 66). Only Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Layth b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl remained.

‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl travelled to Daylam (or Māzandarān), returned to Ahwāz (I.Q., 67), went thence to Mesopotamia, Sāmarrā, and ultimately settled in Salamiyya. He had two sons, Aḥmad and Ibrāhīm (Ist., 95).

About Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abdi’l-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl nothing is known (even his name is not mentioned anywhere except for the Istitār), save the fact that his posterity was still living at the time of al-Mahdī (cf. Ist., 97,—awlād Ibrāhīm).
They were apparently slaughtered later on in Salamiyya by the "Qarmatians", in 291/903.

Ahmad b. 'Abdīl-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl succeeded his father, and is supposed to be the author, or, to use a more up-to-date term, "chief editor" of the Encyclopædia of Ikhwānūs-saḥā. He lived in Salamiyya, and had two sons, al-Ḥusayn, his successor, and Muḥammad, surnamed Saʿīduʾl-Khayr (Ist., 95). As seen above, in the Kitābuʾl-Azhār, Ahmad b. 'Abdīl-lāh is endowed with the surname al-Khayr, and his son Muḥammad is also called Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥakīm. All this obviously may be true: there is nothing improbable in the fact that a person should have been called Abū ʿAlī Muḥammad b. Ahmad, surnamed Saʿīd, and also Saʿīduʾl-Khayr (Saʿīd, son of al-Khayr?), and at the same time also al-Ḥakīm, as a tribute to his learning, or something on the same lines. It is a great pity that the author of al-Azhār does not mention the source from which he has taken this,— perhaps this would put us on the track of something useful. As mentioned in the same al-Azhār, al-Mahdī was married to this person's daughter, the mother of al-Qāʾim. His posterity were living in Salamiyya, and probably perished at the hands of the "Qarmatians" with other members of the house in 291/903 (Ist., 97). He himself died soon after al-Mahdī's wedding,— we will see this presently in detail.

Ḥusayn b. Ahmad b. 'Abdīl-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl, the father of al-Mahdī, is apparently the same "Ḥusayn" who figures in the well-known story of the conversion of Ibn Ḥawshab, later on the Manṣūruʾl-Yaman, although this is not as certain as could be desired. There is apparently much confusion both in the 'Uyūn and the Azhār, of which it seems easy to trace the cause: both derive their information from the Iṣṭīʿār and the Sīra of Jaʿfar, and in these, for some reason, references are very ambiguous: "al-Imām", who is referred to on such occasions, is not named, and from the context it is by no means easy to see who is meant in every particular case, whether
Aḥmad b. ‘Abdī’l-lāh, his son Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad, or the “acting” Imam, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, or, lastly, al-Mahdī himself.¹

As we have seen above, it is clearly stated in the Azhār that Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad died when al-Mahdī, his son, was eight years old. As the latter was born about 260/874, the date of his death must be ca. 288-881-2. Tabari, as is known, refers to al-Mahdī under the name of Ibn al-Baṣrī,—“the son of the Başran”, and the Ismaili sources completely agree in this, emphasising the connection of the Imams, and especially of this Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad, with Southern Mesopotamia and the adjoining province of Khūzistān. It is stated that al-Mahdī was born in ‘Askar Mukram, in the latter province, and that Ḥusayn also died and was buried there. We can easily believe this: apparently in the second half of the third/ninth c. it became ever clearer that the centre of gravity of Ismaili power was shifting towards the South East: Southern Mesopotamia, Khūzistān, Fārs, and the Yaman, which was best reached by sea from such places as Başra. It is therefore not difficult to believe that

¹ On pp. 108 and 109 apparently “al-Imām”, whom Ja’far could remember, was Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. On p. 116 “al-Imām” apparently is al-Ḥusayn, as he is mentioned in connection with the mission of Ibn Hawshab to the Yaman; Fīrūz, the chief dāʾī, who later on rebelled against al-Mahdī, was the instrument by whom Ibn Hawshab was brought into touch with the “Imām”. But it may be also that as al-Ḥusayn died soon after the first meeting, the mission was organised by Muḥammad. Lower on p. 115, and further on, “al-Imām” plainly refers to al-Mahdī. On p. 122, giving details about the career of Abīl-‘Abbās, the elder brother of Abū ‘Abdī’l-lāh ash-Shī‘ī, he again refers obviously to Muḥammad b. Aḥmad: “and he saw al-Imām and al-Mahdī, with al-Qā’im with both of them. He (al-Qā’im) was at that time still a small child”. Further on “al-Imām” again plainly refers to al-Mahdī. As the whole Sīra clearly shows, Ja’far never refers to religious matters, in which he obviously regarded himself as not competent. Although he was a devout slave, it seems to be not quite certain whether he himself was an Ismaili. As one can see from his Sīra, many of al-Mahdī’s intimate servants were Christians (p. 108). Many rose to high position. Therefore there would be nothing strange in Ja’far’s not being really an Ismaili. Perhaps this circumstance may explain the fact of the compilation of his Sīra, as a “reply” to the boastful Sīra of Jawdhar. Ja’far’s unspoken idea may have been that though not himself an Ismaili, or at least not of a high rank in the Ismaili hierarchy, yet he had performed for his masters all the services which he records. If we assume this, it would be quite easy to understand the way in which he avoids dwelling on purely Ismaili matters.
the head of the sect in fact settled in some centre in one of those localities, leaving his son and heir, with other members of the family, in charge of his younger brother, in a comparatively safer place such as the remote Salamiyya, where few would be likely to connect a wealthy merchant family residing in their midst with the growing unrest and activities in the remote South. The ‘Uyūn, however, offers a puzzling piece of information when it states that Imam Ḥusayn lived until al-Mahdī was married, and died soon after this in ‘Askar Mukram whither he had gone in haste on hearing of the rise of the “Qarmatians”, who later on have invaded Syria. To me it seems clear that this is entirely due to a confusion created by the wrong identification of “al-Imām” in the Istitār. If Ḥusayn died soon after the marriage of al-Mahdī, and this took place about the time of the invasion of the “Qarmatians”, i.e. 290/903, there are many absurdities in the situation. Al-Mahdī was then about thirty years old,—surely rather an advanced age for his (first) marriage. If “the Imam” suddenly left Salamiyya, why did he flee not away from the “Qarmatians”, but towards the very territory from which they had started? How could he leave “an infant son” in the charge of his brother, when this infant was thirty years of age? We must therefore surmise that Ḥusayn in fact died when al-Mahdī was a child (Istitār, 95). “The Imam” who died soon after the marriage of al-Mahdī obviously was his uncle and guardian, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad (Šīrāz, 109), and “the Imam” who fled from Salamiyya at the approach of the “Qarmatians” must certainly have been al-Mahdī himself.

It is stated in the Istitār (95) that the guardian, Muḥammad surnamed Saʿīdu’l-Khayr, the “acting Imam”, tried to usurp the Imamāt for his own line, appointing one after another his sons successively as his heir, but that all of these died, so that ultimately the Imamāt, by the will of God, returned to him for whom it was destined, i.e. al-Mahdī. Similar stories are
found in other periods of Ismailism. It is more probable that in reality Muḥammad b. Aḥmad succeeded his brother as the Imam on the death of al-Ḥusayn, and that later on he did in fact appoint one or more of his sons as his prospective heir. On the death of Muḥammad’s sons, however, and on subsequent death of Muḥammad himself, al-Mahdī, the son of his brother Ḥusayn, found himself the eldest of the family, and was recognised as the Imam, as is explained further on.

The absence of detailed biographies of the ancestors of al-Mahdī is explained by the Ismaili sources as the result of their having lived in strict disguise. This seems quite probable, if we realise the situation. What in fact would the popular memory preserve about the religious heads of the sect when these were living ostensibly as merchants, carrying on their business, associating with their friends, marrying, educating their probably numerous children, and so on? The memory of religious tradition is very economical: it retains only reminiscences of the most important names and events. What really constituted the most important part of the activities of the Imams,— their propaganda efforts, was without any doubt carried on in the utmost secrecy, “between four eyes”. Similarly, their agents, also disguised as pious merchants of slightly lower standing, and, perhaps, in isolated cases secretly composing their books in addition to their cautious and quiet propaganda, left little to be remembered of them in the way of “sensational events”. Not all of them were outstanding men of the talents of Ibn Ḥawshab or Abū ‘Abdī’l-lāh ash-Shī‘ī. Further, since the leaving of any trace of their activities in writing was obviously avoided as much as possible, it is certain that very little could really have been preserved in the records and memory of succeeding generations. Thus the long “blank” period in

---

1 As an instance may be mentioned the tradition regarding the similar situation which arose after the death of pīr Ḥasan Kabīrū’d-dīn, the father of lmām-Shāh, the founder of the Satpânthī sect in Gujrat, towards the end of the ninth/fifteenth c.
the story of the Imams, living in such conditions, cannot reasonably be taken as valid proof of the falsity of their claims to continuous succession from their original ancestor, Ismāʿīl b. Jaʿfar. We do not know how, and by what proofs they used to convince their followers as to the genuineness of their claims. But our ignorance does not constitute a "legal proof" of the futility of their case. It seems that it would be far more suspicious if they had had a consistent and clear-cut story, prepared to satisfy the legitimate curiosity of their followers and of outsiders.

It is possible to collect some very interesting information about the family of al-Mahdī from different allusions, scattered in the Istitār and the Sīra: he had a brother, Abū Muḥammad, apparently younger than himself, who had some posterity (Ist., 95, 102). He fell ill, and died on the day Abū Mahzūl, i.e. Ṣāḥibūsh-shāma, the "Qarmatian", invaded Salamiyya (Ist., 100), i.e. in the middle of 290/903. "Sons of al-Mahdī's uncle" are referred to in Ist., 97.

A very interesting, but entirely obscure reference is found in Ist., 102, in which it is stated that the same Abū Mahzūl, writing secretly to al-Mahdī, referred to "his cousin (ibn 'amm) with his son" being deported, or exiled (daft) to 'Irāq (Western Persia or Mesopotamia?). Cf. also Texts, p. 108.

Some interesting allusions are found in the Sīra of Jaʿfar al-ḥājīb. As it should be in a work ascribed to an intimate servant of the family of al-Mahdī, matters are here touched upon about which we should scarcely find information elsewhere, namely questions concerning his women-folk. On p. 108 Jaʿfar remembers the circumstances of al-Mahdī's marriage to his cousin, and plainly says that she later on became the mother of al-Qāʾim. On p. 110 it appears that at the time of his emigration from Salamiyya his own mother (i.e. the widow of al-Ḥusayn) was still living, and that he had two daughters. His family also included two nieces, daughters of his brother, and Umm Ḥabīb, the wife of al-Qāʾim. This is extremely interest-
ing. Was she the future wife of al-Qā’im (married to him later), or was he married already at that time? As we may see, on p. 111 of the Sīra, al-Qā’im during the flight to Egypt is remembered by the old servant as a small child, crying when displeased. In the Istitār, 95, he also appears as a child, as we have seen. Which is true? Was he a small child, or a married youth? If he really was 47 at the time of al-Mahdi’s death, in 322/934, he would then have been 13 at the time of the emigration, in 288/901. But it is more likely that he was born about 280/893, as shown above, p. 32.

It may be added that in addition to al-Qā’im, the Istitār mentions another son of al-Mahdi, still a child, by a concubine, who figures in the story of the “Qarmatian” slaughter of his relatives. From non-Ismaili sources it is also known that later on he had many other sons: Abū ‘Alī Aḥmad (d. 382/992); Abū Ṭālib Mūsā; Abū’l-Ḥusayn ‘Īsā (d. 382/992); Abū ‘Abdī’l-imenti al-Ḥusayn (d. ca. 336/948); and Abū Sulaymān Dā’ūd (d. 341/952). Cf. E. de Zambaur, “Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie”, p. 95. For some reason these sons are never mentioned in Ismaili works.

2. Doubts raised by Esoteric and other Sources.

So far the Fatimid version seems to be surprisingly simple and consistent, and such as to inspire a considerable amount of confidence in so far as it not seldom finds support in the allusions scattered in non-Ismaili sources. I do not speak of such as Aḥkhū Muḥsin, whose information is obviously derived from the Ismaili tradition, but is deliberately vitiated in details. The confusion and inaccuracies noted above constitute a very valuable proof of the antiquity and preservation of this tradition: it is clear that the authors of the works in which it is preserved, did not interfere with it. They simply copied the sources at their disposal, paying no regard to the inconsistency of different reports.
There are, however, certain points of doubt as to whether the picture is in fact so altogether flawless. A strange, though perhaps definitely erroneous variation is found in the names of the three concealed Imams in the fourth part of the Kitābu’l-Azhār of Ḥasan b. Nūḥ of Broach. At its beginning he quotes the well-known esoteric work of Ḥamīdu’d-dīn al-Kirmānī, the Tanbihu’l-hādī wa’l-mustahdī (cf. Guide, No. 118), which appears to be one of his latest compositions, and so written just about the beginning of the fifth/eleventh c. The quotation is from the 26-th bāb: fi’t-tanbih li-amr man yujib ukhḍu’d-dīn min-hu wa’stirāḍ ṭā’ati-hi’l-ladhī huwa Waliyyu’l-lāh fi ardi-hi. The author refers to the Imam of the time, al-Ḥākim bi-amnī’l-lāh, tracing his genealogy to ‘Alī, in the course of which, between al-Mahdī and Muḥammad b. Iṣmā’īl, he mentions three names of the concealed Imams: 1. ‘Abdu’l-lāh (as usual); 2. Muḥammad (instead of the usual Alḥmad); and 3. Alḥmad (instead of the usual Ḥusayn). I have compared two copies of this volume of al-Azhār,—unfortunately not old,—and found that both these completely coincide in this passage. On collating it with two (also modern) copies of the original work, Tanbihu’l-hādī, I found that the passage coincides in everything, except in the names of these three Imams, which are given in their usual form: ‘Abdu’l-lāh, Alḥmad, Ḥusayn. Which version is to be trusted? Is this an ordinary mistake in the K. al-Azhār, which crept in at an early date, and was later on blindly repeated in all subsequent copies? Or may this be the original version, which the shrewd Bohora, Ḥasan b. Nūḥ, found in an old copy of the Tanbihu’l-hādī? In such a case we must admit that at the end of the fourth/tenth c. the Fatimid tradition regarded Imam Alḥmad (the author of the Rasā‘il of Ikhwānu’s-safā) as the father, not the grand-father of al-Mahdī, and his father as Muḥammad b. ‘Abdi’l-lāh. ¹ Against this we have the testimony

¹ It is interesting to note that in some non-Ismaili sources such as the mystic works of the Druzes, al-Mahdī appears to be the son of Abū Shalaghlagh Alḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abdi’l-lāh (cf. de Goeje, p. 21).
of the *Istitār*, which we can hardly believe to be “revised and corrected” in this respect, and, to some extent, a still earlier source, the well-known quotation from the *Sīra* of Mānṣūrū’l-Yaman incorporated in the *Istitāh* and the *Sharhul’-akhbār*, in which his conversion is attributed to Ḥusayn (assuming this Ḥusayn to be the same as the Imam Ḥusayn, the father of al-Mahdī). In any case, there is apparently, so far as I have been able to ascertain, no other work in which these names are mentioned in this form. Tabari, III, 2232 sqq., quotes epistles, sent by the “Qarmatian” leader, apparently on behalf of al-Mahdī. Unfortunately, the text is very uncertain here, and it is not easy to see what the reading should be, whether “from ‘Abdu’l-lāh (b. ?) Aḥmad b. ‘Abdī’l-lāh”, or “from the slave of God (‘ābdī’l-lāh) Aḥmad b. ‘Abdī’l-lāh”, or simply “from (min ‘indī, as in the footnote ḥ) Aḥmad”, etc. The name is often regarded as the “regnal name” which was assumed by Yaḥyā b. Zakrūya, the “Qarmatian”, who “proclaimed himself the Imam”. This seems to be very doubtful, and most probably, if the whole matter is to be taken seriously, and is not a falsification (which is also very likely), the document must be regarded as a letter written in the name of al-Mahdī. Thus he could either be called ‘Abdu’l-lāh, or Aḥmad, and his father’s name could be either Aḥmad, or ‘Abdu’l-lāh. All this of course inspires very grave doubts.

Quite a different question is raised by the indisputable historical facts of a series of defections on the part of the leading ḍā’is under al-Mahdī, which perhaps to some extent may have a connection with doubts in his official genealogy. The “apostasy” of Ḥamdān Qarmat and ‘Abdān seems to be the first in this chain. The next, within a few years, is the disillusionment of the “Qarmatian” brothers, which they, quick to pass from words to acts, expressed in the terrible slaughter of al-Mahdī’s family in Salamiyya, in 291/903. In a few years again, perhaps in quick succession, the chief ḍā’ī Fīrūz deserts al-Mahdī, flees to the Yaman, and there starts a rebellion; and, at the top of
al-Mahdi's remarkable successes, the man who has brought him on the throne, Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh ash-Shi'i, revolts against him. These moreover are only the cases which are known.

Formerly only the first and the last cases were known, but already de Goeje had tried to connect the apostasy of Qarmat with the revolt of Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh ash-Shi'i (Mémoire, p. 67). It seems worth while to examine these cases more thoroughly. The story of the apostasy of Ḥamdān Qarmat is narrated by Nuwayrī, an author who apparently had at his disposal some Ismaili sources, but who, out of enmity, or for some other reasons, quite impudently perverted facts in his own writings. The events according to him were as follows (de Goeje, Mém., 58; de Sacy, Expos', Intr., 193 sq.): Qarmat, with his secretary 'Abdān, was staying at Kalwādhā, near Baghdad, keeping in touch with the headquarters in Salamiyya. When the head of the sect died (Muḥammad b. Ahmad, ca. 283/896 ?), his son (?) and successor (al-Mahdi ?) wrote to him a letter in which he found "some unusual expressions, deviating from the established custom, and indicating some important change". To clear his doubts he sent his trusted secretary 'Abdān to Salamiyya. The latter, in an interview with the son of the deceased head of the sect, was informed that he (al-Mahdi ?) was not a descendant of 'Aqil b. Abī Ṭālib (for whom obviously he was giving himself out in Salamiyya for the sake of disguise), but of 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn b. Dayṣān, who had nothing to do with Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl. The preaching in favour of the latter was nothing but a trick to dupe people, etc. 'Abdān returns, reports to Ḥamdān Qarmat, the latter assembles his dā'īs, reveals to them the news, and suspends the propaganda. "One of the sons of 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn", who usually resided in Ṭāliqān (in Persia, East of Alamūt, familiar to students of Ismailism), passing through the Sawād of Kūfa, failed to find Qarmat, who absconded; he meets 'Abdān, apparently tries to win him back, but fails, and, with the help of Zakrūya, gets rid of him. These events took place during the years 286/899 and 287/900 (de Sacy, Intr., 200).
All this, with lively dialogues, and surprisingly intimate knowledge not only of the minutest details of what happened, but also of the deepest thoughts and intentions of the participants, can be nothing but one of the numerous improvisations of Nuwayrí, whose primary purpose was to provide entertaining reading, and who cared less than anything for the truth. But the basis of this story, namely a radical change in the policy of the Salamiyya headquarters, which caused a split in the sect and opposition on the part of Ḥamdān, probably contains some grains of truth.

What such extraordinary changes could have been, is difficult to guess. It seems obvious that the phrase “preaching in favour of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl”, who died about a century earlier, is probably a mistake, and should be understood as “preaching in favour of a descendant” of the saint. The mention in the same story of the statement of the successor of the defunct head of the sect that he had nothing to do with this Imam, clearly suggests such a correction. It is quite probable, although there is no documentary proof, that there was such a sect, perhaps the “Qarmatians of Bahrayn” (and obviously of Southern Persia), who really expected the “return” of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl. We do not know for certain whether Ḥamdān Qarmat had anything to do with them. But it would be extremely difficult to believe that the heads of the incipient Ismaili movement would have been content with the rôle of chief ḏāʾīs, and only at the last moment would have revealed to one of the most trusted ḏāʾīs their real position. The split could have been caused by some irregularity in succession, either that of al-Mahdī instead of one of the sons of Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, or that of al-Mahdī instead of his own (elder?) brother, Abū Muḥammad. We must also recall the fact that Shiʿism was a living religion, the supply of the Alid candidates was plentiful, and although there were all kinds of sects of the wāqīfa type, they were apparently not very popular.
The most important consideration is that although Ḥamdān Qarmaṭ rebelled, or even seceded, together with a certain following, the heads of the sect, nevertheless, commanded the recognition of the great majority. The masses at that particular period could hardly have been moved to such an extent as we see in the rise of the Fatimids simply by vague and mystic promises. The story of the adventures of Ibn Ḥawshab, supposed to be narrated by himself in the lost *Sīra* (cf. *Ijtīḥād, Sharḥu‘l-akhbār*), clearly shows the “thirst” of the masses for a definite candidate, not a “symbol”. Therefore there may be serious reasons to think that the stress in the narrative of these events is laid on the claims to Mahdi-ism.

Sayyid-nā Idrīs, implicitly following the *Ghāyatul-muwālīd* in his *Zahru‘l-ma‘ānī* (as may be seen from the extract edited here in the original Arabic, and translated further on), gives us to understand that the religious position of al-Mahdī was somewhat inferior to that of his son and successor, al-Qā‘im. We can see that apparently al-Mahdī himself did nothing to bring himself more into tune with the numerous prophecies current among the masses, while everything in this respect was done to cause al-Qā‘im to come up to expectations. One of the earliest prophecies, which apparently already existed by the end of the first/seventh c.,1 promised that the name of the Mahdi should be exactly the same as that of the Prophet himself. In non-Ismaili sources it is reported that the original name of al-Qā‘im was ‘Abdu‘r-Rahmān 2, but it was subsequently changed into Abū‘l-Qāsim Muḥammad, the name of the Prophet. Similarly, in esoteric sources stress is laid on his being the twelfth in descent from ‘Alī, in accordance with another Shi‘ite prophecy.3 His regnal name, *al-Qā‘im*, is the Shi‘ite equivalent for the all-Islamic *Mahdī*. A trivial, but noteworthy detail is that in the story of an alleged miracle of al-Mahdī, narrated in the *Sīra*

---

1 Cf. my article “Early Shi‘ite Movements”, JBBRAS, 1941, p. 8.
3 See the tradition no. 43 in the extract from the *Sharḥu‘l-akhbār*. 48
of Ja‘far (120), the miracle is really worked by al-Qā‘im, who supernaturally produces water in a dried up stream, according to an old local prophecy concerning the advent of the expected Mahdī.

In esoteric and extremist speculations, such as those of the Druzes, the position of al-Qā‘im is incomparably greater than that of al-Mahdī. We may feel strong suspicions that in these speculations dating from long after the death of al-Mahdī the principal part was played only by superstitious ideas, which had no connection with the facts. And it is highly probable that the same superstitious ideas may, in a different way, have been dangerous to his cause, because they forced him to pass the test of miracle-working, as is often narrated in non-Ismaili historical works. Disillusionment in this respect was obviously a very powerful source of opposition.

The strongest proof of the fact that the danger was quite serious, and that measures were devised to meet it, is found in a fact which has hitherto remained unknown. As may be seen from the chapter dealing with prophecies concerning the advent of the Mahdī, Qādī Nu‘mān (obviously in his capacity as official speaker for the early Fatimids in matters of religious policy) systematically adheres to the idea that Mahdī-ism is the same thing as the Imamat (in Ismaili sense). According to his theory, the Mahdi is a kind of a collective name, applicable to a dynasty of the Imams (al-A‘immatu‘l-mahdiyyūn): whatever has not been done by any one member of the dynasty in fulfilment of the prophecies, will be done by his descendants. There is hardly any room for misunderstanding of the implications of the theory, and the reasons of the policy. It was an attempt to find a suitable pretext to postpone “payment of the cheques” by transferring the liability from the founder of the dynasty to his successors.

It may be noted that the term Mahdī is used in Ismaili literature as merely a name. Its Ismaili equivalent, the Qā‘im, i.e. the “One who ariseth (at the Last Day, i.e. in the last phase
of the "old order", to uphold the purity of religion"), has vast implications, both of a religious and secular nature which obviously would not fit the historical al-Mahdī. Though undoubtedly a man of a brilliant intellect, extraordinary personality, and organising talent, he appears, nevertheless, in all reports about him as a remarkably secular figure, entirely devoid of any mystic nimbus, or any aspiration to the rank of a great religious teacher of humanity.

With all this in mind we may perhaps be able to penetrate the causes of the defection of different dā'īs. It is quite possible that both Ḥamdān and Firūz, experienced and intelligent men, realised quite well the risk connected with such extraordinary claims. Perhaps finding a pretext in some irregularities of the succession, they tried to dissociate themselves from al-Mahdī, while carrying on their mission along lines which they regarded more profitable. As is known, Ismaili sources do not mention Ḥamdān at all (probably because he became a renegade and rebel). The case of Firūz is narrated with slight differences in details in the Sīra of Ja‘far, and in the Iftīṭāḥu‘d-da‘wa. The latter, as we have seen, is particularly reliable, because it is based on reports of contemporaries. The extract relating to this matter is translated further on, and is edited in the original Arabic. It is not clear whether Firūz rebelled because al-Mahdī wanted to move to the Maghrib, as narrated in the Sīra (113–115), or al-Mahdī had to give up the idea of going to the Yaman because Firūz preceded him there, as is stated in the Iftīṭāḥ. In any case the reasons of the rebellion of Firūz were obviously more serious than the fear of certain discomfort connected with the journey. Most probably the choice was between the quiet and certain position of an ordinary Imam in the Yaman, and of the ambitious programme of the Mahdī, "the sun rising from the West".

The reason for the disillusionment of the Qarmatian brothers, and their wild Bedouins, is quite obvious — their own defeat, for which they, regarding themselves as al-Mahdī’s army, laid
the blame on him. The army of the Mahdi cannot be defeated. But they suffered a defeat. Therefore their master was not the Mahdi. It is highly probable that the story in the Istidār of their having slaughtered the relatives of al-Mahdi and pillaged his house only at the last moment, when everything seemed lost, is quite true.¹

The reasons for the rebellion of Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh ash-Shi'i are more difficult to trace, unless we admit that the realisation of his failure to make al-Mahdi merely a puppet in his hands played an important part. The hints that he had discovered that al-Mahdi was not an Imam, but an ordinary dā'i, are highly improbable. It is more likely that he suffered some disappointment in regard to the Mahdi-ism of his master. If al-Mahdi was really nothing but a temporary Imam-guardian, in charge of the real Imam, al-Qā'im, who was a minor, not more than 17 years of age, there would be nothing extraordinary on the part of al-Mahdi; at least his right to the rank would have been equal to that of Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh himself. The official appointment of al-Qā'im as heir apparent almost immediately after the execution of the rebels may look suspicious. But it could easily have been dictated also by quite natural fears of another plot, which, if successful, would have undone much of what had been achieved so far with so much sacrifice and labour. In any case, complete accord appears to reign through all the relations between al-Mahdi and al-Qā'im. Although, as we have seen, cf. p. 45, al-Mahdi had many sons, of which there is no doubt, he never attempted to appoint one of them as his successor, and they never played any important part. Only after his death a certain "Ibn Ṭālūt al-Qurashi" rose in Tripoli, claiming autho-

¹ It might appear as if the slaughtering of al-Mahdi's family was a kind of revenge for his "desertion", and his failure to take his place at the head of the forces that were fighting for him. But this would be an illusion. In fact, it was not so. His conduct was apparently regarded as quite natural; al-Mahdi similarly took no part in Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh ash-Shi'i's campaigns, and in general never commanded an army in the field. The same was the case with the Abbasids when Abū Muslim was fighting for them, and with many earlier A lid insurgents.
rity for himself because he was a son of al-Mahdī. But he is stated to have been a pretender. It would be difficult to regard him as such in case he was a real prince. Surely, all sons of al-Mahdī were well known to everybody.

To sum up, the doubts as to the genuineness of the rights of al-Mahdī, which are derived from this survey of the known facts regarding the defection of his closest collaborators, point more to their disagreement with his ambitious assumption of the part of the expected Mahdī rather than to any doubts that he was not the Imam, or the father of al-Qāʾīm.

In my paper “Ismailis and Qarmatians” (JBBRAS, 1940, pp. 73-74) I have already touched on the question of the theories of Dr. B. Lewis, in his work mentioned above, concerning the two varieties of Imams, the mustaqarr, or real, and the mustawdaʿ, or acting, that is to say, acting during the minority of a real Imam, when the latter succeeded his father. His “reconstruction” of the genealogy of al-Qāʾīm (p. 72 of his book), is based on several misunderstandings,—firstly, on a mistake in his copy of the Ghāyatul-mawālid, secondly, on the acceptance of the fantastic (or mystic) theories of the Druzes, and, thirdly, on the introduction of beliefs which only developed much later on. His “reconstruction” of the genealogy of al-Qāʾīm is quite improbable: Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl was almost certainly born about 120/738, and al-Qāʾīm, the fifth generation, died in 334/946. This makes five generations for 214 years, or 43 years per generation, while in the case of the historical Fatimids it is only 23. Thus it is obviously unacceptable.

From a great mass of indirect indications, scattered in Ismaʿili and non-Ismaili sources, it seems highly probable that the earliest ideas concerning the Imamat and the succession approximated to the archaic type still preserved in Zaydism. To me it seems almost indubitable that succession had little that was mystical about it in those early days. The Imam was the eldest member of the family. Thus, as we have seen, Ḥasan succeeds his father ʿAli; on his death he is succeeded by his brother ʿ Husayn,
and the latter, most probably, is succeeded in his turn by his half-brother, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya. After him later on 'Alī b. Ḥusayn (Zaynu’l-‘ābidīn) succeeds as the eldest in the family. Similarly, Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, according to the custom, was regarded by many as the rightful successor of his grand-father, Imam Ja‘far, although according to the shari‘at the successor was his uncle, Mūsā, b. Ja‘far (as admitted by the Ismailis). In his newly founded community his Imamat, continued in his successors, makes his father also an Imam. As we may see, early works, both plain and esoteric, concentrate their efforts on proving this point. It is quite probable that the general attitude to the question of the succession of al-Mahdī and his immediate ancestors was quite the same, and only after the foundation of the Fatimid dynasty the succession from father to the son becomes a rigid rule, the designation of the heir apparent becomes irrevocable, the act of the nass receives the nature of a divine act, etc. In esoteric speculations the position of the Imam is continuously expanding and acquiring greater and greater affinity with things divine. But there is not the slightest reason to believe that such was the position at the earliest period.

Such theories as those of the difference between the mustaqarr and mustawda’ Imams, or the identity of the Mahdī and the Imam belong, without the slightest doubt, to the much later phase in which, under the Fatimids, the belief that genealogy and succession are one and the same thing had been universally accepted. The whole list of the early Shi‘ite Imams has been drastically revised, even it may be several times in the course of the evolution of Ismailism. Exception was made only for the case of Ḥasan being succeeded by his brother Ḥusayn, but Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya was forgotten, and his memory was preserved, as that of a mustawda’ Imam, the guardian of Zaynu’l-‘ābidīn, then a minor, in esoteric works only. Similarly, there was rigidly enforced the principle of the impossibility of the heir apparent predeceasing his own father without compromising
his rights to the Imamat. But an exception was made for the case of Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far, explained by a complex system of various proofs from Biblical and Coranic analogies, etc. Such works as the Asrāru’n-nuṭaqā’, quoted further on, give glimpses of this mentality. It is possible to collect many such traces of gradual adjustment of the tradition to the later and later religious ideas. For instance, Ḥasan disappears later on from the list of the regular Imams with the Nizāris, and is regarded merely as a ḥujjat (also in a later, mystical and higher sense).

Thus nothing can be more erroneous than to follow in the footsteps of the religious writers, and to permit oneself to be misled by anachronisms. There cannot be any doubt that the early Imams were simply Imams, without any difference in their rank, and that it was absolutely impossible for any non-Alid to be regarded as an Imam, on any pretext whatever. There was no division into mustaqarr and mustawda’, and there could have been no necessity for this, because, as may be very often inferred from the early works, there was a rigid principle that a minor cannot be the Imam. Most probably the first case of legitimate succession of a minor was that of al-Ḥākim (in 386/996). Cf. also Asrāru’n-nuṭaqā’, Texts, pp. 89-90.

It may be noted that even the idea of the ḥijāb, or of a dignitary whose duty was to pretend to be the Imam, thus sheltering the real holder of the office, did not apparently come into use before the third/ninth c., and does not seem to have been extensively used. But it is quite obvious that such “screens” had nothing to do with the genealogy and the succession of the real Imams.

We have now to analyse the doubts raised by the Ghāyatul-mawālīd, referred to above (cf. pp. 20-23), a late esoteric work, which tradition regards as the work of Sayyid-nā al-Khaṭṭāb, who died in 533/1138. This, however (as mentioned above, p. 22) is highly doubtful; most probably it is a production of a much later period. It contains several surprising revelations regarding the history of the Fatimids. Firstly, al-Mahdī was
not a real, mustaqarr, Imam. He was not the ‘Ubaydu’l-lāh or ‘Abdu’l-lāh, known to history. We must presume in general that this ‘Ubaydu’l-lāh never really existed. In reality al-Mahdī was Muḥammad (son of Aḥmad the Imam, we must presume), surnamed Saʿīd, or Saʿīdu’l-Khayr, who in all other works is regarded as the uncle and the guardian of al-Mahdī (‘Ubaydu’l-
lāh).

Secondly, al-Qā‘im, the second Fatimid caliph, was not his son, but the son of the fourth concealed Imam, ‘Alī, entirely unknown from any other sources, either Ismaili or non-Ismaili. He died on his way to the Maghrib, leaving his son and successor in the charge of this Saʿīd, who later became known as al-Mahdī.

We have no sources either confirming or directly contradicting these statements, and can only rely on the analysis of known dates. The only indication that may be relevant is the strange fact that the author of the K. al-Azhār counts the Imamat of al-Mahdī from the date of his departure from Salamiyya (apparently a parallel to the hijra of the Prophet) which according to his calculations falls in 283/896 (cf. p. 31).

The only date in this obscure period which is available, and which can be to a certain extent (but by no means unreservedly) relied upon, is that of the birth of al-Mahdī the caliph, 259–260/872-873. If al-Mahdī was ‘Abdu’l-lāh, his father (and if he was Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, his brother) al-Ḥusayn died when he was only about 8, according to the best available information, that is to say, in 268/881-2. Although it is by no means certain, it seems that the despatch of Ibn Ḥawshab to the Yaman with his mission was an act of this al-Ḥusayn, in 286/880. Thus, if al-Mahdī was Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, a brother of al-Ḥusayn, the following, consequences seem to follow. Firstly, al-Ḥusayn was Imam for a very short period, as his brother was born to him in 260/873. Secondly, that he was succeeded by this unknown ‘Alī, who ruled for at least the period 268–283/882–896, i.e. for fifteen years, without leaving the slightest trace of his existence, despite his proximity to the fully historical period of the existence
of the sect. Thirdly, the date of 283/896, for al-Mahdi’s departure from Salamiyya is rather too early,— he left not before 287/901 at which time al-Qā’im was a child, who had to be entrusted to a guardian. Thus an Imam, who was in office for 20 years, and must therefore have been not less than about 35-40 years of age, had no other sons except this child,— a situation which seems somewhat improbable.

All this is an accumulation of details which make it difficult to accept the theory. But there are other considerations also. If this ‘Ali died on the way to the Maghrib, as stated in the Ghāyatul-mawālid, the question arises who was the real Mahdī,— he, or his uncle Sa’īd? There is no doubt that the great revolt in N. Africa was a Mahdī movement, and it is extremely difficult to believe that if he really claimed to be the Mahdī, but died on the way, his place could have been taken by his much younger relative in such a way that no one noticed the fact, and that even his name, and his very existence, remained unknown to anyone. This theory places considerable strain on the imagination, especially when contrasted with the plain and natural version of the official Fatimid tradition.

Turning to the latter, we may attempt to see whether there is any name mentioned which could form the “substratum” of the legend. The only name that suggests itself is that of the person, mentioned in the Istiḥār only, known as Abū Muḥammad, the brother of al-Mahdī. We do not know whether he was elder or younger than the latter, and what his own name was: he may be anyone, including the ‘Ali, mentioned in the Ghāyatul-mawālid. It is briefly stated that he remained, with other members of the family, at Salamiyya, after the flight of al-Mahdī, obviously regarding himself as safe from any danger. He had some descendants (97, 102) was suffering from an illness, and died on the day the “Qarmatian” forces, after the siege of Damascus, arrived in Salamiyya, i.e. in the middle of 290/903.

But again doubts arise from the laconism of the available sources: it is noteworthy that in the same place it is stated that
when the “Qarmatian” brothers previously arrived in Salamiyya (in connection with their complaints, and negotiations concerning the dismissal of the eldest, as the Isti‘ār narrates), they addressed themselves to this Abū Muḥammad, but were informed that he was not (or no longer was?) the Imam, and that the real Imam, al-Mahdī, had left. The reference to this strange incident (surely, the man who claimed to be the chief dā‘i of an important province should have known who was his Imam), apparently preserves in an extremely simplified form an allusion to a very knotty situation.

The most likely solution of this historical puzzle is that the real happenings have suffered later from attempts to force the earlier history of the sect into religious moulds evolved at a much later period under the Fatimids, under the influence of an entirely changed outlook and conditions. It is possible therefore to suggest, quite tentatively and hypothetically, a scheme of reconstruction of the events. Most probably al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad was the Imam who died ca. 268/881-2, and was succeeded by his brother, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, surnamed Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥakīm, or Sa‘īd, who was the eldest male member of the family, and was regarded as an ordinary Imam, in accordance with earlier ideas. He himself died ca. 283/896, apparently leaving some posterity, as referred to in the Isti‘ār. Apparently he was succeeded by his eldest nephew, Abū Muḥammad, mentioned in the Isti‘ār, the elder brother of al-Mahdī, as the eldest member of the family. But the latter, being sickly and not very active, most probably was superseded by his ambitious and energetic younger brother, ‘Abdu’il-lāh, later known as al-Mahdī. This caused discontent in certain circles, and the defection of Ḥamdān surnamed al-Qarmat, the chief Mesopotamian dā‘i, residing in Kalwādhā, near Baghdād. The latter himself apparently really absconded, possibly apostatized, or died (being obviously a very old man), and nothing more was heard about him. His secretary, and possibly successor-designate, ‘Abdān, remained in touch with Salamiyya, although to a
certain extent in opposition. At this time Zakrūya b. Mahdūya, i.e. Abū Muḥammad (or Abū Maḥmūd, as he is called by Tabari) Zakariyā b. al-Mahdī al-Kūfi, the chief dāʾī of Southern Mesopotamia, died, and his eldest son, Yaḥyā, known as Ṣāḥibu’n-nāqa, “the owner of the miraculous she-camel”, apparently succeeded him as the chief dāʾī. But the ambitions of Yaḥyā and his brothers apparently led to a clash with his North-Mesopotamian colleague, ‘Abdān. Under pretext of disloyalty to the Imam, he disposed of ‘Abdān, thus causing ill-feelings in the community, and perhaps even a major split: in the absolute darkness of this period we cannot be sure as to whether this split in fact may not have brought into existence the real Qarmatian movement of the South. As a measure to placate the supporters of ‘Abdān, Yaḥyā was dismissed by the Imam (i.e. al-Mahdī, as mentioned in the Iṣṭiḥār, 96, quite unequivocally). He, Yaḥyā, acting in full accord with his brothers, tried by negotiation to settle the dispute, and to obtain reinstatement in his office, but failed. Thereupon the brothers personally went to Salamiyya to settle the dispute, but did not find al-Mahdī there. It is more than probable that the affairs which accompanied the dispute, the split, the murder of one of the chiefs, etc., could not have remained hidden, and that the caliph’s government really intended to take action against the Salamiyya headquarters. In a legendary form this is found in the story of the Iṣṭiḥār regarding the local Turkish governor, who wormed out the secret, and blackmailed al-Mahdī.

One of the most interesting details is the story of the brothers applying to al-Mahdī’s brother Abū Muḥammad. Was this an attempt to proclaim him the Imam? They obviously had come not only for the settlement of their personal matters, but also for a sort of a council of war, to plan defensive operations against the Baghdad caliph. At any rate, immediately afterwards the elder brother, Yahyā, goes to the Bedouin tribes, who were already converted to Ismailism, in order to mobilise a force; his younger brother, al-Ḥusayn, Abū Mahzūl of the Iṣṭiḥār,
known to history as Şahibu'sh-shâma, or Şahibu'l-khâl, i.e. "the possessor of the (prophetic?) mole", remains as a sort of a liaison officer between al-Mahdî in his secret refuge, and his own brother; and the youngest, Muḥammad, apparently returns to Kūfa to act as a deputy to his brother in his original headquarters. The rest of the story is narrated in the Istīlār, and is sufficiently known from general history.

If we suppose that the Abū Muḥammad, mentioned here as the brother of al-Mahdî, was really the mysterious ‘Alî, and the father of al-Qā'im, who really died in Salamiyya from illness while preparing to start on his journey to the Maghrib, many difficult situations arise, as already mentioned above (p. 57). If he really reigned for twenty years, why has his name fallen so completely out of the history of the sect? Why was Muḥammad b. Aḥmad given the name of ‘Abdu'l-lâh, and why was al-Mahdî generally treated as a different person? We should have to introduce a large number of "corrections": Abū Muḥammad was not a brother of al-Mahdî, al-Qā'im was not his son, ‘Abdu'l-lâh b. al-Ḥusayn never existed, the story of Muḥammad b. Aḥmad having been his guardian is an invention, and so on. It looks as if this mysterious ‘Alî is a mere product of imagination; but, at the same time, it is difficult to be certain of this. We can therefore only postpone a final decision until more materials come to light.

To sum up, it does not seem that the doubts which arise from the various reports found in Ismaili sources, or other facts which evoke suspicions, are sufficiently strong to shake the traditional version very seriously; but this is without prejudice to the question whether that version is true, or not.


To the details concerning al-Mahdî and his family, reviewed above, an interesting addition may be made,— namely what most probably is quite a reliable and true indication as to his personal appearance. This is found in the Sharḥu'l-akhbâr,
by Qādī an-Nu‘mān, mentioned above, in the fifteenth book, dealing with the prophecies concerning the Mahdí. A special chapter is here entirely devoted further on to prophecies concerning his advent; we may simply analyse the matter without going into the general nature of this kind of historical information.

As is known, amongst other matters connected with the expected advent of the Mahdí, that is Divinely guided Deliverer of the world, some prophecies set out certain features or physical qualities which the promised Messiah should possess. Both Sunnite and Shi‘ite traditions preserve references to these. As is already pointed out by the late D. S. Margoliouth ("On Mahdis and Mahdiism", in the Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. VII, pp. 9-10), such references are already found in the collection of the hadîths of Abû Dâ‘ûd (202−275/817−888), from which they were derived by different later authors. "It is here that a description of the Mahdí is given: his nose is to be of a particular shape, and his hair of a particular cut". Cf. also D. B. Macdonald's article in the E.I., vol. III, p. 114b. It seems very probable that if such physical features were already described in the earliest versions of such prophecies, they were adjusted on different occasions to fit different claimants. In Shi‘ite literature they were numerous. The Ithna‘ashari versions most probably were modelled on the traditional description of ‘Ali ibn Abî Ṭâlib himself ¹, perhaps with certain modifications. We find many of these in the great Shi‘ite Encyclopaedia, the Biḥāru’l-anwâr, of Moḥammad Bāqir b. Muḥammad Taqī Majlisî, vol. XIII (completed in 1078/1667; lith. Isfahān, 1304).

On p. 11 it is stated that the Mahdí will be a man from the progeny of Fâṭima, young, of middle height, with handsome face, with hair hanging to his shoulders, with hooked nose, and

¹ As is well-known, the traditional portrait of ‘Ali was that of his ripe age, probably not long before his death: he was rather short in stature, corpulent, with big stomach; of darkish complexion, big black eyes, tall forehead, signs of incipient baldness. When he was smiling or speaking, he showed a full mouth of excellent teeth.
high forehead. This is said on the authority of Jābir (ibn ‘Abdi’l-lāh) al-Anṣāri, who heard it from Imam Muḥammad al-Bāqir. Other prophecies (page 10) invariably add a fat stomach (which the Arabs regarded as the sign of bravery). Some other prophecies add moles between shoulders, or on the face.

Qāḍī Nu‘mān quotes four hadiths which in many respects resemble all these. But of the foregoing features only the hooked nose is left: the fat belly, and different moles are not mentioned. Instead of these other features are referred to.

Tradition no. 11: “From the hadith narrated by Sufyān ath-Thawrī, who related it from the Prophet, who said: the Mahdi will be a man, descending from me. I see his face shining like a glittering star: his complexion will be as that of the Arabs, and his figure like the figure of a Jew”.

Qāḍī Nu‘mān adds: “And so it was with al-Mahdī, who was handsome, one of the handsomest faced man. His face really was like a “glittering star”, as the Prophet described it. The glittering star is the one which shines much. And so it was in the case of al-Mahdī: his face was lit and luminous, as if light radiated from it upon those who were looking at him. The expression “his complexion will be that of the Arabs” comes true because it was the same as that of the Prophet of God, the lord of the Arabs,— light, with red showing through it. It was that which Arab connoisseurs in such matters call “soft bronzed”,— the term abyād, “white”, is not used in application to the complexion of human beings. This colour is found in the majority of the Arab noblemen, and is regarded as the most attractive.

And the words of the Prophet: “his body will be like the body of a Jew” refers to the circumstance that Jews are usually well built, in a great majority of cases heavier than the Arabs.1

1 Any one who has seen various kinds of Oriental Jews will be surprised to read this. But this is not merely a matter of taste: this is obviously a variant of the element of corpulence, found in other traditions. A respectable, highly placed man must not be thin, looking underfed or emaciated; and the Jews, usually leading a sedentary life, were obviously more inclined to corpulence than the Arabs.
And so was al-Mahdī,—handsome, portly, strongly built. Every one who would walk by his side would look smaller in comparison with him. And the same was the case with all those to whom the Imamat was transferred after him, till now. God has given them superiority, handsomeness, and perfection.

During the days of his life in disguise al-Mahdī was trying to conceal himself, and make himself unnoticeable, but could not: wherever he went, every one who was spying for him, on seeing him, would say: "by God, this must be a prince; he cannot be a shopkeeper or trader, as he says he is".

The same was the case with al-Manṣūr when he tried to disguise himself in order that he might overhear what some people said. He used to change his dress, putting on different clothes, and mixing with the crowd, ordering them not to show him signs of respect, but to treat him as one of themselves, and they did so. He did this in some of his journeys, but could not hide his identity. He entered in disguise certain frontier fortresses, occupied by people who have never seen him before, but was recognised by them. He did this after his victory over the accursed Mukhîd, when the latter was taken prisoner; and also when Mu’tadd b. Muḥammad b. Jazar was in prison. When they saw him, both of them recognised him, although they had never seen him before. The Arabs have a proverb about such things: "alas, the moon cannot be concealed".

Tradition no. 12. "Said 'Abdu’l-lāh b. 'Umar what was reported to him, or transferred to him from the Prophet: the Mahdī will be given the strength of ten people.

And so it really was with al-Mahdī, who was physically very strong, and famous for this, since his early days".

Tradition no. 13. "One of the hadīths of Qatāda, ascending to the Prophet, who said: al-Mahdī will have a high forehead, and aquiline nose. He shall fill the earth with justice and equity even as it has been filled with injustice and oppression".

"And so it was the case with al-Mahdī, who had a hooked nose and open forehead,—both qualities being regarded as
the most attractive. And he really filled the country that had come under his authority with justice; and those who come after him, his descendants the Imams, will fill with justice the rest of the earth, with their preaching. Its foundation has been laid by him, as we have already mentioned above. One of the past Imams was asked: art thou the Mahdi? And he replied: how can I be the Mahdi when I am an old man? And he took the hand of one of those who were asking, and passed it over his skin, saying: al-Mahdi should be the one who does not require help in mounting a horse”.

Tradition no. 14. “It is narrated from ‘Abdu’l-lâh b. Mas‘ûd, from what reached him from the Prophet, that the latter said: the Mahdi will not have a single white hair in his head or his beard”.

“And so it was the case with al-Mahdi. When he became the Imam, succeeding the Imam who was before him, appointing him as his successor by a naṣṣ, as the Mahdi‘l-a‘imma (or Muhdi‘l-a‘imma?), and his dâ‘îs began to preach this everywhere, he was young, passing from boyhood to the age of young men, and being a very handsome young man”.

It is quite obvious that Qâdi Nu‘mân was writing this after the death of al-Manṣûr (334–341/946–953). And although his tone is clearly laudatory when he refers to his masters, it is difficult to believe that he could completely pervert facts, known to a wide number of his contemporaries. Therefore we may safely expect that his remarks are quite reliable, and contain historical truth. What he says about al-Mahdi’s age at the time of his succession, fits very well the assumption that he became an Imam about 283/896: he was then just over twenty years of age.

In any case, Qâdi Nu‘mân is fully entitled to speak with authority on such a matter as the appearance of al-Mahdi. As is known, he came into his service in 313/925, and undoubtedly had ample chance of seeing him during the nine last years of his reign.
The history of the Shi‘ite movement, of which Ismailism was one of manifestations, has not yet received the attention which it deserves. What is available in early Ismaili sources has been collected in my paper, “Early Shi‘ite Movements” (JBBRAS, 1941, pp. 1–23). What can be gathered from Ismaili sources about the origin of the sect is discussed in another paper, “Ismailis and Qarmatians” (JBBRAS, 1940, pp. 43–85), and the further history of the family of the Imams is traced above, on pp. 29–45. Summed up in a few lines, the picture appears to be approximately as follows. Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, who escaped to Persia, and most probably lived somewhere on the confines of Khūzistān and N. Fārs, found a certain number of supporters and followers, just in the same way as other Alids did. On his death, most probably soon after 180/796, his party, or sect, split between his different sons, and a considerable proportion of his following, making much capital out of his being the seventh in succession from ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, adopted the belief that he, being the seventh Imam, should also be the seventh Nāṭiq, or Great Prophet, whose mission was to reveal the last, final, and perfect religion which would fill the earth with justice. Such beliefs have left indellible traces in the esoteric doctrine of Ismailism; similar theories, as we see from the account of different Shi‘ite sects of that period, were very often adopted in respect of other Alids on their deaths. But, in the atmosphere of the strong living spirit of Shi‘ite aspirations, such sects, of the wāqīfa, or waqfiyya type, apparently never lasted long. Expectations of the “return in glory” of this or that Shi‘ite saint were quite acceptable, but life insistently demanded something tangible, and most probably in all cases the partisans of such sects gradually filtered into the groups
supporting this or that new candidate. It is quite possible that one of the sons of the late Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, ‘Abdu‘l-lāh (whose existence is doubted by Tabari, III, 2218, and who possibly was the real “impious ‘Abdu‘l-lāh b. Maymūn”), proved to be stronger than the other brothers in the struggle, and won the day. He settled in Salamiyya, probably in the beginning of the third/ninth c., living in disguise, and gradually his and his successors’ efforts at propaganda were crowned with considerable success. In this they profited by the unrest and discontent prevalent in the Abbasid state, and especially the failures and discords in the other Shi‘ite sects, from which followers could be won over as time passed.

If all this is to some extent true,—and this seems very likely,—this ‘Abdu‘l-lāh could only have been a genuine descendant of Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl: rarely is the argument of cui prodest so convincing. He supported the principle of the continued Imamat because he was the person who would benefit from its acceptance by his followers, and he could claim this only because there was no doubt as to his right. It is quite possible that an early Shi‘ite theologian, a contemporary of Imam Ja‘far as-Ṣādiq, ‘Abdu‘l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ, together with others, had some connection with the sect, perhaps in its earliest phase,—this is entirely obscure. But it seems utterly improbable that he could “pose” as an Imam, and become the progenitor of the Fatimids. Most probably he was elder than Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, and it is very unlikely that he survived him. Even if he did, there is little doubt that he would have supported the Messianic beliefs regarding the deceased Imam, himself assuming the rank of his supreme lieutenant, high priest, or whatever it may be, which would give him a complete control of the whole movement. This, in fact, was the course adopted by the founders of the sect of the Druzes two centuries later.

The question of the relation between the Ismailis and the Qarmatians, and also of the religion of this latter sect, is extremely
complex, and this complexity obviously comes from great confusion of terms, wrongly applied to different religious groups. The only sense that we can get from the conflicting reports is that the local Lower Mesopotamian term, karmithā or karmithā, unknown to Arabic elsewhere, implied an agriculturist, a villager. This later on was Arabicised into qarmat, which had different meanings in Arabic. This occurred in connection with the name of a prominent local leader, Ḥamdān Qarmat, and the whole group was treated as his followers, as "named after him," although many of its members possibly had no real connection with him.

Looking into available reports, such as that of Tabari and others, we find an extraordinary combination of the most irreconcilable religious elements reported as forming the Qarmatian religion. Rejection of formal Muhammadian worship (ruṣūḍuʿiz-zāhir) is mentioned side by side with a maniacal external piety in the form of fifty Islamic daily prayers obligatory on every member. An extraordinary collection of Imams of rival branches are supported: Ismaili, Kaysanite, and others. In some beliefs we may recognise a connection with the Kaysāniyya, in others with the Khāṭṭābiyya; and even Kharijite ideas are common. All this presumes a certain amount of syncretism, which would be quite probable in the beliefs of the masses, in which all these sects, at different times, found many recruits. But it is obvious that there must be certain limits even in the

---

1 Cf. L. Massignon's article on the subject, "Enc. of Islam", vol. II, p. 767. Almost every author offers his own version. At present, according to the statement of a specialist on Lower Mesopotamia, it appears that the expression is no longer used.

2 In Arabic the root q-r-m-t means "to walk, making short steps", and thence "to write closely", etc.

3 Tabari, III, 2126. His reference is quite unique; most probably it refers to only a small community.

4 It must be carefully noted, however, that as no genuine Qarmatian literature is preserved, all such references are necessarily derived from various non-sectarian authors, who with the rarest exceptions are not only unreliable, but usually deliberately misleading. In any case, no reference is known to any Imam of the real Qarmatians, i.e. the Qarmatians of Bahrayn.
worst cases of syncretism, and it seems highly probable that there were distinct groups, perhaps even rival sects, which were all sweepingly styled "Qarāmiṣṭa", or Qarmatians, without any regard to details. Then, when the "Qarmatians" of Bahrayn made their name hateful to the whole of the Islamic world, such confusion was perpetuated consciously and deliberately.¹

Information concerning the "Qarmatians" of Bahrayn, and their real beliefs, clearly points to their close connection not with Mesopotamia, but with S.W. Persia,—Jannāba, Şirāf, etc. It is quite possible that they must ultimately be classed as a variety of the Ismailis (as both these sects are persistently connected in all reports), and different features in what little transpires about their religion may give some ground for the suggestion that it may have been a development of the original wāqi'fa phase of Ismailism, expecting the "return" of Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl, complicated by other Shi'i and even Kharijite influences. Most probably these had very little in common with Fatimid Ismailism, both in letter and spirit. Neither did Fatimid Ismailism present a toned down form of the "original revolutionary ideas" of the "Qarmatians", nor was the religion of the Abū Sa'īdis of Bahrayn in any way dependent on the doctrine of the Fatimids. Both obviously were products of separate lines of evolution, of different social and economic conditions, ethnic milieus, etc.

The success of the Fatimid propaganda was not due to any supernatural causes. The Shi'i movement had already attained quite a respectable age of almost two centuries, and was still vigorous despite the absence of prominent figures amongst the crowd of candidates for the leadership. Even the most important of these, the future line of the Twelvers, temporarily

¹ That the word Qarmaṭi was used as an abusive term clearly appears from the fact that the authors of the Ištiʿār and Sīrat of Jaʿfar apply it to the Šāhibuʾsh-shāma, the younger brother, although they do not apply it to his elder brother, Šāhibuʾn-nāqa. Both knew quite well that these "Qarāmiṣṭa" were really Ismailis, devout followers of al-Mahḍi, and had nothing to do with the Qarmatians of Bahrayn, who looted Mekka.
lost all their prestige in the second half of the third/ninth c., on account of family discords and the unworthy behaviour of some of its members. The Abbasid empire was already a matter of the past, and new dynasties were springing up in all provinces. Economic distress, due to unsettled conditions, was growing.

The extraordinary triumphs of the Fatimids, following each other in quick succession, were obviously due to this widespread discontent and unrest, coupled with a favourable superstitious atmosphere, widespread and ardent expectations of the advent of the promised Messiah, the Deliverer, who was due to make his appearance by the end of the third century after the death of the Prophet. Strangely enough, though there are many reports of insurrections led by different Alids in connection with the similar beliefs concerning the end of the first century A.H., reports of similar risings at this period are remarkably few. Obviously the Fatimids, and al-Mahdi, staked their all on this,—and won, completely overshadowing their competitors.

Scrutinizing the map of the Ismaili movement at this period we may to some extent perceive the mainsprings of its mechanism. The mission to the Yaman is sent in 266/879, and by 293/908 the province is completely under the control of Ibn Ḥawshab. The activities of the “Qarmatians” in Lower Mesopotamia begin, as Tabari attests, in 278/891; and although the main effort, probably badly organised, the invasion of Syria in 290/903, fails, repeated raids continue long after this. Ultimately comes the grand insurrection in the Maghrib, which in 297/909 crowns the success of the Fatimids, and permits them to lay the foundations of a new caliphate. The only corner where their activities did not produce any visible result was “Daylam”, i.e. the Caspian provinces with the adjoining Elburz mountainous belt.

Lower Mesopotamia, with the neighbouring parts of Khūzistan, which was apparently the cradle of the Ismaili movement, as is known, had a long record of continuous insurrections, led
by different Alids. The new cities, which rose under the Arabs, Bagra and Kûfa, originally as military settlements, and later as important trading centres, were always famous for their turbulent population, and were hotbeds of unrest. This is usually explained by the statement that they were always full of fluid elements, collected from different provinces. It seems, however, from different reports of Alid risings that not only the cities, but also the sawâd, i.e. the rural area, contributed to such movements; and this, as also the mixture of different sects, is easily explained by the local conditions.

Lower Mesopotamia, a very fertile, but also a very unhealthy country, a real image of hell during the greater part of the year, entirely depends on its canals for cultivation. An irrigation system, as is well-known, requires considerable investment of capital, which only wealthy landlords possess. The labour in such localities is usually drawn from different areas affected by economic distress. Agriculturists who for some reason become unsettled in their original habitation, or are pressed by such factors as religious persecutions, are usually the only labour available on the market. It is exactly what this “karmithâ” population was,—a motley crowd of hard pressed needy villagers from different districts, with very various religious beliefs, customs, etc. Their life in difficult conditions, in great misery, and with not the slightest prospect of betterment, most probably was terrible, and fully explains their readiness to support any political movement which could promise them even the slight hope of a change for the better. The great demand for agricultural labour is shown by the fact of the intense importation of Negro slaves, which led to the well-known and terrible insurrection of 255–270/869–883 (cf. E.I., IV, 1213), accompanied by desperate struggle and enormous bloodshed on both sides, and only suppressed with great difficulty; such reports as Tabari’s (III, 2127)

---

1 Bagra was the most important port on the Persian Gulf, and had superseded the ancient Obolla; and Kûfa was the head of the caravan routes across the desert to Syria and to Mekka.
about the policy of the local governor, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad at-Ṭayyī, is very interesting. Being appointed in 269/882 as governor of the Western districts of Lower Mesopotamia, and residing in Kūfa, he permitted the “Qarmatians” to profess their religion, but imposed a tax of one dinār per head, collecting by this means large sums. Such extraordinarily tolerant policy most probably was not only dictated by financial considerations, but also evidently was endorsed by the practice of attracting necessary labour, badly needed by the country. Apparently such magnanimous tolerance towards Shiʿites by no means formed a part of the Abbasid policy in general, as is clear from the subsequent lines, referring to protests of cautious people who warned the government against the “new sect”. The restrictive measures, apparently taken after the retirement of the governor in 275/888 (de Goeje, Mém., 27) by his successors, led to insurrections of 279/892, 284/897, 287/900, 288/901, and 289/902, before the grand revolt and invasion of Syria.

Economic conditions in “Daylam”, i.e. Caspian provinces, with which the Imams of Salamiyya had strong connections, as is persistently indicated by different Ismaili sources, were a parallel to those in the sawwād of Kūfa and Baṣra. Here the belt of ricefields on the coastal plains even to the present day is chiefly cultivated with the help of what may be called “distress labour”, the proletarianised surplus labour of the half starving villages in the adjoining mountainous districts of Rūdbār, Alamūt, Tāliqān, and elsewhere, who for miserable wages do enormously hard work in terrible conditions of continuous excessive humidity, heat or cold. These provinces always harboured many Shiʿite sects, and were the scene of various insurrections which lacked importance only on account of the remoteness of the provinces from the vital centres of the caliphate.

The Yaman, with its terraced slope cultivation, and the proximity of nomads, probably presented its own economic difficulties, while the grievances of the Banū ‘Ulayṣ camelmen,
plying between the trading centres of Southern Mesopotamia and Syria, probably were much nearer to those of the Berbers of the remote portions of Ifriqiyya, exploited by the Arab city population.

Ismaili sources preserve no detailed information as to the activities of their headquarters, or individual ḍāʾīs, until we have an apparently authentic report preserved in the Sīra of Ibn Ḥawshab (which itself, very unfortunately, is lost), relating to as late a date as 266/879. But such an act as sending a missionary to the Yaman shows that the practice was not a novelty in other places. In the reports preserved in non-Ismaili literature we may find some interesting references, though it is not an easy task to separate the grains of truth in them from inventions and deliberate perversions.

The story of the "origin" of the "Qarmatian sect", as narrated by Tabari and other early authors, has been carefully analysed, after de Sacy, by de Goeje, in his Mémoire (pp. 16 sqq.); it was repeatedly popularised by many other authors, and is familiar to every student of Ismailism. There are, however, many implications in it which completely escaped the attention of those who were not familiar with Ismaili sources. Pieced together with the latter, this story, as usually happens after such an operation, shows the matters in a different light, revealing their true proportions.

In his summary de Goeje collates two versions of the origin of the Qarmatian movement. One, by Akhū Muḥsin, which is probably taken from the lost work of Ibn Razzām (de Sacy, Intr., 168 sq.), and is also quoted in the Fihrist of Ibn an-Nadīm, most probably ultimately comes from early Ismaili sources. The other is that of Tabari (III, 2124, sq.), based on the report of an Abbasid official, Muḥammad b. Dāʾūd b. al-Jarrāḥ, who interrogated a captured Ismaili, supposed to be the son-in-law of the famous Ismaili ḍāʾī Zakrūya b. Mahdūya.

The most interesting point about this version is that it is strictly localised: the scene is laid on the estates of a rich landlord,
al-Haytham al-‘Ijī, whom Tabari mentions as early as under 250/864, and then under 267/880 and 269/882. This gives us some material for the dating of the events. The estate is situated in the district of Nahrayn, or Quss Bahrām. A certain Ḥusayn, a man of ascetic habits, an Ismai`i dā`ī, comes from Ahwāz, in Khūzistān, which, together with ʿAskar Mukram, so often figures in these early Ismai`i stories. He succeeds in converting several people, including an able and talented local man Ḥamdān, surnamed Qarmat. After this Ḥusayn the dā`ī is never mentioned again; probably he leaves the place, and attention is entirely concentrated on Ḥamdān. De Goeje speculates as to whether this Ḥusayn is the same as Ḥusayn, son of ʿAbdu`l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ (the latter had by that time been dead for nearly a century), the father of al-Mahdī. This is obviously highly improbable: the head of the sect, living in strict disguise, would hardly risk going through the experiences described in connection with this Ḥusayn ¹.

We may note the admirable logic of these stories: a missionary comes to a village, and, amongst others, converts a certain capable man. The convert takes his new religion with enthusiasm, makes progress in the service of the sect, and, probably after a considerable time, attains a high position as the local "bishop". It is even not certain whether he really was the chief dā`ī. Then for the sole reason that his name was Ḥamdān the Karmūthā, i.e. S. Mesopotamian villager, which he was, Arabised into Qarmat, all his compatriots — karmūthās,  

¹ As may be seen from the Iṣītūr, the Bedouin tribes of the Syrian and Mesopotamian desert were converted by the efforts of Abū`l-Ḥusayn b. al-Aswad, obviously an expert missionary of long standing who was appointed the chief dā`ī by al-Mahdī. It may be not altogether improbable that this Abū`l-Ḥusayn and Ḥusayn in Tabari's account are one and the same person. The reason that after the conversion of Ḥamdān he completely vanishes from the stage, is quite obvious: as may be seen further on, translations (Texts, p. 100), there is a precious allusion in the Aṣrārūn-Nuṭaqā' to an important detail of the Fatimid methods of organisation of their propaganda. Missionaries sent from the centre organised local "cells", which carried on the further spread of the preaching. Thus, on the local "cell" under Ḥamdān being set up, the dā`ī shifts to some other place.
regardless of their real persuasion, and their relations with him, have become Qarmatians, and he himself has bloomed into the founder of the "Qarmatian sect"! This story is then for centuries repeated by learned authors, and is even now discussed with profound learning by modern scholars, who build wonderful theories on this basis.

There is an important feature of mediaeval and popular psychology, the full implications of which are not yet properly realised. The mass mind is extremely personal and categorical in its reasoning. Such ideas as those of cumulative process, the creative activities of the masses, and so on, do not exist for it. Everything must have a definite cause, and this cause is always personal: God creates the world, Adam is the first man, Eve—the first woman, etc. Any amount of similar reasoning is to be found in Muslim historical works: the first man who composed a poem in Persian, or was called Şüfi, and so forth. Qarmaṯ and `Abdu'l-lāh ibn al-Qaddāḥ also belong to the same popular series of the "first men who": Qarmaṯ was "the first man who" was so surnamed, and the "Qarmatians" are called after him. Therefore he was the founder of the sect. In just the same way `Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ was "the first man who" introduced the Isma'ili doctrine. Therefore he was also the progenitor of the Fatimids.

As mentioned above (cf. p. 48), Ḥamdān was the chief dā'i, although it is not clear whether he was in charge of his own district only, or the whole of Mesopotamia. The latter is more probable. ‘Abdān, his brother-in-law, acted as his secretary,—probably he was his deputy. Their headquarters, as mentioned above, was in Kalwādhā, close to Baghdād, since 261/875, according to the Fihrist (cf. de Goeje, 31). If this is true, the conversion of Ḥamdān was a matter of the earlier half of the third/ninth century.

As we have seen above (p. 48), in 286 or 287/899-900 great changes took place: Ḥamdān "apostatized" and disappeared. His "secretary" was murdered. (Abū Muḥammad) Zakrūya
b. Mahdūya (al-Kūfī), apparently a district ḍāʾī of Kūfa, was appointed the chief ḍāʾī (for the whole of Mesopotamia?) in succession to Ḥamdān, but died soon. He was succeeded (in his post of the ḍāʾī of Kūfa?) by his eldest son Yaḥyā, who is known to history under the name of Ṣāḥibu’n-nāqa (“the owner of the she-camel”), or “the Shaykh”, and is in the Istīṭār politely referred to under the name of Abū’l-Qāsim. He perished in the battle of Damascus, in 290/903.

Abū’l-Ḥusayn b. al-Aswad, who dismissed him from his post, as stated in the Istīṭār, 96, was apparently the ḍāʾī-in-chief, and in this office he was later on succeeded by Fīrūz. The reason for his residing in Ḥamā, just over twenty miles from Salamiyya, is clearly stated. It was obviously a precautionary measure.

It is interesting that although Ismaili tradition plainly mentions the death of Zakrūya as having occurred before the invasion of Syria, non-Ismaili sources make him live much longer, and after a series of romantic adventures, periods of hiding, etc., he appears as participating in a raiding party in 294/906. Tabari, III, 2275, narrates a lengthy story of such a Qarmatian raid, which ended by the siege of a certain village

1 The name appears as Dhimrawaih, Zikrwaīh, Zikrūya, Zakrūya, etc., son of Mihrwaih, Mihrwaīh, Mihrūya, Mahrūya, etc. There is not the slightest room for doubt as to this being a “contemptive diminutiv” form, of the Persian type, which was widely used in the third/ninth c., but later completely disappeared. It is quite obvious that “Zikrwaīh” has nothing to do with dhikr, but is a contemptive form of the name Zakariyā. De Sacy consistently writes “Zakrouya, fils de Mahrouya”, but on p. 184, Introduction, note 2, he “corrects” himself: “Je crois que la vraie prononciation de ces noms persans est Zicrwaih et Mihrwaih. Mihrwaïh signifie semblable au soleil ou à Mithra”. This is obviously the effect of the silly stories about Ismailism trying to supersede Islam with the “religion of the Magians”, etc. No, it seems quite obvious that “Mihrwaih” has nothing to do with the sun, Mithra, and the Magians. It is simply a similar “contemptive” form of the name of Mahdī, in which d, easily confused in some handwritings with r, has been read wrongly under the influence of these stories.

2 Ḥamā, the ancient Epiphania, one of the most important towns of Syria, on the Orontes river, lies on the main road Aleppo-Hama-Homs-Damascus-Jerusalem. As is stated in the Istīṭār, the purpose of his settling there was to be “on the road to Egypt”, with which Syria was connected at that time, being under the jurisdiction of the Governor of Egypt. At the same time, of course, the chief ḍāʾī was within easy reach, a day’s ride by an easy road.
known as Fayd. At the beginning of Rab. I 294/January 907 a certain Waṣīf b. Ṣawārtagīn was sent against him from Qādisiyya with a force of tribal levies. He came in contact with the raiders on Saturday 22 Rab. I 294/11-I-907 (the day really was a Saturday); fighting continued on the next day, and "Zakrūya" was severely wounded, captured with his relatives and closest associates, and died five days later. All this seems highly improbable: it is difficult to believe that an old man much over sixty would participate in a desert raid and in fighting. Most probably it was a real Qarmatian headman, who was made into the famous Zakrūya to enhance the glory of the successful operation.

Concerning Zakrūya, i.e. Abū Muḥammad (in Tabarī Abū Maḥmūd) Zakariyā b. al-Mahdī al-Kūfī, question has been already raised whether he was the son of al-Mahdī b. Hurmuz mentioned in the 'Uyūnu’l-akhbār as a devout dā’ī of Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl and his successor, and whether he was a brother of Yaḥyā b. al-Mahdī aṣ-Ṣamāmī or aṭ-Ṭamāmī, who was murdered about the same time in Baḥrayn 1. There is nothing improbable in the supposition that all these leaders were related to each other.

Neither the name of Ḥamdān, nor of ‘Abdān is found in Ismā‘ili sources, as far as I know. But there can be little doubt that the passage in the Iṣṭiḥār, 96, concerning the murder of their brother-in-law by the sons of Zakrūya, on account of his being a munāfīq, i.e. a renegade, or traitor, refers to ‘Abdān. "There was a man who was the husband of their sister". Seeing that such a severe punishment was meted out to Yaḥyā for his crime, it is obvious that "a man" in question was of considerable importance. Nuwayrī, or his sources, credit the murder to the Imam himself; but this is only one of the innumerable instances of his super-knowledge of all secrets and mysteries. It is, nevertheless, worth notice that the brothers seriously regarded them--

---

1 Cf. "Ismailis and Qarmatians", p. 85.
selves as having been wronged, and were extremely indignant. If it is true that the murder took place about 287/900, the chronology excellently fits the version of the *Istitār*, which seems quite reliable here. It appears that they made lengthy complaints and protests by correspondence, which were left unanswered by al-Mahdī, and that the matter occupied a whole year (*Istitār*, 97). Only after this did the brothers apparently venture to pay a personal visit to Salamiyya. They, however, did not find al-Mahdī there: he had fled before this date, and was hiding at Ramla (*Ist.*, 97). The reasons for his flight were most probably many: according to the *Sirā* of Ja‘far (cf. p. 109 sq.) he fled from the danger of arrest by the Abbasid agents, because his activities were unveiled by an energetic local governor. The *Sirā* explains that al-Mahdī was always generous with presents to the governors, thus probably buying their acquiescence. But this one, collecting important information about him, began to blackmail him. By wirepulling through his ḍāʿīs in Baghdād, al-Mahdī succeeded in having him recalled. But the Turk submitted a report to the caliph, and was sent back with a military force to seize al-Mahdī, who was informed by his agents by carrier pigeon. Perhaps another serious consideration was the threat of revenge from the supporters of ‘Abdān. It is interesting that Sayyid-nā Idrīs incorporates only the version connected with the suspicious governor (cf. also above, p. 60).

The flight from Salamiyya soon after 286/899 is positively confirmed by an important witness,—Ibn Ḥawqal, himself probably an Ismailī (de Goeje, 63). It is apparently a fact that al-Mahdī was already settled in Sijīlmāsā in 292/905. Different authorities mention that al-Mahdī arrived in Egypt during the governorship of ‘Īsā Nūshārī, who was appointed in the month of Jum. II 292/April 905. De Goeje (64-65) expresses doubts, but it seems that the *Istitār* not only supports this,

---

1 Here comes the interesting statement that they, on arrival there, applied to al-Mahdī’s brother, Abū Muḥammad, taking him for the head of the sect. Cf. above, p. 59.
but also explains the reasons, which are entirely obscure in non-Ismaili versions. It is interesting that according to the version of the Sīra of Ja‘far, al-Mahdī travelled to Egypt without any stop en route. But he apparently confuses much by reason of the remoteness of the events.

The version of the Isti‘ār throws the most interesting light on what followed: the three brothers, i.e. Yaḥyā (who is more or less respectfully referred to as Abūl-Qāsim), Ḥusayn, who is here invariably styled Abū Mahzūl ¹, or al-Qarmaṭī, and Abūl-‘Abbās, the youngest, who apparently soon returned to his country (Ist., 97; he was also called Muḥammad), began to make inquiries in Salamiyya about al-Mahdī, and wormed out the secret of his refuge in Ramla. Then the elder, Yaḥyā, went to the camps of the tribe of the Banū ‘Ulayṣ, who had been converted by the dā‘ī Abūl-Ḥusayn, and called themselves Fāṭimī (probably the early appellation of the Ismailis) ². Whatever were his real intentions, apparently the official purpose was clear: to defend the head of the sect, the Imam, who was in danger, and had had to flee, leaving behind his family and property. Apparently the story about the Turkish governor is not entirely false: the Badoos, who, it seems, immediately answered the call with great enthusiasm, definitely followed the course of the Euphrates, by which the Abbasid force was moving, raided Ruṣāfa, an important old town between Upper Mesopotamia and Syria, burning the chief mosque there (Tabari, III, 2219) in the end of 289/Oct.-Nov. 902, after having completely defeated the Turk, who is called Subk, or Subuk ad-Daylami (or also Salami). According to Tabari, “Zakrūya b. Mahdūya” specially converted the Badoos, through his sons

¹ It is difficult to see the abusive implications of this expression: the father of the contemptible one, the subject of jokes. Perhaps the expression is chosen to rhyme with his original kunya.

² In the text of the Isti‘ār the tribes are called Qāsiyyūn. This apparently is a misreading of the original Fāṭimiyūn. Most probably later scribes, being ignorant of history, were puzzled by such a strange application of the term, and “corrected” the expression.
(III, 2217); the version of the Istilâr seems to be more reliable. Apparently everything was rapidly improvised, and this is why the rising did not achieve any serious success.

We are now on sound historical ground,—Tabari gives sufficient information about the events. The information of the Istilâr is invariably more detailed, and apparently comes from a much better informed source, supplying the most vital and essential parts of the picture.

When news about the attack of the Badoos reached the governor of Syria, Tughj, or, probably better Tughuch, the founder of the Ikhshidid dynasty in Egypt, he moved out against them with a small punitive force, probably acting on inadequate information, was severely defeated by the Badoos, and hardly succeeded in slipping into well fortified Damascus. The “Qarmatians” followed him to the city, and besieged it.

It is difficult to see how large the horde of the Bedouins was. Tabari (III, 2219) says that there were a hundred thousand of the followers of Zakrûya amongst the Banû ‘Ulayṣ and Banû’l-Aṣbagh, “in Sawâd, in the East, and in the West”. According to Tabari (III, 2221), the report of ‘Ali b. ‘Īsâ, the governor of Raqqa, in Upper Mesopotamia, received in Baghdâd on the 25 Muḥarram 290/28 Jan. 903, emphasised their numbers. But it is doubtful whether their total strength exceeded 6-7 thousand. According to this report, Subk himself attacked the Bedouins, making a sortie from Raqqa, where, apparently, he was already encamped; he himself was killed in action, and the remnants of the Abbasid troops fled. The invaders turned towards Ruṣâfa, looted some villages and the town, as mentioned above, and continued their way to Syria, where they probably were attacked by Tughj in February. Already on the 7th Rab. II/10-3-903 a report was received in Baghdâd of Tughj having made an unsuccessful sortie from besieged Damascus. Merchants and other people were mobilised for the defence (T., III, 2222). The news of the death of “the Shaykh” in the battle at the gate of Damascus, which is described in the terms quite similar to the
picture given in the Istitār, was received in Baghdād on the 16th Sha‘bān 290/15-6-903. It is therefore quite clear that the siege lasted about four months. Tabari gives further on a summary of the activities of the “Qarmatians”, unfortunately not giving the dates of the different phases of their progress. Orders were only then given by the caliph al-Muktāfī for the formation of an expeditionary force against the invaders, — on the 2nd Ramaḍān/31 July 903. He acted under pressure from Egypt, from whence came complaints of his inaction in the calamity. The date of the departure of the force is not stated, but already on the 15th of the same month (the 12th of August) a ten-thousand strong force under the command of Abū‘l-Agharr was annihilated by the “Qarmatians” in wādī Buṭnān, on the Aleppo road:\footnote{This apparently is the same as the stream on which stands the village called Khurbatu‘l-Bidjān, about 40 miles from Aleppo.} the Bedouins surprised them as a wicked satyr a bathing nymph. The force, after a march in the temperature of the Mesopotamian August, something like 115°F., camped by a stream; the men undressed, entered the water, and were slaughtered by the attacking Bedouins in a defenceless state. A bare thousand out of the Farghāna bodyguard and others succeeded in saving themselves with Abū‘l-Agharr, and fled to Ḥalab. As is also mentioned in the Istitār, the whole of their camp fell into the hands of the raiders. Again the two versions, from obviously different sources, completely tally with each other.

It is quite probable that Salamiyya was in fact so far spared, and the “Qarmatians” were still waiting for something. The account of Tabari (III, 2225-6) is rather obscure. After having looted different places (apparently immediately after the raising of the siege of Damascus), they went to Salamiyya, but the inhabitants beat off their attack. Şāḥibu‘sh-shāma made a truce with them, promising safety (this is very interesting, and apparently confirms the Istitār version). When the inhabitants opened the gates, the “Qarmatians” entered, and started by first slaughtering all the Hashimites, of whom a number were

\footnote{6b}
residing in the town. Then they did the same with (other) inhabitants of the place, slaughtering every one, even children, and animals, leaving none alive. Then they went on further, plundering and slaughtering people.

The account may be strongly coloured by natural sentiment, and it is quite possible that such a thing as slaughtering animals was done not out of cruelty and rage, but simply as the ordinary destruction of supplies which may fall into the hands of an approaching enemy. But it seems much more probable that the progress of destruction was not so instantaneous, as it appears at first from this summary, and that there were pauses between its different stages, as narrated in the Istitār.

Unfortunately Tabari does not mention the date on which it was decided to send an expedition under Muḥammad b. Sulaymān (III, 2236). Apparently it was not a regular army, but a horde of Bedouin levies, drafted from different local tribes which still remained loyal to the Abbasids, or portions of those tribes from which different sections rebelled. The general in command was given the authority to mobilise them, and local officials were specially instructed to offer him all possible assistance.

We have every reason to trust the version of the Istitār, seeing that the expeditionary force really moved towards Salmiyya (III, 2237), and came in contact with the "Qarmatians" at a distance of 12 leagues from Ḥamā, i.e. not far from that place. True to the Istitār, Šāhību’sh-shāmā stays behind, with his treasury. The battle takes place on the 7th Muḥarram 291/30th Nov. 903. The leader, receiving news about the defeat of his army, flees across the desert, with only three men, and later on the party, starved and exhausted, emerges near Dāliya, on the Euphrates, and is caught when trying to obtain supplies (III, 2238) ¹.

¹ No place called Dāliya apparently exists at present on the Upper Euphrates. Tabari (III, 2255) says that the Qarmatian was going to Kūfa, and approached a Dāliya, known as the Daliya of Ibn Ṭawq, on the
It seems useful to offer here an abbreviated translation of the official report of the general commanding the expedition, Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, quoted in extenso by Tabari (III, 2238–2243). It is a complete account of the operations, submitted after a preliminary report, referred to in it, and contains many names of different officers, etc., whom the general recommends for a reward, and so forth.

"On Tuesday the 7th Muḥarram (the 30th Nov. 903) we marched from the locality known under the name of al-Qarwāna to another, known as al-ʿUlyāna. We advanced in a state of readiness, properly formed into the centre, right and left wings. We were not long on our march when a report was brought to me that the Qarmatian infidel had sent against us one of his ḍāʿīs, an-Nuʿmān b. Akhī Ismāʿīl b. an-Nuʿmān, with 3000 horse and a number of infantry, and that they had camped in the locality known as Tamnaʾ ¹, twelve leagues distant from Ḥamā (i.e. about 16 miles), and that this force had been joined by all the garrisons stationed at Maʿārratuʾn-Nuʿmān, al-Faṣīṣī, and other places. I kept this information secret from officers and men. I asked the guide as to the distance between us and the place where the Qarmatians had camped, and the reply was: six leagues (i.e. about eight miles). So, relying on God, I ordered him to lead us to that place, directly; and we accordingly took that direction. As we advanced, we came in sight of the infidels, — they were already on the alert, in battle formations. Seeing our force moving towards them, they also began their advance towards us.

road along Euphrates. The word dāliya means water wheel. In the Iṣṭitār is said that he was caught at Qarqāisiyya (ancient Circeïsium), a place at the confluence of the Khābūr stream with Euphrates, about 20 miles South of Dayruʾz-zūr. It is quite possible that this Dāliya was a small village in the same district, as may be inferred from Tabari, III, 2284.

¹ Perhaps it is the same place as "Tamania" on the maps, a village half way between the railway and the motor road in about twenty miles North from Ḥamā. If so, it appears that the Abbasid force was moving via Aleppo.
They had arranged their left wing in six squadrons (the names of the leaders are mentioned as they were probably ascertained later on from the prisoners), altogether about 1500 horse, and a special reserve about 400 strong. The centre was under command of an-Nu‘mān himself, and others, with about 1400 horse, and 3000 infantry. The right wing was composed of several squadrons (names of the leaders are given), also about 1400 horse, and about a hundred in reserve. They began to advance rapidly against us, while we moved towards them, in whole mass, unsplit. I addressed my officers and men, promising good reward for good work."

"When we were in full view of each other, a squadron on the left wing of the enemy put their horses to the gallop, and attacked the squadron of al-Ḥusayn b. Ḥamdān, who was on our extreme right ".

So he goes on, describing the battle, in which the "Qar-matians", obviously greatly outnumbered, spent their force in continuously attacking, one squadron charging immediately after the other. An enormous proportion of them fell in the battle which was very fierce. The remnants ultimately retreated, and were pursued for five leagues.

"We moved still further for about a league and a half, and halted, in order to enable the infantry and others to come up with us, fearing a ruse or an ambush from the enemy ... We camped at the place where we halted, and, after a rest, I came out of the encampment with my officers, staying outside till morning, fearing a surprise attack. (Next morning) we started for Ḥamā, and thence to Salamiyya, because what remained of the enemy forces were at Salamiyya with the (chief) infidel, who had arrived there three days before". Unfortunately, this is all. The general proceeds with requests for rewards for different ranks, and promises to send the severed heads of the fallen enemy leaders.

This passage obviously implies that Salamiyya had not been ravaged three days before this report was written: if it
had been ravaged earlier, what would have been the use for the “Qarmatian” leader going there? Thus apparently the version of the Istitār is right again, and the slaughter of the family of al-Mahdī, with others, did not take place before the middle of Muḥarram 291/beg. of Dec. 903. The story, narrated in the Istitār, regarding the intention of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, on his arrival, to punish the inhabitants of Salamiyya, and their request to send somebody to ascertain the terrible extent of the sack, apparently is not a fiction,—it tallies well with the trend of the report.

We may add that according to the Istitār (105) the number of the victims was only 88. After the murders the leader went to the village of Akhbiyya (or Ukhbiyya, no longer extant), and stayed there seven days. The forces of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān arrived six days after his flight. All this tallies excellently with the report. It seems that these details are based on facts: if they were fiction, based on books, the author could hardly have resisted the temptation to dramatise the narrative, by making the relief arrive just too late, etc. It may be noted, however, that the author of the Istitār obviously knew something about the reports sent by Muḥammad b. Sulaymān to “al-Muʿtaḍid” (i.e. al-Muktafi), but it is also obvious that he had not seen the text of Tabari, because the details are different: the “Qarmatian” is caught not at Dāliya, but at Qarṣīsiyya, the caliph is al-Muʿtaḍid. It is also somewhat surprising that the author mentions that the captured leader refused under torture to acknowledge that he was one of the Qarāmiṭa. According to Tabari, III, 2243, he was executed on the 23rd Rab. I 291/14th Febr. 904, in Baghdād, in the most cruel way. The most remarkable detail is that only just over seventy prisoners of war could be produced for execution. To make the number more imposing, by the orders of the caliph nearly three hundred people were arrested in Baghdād, Kūfa, and other places, on suspicion of their being Qarmatians. The prisoners, despite terrible tortures, denied that they belonged to the sect (III,
2246). The Sahibu’sh-shāma, while in prison, tried to commit suicide by opening the veins with a piece of broken glass, but this was noticed, and his life was saved.

According to the Istītār, when the news of the “Qarmatian” having been captured had been received, al-Mahdī left Ramla, and entered Egypt. The reason, given by the author, is his fear that the “Qarmatian”, out of hatred, would disclose to the Abbasid government the secrets of the propaganda. In any case, if al-Mahdī was really by the end of 292/904 already in Sijilmāsa, having passed through Egypt in the same year, his departure from Syria has really taken place after the execution of Abū Mahzūl. Reports which are found in general literature, as referred to above, about his arrival in Egypt, may really refer not to his arrival, but to his being discovered there, which, as we may also see from the Istītār, happened only after a considerable lapse of time. It is also possible that his decision to go to the Maghrib was prompted by the serious successes of Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh ash-Shī‘ī, which had developed by this time.

Thus ended a grand enterprise which, if crowned with success, might have substantially altered the whole course of the later history of Islam, by replacing the effete Abbasid caliphate with the Fatimid in Syria. Ismaili sources, and especially the Istītār, clear up very many points which so far remained obscure. The picture is now perfectly clear. The movement was Ismaili, and had nothing to do with the Qarmatians of the South. It was exactly the same in nature, aims, and methods as the Berber rising in Ifriqiyya which seven years later brought the Fatimids to the throne of the new caliphate. In fact, it was quite of the same character as many and many other Shi‘ite and Messianic risings, differing from its predecessors only in the grander scale of the events: just as those, it was swiftly improvised, had a great momentum at the beginning, and fell away later. It failed, as other Shi‘ite early risings failed, to attain its aims, and we can now clearly see the reasons: though probably preached for a long time, and though animating great masses
of population, it was precipitated by events, and the leaders had to act before the movement was properly organised and co-ordinated; the existing documents do not show any sign of collaboration between the settled population and the invading Bedouins, and it seems that this did not exist. Leadership was bad, apparently lacking thorough plans; in addition, the only recognised leader, Yaḥyā b. Zakariyā, was killed just at the moment when the invaders were on the point of achieving a great success. After his death the movement degenerated into what may be called a plundering occupation of a defenceless country. The brilliant and uninterrupted military successes of the invaders were obviously due to three causes: religious animation, thirst for loot, and the hopelessly bad quality both of the Abbasid military forces, and generally, of the organisation of the Abbasid state which was obviously in a desperate condition. The Bedouin rising was crushed by overwhelming forces of their own Bedouin brethren, bribed by the Abbasids. With proper leadership, and more resources, these people, most probably, would have been easily won over to the other side, and the final success of al-Mahdī obviously was not an impossibility in different circumstances.

The policy of al-Mahdī, as it appears in the Iṣtitār, is remarkably "evasive". He flees from Salamiyya at the first sign of complications, and hides himself, remaining in touch with events, and with the leaders of the invaders, but apparently taking no part in the direction of the war. He apparently never in his life participated in any military operations, leaving these to others,—his dā'īs, such as Maṃṣūru'l-Yaman, Yaḥyā, mentioned above, Abū 'Abdī'l-lāh ash-Shī'ī, and later on his son, al-Qā'im bi-amri'l-lāh. This policy of his is perfectly consistent, from the beginning to the end. ¹ In the case of the invasion of Syria he probably had many serious reasons. The cruel and rapacious sons of the desert, who ravaged and plun-

¹ Cf. above, p. 53, note 1.
dered unfortunate Syria, were hardly fit to appear as the servants of the expected Mahdî, who came to "fill the earth with justice and equity" on his behalf. Most probably he had not much trust in the good intentions of the leaders, and when the elder brother was killed, the younger, Ḫusayn, apparently did not command much prestige. He was a young man, still in his twenties, as mentioned by Tabari (III, 2219), and the Istitār probably rightly reflects the persistent friction between him and various parties amongst the Bedouin leaders. We can see that he makes every effort to lure al-Mahdî out of his hiding place; but the latter was certainly not so simple as to submit himself to the control, which the other would have in his hands as the commander of the army. It is quite natural therefore to find that the fulfilment of his promises of joining the army was continuously postponed, originally perhaps in the expectation of a decisive success, and later on such promises were given simply in order to placate the invaders.

Speaking of the sons of "Zakrūya", it is difficult to assess their activities properly. Undoubtedly their personal ambitions were the major moving force. But it is significant that the author of the Istitār, though not very friendly, nevertheless does not make Yahyā to be an accursed villain as his younger brother. This, perhaps, may indicate a certain recognition of sincerity, preserved in sectarian tradition, if indeed it implies anything at all. Further, in passing judgment on his brother, we must not forget that his desert ideas, and still more the ideas of his followers, could hardly boast of much refinement and mildness. It seems at least that the Abbasid caliph Muktafī with his court and government represented no great advance on this "Qarmatian" leader, as we may judge from the sickening scenes, and their accompanying sentiments, described in detail by Tabari in connection with the execution of the captured rebels, and of something like three hundred people killed merely on suspicion. It is quite possible that the atrocities perpetrated by the invaders in Syria, as reported by different historians,
are grossly exaggerated, in conformity with the general attitude of painting the "Qarmatians" in the blackest possible colours. One would naturally expect the author of the Istītār to make the accursed heretic, who slaughtered the family of the Imam, as horrible as possible. But he does not mention such wholesale murders either elsewhere in Syria, or in Salamiyya. Here the "Qarmatian" leader, probably in order to arouse the failing religious enthusiasm, exterminates the Hashmites (looting, of course, their property), not only as the enemies of the Imam, but also as the personal and treacherous enemies of his own army, proved by the most decisive documents. It is not only in those remote and savage days that such execution would be considered natural. The final execution of the relatives of the Imam was probably an act of revenge on his master, who, in his opinion, had failed him. Even after having committed such an atrocious act, he, Ḥusayn b. Zakariyā, still attempts to persuade the fickle leaders of the Bedouins to wait (p. 105), but they desert him, compelling him to flee. To wait for what?—The promised arrival of al-Mahdī, who would miraculously help him to win his cause?—But it is also quite probable that in reality the defeat of the "Qarmatians" was equally exaggerated. The report of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, quoted above, clearly shows that the expeditionary force had great fear of an impending attack, ambush, etc. The figure of the prisoners of war, executed in Baghdad, just over seventy, is also very significant. Therefore we may safely believe that it was not so much the defeat as the psychological effect that caused the collapse. The invaders were accustomed to an uninterrupted series of successes, perhaps seeing in this the sign of Divine help, and the righteousness of their cause. Meeting with a serious setback, they at once became seized with panic, and, in the usual manner of the fickle Bedouins, deserted their leader and abandoned the campaign,—an event, which a shrewd and clever man like al-Mahdī could easily have foreseen.
There is a feature of this campaign which merits notice. Tabari gives many indications as to the two sons of Zakrūya having posed as the Imams, and having claimed descent from Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl. The Istī‘ār, and the Sīra of Ja‘far, are silent on this point, although, in their emphatic denunciation of the movement, it is unlikely that they would have missed an opportunity to refer to so outrageous a crime against religion. It is quite natural that the religious atmosphere of the campaign should have generated a considerable number of superstitious beliefs. Such things as the miraculously “guided” she-camel of Yaḥyā b. Zakrūya, or the mole on the face of his brother, or his mysterious sacred books, dafātir, which he carried with him, and was contemplating while the fateful battle at the gate of Damascus was raging, and so forth, are mentioned. Such beliefs might appear spontaneously, or even might be encouraged by the leaders. An element of “playing to the gallery” is always unavoidable if popularity among the masses is sought. But the claims to the Imamat are a different thing. These are mentioned by Tabari categorically (III, 2218), and he even quotes two letters, supposed to be addressed from and to the “Qarmatian” leader.

On pp. III, 2217-8 it is clearly stated: “Zakrūya sent his sons to them (the Kalbī clans in the Sawād of Kūfa), and they entered into an agreement and alliance with them. They (the sons of Zakrūya) claimed descent from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib through Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, explaining that they were threatened by the government, and seeking for help. The tribes believed in this. Thereafter (the sons of Zakrūya) gradually spread amongst them propaganda of the Qarmatian beliefs. None of the Kalbite clans accepted this, except for the portion (fakhidh) known as Banū ‘Ulayṣ b. Ḍaḥmān b. ‘Adī b. Janāb, with their particular clients. They swore the oath of allegiance in the end of 289/902 near the tent of the son of Zakrūya, whose name was Yaḥyā, Abū‘l-Qāsim, surnamed Shaykh”.
Tabari further informs us that the "Shaykh", or Yahyā b. Zakrūya, claimed one genealogy as follows:

Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl;
Muḥammad b. 'Abdi'l-lāh b. Yahyā (?);
Muḥammad b. 'Abdi'l-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl;

He said that his father, known under the name of Abū Maḥmūd, was his dā'ī, preaching in support of his claims, and that he had in the Sawād, and the East, and the West, a hundred thousand followers”.

Further on, III, 2225, it is said that after the death of his brother, the younger leader, Ḥusayn, assumed the name of Abū'l-
-Abbās Aḥmad b. 'Abdi'l-lāh (b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl ?).

Still further, III, 2232, a letter, supposed to be written by him to one of his deputies, begins as follows "From the slave of God Aḥmad b. 'Abdi'l-lāh, the Mahdī, Divinely Helped, the Protector of Religion, etc." And in the reply, III, 2234, it is said: "To the slave of God, Aḥmad, the Imam, the Mahdī, Divinely Helped", etc., as discussed above, p. 47.

All this is extremely suspicious. The first genealogy is an obvious error. The second is strange: who was this Yahyā, whose grandson the leader pretended to be? ¹ The third is obviously absurd: if Yahyā b. Zakrūya was not older than forty, he certainly could not in 290 A.H. have been the grandson of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, who was born about 120 A.H. From what follows, it appears that his younger brother stuck to this version: thus if he was about 25 years old, it means that between the birth of his grandfather, and his own, 145 years have elapsed. Thus all this must be regarded as the purest nonsense, and a very crude forgery. Other details are equally absurd: his father, i.e., "Zakrūya", who thus should be 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl himself (who probably died in the beginning of the third/

¹ Perhaps this should be reverted, and read as: Yahyā b. 'Abdi'l-
lāh b. Muḥammad (b. Ismāʿīl) † Thus the question arises whether “the Shaykh” was called Yahyā or Muḥammad.
ninth c.), was not an Imam, but the dā'ī of his own son. On the top of every thing else it is obvious that he was known very well to every one as the son of this Zakrūya, who, as every one knew, was "calling" the people not to him, his own son, but to the house of the Imams residing in Salamiyya.

It is therefore quite possible that all this consist of nothing but perverted and confused tit-bits of the Fatimid genealogy, and that the sons of Zakrūya really acted on behalf of their Imam, al-Mahdī. But, as the latter was hidden, and not known to the masses, it appeared as if they, the brothers, themselves posed as the Imams. The fact that one name is ascribed to one, and another to the other, does not prove anything: in such accounts two different versions could be easily "rationalised" into the names of two different persons. It is also not quite impossible that the name of the Imam was deliberately given in a wrong form.

Dr. B. Lewis ("The Origin of Ismā‘īlism", p. 74) quotes from his new source, Thābit, who cites the khuṭba, recited in Ḥimṣ "during its occupation by Yahyā ash-Shaykh in 290". The khuṭba itself, if not fabricated,—and this seems likely,—proves nothing whatever, or perhaps, even proves that the invaders really recognised al-Mahdī as their master. But it is interesting to ascertain whether Ḥimṣ was really occupied during the leadership of Yaḥyā: the invaders hastened on the heels of the fleeing governor to Damascus, and remained busy with the siege until the death of Yaḥyā. Cf. Tabari, III, 2225; it is explicitly stated that Ḥimṣ was occupied later on.

Thus there is no serious reason to accept the information as to the sons of Zakrūya posing as Imams or Mahdīs at its face value. It is natural enough that such rumours should have been in circulation, but from the point of view of the history of Ismailism they appear so absurd that they could only be regarded as proved if we had in our hands genuinely reliable documents. Tabari accurately records the news that came to his notice. But he apparently never took any interest in Shi‘ite sectarian matters,
and their intricate doctrines, and he could easily have mistaken the general term imām, in the sense of the religious leader, high priest, etc., for the Shi'ite term "Imām", with all its implications.

It is very unfortunate that Tabari’s great Annals come to an end soon after these events, and that the last pages were hastily composed. Perhaps a proper study of the history of the Yaman will reveal the true nature of the events connected with its conquest by Ibn Ḥawshab, who, as is known, was himself regarded by his followers as a Mahdī, — "Maṣūr", according to the local terminology, though his loyalty to the Imam is beyond any doubt, and his position in the history of Ismailism is very high. We must regret very much the fact that his Sīra (supposed to be written by his son, or, really, grandson, Ja'far, as stated in the Kitāb al-Azhār) is lost. It is strange that even the date of his death has not been preserved. We therefore cannot see clearly why the plan of the move to the Yaman should have been altered, and when this change took place.

Summing up, the picture as drawn by the Istitār, and completely confirmed by Tabari and other sources, if properly analysed, is such as could not have been invented, and cannot be regarded as falsified to any considerable extent. There is therefore very little reason to doubt that al-Mahdī in this story, and the historical al-Mahdī in N. Africa is one and the same person. If so, there can be equally little room for doubt as to his really being a descendant of ‘Ali. If this is so, then there is nothing improbable in the supposition that he really was a descendant of Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il (because otherwise he could have claimed another genealogy for himself). Whether this is true, or not, there is an incomparably greater degree of probability in this story than in the versions which attribute to him descent from Ibn Qaddāḥ, for this at once implies events whose probability is very slight.
IV. THE FATIMIDS IN PROPHECIES.

Prophecies, foretelling different important historical events, are often a very valuable source of historical information. They do not reflect the opinions or expectations of individuals or narrow circles, but voice the dreams, aspirations, and wishful thinking of wide masses. In a Muslim atmosphere they are expressed in the form of ḥadīths or akhbār (amongst the Shi‘ites) because Islamic mentality does not attach any importance to the prophesying of private individuals; only the Last and Final Prophet, Muḥammad, can be recognised as a real prophet. The Shi‘ite akhbār are merely a variety of the ḥadīths, because in theory the Imams were only revealing what hidden esoteric knowledge the Prophet himself had revealed to ʿAlī, who had left it to his posterity.

But although there is much similarity between general and prophetic tradition in origin and evolution, both in the Shi‘ite and Sunnite environments, prophecies have peculiarities of their own. The ḥadīth referring to the dogmatic or legal side of the Islamic doctrine is usually a part, or element, of a certain school, or current in public opinion, created, popularised, developed, or rejected by specialists in their struggle for certain general tendencies in Islam. Contrary to this, a prophecy, by its nature, usually is individual, as concerned with individual events. It is merely an effort of the religious mentality of the masses to obtain religious sanction for their aspirations, superstitious beliefs, or political sympathies or antipathies. Its religious form is the work of more or less skilled specialists theologians, but the contents rarely come from theological circles. If in other ḥadīths the “pressure of public opinion” plays a considerable part, but is modified by the interference of conservative religious tendencies, in prophecies the way is wide open for additions and substantial alterations. One example
will suffice: it is quite possible that public opinion, feeling it hard to reconcile itself to the fact of the death of the Prophet, expected his return “in due course”, or the advent of another religious leader of a similar standing, even immediately after the sad event, and expressed these expectations in the form of belief in certain predictions attributed to the Prophet himself. We see further how the Islamic world becomes gradually filled with expectations of the advent of the expected Messiah at the end of the first century after the death of the Prophet. Then the expectations are shifted to the end of a three hundred years' period, later on of a thousand, and so forth. How strong such beliefs could be, and how great an appeal they could make to the religious sentiment of the masses, may be seen from the fact that similar “cheques” have on many and many occasions, even in modern times, been successfully “cashied” by enterprising people. Here wishful thinking creates faith, and faith accepts as the fact that what is wished has been predicted by the source of religious knowledge, the Prophet himself.

The most valuable feature of many prophecies is the internal evidence which permits their accurate dating. Especially in different sectarian circles they are so crudely adjusted to the general hadith style that dating does not present much difficulty, and permits the student to steal a glance at the popular mentality of the period. But, unfortunately for the historian, the same religious sentiment which helps the preservation of such information, also acts in the opposite direction. Such “too accurate” or “too concrete” predictions awake the rather dormant critical sense of theologians; and they, with full right, indeed, declare such “prophecies” spurious, retaining in standard and high class works only those which are formulated in the vaguest way. For this reason it is extremely difficult to collect such “vivid” prophetic tradition. It is scattered in the most different works, sectarian or orthodox, in the form of quotations in controversial passages, references to different subjects, and so on, but it seems that systematic collections of prophecies are extremely rare;
still more rarely are they left free from ruthless "purification", which deprives them of what from the historian's point of view would be the most valuable items.

For this reason special appreciation is due to a most interesting set of about fifty prophetic traditions concerning the Mahdī and the Fatimids, preserved in the fifteenth part of the Sharḥu'l-akhbār of Qādī Nuʿmān (Guide, 68; cf. also above, pp. 12 and 61 sq.). As may be seen from other parts of this work, which is one of his latest compilations, the aged Qādī Nuʿmān freely epitomized in it portions of his earlier works. It is therefore quite possible that this section is substantially based on his other compilation, the Maʿālimu'l-Mahdī (cf. Guide, 101), which, very unfortunately for us, is lost ¹.

As is known, prophecies about the Mahdī (in general) have been to some extent studied, chiefly from Sunnite sources, by different Orientalists: Snouck Hurgronje ("Der Mahdi", Revue Coloniale Internationale, 1886); E. Blochet ("Le messianisme dans l'hétérodoxie musulmane", 1903; "Études sur l'ésotérisme musulman", 1910); D. S. Margoliouth ("On Mahdis and Mahdism", Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. VII, pp. 1–21); D. B. Macdonald (article "al-Mahdi" in the third vol. of the Encyclopaedia of Islam, 111–115), etc. The most accessible and handiest collection of the Shi'ite (Ithna-ashari) tradition is to be found in the famous compendium of Shi'ite theology, the Bihāru'l-anwār, by Muḥammad Bāqir b. Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī, its thirteenth volume (completed in 1078/1667; lith. Iṣfahān, 1304/1887).

In order to avoid repetition here of various general points, the student is advised to acquaint himself with the short, but very valuable article of the late Prof. D. S. Margoliouth, referred to above. For the sake of economy of space we may take it here as already known to the reader.

¹ As suggested above, on p. 13, note 2, perhaps it is really nothing but the same fifteenth jus' of the Sharḥu'l-akhbār, treated as a separate work?
Vol. XIII of the *Bihārul-anwār* presents a formidable appearance of 249 folio closely written pages. For our purposes, however, only a small portion can be used, because the whole emphasis of the work is not on the traditions regarding the Mahdī in general, but on those concerning the Ithna-‘ashari twelfth Imam, whose historical reality is, generally speaking, very doubtful. Therefore only certain isolated general prophecies about the signs of the advent of the Mahdī, miraculous proofs of his mission, etc., are of any use for us. It is therefore a matter of great importance to note that even in spite of this there are numerous cases in which Ithna-‘ashari traditions closely resemble Ismaili ideas. The most remarkable point, however, is the preservation of obviously “Sevener” beliefs as to the Mahdī being the *seventh* in his line of descent from ‘Alī,—“*ibn sīlta*”, “the descendant (or successor) of six” (or “*sābi* min-nī”, p. 35).¹

In his collection of traditions Qādī Nu‘mān certainly used, first of all, the well-known general *hadīths*, known to all schools of Muslim thought, as also those favoured by the Shi‘ites. But despite the restraint and sobermindedness, so evident in his works, he has added a number of traditions emanating from devout Ismaili circles, which express the ardent expectations of those strata, concerning the Fatimids, their administrative activities, and their high policy towards the Muslim and non-Muslim world. These are especially precious as they offer us a certain degree of reliable guidance on the obscure question of the “revolutionary” activities, so often sweepingly attributed to Ismailism.

In addition to a few prophecies referring to the personal appearance of the coming Mahdī, already dealt with above, pp. 61–65, the collection may be split into three main groups:

¹ Majlisī is puzzled by the implications of this *ibn sīlta*, and explains it in the sense that amongst the eleven ancestors of the (Ithna-‘ashari) Mahdī there shall be six different names repeated (‘Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, Muḥammad, Ja‘far, and Mūsā). But this obviously is too artificial to be acceptable.
firstly, traditions concerning the descent of the expected Mahdī from ‘Alī and Fāṭima; secondly, his expected activities as a theocratic ruler, who is to introduce law and order into the world in accordance with the letter and spirit of Islam; and, lastly, the aspirations of Islam to union under the sceptre of such a theocratic ruler. We may sum up each group separately, in literal translations from the hadīths or akhbār belonging to each group. It may be noted, however, that very often Qāḍī Nu‘mān accompanies them with necessary explanations of rare words, and other comments. These may be found in the original Arabic, to which the students interested in the details may refer, but are omitted as far as possible here, for the purpose of simplification and avoidance of superfluities.¹

1. The Alid descent of the Fatimids. (No. 18). "It is related from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib that he once asked the Prophet: shall the Mahdī be one of our descendants, or of some one else? The Prophet replied: yes, he shall be a descendant of ours. By us the religion shall be brought to completion, just as it was by us initiated. By us God shall cause the hearts (of His enemies) to be reconciled after their enmity, just as by us He has smoothed the hearts of idolaters after their opposition." Qāḍī Nu‘mān adds some comments, explaining that the religion (of Islam) will triumph under al-Mahdī and his descendants, so that the present order will end, and the Qiyāmat (religious revolution) will come under one of his successors.

(No. 19). "And it is reported from ‘Alī who said that the Apostle of God said to him: al-Mahdī shall be our descendant, from the ahlul-Bayt, or his family. God shall make him ready overnight". Qāḍī Nu‘mān explains that the expression yuslihu-hu, which can be used in different senses, does not mean that the

¹ Every tradition is here given its consecutive number in the original text, under which it is quoted in this chapter. In order to present their contents in a more systematic and clear form, they are here arranged regardless of their sequence in the original. The translation is literal, but invocations of blessings upon different saints, etc., are here omitted.
Mahdī will be bad, and God will make him good, but that God will make him ready to start on his mission.

(No. 24). "Ibn Ghassān, with proper ḯsnāḍ, relates from 'Abdu'l-lāh b. 'Abbās, amongst other matters, that the Mahdī shall be from the ahlul'-Bayt. Just as God has ennobled you by sending the First one to you, so He shall make the Last one to come after the First".

(No. 34). "In a ḥadīth related from Qatāda who said: I asked Saʿīd (b. al-Musayyib):—is the story of the Mahdī truth? Said he: yes. And I asked: from what kind of people shall he be? He said: from Quraysh (and so on,—from Banū Hāshim, a descendant of 'Abdu'l-Muṭṭalib, from the son of Fāṭima)". Qādī Nuʿmān adds: "and if he should ask Saʿīd, from which son of Fāṭima, he would surely have said: from al-Ḥusayn, because he mentioned this in another ḥadīth, as we shall see. He, Saʿīd, was not a man who related matters other than what he really heard (from the Prophet)".

(No. 35). Another ḥadīth, related from the same Saʿīd, who heard it from Umm Salma: "I heard the Apostle of God saying: the Mahdī shall be a descendant of mine, through my daughter Fāṭima".

(No. 38). "It is reported from Jaʿfar as-Sādiq 1, who, through his ancestors, heard that al-Ḥusayn was asked once about the Mahdī. He said: he shall be a descendant of mine".

(No. 43). "Abū'l-Ḥarr 2 b. Furwa relates from the Prophet who said: the Islamic community shall not disappear before it possesses twelve lieutenants (of mine), all of them my descendants, each acting according to the Truth and the religion of the Right Path. Amongst them there shall be one who shall rule for forty years, and another for thirty years".

---

1 Qādī Nuʿmān, in true Arab style, always calls all the Imams by their full names; and Imam Jaʿfar always appears here as Abū 'Abdīl-lāh Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad. Further on this abbreviation is introduced to save space.

2 In some MSS he is called Abū Jārūd, as further on. In some other copies both forms appear together, cf. no. 45 on the next page.
(No. 42). "It is related from 'Ali b. al-Ḥusayn (i.e. Zaynu'l-ābidīn), who said: there shall come amongst us the Qā'im, (i.e. the Mahdī). And after him there shall be twelve other Mahdīs" (i.e. the Imams from his progeny)". Expressions in brackets obviously belong to Qāḍī Nu'mān. The preceding hadīth is obviously intended to sanctify the position of al-Qā'im, who was the twelfth in the line, but No. 42 obviously is a later development of the same idea, produced after the death of al-Qā'im.

(No. 45). "From what is related by ad-Da'shī, whose story comes from Abū'l-Ḥārr (or Abū'l-Jārūd ?) 2, who said: the Mahdī and seven (of his descendants) who will succeed him, will all be righteous (ṣāliḥ), so much so that none like them was ever heard of".

(No. 48). "Said Ṣafwān al-Jammāl: I asked once Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq, while being in his presence: o, son of the Apostle of God! Shall there come amongst you (i.e. the Imams) one who shall shed much blood?— He (Ja'far) sat a while with his head bent down. Then he said: o, Thābit (sic), from amongst us shall come those who shall shed blood, and those who shall kindle fire, the righteous and the wise, the leaders to salvation (ḥādī) and the Mahdī (i.e. Divinely guided), the rightful Guide (muḥtaḍī), and the one by whom people shall be led. From amongst us shall be the one over whose head the sun shall come down, and then rise from the place where it sets. We are the Divine family,— from us comes the Lion of God. We are Divinely appointed guardians,— o Thābit,— not the guardians of gold or silver, but of His secret wisdom. We are Divine Pillars, the treasury of God. His Prophet is our grand-father,

1 In all these prophecies the term qa'im has none of the implications which it has acquired in later Ismaili literature, where it means the initiator of a new era in religion, the Qā'im of the Qiyāmat. Here obviously the sentence idhā qām qa'im min-nā means simply: when one of our progeny (successfully) rises in a revolt (against the present order, to uphold the purity of religion).

2 Cf. above, note 2 on p. 100.
and 'Ali is our father. Fāṭima is our mother, and Khadija bint Khuwaylid is our grand-mother. Ja'far at-Ṭayyār, who is in Paradise, is our uncle; Ḥamza, the lord of the martyrs, is the uncle of our father. Who has such noble origin and descent as we have? God has entrusted us with His Mystery, His inspiration, and His knowledge. He made us speakers of His wisdom.

(No. 30). “It is related from Ibn Ghassān, who related from 'Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib, who said: two men shall come from amongst us, one descending from the other. One shall be called al-Mahdī, and the other al-Murḍī (i.e. pleasing)”. Qāḍī Nuṣān adds: “al-Mahdī had already come, and al-Murḍī shall come from his progeny, because 'Ali said that he, al-Murḍī, shall be a descendant of his (i.e. al-Mahdī’s)

(No. 28). “I (i.e. Qāḍī Nuṣān himself) heard Imam al-Mu'izz li-dīnī'l-lāh (341-365/953-975) narrating concerning al-Mahdī. He said: once a certain important man asked him: art thou (really) the expected Mahdī, under whose authority God shall gather His slaves, making him the king of the whole earth, and shall the religion of the world become one under thee? —He (al-Mahdī) replied to him: the mission of the Mahdī is enormous. I have a considerable share in it, and those who are coming after me shall also share it. (And al-Mu‘izz added): if it should be the lot of one person only, how could anything from it come to me?

Then al-Mu‘izz continued: al-Mahdī was the key which opened the lock of the Divine bounty, mercy, blessing, and

---

1 This obviously refers to the well-known tradition about the Prophet naming certain people as those to whom Paradise is promised. This Ja'far was one of them.

2 This is neither undignified boastfulness, nor self-advertisement, but simply a literary device of the original compiler: imitation of “pre-Islamic” poems of contest between warriors.

3 As the student may easily notice, the akhbār related from 'Ali himself and Imam Ja'far are usually lengthy, elaborate, with obvious pretense to high literary style, occasional “Bedouinization” and introduction of all sorts expressions and similes concerned with camels, etc., such as are quite rare in other hadiths and akhbār. Their uniformity of style suggests their common origin from a well-known early collection. It would be extremely interesting to identify it.
happiness. By him God has opened all these to His slaves. And this shall continue after him in his successors, until the promise of God which He made to them in His bounty, might and power, will be fulfilled.”

(No. 5). “Ḥamza b. Ḥamrān related from Jaʿfar as-Ṣādiq: I mentioned before him the successive Imams after the Apostle of God, one after another, ultimately coming to himself. I testified that God has made it obligatory to obey them. And when I pronounced his name, he made me a sign with his hand to be silent; and I became silent. Then he said to me: the Imams, after God has taken His Prophet, were no others than thou hast named one after the other. Then he added: and if I relate to you a prophecy (of the Prophet,—ḥaddathu-kum) about a certain Imam from amongst us, concerning something that should have happened, and it in fact had not happened, it means that this shall take place under (one of) his successors”.

We may add, that, as is well known, the term mahdī does not appear in the Koran. Prophecies concerning the Mahdī are not found in the earliest collections of the ḥadīths; Bukhārī does not mention any ¹. The doctrine grows gradually, and apparently becomes widespread not earlier than about a hundred years after the time of the Prophet. It appears to be considerably influenced by non-Islamic messianistic ideas, such as Christian, Zoroastrian, and Jewish. The most important development, as can be seen above, was the effort of Ismaʿili circles to amalgamate this doctrine with the doctrine of the Imamat, and to make the mission of the promised Mahdī not individual and personal, but a family affair,— a task carried on by several succeeding generations.

There is no doubt therefore that all these prophecies date from the end of the second/eighth c. at the earliest; and those regarding the continuation of the Mahdī’s mission by his suc-

cessors are probably not earlier than the first half of the fourth/tenth c.

2. The Mission of the Mahdi and the Fatimids. Exactly one-third of the prophecies collected by Qadi Nu'man refer to the expectations connected with the advent of the Mahdi, either as an individual ruler, or as a dynasty of Fatimid descent, as shown above. We may consider first those which refer to the general conditions, the “new order”, to be introduced in Islam. In the religious atmosphere of the time, the panacea for all ills and evils was necessarily strict enforcement of the letter and spirit of religious law: this is to be the means of filling the earth with justice even as it has been filled with injustice and oppression, and thus performing the primary and the ultimate purpose of the theocratic rule of the true successors of the Prophet, sprung from his holy progeny. Thus almost without exception these prophecies hinge on the dream of the “restoration of piety”, and the unification of the religion of the world: humanity is to become one flock under one shepherd. This is rather a striking contrast to the usual idea of the “revolutionary” aspirations of Ismailism, and the silly tales of the malicious scheming of the devilish son of al-Qaddâh to uproot Islam, and supersede it with the “religion of the Magians”.

(No. 1). Apparently an ancient tradition, cf. Bihar, p. 152: “Said Abu Ba'sir: I heard Abu 'Abdi-l-lah Ja'far b. Muhammed (i.e. Imam Ja'far) saying: Islam started as a stranger, and shall again become a stranger that it was at the start, preached to strangers”.

Qadi Nu'man adds: “this is a well-known hadith related from the Prophet by many Shi'ite and Sunnite authors. In other versions it is explained by Imam Ja'far to Abu Ba'sir at his request: “A Preacher (ad-dâ'i min-nâ) from amongst our descendants shall start a new preaching, just as the Prophet

1 The expression gharib, which is here used, implies a considerable degree of poverty. Gharib is not so much an “outsider”, as a poor, stranded man, without relatives to help him.
started his”. Al-Mahdi really launched a new campaign of preaching when religious practice had become perverted, sinful innovations had been introduced, leaders of impiety had usurped authority, and even the mention of the true leaders had been discontinued,— those, the obedience to whom God made obligatory upon His slaves”, etc.

(No. 2). “It is related about ‘Ali that he once preached in the mosque of Kūfa 1, calling men to exert themselves for religion, and warning them against cowardice, and what it brings in its train. And when he completed his sermon, a man stepped out, and said: o, Commander of the faithful! What can affect us while thou art with us, the brother of the Apostle of God, his cousin, and son-in-law; while the banner and the standard of the Apostle of God is with us; while two grand-sons of the Prophet, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn are with us, the lords of the youths, and those to whom Paradise belongs? Even if all Jinn and all men rise against us, they cannot overpower us!

To this ‘Ali replied: how can this be achieved until suffering becomes acute, until the progeny of the Prophet are humiliated and abused, and the millstone of calamity crushes you, until there shall remain in this world none but the helper to adversaries, or one who does not dare to oppose them? And when matters come to this state, then God shall send the best man in His community (or: amongst our progeny), who shall slay the tyrants in one battle after the other, until God shall be propitiated, and the people should say, the Qurayshites and (other) Arabs: by God, if only this man could be a descendant of Muḥammad the Prophet, verily he should pity us!2— And they shall regard as a great blessing if they could see me (again, even) for a while on the day, from which there is no escape for them.— And the man asked again: and when God shall be propitiated?— ‘Ali replied: God shall put mercy in his (this warrior’s) heart, and he

---

1 Kūfa, the mosque in Kūfa, and its minār, play a considerable part in mystic akhbār of the Shi’ites.
2 Cf. Bīḥār, p. 30,—the same prophecy.
shall lift his sword from them.— The man asked: and when shall this happen?— 'Ali replied: when God shall desire this.'

In his comments Qāḍī Nu‘mān says that this promised warrior was al-Mahdī who has slain the enemies of God, those whom his hand reached, and his successors shall slay their successors who still remain alive, until God shall put mercy into their heart, and they shall lift their swords from them. This was revealed by 'Ali, and he never said any such things unless they had been revealed to him by the Prophet of God. This is one of the proofs of the mission of al-Mahdī.

(No. 3). "It is related from Imam Ja’far that he said: when the Qā’im from our family arises, he shall not make men to be pious except with his sword; and in this he shall follow the example (sīrat) of 'Ali b. Abī Tālib".

This tradition is apparently taken from a context dealing with some questions of divorce. In his lengthy comments Qāḍī Nu‘mān explains that this refers to the fact that al-Mahdī compelled men to follow the practice of the ṭalāqu’l-ʿiddat wa’s-sunnat, instead of the ṭalāqu’l-bid’at,— obviously the Shi’ite observances connected with divorce instead of some later simplified proceedings. He takes it as simply an example of the restoration of correct religious practice in general. And in doing this, al-Mahdī and his successors, and continuators of his work, followed the policy of 'Ali himself.

(No. 15). "From 'Abdu’l-lāh b. Mas‘ūd, who heard the Prophet saying: you, people of this community, shall belong to four different parties: the first, standing for the truth,— evil shall never affect it.

Some one interfered, asking: and shall they never be attacked?

The Prophet replied: yes, and they shall never be shattered by any great shock.— And he continued: and the second party, siding with wrong, shall always err in everything.

1 Cf. note 1 on p. 101.
Some one interfered, asking: but shall they offer prayers?

The Prophet replied: yes. And their prayer shall be a testimony against them.— And he continued: the third party shall pursue the truth, but fall into error, violating prescriptions of the religion, as a strayed arrow shot from a bow; and they shall never return to the truth as the arrow never returns by itself backwards. And the fourth party shall always reason whether this or that is correct, but shall abide by what God wished them to abide by. Then Islam shall be near to the returning to the door from which it has entered the world.

Some one asked: to which, o, Slave of the Merciful?— The Prophet replied: to the descendants of ‘Abdu’l-Muṭṭalib”.

In his commentary, after philological explanations, Qādī Nu’mān identifies the erring party with the Kharijites, the truthful one with the Shi‘ites, those against whom their prayer shall be a testimony with the Omayyads and Abbasids, and so on. The advent of al-Mahdī brought Islam to the door from which it came into existence.

(No. 17). “And ‘Inān b. Ibrāhīm relates from Imam Ja‘far, who said: if I would possess even a little of (secular) authority, I would pull down all the buildings between the hills of aṣ-Ṣafā and al-Marwa (in Mekka). Such a thing can only be done by a Hashimite”.1

Qādī Nu’mān explains that this refers to the sacred open space, intended for the hajj ceremonies, associated with the memory of Adam. Private houses encroached on it at later periods. As the Qādī says, such clearing of the sacred space had not been done by his time, but shall be done soon by one of the true Imams.

1 A somewhat similar hadīth is included in the Bihār, p. 188: “said Imam Ja‘far: when our Qā‘im shall rise, he shall pull down to the foundation the Mekka mosque, and return it to the place on which it originally stood. He shall cut the hands of Banū Shayba, attaching these to the door of Ka‘ba, under a poster: these are the thieves of Ka‘ba”.
(No. 20). "'Abdu'l-lāh b. Mas'ūd relates from the Prophet who said: the world shall not end until it shall be ruled by a descendant of mine, by the law revealed by God".

(No. 21). "And 'Abdu'r-Razzāq, from Abū Sa'īd al-Ḥadharī relates that the Prophet mentioned a great calamity which shall affect this community (Islam), so much that no one shall be able to find a refuge to hide himself from oppression. Then God shall send a man from amongst his (the Prophet's) descendants, who shall fill the earth with equity and justice even as it has been filled with injustice and oppression. Inhabitants of the heaven and of the earth shall be pleased with him: the heaven shall not retain even a single drop of rain unshed, and the earth shall not retain any plant ungrown, so that both the living and the dead shall be happy".\footnote{Cf. Bihār, p. 188.}

Qāḍī Nu'mān explains the expression 'itrat, progeny of the Prophet, and says that by it al-Mahdī is meant.

(No. 25). "Ibn Salām relates, through a correct isnād from 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, who said: there are three kinds of calamities: the calamity of excessive opulence, of excessive scarcity, and that by which men are purified as gold is extracted from the ore. This shall not cease until there comes a man from our family, progeny of the Prophet, and God shall make their task a success".

Qāḍī Nu'mān explains that "opulence" here means too much authority given to those who used it for the oppression of the progeny of the Prophet. Calamity of scarcity means inability to resist this on the part of the faithful; and the "testing of gold" refers to the circumstances of the advent of al-Mahdī when the pious received their reward after enduring hardships.

(No. 26). "Aḥmad b. 'Umar, through his isnād, relates from 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, who said to some of his followers when they complained on the oppression of the impious: o ye people of our following! Pray with them, participating in Friday
prayers, and do your duty as prescribed by them. Because once
discrimination arises, then comes war. We, members of the
family of the Prophet, are in charge of one of the gates of Para-
dise. Who follows it (the Prophet's family) shall succeed, and
who opposes it shall be destroyed; whosoever adheres to it,
adhers to the truth. Is it not true that Islam was introduced
by us, and shall be completed by us? Even if the world shall
be at its last day, God, nevertheless, shall appoint to it a man
from amongst ourselves who shall fill it with justice even as much
as it has been filled with oppression”.

Qādi Nu'mān adds that the expression “a gate of Paradise
is with us” means that the true Imam belongs to the family
of the Prophet.

(No. 27). "And 'Abdul-lāh b. Ḥabla, through his isnād,
relates from 'Alī that he said: verily, Islam shall disappear from
amongst people just as a frightened camel bolts from the herd;
and God shall not return it back except through a descendant of
ours”.

(No. 31). "And it is related from 'Alī: I see your religion
as if it were an obstinate (mutawallī) camel which wags its tail,
and does not permit itself to be caught. This shall be so until God
shall return it to you by the hand of a descendant of ours”.

The "Bedouinization" of these two traditions obviously
points to a late origin, when such camel terms, and other details
of the Bedouin life, came into fashion,—probably well into the
third/ninth c.

(No. 32). "And 'Alī also said: with regard to the dawn of
universal love, it shall breathe in any case; even if the world
shall have to come to an end the next day, God shall prolong the
single remaining day of its existence in order that a man shall
rule it, from our descendants. When you see this day, you shall
see that no one shall shoot an arrow or stone at anybody, nor
shall any one strike others with his spear. Then offer thanks
to God! Be patient till its arrival if you are suffering,—reward
belongs to those who fear God.”
(No. 36). "Zādān relates from Salmān al-Fārṣī, who said: a Qā'īm shall inevitably rise from amongst the descendants of Fāṭima. He shall rise from the Maghrib, smashing the power of the heretics and slaying the tyrants".

(No. 37). "Ḥabīb b. Abī Thābit relates from Ibn Idrīs, who said: I was sitting once in a gallery of a mosque, while al-Musayyib was present. He said: I heard ‘Alī saying: did not I tell you about the members of my family? Is ‘Abdu’ll-lāh b. Ja‘far their (i.e. enemies') associate? And al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī, who is fond of feasting and eating, shall he, even being surrounded by a crowd of gluttons, neglect you in the battle if trapped as birds? Or shall not Ibn ‘Abbās recite (the Koran) for you? And I myself and al-Ḥusayn belong to you, and you belong to us.

Verily everybody takes as the proof of your wickedness your disobedience to your Imam who is the true one, and compares it with their (the supporters of the Omayyads and Abbasids) obedience to their caliphs, who are the false ones; the disorder in your country, as compared with the order in theirs. Their authority over you shall last so long that there shall remain only their helpers and those who shall not oppose them. You shall be able to endure this only by adopting the tactics of the slave who obeys his master in his presence, and abuses him in his absence. Every one shall cry out, one over his religion, the other over his lost property. All that God has prohibited they shall make permitted, and their oppression shall enter every house or tent. You should offer sincere thanks if God shall forgive you then; but if you suffer, you should be patient, because the reward belongs to those who fear God!" (and so on, as in No. 32 and 1).

(No. 44). "From what Yaḥyā b. Salām used to relate from ‘Abdu’ll-lāh b. ‘Umar, who said: be gladdened, the days of tyrants shall end soon. And after them shall come a "bonesetter", whom God Himself has appointed to set right the community of Muḥammad,—he is the Mahdi. After him shall come the
Manṣūr (Divinely helped), and after him a number of the righteous Imams”.

Comments: this ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. ‘Umar could only have said this if he heard the Prophet himself, or heard from others who heard him,—such foreknowledge could only be revealed by God. Already al-Mahdī and al-Manṣūr came, and other righteous Imams shall come in due course.

In reading through all these traditions and prophecies, quoted above, it is easily seen that they express strong disappointment at and resentment over the general conditions in the world, and expect these to grow gradually still worse. This state of things can only be repaired by the theocratic form of government, and only a direct descendant of the Prophet can be eligible as a candidate to the high office of the head of Islam. Only he, continuing the line of the one who introduced Islam, can benefit the world by enforcing the Divine law, and himself observing it.

Qādī Nu‘mān obviously selected only those traditions which were completely acceptable to the strict Ismaili. Yet we can easily see that, except for a few, obviously very late traditions, specially concerning the Fatimids, all these traditions can be easily classed as generally-Shi‘ite. Moreover, similar longing and impatient expectations regarding the Deliverer, were widespread all over the Sunni world: the beliefs concerning the Mahdī soon became universal, and were variously developed by the addition of different Sufyānīs, Shāmīs, Khurāsānīs, Yamanīs, etc., depending on provincial ambitions. Taken in a strict sense, all such dreams were anti-dynastic, because they implied discontent with the Abbasid rule, and a wish for revolution (to use a modern term). It is also obvious that Ismailism, sharing such popular beliefs and dreams, presented no exception, and was not even more deeply tinged in this respect than other branches of Shi‘ism. Therefore there is not the slightest foundation for regarding Ismailism in this respect as a specially “revolutionary” movement.
As can be seen above, there is not the slightest trace of any "class war", or even class-consciousness, not the slightest allusion to any of those "communistic" ideals, which are from time to time "discovered" by students who supplement the scarcity of materials at their disposal with the richness of their imagination. If we have to translate the alleged "dangerous revolutionary doctrine of Ismailism" into modern terms, it would be only a peculiar religious form of constitutionalism: equity of all before the law in a theocratic state in which the necessary constitutional guarantees are found in the family tradition of the hereditary king, who, being the lineal descendant of the Apostle of God, sent by Him to reveal His religion, is Divinely protected against corruption, and abuse of his powers. If such very modest demands appeared as a "dangerous revolutionary movement" to the Abbasids, we can only imagine what were the real conditions under their rule.

No doubt, there is much exaggeration on both sides: neither was the Ismaili movement so outrageously "revolutionary", nor were the general conditions of life under the Abbasids so terribly bad as reflected in these prophecies. Most probably they were such as they were believed to be only in certain individual localities, at certain particular periods. But, as is well-known, popular psychology is never "critical" or "scientific": it goes from a few isolated striking cases, which captivate its imagination, to sweeping generalisations; and its marked feature is its pronounced pessimism: Hell, Eternal Punishment, tortures after death, the impatient expectations of the Last Day, with all the horrors which are expected to accompany it, etc., occupy the popular mind beyond all comparison more than the matters referring to Paradise and its promised bliss. It is one of the main functions of the official clergy in every religion to restore the balance by emphasising its official optimism founded on the promises of the Divine mercy, forgiveness, intercession of Jesus, Muḥammad, saints, etc.
It is also remarkable that all such dreams and expectations are concerned only with earthly matters, or, rather, one such matter only,—the enforcement of law and order. They never refer to such eschatological matters as salvation of the soul, atonement, delivery from sin. Popular psychology appears in them in quite a sober and secular strain. In Shi'itic interpretation, in which the promised Mahdi has gradually become, as we can see from these prophecies, nothing but the founder of the Alid dynasty which is to supersede all non-Alid dynasties in the Muslim world, his advent is by no means treated as the End of the World, Day of Judgment, and Resurrection. It is nothing but the longed for revolution,—purely dynastic, but neither social, nor religious. Its aim is to enforce Islam in its pure form, and in no way to upset or to abolish it.

3. *Special Political Aims and Mystic Mission of the Alids.*
The prophecies mentioned above are all concerned with the general aims of the expected Alid, and particularly the Fatimid, rulers. But there are many prophecies which touch on popular dreams of wider interest relating to political affairs, or to military plans based on religious sentiment, or to various acts connected with ancient superstitious beliefs. This group of prophecies presents very great interest on account of certain historical references imbedded in them, which offer material for determining their date and the *milieu* in which they arose.

(No. 29). "Ibn Ghassān (through his *īsmād*) relates from ‘Alī, who said: guard your faith from these three: the man to whom God has revealed His Coran, but who, nevertheless, tries to make his own Islam, different from that revealed by God; him who neglects it, throws it away; and the man who shall draw his sword against his neighbour, accusing him (falsely) of impiety. Some people asked him: o, Commander of the faithful! And who is the worst amongst these? He replied: the one who accuses others (falsely) of impiety. Or the one who treats with contempt the *hadiths*, regarding these as tissues of lies, the
one who always tries to supersede a lengthy hadith with a still longer one, thus advertising his own erudition.

Or the ordinary man, whom, by a chance, God has given authority, and he claims that every one who obeys him, obeys God, and who disobeys him, disobeys the Deity. This is a lie: no mortal can claim obedience to himself when it constitutes disobedience to God. Otherwise the millstone of authority would keep on grinding even when it has gone wrong. Contrary to this, mercy should constitute the basic force of authority. Only God can relieve it from this condition.

Is it not that the best of my descendants, and the prominent members of my family are the wisest men since their youth, and the most learned men in their ripe age? By us God breaks the difficult times, by us destroys falsehood; we are the family (of the Prophet), our wisdom comes from the wisdom of God; we listen to the Speech of Absolute Truth (gawlu's-sidq). If you follow in our footsteps, you shall be guided by our foresight, and if you stray from us, you shall perish at our hands, or as God may command.

And woe to the children of the house of the Prophet from the one who shall pose as his lieutenant, though he was not properly appointed as such: he shall slay my sons, and the sons of their sons. But, by God, even if the world would have to last but a single day, God shall prolong it until comes a man called the Mahdi, who shall fill the earth with equity and justice even as it has been filled with injustice and oppression”.

(No. 40). “As it is related, in some one’s book, from the Prophet, he said: I see the Omayyads on the minbars of the earth, ruling over you. And you shall find them vile men. Then wait for the errors committed by the fools amongst them. And when these (errors) shall multiply, they shall receive their punishment. They shall be unable to repair even a single breach ere God shall cause them another, greater one. Then shall come our Mahdi”.  
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(No. 33). "Miḥnaf b. 'Abdīl-lāh relates (through his isnād) from the Prophet, who said: the Mahdi shall be from the descendants of Fāṭima, the queen of all the women in the world. Whether it shall be long, or soon, yet he shall come, to fill the earth with equity and justice even as it has been filled with injustice and oppression. Life shall become better under his rule. Curses shall be invoked upon the Omayyads and their supporters, and the prayers of God upon Muḥammad, and blessings upon ‘Alī and his followers. On that day all mankind shall become true believers”.

Qādī Nu‘mān explains that this should be understood in the sense that such events are to take place under one of the successors of al-Mahdi, repeating his theory that in such prophecies the expression “al-Mahdi” refers to the whole dynasty.

(No. 41). "Yaḥyā b. Muḥammad b. Salām relates from ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Mas‘ūd, who said: once the Apostle of God said to me: come along with me. We went with him, and came to a house which was full of Hashimites. The Apostle of God said to them: whoever is here present who is not a Hashimite, he should go out.— And the outsiders went away, leaving there only the Hashimites, especially those who belonged to the families of ‘Abdu’l-Muṭṭalib and al-‘Abbās. Then the Prophet said: O, ‘Alī! Jibri’il informed me that thou shalt be slain after my death. I tried to implore God to withdraw this decision, but He refused to do this. It is as if I appoint you (Hashimites) to be dependents of the Omayyads, who should keep you in poverty, and force upon you difficulties. Thereafter shall come the power of the Abbasids, who will act as tyrants. Woe to my descendants, to the members of my family! And woe to the Omayyads also,— they shall suffer at the hands of the Abbasids. Some of them shall flee, and stay in the remote West, acting impiously there, for a time. And then shall come out a man from amongst my descendants who shall avenge all that my descendants had suffered, and who shall fill the earth with justice (etc.). God
shall quench his thirst with a downpour from the clouds (of Divine Mercy).

Some of the descendants of al-‘Abbās asked the Prophet: shall this happen while we are still living?—The Prophet looked upon them with hatred, and said: by the One in Whose hands is my life, the descendants of Persians or Romans are not so alien from me and my family as the Abbasids”.

(No. 47). “Ad-Da‘shī relates from ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Mas‘ūd, who said: once the Prophet was sitting with his companions, when a Qurayshite youth passed by. The face of the Prophet expressed a strong emotion. Some of those present asked him what had displeased him? And he said: verily, God has given to the members of my family bliss after death in preference to the comfort in this world. After my death they shall suffer in exile, from calamities and fear, until some shall come out from here (— he pointed here towards the East—), carrying with them black banners, demanding their right which shall be refused to them. Thereafter it shall be returned to a descendant of mine, who shall fill it (the earth) with justice”.

(No. 46). “Ad-Da‘shī relates that the Prophet said: after my death a Hashimite shall come out, to whom the faithful shall swear allegiance (in the sanctuary of Mekka) 1 between the “corner” (i.e. the corner of the Ka‘ba containing the sacred Black Stone) and the Maqām (i.e. Maqām Ibrāhīm) 2. Four thousand (of his followers?) shall defeat the ruler of Syria, while he (the Hashimite?) shall disappear from them in the desert. Then he shall rejoin them, and the one who had deprived them of their booty shall (himself) be deprived. After this he shall reign for seven years”.

This apparently refers to historical events, but is too obscure to permit of their identification. Qāḍī Nu‘mān himself did

---

1 As is known, special significance and importance was always attached by the Shi‘ites to the claims for Imamat presented in Mekka, as the religious centre of the world of Islam.

2 This swearing the oath of allegiance “between the corner and the Maqām” is found in other traditions, cf. Biḥār, pp. 179, 202.
not know what was implied. He only adds that this has not happened so far, but is certainly going to happen.

The general tendency of these prophecies is quite clear: the Fatimids were to be the successors of the Omayyads and Abbasids. Apparently these aspirations were raised by the successful turn which the affairs of the Fatimids took towards the middle of the fourth/tenth c.

(No. 4). “What had already been fulfilled, is related by Salmān al-Fārṣī 1, who recollected it in connection with the Prophet, who said, referring to the Mahdi: he shall slay tyrants, exterminate heretics (zanādiqa), never accepting their repentance, or levying on them the jīzā tax 2. He shall not leave on the earth even a single man who would profess any other religion than Islam: all such he shall slay. He shall destroy the Turks and Khazars, the Daylamites and Abyssinians. Then the kings of Byzantium, wearing steel armour, shall be subdued

---

1 As is known, Salmān Fārṣī, together with Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh al-Anṣārī, Jābir al-Ju‘ffī, and some other early Shi‘ite saints, were specially chosen by different mystic circles as reliable authorities for their akhbār and hadiths. In such traditions Salmān usually appears only in connection with the most important questions, and relates directly from the Prophet. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib usually speaks on his own behalf, and after him, as the source of mystic prophecies and revelations comes Muḥammad al-Bāqir, with his entourage of Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh al-Anṣārī, Jābir al-Ju‘ffī, etc. It seems that all these are productions of the end of the third/ninth, or, better, fourth/tenth c., as may be seen from the names of peoples and countries referred to in such prophecies. Apparently no collection of such traditions, specially devoted to this kind of akhbār, is known, and different anecdotes are scattered in esoteric works. Nāṣiru‘d-dīn Ṭūsī, in his Rauḍatu‘l-tasālim (cf. Guide, 642), apparently from the same sources (this time attributed to ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Abbās), quotes a similar prophecy, only adjusted to the political situation of his time (seventh/thirteenth c.): ‘Alī shall raise his minbar in Cairo, capture Damascus, then go to Daylam, conquer Māzandarān, Gilān and Mūqān, and then make war on Indiā, China, Asia Minor, etc. (cf. W. Ivanow, “An Isma’ilite Work by Nāṣiru‘d-dīn Tusī”, JRAS, 1931, pp. 560-561). It may be added that the Ghāyatu‘l-mawād, referred to above, contains the same account of the mystic vision of Jābir, concerning the unity of the substance of the Imāmat in different persons of successive generations, so vividly narrated in the beginning of the Ummu‘l-kitāb. The extract from the 117-th Maflīs of Sayyid-nā Ḥātim, given further on, also belongs to the same class. As to the mystic status of Salmān, see L. Massignon’s “Salmān Pāk et les prémices spirituelles de l’Islam Iraouièn”, Tours, 1934.

2 Jīzā is the poll-tax, paid by the dhimmīs, i.e. non-Muslim subjects of a Muslim state, belonging to the communities classed as the ahlul‘khitāb.
to him; and he shall not leave a single Jew or Christian who shall not be made a dhimmī. He shall cause all the people to join the religion of Abraham and Muḥammad”.

(No. 7). “Zādān related from Salmān al-Fārsī, from what he knew from the Prophet, who said: there shall in any case rise a descendant of Fāṭimā, from the Maghrib. He shall slay heretics (zanādiqa), and conquer the Turks and Khazars, the Daylamites and Abyssinians. And then he shall have success against the kings of Byzantium, armoured in steel plates. And there shall be no other banner (in the world) except for the banner of the (true) faith”.

This prophecy, attributed to the Prophet who confided it to Salmān al-Fārsī, permits of correct dating,—the middle of the fourth/tenth c. It names all the powerful rivals of the Fatimids: the Turks who began their move from Central Asia; the Khazars, a Turkish people who for a short time only in the tenth c. A.D. formed a strong kingdom on the Northern shores of the Black Sea; the Daylamites, i.e. Būyides, who first made their appearance in 320/932, and then rapidly encroached upon the Eastern provinces of the Abbasid caliphate; Abyssinia, of no importance to any part of the world, except Egypt and the Yaman, with which the Fatimids had close ties; and lastly the “steel armoured” kings of Byzantium, as a general term for Europe. Thus this tradition, in both its versions, is an excellent specimen of the expectations which the rising Fatimid dynasty evoked in their subjects.

(No. 6). “And like this is related by al-Ḥasan b. Maḥbūb, from Imam Ja’far, who said: when a descendant of ours shall rise (as the Imam or caliph), he shall offer every anti-Shi‘ite to adopt the Shi‘ite persuasion. If they sincerely adopt it, they shall live; otherwise they either shall be executed, or reduced to the state of the jizya-paying subjects, like the dhimmīs of to-day.

1 Dhimmī is the ahlul-kitāb community, paying the jizya poll-tax, mentioned above, note 2 on the preceding page.
Despite of their tears, he shall expel them from the cities to the rural localities”.

This, as Qāḍī Nu‘mān adds, has not yet happened under the Imams, i.e. successors of al-Mahdī, but shall be enforced in the future, when they grow stronger. Then religion shall be one all over the world, as God has promised it.

(No. 8). “As related by ash-Sha‘bī, from Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān, who remembered that the Prophet said: none can conquer Bulanjar, the mountains of Daylam, and Constantinople, except a Hashimite”.¹

Qāḍī Nu‘mān adds: the “Hashimite” here means the Imam of our time, a successor of al-Mahdī.

(No. 9). “And, in the same strain, according to ash-Sha‘bī, who said that he was informed by Malik b. Ṣaḥḥār al-Hamdānī, who said: we fought under Bulanjar in the caliphate of ‘Uthmān in a hand to hand fight. My brother was wounded, and I took him out, carrying him on my shoulders. We got out, and I was moving when a man overtook me, and struck me on the back with a whip which was in his hand. I turned towards him,— and lo, it was Ḥudhayfa al-Yamānī. I greeted him, and he asked me as to who it was in my hands. I replied that he was my brother: have you not seen what we suffered in our fight? I nevertheless hope that we shall be victorious in the future, if God pleases.— And Ḥudhayfa replied: only a Hashimite shall conquer Daylam, Bulanjar and Constantinople. By the Hashimites has God started the religion, and by them He shall bring it to completion. And with regard to what has been conquered, and what is being conquered now, all these different places,— they must be conquered finally by the one after whom there shall be no other religion than Islam”.

¹ Constantinople invariably figures in such prophecies, both accepted by the Sunnis and the Shi‘ites. Cf. Biḥār, p. 188:— the Qā‘im shall destroy four mosques in Kūfa, shall conquer Constantinople, the hills of Daylam, etc. Cf. also Margoliouth, op. cit., p. 10.
(No. 16). "It is related from Abū Ṣādiq that he once heard a man saying: al-Muhallib has conquered Tabaristan. And he said: Ḥudhayfa related from the Prophet that he said: only a Hashimite shall conquer Tabaristan, Daylam, the town Bulanjar, and Constantinople”.

Qāḍī Nu’mān explains that the meaning of victory is complete and final subjugation and conversion of the inhabitants. Not only are the enemies to be ruined, but no mention of them even is to remain.

(No. 10). “From the story of Waki’ b. al-Jarrāḥ, that the Prophet said: verily, Constantinople shall be occupied, and (the seizure of) their prince shall make happy the (Muslim) prince, as the (seizure of their) troops shall make glad these troops. After this Constantinople shall never be seized again”.

Qāḍī Nu’mān adds: this refers to the present Imam, descending from the Prophet.

If such prophecies really reflect the rumours spread in the bazaars of the Middle East, the Crusaders, even without the fanaticism and religious exaltation, attributed to them, had good reasons to take the initiative and to attack before being attacked by the gradually growing Fatimid empire.

So far all the traditions have reflected ideas regarding the purely secular functions of the Fatimids. Let us now see what popular superstition expected from them in purely religious sphere.

(No. 22). “It is related by ash-Sha’bī from Tamīm ad-Dārī, who said: never did I enter a town more pleasant to me than Antioch. The Prophet of God said of it: fragments of the Tables of Moses, the table and the chair (minbar) of Solomon, and the staff of Moses are concealed in one of the caves in the vicinity of it. Not a single cloud, from the East or West, North or South, shall pass over that cave without raining its blessing on it, out of respect for what it contains. But not many days and nights shall pass before it shall come into possession of a descendant of mine, whose name shall be like my name, and the name of his
father like that of mine. He shall resemble me more than anyone, both physically and morally”.

(No. 23). “Muḥammad b. Salām related through others from Imam Jaʿfar, who said: when one of our descendants shall become the Imam (or caliph), he shall go to Antioch, and bring out from the cave there the Torah, together with the staff of Moses, and the Stone (?)”.

(No. 39). “Sharīk b. ‘Abdī’l-lāh relates from Jābir al-Juʿfī, who related from Imam Jaʿfar, who said: when our descendant, of the family of the Prophet, shall become the Imam (or caliph), he shall punish or reward the wicked and the good amongst the creations of God. Who shall obey him, shall obey God, and who shall rebel against him, shall rebel against God. He shall bring out the Torah, the Gospels, and other Divine books in Antioch. And he shall rule over the followers of the Torah according to their Torah, the people of the Gospels according to their sacred book, and the people of the Coran according to their Coran. Then the earth shall disgorge its treasures of gold and silver 1. And he shall say to the people: hey, you, come on, and take all this, for the possession of which you have shed so much blood, ruining so many families.—And he shall give the people what none had ever given before him, and shall never give after him. His name shall be like the name of the Prophet. He shall fill the earth with justice even as it has been filled with injustice and oppression”.

(No. 49). “It is related from Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. ‘Alī (i.e. Imam Muḥammad al-Bāqir) who said: when a descendent of the Prophet shall become a caliph, the staff of Moses shall be brought, and he shall take out the Torah from Antioch. God shall then take fear from the hearts of the Shiʿites, and put it into the hearts of their enemies, strengthening the hearts of

---

1 This is in obvious contradiction with the dreams of “one flock and one shepherd”; therefore it is quite probable that this hadith is of a much earlier origin, long before the rise of the Fatimids. It is also found, in a different version, in the Biḥār, p. 188.
his followers as with iron bars. It shall be so that if he shall summon some one, and behead him, and the people shall inquire as to the reason of his execution, (they shall find that) this was really deserved according to his actions”.

The last four traditions clearly show the influence of Jewish beliefs connected with the promised Messiah, and the fact that such dreams were shared by early Ismailism is remarkable.

In the traditions collected here one particular feature is noteworthy: absence of references to the miracles which the expected Mahdī should work, according to all-Islamic beliefs, as the proofs of his Divine mission. Qāḍī Nu‘mān has not overlooked these. But it is significant that he refers to not a single ancient hadith on this subject, adding at the end of the fifteenth part of his Sharḥu‘l-akhbār a paraphrase of the corresponding pages in his earlier work, the Iftītāhu‘d-da‘wa (cf. above, pp. 6-7), about the miraculous proofs of Divine help in his extraordinary career. In addition to this, he skilfully exploits his theory of “the Mahdī” implying not a single individual, but a dynasty. Thus in every case where popular belief expects something superhuman to be done by the Mahdī, he can distribute the burden between several Imams, or postpone the act for performance by his coming successors.

Undoubtedly this collection, selected by Qāḍī Nu‘mān, bears the stamp of his own individual peculiarities: sobriety, and moderation in religious sentiment, which in different degrees are also noticeable in the works of many other early Ismaili authors. But, nevertheless, the spirit of the prophecies quoted by him, independently of his style, reveals interesting traces of the mentality of the masses of that period. It shows definite signs of religious exaltation similar to what in the modern world would be a high tide of patriotic sentiment in a nation at the initial stages of a popular war: dreams are connected with definite aims, with removal of definite grievances, and with quite positive and practical ideals to be achieved. The Ismailis considered themselves as the spear-head of active Islamic thought, aiming
at the achievement of the unification of all Islamic and non-Islamic peoples in one world empire, under one divinely guided head, who would be able, at last, to introduce and maintain a blissful state of social equality and eternal peace in the world. Religion here is the tool, and not the aim: the aim is purely secular. Piety appears to be here nothing but the supreme social virtue, as the source of discipline, and not a means only of gaining supernatural rewards after death. All early Ismaili works are to some extent full of the same spirit, which later on gradually disappears.

But this spirit has nothing to do either with "revolutionary" aspirations, or more particularly with any sort of fictitious design "to uproot Islam, and to introduce the religion of the Magians". In many respects the earlier Fatimid period, with its remarkable cultural efflorescence, has features in common with the incipient stages of the Renaissance age which appeared much later on in Europe. The calamities which befell Islam so soon after this time stopped the process, and annihilated all its achievements.

It can easily be seen that precisely this spirit of Ismailism was to a great extent the cause of its ruin. This came from quite an unexpected source — the Crusaders. The chronic struggle against them drained the strength of the Fatimid empire. The acts of al-Ḥākim in his attempts at suppressing Christianity were probably not insane, but a direct outcome of this mentality of the masses,— a move towards the realisation of their ideals. This is why such eminent intellectuals as Ḥamīdu’d-din Kirmānī, and others, could sincerely defend him, and their less balanced colleagues even find in these actions of his a reason for deifying him, as the Druzes did. Many of his exploits were nothing but the materialisation of the similar dreams of the masses, carried out with maniacal ruthlessness. It is quite possible that his intentions were excellent, from purely religious point of view. But the mistake was committed in an underestimation of the powers outside. The Fatimid empire was still too weak to think seriously of the "crushing of the Turks and Khazars, the Dayla-
mites and the Abyssinians”, and, in addition, of provoking the “clad in steel armour” kings of Byzantium, or, generally, Christian Europe,— and to do this even before having crushed their deadliest enemies, the Abbasids. The latter could only generate hatred, and pour lies upon their opponents, but were powerless to stir up public sentiment for a decisive act, while in the case of the Franks the aggressive ideology of such “pan-Islamic” dreams evoked a similar ideological reaction of an opposite character.

In the light of the general ideas of Ismailism, as a heterodoxy, the claim of the Fatimids to be the champions of the cause of Islam on a world scale sounds strange. But this is entirely an illusion, created by centuries of propaganda. As a drop of water possesses the properties of all the waters of the ocean, so this small collection of prophecies clearly manifests the same fact as can be observed by the study of the original Ismaili sources: in its early stages, when it really was the religion of masses,— long before it became the secret esoteric faith of a small sect in the Yaman, and other remote corners of the world,— there was little difference between what is treated as “orthodoxy” in Islam, and Ismailism.

A critical examination of the facts shows that except for the central theory of Imamat, the difference between both theologies was chiefly terminological. There was little difference between Ismailism and other schools in the forms of worship and law (shari‘at), in any case no greater difference than is found between principal orthodox schools. What in Sunnism, with its historically cultivated secularistic tendencies, was the sphere of the ijma‘, qiyas, and ra‘y, i.e. consensus of public or expert opinion, or deduction by analogy, was in Ismailism, with its theocratic tendencies, called ta‘wil, in continuation of the tradition of the Koran itself. As we have seen elsewhere, the evolution of religious philosophy in Sunnism and Ismailism was so identical that even the difference in terminology cannot disguise the fact. And just as in Ismailism there were circles
which emphasised mystical and esoteric life at the expense of formal worship, so also it was in many branches of the very powerful Sufic movement, whose orthodoxy in the majority of cases was beyond dispute. Thus the idea of the heterodoxy of Ismailism is a matter of the point of view. The well-known stories of the Ismaili propaganda spread by the vile insinuations of the ḍāʾī to the "victim", who is intrigued by the promises of the revelation of all sorts of philosophic theories and impieties, obviously is one of the numerous mediaeval fictions. Just as nobody can believe that orthodox Islam was spread by any craving on the part of the neophytes to understand the contents of the most abstruse treatises of Ghazāli and other philosophers of Islam, so obviously the esoteric treatises of the Ismailis played no part in propaganda. Ismailism was undoubtedly spread in a non-Islamic milieu exactly in the same way as other schools of Islam, and amongst the Muslim masses by simply accepting from the new converts the recognition of the "rights of the House of the Prophet". The circles supporting the Abbasids deliberately ignored this, and had to resort to the invention of fictions in order to explain what, if we take such fictions seriously, we should have to regard as the superhuman successes of Ismaili propagandists.
V. THE MYTH OF ‘ABDU’L-LĀH B. MAYMŪN AL-QADDĀH.


Every student of Ismailism is familiar with the monograph of de Goeje, “Mémoire sur les Carmathes du Bahraīn et les Fatimides” (Leiden, 1886). I am sure that many of those who have seriously studied it have found it extremely difficult to follow the author through the first sixty pages, in which he discusses the origin of Ismailism and of the Fatimid dynasty. With his remarkable erudition and industry he collected much of very valuable and important information. But, in spite of this, the student does not feel firm ground under his feet; everything trembles in an atmosphere of the unreal, of theories, inferences, guesses and presumptions, none of which in the least convincing. Later researches have revealed the cause of this: de Goeje in his theories is chasing a phantom, the shade of ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. al-Qaddāḥ who died a hundred years before the events with which he is concerned.¹ This error persistently leads him astray, and causes endless mistakes in his interpretation of his materials.

As has already been suggested on p. 76, the theory that ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ was “the first man who” taught Ismaili doctrine, and, it may be for this very reason, was the progenitor of the Fatimids, is apparently of a late origin; and it seems quite probable that this “discovery” was made not earlier than the first half of the fourth/tenth c., by Ibn Razzām, from whose work it spread everywhere. It is also quite probable that although there were many eminent early

¹ The first scholar who traced the historical identity of Ibn al-Qaddāḥ in the Ithna-‘ashari sources was the late P. Casanova (“Une Date Astronomique dans les Epîtres des Ikhwan as-safa”, JA, 1915). L. Massignon, in his subsequent works, entirely sided with him.
Shi'ites who were connected with those groups from which Ismailism sprang, al-Qaddāḥ received preferential treatment for the sake of his name: most probably he was discovered to be the real successor of Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl, instead of the son of the latter, 'Abdu'l-lāh, who was born in the period when the Imam, living in hiding, could not be known anywhere except in the narrow circle of the devout sectaries.

'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ al-Makkī, an associate of Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq, is a shadowy figure, regarded by the later Ithna-ʾasharīs of the fourth and fifth c. A.H. as a somewhat unreliable ṭawīl, inclined to extremism, but on the whole acceptable. Nothing is known about his biography, and only a few lines are devoted to him in Ṭūsī's List (197), and in Kashi's Rijāl (160 and 247, the same passage). Apparently simply a pious man of no importance outside the narrow circle of his colleagues, mystics and fanatics like himself, he obviously played no part in historical events. The date of his death is not known. Jawbarī, in his Kashfuʿl-asrār, says that he died in prison in Kūfa about 210/825, as mentioned by L. Massignon, "Esquisse d'une Bibliographie Qarmate", p. 331. But this is obviously too late: he was certainly not less than thirty at the time of the death of Imam Ja'far, in 148/765. Most probably something like 160–180 A.H. is much nearer to the truth. He was apparently in touch with the Kaṭḥābiyya circles, and some other extremists, but we have not the slightest indication as to whether he shared their ideas, or held other beliefs, of his own. Putting it in mathematical terms, historically he is a quantity next to zero.

---

1 Ṭūsī's List, and the commentary, contain nothing but the name: 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn b. al-Aswad, mawla ("client") of the family of Banū Makhzūm; the author of a book (title not mentioned). Kashi (pp. 160 and 247): "On 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ al-Makkī: Ḥamdīya related to me from Ayyūb b. Nūh, and he from Ṣafwān b. Yahyā, and the latter from Abū Khālīd, who related from 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn, who mentioned that once Abū Ja'far (peace be upon him!);—i.e. Imam Muhammad al-Bāqir,— asked him: o, son of Maymūn! How many of you there are in Makka?— And I replied: we are four.— And he said: you are the light in the darkness, prevailing on the earth".
As collected by B. Lewis ("The Origins of Ismā'īlism", 63-64), Ithna-'ashari information about 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn is very meagre. As we have seen, the earliest source, Kashī, regards him as already a man of a certain repute under Muḥammad al-Bāqir, who died ca. 114/732, while Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl, as has been shown, was born not earlier than 120/738. Thus 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn was at least by 30–35 years his senior. It follows that any theories based on various late non-Ismaili sources as to his having been adopted as a son by Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl, spiritually or in any way whatever, and as to his having succeeded his "spiritual father", are un-deserving of any serious attention, and must be regarded as mere fairy tales (contrary to B. Lewis, op. cit., p. 49).

This very same 'Abdu'l-lāh b. al-Qaddāḥ, who most probably died some time between 160/776 and 180/796, unexpectedly develops his superhuman activities exactly a century after his death. As carefully deduced by de Goeje from reliable general histories, he died just about 286/899,— apparently for the second time (p. 21). Just as there are hundreds of versions of the genealogy of the Fatimids, found in different historical works, so, exactly in the same way, there are as many versions of how the malicious son of Qaddāḥ committed his swindle. The "classical" version is that he was a Persian 1 who wanted to blow up Islam from the inside; he decided to harness the Shi'ite sentiment of the masses, invented in the second half of the third/ninth c. his impious doctrine, leading to atheism and moral turpitude, and, under the flag of the sect of Ismā'īl b. Ja'far, which had

---

1 Apparently there are no authentic reports as to his real nationality, and it is more than doubtful whether he was a Persian. As is known, anti-Ismaili authors make him a grandson of Bardesanes, a gnostic of the fifth c. A.D. Sayyid-nā Idrīs, in his Zahrū'l-maʿānī (in a passage given in a translation, Texts, p. 47), enters so deeply into the spirit of these stories that he even concocts for him a genealogy from Salmān al-Fārīsī. That this is nothing but a crude falsification, is obvious from the wild names which he mentions. But though there is no "documentary justification" for the view that he was a Persian, a large volume would be required to reprint all the learned theories about a Persian nationalistic movement, Persian intrigue, and what not, in Ismailism, which have all been built on this unverified statement.
become extinct long ago, succeeded in starting a powerful mass movement, which ultimately brought to the throne of the caliphs his son or grandson, 'Ubaydu'l-lāh, posing as the expected Mahdī.

This story was so often repeated that it has become a part of "general knowledge". But as it cannot stand the slightest touch of criticism or historical analysis, various scholars, from the middle ages to the present time, have tried their hands at mending it. In the complete absence of facts there was a vast field for theories, based on various religious doctrines which came into existence only at a much later period, or simply on imagination. There is just as much ground for the belief that this 'Abdu'l-lāh was adopted as a son by Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl (who undoubtedly was younger than himself), or that he succeeded him in accordance with the mystical doctrine of tafwīd, as an Imam, as for the plain and simple belief that he fraudulently usurped the Imamat, as also did his descendant al-Mahdī. All such theories are utterly misleading and harmful, as digressions from the path of sound research.

There is one remarkable fact worth noting. We have numerous proofs that many mediaeval historians had access to genuine Ismaili dogmatic and historical works; but they never explored them properly, or took advantage of the opportunity afforded by their perusal for a better understanding of Ismaili doctrine or historical evolution. What is still more remarkable, the same thing is repeated in modern times, among learned orientalists: they do not spare themselves enormous labours in order to collect the crumbs of misleading and erroneous information from hundreds of obviously biased and incompetent works, but completely disregard even those genuine Ismaili works which are in their hands, not to speak of making any serious effort to obtain more of them. This is the amusing situation of Mahomet crawling away from the mountain, while the mountain pursues Mahomet. ¹ De Goeje (pp. 169-70) devotes

¹ Cf. above, p. 2.
only a few lines to one of the most important esoteric works in Ismaili literature, (apparently) the Ta‘wilu‘z-zakāt, by Ja‘far b. Mansūri‘-Yaman (cf. Guide, 40 and 45; MS in Leyden, 1971), which he had in his hands. Although any amount of rubbish has been written since his time, apparently not a single student has taken any interest in this work. The same thing fully applies to the important collection of genuine Ismaili MSS described by E. Griffini in the ZDMG, 1915, pp. 86–88, and to a still more interesting collection purchased about ten years ago by the School of Oriental Studies, London, and noted by A. S. Tritton (BSOS, 1933, pp. 33–39). It is one thing to indulge in fantastic speculations, and quite a different thing to approach life, or religious doctrine, as it really is, with all its complexity, technicalities, long tradition, and great difficulties, which can only be overcome by serious study, sustained effort, and sober reasoning, and which so effectively damp the enthusiasm of the seekers after the theatrical “impieties” or “revolutionary” attitudes, invented by the lying fantasies of anti-Ismaili and generally anti-Shi‘ite propaganda.

Looking at the matter critically and soberly, we can come to only one inevitable conclusion, regardless of whether the Fatimid version and tradition is true or false: there is no doubt whatever that in the stories of ‘Abdu‘l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāh we have a myth, probably, as all myths, accidentally born, and as accidentally developed into a complex theory. It has all the features of a real myth: 1. a gigantic span of life attributed to the hero; 2. a gigantic underground plot and conspiracy; 3. a gigantic fraud; and 4. a gigantic impiety of doctrine.

1. It is obvious that the real ‘Abdu‘l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāh had little or nothing to do with the matter; and even if he preached any particular doctrines, these have undergone a long and thorough evolution through more than a hundred years of the rapid growth of the sect. Nothing belongs to him in the myth beyond his name, accidentally misappropriated by anti-Shi‘ite propaganda. The impious son of al-Qaddāh of the
myth is nothing but the collective idea of the supposed activities of the Ismaili headquarters just before the triumph of al-Mahdi. His name obviously covers the ancestors of al-Mahdi just as much as other eminent Ismaili leaders. It is perfectly possible that different historical reports of this 'Abdu'l-lâh, or his "sons", living in Ahwâz, 'Askar Mukram, Kûfa, Baṣra, Ťâliqân, Sâla-miyya, etc., and coming in contact with Qarmaṭ, various Dindâns, secretaries of different princes, etc., are quite true. But in every particular case the name of 'Abdu'l-lâh covers a different Ismaili leader. Ibn al-Qaddâh becomes re-born at the time of the great intensification of the activities of the Ismaili headquarters, and when matters come too near to the light of history, he "dies" (for the second time), leaving the scene to his "sons". 1

2. The gigantic plot and terrible conspiracy, which outdo Arabian Nights in their fantastic details, are nothing but a symbol of the enormously widespread Shi'ite movement, which was merely a name for the discontent rampant in the Abbasid state, and the popular hatred of the dynasty. The Shi'ite "conspiracy" really took two hundred years to mature, and to produce in the end an effect on a large scale. What is credited to the malice of the impious Ibn al-Qaddâh is in fact no more than the final stage in the process. What really remained to be achieved by the Fatimids was nothing but what we may call "mobilisation" of the available forces. If it is true that the mission of Ibn Ḥawshab in the Yaman started from absolutely nothing in 266/879, the fact that the whole of the Yaman was conquered by him by 293/905, shows that this stage took an unbelievably short time to achieve. The "mobilisation" of the Bedouin tribes in the desert between Syria and Mesopotamia in 289/902 probably took only a few months. The enormous

1 Taking both the plain historical reports, and also the Ismaili tradition, we cannot see any dominating central figure at this period who could be identified with this super-man of the myth. Surely, if such a man had existed, and had played even in a small degree a part similar to that of the Ibn al-Qaddâh of the myth, he would have left clear traces in history.
successes of Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh ash-Shīrī in North Africa probably took not more than ten years. In the slow tempo of life and communications at that time we cannot believe that the propaganda of the dā‘īs was anything beyond the revelation of the fact of the existence of the real Imam, the direct descendant of ‘Alī, who was qualified to take up arms against the Abbasid government, and introduce a new order, securing safety, justice, and relief from the unbearable burden of taxation.

The accounts of Nuwayrī and others, giving the notorious scale of “initiations”, with gradual revelations of impious mysteries, are obviously nothing but a perversion of the idea of the doctrine concerning the ḥudūdu’d-dīn, which had in reality nothing to do with these stories, and especially with their interpretation in the spirit of the masonic lodges of the beginning of the XIXth c. When de Sacy and others first discovered information about these “degrees”, they rather credulously suggested a parallel with masonic lodges; but the only parallel that is suitable is the mediaeval Papacy, and the organisation of the Roman Catholic church ¹.

3. The gigantic fraud perpetrated by the vile Ibn al-Qaddāh was indeed remarkable: his father Maymūn, and himself, were closely associated with the family of the Imams, al-Bāqir and his son Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣādiq. In that semi-patriarchal atmosphere, in a small group of devout people, all were well-known to each other. How, then, this well-known ‘Abdu’l-lāh could “pose” as the son of Muḥammad b. Iṣmā‘īl,—defies comprehension. Yet he is not only supposed to have succeeded in this, but he and his “descendants” for over three hundred years are supposed to have continued to dupe millions of their followers, by posing as the Imams. All this went without a hitch, and only the friends of the Abbasids found out the truth. But when, how, and under what circumstances this was done,—this they did not think deserving of publicity.

¹ All matters concerning the organisation of the Fatimid propaganda are discussed in my paper on this subject in the JBBRAS, 1939, pp. 1-35.
4. The gigantic impiety of the doctrine. On examining different accounts of the nefarious doctrine, maliciously invented by Ibn al-Qaddâh to seduce the Muslims, and on analysing its elements, we can see without any difficulty that it is in reality a picture of a very late and advanced phase of the Fatimid doctrine, but completely misunderstood, reflected in the distorting mirror of their opponents' propaganda, and flooded with ideas derived from popular, "bazar" rumours. Such accounts yield only distorted and twisted fragments of the whole, and contain nothing novel, no elements which the Fatimids "concealed", or "expunged". Wild theories about fantastic "revolutionary" doctrines of the "original Qarmatian phase", etc., found in many learned works, are all a product of imagination.

Ismaili tradition, as seen in the available literature, is extremely tenacious and unyielding in its conservatism, preserving in a mummified form traces of remote antiquity, as, e.g., in the case of the doctrine about "seven Imams", etc. It is therefore reasonable to expect that if there really had been any "revolutionary" theories in an early phase of the doctrine, traces of these would be visible. But in fact there are apparently no such traces. There is much looseness in the application of such terms as "revolutionary", so that very often it is impossible to see what is really aimed at: revolution in religious doctrine, or in social matters, or also anti-dynastic movement. With regard to any religious "revolution" a student dealing with the history of Ismailism must never for a moment forget the religious mentality of the authors of his sources, to whom every minute alteration in dogma, in technicality or worship, and so on, would appear as the sign of "ilhâd", "perversion of the true faith", and "revolution against Islam". The element of anti-dynastic revolution is inseparable from early Shi'ism in so far as it claimed the right of Imamat (or caliphate, which is the same idea in Shi'ism) for the descendants of 'Ali only. With regard of social revolution, there is no trace of such a thing: the fight was not against existing social institutions but for their support and proper
enforcement. In exoteric or esoteric works of Ismaili literature, as it exists, there are no apparent traces, it seems, of ideas which would support the accusations of communistic tendencies, or such modern ideas as "class war", etc. It is quite possible that in some small communities, drawn together by common danger and isolation, the style of life may have been reversed in such a way as to resemble patriarchal conditions. But all the ingenious identifications of Mazdakite, Khurram-diniyya, or other ideas in the doctrine are pure imagination: the authors obviously had no knowledge of these early sects, except for the same "bazar" talk, as in the case of the Ismailis whose beliefs they wanted to explain. It is quite obvious that Ismaili headquarters were making full use of the strong and widespread discontent of the masses, promising them relief. But what they aimed at was a theocratical state, ruled by religion, on the lines of the mediaeval Papacy at the time when it possessed or claimed secular authority,— and not a communistic republic.

Speaking of "Mazdakite" and "Khurram-diniyya" beliefs, it is easy to find in every account of Ismailism by its opponents allusions to the sect holding the beliefs of the Zoroastrians or Manichaeans, of the Christians, and even of the Dahriyya. Hence come all sorts of theories as to Ismailism being a kind of syncretism, a "hotch-potch of religions", etc. When properly analysed, quite a different picture is revealed. It would be really surprising if in the system of what may be called "supermonotheism" which is Fatimid Ismailism, with its ruthless elimination of every idea interfering with the notion of the Absolute Oneness of God, there should be at the same time genuine Dualistic beliefs. The source of the misunderstanding is, however, clear. In the philosophic foundation which they so laboriously laid to reinforce the Coranie inspiration, they used the only available and up-to-date philosophy of the time,—Aristotle with Plato as seen through the eyes of late commentators of the Plotinian school. Here they found what suited them very well: the idea of the Absolute Supreme Deity, transcending
human knowledge, and revealing Itself through a chain of gradual emanations. The highest emanations, immediately below the Deity itself, were quite popular in Islamic philosophical speculations as 'Aqlī Kull and Nafsi Kull, the "Universal Reason" and "Universal Soul", as these are usually (quite inaccurately) rendered in English. In their attempts at evolving a terminology better fitted to abstract speculations, they introduced such terms as al-Mubdi‘īl-awwal and al-Mudbi‘īth-thānī, instead of these, i.e. the "First Creative Principle" and the "Second Creative Principle". This was obviously quite sufficient ground for accusations of their believing in two Creators, i.e. two Gods, and therefore following the doctrine of Mani, Zoroaster, Indians, from which come theories of "Persian influences", and expectations of finding in their secret works almost a complete library of Mani’s compositions. The same thing holds good equally for the accusations not only of zandagaqa, but also tanassur, i.e. Christianising, because the same set of terms, with the addition of the third Mubdi‘, is taken as an incorporation of the doctrine of the Trinity, as Muslims understood, or rather misunderstood it. And the same thing leads still further: some Ismaili authors prefer to use instead of the still somewhat "personal" term Mubdi‘ an impersonal Ibdā‘, "Creative act", which becomes in the hands of their enemies a "positive proof" of their not believing in a God at all, and of their recognising that this world exists through a spontaneous "coming into being". This is probably the truth regarding the impious mysteries which the nefarious Ibn Qaddāh invented, and used to reveal only to those who could attain the top of the long ladder of the "degrees of initiation".

A reliable picture of the evolution of philosophic ideas in Ismailism, and their relation to those of non-Ismaili philosophers of Islam, especially such as al-Ghazālī and Ibn al-‘Arabi, who differ from the Ismailis only in terminology, would be extremely instructive. Such a study may have many surprises in store: it seems that even the earliest known Ismaili philosophical
works, such as those of the very erudite Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī, show already a great advance as compared with the philosophy of the Encyclopaedia of Ikhvānū’s-safā, which is generally believed to be the production of the end of the fourth/tenth, or beginning of the fifth/eleventh c., while Abū Ḥātim flourished just at the beginning of the fourth/tenth c. Thus it is quite possible that the original version, or the nucleus of the Encyclopaedia (if it was re-edited and expanded later on, which is quite likely) may really be one of the earliest versions of Isma’ili philosophy, instead of the supposed colourful “revolutionary” productions of the “original Qarmatian phase”, stuffed with mystic impieties and fantastic schemes.

It is quite possible that there were, within Ismailism and outside of it, in Shi’ite circles, some extremist mystic groups which were not satisfied with the “standard” moderate dogma, just as there were similar groups, left and right, in Sunni Islam. They may, very probably, from time to time, have produced abstruse gnostic and fantastic theories, or semi-poetical inspired books, which revealed surprising ideas about the creation of the world, or the times before its creation, just as the Ummu’l-kitāb. But it must be remembered that the latter undoubtedly is the product of the fourth/tenth c., or even later, and if it reflects to a certain extent some Qarmatian beliefs, we must clearly take into consideration the fact that in all such productions, as in every mystic work, usually the most rudimentary elements and superstitions are brought to the fore. Their authors never look before themselves, but invariably turn their backs on reality and on actual affairs.

1 Cf. above, p. 35, note 2.
2 Similar cases of small groups of devotees, carried away by their religious fancies, are common in every religion,—we have only to remember the mysteries of the middle ages, both catholic and protestant, the Talmud literature, etc. The works of all these groups closely resemble books like the Ummu’l-kitāb, both in spirit, and even in the letter. There is no reason whatever to see in them signs of “antiquity”, or even “Manichaean”, or “Mazdakite”, or other “influences”, the mind of the mystic is usually poorly furnished, and all his dreams are made up out of a very
Such early Isma'ili works as *Kitābu'l-ālim wa'l-ghulām*, or *Kitābu'z-zīna* of Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī, are, by their extremely moderate views, which most probably were those of the rank and file of the Ismailis of that period, particularly disappointing to seekers after "impieties". It is certain that these missionaries who achieved such fabulous successes could not have won hundreds of thousands of illiterate and semi-savage followers by initiating them into abstruse philosophies, or have roused their immense religious enthusiasm by teaching to them *atheism* or the materialism of the "Dahrites". This equally applies to the higher circles of the already initiated. This may be seen from the considerable literature which arose in the priestly circles of early Isma'ilism concerning the controversy which "raged" some time before the rise of the Fatimids, or in the earliest days of their career, probably still before they were in a position to exercise much moderating influence on religious policy. This is reflected in the voluminous work, *Kitābu'l-īslāḥ*, by the learned Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī (cf. Guide, 20a). Later on the controversy was reviewed and summed up in Sayyid-nā Ḥāmidu'd-dīn al-Kirmānī's *Kitābu'r-rijāḍ* (cf. Guide, 137), in which differences between earlier authors are smoothed over: Abū Ya'qūb as-Sijzī, Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī, and an-Nasafī. It deals with minute shadings in the interpretation of certain verses of the Koran, terminology of philosophical speculations, and versions of *ta'wīl*, but no dispute over the important and really fundamental matters.

The accusation of the application of *ta'wīl*, or allegorical interpretation of things religious, is met with very often, but may be justified only to the extent that the practice was open to abuse. By itself the theory of *ta'wīl* is perfectly legitimate in Islam: the Koran itself, as is very often pointed out by the Ismailis, makes much use of it, as also do most of the orthodox commentators on the Koran, as already discussed above.

limited set of elementary ideas. No wonder that their combinations often repeat each other.
There are theories that the third Fatimid caliph, al-Mansūr (334–341/946–953), reversed the earlier religious policy, taking strict measures against extremists. Ismaili literature apparently shows no trace of such reversion. In fact there is nothing strange or novel in a “purge” of the ranks of Ismaili theologians, if it was really carried out: from the earliest times responsible Shi‘ite leaders were always compelled to take serious steps to combat undesirable and misleading mystic extremism. Any quantity of reports to this effect are preserved in the tradition regarding early Shi‘ite Imams; Ja‘far as-Ṣādiq is, in this respect, so to speak, a “classical” example. Not only general history, but to some extent even Ismaili literature itself, preserves the memory of the early Fatimid caliphs almost entirely as quite secular figures, great politicians, or generals, who most probably were not much inclined towards mystic trickery, in the style of their descendant al-Ḥākim. But the reports concerning a “reform” in the reign of al-Mansūr may perhaps have some concrete basis: it was probably during his reign that the great compendium of Ismaili fiqh, the Da‘ā‘imu‘l-Islām by Qāḍī Nu‘mān was completed. Its appearance would certainly not have passed unnoticed, and its tone and contents, being just the reverse of the various fantastic ideas held in regard to Ismaili doctrine, probably gave food for the talk of a “reform”, or the “reversal” of the policy of the supposed “impieties”.  1

It would be difficult to believe that such extremely capable and gifted rulers as the first Fatimids would be simple enough to kill the goose which was laying the golden eggs for them, or to demobilise a victorious army in a country still incompletely conquered, only to please those whom they desired to conquer.

---
1 B. Lewis, “The Origins of Ismā‘ilism”, Cambridge, 1940, p. 87 (from ‘Abdul-Jabbar): “after the defeat of Abū Yazid, he, al-Mansūr, pretended to return to Islam...He listened to jurists and traditionists, and deceived the common people...He affected an interest in jurisprudence (fiqh)”. The Da‘ā‘imu‘l-Islām to this day remains probably the central book in Ismaili literature, and there is little doubt that it perfectly reflects the Ismailism which was the religion of the masses under the early Fatimids.
They could not throw away the ideas which had proved to possess so great an appeal for the masses, in order to appease such discontented Sunnis as remained in their kingdom. There are, moreover, many proofs that their successes and the establishment of their own state with its ample resources had given a new impetus to their widespread propaganda which was active in Central Asia, all over Persia, in Western India, and probably in many other places. The ubiquitous da’wati Miṣriyān, carried on apparently by the same old and well-tested methods, was achieving remarkable successes.

The myth of Ibn al-Qaddāh, and its evolution, is not only interesting from the point of view of Ismaili, and of general Islamic studies; it may also be useful to students of folklore: here we have not merely the fragmentary and conjectural testimony of slight allusions, but can trace almost every step with remarkable minuteness, through the help of Islamic historiography.


It is really remarkable that under what may be in a way called "the pressure of the public opinion", a myth, invented and directed against the most vital and important doctrine of the sect, was forced into their own system, and there accommodated after some slight modification and toning down. The process took a fairly long time, at least some centuries; and here again, as it seems, we have an interesting opportunity of following the evolution and the different stages of the process.

As already fully discussed in my previous paper, in the JBBRAS, 1940 (pp. 74–76), apparently the earliest so far known refutation of the myth (if it be genuine), belongs to al-Muʿizz (341–365/953–975). In his epistle to the chief daʾī of Sindh he gives a reply to an inquiry, which, briefly stated, comes to this: in the conditions of secrecy and obscurity in which the "concealed" Imams had to live, there was much of vague and confusing talk, as it were "gossip", while few facts were known for
certain. The people knew that Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl’s successor was ‘Abdu’l-lāh, who was his real son, and this ‘Abdu’l-lāh has easily been turned into ‘Abdu’l-lāh ibn Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ. The caliph further on develops this idea by suggesting that this perversion of the true facts was helped by the manner of referring to the concealed Imams under some appropriate surnames: al-Maymūn (the Divinely Blessed One), or al-Qaddāḥ (not the “oculist”, but “mystical Flint, spreading sparks of Divine wisdom”), and so forth.

We cannot pronounce as to whether all this is true, or not. But it seems that the idea does not imply anything improbable.

As mentioned above ¹, there was apparently some sort of religious prejudice against mentioning the “concealed” Imams by their names. This possibly was the reason why the Fatimids did not broadcast details, true or even fictitious, regarding their biographies. The institution of the periodical satr, occultation, was according to esoteric theories as much decreed by God as the periods of zuhūr, or secular authority of the Imams. This idea was explained and proved on very many occasions, supported by numerous parallels from the Biblical and Coranic legends concerning ancient prophets, and so forth. Thus, from the point of view of the religious consciousness of the community, there was nothing shocking, alarming, or suspicious in the fact that these three Imams not only formed a “blank” in the tradition, but even were not well known by their names. Apparently it was only later on, in the course of time, when the followers of the Fatimids had become accustomed to know their Imams by a long series of names, that the gap caused by the absence of these three mysterious names began to be felt, and references to these Imams began to appear more and more frequently. At any rate the early authors, like Qāḍī Nu‘mān, do not mention them, and give no details whatever.

¹ Cf. above, p. 27 sq.
The first positive reference to 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn as the alleged progenitor of the Fatimids which I have been able to trace in the Ismaili works which were accessible to me, belongs to the very end of the fourth/tenth c. It is found in a *risāla* by one of the most eminent Ismaili authors, the chief *dā'ī* of Mesopotamia and Persia, Ḥamīdū'd-dīn Kirmānī,— *al-Kāfiya fī'r-radd 'alāl-Hārūnī al-Ḥasanī* (who was a Zaydite Imam, born in 333/944, d. 411/1020; his name was Abū'l-Ḥusayn al-Mu'ayyad bi'l-lāh Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Hārūn al-Butḥānī, cf. Guide, No. 135). The treatise is a kind of epistle in reply to questions put to the author by his deputy, 'Abdu'l-Mālik b. Muḥammad al-Māzinī, the resident *dā'ī* of Kirmān (which at that time of difficult communications and political barriers was chiefly reached *via* the Yaman, with which it was in close touch by sea). It consists of a series of explanations of various points, and the author often refers to his earlier works in which he had already dealt with many of the matters touched on in the letter.

In his book (which, unfortunately, is not mentioned by its real title), the Zaydite author repeats the usual accusations against the Ismailis, which Sayyid-nā Ḥamīdū'd-dīn quotes in full from the original,— they present nothing new. It is interesting that the basis of these accusations is a book, called *al-Balāghu'l-akbar* (apparently the same as the epistle of al-Mahdī, addressed to Abū Ṭāhir, the famous Qarmatian leader, quoted in the *Farq bayna'l-firaq*, pp. 278, 280–282; see L. Mission's Bibliography, p. 332, no. 15). The work is obviously an impudent fabrication. The author of the *Kāfiya* mentions a number of reliable and well-known Ismaili books, and invites the accuser to refer to these works, and not to one which does not belong to their literature. His defence generally is an explanation of the fact that words of the sacred text of the Koran have not a mere literal meaning, and that Ismailism in no way contradicts the *shari'at* of Islam, either in spirit or in letter.
Further on he quotes the words of his opponent: "Know that the notorious pretender in Egypt who calls himself al-Ḥākim bi-amri’il-lāh (i.e. "ruling by the command of God"), is in reality the one who rules by what God has not ordered. He has nothing to do with the conditions with which an Imam has to comply, and he has nothing to do with the descent which he claims for himself. The elders of the family of the Prophet are in agreement on this point. The truth is that he is a descendant of ʿAbduʾl-Ḥāh b. Maymūna al-Qaddāḥ, who was a heretic. Moreover, if he were really a descendant of the house of the Prophet (ʾitrat), would it be possible for him to manifest so much foolishness and depravity, and acts directed against the ṣhaʿrī’at? All this makes it impossible for him to deserve the name of an Imam. No educated or intelligent man can be deceived by him. Only the blind and ignorant are fooled, or those greedy ones amongst his associates who know well that all that we have said here is true, but (pretend to disregard it) for the consideration of material advantages".

Here the case is stated with all necessary outspokenness. The reference to the "agreement of the elders of the house of the Prophet" most probably has in view the solemn refutation of the genuineness of the Fatimid claims, and the proclamation of their impiety, staged in Baghdad with all pomp in 402/1011. Sayyid-nā Ḥamidu’d-din proceeds to refute this passage word by word. To our great disappointment, his argument is based not on historical, but on religious considerations. He refers summarily to his previous works, al-Maṣābiḥ fi ʾiḥbāṭi’l-Imāmat (Guide, 116), and the Tanbiḥūl-hādī waʾl-mustahdī (Guide, 118). In the first the names of the "concealed" Imams are not mentioned, and in the second, in the 26th bab, they are named in a complete genealogy of al-Ḥākim. There is, however, no reference to Ibn al-Qaddāḥ in either these books. The most interesting point for us is the fact that he plainly rejects the

2 Cf. above, p. 46.
descent from Ibn al-Qaddāh, and asserts al-Ḥākim’s descent from ʿAlī.

This is precisely a case of an esoteric work which explicitly states the view that the Fatimid descent was genuine. It is an excellent reply to that current of opinion amongst orientalists which is summed up by B. Lewis in his “Origins of Ismāʿīlim” (p. 16): . . . “historical notes and references in dogmatic and theological works . . . where they occur, are probably more reliable than the directly historical writings, because whereas the historical works are considered to be zāhir, or exoteric, the secret books on ḥaqāʾiq and ‘aqāʾid are often esoteric, reserved for the chosen few, and thus may contain information withheld from the masses”. The Kāfiya exactly comes under this head: it is a confidential reply to an obviously strictly confidential inquiry from a local bishop to the headquarters. It was, most probably, a kind of secret instruction as to the course of policy. Therefore the flat rejection of any connection with Ibn al-Qaddāh, and the absence of any reference to the fact that he was merely a ḥujjat, or hijāb, etc., is of considerable significance.

But it is possible to add something even more decisive, if we accept the argument of B. Lewis. In his work, Kanzu’l-walad (cf. Guide, No. 190), which is one of the few most secret and important esoteric works in Ismaili literature, Sayyid-nā Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥāmīdī (d. 557/1162), the second Yamanite dāʾī, in the tenth chapter, plainly mentions ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl as the successor of his father. Further on, he plainly calls al-Qāʿim the son of ‘Abdu’l-lāh al-Mahdī, and a few lines later, referring to Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, he adds:— “wa huwa mansūb īlā ‘Abd bin Maymūn fiʿt-tarbiyat”,— i.e. “and he is said to be brought up by ‘Abd (sic) b. Maymūn”. If really the Ghāyatul-mawālīd is the work of Sayyid-nā al-Khaṭṭāb, we must take it for certain that Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmīdī knew it. And if so, it is plain that he simply ignored it, only adding, with much doubt in his tone, a few words concerning the supposed connection of the Imam with Ibn al-Qaddāh.
It is disappointing to find that in defence of al-Ḥākim Sayyid-nā Ḥamidu’d-dīn prefers to offer nothing but some compliments to his piety and strict adherence to the injunctions of the shari‘at, and a reminder, that he is recognised as an Imam by millions, who obey him, etc. But we must be grateful to him for his courage in raising the problem so plainly, without the usual evasive circumlocutions of the majority of Ismaili authors. His high position and established reputation probably permitted to him to be so outspoken, without any fear that his expressions might be wrongly interpreted by his rivals. His contemporary, the dā‘ī of Syria at the time of al-Ḥākim, Abū’l-Fawāris Aḥmad b. Ya’qūb, was in a different position, and had to use more diplomatic language.

In his epistle to one of his subordinate dā‘ıs (cf. Guide, 148), preserved in the second volume of the Majmū‘u’t-tarbiyat, he also apparently refutes such allegations, but does this in a manner more usual among the Ismailis, by not referring to the substance of accusations explicitly. His interesting work is a useful summary of the doctrine of the Imamat, as it was at the end of the fourth/tenth c., concisely and clearly formulated. This is why it was selected by the compiler of the chrestomathy. It is divided into 16 bābs, dealing with the different points of the doctrine: the necessity for an Imam, the insufficiency of the Coran and the rules of external worship alone for guidance, on impossibility of an Imam being elected, the naṣṣ (b. IV), the refutation of the Zaydīs, the preferential right of ‘Ali to the Imamat, the impossibility of having two or more Imams at one and the same time. The ninth bāb specially explains why the Imamat can never pass to any one who is not an Alid by birth. The XIXth bāb explains the impossibility of the discontinuance of the line of the Imams. It quotes the genealogy of al-Ḥākim, not mentioning the names of the three concealed Imams 1, and also a

---

1 He mentions after al-Qā’im as usual al-Mahdī bi’il-lāh b. al-a’imma-
tī’th-thalathatī’l-mastūrin min a’dā’ī’l-lāh b. Ja’far aṣ-Ṣādiq, etc. Both Ismā’īl and Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl are overlooked, at least in my copy. That this is simply the scribe’s error, is clear from the 13th bāb.
portion of the sermon, delivered by him (at that time an eleven years old boy) in 386/996, on his ascending the throne after the death of his father, al-'Azīz. The XIIth bāb explains the validity of the succession of a minor; the XIIIth bāb gives a reply to the question why the Imamat must remain in the line of Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl, although this would go contrary to the rules laid down in fiqh about inheritance in general. The XIVth bāb explains the doctrine of istītār, or occultation; the XVth bāb explains, why the genealogy of the Imam should be publicly repeated in the mosques; and the XVIth bāb deals with the question of the situation which arises when several sons of the Imam claim to be mansūs, but the real heir apparent is prevented from proving his rights.¹

From the list of the contents it is obvious that the author has intentionally touched on all the questions which were disputed in his time; but he has done it in an abstract and general form. All the traditional proofs of the Imamat are mentioned here, the difference is explained between the mustaqarr Imam and the mustawda', etc. It is disappointing that in the case of the latter only Biblical examples are cited, and not those from the Islamic period.

Speaking of the Ismaili esoteric authors of the time of al-Ḥākim bi-amrīl-lāh, it is impossible to pass in silence over the question of the relevance to the matter of the genealogy of al-Mahdī, and of the testimony contained in the sacred literature of the Druzes. Through the chance that copies of these books came at an early date into European libraries, and were specially studied by the famous Arabist of the beginning of the XIXth c., Sylvestre de Sacy (1758–1838), in his monograph, “Exposé de la Religion des Druzes” (in 2 vols., Paris, 1838), the Druze ideas on the Imamat, etc., came into circulation long before those of the Ismailis. This has led to many misunderstandings,—this time not imposed by the bias or religious fanaticism of the inter-

¹ Though no names are mentioned, the matter obviously refers to the sons of Imam Ja'far.
mediary orthodox historians, but born of insufficient familiarity with Shi‘ite psychology and affairs on the part of the orientalists themselves. S. de Sacy has obviously misunderstood many of these matters, and his errors were aggravated by others. It is really high time that the whole Druze literature was re-examined in the light of the progress of Islamic studies during the last hundred years, and especially of original Ismaili works.

The Druzes, as a Shi‘ite sect, apparently have much in common in their origin with the Ali-ilahis of Persia and Turkey, the Nusayris or Alawites of Syria, and probably the real Qarmatians of Bahrayn, or the sect to which belonged the Ummu‘l-kitāb, which by chance is still regarded as a sacred book by the Ismailis of Central Asia.

It is easy to see why these “extremist groups acquired ascendency at this time: the activities of al-Ḥākim were such as to appeal to these fanatical groups, and stimulate their tendency towards the “perfecting” of the moderate Ismaili doctrine. As is known, al-Ḥākim was born in 375/985, and ascended the throne as a boy of ten or eleven after the death of his father, al-‘Aziz, who died on 386/996. It is difficult to say whether he was really insane, as the anti-Fatimid sources maintain, or whether he was simply a “spoilt child”, accustomed since his early age to have all his caprices fulfilled, and gradually losing all sense of proportion and reality in his actions. However strange it may be, such freakish and insane-seeming behaviour on the part of religious persons has everywhere and always a great appeal for the masses: all kinds of faqirs, mendicant darwishes, etc., specially cultivate it,—it is indeed their stock in trade. It is therefore by no means impossible that these “insane” actions of al-Ḥākim, invariably coloured by a kind of out and out “democracy”, contained a considerable element of the mere search for popularity, and of consciously “playing to the gallery”. ¹

¹ Cf. also above, p. 123.
Comparing the Druze ideas with those of Ismailism, we find that in place of a highly systematised and elaborate scheme of Islamic theology, such as is the Fatimid doctrine, we have a chaotic bundle of superstitious mystic speculations in which commonsense is the least prominent element. The Druze ideas on the Imamat, succession, and genealogy of the Imams, etc., are quite different from those of the parent religion. The basis of their system is the doctrine of the incarnation of the Deity in human form, which is not found in the Fatimid system. The Imams, Prophets, etc., are of little importance, and historical facts are handled with the greatest lack of ceremony.

The Deity, Mawla-nā, Our Lord, has incarnated Himself in human form ten times, as: 'Alī, al-Bār, 'Alyā, Mu’ill, al-Qā’im, al-Mu’izz, al-‘Azīz, Abū Zakariyā, al-Manṣūr, and al-Ḥākim. The order of the incarnations varies in different works 1. It is revealed that ‘Alī appeared in India, in the town called Chin-u-Machin (not in Mekka or Medina, as we are accustomed to think, cf. Sacy, I, 18). But no wonder,—this ‘Alī was quite different from the ‘Alī ibn Abī Ta-lib known to history. The latter, it is revealed, was in reality ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Manāf (why, and how, I have failed to discover) 2. He was nothing in himself, simply a slave and a servant of Our Lord. ‘Abdul-lāh al-Mahdī was his nihāyat, i.e. in him the excellent qualities of ‘Alī have found their perfect development, because al-Mahdī was superior to him. The reason is that ‘Alī swore allegiance to Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān, and with all the support he commanded, and the resources at his disposal, he was defeated by Mu’awiya, and his sons become the latter’s subjects, while

---

1 See de Sacy, “Exposé”, vol. I, p. 18-19. Strangely enough, the number of incarnations,—ten,—reappears much later on in the Indian Isma'il communities, which to a great extent combined the doctrine of Isma'ilism with Hinduistic beliefs, such as the theory of Das Avatar. There can hardly be any possibility of direct borrowing, or of common origin, unless we postulate a Qarmatian source (remember the ten 'Iqdāniyya) in the case of both.

2 Cf. R. Badwūt-tawhīd li-da'wati'l-haqq (No. 7 in de Sacy’s list): ... kullu-kum yushirin ilā 'Alī b. Abī Ta-lib wa huwa 'Alī b. 'Abd Manāf...
al-Mahdī, without money and with a handful of men, achieved what ‘Ali was never able to achieve 1.

The basic condition for the incarnation of Our Lord is to be "born in the purple", to be a sovereign king from the start. Therefore Our Lord, after these mysterious ‘Alyās, al-Bārs, Mu‘ills, was incarnated first in al-Qā'im alone. Nor does this mean that in this capacity of his, he (al-Ḥākim) was the son of al-‘Azīz, and the father of so-and-so; no, Our Lord incarnates Himself wherever and whenever He desires, without any rules being laid down for Him 2.

‘Alī, son of Abū Ṭālib (or, as we have seen, in reality of ‘Abd Manāf), really was the asās (i.e. the founder of the line of the Imams) at the time of "Muḥammad b. ‘Abdi‘l-lāh" (as Muḥammad the Prophet is always called in the Druze books), who was the sixth Nāṭiq, or law-giver. The earlier Imams are hardly ever referred to, except for Ja‘far as-Ṣādiq, who is occasionally cited simply as a theologian, in connection with some familiar sayings.

Islam, the religion revealed to Muḥammad b. ‘Abdi‘l-lāh, was not final or perfect. The proof of this is that by now, i.e. four hundred years after him, the Christians still outnumber the Muslims in Egypt, Northern Africa, Syria, etc. The last and final, the Seventh Nāṭiq was Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, who has revealed a new law, cancelling that of Muhammad (although in fact, they often are referred to as "sharī‘atayn", the "two religions", explained in marginal glosses as tanzīl wa ta‘wil). But it also transpires that the Last, Final, and Seventh Nāṭiq

1 Ibid., as the continuation of the above.
2 Cf. R. al-Balāgh wa‘n-nihāyat fi‘t-tawḥīd (No. 9 in the list). Perhaps it would not be too hazardous to conjecture that this belief may be to some extent an explanation of the strange act of al-Ḥākim in appointing as his heir apparent his remote relative, a direct descendant of al-Mahdī by a different line, Abū‘l-Qāsim ‘Abdu‘r-Rahmān (or ‘Abdu‘r-Rahīm) b. al-Yās b. Abī ‘Alī Ahmad (d. 382/992) b. al-Mahdī, who was proclaimed as heir to the throne in 404/1013. After al-Ḥākim’s death he proclaimed himself the independent ruler of Syria (where he was the governor). But his rule soon became unpopular, he was arrested, brought to Egypt, cast into prison, and died there about 415/1024, probably poisoned.
was al-Mahdi as well. Further, in addition to these duplicated seventh Nātiqs, Our Lord al-Ḥakim has also revealed a new religion,— obviously the one compiled by Ḥamza, the founder of the Druze sect.

It is interesting to note that just as ‘Ali was the asās of the time of Muḥammad the Prophet, so ‘Abdu’l-lāḥ b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ was the asās of Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl. But, to our surprise, the very same ‘Abdu’l-lāḥ appears also to be the asās of al-Mahdi; and just as between ‘Ali and Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl there were six links, so there should have been six (or even seven) links between Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl, his asās ‘Abdu’l-lāḥ, and al-Mahdi. Seven names are really quoted: Ismā’īl (II), Muḥammad, Aḥmad, ‘Abdu’l-lāḥ, Muḥammad, Ḥusayn, and Aḥmad. It appears that al-Mahdi was either this latter Aḥmad, or the son of this Aḥmad. On top of all it appears that ‘Abdu’l-lāḥ, mentioned as the fourth name in this line, was ‘Abdu’l-lāḥ b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ himself. The next name, that of Muḥammad, is accompanied with a note to the effect that he was “of the stock of al-Qaddāḥ and of Ḥusayn,”— which Ḥusayn, is not explained. And his successor, the sixth in the line, Ḥusayn, is noted as merely “of the stock of al-Qaddāḥ.”

Thus we have three ‘Abdu’l-lāḥ b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥs to deal with: the first was the asās of Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl, the second was the asās of al-Mahdi, and the third was an Imam,

1 As is stated in an-Naqḍu’l-khaṭīb, by Ḥamza (No. 6 in the list), cf. Exposé, I, 74 ad 79, al-Mahdi, or Sa’īd b. Aḥmad, was the seventh Nāṭiq. In ar-Radd ‘alā’n-Ḵawāṣṣ (No. 15 in the list), he is called the ḥujjat of al-Qā’īm, apparently using the term in the higher sense which it has in later Persian Ismailism. But it is definitely stated that he was the father of al-Qā’īm: asḥara’l-Muwalā nafaṣa-hu min-hu, i.e. “manifested himself from him”. He, al-Qā’īm, was acting and speaking through al-Mahdi.

2 Cf. Exposé, I, 84-85. Sometimes he is simply called “Qaddāḥ”, and sometimes Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ, so that there is complete chaos.

3 The same “Qaddāḥ” is called the wasī (i.e. asās) of al-Mahdi in the same an-Naqḍu’l-khaṭīb (No. 6 in the list).

4 He is usually called in Druze texts Sa’īd b. Aḥmad, obviously for Muḥammad b. Aḥmad of the Isma’ili texts, the uncle and guardian of al-Mahdi.

5 Cf. Exposé, I, 85.
the descendant of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, midway between the latter and al-Mahdī.

At the same time one of the sacred works respectfully quotes the saying attributed to al-Muʿizz: "I am the seventh in the second heptade; after me there will be no more complete heptade" ¹. As is known, al-Muʿizz really was the fourteenth Imam, according to Ismaili ideas, and al-Ḥākim the sixteenth. Therefore, although the saying was invented (or amplified) in al-Ḥākim’s time, it is obvious that the Ismaili genealogy was recognised as true. Moreover, speaking of the Imams after Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, it is said that "they were three, and al-Mahdī was the fourth of them", and it is added that they had also three "khalīfās" ². What were these khalīfās: mustawda, Imams, or their bābs, or bujjats? ³

All this may be an excellent specimen of highly mystic speculations, but from the point of view of history it is pure nonsense.

We have already discussed (cf. above, pp. 45-46) the theory of B. Lewis, "The Origins of Ismāʿīlism", pp. 71–73, concerning the "hidden Imams", based partly on these speculations of the Druzes, and partly on a faulty copy of the Ghāyatul-mawālīd, in which the name of the Imam ʿAbduʾl-lāh b. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl is omitted from its proper place. The genealogy of the Fatimidics, suggested by him, Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl—Aḥmad—Ḥusayn—ʿAlī (from the Ghāyatul-mawālīd)—al-Qāʿīm, is impossible. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl was most probably born

¹ Cf. an-Naqdul-khaṭī (No. 6).
² Cf. as-Siratul-mustaqima (No. 12). Also the same in an-Naqdul-khaṭī, where it is said that al-Mahdī was the fourth of the khulafāʾ: wa huwa rābiʿuʾl-khulafāʾ wa huwa Saʿīd b. Aḥmad.
³ According to the Fatimid terminology, the members of the first heptade of the Imams were called atimmaʾ, while those of the second—khulafāʾ. Thus this title was applied both to al-Mahdī and al-Qāʿīm. It is difficult to see what is meant by the Druzes; cf. as-Siratul-mustaqima: wa kāna thalathat alladhin rābiʿu-hum Saʿīd b. Aḥmad al-Mahdī fī dawr Muḥammad ism Ismāʿīl wa thalāṭ khulafāʾ min gabiḥ-him. Thus it appears that in the dawr of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl there were seven Imams, and the khulafāʾ were the first three,—al-Mahdī was not one of these, contrary to what is stated above.
about 120/738, and al-Qā'īm died in 334/946. As already mentioned above, this gives five generations for 214 lunar years, or 43 years per generation. Even if we restore the omitted name of 'Abdu'l-lāh, it shall be 36 years per generation, while for the historical Fatimids it is only 23. Cf. above, p. 54.

Thus a reference to the original text completely changes the situation. This is particularly necessary with regard to the Druze texts: de Sacy's analysis or summary is quite obsolete now. His "orientation" is quite different from the modern because he, with all his great erudition, had no knowledge of many matters which have become known in the course of the century which has elapsed since his time.

We can now easily see that the talk of Ibn al-Qaddāḥ being the ancestor of al-Mahdī transformed every 'Abdu'l-lāh into 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ. This was in no way repugnant to the mystical mentality. These transformations prove only one thing definitely, i.e. that knowledge concerning the true bearer of the name was as vague in sectarian circles as it was in those of their opponents. For non-Ismailis he was a kind of Shaytan, who was always at hand to be blamed for everything. For the sectarians it was the name of a supposed saint, about whom their memory was blank. But, as many other genuine saints were just in the same position, they could give him the benefit of the doubt.

The perusal of the Druze literature which is chiefly based on these mystic, or merely superstitious beliefs, is very instructive, as it allows us an insight into the hidden causes of various prejudices in the handling of historical tradition: we can see that al-Mahdī, although he was supposed to be the (second) Seventh Nāṭiq, the revealer of the Final and the Most Perfect Religion, and although he was admittedly the father of the first and greatest incarnation of Our Lord, al-Qā'īm, and was superior in rank to 'Alī and all his predecessors, he, al-Mahdī, was nevertheless regarded as the "slave and subordinate" of Our Lord, his son, al-Qā'īm. Why is this so? We may with full right
suspect that it is not only because he was not “born in the purple”, but also for a reason that may appear very trivial to us: his name was ‘Abdu’l-lāh or, still worse, ‘Ubaydu’l-lāh. A person with such a plebeian name cannot be the Lord. It is moreover quite possible that this is one of the reasons why all the numerous ‘Abdu’l-lāhs were so easily associated with ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Maymūn: because ‘abd, slave, cannot be the name of the Lord.

We may suspect that the omission of al-Mahdi in the Ghāyatul-mawālid, and his replacement by a spurious ‘Alī, was not only due to the confusion of himself with Muḥammad b. Āḥmad, surnamed Sa‘īd, his uncle, but was also influenced by the same prejudice.

Turning again to the Ghāyatul-mawālid, we may see that, so far as the Qaddāḥ myth is concerned, this work apparently forms the first and as yet a very feeble attempt at compromise. Here “al-Qaddāḥ”,—it is not clear whether Maymūn or his son,—appears as one of those to whom certain Imams entrusted (wassā) their heirs during their minority. Leaving aside the Biblical prototypes, it appears that the predecessor and successor of “al-Qaddāḥ” during the Islamic period were the following:—Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya as the wasṭ in charge of Imam Ḥusayn (sic, an obvious error for ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn, surnamed Zaynu’l-ābidīn,—an entirely spurious tradition, which rests apparently on some special, non-historical grounds. Ḥusayn, of course, was an elder brother of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya) and, later, al-Mahdī Sa‘īdu’l-Khayr in charge of al-Qā’īm.¹ There is, however, not a word to the effect that

¹ It is interesting that while accommodating ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Maymūn, Sayyid-nā Idris not only separated him from his father, but also took into consideration the usual story concerning his being succeeded by his son Āḥmad (in his part of the progenitor of the Fatimids). As may be seen from the translation of the Zahrul-ma‘ānī, further on, he mentions that ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Maymūn handed his high rank after himself to an Āḥmad. But this Ahmad was a descendant of ‘Alī, and not his son. It would be exceedingly interesting to find out whether there was anything like a historic foundation for this detail, and whether Sayyid-nā Idris does not here entirely depend on his own pious imagination.
this "al-Qaddāḥ" was a mustawda' Imām, like al-Mahdī. As we can see, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya, mentioned here, is also not always regarded as such. There is not the slightest ground for any belief that on certain occasions Ismailism recognised the temporary transfer of the Imamat to a non-Alid. Contrary to this, Ismaili dogmatic and esoteric works are not only unanimous, but also emphatic on the point that never, and under no circumstances, can the Imamat pass to any one who is not of the 'īтрат, or progeny of Fatima. As mentioned above, the term mustawda' by no means always implies a mustawda' Imām. It is an ordinary adjective, or participle, and may be applied to any one. ¹

Whatever may be the real relation between the Ghāyatu'l-mawālīd and the Zahrul-ma'ānī of Sayyid-nā Ḫirdī, a work of the middle of the ninth/fifteenth c., it appears that in the latter

¹ In addition to what has been said concerning the term mustawda' on pp. 54 sq. above, it may be mentioned that Sayyid-nā Ḫirdī, speaking of Ībn al-Qaddāḥ (Zahrul-ma'ānī, Text, p. 47), and Muḥammad b. Ḫīṣā'il having been entrusted to his care, employs the phrase: kafīlu-hu wa mustawda' amri-hi. The meaning of the last words is not clear. Some help may be derived from another passage in the same work (Text, p. 79), the story of the death of al-Qā'im, and the declaration of his will: wa'stawda'-a-hu rubāta waladi-hi-l-Manṣūr, wa nasī'a 'alay-hi wa 'āhadā-hu la-hi. Fa-lāma Jawwār mustawda'an l-il-Manṣūr b'il-lāh. Taken out of its context, this quotation would prove beyond doubt, on the lines of the usual interpretation of the terms mustawda', that Jawwār was in fact a mustawda' Imām for al-Manṣūr. The context, however, obviously a paraphrase of an early document (beg. of the Sīra of Jawwār), clearly shows that this was not the case. And really, there obviously was no need in such a dignitary while al-Qā'im was himself living. It seems clear that in reality Jawwār was nothing more than a trusted witness, and the physical guardian of the important state document containing the will of the caliph. By his position he was nothing more than a trusted treasurer and the manager of the palace. In the account there are plainly mentioned the ṣāhibu'r-rūba, probably the highest religious authority, and Jawwār himself has to ask those present whether they realise his own position of trust with the Imam. It follows that there is no connection between his being the guardian of the document and his rank in the religious hierarchy. In the ambiguity of the Arabic relative pronouns it is not easy to be certain whether the words wa nasī'a 'alay-hi wa 'āhadā-hu la-hi refer to Jawwār, or to al-Manṣūr. The latter is more probable. Thus the expression mustawda' amri-hi in all probability means "entrusted with the order, or will (of Ḫīṣā'il) concerning him (i.e. Muḥammad b. Ḫīṣā'il)"., either the written or the oral declaration,—and nothing more.
the compromise is complete, and the Qaddāḥ myth has been finally accommodated in Ismaili literature.

Obviously under the influence of general historical literature, Sayyid-nā Idrīs admits "al-Qaddāḥ" as an Ismaili saint. He duly differentiates between the father, Maymūn, and the son, ʻAbdu'l-lāh. Both are canonised in the rank of ḥijābs, i.e. trusted high priests, whose functions were to "screen" the real Imam from his enemies. The father is associated with Ismāʿīl b. Jaʿfar, and ʻAbdu'l-lāh with his son Muḥammad, to give the story a greater degree of verisimilitude. The story most probably has as much historical substratum as many other esoteric revelations of this kind. The institution of ḥijābs, most probably, belongs to a period at least a century later. There is not the slightest trace of it either in the Ithna-ʿashari or in non-sectarian literature. Thus all this can be nothing more than a pious fiction.

To sum up, the question of ʻAbdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn so far as concerns Ismaili literature, stands as follows. The earliest sources never mention him, and apparently preserve no memory of him. Later, apparently after the theory, possibly advanced by Ibn Razzām, began to spread, we find documents unequivocally refuting these theories: the epistle of al-Muʻizz, and al-Kāfiya by Ḥamīdu'd-din al-Kirmānī. Apparently these authors in fact knew nothing about him, and therefore were unable to pin down the falsifiers by quoting any definite historical details.

Still later, however, the legend becomes too widely known in non-Ismaili circles, and, in the absence of detailed historical information concerning that early period, too difficult to refute convincingly. Therefore a certain "tactical" compromise was introduced in Ismaili literature, and ʻAbdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn, together with his father, were posthumously canonised in the rank of ḥijābs, although this rank, most probably, had not come into existence until much later after his death. The process of the canonisation of these early worthies was completed not
earlier than the ninth/fifteenth c., i.e. seven centuries after the death of 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn.

It is therefore clear that there is very little probability that Ibn al-Qaddāḥ played any prominent part in the launching of the Ismaili doctrine, and there obviously is no foundation whatever to regard him as the progenitor of the Fatimids.
VI. TRANSLATIONS.

Note.—In the translations offered here figures in heavy type, within square parentheses, show the beginning of the corresponding pages in the original text of extracts in Arabic, edited further on. In the first two works, translated here, i.e. the Istitāʻul-Imām and the Sirat of Ja'far al-Ḥājib, such figures refer to the text edited in the Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Egyptian University, Cairo, vol. IV, 1936 (published in 1939).

It must be carefully noted that references in the indexes, given further on, if given in heavy type, refer to the original text, and to the corresponding pages of the translations, as marked in the way mentioned above. As the text of the first two works is not published here, references to these, in heavy type, are enclosed in parentheses in the index.

1. Istitāʻul-Imām.

(For the work and the author see above, pp. 7–10.)

The Book on the Concealment of the Imam and the Departure of the Dā‘īs to Different Provinces in Search of Him.

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate!

Praise be to God,—great praise,—which is appropriate to Him, and which truly belongs to Him! And blessings of God be upon Muḥammad, the head of God’s Apostles, and upon the members of his family, the pure,—great blessings!

Know, reader (of this book),—may God make thee a knower of the truth!—that as soon as the dā‘īs lost touch with the Imam, and remained in great confusion, the principal amongst them held a meeting in the town of ‘Askar Mukram. They were seven: Abū Ghafīr, Abū Salama, Abū’l-Ḥasan b.

1 Now non-existent, but in the IV/IX-th c. a large and flourishing town on both banks of the Mashrūqān (Ābi Gargar) branch of the Qārūn river in Khūzistān, about 28 miles South of Shushtar. Now ruins near Bandi Qīr.

2 As can be seen, there are only six names mentioned; so it is in all copies that I have been able to examine.
at-Tirmidhī, Jiyād\(^1\) b. al-Khash‘amī, Aḥmad b. al-Mawṣīlī, and Abū Muḥammad al-Kūfī, the latter being the father of Abū Mahzūl, the one who (later on) slaughtered (at Salamiyya) the dependents of our lords, the descendants of the Prophet,—blessings of God be upon them! \(^2\)

When the people, mentioned above, met, they said: “We have lost touch with our Imam. Without him our prayer, fast (etc.) is of no use. We do not know, to whom we should hand the religious tax \(\text{zakāt}\).” (Later on) they held a meeting also with their subordinates \(\text{awliyā‘}\) and sympathisers. These collected donations, and said to the \(\text{dā‘īs}\) mentioned in the beginning of this narrative: “Go, disperse in the provinces of Persia, ʿIrāq, Ῥarrān \(^3\), and the Yaman, and search for him”. Accordingly, the \(\text{dā‘īs}\) started on their journey, dispersing everywhere, each of them carrying with him a description of the appearance and characteristic features of the Imam. They travelled in the guise of wandering hawkers, carrying with them on their donkeys different wares, such as pepper, aromatic plants, spindles, mirrors, frankincense, and different kinds of millinery that find demand amongst women.

Amongst themselves they agreed to meet on a fixed date at a certain place, selected in every province, different districts of which were allotted to every one of them to be toured. So that, completing their tour in a certain province, they would meet at an agreed place, informing each other as to whether they had collected any news (about the Imam). And if they could not find him in one province, they would tour another, in which another meeting place would be fixed.

\(^1\) His name appears both in the form of Jiyād and Jiyāda.

\(^2\) This is quite impossible, and is probably due to the coincidence in names. Abū Muḥammad al-Kūfī, who is known to general history under the name of Zakrūya b. Mahdūya, the father of Abū Mahzūl, i.e. Ḥusayn surnamed Ṣāḥibu‘sh-shāma, “the one possessing a (prophetic) mole”, could not have been one of the senior \(\text{dā‘īs}\) in the early years of the third/ninth c., because he had sons just over twenty years of age in 290/903.

\(^3\) Harrān, a town in Upper Mesopotamia, is here called jazīra, “island”, or “section” obviously in the sense of “province”, as the term is used in Ismaili texts. Cf. above, p. 20, note 1.
Whenever children and women came around them, they would ask whether there was in their locality a person, answering such-and-such description. This was done everywhere. Thus they toured the provinces of Aleppo (Ḩalab), Upper Mesopotamia, [94] and other places, but found nothing. Later on they came to the district of Ḫimṣ, and happened to be near Ma‘arratu’n-Nu’mān ¹. Their (next) meeting place they appointed the mosque of that town. So it happened that the Imam also was in the same district, namely in the hills of Sumāq (Jabalu’s-Sumāq), in the monastery known as “the Monastery of sparrows” (dayr ‘asfūrīn), near Kafrabḥūm ².

When Abū Ghafīr, with Jiyaḍa, were passing Ma‘arratu’n-Nu’mān, situated in the Sumāq hills, they were (as usual) shouting (offering) their goods: spindles, frankincense, mirrors, etc. Some women and children came out to them, and they, as usual, asked these whether there was amongst them a man, having such-and-such appearance. To their surprise, a boy and a woman demanded from them as a present something from their goods, promising to show them where the person answering their description could be found. They offered to them mastic, frankincense, and other things, liked by women and children. The woman and the child told them ³ that when just a short while ago they were passing near the “Monastery of sparrows”, (they saw) the person (standing) with his servant. Abū Ghafīr exclaimed: “Allah, Allah! Show me the way to the monastery!” He rode on his donkey to, and reached the monastery. He took

¹ Salamiyya lies E.N.E. from Ḫimṣ, and E.S.E. from Ḥamā, nearer to the latter, just over twenty miles. Ma‘arratu’n-Nu’mān is now a small town further N.W. It is probably referred to here because at that early period it was more important than Ḥamā (ancient Epiphania). Ḫimṣ (ancient Emessa) is also pronounced Ḥoms.

² F. ‘asfūrin. This obviously refers to what is shown on the map as “Tell Afer”, approximately half way between Ḥamā and Masṣyaf, regarded as belonging to the district of the village Kafrabḥûm, about ten miles South of Ḥamā. The name of the hills, J. Sumāq, does not appear on the maps,—probably it is an earlier version of the present J. Anṣāriyya. For k-f-r g-w-m read Kafrabḥûm. Sumāq is now the name of a village East of Tartūs.

³ For la-hu read (as in F.) la-humā.
out the paper with the description which he had with him (in order to refresh his memory), because he had never seen the Imam personally before that. But when he glanced at the Imam, he (at once) recognised him from the description. He rushed from his donkey and fell prostrated before God, thanking Him that he had found him, for whom he was in search. (Then) he bowed to the Imam, and the latter asked him: "Who art thou?" The dā'ī mentioned his name, and explained that seven of them, the dā'īs, since that day exactly a year before, were in search of him, after they had lost touch with him. He, just as the other dā'īs, had searched for him (all the time), so far being unsuccessful. The Imam replied that he came to the place to hide himself, and these people came to expose him. "But as thou hast come here,— added the Imam,— and as thou hast met me,— go back, and send a word to all thy colleagues to come here and see me, so that I may meet them, and give orders with which you may return, by the will of God".

With great relief and jubilation Abū Ghafir went to his colleagues, who also were immensely gladdened. All came to the "Monastery of sparrows", to meet the Imam. He ordered them to return to their homes, and to inform the other dā'īs about his being found. So, the seven dā'īs returned, and informed all the dā'īs everywhere. Later on a number of them visited the Imam, greeting him, and praising God at being able again to be in touch with him. The Imam received them with great kindness, and said to them: "I lived here for some time, but it is impossible to find here either medicine when required, or a surgeon for bleeding when one is in need of him, nor is there any bath available". Therefore the dā'īs went (in search for a better place) to the towns Shabūn (?), Ḥammā, and Kafr Ṭāb (?). Incidentally they visited Salamiyya. This was a newly built

1 Shabūn (or Shayūn), and Kafr Ṭāb most probably are the names of local villages, which no longer exist. They are not referred to by Tabari. Perhaps Kafr Ṭāb is the same as 'Aynātāb, the well known town North of Aleppo, now in Turkey.
town, founded by Muḥammad b. 'Abdiʾl-lāh b. Sāliḥ, [95] whom the caliph sent away from Baghdād, ordering him to leave the city, and to find for himself a town in which he could build a house, and to live there. 1. There was near the site (of Salamiyya) a collection of twenty-four Christian monasteries. Muḥammad b. 'Abdiʾl-lāh b. Sāliḥ built a wall around it (read sūran), and settled there with his slaves, expelling the original inhabitants. He sent a word to the caliph in Baghdād, who was his cousin, informing him that he had settled in a town, situated in a remote corner (of the kingdom); but he wished to make it prosperous, and for this reason he wished the caliph to send a proclamation to merchants in every town, inviting them to come and trade at its market, so that it might become wealthy. He built in three months’ time a bazar, being never tired of supervising the workers. Merchants began to come and open their shops, and (Salamiyya) gradually became a prosperous town. The tradesmen who used to visit it did not like to leave it; so (some) asked permission of the owner to settle there. The owner used to permit this to them, and the merchants began to bring their wares; their slaves began to deliver these, also requiring place to stay in the town. So in Salamiyya there were formed special quarters for merchants. The owner invited them to settle in groups (according to their origin). Therefore natives of different places settled separately: those who came from Bakhkh, from Medina, from ʿHašab, Raqqā, etc.

The dāʾīs came to Muḥammad b. 'Abdiʾl-lāh b. Sāliḥ, and said to him that there was a merchant from Baṣra who desired

---

1 Salamiyya was not founded by Muḥammad b. ‘Abdiʾl-lāh, but certainly considerably expanded by the attraction of new settlers. The town is very old, and, apparently, there must have been many Byzantine churches,—carved stones are still numerous there. The relatives of the Abbasids settled there soon after the change of the dynasty, i.e. about the middle of the second/eighth c. Muḥammad b. ‘Abdiʾl-lāh b. Sāliḥ is not mentioned byTabari. But his father already had a sumptuous house there, which the caliph al-Mahdi (158–169/775–785) visited; he was the governor of Iraq for a time, and it is quite possible that his son, Muḥammad, was really exiled to his father’s estate.
to obtain the usual permission to settle in the town. (The owner) ordered them to select a suitable plot in which the applicant would feel comfortable; he earmarked a plot along the main street, near the bazar. The ḏā‘īs bought for (their Imam) the house of a certain Abū Farḥa. The Imam settled in Salamiyya just in the same way as ordinary merchants. When he came to live there, he built high walls (around), pulled down old buildings, and erected new ones. He married; his followers and ḏā‘īs began to come to him. Later on he built a new lofty building (qaṣr).

The name of the Imam was ‘Abdu’l-lāh the elder (or the Great, Akbar) ¹. He used to send his ḏā‘īs everywhere secretly, commissioning them, or dismissing from service (as required). In appearance he was an ordinary merchant. Two sons were born to him in Salamiyya, Aḥmad and Ibrāhīm. He died there, and his son Aḥmad, not Ibrāhīm, succeeded him as an Imam. Imam Aḥmad (b. ‘Abdī’l-lāh) had a son, al-Ḥusayn, who (after his death) became the Imam; he was the father of al-Mahdī. Imam Aḥmad also had another son, Sa‘īdu’l-Khayr. Imam al-Ḥusayn lived until al-Mahdī was born to him ². Before his death he put his son in charge of his own brother, Sa‘īdu’l-khayr, because al-Mahdī was still a minor. But Sa‘īd usurped the Imamat, and designated one of his own sons as his successor. This his son died (soon). Then he appointed another son, who also died. He had ten sons whom he appointed as his successors one after another, but all of them died. Thus he found that the Imamat can only belong to him who had the right to it. [96] Then he repented, and prayed God for forgiveness. Summoning all the ḏā‘īs, he explained to them that he himself was only a guardian of (his nephew) al-Mahdī. Realising this, Sa‘īd returned the Imamat to al-Mahdī (when the latter reached majority), giving an account of what he had done. In this way

¹ No other ‘Abdu’l-lāh is mentioned further on. Most probably this is merely an honorific epithet.
² Cf. above, p. 41 sq.
al-Mahdī became the Imam. A poet commemorated this in the couplet as follows:

God has given thee something, than which there is nothing higher;
How many people there are who wish prevent it from reaching thee, keeping it for themselves
Instead of thee! But God denied it to all, handing it over
To thee,—and thus the precious necklace is put around thy own neck.

The first thing that al-Mahdī did was to invite Abūl-Ḥusayn b. al-Aswad to stay in the town of Ḥamā. He was a very clever man. Mahdī said to him: "I appoint thee to be the head of all dāʿīs; whomsoever thou makest a headman, he shall be the headman, and whomsoever thou makest a subordinate, he shall be a subordinate. Thou shalt reside on the road to Egypt". After this the dāʿīs began to report to Abūl-Ḥusayn, submitting to him the taxes which they collected (zakāt), and presents, and he forwarded all this to al-Mahdī.

The first thing that Abūl-Ḥusayn (appointed as the chief dāʿī) had done in the way of altering the arrangements (which existed before him) was this: when Abū Muḥammad, the dāʿī of Kūfa, died, he left three sons,—Abūl-Qāsim, Abū Mahzūl, and Abūl-ʿAbbās. They had a brother-in-law, the husband of their own sister; they murdered him on the accusation of his being an enemy (of the religion), disobedient to the Imam. Their sister complained, but they insisted, saying that their brother-in-law was a traitor. Abūl-Ḥusayn dismissed Abūl-Qāsim b. Abī Muḥammad from the post of the dāʿī of Kūfa; and the latter, together with his brothers, was furious. They wrote to al-Mahdī, complaining that Abūl-Ḥusayn deprived them of the

---

1 Cf. above, p. 42 sq. In F.—aʿlama-hum instead allama-hum.
2 In F. the quatrain is omitted. The necklace is here a metaphor.
3 In F.—aʿmala instead of amala.
4 F. adds Muḥammad (as a real name of this Abūl-ʿAbbās). Further on F. reads: wa kāna gihrun la-hum wa zawj...
5 In F.—nafaqa.
dā'ī-ship of Kūfa without any serious reason, or fault on their part. Al-Mahdī sent no reply to them.

The three brothers then conspired, making a sworn agreement between themselves, to make a sudden attack on Salamiyya, and to kill this Ibn al-Baṣrī who empowered Abū'l-Ḥusayn to commit such an offence on them. They promised never to leave him alone until even the mention of ‘Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib disappears from the world. After this they wanted, if possible, to kill Abū'l-Ḥusayn; if impossible, they intended to report on them to the government of Syria.

News about this transpired to the dā'īs resident in Baghdād, i.e. Ḥāmid b. al-'Abbās, and Ibn 'Abd. Some Shī'ites wrote to al-Mahdī, informing him that the sons of Abū Muḥammad conspired to murder him, with his family. "If thou art sitting,— as they wrote,— then get up. The brothers have already started, intending to murder thee. If they do not succeed in this, [97] they will expose thee to Aḥmad b. Ṭūlūn. They say that thou art the enemy of the religion, and they want to expose thy affairs. Do everything to save thyself, without wasting a moment."

As soon as this news reached him, al-Mahdī gave orders to prepare for a journey. He took with him only his son Abū'l-Qāsim, and also Ja'far the Chamberlain, Ibn Barka, and the tutor of Abū'l-Qāsim. He abandoned his residence with all that it contained: carpets, clothing, property, servants, and also the family of his uncle and brother, male and female, and

---

1 In F. wa kāna jamā'atun... katabū... Strike out the comma after ash-shī'ati.
2 After sabīl can F, adds wa illā.
3 Aḥmad b. Ṭūlūn was the governor of Egypt in 254-270/868-884, and was dead long before the events. It is obvious that the author means Ibn Ṭūlūn, in the sense of a descendant of his, the Tūlūnid. In fact, the governor at that time was Aḥmad’s grandson, Ḥārūn b. Kamhrūya b. Ahmad b. Tūlūn (283-292/896-904).
4 The reference to the tutor obviously implies that al-Qā'im was a small boy at that time. Cf. Sīrat Ja'far, p. 110. Apparently this is the same person as Ṭāyyib, often referred to in the Sīra: “his name was then Burkān; al-Mahdī bought him for the education of al-Qā'im”.
the children of Ibrāhīm. He entrusted all his wealth, with his house, wares and granaries, to Ḥasan b. al-Mu‘ādh. He left at the time of the evening prayer, unnoticed by any one, entrusting everything (to God).

When he came out from the limits of the town, he sat for a while, pondering over what was to be done, and praying God to give him the right decision. He then sent someone to Ghaylān ar-Rabāḥī 1, a well-known man, an Arab, residing in the village called Salhab 2, who was a dependent of the family of al-Mahdī’s uncle. He came with thirty horsemen, and al-Mahdī travelled the whole of the night, arriving in the morning in Ḫims 3, whence Ghaylān returned to his village. Al-Mahdī continued his journey, the same day reaching Tripoli in Syria 4, where he rested for a day. Then he went to Palestine, and stopped in Ramla 5. Here he received the news that the sons of Abū Muḥammad had reached Salamiyya, and were searching for him, fruitlessly.

The brothers continued searching for al-Mahdī for a whole year. They came to his brother, Abū Muḥammad, claiming him as their religious leader. But the inhabitants of Salamiyya pointed out that he was not their leader, who had fled, and was hiding in Ramla. (Hearing this), they continued their questioning, and ultimately made themselves perfectly certain that al-Mahdī was hiding in Ramla.

By this time one of the brothers, Muḥammad, had returned to ‘Irāq, but Abūl-Qāsim and Abū Mahzūl remained in Salamiyya. They often visited Abūl-Ḥusayn, secretly, in Ḥamā, trying to find out from him information about al-Mahdī, and

---

1 In F.— ar-Rayāḥī.
2 Not found on the maps.
3 The distance is about thirty miles by road.
4 From Ḫims there is a direct road to Tripoli (there is nowadays a railway), and it is quite possible that al-Mahdī took this direction. But the Sīra of Ja’far (111-112) mentions the route — Damascus, Tiberias, Ramla and Egypt. Thus it is obvious that both sources are independent of each other. It is difficult to decide which version is more reliable.
5 Ramla is now a small village between Haifa and Jerusalem, near the railway junction called Lydda. In the Middle Ages it was an important place,— the first large town on the road from Egypt to Syria.
returning again to Salamiyya. When they realised that it was hopeless to find out anything from Abū’l-Ḥusayn, and that they could not trace al-Mahdī, who was lost for them, Abū’l-Qāsim, a real cheat, left, carrying with him the books (dafā‘ir) ¹, while Abū Mahzūl continued to stay in Salamiyya. Abū’l-Qāsim went to the tribe of Qaṣiyyūn ², giving them preference over other tribes. There were already some dā‘īs preaching amongst them, some of the subordinates of Abū’l-Ḥusayn. They converted the leaders of these tribes, such as Sa’dūn b. Da‘laj amongst the Banū Mālik, and also the headmen of Banū Mu‘riḍ, Banū Hujayna, Banū’l-Balwā, Banū Fakhdāsh, Banū Hudhayl, and Banū Ziyād. These tribes swore allegiance to Abū’l-Qāsim, followed him, rose in a rebellion [98] led by him, and collected together to march against Ṭughj ³ and Damascus. This Ṭughj was ruling Damascus with great injustice and tyranny. God avenged this on him, and these tribes fought him near the village called Mazzatu’l-Abā‘ī ⁴. Ṭughj ignominiously fled.

The insurgents inflicted heavy losses on his force, and besieged Damascus. Then they attacked him again near the place called Mazza (?) near the Madīna gate ⁵ again defeating him, and driving him into the city, placing him in a dangerous situation. Then Ṭughj sent a message to Badru’l-Ḥamāmī, imploring him to send help, because his enemy was pressing him seriously.

¹ These dafā‘ir, “note-books”, re-appear again in the story of the siege of Damascus (99),—obviously some sort of sacred writings.
² This is obviously Fāṭimiyūn, as the early Ismailis called themselves. Cf. above, p. 80. Tabari, III, 2218, calls them the members of the Banū Kalb tribe, of the clan Banū’l-Ulayṣ b. Ḍaḥṣam.
³ Probably Ṭughbuh b. Juff, the founder of the dynasty of the Ikhshidids; he was the governor of Syria in 283–293/896–906.
⁴ Apparently non-existent now.
⁵ The name in different MSS appears both as Mazza or Marra. When on a visit to Damascus in 1937, I specially consulted the best authority on Syrian history, Prof. M. Kurd ‘Alī, who, however, told me that at present the only village of that name known near Damascus, lies in about three miles distance from it in a SW direction. This, however, seems hardly probable: the “Qarmatians” were moving from NE. Probably here one should read not the “Medina gate”, but “a gate of the city”. If so, perhaps this was the Bāb Tiṃmā: there is near it a ruin of a mosque called Masjidu’l-Mazāz, which may have some connection with an early village of that name somewhere further North near the city.
Badr came with a relief force from Egypt, and succeeded in entering Damascus without being observed by the “Qarmatians”.

The cursed Abū Mahzūl, meanwhile, left Salamiyya, and betook himself to Ramla, while his brother Abū'īl-Qāsim remained before Damascus, repelling the attacks every day. When Abū Mahzūl came to Ramla, he incidentally met Ja'far al-Ḥājib in the bazar, while he was purchasing provisions. A man who accompanied him, and who personally knew Ja'far, said to him: “This is a servant of thy Master, about whom thou askest”. He followed Ja'far, and entered the house with him, and sat in the entrance porch, bidding Ja'far to convey his greetings to the Imam, and to tell him that he, Abū Mahzūl, son of Abū Muḥammad, must have an interview with him. If not, he would at once cry out and reveal the identity of the Imam (to the public). So Ja'far entered before al-Mahdī, and told him what had happened. To this al-Mahdī replied: “Now that he has seen thee, and discovered us, better bring him in, as otherwise he may expose us”.  

In Ramla al-Mahdī occupied a large plot, hiding in different buildings (on it). (Into one of these) Abū Mahzūl was brought before al-Mahdī. When he entered, he bowed before the Imam, and the latter received him kindly and with respect. Then Abū Mahzūl said: “O my Lord, verily we, i.e. myself and my brothers, left our houses 2, searching after thee. Now praise be to God who helped us to find thee. My brother came with a force which besieges 3 Damascus; I left him when he was on the point of taking it. Come back, because thy position is so strong now. All purpose of our campaign was to satisfy thee, and to appease thy anger, which was provoked by the machina-

---

1 It is interesting that this incident is not mentioned in the Sīra of Ja'far. It is quite possible, of course, that even if it is substantially true, the name of Ja'far appears here only because he was the best known of the private servants of al-Mahdī, and in reality it may have been some one else.
2 Instead of baladi-nā better read bilādi-nā, as in F.
3 Instead of ḥadāra read ḥasara.
tions of Abū’l-Ḥusayn, who stirred up us against each other. And if thou dost not wish to come personally, write a letter to my brother, to appease him, as he is angry with me”.

Then al-Mahdī wrote a letter to his brother, asking him to forgive Abū Mahzūl, and not to punish him in any way. He promised to come personally soon after the arrival of the letter. He also gave a letter to Abū Mahzūl, addressed to Abū’l-Ḥusayn, bidding him to pay the bearer 500 dīnārs from the Imam’s funds, kept by the dā‘ī.

Abū Mahzūl then left, and went to Abū’l-Ḥusayn, and presented to him the letter of the Imam for payment. The dā‘ī asked him, where [99] he had seen the Imam; and he replied: “at Ramla”. Abū’l-Ḥusayn refused to pay anything, and Abū Mahzūl returned to his brother, who was still before the walls of Damascus. He met him in a somewhat unfriendly manner: “Thou hast come back, cursed one! Verily I shall murder thee!” At this Abū Mahzūl produced his letter. When his brother saw it, he kissed it, and read it. Then he asked: “Where hast thou seen him?”—“At Ramla”, replied Abū Mahzūl,—“I had an interview with him”. His brother asked: “Didst thou really see him?” And he told him that the Imam gave him, in addition to this letter, also another, to Abū’l-Ḥusayn, bidding him to pay 500 dīnārs, but when the letter was presented to him, he refused to pay anything. So he came to his brother to inform him about this.

After this he, Abū’l-Qāsim, summoned the headmen of Qāṣiyyūn¹, from the tribe of Nuḍār, presenting to them his brother who had just arrived. He told them that next morning they would launch an attack at the Mazza gate. He ordered them to swear allegiance to his brother, for forty days, because the next morning he was going to heaven, and would return after forty days. The shaykhs accordingly swore allegiance for the period of forty days only. He ordered them to place

¹ This is to be read Fāṭimiyyūn. Cf. above, p. 166, note 2.
at the disposal of his brother five hundred cavalry, which should be hidden in a certain garden, and would be able to come out in the action at a proper moment.

This was done, and they spent the night. Next morning they started the combat early, and Abū Mahzūl went into ambush, in a garden. The forces of Ṭughj and Badru’l-Ḥamāmī emerged. Abū’l-Qāsim ordered his men not to move until they saw himself mounting his she-camel. He made his she-camel lie, in the centre, while his troops were arranged on the right and the left. He was gazing into his book (daftar).

Abū Muḥammad, a dāʾī, disagreeing with him, said: “The enemy saw us, and is approaching”. Abū’l-Qāsim rebuked him: “Wait till I rise”. When the dāʾī insisted on his uttering the (word of) command, and the enemy was quite close, he threw a handful of dust (towards the enemy), exclaiming: “O Lord, burn their eyes with fire!” Then his she-camel stood up with him, and he shouted: “O ʿAḥmad, O Muḥammad, O Naṣru’l-lāh (= help of God), descend!” The troops attacked each other, but very soon Abū’l-Qāsim was wounded by a man belonging to the force of Badru’l-Ḥamāmī, and fell off (the camel). Badru’l-Ḥamāmī shouted his men to dismount and to sever Abū’l-Qāsim’s head. And while his head was being severed, an explosive missile of naphtha was thrown by some one, and it burnt all — the murderer, the murdered, and the she-camel. At this moment his brother rushed from his ambush, putting Ṭughj and Badru’l-Ḥamāmī to flight, and chasing them (to the city), after a sanguinary battle.

When they had fled, and when the troops had collected in their camp, they began to talk (saying) that their master had gone to heaven, and that they should disperse. But Abū Muḥammad, the dāʾī, and their leader, told them that they had sworn allegiance to the brother of the deceased for forty days, until he should return. And if he did not return, they would have the right to disperse. Thus he made them wait for forty days. (Soon after this) the inhabitants of Ḥimṣ sent a petition
to Abū Mahzūl to come to their town, abandoning Damascus, and promising obedience. So he did, raising the siege of Damascus, and departing for Ḥimṣ. [100]

During the time at which all these events happened, Mawlānā al-Mahdī resided in Ramla, receiving reports.

Abū Mahzūl then marched to Ḥimṣ, and its inhabitants offered submission and obedience to him. Abū'l-Ḥusayn, amongst different local headmen, came from Ḥamā to congratulate him. When Abū Mahzūl saw him, he glanced at him with such hatred that the ḍāʾī became frightened, and fled, hiding himself with some one of his associates. When next morning the headmen re-assembled to greet him, Abū Mahzūl inquired about Abū'l-Ḥusayn, whom he could not see amongst them. He was told that Abū'l-Ḥusayn had fled. So he ordered (them) to make a public announcement to the effect that any one found harbouring Abū'l-Ḥusayn would be executed, and his property confiscated. This proclamation¹ was made on seven days, and then the ḍāʾī was found, and brought before him. Abū Mahzūl told him that his evil actions could not be worse than these. To this Abū'l-Ḥusayn's reply was only that whatever God does, He does the best. Abū Mahzūl treated him severely, and ordered him to be paraded on a camel, tied together with his son. They were dishonoured publicly, and cursed. After this they were brought to the camp in chains. The shaykhs of the Qāšiyūn (Fāṭimiyūn) intervened on his behalf, asking (him) not to molest him, as he was their headman, and spiritual leader.² To this Abū Mahzūl replied that he had no evil intentions against him, and that nothing bad would happen to him. After this he marched from Ḥimṣ to Salamiyya, carrying with him Abū'l-Ḥusayn and his son.

¹ Correct al-mundādi into al-munādi.
² Here, and in several places further on, the shaykhs of the Fāṭimiyūn are made to act differently from the other "Qarmatians". It is quite possible that the invading force really included non-Ismaili elements, who joined it merely for the sake of loot, perhaps even real Qarmatians. Thus it is quite possible that in the matters connected with religious motives conflicts could arise very often. Cf. also p. 175.
He camped near the village called Fāyāḥa, with his troops and the two prisoners, and ordered his servants to dig a pit in the middle of the camp in order to bury Abū’l-Ḥusayn alive. This, however, was not done, and in the morning the troops continued their march to Salamiyya. They ultimately camped, and Abū’l-Ḥusayn was (still) amongst them,—nothing untoward so far had happened to him. The place at which the invader camped was near the gate of al-Ḥafnada. He remained there for three days, before he executed Abū’l-Ḥusayn.

(On his arrival) the elders of the family of the Hashimites came out to greet him; these included Ḥasan b. Mu‘ādh, (representatives of the) followers of al-Mahdī, and also his relatives and associates. Abū Muḥammad, the brother of al-Mahdī, was ill at that time, and expired on the day on which the cursed Abū Mahzūl arrived. The latter remained (near Salamiyya) for a fairly long time before he arrested all the elders of the family of the Hashimites, ordering them to be brought in chains to the camp. (This time) he left in peace the followers of al-Mahdī, causing them no harm. When the leaders of the Qāšiyyūn (Fāṭimiyyūn) tribes saw what he had done with the Hashimites, they came to Abū Mahzūl in a body, imploring him to release these, as they were relatives of the caliph of Baghdad. Abū Mahzūl yielded to their demands. Next morning he rode to Ḥamā, coming straight to the house of Abū’l-Ḥusayn, and the quarters of Banū ‘Uthmān b. Ḥijāz, looting all the property of al-Mahdī and the personal possessions of Abū’l-Ḥusayn. (As mentioned above) the house of the latter was the treasury of al-Mahdī. [101]

While still in Ḥamā, Abū Mahzūl received information that Abū’l-Agharr as-Salamī left Baghdad with a force to pursue the rebels. He re-arranged his troops, appointing ‘Aṭr b. al-Qandāsī al-Aḥmī as the commander of a special force, which he sent against the troops of Abū’l-Agharr. The two forces

---

1 Apparently it does not exist now.
2 The reading is uncertain: al-Ḥafanda, al-Ḥaqīda, etc.
met on the banks of the Euphrates, and attacked each other; the troops of Abū’l-Agharr were defeated, and he himself fled. His whole luggage, everything, was captured, and his own son was killed. In the loot was found the letter of the Hashmites of Salamiyya in which they implored al-Mu’taqid for help, and asked him “to extinguish the fire before it spreads”.

When the troops returned to Abū Mahzūl, informing him of the flight of the enemy, the capture of the whole of his luggage, and their discovery in the loot,—the letters, he took the letters of the Hashmites, and, calling the shaykhs of the Qāsiyyūn, made them acquainted with it they contained. He then said that these were the letters of those people whom the shaykhs defended: these people asked al-Mu’taqid to send troops against them, and to kill him, Abū Mahzūl, and the shaykhs themselves, together with him.

About all these events al-Mahdī, who was staying in Ramla, was well informed. Ṭayyib, the tutor, was travelling between Salamiyya and Ramla, carrying the news. Also Umm ‘Alī (the nurse), whom (the little) Abū’l-Qāsim (= al-Qā’im) was calling for, weeping very much, went to Ramla, safely reaching the place together with another woman. So al-Mahdī could see from Ramla what was going on with Abū Mahzūl, and what he did after his retreat from Damascus to Salamiyya. The news was also received of what he had done with Abū’l-Ḥusayn and his son, and of his looting and burning the house of the dāʾī.

When the petitions of the Hashmites of Salamiyya, addressed to al-Mu’taqid, and found in the archives of the son of Abū’l-Agharr, were shown to the shaykhs of the Fātimiyūn, all the dāʾīs agreed that as these people had acted in this way, Abū Mahzūl might do to them what he found necessary. He (at once) sent his men after them, and they were arrested: Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad, Sāliḥ b. Muḥammad,

---

1 This happened on the 15th Ramadān 290/12 Aug. 903. Cf. p. 82.
2 In reality the caliph was al-Muktafī (289–295/902–908), and not al-Mu’taqid.
Faḍl b. ‘Abdi’l-lāh, ‘Abbās b. ‘Abdi’l-lāh, Balhaja b. ‘Abdi’l-lāh, and many other Hashimites,—there were altogether ninety five shaykhs. When they were brought before him, they asked, what for he sent for them. He showed them the correspondence, and asked them whether these were not their own letters, written in their own hand-writing, the petitions in which they implored the caliph al-Mu’taḍid for help, asking him to send troops against the invaders. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, who was the speaker of the party, admitted this, and implored forgiveness. To this the accursed Abū Mahzūl replied that God would never forgive him, if [102] he forgave them.

He then ordered them to be dragged in chains to the Jewish gate, where all of them should be decapitated by a Jewish convert, a man originally from Palmyra (Tadmur) ¹. Next morning he sent his men to the Hashimite quarters to burn their women and children, male and female. The number of victims was 141,—all of them were killed. A public proclamation was made forbidding anyone to bury or hide their bodies, on penalty of death. The bodies remained in the open until they were ultimately devoured by dogs and birds.

The people of Salamiyya, going one to the other, began to talk, discussing what had been done to the Hashimites by the invader. They emphasised the fact that nothing had been done to the palace of al-Mahdī, or to his men ². This, in their opinion, was because the invader was siding with al-Mahdī. Therefore they brought much of their valuables and property to be hidden and preserved in his palace.

Before the execution of the Hashimites, the “Qarmatian” argued with them, saying that they were the cause of Ibn al-Baṣrī’s having left the town. He accused them of causing his house to remain empty, and his and his brother’s families to

¹ Obviously the same person as Ibn Naddāf (or Ghudāf) at-Tadmuri, mentioned on p. 179 (p. 105 of the text) further on.
² By implication, this sentence obviously refers to the fact that al-Mahdī posed as a Hashimite (i.e. Abbasid), thus being one of the people who were so severely punished.
become helpless orphans. On hearing all this the inhabitants of Salamiyya became perfectly certain that he would never cause any harm to the family of al-Mahdī, and that he wished them nothing but good. Therefore they brought into the palace their goods and property for safe custody.

At the same time Abū Mahzūl secretly sent a letter to al-Mahdī, informing him that he had killed all his enemies who were the cause of al-Mahdī’s flight from Salamiyya, and also the cause of his cousin having been, with his son, earlier deported to ‘Irāq. He invited al-Mahdī to come, without further postponement.

All this was only a ruse on his part, in order to lull suspicions in al-Mahdī, and lure him to Salamiyya. When al-Mahdī read his letter, he wrote to Abū Mahzūl, approving of what he had done, adding that he, Abū Mahzūl, would not be worthy of being called a Shi’ite, and his follower, if he had acted differently. In conclusion, he promised to come soon after the letter was received,—if God so pleased.

On reading this letter, the miscreant showed much joy, believing in what it contained. But God did not permit that the intentions of the evil-doer should be attained, and that what belonged to al-Mahdī should miss him.

He read the letter of the Imam to all the dā‘īs, informing them that their lord was coming soon to the town, to occupy his palace and to enjoy his wealth, of which he had been deprived by the (local) intriguers. The dā‘īs were extremely happy.

Abū Mahzūl stayed there in expectation of the arrival of al-Mahdī for four months, till the beginning of 291/(end 903).

---

1 Unfortunately there is no key to the real implications of these recriminations, which if known would most probably throw much light on the development of the events.

2 Cf. above, p. 44. This is also a very interesting, but at the same time entirely obscure allusion to certain facts.

3 As we have seen above, the defeat of Abūl-Agharr took place on the 15th of Ramaḍān 290/12-8-903, and the “Qarmatians” were defeated themselves on the 7th Muḥarram 291/30-11-903, by Muhammad b. Sulaymān’s forces, that is to say almost exactly four months later. There-
He was still waiting for the Imam when the news was received that a force had been sent against him from Baghdad, under Muḥammad b. Sulaymān.

He at once despatched a force of eight thousand cavalry and sixteen thousand infantry, under the command of ‘Aṭr b. al-Karsh, and Qarmīz (?) b. as-Sahm, of Banū’l-Aḥm tribe. They engaged the troops of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān at the place called Qaryatu’s-Sayl, while Abū Mahzūl himself remained in Salamiyya. The men who were sent on the expedition were devoted to al-Mahdī; they had been converted by Abū’l-Ḥusayn. The command to start on an expedition was an unpleasant surprise for his men, and a certain number of them remained in the camp (disobeying orders and) remaining at home.

(On one occasion) Abū Mahzūl said to the dāʿīs, who remained with him, that he wanted to go to the bath house in Salamiyya. So far he had remained outside the town, since his arrival till that (memorable) day, never entering it. This was merely a ruse on the part of the accursed one, (postponing his entry until) the devotees of al-Mahdī had gone. He began to despair of the arrival of the Imam, fearing that his evil designs would fail. At the same time he was afraid of Muḥammad b.

fore min is here an obvious mistake, or some one’s later “emendation” instead of ʿilā.

1 Cf. above, p. 83 sq.

2 In his report (Tabari, III, 2239), Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, who can be scarcely expected to minimize the strength of his enemy while writing to his government, mentions only 3,000 cavalry, and does not specify the strength of infantry. His figures, therefore, should be nearer the truth, though probably still too high. The names of the leaders, given further on, in his report, obviously on the basis of the information collected later on from the prisoners, differ from these. But it is quite possible that either the prisoners were giving false information, or one and the same person was known in Isma’ili circles under a different, non-official name, as often happens. The difference in the tribal names may mean that clan name stands instead of tribe name.

3 Tabari, III, 2239, from the report of M. b. Sulaymān, mentions al-ʿUlyāna, as the place near which the battle took place. Qaryatu’s-sayl simply means “a hamlet on a stream”; it is quite possible that both refer to one and the same locality. No such names are found on the modern maps.
Sulaymān, who would expel him from the town, but would retain the dependents of al-Mahdī who inhabited the palace.

He ordered the bath to be prepared for him, and entered the town through the Eastern Gate, riding a mule at the head of a party of about a thousand horsemen. The road to the bath house passed by the door of al-Mahdī's palace. He entered the bath, and (later) came out, pretending that he was going to the camp. But when he passed by the door of the palace, he halted.

There was a slave woman belonging to al-Mahdī, with her son Muḥammad. Finding that the malefactor had entered the palace from the main gate, she fled by a back door, with her child and his nurse. The name of the woman was La'b. She had lived in the palace for a long time, because she originally belonged to shaykh Muḥammad b. Ṭhammad, and after him came in possession of al-Mahdī. When she fled, she was noticed by Muḥammad b. 'Azīza, who knew her personally. (On seeing her) he said to the men who accompanied him: "Here is a slave woman of the shaykh, fleeing in fear!" He followed her, taking with him five men. He asked her whither she was running, and she implored him to hide her, telling him that he himself and his ancestors were under the protection of the family of al-Mahdī, and now he was breaking into their house; now that this dreadful
man had for unknown reason entered the palace, she was afraid. Nobody except him, Muḥammad b. ‘Azīza, knew her.

The man demanded from her all her ornaments, promising to let her go. She handed over to him all the ornaments that were with her, and went to the house of a merchant, Ibn Abī Muṣaḥḥif by name, asking him to conceal her. The merchant permitted her to come in, in case no one had seen her entering his house. She told him that the evil-doer had entered the palace.

But she was followed by one of the five men who were with Muḥammad b. ‘Azīza; he returned to his people, and reported her hiding place.

The accursed one entered the palace, and, in his impertinence, ascended and sat in the Imam’s place.1 [104] (Seeing this) the dāʾīs who were in the suite of Abū Mahzūl said to the dāʾī Abū Muḥammad: “Thou art on easy terms with this man, so find out what he intends to do with the palace. Tell him that its master is the person to whom we have sworn allegiance, and Abū’l-Ḥusayn converted us (to his religion)”. Then Abū Muḥammad came to Abū Mahzūl, telling him that he came to speak on behalf of the faithful followers of al-Mahdī, who want him to realise that they were sworn adherents of their master, and demand that he should not do any harm to the palace, or molest its inhabitants. He promised this, and requested Abū Muḥammad to go to the camp, intending to come after him very soon.

When Abū Muḥammad left, the cursed one sent his attendants after Laʿb, because she was the chief amongst the servants in the palace, and knew better than anyone about the property and hidden treasures. The servants were seeking in vain for her, shouting loudly: “Laʿb, Laʿb!” Then Muḥammad b. ‘Azīza mentioned that he knew her hiding place, and could bring her. He was therefore brought before the “Qarmatian”, who ordered

1 It is not clear whether this act of disrespect to the absent Imam had any serious significance, and was connected with the reports about the “Qarmatian” brothers posing as Imams, cf. above, pp. 47 and 92-93.
to him to go and to produce her immediately. The man went to the house of Ibn Abi Muṣaḥḥif, and began to knock at the door, shouting to La‘b to come out, as otherwise she would be taken by force. The master of the house dragged her out, fearing for his own life, and Muḥammad b. ‘Azīza took her, with her child and nurse, to the “Qarmatian”.

He greeted her kindly and politely, and inquired about her master. He reproached her for fleeing from them while they needed her help. Then he asked what she had heard about her master, who had fled from them. She replied that the master was coming soon, if God willed,—he would not delay his return any longer. After this (preliminary) conversation he began to ask her, where was the property (cash) of Aḥmad, Muḥammad, Ḥusayn¹, and of her master who had fled from them. He tried to provoke her gradually, and she replied that she did not know anything, as she was a newcomer in the palace. Then (losing her temper), she said: “Why all this long talk and false accusations? Thou hast come to murder us, just like the Hashimites, and to murder children,—God will revenge thee for us! O enemy of God, O cursed one, thou hast forgotten the benefactions which my lord bestowed on thee, and thy father before thee! Thou hast sprung upon us, frightening our children, ungrateful for all that God has given thee, and deceiving his saints!”—And she made him hear things that were not to his liking, knowing well that he was in any event about to murder all of them,—the curse of God be upon him!

Then she added: “O enemy of God, and of His saints! If thou desirest to kill us,—may God kill thee!—and so it is going to be!—do not cast our bodies out in the open, as thou didst with the Hashimites. We are different from them, so do not cast us out in the open, but bury us”.

¹ It would be interesting to know whether the order of the names mentioned here is chronological. They obviously belong to the ancestors of al-Mahdi.
Abū Mahzūl asked her, where she wished to be put in case he killed her? And she replied, pointing to a cellar near by, that she wished to be put there.

Then Abū Mahzūl sent his attendants to call Ibn an-Naddāf the Palmyrean executioner, who came, with his sword in his hand. Then the malefactor ordered him to strike off her head, and throw her body into the cellar. This was done, and also her son and all who were with her were slaughtered. The attendants of the heretic then dispersed in the palace, and brought all its inmates, and all were slaughtered, old and young, men and women; their bodies were thrown into the same cellar,—eighty-eight people altogether. When it was finished with them, his servants brought his mule, he mounted it, and rode away, leaving in the palace a guard to look after it, and keep what was there.

He went to the village of Akhbiyya, and remained there for seven days, when on the eighth came his troops, fleeing in disorder. They had been defeated and put to flight by the force of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, who annihilated all his infantry, and the majority of the cavalry. They told him that all his troops had been slaughtered, and there was no possibility of further resistance. They invited him to flee with them (to the desert), as otherwise Muḥammad b. Sulaymān would seize him. He replied to them: "Sit down". But they argued: "Thou mayest abuse us, but we have warned thee. So, if thou wilt go with us, then go (at once); and if not,—then remain to sit alone". And when he saw their determination, he started with them. No one prevented them from making use of the Palmyra watering place. They rested there, and then departed from Palmyra (Tadmur) for al-Warq.

Six days after his flight Muḥammad b. Sulaymān with his force reached Salamiyya, inquiring about the "Qarmatian".

---

1 Cf. above, p. 173, note 1.
2 Cf. above, p. 171, where it is said that his camp was pitched outside the town, near the Ḥafnāda (?) gate.
3 This probably is the name of a district, and has nothing to do with al-Warqā’, the ancient Uruk, in Southern Mesopotamia.
On hearing that he had fled, he said that al-Mu'taḍid (the caliph) had ordered him, in case the "Qarmatian" had escaped, to lay his sword upon the settled and the nomad population of the place. The inhabitants of Salamiyya prayed for mercy, asking him to have fear of God: they had been slaughtered by the "Qarmatian", and now he also came to kill them. On his demand for proof of the truth of their complaints, they asked him to send a reliable man, to whom they might show the bodies of the slaughtered.

When Muḥammad b. Sulaymān heard this, he felt pity for them, and told them to go and to remain in their houses, shutting the gates to protect themselves, because his troops were approaching the town, and he was afraid that they might plunder the inhabitants. He promised to send a man who would see their dead, if their story was correct. Then he deputed to them Muḥammad b. ad-Dayraji, an old and trusted man, to whom the

---

1 In reality al-Muktasif. Cf. above, p. 172, n. 1. The same also further on.
2 If this is true,— and it sounds reliably,— the story of the whole population of Salamiyya, and even animals, having been slaughtered by the "Qarmatians" (cf. p. 83), is an exaggeration. If such a thing had happened, the news would certainly spread everywhere, there would be no question of punishing the population, and no one to be punished. There is at present in Salamiyya an Ismaili shrine, consisting of a small compound, apparently of modern origin, surrounded by one-storied buildings; in one of these is found what the local people call "the grave of Imam Ismā'īl", where they declare Ismā'īl b. Ja far lies. This tomb possesses one extraordinary feature: it is extremely long, something like 25-30 feet. Having seen thousands of tombs in the greater part of the Islamic world, between the Nile and the Brahmaputra, I do not remember a single one like this, and have only heard that something on these lines is shown in Jedda, as the tomb of Mother Eve. The local Ismailis say that Ismā'īl did not die in Madīna, etc., as in the legends narrated further on in the extracts from the Aṣrāru'n-nuṣajā' and the Zahru'l-maḍansī, but ultimately settled in Salamiyya, and died there. There is not the slightest doubt that if this tomb has any connection at all with Ismā'īl, who certainly never visited this place, it should be in connection with one of his descendants, and the extraordinary shape of the tomb perhaps may suggest that not one, but several persons have been buried here, and that probably the name was originally something like avūdād Ismā'īl. Perhaps, by chance, it may really mark the spot where the bodies of the family of al-Mahdi, slaughtered by the "Qarmatians", were buried. It would be quite natural that the memory of such "martyrs" should be revered in the community. In such a case perhaps the spot may really indicate the position of the house of the Imams' families of a thousand years ago.
bodies were shown. He saw the slaughtered children and women, and invoked the curse of God upon the man who had committed such a crime.

Muḥammad b. Sulaymān made inquiries as to where the “Qarmatian” had gone, and received the reply that he had gone towards Palmyra. He then sent a thousand cavalry to pursue him. They received information that he had entered al-Khaḍrā’ (the oasis), but his men had dispersed, after having looted all his possessions. The shaykhs of the Fāṭimiyūn reproached him for being ill-starred. He had fled on his camel, carrying some money with him, and had entered the Sawād of ‘Irāq, never remaining (long) in the places through which he was passing on his way. [106]

Muḥammad b. Sulaymān sent a report to the caliph al-Muʿtaḍid regarding the defeat of the forces of the “Qarmatian”, their grave losses, his own flight, and the dispersion of the men whom he was leading, which left him quite alone. He asked for further orders. The caliph ordered him to withdraw to Baghdad, and he returned. Four months later the accursed “Qarmatian” was seized on the banks of the Euphrates, at the town called Qarqīsiyūn, together with his two servants. All were despatched to al-Muʿtaḍid in Baghdad.

News was brought to al-Mahdī about what he had done with the palace, slaughtering all whom he found in it, and later on that the “Qarmatian” was brought before the caliph. Then al-Mahdī left Ramla, and entered Egypt, remaining there for a while.

When the “Qarmatian” was brought back to Baghdad, he was paraded before the crowd, and cursed. A special committee was appointed by al-Muʿtaḍid, and he was tortured before he was honoured with the sentence of death. While he was flogged, he was questioned as to who he was, from where, what he was after, and in whose favour he was carrying on his propaganda.

1 Cf. above, p. 83, and note 1.
He denied both that he was concerned with political aims, and that he was a Qarmatian. He said that he had been ordered to stir up a rebellion by so-and-so, i.e. al-Mahdî, from the town of Salamiyya. He described to them his appearance, and his ways of dressing. All this was recorded in writing, according to his revelations. Then he died a terrible death,—the curse of God be upon him,—and his body was burnt.

The caliph sent messengers to all the provinces, ordering his governors to arrest the man answering this description; but he was not found, because he, al-Mahdî, had already left (Egypt) in the company of some Baghdadi merchants, and Abū'l-'Abbâs (the brother of Abū 'Abdi'l-lâh), on his way to Tripoli in the Maghrib. He was attacked by robbers on the way near Taḥūna, when Abū'l-'Abbâs, the brother of Abū 'Abdi'l-lâh, was wounded with a sword in his face. They arrived in Tripoli just after the messenger carrying the orders about his arrest had reached there.

When the order regarding his arrest was received, the officials began to search for the man answering the description, calling on the merchants who arrived from Egypt. Incidentally they came to the house where al-Mahdî was staying. When they saw him, they recognised him from the description, and said that they had no doubts that it was he who was to be arrested. But they were prepared to let him go if only he left the town at once.

There was in the caravan with him a man, called Abū'l-Qāsim ibn Ḥassān (who intended to continue his journey) 1. So al-Mahdî left in his company, passing Qaṣṭiliyya, and entering Sijilmâsa, where he remained for three months, until his family joined him there, being conducted by Yūsuf al-Qahramān and Tayyib the tutor. While there, he received letters from Abū 'Abdi'l-lâh who was in touch with him wherever he stopped. He urged al-Mahdî to come, because a strong force of his supporters

---

1 Apparently the same person as "al-Muṭṭalibi" mentioned in the Stra of Ja'far (119, 121, 122).
was now gathered. But he waited in Sijilmāsa until Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh arrived (with troops).

Then al-Mahdī came out [107] to him, with Abū'l-Qāsim Muḥammad, the Imam (al-Qā'im), with Ja'far the Chamberlain, and all other people belonging to his suite. And then happened what everybody all over the world knows.

Praise be to God, the Lord of the Worlds, and prayers be on our master Muḥammad, and his holy progeny!
2. *Sirat Ja’far al-Ḥājib*.

(For the work and the author see above, pp. 10–11.)

Memoirs of Ja’far b. ‘Alī, the Chamberlain, concerning the departure of al-Mahdī (blessings of God be upon him, and upon his holy progeny!) from Salamiyya, his arrival in Sijilmāsā, and departure for Raqqāda. Collected by Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Yamānī,— mercy of God be upon him!

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate!

And there is no assistance for me except from God, upon Whom I rely! He is the Lord of the Great Celestial Throne. I pray for His help to please Him, and to please His Prince, our lord and our master, Imam al-ʿAzīz bi’l-lāh, the Commander of the Faithful,— blessings of God be upon him, upon his forefathers, the pure, the Imams and the Waṣīs, and upon his descendants, the righteous and the pure! And I also pray God that all nations of Islam, the community of his Forefather,— may God bless him and his progeny! — may be united into one, under his, the Imam’s, sovereignty, and that the religion and the order of the world may become perfect under his continuous rule, remaining under it for ever 1. And may dangers never threaten his followers, by His mercy and generosity! Verily, He is the helper of these, and good is to be prayed from Him,— as God wishes!

He, the Imam, desired (to know) about all that happened to his slave (i.e. Ja’far, the author of these memoirs), and about the events which took place in the days of his ancestors, the holy Imams,— may God sanctify their spirits, and bless them all! The author therefore prays the Imam to forgive his mistakes, and pardon his errors, with his usual generosity and benevolence!

---

1 Cf. above, pp. 104 sqq., on the ideal of “one flock and one shepherd” under the Fatimids.
May he overlook these, in his glory and greatness, as he himself knows better all about the matters which he has ordered his humble servant and slave to write, preserving their memory more correctly and more completely.

Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Yamānī, the humblest slave of Our Lord, the Imam, says: I heard these stories from Jaʿfar b. ʿAlī al-Ḥājib (the Chamberlain), the slave of Our Lords the Imams,— may God sanctify their spirits, and bless them all!— who told me:

I was only a few months younger than al-Mahdī biʾl-lāh, [108] and grew up in his palace. The Imam\(^1\) marked me specially for his service. I was brought up with him, while serving him, and was educated in the best possible way. The Imam never spared anything necessary to make me strong and well trained, until he attained what he wished. It was not necessary for him to tell me what he wanted,— it was enough for him to look towards me, and I could at once understand what he required, and would bring it to him, serving him in the way he liked.

He always preserved the best relations with his neighbours in Salamiyya, the Hashmites, who were descendants of ʿAbduʾl-lāh b. alʿAbbās b. ʿAbdīl-Muṭṭalib b. Hāshim\(^2\). He even pretended before them to be a Hashmite (i.e. Abbasid) himself.

Great quantities of goods and large sums of money were brought to him to Salamiyya from his ḏāʾīs residing in different towns. For storing these he excavated a cellar under the ground outside the town, connected by an underground passage twelve miles long. The goods and other valuables were usually brought to him on camels. The entrance of the underground

---

\(^1\) Most probably not al-Mahdī’s father, but his guardian, who is usually referred to here as “the Imam”.

\(^2\) He was the cousin of the Prophet, the ancestor of the Abbasids. Died in Ṭāʾif ca. 68/687-8. Here, as in the Ḥistiʾ, the term “Hashmite” is used in the sense of the “Abbasid”, contrary to the Sharḫūʾl-akbūr, where it is used in the sense of the “Fatimid”. In fact, both the Fatimids and the Abbasids were Hashmites, because both descended from the same Hāshim.
passage would be opened for them at night, and they could march, loaded, along this subway, to deliver everything right into his house. Then they would also leave by night, and the entrance to the passage would be covered with earth, so that no one could ever notice it. It was an extraordinary wealth, and it is said that al-Mahdī after his successes in the Maghrib could not collect even approximately as much as he left in Salamiyya.

Every governor appointed to Salamiyya (by the Abbasid government) was treated with great politeness by al-Mahdī, who used to present them with valuables, showing considerable generosity to them. For this reason all the governors supported his interests before their superiors, behaving as if they were his servants. The Imam used to offer public entertainments, to which Hashimites, and other (distinguished) people were invited. After the completion of the feast all that remained was given to Umm ‘Ali al-Qahramāna, the wife of Abū Ya‘qūb al-Qahramān, a Christian, the grandfather of Abū Ayyūb, the chief cook 1. (Both were slaves of al-Mahdī; the wife died in Mahdiyya, after she had embraced Islam. But this was long after the time when she was serving al-Mahdī in Salamiyya). She used to collect all the bread that remained on the table (after the meal), and give it to the servants who looked after the cattle, which were being fattened to be consumed at feasts. Other foods and bread were distributed amongst the servants, and every one used to receive from her his proper share.

The Imam 2, as Ja‘far recalls, married al-Mahdī, just before he died, to the cousin of the latter, who later on became the mother of al-Qā‘im. Ja‘far adds: I remember that al-Mahdī ordered to me not to leave the door of his bedroom on the night

---

1 Obviously in charge of the palace kitchen under al-‘Azīz. Thus it is an interesting link with al-Mahdī’s biography before his emigration to the West. It is an interesting testimony to the somewhat patriarchal conditions in al-Mahdī’s family, when the husband and the wife, both obviously slaves, both were serving. Note the surname al-Qahramāna, and not al-Qahramāniyya, as one would expect.

2 Obviously the guardian, not the father.
of the wedding. I was sitting with some women, who sat unveiled, when al-Mahdî opened the door of his room, and threw a valuable garment\(^1\) upon me. [109] I put it upon my head, and danced with the women, who were playing, and congratulating me. Many (similar) events (of intimate house life) which I remember, were also remembered by al-Mahdî, al-Qâ’îm, al-Manṣûr, and al-Mu‘izz.

Everything was quiet; messengers from dā’îs in different places were continually coming from everywhere, bringing money, presents, taxes paid by the faithful, khums moneys, and correspondence. The Imam\(^2\) appointed al-Mahdî as his successor, making the recognition of this obligatory, already before he married him to his cousin. He sent special intimation everywhere, and made the dā’îs everywhere swear allegiance to him. Shortly after this he died.

A certain Turkish slave\(^3\) was appointed by the Baghdad government as the (new) governor of Salamiyya. (When he arrived) al-Mahdî, as he usually did with every governor, presented to him valuable gifts. Other presents followed later on, but the Turk conceived some suspicions as to whether there was an intrigue being carried on against him with his superiors (by al-Mahdî), whom he began to detest. Being a mean man, he began to make inquiries amongst the people of the town, trying to find the cause of the rather exuberant generosity on the part of al-Mahdî, who, however, did not demand or aim at any benefit for himself. Some people who envied al-Mahdî informed him that this was the latter’s usual policy with all governors,— to present them with horses or slaves. This was because he aimed

\(^1\) *Sabaniyya,*—“veil of black silk”. Perhaps used for turbans?

\(^2\) Apparently not the father, but the guardian. The passage is really noteworthy, and would be invaluable for the solution of the Fatimid problem, if only the name of the Imam had been given. It may also imply a certain forced decision: *wa qallada-hu’l-‘ahda.*

\(^3\) Cf. above, p. 80. Apparently it was the same man as Subk ad-Daylamî (Tabari, III, 2221), who was the leader of an expeditionary force, and was defeated by the “Qarmatians” near Raqqa in Muḥarram 290/January 903.
high: it was said that he really owned the East and the West, and in every town his dā'īs were found; his wealth was greater than that of the caliph of Baghdad himself.

On learning this the governor was seized with greed, and started begging from al-Mahdī continuously, for what was possible and impossible, far beyond all limits of propriety. No sooner would one of his requests be granted than he would ask for something else; on a certain day he made no less than ten different requests, acting more and more as a brigand.

When al-Mahdī realised what the governor was aiming at, he wrote to his dā'īs in Baghdad, instructing them to bribe the authorities to secure the governor’s transfer from Salamiyya. The dā'īs succeeded in this, and the cursed Turk was in fact transferred, and recalled to Baghdad. But he found the source from which such a change came to him, and presented to the Baghdad caliph of that time a report, in which he summed up all that he heard about al-Mahdī, asking permission to return to Salamiyya, and arrest him.

At this particular time, as Ja'far remembers, a rebellion was started by a man, a Kharijite, whom some people regarded as a Qarmatian. The caliph had no doubts about his preaching in favour of al-Mahdī, and acting under the latter’s instructions, because his force marched in the direction of Salamiyya. For this reason the caliph warned the Turk to forestall the “Qarmatian” in his movement towards that town, threatening to execute him in case he was too late. He had to make haste to reach Salamiyya before the rebels, and to seize al-Mahdī, sending him to Baghdad by river. Because if the rebels came first, and joined him, his power would increase very much, and it would be difficult to deal with him.

The dā'īs in Baghdad at once sent a message about this, by carrier-pigeon, and by messengers, urgently. Their message reached al-Mahdī before the arrival of the Turk. Ja'far asserts

1 The term “Kharijite” is obviously used here simply as an abusive expression.
that there was no connection between al-Mahdī and between the "Qarmatian", who did not belong to the followers of the Imam, even was unknown to him, and himself did not know al-Mahdī. Thus both the Turk and the "Qarmatian" were approaching Salamiyya.

Having received such news, al-Mahdī summoned Firūz, the chief dāʿī, and the person who occupied the highest rank before the Imam, and was the highest officer of his, being like a "father" of all the dāʿīs, who all were his subordinates; he was the bābuʾl-abwāb, the chief assistant to the Imam. Another man who was summoned was Tayyib, who at that time was still called by his original name Burkān. He was purchased by al-Mahdī for the tutorship to al-Qāʾim. Other people summoned were: Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Zakariyā (the brother of Abū 'Abdīl-lāh ash-Shīʿī, the dāʿī in the Katāma territory), Abū Yaʿqūb al-Qahramān, and Muḥammad b. 'Azīza. The latter was a cousin (the son of a maternal aunt) of Jaʿfar the Chamberlain; he also was a servant of the Imams.

All of these were ordered to take provisions for a journey, and to start with him. He mentioned to them that he was going to the Yemen. All the ladies of the family of al-Mahdī were left by him with Abū Aḥmad Ṣuʿlūk,—they were: the mother of al-Mahdī, both his daughters, two daughters of his brother, Umm Ḥabīb (the future) wife of al-Qāʾim, and Umm 'Alī al-Qahramānā, the wife of Abū Yaʿqūb (al-Qahramān). This Abū Aḥmad Ṣuʿlūk was later on re-named by al-Mahdī as Jaʿfar; he also was a son of Jaʿfar the Chamberlain's aunt, but they used to call each other "brother". He occupied an important post of trust under al-Mahdī and al-Qāʾim, and died.

---

1 This, of course, is incorrect, but may be not merely a pia fraud: as suggested on p. 41, it is quite possible that Jaʿfar, although a devout slave, was not an Ismaʿili, and in any case was not in touch with the secret religious matters.

2 Cf. about him above, in the Iṣṭiḥār (103, 104). Perhaps, however, a different person is here meant, a name-sake.

3 Ṣuʿlūk means: beggar, brigand, thief. This is the reason of his being re-named.
in the reign of al-Mahdī, who sent him on the expedition in the (former) Byzantine possessions in Africa, where he conquered a large town called Wārī, making great wealth for himself from it. (Mūsā, the physician to al-Manṣūr bi’l-lāh, al-Mu‘izz bi’l-
lāh, and al-‘Azīz bi’l-lāh, was one of the notables of that town). This Abū Aḥmad Ṣu’lūk exhibited conspicuous courage while serving under al-Qā‘im in the Eastern and Western parts of Northern Africa, and was an able and brave man. And Ja‘far the Chamberlain remembered that this Abū Aḥmad, his “brother”, formerly known by the surname of Ṣu’lūk, killed three people in three years, while still in Salamiyya, and al-Mahdī paid an indemnity of three thousand dīnārs for him (to their relatives).

Thus al-Mahdī put him and Abū Ja‘far al-Jazārī in charge of his family. This al-Jazārī [111] also occupied a position of trust under al-Mahdī, because he was one of the dā’īs of the highest rank. He died in Raqqāda, formerly the capital of the Aghlabides, after its conquest by al-Mahdī.

We started with al-Mahdī,—continues Ja‘far al-Ḥājib,—being sure that we are going to the Yemen. Abū Ja‘far (i.e. Aḥmad) Ṣu’lūk and Abū Ja‘far al-Jazārī also left Salamiyya before the arrival of the “Qarmatian”, on the day which was fixed by al-Mahdī.

We left in great haste, and hurried to Damascus ¹ where we arrived safely. The “Qarmatian” entered Salamiyya after our departure, coming ahead of the Turk, the governor. He looted the town, slaughtering the majority of its inhabitants, and plundering our quarters, putting to death everyone whom he saw of al-Mahdī’s relatives and dependents. There was no atrocity which he did not commit on the inhabitants of the town. The master of Baghdad (i.e. the caliph) began to take notice of him,

¹ It is difficult to see whether, owing to the lapse of time, Ja‘far mentions Damascus instead of Hīmṣ. The version of the Istī‘ār seems to be preferable, because it would be strange if al-Mahdī had gone to the capital of the province, where the authorities would be the first to be informed about him, and to receive orders to arrest him.
although at the same time he did not cease to search for our party 1.

We left Damascus, and I remember that on that day I accompanied al-Mahdi, who rode ahead, leaving behind Tayyib and Abū Yaʿqūb al-Qahramān, who supervised the servants and the pack animals with the luggage. The little al-Qāʾīm, who at that time was a small child, was with them. He saw a man holding a small white Yamanite dog, and began to ask Tayyib to buy it for him. His tutor objected to this, fearing the displeasure of al-Mahdi. Qāʾīm swore that he was not going to move from the place unless he had the dog. Meanwhile al-Mahdi waited for quite a long time, and then sent me to see what delayed them. I returned, found al-Qāʾīm crying, and asked him what had happened? He explained that he had asked Tayyib to buy for him the dog, but he objected to this. Tayyib explained that he did this out of fear of al-Mahdi's displeasure, who forbade him to do anything without permission. Then I promised to buy the dog, asking al-Qāʾīm not to cry, because it was difficult for me to bear the sight of his tears. We then tried to make the owner part with it for a reasonable price. The owner, however, seeing how much the prince wanted to get the dog, did not agree to come down from the five dinārs which he asked for it. We argued and argued, when al-Mahdi sent Firūz after us. We explained what had happened, he went to him and reported, and he told him to go, and give orders to pay the man what he asks, because that day a messenger in search of him was coming to Damascus. So we bought the dog, and went on, travelling the whole of that day, and of the next, and arriving in Tiberias on the third 2. We found the local dāʾī waiting for us on the road. When he saw al-Mahdi, he approached and said that he had received by carrier-pigeon the news from

---

1 This, of course, is a summary of events, which were spread over several months.

2 The timing is fairly correct, for forced marches; the distance, by motor road at present, is about 80 miles.
the Damascus ḏāʿī, [112] informing him that a messenger came from Baghdad the same day on which we left, bringing to the governor of the city orders to arrest us. The ḏāʿī asked al-Mahdī not to enter the town in order not to be recognised. So we continued our journey without stopping in Tiberias, and arrived in Ramla, putting up with the governor (ʿāmil), who was a devout follower (maʿkhūdḥ ʿalay-hi) of al-Mahdī. He did not know, out of joy at seeing al-Mahdī, how to serve him. He prostrated himself before him, and kissed his hands and feet.

I remember,—narrates Jaʿfar,—that I was waiting on al-Mahdī, together with Tayyib and Abū Yaʿqūb at the table, at which al-Mahdī, the governor, al-Qāʾim, and Firūz were taking their food, when there entered a messenger, the same who had been sent to Damascus, carrying orders from Baghdad about our arrest, accompanied by the name and description of the appearance of al-Mahdī. The governor read the orders, and handed the paper to him. When the Imam read it also, the governor knelt before him, crying and kissing his feet, and al-Mahdī said to him: "Keep quiet, do not cry. He, in whose hands my life is, will never permit them to catch us. Verily we,—I and my son,—shall catch their heads by the hair, and my horses will trample on the stomachs of the sons of ʿAbbās. Do not be afraid that anything that thou fearest will happen with me".

So the governor of Ramla wrote to the governor of Damascus in reply to his letter that no man answering the description had been seen, and it was not known whether he had already passed the town. In case he had not yet passed, watch would be kept for him on all roads.

Then al-Mahdī renewed the oath of allegiance of the governor, and spent in his house the remainder of that day, and the night. On that night there was a shower of shooting stars, so al-Mahdī, the governor, al-Qāʾim, and many other people ascended the roof of the house to look at the phenomenon. The town was filled with the shouts of the people, and their invocations of God.
Ja'far adds: according to my calculations, this happened in 289/902, apparently in the month of Rajab (= June-July). And I saw that al-Mahdi pressed with his hand the hand of the governor. And he said to him that this phenomenon was a testimony of his high mission, and one of the signs of his success.

Then al-Mahdi summoned Muḥammad b. 'Azīza, mentioned above, and said to him: "We start to-morrow, with the blessing and help of God. And thou must go back to Salamiyya, collecting as large a crowd of low class people as possible, taking a spade in hand, and distributing to them as many spades and pickaxes as possible. Then start abusing me in the vilest possible way, ascribing to me all sorts of disgusting acts. Stir up the crowd to destroy my palace. If thou succeedest in this, make them pull the building down upon the pond which is at its foot, so that no trace of it may remain, and it would completely disappear. [113] And if this is successful, lead them to the date tree which grows at the gate of the town, and make them cut it down, saying that under it the oath of allegiance used to be taken (from followers). After having achieved all this, stay there until there comes my order to rejoin me, at the time when thy arrival is needed.

Ja'far explains that the reason for this was that the Imam had dug a tank, strongly built, which was filled with valuables, and then closed it in. Over it was built another tank, of the same size, and filled with water; it was kept full the whole year. The Imam himself mostly sat near it. And with regard to the cutting of the date tree the reason was this: goods were usually brought to the Imam at night, in order to be delivered to him.

---

1 Apparently this phenomenon (probably the periodical re-appearance of the Leonidas) firmly associated itself in the memory of the old slave with the events of the flight. Therefore it would be extremely interesting if an astronomer could find leisure to calculate the dates in or about 902 on which shooting stars would have been visible in Palestine,—this would be of great help in our search for reliable dates.

2 This detail may indicate that al-Mahdi really started for Egypt after the "Qarmatians" had slaughtered his relatives, in the beg. of 291/903.

3 Again apparently the guardian of al-Mahdi.
(through the underground passage). But the men who accompanied (the caravan) once missed the entrance, and approached the gate of the town. As they were afraid that the dawn was near, they buried the goods under the date tree which was growing near the city gate, or near the city wall,—I (the compiler) cannot remember correctly.

We started from Ramla 1.—Ja'far continues his narrative, —for Egypt, where we were met by ḏāʾī Abū ʿAli, who was residing and preaching there, having increased the number of assistant ḏāʾīs of the Imam under him. Fīrūz, who had converted him and trained him, married his daughter, Umm Abīl-Ḥusayn, to his son. Before entering Miṣr, al-Mahdī ordered him not to accommodate him in his own house, or in the house of any one who was known as being connected with the organisation, but to arrange for him a place with a trusted (outsider). Accordingly, Abū ʿAli settled al-Mahdī with a certain Ibn ʿAyyāsh 2. And we did not stay long before a messenger arrived with the orders about our arrest. The governor sent for Ibn ʿAyyāsh, informed him about the arrival of the messenger, and read to him the letter. Ibn ʿAyyāsh replied that the person who was staying with him, by God, was not suspicious in any way. He was a nobleman, a Hashimite, an important merchant, known by his learning, piety and wealth. And with regard to the man who was sought for, news had come that he had left for the Yemen long before the messenger arrived. The governor believed what Ibn ʿAyyāsh said about his guest, but said to him that it was absolutely necessary to arrest one of the servants of al-Mahdī, and subject him to tortures, out of fear of secret reporters (to the central government). But otherwise he and his guest were free to do what they liked. Ja'far adds that he was the servant

1 According to the Iṣṭitār, 106 (cf. above, p. 87), al-Mahdī stayed at Ramla for nearly two years. It is quite possible that some sort of confusion over the names of the towns is responsible for this discrepancy of information.

2 In F. uniformly: Ibn ʿAyyās.
of al-Mahdi who was arrested, tortured, suspended, and lightly flogged, by light strokes, which caused him no harm. [114]

Before my arrest al-Mahdi summoned me, and said that I should not feel offended at being selected to be handed to the authorities for tortures. His intentions were to send me back to Salamiyya to unearth two "water-pots" (with treasure), which I had buried by his order, and about the location of which the other servants did not know. And al-Mahdi instructed me that when interrogated, I should say that I was a free man, employed by his master for a certain salary, and that there was no cause for interrogation, and that I had served him for a short time only, and now wanted to abandon to him the balance of my pay, and to return to my own place.

All was done according to his instructions, and when the governor released me, I visited al-Mahdi at night, and he ordered me to start next morning, not to deviate from the road until I arrive in Salamiyya, and to dig up the treasure. Then I was to buy some loads of cotton, hide the treasure in them, and hurry back. He told me to be careful not to show myself to any one in Salamiyya, except Muhammed b. 'Aziza, his son, known as Abul-Layth, and Hasan, son of my sister. He promised to await me in Tripoli in the Maghrib, from where he would not move until he saw me.

So far we had no doubt that we were going to the Yemen; al-Mahdi never revealed his real intention of going to the Maghrib until that night. This appeared utterly disappointing to all who accompanied him, and every one hated even the mention of the Maghrib. But of all of us Firuz felt the disappointment the most. In the morning,—continues Ja'far,—I left, as ordered, for Salamiyya. The trial I had in Egypt was the first painful experience of its kind for me; but for it I would not have passed through the other one, in Sijilmassa, safely.

When Firuz became quite certain that al-Mahdi really intended to go to the Maghrib, his devotion disappeared, and he decided to deceive the Imam. As mentioned above, he had
married his daughter to Abū 'Ali, the ḍāʾī of Egypt. The latter had a son, Muhammad Abūl-Ḥusayn b. Abī 'Ali, who, serving under al-Mahdī, al-Qā'im, al-Ānsūr and al-Mu‘izz, attained a high rank, and (ultimately) became the chief ḍāʾī. This Abū ‘Ali, the ḍāʾī, insistently prayed al-Mahdī to take him with himself to the Maghrib, so that he should not part from the Imam; but al-Mahdī would not consent to this, and ordered him to remain in Egypt, until the time came when he would be able to come to him,—to his great sorrow and disappointment.

When al-Mahdī left Egypt, Fīrūz deserted him on the eve of his departure, fleeing to the Yemen. (Later on) al-Mahdī used to say that he had seen [115] two extraordinary devotees: one of them was very much aggrieved by separation from him, and the other by remaining in his presence.

Fīrūz reached the Yemen, arriving in the place of the local ḍāʾī, a man from Kūfa, called Abūl-Qāsim b. Farah, surnamed Manṣūru'l-Yaman, of a noble Shi‘ite family (bayt tashayyyu‘). He had come in touch with the Imam through Fīrūz. So, when the latter reached him, he met him with the great honour and veneration to which he was entitled on account of his position with the Imam. He went out of the door of his house to meet him, caused him to be seated there, and waited on him until Fīrūz had given him the permission to sit (in his presence). Fīrūz told him that the Imam had sent him as a messenger to inform him that he, al-Mahdī, was going to invade Egypt with the troops of the Maghrib, and was going to write to the Yamanite ḍāʾī to join him there with the troops of al-Yaman. The ḍāʾī Abūl-Qāsim, certainly, took all this for truth.

Fīrūz no doubt understood what he was doing, and that the Imam would certainly write to the ḍāʾī about his treason, and

---

1 It is stated on the preceding page that he married his daughter to the son of Abū ‘Ali.
2 Cf. above, p. 52.
3 A puzzling statement: was he converted by Fīrūz? Or did he enter the religious service through him? Or was he promoted? Most probably even here “the Imam” referred to is the guardian of al-Mahdī.
4 Here “the Imam” obviously refers to al-Mahdī.
give him orders to take the necessary steps. He bribed a young servant of Abū'1-Qāsim, by offering him much more than he received from his master, so that the servant became his spy in the house of the ḍā'ī. He was instructed to report about everything that was going on there, sending him word at any time of the day or night. And the spy used to report everything. Then came the letter of al-Mahdī, together with another from Abū 'Alī, the son-in-law of Fīruz, informing him of the exploits of the latter, with al-Mahdī's orders for his execution. When the letter came, the spy immediately informed Fīruz, and he fled at once. When the ḍā'ī sent for him, nobody knew where he had gone. The ḍā'ī searched for him everywhere until he found that Fīruz had joined 'Alī b. al-Faḍl al-Jayshānī 1, stirring him up to rebellion and treason. The ḍā'ī Abū'1-Qāsim, learning of all this, and of the efforts of Fīruz to proclaim himself an Imam, helped by the shaykh and the people of that place, attacked them with a force, and, after a long struggle, ultimately suppressed them, and executed both of them.

(Returning to the story of al-Mahdī) Ja'far narrates that while he was travelling with a caravan between Egypt and Tāḥūna, the party was attacked by the Berbers, who looted the caravan, taking away some portion of the baggage of the Imam, who lost his books which contained “numerous revelations”. This last circumstance grieved him much more than the loss of all other things. But God returned these books to him, and they were recovered during the first campaign of al-Qā'īm against Egypt. 2 [116]

When al-Mahdī reached Tripoli, all the people who travelled by the caravan dispersed, except for Tayyib and al-Qahramān. He sent Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, the brother of Abū 'Abdīl-lāh

---

1 Cf. p. 225, and Texts, p. 40, the events as narrated in the Iṣṭitāfu'd-da'wa.

2 This may imply certain sacred books. They are also mentioned in the Iṣṭitāfu'd-da'wa (Texts, p. 41), from where apparently this information is taken (cf. also Iṣṭitār, 106). Cf. p. 226 sq.
(the ḏrī in the Katāma territory), to Qayrawān, together with the Katāma tribesmen who were sent to the Imam to Salamiyya. His mission was to get through with these men to his brother, and inform him of the arrival of al-Mahdī. Abūl-‘Abbās Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad safely reached Qayrawān. It was the intention of al-Mahdī to go to the Katāma territory to join Abū ‘Abdīl-lāh. But when Abūl-‘Abbās reached Qayrawān, he found that Ziyādatu'l-lāh, the ruler of the Maghrib, had already received orders to arrest al-Mahdī, accompanied by a description of his appearance, and the information that they had missed him in Egypt. He was instructed to make a search for him. Some people, who travelled by the same caravan, informed the authorities that the man who was searched for had remained in Tripoli, but Abūl-‘Abbās Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad was one of his associates. The latter tried to take shelter somewhere, but did not succeed in this, finding no one whom he knew, and in whom he could trust and confide. So he was ultimately arrested, and tried. He denied all connection with al-Mahdī, insisting that he was an ordinary merchant. He was, nevertheless, imprisoned, and the news about this reached al-Mahdī.

I met al-Mahdī,— Jaʿfar continues his narrative,— after my return with the treasure for which he had sent me, and soon after this a caravan was formed, with the intention of travelling to Sijilmāsa via Qaṣṭiliyya. He thanked God for my safe return, and for being able to regain his treasure. Thus, al-Mahdī started with this caravan, taking us with him as servants, to Samāṭa (?) in the Qaṣṭiliyya province. We stopped in the town of Tūzar, remaining in it for a few days in order to celebrate the holiday, and on the ‘īd day we started for Sijilmāsa.

---

1 This is an extremely interesting reference. Unfortunately for us, no further information is given about them. It seems that they played no part in al-Mahdī’s experiences in Sijilmāsa, and his release from captivity. Cf. p. 226, obviously the source of this information.

2 The last ruler of the Aghlabid dynasty (184–296/800–909), whose full name was Ziyādatu'l-lāh III b. 'Abdīl-lāh b. ʿIbrāhīm b. ʿAḥmad (280–296/903–909).

3 In F.— Ismāṭa.
I remember,—narrates Ja'far,—that while we were resting there, al-Mahdi told me once to go and find for him a small fat lamb, and, if found, to buy it, roast it, and serve it to him. I went to look for it, and a local inhabitant offered me one, inviting me to come to his house. I went with him, and he took me into his house where I found a hairy dog on a strong chain, with reddened eyes (ready to attack). The owner said to me that it was then two months that he had been feeding it with dates. He kept it chained so that it could not move,—its skin had become tight on it because of the great amount of fat. It appears that the local people eat dogs, applying to them the name of lambs. So the dog jumped upon me on its chain,—a dog fearsome as a lion when it attacks. I was sure that it would break the chain, tearing my stomach. So I fled for all that I was worth, out of the house, despairing of my life, while the owner was shouting (to return), but I did not dare to do this. I felt terror stricken [117] until I entered the house of al-Mahdi half mad, with hands on my heart. When he saw me much frightened, with pale face, he asked me, who was chasing me. I replied: "My lord, curse be upon the people of this town!" And I told him how I had gone in search of what he ordered me to get, and what happened as a result of this,—the whole story. And while I was telling my story, he, and my lord al-Qā'im never ceased laughing, and consoling me until I became quiet.

A day or two later al-Mahdi ordered me to bring him a barber, instructing me to get one who was a stranger in the town. So, I went, and by chance met a barber, in whose appearance there were traces of a journey. I asked him whether he was a stranger, and he said yes. I asked him when he entered the town, and he said that he had arrived two days ago. I took him with me, brought him to the house, and told al-Mahdi that he was a stranger. When the Imam saw him, he asked his name, his place of origin, and whether he was a freeman, or a slave. It was his habit that when seeing a man for the first time, he would first ask the name and the birthplace of the man before
starting a conversation and acquaintance with him. So, when he asked the barber his usual questions, he said that he was a native of Ifriqiyya, from Qayrawān, that he had left his native place a long time ago, spending his time in the Katāma territory, from whence he had arrived in this town. The Imam asked him, how he could enter the Katāma districts, and stay there, while, as people said, there was so much excitement, and the country was ruled by the heretics. To this the barber replied that, by God, there was no more righteous administration than in the Katāma territory. Al-Mahdī remarked that this was contrary to what was everywhere narrated about the rule of a stranger \(^1\) who had installed himself there. The people said that he had seduced them into heresy, making lawful to them their daughters and sisters, or permitting them not to fast or offer prayers. To this the barber replied: "By God, beside of whom there is no other deity,—there is nothing like this in reality, and there is no other true religion in the world except that which is preached by that man in the Katāma country". The Imam asked, what made him so pleased with the rule of the man, whom he praised so much while nobody would endorse this view. The barber narrated that he had a partner, whom he persuaded to come with him to the town of Saṭīq, and work there for a month. "We shared our earnings which God gave us. We went to Saṭīq, and when we wanted to enter it, through the gate, we were stopped and told that carrying arms was prohibited in the town. We pleaded the impossibility of leaving our arms outside as we did not know any one who would keep these. But the guards told us simply to leave our arms near the city walls. We asked as to how we should simply throw these away, and were assured that we need not be afraid about their safety. So we left them, and entered the town, and stayed long there, \([118]\) because it was difficult for us to leave it after we had settled there. And we remained there a month. But when

---

\(^1\) May also mean: a Kharijite.
we left, we found our arms quite safe, nothing missing in them. This is, O my lord, the way of life, established by that person whom rumours accuse of heresy and atheism.” Ja’far adds: “And I saw that the face of al-Mahdī was shining (with delight)”. When the barber finished his work, al-Mahdī ordered him to be paid handsomely, and dismissed him.

And on another occasion,—continues Ja’far,—I went out in order to buy aubergines (brinjal), and could not find good ones except in the shop of a man who proved to be the greatest villain that I have ever seen. He kept me bargaining for a couple of hours, and when I ultimately bought from him what I needed, I began to count out the money to him. But whatever coin I gave him, he would return it, saying that this was base and that was worn. He was merely trying to annoy me, and I only realised this after a time. When he saw that I had understood his trick, he jumped at me, and began to shout, collecting a crowd, and calling me a ṛāfūḍī (heretic). He scratched my cheeks, hit my sides, struck me in the face, and I had a considerable struggle to get rid of him. Much later on, adds Ja’far, when I arrived to Ifriqiyya after it was conquered by al-Mahdī, it was once reported that a certain man in Qasṭiliyya, seizing the opportunity of the flight of its ruler, Ziyādatu’l-lāh, had collected around him a band, and occupied the town. And the Imam sent a governor to that town, who arrested the rebel, and sent him to al-Mahdī, to Raqqāda. When the rebel was brought, the Imam said to me: “Come out, and ask him what made him to rise in rebellion?” I went out to see him, and, to my surprise, I saw before me the man who had sold me the aubergines! I returned to al-Mahdī, and reported this to him. He smiled, and said: “Praise be to God who has delivered him to thy revenge! Go and behead him, the curse of God be upon him!”—And I went to the Qayrawān gate, taking him with me, and then beheaded him, and crucified him.

So,—continuing the original narrative,—we spent a few days in Tūzar before the ‘īd, and left after offering our prayers
on that day. We asked al-Mahdi to stay longer, so as to spend the holiday, and leave on the second day, but he did not agree. The leader and all other people in the caravan tried to do their best to help him, because the leader praised him and his generosity very much. Then al-Mahdi went with the guide and the caravan, in response to what was his duty in his high Mission. We went across the desert directly to Sijilmāsa, becoming exceedingly tired on that day, because al-Mahdi did not give permission to the guide to call a halt. Every one was suffering immensely from fatigue, and reproached the guide. But the latter told all that if [119] Abū Muḥammad (i.e. al-Mahdi) so commanded him, he would not give orders to camp even so long as they had not reached Sijilmāsa, so as not to disobey him. So, we marched on until night, and when we camped, the Imam said to us: “To-day a messenger with orders for our arrest has arrived in Tūzar”. And so it had really happened.

Then al-Mahdi asked the guide as to how much they had done that day; and the man answered that they had travelled four stages. (Next day) we also did not halt until we reached Sijilmāsa. The governor of that place was Alīsa b. Midrār, a Berber.

Before entering Sijilmāsa, al-Mahdi met a man, of decent appearance and manners, who had a son with him, and was travelling on account of some trade affairs. When they were riding together, al-Mahdi asked him about his name, place of origin, etc., and he replied that he was a Muṭṭalibī, from Qayrawān. Al-Mahdi was carrying on a conversation with him, and became friendly with him, and liked him, finding him to be a Shi‘ite by persuasion. He carefully examined him, and, being satisfied with his beliefs, he accepted him as one of his followers (akhaddha ‘alay-hi). When we arrived in Sijilmāsa, we rented a good house for al-Mahdi from a man called Abū Ḥabasha.

---

1 Apparently the same person as mentioned in the Istītār (106) under the name of Abū‘l-Qāsim ibn Ḥassān. Cf. above, p. 182.
Says Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Yamānī: Ṭāhir, the cashier of the treasury, when by chance the subject of al-Mahdī’s arrival in Sijilmāsa was touched upon in his presence, narrated to me the story which he heard from ‘Alīṣh, the trainer: “We were in the stables in Mansūriyya, said he,—when suddenly there entered al-Muʿizz li-dīnī ’l-lāh, who was suffering from difficulty in breathing, caused by intense heat. He sat in a cool space, in which there was much air, looking at the horses in the stables. After he had rested for some time, there entered Jaʿfar the Chamberlain; al-Muʿizz asked him, what had happened that he came out at such an unusual hour? He replied that it was reported to him that Mawlā-nā the Imam had gone out of the private part of the palace to the stables, and he knew that this the Imam would not do at this time of the day except on account of his suffering from suffocation. So he had come to distract and console him. The Imam said that he had really come out on account of the heat, to find a refuge in a spacious and airy place such as his stables, and to enjoy the sight of his horses.

Then Jaʿfar asked permission to relate to him an extraordinary occasion of which he himself was a witness, while staying with al-Mahdī in Sijilmāsa, so that while listening to it, the Imam might feel less his sufferings from the heat. The Imam gave him permission, and he said: “We lived in Sijilmāsa in the house known as the house of Abū Ḥabasha, and near it there was a garden, which was entered through a door in the house. On an extremely hot summer day, just such as this one, al-Mahdī [120] was feeling great discomfort. He ordered us to open the door of the garden, and to spread a carpet in an airy place, so that he might sit in the extreme heat of that day. We opened the door of the garden, searched for a suitable place, and found a huge tree under which was a large shaded place. We spread for him a carpet there, and he came with al-Qā’īm, and

1 A suburban “cantonment” near Qayrawān, built by al-Manṣūr.
both sat under the tree. Qā'im went later on for a walk in the garden, accompanied by some servants, and by chance came across a stream in which there was a very little water. So he sat down by its side, washed his hands and face, and put his feet into the water. And no sooner had he put his feet into the stream than water began to flow in it, rapidly increasing in volume. The gardener, who saw this, suddenly started shouting: "by God, the Mahdī is before me!" Al-Mahdī gave orders to look who was shouting there, and to bring the man before him. We all rushed to the gardener, and brought him to the Imam, making him cease shouting. Al-Mahdī asked him, why should he so foolishly expose them to a mortal danger? How did he find that he is the Mahdī? Is he not a spy to watch them? —To this the gardener replied that in his garden there was a spring, in which there was almost no water. And it was predicted from antiquity that its water would not run again until the Mahdī entered the garden and put his feet into the stream, he himself, or his son 1. "And to-day I saw with my own eyes what was thus predicted".

Al-Mahdī told him that if he saw this, he should keep quiet, and not risk their lives foolishly. "No, by God", —replied the gardener,—"if I could conceal thee, my lord, in my body, and cover thee with my eyelids,—verily I would do this! But I have to ask thee for something". And when al-Mahdī asked him what it was, he said that the garden belonged to his father and grandfather, who inherited it from their ancestors. But recently Alisa b. Midrār (the governor of Sijilmāsa) had seized it from his family, leaving them to work in it as paid labourers. As he was certain that al-Mahdī would win the authority, he asked to return this garden to him. This was promised by al-Mahdī, and the man was dismissed with good presents and the order to keep silence about what he had seen. The man really kept silence to the day of al-Mahdī’s triumph, after the arrival

---

1 Cf. above, p. 50 sq. The last words are an obvious after-thought of the compiler.
of the troops of Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh, a large force which defeated the governor,— the events which are narrated later on in this book. He came to the camp of Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh, and was staying in the tents which were prepared for him, and for the ceremony of the taking of the oath of allegiance from the members of the Katāma tribe,— arranged as described later on in these pages,— after the flight of Aliṣa' b. Midrār. And here was our gardener, standing near the door of the tent, [121] and shouting at the top of his voice: "Here is God and Imam al-Mahdī!". On hearing this, al-Mahdī at once recognised his voice, and told me to come out, give him some present, and arrange about the return of the garden to him, adding to it the gardens that adjoined it".

Al-Mu'izz li-dīnî'l-lāh, hearing this, expressed his admiration. He liked the story very much, and always remembered it afterwards.

In Sijilmāsa,—Ja'far continues his original story,— al-Mahdī became very friendly with the Muṭṭalibite, speaking often to him, inviting him to meals, and confiding to him various things. When he had finished his trade affairs in the town, he came to say good bye to al-Mahdī before returning to his native Qayrawān. Al-Mahdī said to him that he would not let him go at such a time, if he did not know how great dangers were ahead for his followers and servants, and generally for every one who knew him, and whom he knew. 'And, under the circumstances as they were, he advised him to go, with the help of God; and when he heard that the dā'i of the Katāma territory had conquered the province of Ḥrifqiyya, seized Qayrawān, and entered the town of Raqqāda, he was to go to him, and convey to the dā'i his, al-Mahdī's greetings, and introduce himself to him. The Imam promised to write to the dā'i about him, and give necessary instructions. And if he saw that the dā'i intended to move towards Sijilmāsa, he should come with him, sending his son with the dā'i. This son was a youth at that time, who had just got his moustache.
Ja'far continues:—"The purpose of sending the Mu'ttalibite to Abū `Abdi'l-lāh ash-Shi'i was al-Mahdi's desire to have him there for his own identification, because the ḍā'i had never personally met the Imam. His own story runs as follows: he was a Şūfī, living near the ḍā'i of Kūfa, Abū 'Ali, with his brother Abū'l-'Abbās Muḥammad. His full name was Abū `Abdi'l-lāh Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad b. Zakariyā. His brother Abū'l-'Abbās was elder than he; both were Shi'ite by persuasion. When they learnt about the transfer of Abū 'Ali to Egypt, they applied to the father-in-law of the latter, Fīrūz, and both were received with honour (into the sect), for their piety and strong Shi'ite feelings. They never saw the Imam (before that), and never came into his presence. Fīrūz asked the Imam about them, after the latter had accepted them (akhatā 'alay-himā), and had given them tuition and instruction in theology, suggesting to the Imam that Abū `Abdi'l-lāh should be sent to Egypt, and thence to the ḍā'i Abū'l-Qāsim in the Yemen, as an assistant in his propaganda. His brother Abū'l-'Abbās should be sent to the resident (qā'im) in Egypt¹, together with Abū 'Ali who was sent as a ḍā'i there. The Imam accepted his suggestions, and sanctioned these appointments. Therefore Abū `Abdi'l-lāh was sent from Egypt to the Yemen, and his brother remained in Egypt, with Abū 'Ali. Abū `Abdi'l-lāh did not stay long in the Yemen, because Abū'l-Qāsim did not need his services. Thus his expectations of a distinguished career came to an end, when the Imam wrote to Abū'l-Qāsim, ordering him to send him back to Egypt. But when he came to Mekka, he came across a number of people belonging to the Katāma tribe (in Africa). He travelled to Egypt in their company, and then continued his journey to their country in the Maghrib, with the permission of the Imam, whom he, however, thus had no chance to see.

¹ Apparently qā'im in this sense is used for the ḥujjat. The reference is extremely interesting as implying the fact that by about the middle of the third/ninth c. there were already many Ismailis in Egypt.
His brother, Abū’l-‘Abbās, served under Abū ‘Alī in Egypt, and was used for the purpose of conveying his correspondence with the Imam through Fīrūz. He ultimately asked the latter, after a long period of service, to ask the Imam about his being taken into his personal service. The Imam granted his demand, accepting him “from behind a curtain” (i.e. without the right to appear before him personally)\(^1\). But later on “the curtain” was lifted before him, and he saw the Imam, and also al-Mahdī with al-Qā’im, who was an infant at that time.

To return to the interrupted story,— continues Ja’far,— the departure of the Muṭṭalibite. He took his farewell of al-Mahdī, and went to Qayrawān. At that time al-Mahdī ordered me to buy a slave, originally a man from Damascus, who at that time had come to Sijilmāsa. He was a handsome looking young man, and al-Mahdī named him Ṣandal\(^2\). He was the same man who fell in a battle, fighting under al-Qā’im in the Katāma country during the rebellion of al-Māwāṭī, who rose in arms after the arrival of al-Mahdī at Raqqāda. He was a brave man, and God has given him the death of the warrior.

Then al-Mahdī also ordered to me to buy another slave, a Greek\(^3\), for the service to al-Qā’im, and I bought a Greek goldsmith, from a Sijilmāsa woman. He was named Muslim.

Verily, al-Mahdī foresaw what calamities were going to befall us, and for this reason he made arrangements in order to be properly served, with al-Qā’im (after we, his old servants, were imprisoned).

---

\(^1\) It is a conjectural translation; it would be interesting to find a detailed explanation of the term. The implications of “the curtain” apparently refer to the revealing of the residence and person of the Imam. The next sentence also has interesting implications: here again “al-Imām” obviously is the guardian of al-Mahdī, who, most probably, as we have seen above, died ca. 283/896. If so, it is obvious that Abū ‘Abdīl-lāh was already in the Maghrib by this time.

\(^2\) As is known, slaves usually received the names of precious stones or flowers.

\(^3\) This may also imply that he was a native of Asia Minor, or even Italy.
When we were arrested, al-Qā’im escaped from the house in which al-Mahdī was staying, and settled in another house, and his father sent with him Muslim, the slave, to serve him, and to keep him company. Ṣandal remained with al-Mahdī in the house which he occupied originally.

We were thrown into prison,— I, Ṭayyib, and Abū Ya’qūb al-Qahramān. Al-Mahdī used every day to send Ṣandal to bring him news about al-Qā’im and about ourselves, sending by him food for us. Both al-Mahdī and al-Qā’im were staying in their houses, being treated with respect, and feeling no need,— God had laid respectful fear of them in the heart of the local governor, and reverence in his soul. But, at the same time, he was extremely brutal to us, torturing us every day by flogging with whips. After some time Abū Ya’qūb al-Qahramān was unable to endure it, and betrayed al-Mahdī. [123]

And I remember,— continues Ja’far,— that on the day when he confessed, after we were brought back to the prison, I hit him with my fist and said to him: “O thou, son of the uncircumcised! Why hast thou made confession?” And he replied: “Friend, the pain of the lashes made me do so.”

Both my friends made confession, after a few days of torture, and were left in peace, while I was still tortured, because I refused to make the confession. It is true, Ṭayyib did not tell everything; he, nevertheless, when being flogged for a long time, shouted: “You, men, if all that people say about us is true in your opinion, kill us, and let us be free from the torture.” But I did not utter any treasonable word, and this made them furious. They flogged me with lashes, and struck sharpened sticks under my nails, in anger that I said nothing, and to make me confess.

God by His mercy made me strong to endure all this. And, by God, I remember that I felt terrible thirst one day while in the prison. The water carrier, who usually supplied us with water, failed to bring it on that day. So I called the warder of the prison, beseeching him to give me to drink, nearly a
hundred times. His only answer after all this was to throw a stone at me, breaking my teeth; so I had to drink the blood streaming from my mouth. In their cruelty, they placed us in the prison latrine, and, as there was not much room in it, we had when sleeping to put our faces upon the stones on which people place their feet. But God relieved us from all this, at last.

In 296/908–909 Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh conquered Ifrīqiyya, and remained there for about three months to set the administrative machinery in motion. Then he marched towards Sijilmāsa, to relieve al-Mahdī. He appointed as the governors of the province Abū Zāki Tamām b. Mu‘ārik al-Asjānī, or an-Nā‘īlī, and his own brother, Abūl‘-Abbās Muḥammad b. Aḥmad.

Ja‘far b. ‘Ubayd arrived with the ladies of the family of al-Mahdī, either shortly before, or soon after the latter occupied Raqqāda. The humble slave of the Imams, the compiler of the book, feels doubt on this point, because much time has elapsed since he heard this story.

Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh,—continues Ja‘far,—marched at the head of a large army towards Sijilmāsa, accompanied by Abūl-Qāsim al-Muṭṭalibī. He had already received letters of al-Mahdī in which he recommended the Muṭṭalibite to him, ordering to protect and take care of him, to treat him well, and exempt him from the ‘uṣhr tax, and from all duties and taxes on his goods. He was to regard the father and the son as occupying a high rank, treating them with respect and distinction, attaching them to his staff, and he was to bring with him the son when marching to Sijilmāsa, recommending his father, who remained in Ifrīqiyya, to the governor in the same way as ordered by al-Mahdī. [124] Accordingly, Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh brought with him to Sijilmāsa Abūl-Qāsim b. al-Muṭṭalibī, acting as ordered by al-Mahdī.

On reaching the town, he besieged it, and sent an ultimatum to the governor, Alīsa' b. Midrār, demanding the release of al-
-Mahdī. He promised to spare the town, if his demands were complied with. But the governor in the first instance refused the demand of Abū 'Abdīl-lāh, and attacked him. Then the dāʾī started hostile actions, and encircled the town with his troops, after a fierce fight.

Realising his helplessness to resist, the governor summoned his assistants to confer, and discuss the situation. Some of his advisers recommended to him the execution of all suspects who were arrested: if they were associates of the insurgents, this would split their unity, shatter their religious beliefs, and render false their dogmas. Another party advocated a friendly settlement, urging the governor to comply with the request of the enemy. As they pointed out, the insurgents only demanded the surrender of the prisoners,—if these really were the people whom they wanted. If their demand was satisfied, they would not ask for anything more, seeing this friendly attitude towards them.

There was also in the town,—says Jaʾfar,—a man under suspicion of complicity in the same thing (i.e. the Ismaili propaganda),—a merchant, Ibn Biṣṭām by name. The fact was that other merchants envied his wealth, and disliked him for his base mentality, planning to get rid of him, and ruin him. They came to Alīṣaʾ, and persuaded him that the enemy did not demand the men who were being tortured, but this Ibn Biṣṭām. The latter was summoned, and this turned the suspicions of the governor from us, and our tortures were suspended.

But let us return to the deliberations of the governor’s council. Some of his advisers, on whose opinion he usually relied,—and their suggestions carried the day,—argued that, being surrounded on all sides, they could not continue resistance. If the prisoners were killed, then the assailants would surely slaughter all the defenders. Therefore the best course would be to release the suspects, and send them out to the insurgents, one by one. When the enemy saw the man whom they expected,

---

1 Cf. the Texts, pp. 31–33, and 44–46, the version given in the Šarḥuʾl-akhbār, and the Iḥtiāḥuʾd-dāʿwa.
they would busy themselves with him, turning their attention from the governor and his force, who would have an opportunity to escape. Besides, after getting the people whom the besiegers demanded, they would be unable to plan anything except for a hurried withdrawal to Ifriqiyya, fearing lest Ziyādatu’l-lāh b. al-Aghlab, who had fled before them, might return there, on receiving the news that they had gone to Sijilmāsa; and, collecting his Arabs, while they were far away, might re-install himself there, making things difficult for the insurgents. And when they departed, carrying with them their man, the governor and the force might return to the town. [125]

So it was ultimately decided to send out Ibn Bīṣṭām, the merchant, whom other merchants had slandered to the governor. He was sent out to Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh. When the latter saw him approaching, he dismounted from his horse, thinking that this was al-Mahdī. And Ibn Bīṣṭām also dismounted, out of respect for Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh. On seeing this, the latter mounted again, and did not pay any more attention to him. He then summoned Abū’l-Qāsim, the son of al-Muṭṭalibī (mentioned above), and ordered him to remain in attendance at his side, because that was why the Imam had sent him. If Abū’l-Qāsim had been with him from the beginning, he would have never dismounted to greet an ordinary man.

This happened,— adds Ja’far,— because Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh had never seen al-Mahdī personally, and could not recognise him, as mentioned above. He came to Africa being sent by Abū’l-Qāsim, the dā’i of the Yemen, who also sent with him a certain Ibn Abī Malāḥif, a Yamanite. He met some Katāma tribesmen in Mekka, travelled with them to Egypt, and, after many adventures, came to the Maghrib. It would be too long to relate all this here. The story is narrated by Qāḍī an-Nu‘mān b. Muḥammad in the book compiled by him about the origin of the Fatimid empire 1.

1 This is the Ḥifṭī Ḥu’d-dā’wa. The most interesting implication is that the original Sīra of Ibn Ḥawshab, from which extracts are preserved
Abū 'Abdi’il-lāh remained in the Katāma country until his dream was fulfilled,—he saw al-Mahdī whom he had never seen before with his own eyes. It was for this purpose that al-Mahdī commanded him to bring with him the son of al-Muṭṭalibī who might show him the Imam whom he had had the chance to see while with his father in Sijilmāsa where he swore allegiance to the Imam.

But let us return to the story of Ibn Bistām and al-Mahdī. When Ibn Bistām dismounted, he stopped at the feet of the horse of Abū ‘Abdi’il-lāh, congratulating him on the victory, and bringing him the news that al-Mahdī was safe, with al-Qā’im.

When the population of Sijilmāsa with their governor saw that their enemy paid no attention to Ibn Bistām, their sorrow was great. The governor then sent a bay horse to al-Mahdī, ordering him to ride out from the town to the enemy, if these people were his associates. Al-Mahdī,—narrates Ja’far,—rode out in the same dress in which he had remained in his house,—a Dabīqī dress, Yathrib shirt, and broad turban, the tail of which he spread over his shoulders. On his feet were Arab sandals.

When he emerged from (the gate of) Sijilmāsa, and approached the besiegers near enough for those who were waiting for him to be able to recognise him, the son of al-Muṭṭalibī said to Abū ‘Abdi’il-lāh: “Here is the Lord, mine and thine, and the Lord of all peoples”. Abū ‘Abdi’il-lāh dismounted, and so did all his troops. He bowed, and the others bowed. He stepped forward, and his troops did the same, bowing as he was bowing, until he prostrated before the hoofs of al-Mahdī’s horse. Then he rose, and kissed the stirrup [126] of the Imam, being unable to say anything under the influence of emotion. Then al-Mahdī raised his head with his own hand, and, bending towards him, said: “Be gladdened, Ḫusayn, at this auspicious event.” But Abū ‘Abdi’il-lāh burst in tears, being unable to

in the Ittiḥād, obviously was not known to the author. Thus, most probably, it was lost at an early period.
say anything, overcome by his feelings of awe before al-Mahdî, and his great joy.

Then al-Mahdî, smiling, praising God, and thanking Him, ordered Abū ‘Abdi’l-lâh to give him his horse,— the grey one, which he was riding on that occasion. Abū ‘Abdi’l-lâh ran swift, took the reins of the horse from the hands of the servant, and personally led it up, bringing it beside the horse which al-Mahdî was riding. Then the Imam took his foot from the stirrup, set it in the stirrup of Abū ‘Abdi’l-lâh’s horse, and leapt upon it, turning its head towards the town.

Ja‘far said that about all these events he heard from Abû’l-Qâsim b. al-Muţţalibî. He (certainly) could not witness all this because at the time he was still in the prison.

The people rushed to greet al-Mahdî, crowding round him, and striving to have a glimpse of him, jubilant at seeing him. In the excitement of the moment Alîsa‘ b. Midrâr, with his associates, fled from the town under the noses of the troops, escaping towards the desert, in the direction of “Ṣanhâja of the Unbelievers”, a province lying at the entrance to the Maghrib, originally called “Ṣanhâja of the Muslims”, where Zayrî and his son were hiding.

(When the report of the governor’s flight was received) al-Mahdî ordered Abû ‘Abdi’l-lâh to occupy the town. The dâ‘î turned towards his troops, and said:—“Take it”. Before even he had finished his command, the troops rushed upon the town from all sides, and at once occupied it. They looted it, and broke into the prison, looting it also. We,— says Ja‘far,— were also plundered together with the other prisoners.

Al-Mahdî ordered Abû ‘Abdi’l-lâh to search for al-Qâ‘im, and to send someone to release his servants from the prison, ordering them to point out his hiding place to the messengers.

Ja‘far continues:—“When the prison was broken into, and we were plundered, we came out naked, roaming about the streets,

---

1 The dynasty of Zayrîds ruled in 362–543/972–1148, in Tunis.
and lanes. Tayyib incidentally picked up an old white burnus, and we divided it between ourselves. Ascending the roof of a house, we three,—myself, Tayyib, and Abū Ya‘qūb al-Qahramān,—saw the parties of the Katāma horsemen who were moving up and down in the town. Later on we came to know that they were searching for us in the prison, and, not having found us there, were greatly upset at being unable to trace us, or recognise us. Thus they could not take us with themselves to the hiding place of al-Qā‘im.

Suddenly Tayyib said:—“By God, I do not think that these horsemen would move to and fro except in search of al-Qā‘im. I am sure he is not yet [127] with his father. Let me ask them.” So, when one of these parties approached us, we shouted to them: “Brothers, we are servants of our Lord al-Mahdī, who were imprisoned and tortured. If Mawlā-nā al-Mahdī has not yet found his son, Abū‘l-Qāsim, and if it is he who sent you to search for him, we can show you his place. Take us with you, and we will point it out.”

As soon as the Katāmites heard this, they rushed towards us, gave us three cloaks and three turbans, seated us on their horses, and we went with them until we saw the door of the house in which al-Qā‘im was hiding. We began to shout “Muslim”, or “Ṣandal”, but there was no reply. When al-Mahdī departed, on his ride out to Abū ‘Abdī-l-lāh, Ṣandal had come to our prison to tell us about this. We told him to hurry to our lord Abū‘l-Qāsim (i.e. al-Qā‘im), to inform him, and to remain with him. He went, and both he and Muslim remained there on that day.

We stood long before the door of the house, shouting for Muslim or Ṣandal, but there was no reply. We began to feel afraid that the Katāma men might suspect a fraud, and slaughter us on the spot. Then I and Tayyib began to shout: “Our Lord, Abū‘l-Qāsim, open the door for us, and come out. We are thy slaves, with Katāma tribesmen, thy friends. God has given a victory to our Lord al-Mahdī, fulfilling predictions and promises.
Our Lord al-Mahdī is searching for thee the whole day, never dismounting from his horse. Come out to us!"

When al-Qāʾīm heard this, he, still doubting what Ṭayyib shouted, asked me: "Jaʿfar, is Ṭayyib with thee?"—"Yes, Oh! Our Lord!"—shouted I,—"open the door". But as soon as the Katāma tribesmen heard his voice, they rushed to break the door, jumped upon the walls, broke into the house to him, and carried him out on their shoulders. They offered him the best horse that they had with them, and galloped with him to the camp, quite forgetting about us, and leaving us in distress. There were three of us, at the beginning, and now there were five,—I, Ṭayyib, Abū Yaʿqūb, Muslim, and Śandelier. We were discussing the situation, and what we should do. Some expressed the opinion that we should go to the camp. I opposed this, arguing that if we approached the camp, we could not be certain when near it that the tribesmen would not come out, suspecting us to be enemies. They do not understand well Arabic, do not know us, or realise that we are servants of al-Mahdī. Even if we tell this to them, they may disbelieve us, and kill us. The best plan will be to return to the house in which al-Mahdī used to reside. When he sees al-Qāʾīm safe, he will surely take steps to find us. And he surely will expect to find us in his house, guarding the property that was left by him there. [128]

The Katāma tribesmen pillaged the whole of the town, except for the houses in which al-Mahdī was residing, and the other in which al-Qāʾīm was hiding. Verily, God blinded them with regard to these two houses. Śandelier suggested we should carry the things found in al-Qāʾīm’s house to the house of al-Mahdī, so that all should be in one place. We did this, collecting everything in that house.

When visiting us in the prison, Śandelier told us that before leaving the house, al-Mahdī had ordered him to put everything in the house into the cellars which it possessed,—clothes, carpets, various articles. He himself supervised the packing, to be sure that everything is done properly. And it was not
until everything was packed, and the entrances closed, that the messengers of the governor came, summoning him to go to Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh.

We sat in the entrance porch of the house, while a great multitude of people sought refuge with us, the inhabitants of Sijilmāsa,—men, women, children, wounded and sound, all clothed in rags. They begged us to protect them, despairing of their lives. Time passed, (and night fell), and it was not before one third of night was over that we suddenly heard a great uproar, and the sound of the hoofs made by the horses of cavalry. It was a large party of about a hundred horsemen, who were coming by the light of torches, moving towards the house, and led by local people who showed them the way to us.

Our Lord al-Mahdī repeatedly sent men in search of us after the return of al-Qā'im. Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh all the time sent parties, one after another, and they searched for us in the house which was occupied by al-Qā'im before he joined his father. None of the inhabitants of Sijilmāsa came to tell us that they were looking for us; nor did they direct them to the place where we were. The tribesmen went and returned to Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh, reporting their inability to find us. Then al-Mahdī told Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh to order them to make inquiries from the local inhabitants about the house which was his residence, saying that the servants might be expected to be there. A search party returned to the town, asked the local inhabitants about the house, and were led thither by them.

Seeing them approaching our house, we rose and went to meet them. We saw amongst them a Ṣaqlābī slave, whom they obeyed with respect. He was a slave of Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh, who on that day had presented him to al-Mahdī. He was called al-Īkījānī, because he was purchased by his master at Īkijān, the [129] town in the Katāma country in which he at that time resided, soon after he came there. The party dismounted, and embraced us, after coming into the entrance porch of the house. They remained there, while the (personal) servant entered the
house with us. He asked each of us his name, so we introduced ourselves, and inquired about his name. He said, that, thanks to God, he had become one of us because he was presented to al-Mahdí by his master, mawlā as-sayyid, as in the Katāma country they used to style Abū ‘Abdī‘l-lāh, the dā‘ī.

We brought out from the house everything that could be taken away,—luggage, personal belongings, clothes, etc., and loaded the animals with this. Horses were allotted to us, and we rode down to the encampment. On arriving there we found Abū ‘Abdī‘l-lāh mounted on his horse, awaiting us. It was the order of al-Mahdí, who himself was staying in the tent pitched for him by the dā‘ī; he entered it only after he saw al-Qā‘im returned to him, safely brought by the tribesmen.

When Abū ‘Abdī‘l-lāh saw us approaching, he dismounted, and we similarly dismounted, and embraced him one after another, while the Īkijānī slave was introducing every one of us to him, mentioning his name. He said: “I swear by the head of al-Mahdí that he has given me the power to achieve what he desired; and this is how I accomplished this”. He made me to uncover my back, and touched the wounds inflicted by flogging, my deformed fingers, and the eyes. Then he did the same to Ṭayyib, touching his back and the eyes. But he paid no attention to Abū Ya‘qūb. After this he took us to the tent of the Imam, at the entrance to which al-Qā‘im was standing, awaiting us,—looking like a moon. When he saw us, he smiled and congratulated us, and then took us into the tent, before al-Mahdí.

We saw al-Mahdí sitting on a raised platform in the middle of the tent, shining as the sun in his gorgeous apparel. We prostrated ourselves, weeping, and he, smiling, knelt to God, praising Him, thanking Him, and glorifying Him,—blessed be His name. Then he ordered Şandal to produce from a certain box the two dresses of honour which he had packed there. The slave brought these, and al-Mahdí put one on himself, ordering al-Qā‘im to do the same with the other. Then he ordered [130] other dresses and swords to be brought, which were also
kept packed. Then he put with his own hand the dress of honour on Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh, also giving him a turban and a sword, and then did the same to myself. He made me to put on the dress lined with Dabīqī stuff, also a turban, trousers, and boots. He also gave me a sword. Then he gave dresses and swords to all others,—Ṭayyib, Muslim, Sandal, and Abū Yaʿqūb. All these articles he had really had ready for us ever since the time when we left Salamiyya.

Then he ordered to Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh to pitch another large tent for himself and for us. This he did, and al-Mahdī sent expensive carpets to spread in it.

Then the Imam ordered Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh to tell his men to parade next morning for the salutation of al-Mahdī. They should be introduced to the Imam by the dā'ī according to their rank and position. To this Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh replied that his men being rough, were all too anxious to have a look at the Imam (so that they would not be easily managed on the occasion). So it would be better to instruct them to look from a distance at the Imam who might sit in an open tent (samā'). He, Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh, might stand in front of them, leading up for introduction those who were entitled to this, by tens, presenting them to the Imam. They might greet him, and then depart. When all the dā'īs had been presented in this way, and also qā'ids, the functionaries of the lower rank would be introduced by fifties. Still lower ranks in hundreds, and in five hundreds. Then he intended to march the rank and file of the troops before the Imam in squadrons so that all of them could have a look at him, and perform the ceremony of greeting ¹.

Ja'far continues: al-Mahdī pointed me out to Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh, appointing me to assist him. Next morning al-Mahdī sat on a throne, placed in an open tent. He was in gorgeous attire,—

¹ The ceremony described here in detail is not mentioned in the Ifritahū'id-dā'wa, or by non-Ismaili historians. It would be interesting to find out whether in reality it was held when al-Mahdī subsequently reached Raqqāda, where he was proclaimed the caliph.
as if the sun was rising from his face. On his right was standing al-Qā'īm, armed with a sword, standing close to the throne, as resplendent as a moon. Further on, on the right, at the distance of two paces, was standing Ṭayyib. On the left, at a distance of two paces from the throne, was standing Muslim, and behind the throne were standing Abū Ya'qūb, the new slave, and Ṣandal, on the left and the right, holding fans in their hands, and moving these over the head of al-Mahdī. I, Ja'far, was standing at the entrance of the open tent (samā'), with my sword in my hand. Abū 'Abdīl-lāh was standing at the distance of about a hundred yards from the entrance, assisted by a thousand guards, who were standing in two rows. He called out by name all the ḍā'īs and qa'idās, sending them in batches of ten. As soon as ten of them had come together, he would instruct them to go and present themselves to the chamberlain standing at the entrance, and not to say [131] whatever they might choose, when brought before al-Mahdī, but to greet him, and offer prayers to God for our Lord. And when the latter made them a sign to go, they were to depart.

Said Ja'far: it was since that day that I was called the chamberlain.

I conducted the officers in tens, and was the first amongst the servants to congratulate al-Mahdī on the occasion of his assumption of the title of the caliph 1. When (the first batch) finished uttering their greetings and benedictions, the Imam blessed them, thanking them for their devotion, and explaining to them how God would count this, repaying it with the greatest rewards, in this world and the next.

We spent in this occupation the whole of that day, and after this al-Mahdī had to sit three days more before the ceremony ended. I was busy with this when the news came of the arrest of Alisa 'b. Midrār. This gladdened al-Mahdī very much, and the camp resounded with the shouts of joy and thanks to God.

---

1 This clearly indicates that in fact the ceremony was that of the proclamation of al-Mahdī as caliph. Cf. the preceding foot-note.
When the governor was brought, al-Mahdī ordered him to be flogged together with his associates, and his property to be confiscated. After that they were to be executed, except for the governor himself; al-Qāʿīm prayed that his life be spared, and the Imam granted this to him 1. But he lived only a few days after the execution, suffering from flogging so much that he could not either eat or drink, and died, while no one prayed God to forgive him.

Al-Mahdī then marched at the head of a huge army, such as no king before him could ever muster, and ultimately reached the Katāma country. I remember,— said Jaʿfar,— that when we were passing through the Ṣanḥāja country, and were marching near the place in which (later on) was founded the town of Ashīr, al-Mahdī asked the name of the hills that appeared before him. He was told that the name of the range was Jabal Ṣanḥāja. And he said that a treasure was buried in these mountains.

Says Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Yamānī, the compiler of this book: I never heard this (later) story from Jaʿfar himself, but it was related to me, on his authority, in Egypt, a short time after his death.

Let us return to the story of al-Mahdī’s arrival in the Katāma country. He took possession of the sums of money which were collected for him, and marched to the province of Ifrīqiyya, in 297/909-910. All the notables of the province, both Arabs and non-Arabs, without exception, and many ordinary people came out to receive him, on the day of his arrival there. But al-Muṭṭalibī and al-Marwardī came out from Qayrawān as far as Tāḥart, in twenty days’ distance, to meet him. In Bāghāya, at a distance of six days, he was met by many people who claimed to be descendants of Ḫusayn, or Jaʿfar, and who held Shiʿite beliefs in Qayrawān. [132]

---

1 Apparently this leniency was dictated by considerations of the governor’s tribal connections with the Berbers.
When al-Mahdī entered the province of Ifriqiyya,—continued Ja’far,—he made a proclamation, promising an amnesty to every one there, and in other towns; even ‘Abdu’l-lāh ibn al-Qadīm and Ayyūb, who was the deputy of Ziyādatu’l-lāh at the time of al-Mahdī’s occupation of the province, came under it. Both, being informed of this, made their appearance. This Ayyūb was one of the most eminent officials under the Aghlabid rule.

‘Abdu’l-lāh b. al-Qadīm was given an important post by al-Mahdī, who appointed him to be in charge of all revenue offices and tax collectors. He continued in his high office until Satan confused his soul, and he joined the Katāma insurrection, and (ultimately) committed suicide.

There was also a certain Abū Ja’far Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Baghdādi who came from Andalusia before al-Mahdī occupied Ifriqiyya. He came into favour with certain administrators whom he served, and was appointed as a secretary in the government office when al-Mahdī arrived. The latter left him to continue in charge of the revenue department, and ultimately he succeeded Ibn al-Qadīm in his office. He was ultimately entrusted with general administration, being in charge of every thing, both important and other affairs.

The reason of his brilliant career,—said Ja’far,—was this. While we were in Sijilmāsa, he once appeared before al-Mahdī, and offered to him a laudatory ode (qaṣīda). Through this he found his way to al-Mahdī, whom he pleased by his eulogy, so that he ordered him to appear before him, and ask what he needed. He used to visit al-Mahdī, eulogizing him in his odes. Once al-Mahdī asked him the reason of his departure from Baghdād, and he explained that ‘Alī ibn ‘Īsā 1, out of envy intended to kill him. Therefore he fled in despair of his life, and various circumstances brought him to that country,—the

---

1 The wazīr of several Abbasid caliphs, born in 245/859, d. 334/946. His full name was ‘Alī b. ‘Īsā b. Dā’ūd, surnamed Ibn al-Jarrāḥ.
Maghrib. Al-Mahdī carefully examined him, his (religious) views, and his qualifications, and found him an excellent secretary, intelligent, clear minded, and firm,—a man who would make a good minister (wazīr). He initiated him (akhadha 'alay-hi), and ordered him to go back to Andalusia, saying that he would not let him go if he did not foresee great dangers which were threatening his servants and followers. He said that he ordered him to go only because he feared for his safety. But he was to make his way to Qayrawān as soon as he heard about the occupation of Ifriqiyya by the dā'ī of the Katāma country. This was in fact done by Abū Ja'far al-Baghdādī, and he received various rewards from al-Mahdī, al-Qā'im, and al-Manṣūr which only they could know.

Later on,—adds Ja'far,—there arrived Abū Ja'far al-Jazarī and Ja'far al-Ḥājib surnamed Şu'lūk (my cousin, whom I used to call "brother"), bringing the ladies of al-Mahdī's family to Raqqāda, which at that time was the capital of al-Mahdī after [133] the occupation of Ifriqiyya 1. This gladdened al-Mahdī very much. He was established on his throne, and thus God had fulfilled His promise, despite the opposition of His enemies, and the enemies of His saints.

Praise be to God, the Lord of the worlds!

This is what has reached the knowledge of the humblest slave and servant of our lord and master, the Commander of the Faithful,—the prayers of God be upon him, his forefathers and descendants! These were the circumstances of the departure of al-Mahdī and al-Qā'im from Salamiyya, and their progress until they reached Raqqāda. I heard all this from the humble slave of our lord, Ja'far b. ʿAlī, the Chamberlain,—the mercy of God be upon him,—when he had already forgotten many details by reason of the remoteness of the time, and the many misfortunes that had befallen him.

---

1 Cf. above, p. 209 (p. 123 of the Text), where the re-union of the family is referred to.
Praise be to God, the First and the Last, the Apparent and the Hidden! Prayers be upon the best of those whom He sent to mankind, and upon the noblest of the heirs, Muḥammad, His Prophet and Saint, and on his Trustee ʿAlī, with the Imams his descendants,—on all of them be salutation in the highest degrees!
3. From the *Iftīḥār d-dā'wa wa ʿibtīdāʾ ʿuʾd-dawla*.

(For the work and its author see above, pp. 6-7; for the text see Extract 3.)

1. The Story of the Emigration of al-Mahdī from his Home in the East, and his Arrival in Sijīlmāsa.

[40] When the Imamat came to al-Mahdī, and the Imam who was his predecessor died,—the one who transferred his high office to him (he used to say to him: after my death thou shalt flee far away, meeting with many misfortunes and difficulties),—so, when God had taken him, and al-Mahdī had become the Imam after him, rumours about him spread widely, signs of his advent began to appear, and prophecies concerning him became clear to everyone as about to be fulfilled. He was in (constant) mortal danger from the Abbasids. Many things happened to him,—it would be too long to narrate and explain all of these,—many calamities, predicted to him by his predecessor. He finally left his place, himself, and the Imam, his son, al-Qāʾīm, who (later on) succeeded him. The latter at the time was a small boy, while al-Mahdī himself was a young man. In fulfilment of the true (predictions), he reached Egypt, expecting to proceed to the Yaman. A certain dāʾī (however) preceded him; he went there before him, and upset his plans.₁ He, the dāʾī, came to Abūl-Qāsim, who was in charge of the preaching in the Yaman, trying to seduce him, but found him firm in his loyalty to the Imam. Therefore he left him, departing to his (Ibn Ḥawshab’s) colleague, ʿAli b. al-ʿAzīl, who was residing in one of the districts of the Yaman. He succeeded in winning him over, and making him rebel. Therefore people used to say at

₁ Cf. above, p. 52 sq. The version differs from that of the Sīra of Jaʿfar (114-5) in details. The latter obviously has in view the Ismaili reader, while Qāḍī Nuʿmān addresses it to the general public.
that time: "an ‘Irāqi came to another ‘Irāqi, trying to swindle him, but could not succeed. Then he approached a Yamanite, and deceived him".1

‘Ali b. al-Faḍl ceased to obey the commands of God and His Men (i.e. the Imams), making lawful to his followers things unlawful, rejecting the prescribed forms of worship, and preaching depravity. When all this had become known to all, the man who had seduced him disowned him, acting as is narrated in the story of the cursed Iblīs (cf. Koran, VIII, 50): "he told the man to disobey God, and when he disobeyed, Iblīs said: I have no connection with thee,— I fear God, the Lord of the Worlds". He offered armed resistance to Abūl-Qāsim (Ibn Ḥawshab),— there were many things which it would be too long to relate,— and died in such state of utmost error and sinfulness,— may God give us refuge from similar dejectedness, error, and fall!

All that happened reached the knowledge of the Imam (i.e. al-Mahdī), who did not wish to go to the Yaman while the state of local affairs was such as described, and continued to reside in Egypt, in disguise, posing as a merchant. Meanwhile letters came from Baghdad to the governor of Egypt, giving al-Mahdī’s description, and ordering his arrest. Similar orders came to his deputy (‘āmil). One of the higher officials of the deputy governor was a faithful devotee (an Ismaili). He at once informed al-Mahdī, advising him to conceal himself. The Imam was grateful for his advice, and left Egypt, with his son al-Qā’im, and several slaves, carrying with him many camel loads of property. He bought with his money various goods, concealing cash in these, and travelled in a company of different

1 Apparently this ‘Ali b. al-Faḍl (al-Jayshānī, according to the Sirā of Ja’far, 113–115) is referred to by Tabari (III, 2256, footnote e) under the year 293/905, as leading successful operations against Ṣan‘ā and other centres in the Yaman. It is not stated on whose side he was: al-Mahdī’s, or was fighting against Ibn Ḥawshab. The words of the author: "he attacked Abūl-Qāsim," etc., may refer to this, if Ṣan‘ā was already in the latter’s hands.
people, as an ordinary merchant. Near Ṭāḥūna (i.e. a "mill") brigands attacked the caravan, looting many travellers. Much of what belonged to al-Mahdī was lost. The most important was the loss of the books, which contained certain matters belonging to the wisdom of the Imams.

When (later on) al-Qā'īm bi-amrīl-lāh marched in his first campaign against Egypt, he caught the brigands who had attacked that caravan, seizing their loot, and regaining the original books. About this al-Mahdī used to say:—"Even if this campaign had been undertaken merely to regain these books, this would have been worth while. He was extremely pleased to have them back."

On the day of the raid upon the caravan of al-Mahdī, Abūl-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Ṭāḥūn b. [42] Zakariyā, the brother of Abū 'Abdīl-lāh, was wounded, while accompanying his Master. When the caravan reached Tripoli, the travellers dispersed. Every one saw that they, i.e. al-Mahdī and Abūl-'Abbās, were companions, merchants. Abūl-'Abbās, with some others, went to Qayrawān, with orders from al-Mahdī to join him in the Katāma territory to which he was himself going. There were with him several Katāma tribesmen who had been sent to the Imam before.

When Abūl-'Abbās arrived in Qayrawān, letters containing description of al-Mahdī, and orders to arrest him reached Ziyādatu'l-lāh, after they, (as mentioned above) had missed the party in Egypt. Accordingly, Ziyādatu'l-lāh gave orders to collect information about al-Mahdī; and some of those who were travelling by the same caravan informed him that he had remained in Tripoli. They mentioned that Abūl-'Abbās was one of his associates. He was arrested and tortured, but denied everything, stating that he was a merchant; he was imprisoned, and news about this reached al-Mahdī, who was still in Tripoli. He by chance got hold of a caravan leaving for

1 The corresponding passage in the Sīra of Ja'far (115) is apparently based on these lines.
Qaṣṭilīyya, and left with it. The letter came to the local governor, from Ziyādatu’l-lāh, with his description and orders to seize him. Al-Mahdī, however, succeeded in gaining the favour of the local governor by gifts; the latter therefore replied that the person in question had already left, and had reached Qaṣṭilīyya. Al-Mahdī really reached the place, and spent there the ʿĪd (i.e. one of the two great Muslim holidays).

There were in the same caravan with al-Mahdī different people from several towns in the Maghrib, from Dhaḥb, and Sijilmāsa. The destination of al-Mahdī was the province occupied by Abū ʿAbdīl-lāh. But when he heard that Abū’l-ʿAbbās had been arrested, and that he was known as one of his associates, he became afraid of going (directly) to his destination, because his going there would justify these suspicions, and he (Abū’l-ʿAbbās) would be killed. Therefore he abandoned his intention of joining Abū ʿAbdīl-lāh (at once), and went to Sijilmāsa. Having said his ʿĪd prayers in Qaṣṭilīyya, he called one of his slaves, and said to him: “Verily, my instinct (nafs-ī) and God have told me that I am being searched for”. He ordered the slave to convey [43] to the leader of the caravan that, “Having said our ʿĪd prayers, we must start (immediately), and the more distance we can cover,—the better. If thou findest it possible to go with us at once, then do this”.

The leader of the caravan was much feted by al-Mahdī with presents and gifts. And when his messenger reached him, he said that although this would be extremely disagreeable to the travellers, yet he could not refuse the request of Abū Muḥammad (i.e. al-Mahdī). He struck the signal drum, and started, and others started after him. Next day arrived the messenger from Ziyādatu’l-lāh to the governor of Qaṣṭilīyya, with orders to seize al-Mahdī, but he had already left the province.

---

1 The version of the Sīra differs only in the names of the places. It is quite obvious that Ja’far had his own information, and did not derive it from the Ifṣāḥa.
God helped him, diverting their attempts from him, because He wished that his Mission, and what was written in the Sacred Book, should be complete to his death. He travelled on, reaching Sijilmāsā, where he settled. And every one whose eyes could see al-Mahdī wherever he came, in any city, if the man possessed reason and intelligence, would say of him:—“By God, he is not a merchant: surely, he must be a sultan, or one of the kings” 1. And many of the people of Sijilmāsā used to say the same thing about him. It was his superiority to every one who came in contact with him, the dignity and greatness which God had put into the eye of every one who looked upon him.

At that time the governor of Sijilmāsā was Alīṣa’ b. Midrār. Al-Mahdī treated him generously with presents; therefore he paid him due respect, and treated him with courtesy. After it had been discovered that he had gone there, the letter arrived from Ziyādatu’l-lāh informing the governor that he, al-Mahdī, was the person in whose favour Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh was preaching. This fact completely altered the governor’s attitude towards him. We shall narrate this in due course, if God wishes.


... [44] (Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh) was approaching Sijilmāsā, and the news of his advance reached Alīṣa’ b. Midrār, its governor, concerning his intentions. Ziyādatu’l-lāh had already written to him about al-Mahdī, giving his description, and stating that he was the person in whose favour Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh was preaching. The governor did not pay much attention to this. But when Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh advanced towards the town, he sent someone to ask him, i.e. al-Mahdī, about his descent, his business, and whether Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh’s movement was in his favour. Al-Mahdī admitted his (Alid) descent, which it was impossible to deny, but gave an ambiguous answer concerning Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh,

1 This is incorporated in the Qāḍī’s other work, the Shārḫu’l-akhbār (cf. above, p. 64 sq.).
saying that he had never seen or known him. And it was true
that he had never seen him,—we have already explained the
story of his (Abū 'Abdīl-lāh's) early career. Al-Mahdī insisted
on stating that he was a merchant,—because he was afraid
for his safety.

Finding him unwilling to proceed to Abū 'Abdīl-lāh, and
averse from the idea of entering the territory occupied by him,
the governor accepted as satisfactory his statement concerning
this, but took up his first statement (concerning his descent).
God had put still greater respect for al-Mahdī into his heart,
and admiration into his eyes; therefore he did not cause him
more discomfort than to place him under "domestic arrest",
under a guard. Similarly, he put his son, al-Qā'im bi-amrīl-
lāh, into another house, so that they should remain separated,
and the statements of both of them could be collated. But their
statements were uniform... The governor submitted their
servants to torture, trying to extort confession from them,
but they only repeated what al-Mahdī and his son were saying.

News of this reached Abū 'Abdīl-lāh, perplexing him very
much. He used to say to his followers:—"God shall make
manifest the mission of al-Mahdī by a great victory". He sent
to Alīṣa' b. Midrār several of his servants as messengers, with a
letter, [45] assuring him of safety and kind treatment, and stating
that he advanced for a certain transaction, not for an attack.
He promised to the governor his personal favour, honour, and
gratitude, with strong and sincere assurances. But when the
messengers with his letter arrived, the governor, having learnt
the contents, threw it away, and ordered the execution of the
bearers, so that they were slain.

When the news of this reached Abū 'Abdīl-lāh, he repeated
the attempt, disregarding this act, out of fear of what might
happen to al-Mahdī. He, however, did not refer to him, out of
taqiyyya. But the same thing happened with this second attempt.
The governor was obstinate in his vileness. Abū 'Abdīl-lāh
repeated the attempt for the third time, disregarding his in-
tolerable acts. But God helped and protected his troops, and he approached the town.

The governor came out with his force against the invaders; but it was not long before Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh's cavalry chased them into the city after a short engagement, in which many of the defenders were slain. The night was approaching, and already dusk had fallen. The troops therefore withdrew, and camped where they stood. When night fell, Ibn Midrār escaped, with his nephews and other relatives. Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh and his men spent the night in great anxiety, not knowing what had been done with al-Mahdī. It was impossible for them to enter the town, and they did not know about the flight of the villain until the day dawned, and the notables of the place came out to them, informing them of what had happened. Then they entered the place in which al-Mahdī resided, and took him and al-Qā'im out. There was immense rejoicing amongst the troops, who were almost mad with joy. Two horses were brought for them, and they rode away. Their faithful followers crowded around, and the dā'īs surrounded them. Abū 'Abdi'l-lāh walked before the Imam, repeating:—"This is my Lord, [46] and your Lord, o faithful!" He offered thanks and praise to God, and wept from his great joy. Ultimately the Imam reached the camp, and entered a tent which had been prepared for him. He gave orders to find Alīsa b. Midrār, and a party went out in search.

He stayed in his tent until past noon; then the commander of the camp prepared a place for him. (He came out), and the faithful crowded around him, listening with tears of joy to what he was saying, praising God for His having given them the chance to see him. And al-Mahdī thanked them, recognising their valour, saying that God had helped them greatly, rewarding them for their virtues. He gave them glad tidings of the attainment of complete success in this world and the life after death.

Then the mu'adhdhīns shouted the call to the maghrib prayer. He stood up, and prayed with them, reciting the first (rik'at) with the Fātiḥa, and the sūra ar-Ra'ḍ, and second with the
same Fātiḥa, and the sūra "quil huwa’l-lāh aḥad". Then he completed the prayer, and entered his tent, and the men dispersed ¹.

¹ Details given in the Sīra of Ja’far differ in some essential points. But he himself admits that he was imprisoned at the time, and heard from others the circumstances in which al-Mahdī joined the forces of Abū ‘Abdī’l-lāh. It is quite possible also that he dramatised the story with the view of making his own part more prominent. His version, however, is not incompatible with Qāḍī Nu’mān’s, which is very much condensed, and most probably contains quite reliable information concerning some details.
4. From the 17-th Chapter of the
Zahru’l-ma‘ānī.

(For the author and the work see above, pp. 22, 23;
for the text see Extract 4.)

6. (Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far.)

... [47] Then rose Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far, the Blessed, the Divinely Protected (al-Mubārak al-Maymūn), brought up by his father.

He is the sixth amongst the Imams, just as flesh occupies the sixth place in biology¹, interpreted spiritually, corresponding in his rank with his ancestor, the Prophet of the right guidance, the sixth amongst the great teachers of humanity, the final amongst the great Prophets. ‘Alī the Commander of the Faithful was like his second self (al-khalqu’l-ūkhar), similar to the vegetating, moving, and making to move, animating and reasoning spirit. In a like way Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far was the last of the “perfect” (atimmā‘, i.e. the Imams of the first heptade), and his second self (al-khalqu’l-ūkhar) was his son Muḥammad. He had already come into existence, and the signs of his mission were apparent,—he had the rank of the Qā’im, the Seventh of the great Teachers of humanity, the Spirit of Life.

When the time came to Ismā‘īl to dissemble death, using this ruse against his enemies who were full of hatred, enmity,

¹ Every Imam and Prophet, in this mystic scheme, is symbolically compared with one of the phases in the evolution of the embryo (as mediaeval biology knew it), with a stage in the creation of the world, with one of the seven great Prophets (the Seventh still expected), and with his own predecessors, the Imams. None of these has any connection whatever with the importance or significance of such “parallels”, or the nature of the activities of predecessors. The sixth Imam is thus associated with the sixth prophet, or the sixth phase in the development of the embryo, etc., only because these are the sixth, and not the seventh or fifth. There was obviously very little resemblance between the biography of Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far and that of Muḥammad the Prophet, as between other parallels.
and the ardent desire to extinguish the Light of God,—although God will always preserve His Light as He intended it to be, if He wishes (allusion to Cor. IX, 32),—he, Ismā‘īl, made a will addressed to his father, Ja‘far as-Ṣādiq, the Veracious, the Faithful, so that he should appoint "veils" (hujūb), and one who should be the guardian (mustawda‘) for his son, Muḥammad. It was in conformity with what Hārūn instructed Moses to do, raising a trustee for his son. And Moses appointed Yūsha‘ b. an-Nūn to act as a "protective screen", or "veil" to him. And he (Ja‘far as-Ṣādiq) entrusted him, i.e. Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, to Maymūn b. Ghaylān b. Bīdār b. Mīhrān b. Salmān al-Fārsī. The Imam educated him (Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl), and guarded him with the help of Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ, while he was still three years of age. And Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ was the trustee (mustawda‘) of the high position of his son. He was from the

1 This is an obvious fake: no reliable historical information is available about his posterity. And it would be surprising if such an ardent devotee as Salmān were followed by a series of descendants bearing non-Muslim names. This seems to have been overdone by the authors of the "genealogy". In reality the obscure and mythical figure of Salmān (either a Persian Christian or a Jew) belongs entirely to the series of "the first men who" (cf. above, pp. 76 and 127). He is the mythical prototype of Persian Shi‘ites (cf. "Enc. of Islam", IV, 116, article of G. Levi Della Vida; J. Horovitz, in "Der Islam", 1922, pp. 178-183; and L. Massignon, "Salmān Pāk et les Prémices Spirituelles de l’Islam Iranien", Tours, 1934, in the series of the Société des Études Iraniennes, No. 7).

2 This is an esoteric revelation. As may be seen further on, cf. p. 236, the dreaded arch-enemy who pursued the "infant" Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, was the brother of his father, Mūsā b. Ja‘far, who, most probably was much younger than himself, perhaps by as much as eight years.

3 In connection with the expression mustawda‘ amri-hi it would do no harm to emphasise again what is mentioned above, on p. 154. Mustawda‘ by no means always implies the "temporary Imam", and is an ordinary participle, meaning "entrusted with". A complete parallel to this particular case is found in the end of the extract from this work, the Zahrul-ma‘ānī, given here, in the story of Jawdhar. He obviously could not be a temporary Imam while the real Imam, his master, was living. He was mustawda‘, i.e. entrusted with only the knowledge of the secret bequest of the Imam concerning his successor. Most probably special secrecy was introduced in order to have a way out in case of the necessity to alter the nomination. He was acting as a kind of "notary public", guarding an important, but secret will of his master. Mustawda‘ amri-hi therefore obviously means nothing beyond the "trusted man who knew the real status of the Imam-designate", which was kept in secret under the circumstances, and which he had to reveal on a proper occasion to others. It is quite obvious that there could not be room for a temporary
descendants of Salmān, and the latter was a descendant of Isaac son of Jacob, who were all hereditary "trustees", those who were preaching and devoutly serving religion.

Ismā‘īl was under the protection of his father, Imam Ja‘far, just as Muḥammad, his grandfather, was under the protection of the Lord of [48] the time, Abū Ṭālib. Ismā‘īl dissembled illness, and people began to visit him, from near and far. His father, however, watched the visitors, and noted their presence. When the death of Ismā‘īl had taken place (in appearance), he was kept lying covered for three days, while Imam Ja‘far noted the presence of those Hashimites and others who came to express their condolence. On the third day he gave orders to take the body to the grave, and, unveiling the face of the deceased, he asked those present whether they were sure that this was his late son Ismā‘īl; they testified to this. And he again recorded those present. Then he buried Ismā‘īl, and later wrote to Abū‘d-Dawānīq (i.e. the Abbasid caliph al-Mansūr, notorious for his parsimony, 136–158/754–775), informing him of what had taken place. His informers also submitted their reports to the same effect, gladdening him, relieving his anxiety as to what otherwise might worry and upset him...

After some time had passed, Ismā‘īl appeared in Baṣra. People rushed to him, shouting that Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far had risen

Imam while Ja‘far as-Ṣādiq was still living. The story is an obvious fiction, and is built out of the ideas which became current much later on.

1 Many indications found in sectarian literature suggest that probably about the middle or the end of the fourth/tenth c., for some strange reason, the myth of Salmān received great prominence: he is a Divine being in the Ummu‘l-kitāb, in the texts of the Druzes, in the Nusayri beliefs; he figures in many extremist prophetic akhbār, etc. It would be extremely interesting to trace his evolution in Sufic speculations, his part as a link in Sufic spiritual genealogies. Later on the myth continues to flourish for some time, but already in the tenth/sixteenth c. in Persia it is losing its great importance. The theory of the "hereditary trustees", ḥujjats in later Ismailism, in Persia and India, is a post-Fatimid development. There is apparently no trace of it in earlier works.

2 What follows is obviously one of those fairy tales typical of "secret" -esoteric works, "reserved for the trusted and fully initiated few". This version apparently is the most elaborate on record, although by itself the story of the strange precautions of Imam Ja‘far at the burial of his son Ismā‘īl seems to be really old, and is often quoted.
from the dead. He passed an old man, a Shi‘ite, who was a paralytic, in his shop, a "client" of his father. (On seeing him) the old man said:—"O, son of the daughter of the Apostle of God, take me by hand, so that God may take thy hand!"—"Ismā‘īl" looked at him, tapped on his back with his blessed hand, and the old man's back became straight, cured of his illness. People saw this; and "Ismā‘īl" disappeared 1.

When it was reported to Abū’d-Dawānīq, he remarked that in truth the descendants of Abū Kabsha 2 were great tricksters. He then summoned Imam Ja‘far; and when the latter arrived, he started to reproach him; but as-Sādiq produced a list of those who were present at the death, and many of whom were also present at the time. They testified the fact. This appeased the caliph’s wrath, and Imam Ja‘far was left in peace.

[49] What Ismā‘īl had shown by his death, and later on by his reappearance after a time, was similar to what his grand-father, the Great Teacher and the Apostle of God, Muḥammad, had done when ‘Alī produced (a document) to the adversary when the latter reproached him with (illegally) taking possession of a certain property . . . (follow other parallels from tradition and Biblical lore). Ismā‘īl manifested his miracle to manifest the miracle of the Divine omnipotence to people, in his own case, and the fact that the "Word of God" (i.e. the Imamat) will always remain with his pure descendants from the house of the Prophet, until the Wisdom of God becomes complete, the mercy of God reaches mankind, His proofs become obvious, and His bounty triumphs.

Such are the great miracles which reason and logic are unable to comprehend; they are performed by the First Reason, which is the Primal Principle of Creation (al-Iḥdā‘u‘l-awwal),

---

1 This anecdote is obviously taken from the Aṣrāru‘n-nuṣṣāqā’ (cf. the Texts, p. 104), where it is narrated with more detail. It is by no means improbable that such an instance of a faith cure may really have happened, through an old devotee taking some one for the deceased on account of his great likeness.

2 Obviously a contemptuous surname of ‘Alī.
to reveal Divine omnipotence to the people, to those capable of knowing God, and to leave in confusion the enemies of the friends of God, those who oppose them and are hostile to them. Only those who know can understand these; and the promise of God does not concern the associates of the oppressors (cf. Cor., II, 118).

After this Imam Ja‘far appointed his son Mūsā b. Ja‘far as a “veil” for Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, over (‘alā) the one whom he appointed as a bāb (or chief dā‘ī) to him, namely Maymūn, his “screen” and trustee 1. Mūsā b. Ja‘far taught ta‘wīl and ḥaqā‘iq 2; he collected round him many Shi‘ites who had missed the right road, and were following the mere name, instead of the real object, being content with words instead of meaning. Imam Ja‘far concealed the residence of his grandson, Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, appointing Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ, and his son ‘Abdu‘l-lāh as his guardians, in secrecy from every one except for a few trusted and knowing ones, to whom God had given special devotion to him. Maymūn and his son then began to search for dār hijra 3 for Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, appointing devoted dā‘īs, who could lead him [50] there, while the community was split in their allegiance. The righteous preached in favour of the real Imam, and those who were specially privileged, knew him personally. They were strictly ordered to keep what they knew a profound secret, and they did this, fearing their enemies.

A certain section believed in the revocability of the Imam's appointment. Others believed that the Imam was Mūsā b.

---

1 Thus it appears that there were two “screens” for Muhammad b. Ismā‘īl: the chief dā‘ī Maymūn, and his own uncle Mūsā, who was the mustawda‘ Imam, and, at the same time, his bitter enemy and rival.
2 Mūsā b. Ja‘far was eighteen at the time of his father's death, and could hardly have been an expert lecturer on theology. Apparently there are no proofs of his being such even at a ripe age: in the Ithna‘-ashāri tradition he figures very rarely as an author either for akhbār or for theosophic theories.
3 In all available accounts of Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl’s migrations there is no reference to either of these worthies. The dār hijra is the “country of refuge”, according to the theory based on the example of the Prophet, who emigrated to Medina. The story probably is a concoction.
Ja'far, whom in reality his father appointed only as a "screen" for his, Ismā'il's, son after the former's death. Another section thought that the Imam was 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Ja'far, surnamed al-Aflah (al-Aftah). But he predeceased his father, and left no posterity,— thus their claims were futile. And another branch recognised Muḥammad b. Ja'far. Thus the community split after the disappearance of Ismā'il b. Ja'far, and superstitious beliefs began to spread among them 1.

When the time came to Imam Ja'far to leave this world, and he died, he had previously, in order to placate Abū'd-Dawāniq, made a will addressed to his dignitaries, for the protection of his real successor, and of the community of his faithful followers ... (Follows a parallel with 'Ali) ... 

Mūsā b. Ja'far 2 occupied the place of his father, and the majority of the Shi'ite community recognised him; the ideas of the mob favoured him. Similarly, every one amongst the sons of Imam Ja'far claimed the Imamat for himself, while the real "man of God" was concealed in disguise from his enemies, and those who supported them. The sons of Imam Ja'far upheld the sharī'at and ta'wil, with those true believers amongst their followers who recognised the rights of the real "Man of God".

(As we have seen) the futility of the claims of 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Ja'far became clear with the extinction of his posterity. Muḥammad b. Ja'far [51] drew his sword in the sanctuary of Mekka, interrupting the ceremony of the ḥajj, which God has prescribed; and he was overcome by his enemy. A rope was hung on his neck, and he was taken through many towns, shown on the minbars of mosques, repudiating his claims, acknowledging his error, openly and publicly 3. But the real Imam never

1 This is another borrowing from the Aṣrāru'n-nuṭaqā', much condensed.
2 Here he is called Mūsā b. Ja'far ar-Riḍā. The surname ar-Riḍā, as is known, really belongs to his son, 'Ali. He himself was surnamed al-Kāzīm. This is obviously a lapsus calami.
3 This is both found in the Aṣrāru'n-nuṭaqā', and in the Sharḥu'l-akhbār.
repudiates the "word of God" and His mystery, even at the threat of death, as did Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī; otherwise he conceals himself, as did the pure ones from the posterity of ʿAlī.

As regards Mūsā, his father, Imam Jaʿfar, appointed him only as a "screen" for the real successor, so that the latter's position might be concealed from his enemies, and in order that they should not know his privileged position. But Mūsā began to claim to be a real Imam, himself and his descendants. They said that the Prophet had given the indication that the Mahdi was to be the 12-th after ʿAlī. Therefore they made Jaʿfar the sixth, and Mūsā the first in the second half-dozen, inventing impious beliefs and fantastic stories. They declared as untrue the words of the Prophet about the "sun rising from the West", or that "the banner of the Mahdi, when he rises under it, will never be turned". But God Himself explained what He meant in the case of the Lord of the Command, and the real Successor, who performed real miracles, and explained the signs of God, al-Mahdi bīl-lāh, who rose in the West. He rose as the Prophet had risen, slaughtering those who opposed him by military force. Thus the rubbish was thrown away, and the earth was lit with the Light of its Lord, in full splendour and glory. All that was invented by Mūsā, and what he falsely claimed, became futile, and the Light of God appeared in the Imams who descended from Ismāʿīl b. Jaʿfar.

Once Imam al-Muʿīzz was asked about wahi, the Divine inspiration. He replied:—"It means Divine [52] indication, which shines forth by Divine Light". Jaʿfar b. Maṣūriʾl-Yaman said:—"The Imamate neither changes, nor can be transferred (to another line), continuing in the course of long periods of time. Individual Imams change and go to the other world and the place of bliss, by the disappearance of their mortal self. But their progeny remains in their stead, and the Imamate continues, because the Imamate is transferred, but cannot be discontinued. The Imams succeed by transfer and connection of the successors from the ancestors, just as the Throne of God
changes, but is imperishable' (follows a Biblical parallel of Noah and his sons)...

When the progeny of 'Ali was discontinued in the line of Mūsā and his descendants, it was proved that they never possessed the robe of honour of this priceless rank, because the Prophet said:—'I leave with you the Book of God and my progeny, the descendants of my house, so that you may hold fast, in order never to err after my death. They shall never separate until both return to the "pool" (ḥawḍ)'. And the "pool" here means the Qā'īm, whose chain of the Imamat can never be interrupted. And it is mentioned that 'Ali, the Commander of the Faithful, will give to his followers from the community of the Prophet of God to drink water from this "pool" on the day of Resurrection. It is he who will give to every one of his supporters his share of the true knowledge, and repay his debts. He is the real "pool" of prophetship, of Apostleship, trusteeship and Imamat. He is the rallying centre of the pious to whom God has given His miracles. He is the possessor of the real Truth and the excellent knowledge which will spread on his return to the people of the time, after having been hidden in appearance. Such are the signs and proofs of his book (sifr) concerning the successors who will succeed each other by the manifestation of miracles and the revelation of mystical knowledge, by the guidance of their followers towards the light from the darkness, [53] and their salvation from being drowned in the flood of error and doubt. Whoever wishes may believe, and whoever prefers it may disbelieve.

Thus the Imamat of Ismā'īl b. Ja'far has been proved; and the "Word of God" has remained in his successors, in every Imam in his posterity, whether manifest or hidden. And all that the mischiefmakers claimed has been in vain, and the unfortunate deceivers have failed. God wishes to make His

1 Obviously an allusion to Ka' thar, a pool in Paradise, which is connected with 'Ali.
Light complete, even if this displeases the unbelievers (cf. Coran, IX, 32).

When Muhammad b. Ismā‘īl grew up, and suspicions about him amongst the oppressors had been distracted by the measures taken by his grandfather (Imam Ja‘far), he became the Imam.

7. (Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl).

Then rose to the Imamat Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, the Seventh amongst the Imams, and their Qā‘im, corresponding to his forefather ‘Alī, the Commander of the Faithful, completing this spiritual cycle, the final creation, which is the soul of things, their spirit, and their meaning. He brought to the completion the first spiritual cycle (dawr), and after him begins the second cycle.

He was in Medina when he rose to the protection of the religion of God, despatched his dārīs, spread his doctrine, and ordered his missionaries to search for the "land of refuge" (dār hijra) in which to seek safety. He flourished during the reign of ar-Rashīd (the Abbasid caliph, 170–193/786–809) ¹. When the latter heard about Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, whose propaganda had spread by that time, he gave orders to arrest him, and bring him to the court. The Imam meanwhile had built in his house an underground passage in which he used to conceal himself from his enemies ². So, when a messenger arrived from ar-Rashīd with his demands, the Imam entered his subterranean refuge, and remained there. The agents of the caliph searched for him, but could not find him. They returned to ar-Rashīd, and submitted a report on their actions.

¹ This is extremely doubtful. Information which seems to be more reliable, from the earliest sources, indicates that he was born most probably soon after 120/738. Thus by the date of the succession of Hārūn he must have been in his sixth decade. Most probably this is based on the legends in the style of the Arabian Nights, related by Sayyid-nā Idrīs in his 'Uyunu‘l-akhbār (cf. my "Isma‘ilis and Qarmatians", JBBRAS, 1940, pp. 60-61).

² It is indeed remarkable, how invariably all sorts of "underground passages", refuges, etc., figure in stories of Isma‘ili eminent men: in the Sīra it is a hidden treasury, in the stories of ‘Abdān, of Zakrūya b. Mahdūya, etc., it is a refuge, and so forth.
When the excitement had subsided, the Imam started on his journey in search of the "land of refuge", leaving behind in Medina [54] his two sons who were not expected to succeed him as the Imams, Ismā‘īl and Ja‘far. He himself went to Nīshāpūr, in disguise, concealing himself from his enemies. He then continued to move about between these two places (?) and Daylam. He married in Nīshāpūr a woman, by whom he had a son, called ‘Abdu’l-lāh, surnamed ar-Raḍī. This Imam ‘Abdu’l-lāh was generally known as ‘Aṭṭār (druggist), which surname he assumed as a protection for his real position, and as a precaution.

He appointed for him (i.e. his son and heir) several hijābs, or "veils", ordering them all, and the hujjats, to bear one and the

1 This is apparently the only place in which these two sons of the Imam are mentioned in Ismaili works. Ithna‘-ashari works on genealogy, as the ‘Umdatul-Tillib, mention their numerous posterity.

2 Cf. "Ismailis and Qarmatians", JBBRAS, 1940, pp. 61–67. It is indeed instructive to note that Sayyid-nā Idris in his ‘Uyunul-akhbār narrates that Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl went to Nihāwand (which seems more likely), but in his Zahru‘l-ma‘ānī, tells the "fully initiated and trusted few" that he, the Imam, went to Nīshāpūr. We can only infer that for him, a Yamanite Arab, with no connection with Persia, over two thousand miles away, both places were the same, or equally "abstract". We have no facts or documents to prove or reject his story; but there is much improbability in the Nīshāpūr version of the Imam’s route: towards the end of the second/eighth c. it was the seat of the governors of Khorasan (later on of the Tahirida), who supported orthodox theologians. It was an important centre on the direct road between Baghdad and the Eastern Provinces, a small place (before it had grown immensely under the Saljuqs), in which it would hardly have been easy to live in disguise.

3 Most probably a mistake, bayna-humā for bayna-hā.

4 This is obviously Sayyid-nā’s fantasy, based on vague recollections regarding the famous Persian Sufic poet, Farīdu’d-din ‘Aṭṭār of Nīshāpūr, whose mausoleum still forms a conspicuous landmark in the environs. He died some time between 618 and 627/1221–1230, and although his name,— Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr Ibrāhīm,— hardly suggests that he was a Shi‘ite, nevertheless there is a strong tradition amongst the Persian Ismailis that he was an Ismaili, and some of his works,— unless they are wrongly attributed to him,— bear clear traces of some Ismaili connections. It is interesting that nothing like this is mentioned in the ‘Uyunul-akhbār. There are indications in the latter work to the effect that Sayyid-nā Idris came across a Nizārī Ismaili, supposed to be from Samarqand, apparently an ignorant man. Perhaps all these statements are based on information derived from him.

5 All this sounds very inconvincing: apparently this is a retrospective application of methods introduced at a much later stage. The Ismaili propaganda organisation probably became developed only about a century later.
same name as that of the (future) Imam. So that those of them who were accepting the oath of allegiance on behalf of the Imam from the neophytes would name as such one of the "veils", and suspicions, if roused, should be distracted upon him, from the real Master of the Religion. This practice became established with all three "Concealed Imams". This is why the dā'īs in different localities give different names to these three Imams, so that each version is quite different from the other 1.

Thus Imam Muhammad started his propaganda, and the sword (of his enemies) did not reach him until the predestined hour of his death had struck. He spread religious knowledge, explained esoteric doctrines, and revealed to the chosen ones the "great mystery". Many revelations of esoteric ideas, miracles, Divine signs, proofs of his high mission, and signs of his position were revealed by him,—so much of these as never was revealed by any Imam before him. And there never was (or will be) any other Imam like himself, because he was the Seventh Imam, who possessed the authority, was not concealed, had the Divine Glory and Light, and was the Interpreter of the Hidden Knowledge 2. He was the crown of the cycle to which he belonged.

---

1 This is a very interesting allusion to the fact that even as late as in the ninth/fifteenth c. there was a difference between different branches of the Ismailis in respect of the names of the three "concealed Imams". The explanation of the fact does not sound very convincing, of course. Much more probable would be the suggestion that this difference was due to the continuance of the original tradition in the different Shi'ite sects which in the course of time became amalgamated with Ismailism, by acceptance of their Imams. We can easily believe that for the fanatical and conservative mentality of the devotees it would be easier to "graft" al-Mahdi and his descendants, the Fatimid caliphs, on the line which they were accustomed to regard as the true Imams, rather than to accept the correct Fatimid genealogy by proclaiming their own earlier version incorrect, and the Imams previously recognised as untrue. It is highly probable that as soon as the news of al-Mahdi's triumph had spread, many sectarian Shi'ite communities joined Ismailism, seeing its truth so tangibly proved. Some, perhaps, became amalgamated in a body. Therefore it is quite likely that the extraordinary variety of al-Mahdi's genealogies is by no means entirely due to the inventions and theories of historians or heresiologists. Many, especially, most probably, those connecting the Fatimids with the Ithna-'ashari Imams, must be the creation of popular sectarian religious conservatism.

2 Compare this account of his activities, and the story found in the Uyunu'l-akhbār ("Ismailis and Qarmatians", 61–67). There is not the
He was the Utmost Limit of the final laws of the final shari‘at (ghāyatu‘sh-sharā‘i‘i‘i‘l-makhtūma),\(^1\) arranged according to the rank of the believers (ḥudūd), whose minds could comprehend each stage\(^2\).

He is the Fully Authoritative (potential) Qā‘im (al-Qā‘im bi‘l-quwwa), the Lord of the Primary Period of Revelation, because the Real “practicing” Qā‘im (bi‘l-fi‘l) is the Universal One, the Lord of the last period of revelation, and of the “last Commotion”, the Qā‘im [55] of the Great Qiyyāmat.

Qiyāmats (= revolutions, uprisings) are numerous (in the spiritual life of the individual). The first of these is the rank of the “restrained” ma‘dhūn (al-ma‘dhūnu‘l-makfūf), then the “authorised” ma‘dhūn (mu‘laq), then the “trusted” dā‘i, then the “authorised” dā‘i, then the “preaching” (i) dā‘i, then the ḥujjat, and their crown,— the bāb\(^3\). All such spiritual ranks are (spiritual) risings, in which each stands by what is given to him to know of the special ideas, intended to distinguish between the material things which are within his vision. And all these “uprisings” are ultimately crowned with the Qā‘im of the Great Revolution (qiyyāmat), and this position in the individual spiritual world is symbolised by the Imam, who is the Qā‘im of the Qiyyāmat, and the Ultimate Goal of all goals. Each spiritual rank, which we have named above, symbolises the Qā‘im with regard to that which is just below him, until all these ultimately are under the Qā‘im of the Great Uprising, the Lord of the Great Commotion, under whom are all positions.

---

\(^1\) Obviously the hypothetical “final” shari‘at which the Seventh Nāṭiq was expected to reveal. Further on the author tries to find a way out from an obviously impossible and undesirable situation.

\(^2\) This is one of the instances of the concessions made by Sayyid-nā Idris to non-Ismaili ideas about the Isma‘ili doctrine, namely a vague admission of the “degrees of initiation”.

\(^3\) All this, of course, is the theorising of Sayyid-nā Idris himself, and probably has nothing to do with Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il’s own teachings, which remain unknown, as no written testimony is preserved.
He is the Ultimate Sacred Goal for them, comprising all, from the first three thousand years which were the end of the cycle of *kashf* (i.e. full revelation), to the period of Muḥammad the Prophet.

It was to him (Muḥammad b. Ismāʻīl) that the Commander of the Faithful ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib alluded in his expression: “after (?) (or — in ?) ten thousand years a person shall rise as a symbol of this great position, uniting in himself all the highest spiritual ranks (*maqāmāt*) of all periods, in the scope of His organising wisdom. He shall be the one who will leave behind him the Tenth Reason 1 after his death, and this will rise as the factor bringing the universe into order, within his own sphere of activities.” He (i.e. Muḥammad b. Ismāʻīl) was named the Seventh Nātiq (i.e. great teacher of humanity), because he rose to preach by the Command of God, incorporating in himself all the virtues which are to be crowned in him. He is neither the Revealer of the final religion (*mutilm*), nor the Apostle of God (*rasūl*) 2, but he is in a class by himself, of a unique rank. This work has already been completed, and order introduced.

Muḥammad b. Ismāʻīl has been chosen for this task of the organisation of the (Ismaili propaganda) ranks during [56] the (impending) period of occultation (*satur*), because if thou takest

---

1 *Yakhlufu* or *yakhalifu*? The tenth emanation of the Absolute, *al-'Aqlu'l-fa'āl*, is associated with the lowest celestial sphere and the moon, which may be described as the complex of the intelligible laws of nature immediately governing life on the earth. What apparently the sentence implies is the ideal state of complete harmony, which will be attained as the result of the activities of the chain of the Imams, crowned by the Qā'im, when humanity, and the world, will live as a smoothly running ideal mechanism.

2 Obviously a concession to the all-Islamic dogma of the Prophet Muḥammad being the last and final one. If the latter is also a *Nātiq*, in fact the Sixth *Nātiq*, then the Seventh also should be a *Rasūl* or Apostle. And just a few lines above it was solemnly stated that he was the revealer of *ash-shari'atu'l-makhṭūma*. Sayyid-nā Idris obviously tries here, as on many other occasions, to avoid falling between two stools, without any convincing result. This is one of the examples of that mystic vision, in which two contradictory statements are both admitted as true at one and the same time. In such cases the student is required to possess strong confidence in the honesty of the author to treat his statements seriously, and not simply to take it for ordinary foolishness.
the number of Adam, his Wasi, and the Imams of his period, the last of them will be a Natiq, i.e. Noah (and so on, other Biblical parallels, ending with) Jesus, his Wasi, and Imams of his period; the last was Muhammad the Prophet, who has inherited from them their high offices. And he is a Natiq, and the Final Natiq.

His Wasi had a singular position, and if thou taketh the number of the Imams of his dawr, thou wilt see that Muhammad b. Isma‘il is the Seventh. And the Seventh (Imam) possesses potential (rights to be a Natiq), quawat, above his predecessors. For this reason he has become a Natiq, the final member of the heptade, and the Qaim. He cancels the shari‘at of the Lord of the Sixth Cycle by explaining its hidden meaning, and revealing its purposes 1.

This was mentioned by Imam al-Mu‘izz li-dini‘l-lah in connection with the prayers prescribed for Saturday 2: “Blessings be upon the true Qaim, the real Natiq, the ninth from his forefather, the Apostle of God, the eighth from his progenitor, the Kavthar (i.e. 'Ali), the seventh in the line of his ancestors the (pure) Imams, the Seventh amongst the Apostles of God, beginning with Adam, the Seventh Wasi, beginning with Seth, and the Seventh Imam of the Prophet’s house”. He continues in this strain, and then he,— may his blessings be upon us!— ('ala-ynā salāmu-hu) adds: “the One by Whom the Universe has been ennobled, glorified, blessed, and crowned with the crown of creation, the One by Whose service (qiya‘) the law of Muhammad the Prophet has been purified (‘atilat) 3, and with whose help the earth shall be filled with justice and equity even as it has been

---

1 If Muhammad b. Isma‘il was the one who superseded or altered (nasikh) the shari‘at of the sixth dawr, by “explaining its hidden meaning”, — then logically we can expect that all the Imams, before and after him, were also seventh natiqs, because such was also their mission. Such a helpless struggle to reconcile superstitious beliefs with a philosophical theory is typical of Ismaili esoterism, one of its “great mysteries”.


3 The original meaning of ‘atilat is “to be divested of ornaments, bare”. This obviously implies making it divested of superfluous elements, obscuring its original substance, as explained further on. Perhaps the reading ‘uttilat would be better?
filled with injustice and oppression. And the One about whom the Prophet of God said: the Mahdī will be from amongst our descendants, of my family, a man with big hooked nose, and black eyes. He will fill the earth (etc.). He will be the translator and interpreter of the Coran, explaining its message, and making it clear; he will be the Qā'im of the Day of the Qiyyāmat, of the separation (of souls from bodies), of the quickening of the bones, and resurrection (taghābun)” 1. These are the words of al-Mu‘izz, explaining the position of Muḥammad [57] b. Ismā‘īl, describing his exceptional and exalted position, because he was the Seventh of the first heptade of the Imams (atimmā’), explaining his real position. The Seventh Imam possesses authority (or potentialities, quusawa) which his predecessors do not possess. For this reason (he), being the Seventh Nāṭiq, was potentially the Qā'im. And the same potentialities which belonged to him, also belonged to the Seventh of the second heptade (khulafā’), i.e. to al-Mu‘izz li-dinil-lah, the seventh of two heptades, and the fourth in the (first) four (of the Fatimid caliphs). And a similar position belonged to Imam at-Ṭayyib, as whatever has happened shall be repeated again, and what has become known, shall become known again,—there is nothing new under the sun. Heptades of the Imams will continue to come into existence, and the seventh of these will always be the most powerful (aqwā), the wisest, the most learned, and eloquent (and so forth), of them, until all this ends in the final Qiyyām, or (final) revelation, manifestation of the Divine power, and broadcasting of the hidden knowledge. The Revelation (kashf) is the unveiling of the original (eternal) ideas from all that obscures them, and their communication to those who deserve to know them. Whoever has reached such a degree of perfection, he is in the possession of the “cycle of revelation” (dawru’l-kashf); by this fact he has already recognised

---

1 Yawmu’t-taghābun, i.e. the day of resurrection (lit. of swindling) is so named because the believers shall as if were swindling the unbelievers, by occupying the place in Paradise which they expected to have for themselves.
the Qā‘im, and the latter will reveal to him the virtue (of piety) and the punishment (for impiety). He will then have reached what was promised to him, having seen the Master of his dawr by his mental vision, not by the physical eye-sight,—and by clear revelation (kashf), in which there is nothing reserved (satr).

Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl did not abolish anything of the formal worship and law (ẓāhir) of the shari‘at of Muḥammad the Prophet; on the contrary, he strengthened it, and ordered every one to act according to it. Such was the practice of (all) the pure Imams, his descendants and successors, who uphold it, who stand fast by the obligatory prescriptions, and carefully observe what has been ordered, without the slightest neglect, overlooking, or simplification of these. What Imam al-Mu‘izz meant by the expression “the shari‘at of Muḥammad was purified (‘uffilat) by his mission”, refers to his explaining its meaning, and revealing and clarifying its hidden points (asrār). By this he expelled for his followers and supporters different elementary (ẓāhir) beliefs which contained traces either of ta‘īl (divesting the Deity of Its attributes), or tashbīh (anthropomorphism), concerning the True Creator, or making the idea of angels similar to that of human beings, and attributing bodies to them, although they are spiritual conceptions; and (generally) this kind of (perverse) beliefs in things which exist in this [58] world. He, Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, purified such beliefs, explaining their real purpose, by revealing their mystical values, and making manifest correct explanation, based on the allegorical interpretation (ta‘wil), through which true belief in the unity of God can be attained. He, God, is free from the properties belonging to His creations; and angels are known as abstract conceptions, or as a difference between the reward for good and punishment for bad, not as what they are believed to be by those who profess that they are material beings.

This is similar to the acts of the Commander of the Faithful ‘Alī who was the first who rose (Qā‘im) to reveal the inner meaning of religion, explaining its precious and sacred hidden
sense. The same was also done by the earlier Imams, as it was their mission to do this, and their eternal purpose in guarding these principles. They rose with full authority to (help) the erring mortals from whom the real meaning (of religion) is hidden and concealed. And they actually helped those who are capable to understand the real truth, revealing to them thoroughly what they tried to acquire in religious knowledge. Verily, brother, they did not possess the necessary wisdom before this. Learn about the virtues of the Men of God, the Imams, and receive what they give thee, being grateful for this, seizing fast the “anchor of salvation” (‘urwatu’l-wuthqā), or the saving rope (ḥablul-matīn)!


When Imam Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl was about to die, he handed over the earth to his son, ‘Abdu’l-lāh ar-Raḍī, making him his successor and trustee. He was the first of the three “concealed” Imams, by the order of God and His inspiration 1. He received his office from his father, and succeeded him in his high position. He corresponds to the seed (salāla) in the embryonal evolution of the human body, and to Ādam in the first dawr of Prophets. He is the first [59] of the second heptade of the Imams (khulafā’), and corresponds with al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī, the first of the atimmā’ (i.e. the Imams of the first heptade).

He concealed himself, his hijābs, and other dignitaries. His ḥijjat and ḥijāb was ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Maymūn 2. The Imam did not show any trace of his existence to any one, or given any in-

---

1 This is the usual formula which is repeated further on in connection with every subsequent Imam, obviously taken from the Asrāru’n-Nuṣūqā’.
2 If Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl really flourished under Hārūn ar-Raḥīd (170-193/786-809), and if, as appears from the story, ‘Abdu’l-lāh was born in his reign, there is little reason to doubt that ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Maymūn, who flourished at the time of Imam Ja’far, must have been already long dead. And it is significant that he is never mentioned again, neither in this story, nor elsewhere. Nor is there any trace of him in such works as the Iṣḥāq, Strat of Ja’far, etc. This matter has already been discussed above, cf. p. 128 sq.
dication of himself, so that nobody knew his hiding place except for the "bearers of the Throne of God", who stand by the Divine order, the guardians of His creation, and the perfect amongst his, the Imam's bujjats, appointed for propaganda. His occultation was like the darkest night, and this happened because the forces of evil received ascendancy over the Truth, as the tyrannical Abbasid government was then strong, and fears and dangers were great. On account of the strictness of his concealment, when his dignitaries were accepting on his behalf the oath of allegiance from neophytes, they used to tell them that they should obey the Lord of the time (waliyyul-'asr), without pronouncing the name of the Imam. Only when the neophyte had advanced in religious learning, and received promotion to a higher position, they would write for him the name of the hijabs, never revealing, however, the name of the Imam, or alluding to it by a sign or expression, until he had achieved the position of a trusted and independent worker (iftaq). Only then would he be found deserving of the knowledge of the Imam’s name, by his request and his merit. This practice was in use through the whole period of the occultation of the Imams, until the Sun of Truth rose from the West, lighting up the horizon of religion for every one who seized fast the “anchor of salvation”. (Follow lines and lines of hollow lyrical eloquence in the same strain)...

Dā‘ī Muḥammad b. Zayd, in his book al-Balāgh (end of the fourth/tenth c., cf. Guide, No. 109) quotes a story about Imam Ja‘far, who said to his intimate associates:— “Strive to reach the sky gradually (by a ladder), and you will find what you want”. On being asked what was such a ladder, he explained that it was progress in learning, by which one advances higher and higher in it, and approaches it by his increasing knowledge and understanding... (follow discussions of the hudūd, found in every book on ḥaqīq, etc., having no connection with the subject)...

[60] When his term of life ended, and propaganda in his favour came to an end, he appointed his son Aḥmad at-Taqī,
and ascended to the holy abodes which rise in the sphere of angels.


Thus rose, by the order of God and His inspiration, Imam Aḥmad b. ‘Abdīl-lāh at-Taqī, the second amongst the khulafā’ (i.e. the Imams of the second heptade). His hujjat was ‘Abdu’l-lāh b. Maymūn. This Imam corresponded in biology to the embryo stage, and in history to Noah, the second Nāṭiq, and to his ancestor, Imam al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī, the second amongst the Imams of the first heptade (atimmā’). He taught humanity as to the plain and esoteric subjects, and compiled The Treatises (i.e. the Encyclopaedia of the Ikhwānu’s-safā), according to the four principal classes of human knowledge (follow the well known details of this work, but nothing is said about the circumstances of its compilation)...

The fundamental principles and institutions of the shari‘at have been strengthened and reinforced by parallels from the physical and psychical world. Arabs and non-Arabs have been enlightened by this work, so that the community hurried to those dignitaries of the Imam who were preaching the sciences treated in it, while the True Lord remained in concealment. This he did because al-Ma‘mūn (the seventh Abbāsid caliph, 198–218/813–833) collected astrologers, lavishing upon them a great wealth, and ordering them to compile a zīj, i.e. astronomical tables, which should be associated with his name ¹, while those who ought really to have possessed supreme authority (wulātu’l-amr, i.e. the Imams) were living in disguise and concealment. The caliph was sure that the (leading) descendants of Fāṭima

¹ It is true that al-Ma‘mūn was much interested in astrology and astronomy, and even built an observatory in Baghdad. But it is difficult to see which Zīj is here referred to: perhaps the tables compiled by Ahmad b. ‘Abdīl-lāh al-Ḥasib al-Marwazi (cf. Brockelmann G. d. A. L., I, 221). Accusations of impiety and the propaganda of heretical doctrines against al-Ma‘mūn do not belong to Ismaīlī circles only: they are chiefly based on reminiscences of his Mu’tazilite leanings, and his encouragement of the doctrines such as of the Coran being created, and others.
had all perished, and that no one remained to uphold the principles of law, or to explain its application. He wished to uproot the *shari‘at* of Muhammad the Prophet, and replace it with (law based on) astrology. While (as he thought) astrology teaches about the beginning and end of the world, is based on mathematics, and the reaction to good and evil (*‘iqāb wa thawāb*), the religion of the Prophet, as every one may see, has no foundation. Thus, if this is true, those who treated ‘Ali as they did, were [61] not free in their actions. And if they cannot bear responsibility for what they have done, it would be obviously wrong to blame others for such things as slaying descendants of the Prophet, as all the blood of Qurayshites was shed by predestination ¹.

It was when the Possessor of the Right (i.e. Imam Aḥmad) was informed about this theory that he compiled his Encyclopaedia, revealing in it four philosophical disciplines, which his enemies could not do. With the help of this the pillars of the *shari‘at* have been strengthened, and its laws have become enforced by the support of parallels, and allusions to the real meaning, which neither could be neglected, nor regarded as impossible.

When the work was completed, and was published by the dignitaries (= *dā‘is*), it met with universal approval and fame. The caliph saw what he could obtain of this book, and was completely overwhelmed and perturbed. He handed it to his astrologers who found it beyond their powers, revealing to them things which they did not know. It introduced to them Almagest ², in which it even made some improvement, while they did not properly know anything of it. At this stage al-Ma‘mūn

---

¹ This is an echo of the disputes between the different Islamic schools in the time of al-Ma‘mūn concerning the freedom of will and predestination.

² The great work of Ptolemy on astronomy, in an Arabic translation. It would indeed be interesting to verify how far this claim to have introduced it to Islamic students really is justified. The first translation, from Syriac, apparently belongs to al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf b. Maṭar al-Ḥāsib, who completed it in 214/829. Cf. Brock. I, 203.
received information that the Owner of the rightful Authority
(i.e. the Imam) was living, as the earth can never remain without
the Proof (of God), i.e. the Imam. Therefore he altered his
original intentions, by which he had expected to have something
to boast of before the Imam and the Alids, and summoned
qādīs and faqīhs from different towns. He also handed over to
the descendants of Fatima the oasis of Fadak and the "heights"
(? — al-‘Awālī, — apparently the name of an adjacent locality).
He argued with the faqīhs on the matter, and disagreed with
them. Then he gave orders to proclaim in all towns that he
summoned all the people who were descended from Fatima.
Some answered the summons, relying on his exhibition of justice
in the case of Fadak and al-‘Awālī. He made judicial inquiry
into the claims submitted to him in connection with this property,
and declared it as proved that Fadak and al-‘Awālī were a gift,
granted by the Prophet to Fāṭima1... Some Fatimids answered
his summons, and amongst them ‘Alī b. Mūsā ar-Riḍā, the
(second) of the (second) six of the Twelvers' Imams. [Follows
the well known story that, being disappointed by the philo-
sophical equipment of ar-Riḍā, al-Ma’mūn, nevertheless, declared
his intentions to abdicate in his favour, etc. Then comes a
learned Ismaīlī dā‘ī, who impresses him; for the purpose of
shielding the Imam he confesses that he is the Imam himself,
and is executed by the caliph. As ‘Alī ar-Riḍā was dead by
203/818, all this is nothing but a tissue of anachronisms: Imam
Aḥmad most probably had not yet been born, and the Ency-
clopaedia of the Ikhwānul-ṣafā did not exist. But it is all
extremely typical of those "highly secret truths, reserved for the
few highly initiated and trusted", which are what esoteric works
usually contain when they touch on historical matters].

... This miracle (of Imam Aḥmad) was similar to the
miracle of the second Nāṭiq (i.e. Noah), which he performed
(by building the Ark), when in his time the Deluge happened in

1 Concerning the story of Fadak cf. W. Ivanow, Kalami Pir, Bombay,
1935, pp. 35-36.
order to destroy the enemies of God, and take them to the abode of humiliation. Miracles of the men [62] of God are great things, the holiest and the most blessed Divine signs, because the Light of Saints comes from the First Light, from which all other lights are derived; the ways of reason are barred from its comprehension. The ultimate limit which the wise in their effort to know it would strive to attain, lies beyond their knowledge of the veil, which, in fact, is the nearest to them, and which is the highest limit of their penetration. This (in the sphere of Ismailli organisation) is the chief dā'ī, the bāb, whom those dā'īs who are under him can know. And this is a different thing from the rank of the Highest Proof, who is the top of the spiritual ladder, and its final goal. Such is the highest universal evolutionary (or: Salsal-like) rank.

Similarly Jābir b. Zayd al-Ju‘fī ¹ relates from Imam al-Bāqir:—“I went to Our Lord, and, on entering, saw in his hand a rosary made of (dried) olives, while he himself was saying: “Glory be to God, for everything from whence I have taken the “veil”, a “door” was opened to me. And over everything at the door of which I was knocking, a “veil” appeared. Glory be to the One who helps and guides those who search after Him, and directs those who speed in the search for His light”. Said I to myself: “Verily, thou art the Great One”. And the Imam lifted his face towards me, and said: “Verily, great is the One Who has been appointed by the Great One, and all-knowing is the One who has been appointed by the All-knowing, by His blessing emanating from Him to me. I am a slave of God, and it was Divinely revealed to me to bid you not to worship any deity except for God the Great”. I said to myself: “This is a veil,—why does he conceal himself?” The Imam turned his face to

¹ Jābir b. Zayd al-Ju‘fī is one of the favourite rāwîs of various mystic and esoteric speculations of Shi‘ite extremists, associated with Imam Muḥammad al-Bāqir. It is difficult to ascertain his real history. He apparently flourished in the beginning of the second/eighth c. Cf. a similar transfiguration vision narrated in the Ummu‘ī-kitāb and the Ghāyatu‘l-mawālid, and note 1 on p. 117 above.
me, and I saw bright light shining and radiating from it,—so much that my eyes could not stand it, and I began to faint. And the Imam uttered:—"This is one of the miracles that some Saints can work". After this he said: "Should I show thee more, Jābir?" And I replied: "No, this is enough for me". And he said: "I will announce to thee, Jābir, the glad tidings: God has purified thee so that His shadow might descend upon thee, by the manifestation of His holy "gate" to thee, the holy Salsal. O, Jābir, Salmān is one of us, a member of the family of the Prophet. His zāhir, i.e. as he appears to the eye of an ordinary mortal, is as the outside of a door (which is shut); but his nature (bāṭīn) is derived from the light of the expression "ar-Rahmān [63] ar-Raḥīm" (i.e. from the formula of the baṣmala in the Coran). When thy vision is screened from thy (lower) self, thy (better) self shall become visible in the shining of his light. Thou hast seen as much as thou couldst stand, and every one shall witness as much as it has been revealed to thee. They also shall say and preach what was said and preached through thee. And we shall be behind all this, all shall be visible to us. If thou couldst bear from Him as much as thou bearest from us, we shall become for thee what we are from Him (i.e. if thou couldst realise as much the Glory of God as thou recognisest our Imamat, thou shalt realise our real mystic nature?). Then hasten to discover the true relation between us and thyself. Then what thou canst not comprehend shall dawn upon thee, if God please".

This is what Imam al-Bāqir has revealed about the great holiness of the "Greatest Veil" which is the highest, the holiest,

1 Salsal is the mystic name of Salmān al-Fārisi. Cf. L. Massignon "Salmān Pāk" (Tours, 1934), p. 35. This name is also used in the Umμu'ul-kitāb. This particular passage is interesting as leaving no doubts as to the identity of these two names: Salmān = Salsal.

2 Cf. Massingnon, op. cit., 16-17. This is apparently a very early Shi'ite hadīth.

3 Here al-ābār. The idea is somewhat Sufic. It is difficult to see whether such speculations really belong to the fourth/tenth c., to which many, if not all esoteric revelations of Imam Muḥammad al-Bāqir belong, or to a much later time.
and the nearest to God of all "veils". And if such is the "veil", what then should be the thing "veiled", if eyes are unable to behold it, and mental vision fails to understand it? This is why it is commanded:—"When Light dawns, prostrate before Him" 1. If so, and the Imams are such, then it is no wonder that wisdom which is spread by them can enlighten even the wisest, and reason trembles, being unable to follow them with knowledge based on causation.

Thus the (chief) miracle of the second Imam of the second heptade was great, and the road to its appreciation straight. And he was the Glorious, Aḥmad, glorified by what the Great One ('Azīm) has given him, by how He kept him concealed and hidden; from his Light other lights were lit, and by his wisdom became known God, the Perfect, Faithgiving, Helper, Great, the Ruler.

When his death approached, and he was about to depart from this world, he handed over his authority to his son al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad, making him the abode of his light, holy and great.


Then rose Imam al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad al-Muqtadā al-Hādī (= "whose example should be followed", and "guiding"). He was the third of the khulajfā' (i.e. Imams of the second heptade), corresponding with the blood condensation ('alaqa) in the physical evolution of human body, occupying the same position as Abraham [64] amongst prophets, and Imam Zaynu'l-ʿābidīn amongst the early Imams, atimmā', as regards the events which took place under him, the necessity of disguise, manifestation of miracles foreshadowing the nearing manifestation of the fourth Imam 2, and his emigration.

---

2 Note this deliberately ambiguous expression: "the fourth Imam". Does Sayyid-nā Idrīs mean here the fourth Imam of the second heptade, or the fourth concealed Imam?
His *ḥujjat* was ʿĀhmād, surnamed al-Ḥakīm, a descendant of Imam Ḥusayn, to whom ‘Abdul-lāh b. Maymūn handed over his position. He was a *ḥujjat* of great rank and standing, the highest amongst the “veils” and “names”, the most skilled and exalted.¹

From him, i.e. the Imam, appeared many revelations to his associates and devotees as it was in the case of Imam Zaynu’l-ʿābidīn, who made (the well known) revelation to Jābir b. ‘Abdīl-lāh al-Anṣārī in the vision of Mīm, Fā, Ḥā, Ṣīn, returning then to the form of ‘Ayn ². In doing this, he asked Jābir:—“Does thy reason stand this? Such are the “shirts”, in all times and periods: shirts are changing, but I am not. And the Prophets and Imams are “temples of Light” through which the Truth shines in Its manifestation”.

On this subject the ḍā’ī Ja’far b. Mansūr, in his *Kitābu’l-Kashf* ³, says: “‘ayn (i.e. ‘Ali) is great, the ultimate limit of all limits. By it indications are made of the Omnipotent Creator, to whom no properties similar to those of His creations can be predicated, nor pollution, nor change in time; but He Himself makes time change, and pass through different periods and epochs, and is the Truth of all eternity. Great is He, the source of eternity, One Who predestines the most intimate motives by which acts

---

¹ According to the anti-Ismaili sources, ‘Abdul-lāh b. Maymūn was succeeded by his own sōn Aḥmad. And now it appears that this Ahmad was a descendant of ‘Ali. Apparently he has nothing to do with Abū ‘Ali al-Ḥakīm, i.e. Ḥusayn’s brother, Muḥammad b. Ahmad, mentioned in the first book of al-ʿAzhār (cf. above, p. 31). Which is true, and which is false? Most probably both statements are equally baseless, and are pure fiction intended to reconcile the “generally known facts” about the Fatimids genealogy with the silence of Ismaili sources. ‘Abdul-lāh b. Maymūn by this time should have been nearly 200 years old.

² This refers to the transfiguration miracle, narrated in the *Ghāyatul-mawālid*, exactly in the same way as it appears in the *Ummul-kīlāb*, in which Muḥammad al-Bāqīr appears to the vision of Jābir ibn ‘Abdīl-lāh al-Anṣārī in the form of Muḥammad, Fāṭima, Hasan, Ḥusayn, and ‘Ali. It is strange that here the miracle is attributed to Zaynu’l-ʿābidīn. Most probably this is unceremonious adjustment of tradition to the author’s own theorising. What were these “many revelations” by al-Ḥusayn b. Ahmad is neither explained here, nor in the ‘Uṣūnul-akībd. ³

³ Cf. *Guide*, No. 50. An edition of it is being prepared by Prof. R. Strothmann.
are decided. He always remains the Something that humanity knows, at any period and epoch, and praises in all His "houses", differing from all forms created by Him, unique in the perfection of His guidance, One in the eyes of those who can know Him, living in the hearts of those who praise Him, glory be to Him, or even those who know (His) "veil" only. He is clad in Glory [65] and Perfection, which belong to the furthest limit of hopes and causes. God the All-high has nothing to do with those who recognise any other Deity beside Him, and worship another god, or a mortal person whom He has not appointed (as His Lieutenant), or recognise a lord whom he has not sent to men". This is what he (Ja'far b. Mansur) says.

The "Great 'ayn" is the First Reason, the Supreme Creative Substance (al-Ibdā' al-Afḍal), which makes itself manifested (to the human perception) in the most perfect guise, while, at the same time, it is deeply hidden at the bottom of every creation, so much that none has the mental power to comprehend it. The 'ayn is great because God the All-high said (Cor., XLIII, 3):—"Verily it is in the "Mother of Books" with Us, high and wise ('Aliyyun Ḥakīmun")'. And whosoever has inherited his (i.e. 'Alli's) position, which is unique, the same applies to him also. And it is inevitable that every high position should have a holy "veil"; and his must be the highest and the most glorious "proof", ḥujjat, which is the most exalted of all such ḥujjats, standing just below the greatest rank of the Imamat, which is the limit of all religious ranks (ḥudūd), the ultimate goal of creation, and the manifestation of the Divine bounty and generosity. Do then understand, brother, the nature of the ḥijāb, its properties and functions, by learning all that thou canst collect about it, in order that thou mayest be saved, entering the abode of bliss with the saints of God.

To return now to the story of Imam al-Ḥusayn al-Muqtadā. He rose to complete the task of his father, his teachings, and institutions. He epitomised the Encyclopaedia into a useful
and instructive Synopsis (al-Jāmi‘a)\(^1\). He also sent his dā‘īs (everywhere), and they had a great success in converting many peoples to the true religion, because the appearance of the promised Mahdī was drawing nearer. He (Imam Ḥusayn) sent to the Yaman al-Ḥusayn b. al-Faraḥ b. Ḥawshab (who later on became known as) Manṣūr.

Astrologers and horoscopists were foretelling the early advent of the Mahdī, gladdening the masses with their tidings of the early arrival of his authority. And soon kings and enemies (of the Imam) perceived the change clearly, so that many of them, as the king of Ṣan‘ā and some others, [66] gave up their authority\(^2\).

[Follows a very important, but very obscure passage]: Soon after this the Imam, the Master of the Epoch (al-Imām Ṣāḥibu‘z-zamān,— other than al-Ḥusayn?) proceeded to his emigration towards the West, while al-Mahdī was with him (under his protection, fi kanfī-hi). He died (azhar an-naqlat) while travelling, appointing (before his death) as his trustee his own brother, Sa‘īdu’l-khayr, as the guardian and trustee for his son (al-Mahdī? or al-Qā‘im?). Sa‘īdu’l-khayr brought him up (whom? — al-Mahdī, or al-Qā‘im?): He (Sa‘īd), by the order of the defunct Imam, was called the Imam, screening the real Man of God (Waliyyu‘l-lāh), and thus concealing his high position from his own followers until the time of his manifestation arrived, and his light rose. He (who,— the late Imam, or Sa‘īdu’l-khayr?) ordered the dā‘īs to do this, as also to call him (whom? — Sa‘īdu’l-khayr himself, or al-Mahdī, or al-Qā‘im?) — “the Rising Sun”\(^3\), in order to divert the unwelcome attention of the enemies from the (real) Man of God, his (whose?) son (or descendant? — waladī-hi) al-Qā‘im, who had to be the Imam after him (whom? — the defunct Imam, or Sa‘īdu’l-khayr?).

---

\(^1\) This obviously refers to the Jāmi‘a, an epitome of the Encyclopaedia of Ikhwānu‘l-safā. Cf. above, p. 36, note 2.

\(^2\) Obviously an allusion to some detail in the conquest of the Yaman.

\(^3\) In all Ismaili works the epithet “Rising Sun” is applied to al-Mahdī.
Nobody knew about all this, knowing nothing about the mystery of God concerning him (whom?), except for the sincerest devotees, trusted, pure, good, and capable of knowing (and keeping) the mystery of God concerning His Men, realising the importance of what has been revealed to them by His trusted servants (ṣfiyā’). And at last came the time of the Advent. The dā’īs intensified their propaganda, (openly) pointing out (to the masses) whom they were ordered to point out, as their Master (whom?). They explained his rights (faqīl) to his followers, guided them to him, and spread the glad tidings that the Sun was rising from its place of setting, and promising that this was going to happen in the near future: it was to appear from behind the veils that had so far screened it.

11. (Al-Mahdī bi’l-lāh).

Then rose al-Mahdī bi’l-lāh. Propaganda in his favour spread everywhere, and his opponents received clear indications (of his success), taking necessary action. He manifested himself in Sijilmāsa, with the help of Abū ‘Abdīl-lāh, who was in charge of the propaganda in the West,— may God sanctify his spirit! With him was Imam al-Qā‘im bi-amrīl-lāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abdīl-lāh, the true Imam (al-mustaḥaqq) after him on the throne of the caliphs, and in whose favour the propaganda was carried on by all the dā’īs (al-awliyā’). And al-Mahdī was his (al-Qā‘im’s) tutor, pointing his high office to his followers.

[67] Al-Mahdī bi’l-lāh was the fourth amongst the khulafa’ (i.e. the Imams of the second ḥeptade). His position was similar

---

1 As mentioned above (cf. p. 50 sq.), this is obviously an intentionally obscured paraphrase of the passage from the Ghāyatul-’ma’ālid, dealing with the matter. Without it the passage seems to be quite unintelligible. It is yet another instance of the “truth reserved for the trusted few” in esoteric works.

2 Here the word Imām is obviously added to avoid misunderstanding, and to show that the words al-Qā‘im, etc., are the name, not the technical term.

3 Again the same faint implication of al-Qā‘im being the main figure, while al-Mahdī, as mentioned in the next sentence, was “his guardian and tutor”. Nevertheless, the author proceeds to treat al-Mahdī on the same lines as other Imams.
to that of the "clot of blood" (madghat) in the physical evolution of man. He corresponded to his ancestor al-Bāqir, and to the Prophet Moses, the owner of the miraculous staff, the one who worked miracles and produced Divine signs. His miracles were obvious, and his signs clear. He also corresponded to the sun, in the universe, the fourth of the powers, which exercises its influence upon what is higher and what is lower than itself in the natural world.

He stood firmly by what was predicted and promised by his great ancestor, Muḥammad the Seal of the Prophets, the Lord of the Saints, who announced his advent on many occasions, and in numerous indications. Thus he said that about the end of the third century after his Hijra "the sun shall rise from the place at which it sets." And in fact the sun really rose, and its miracles spread.

He was the greatest Veil, the holiest and greatest "Gate", the bearer of what God has entrusted to him of His trust, which he handed over to al-Qā'im bi-amri'l-lāh, his son, which was to belong to him on the completion of his education and studies, as he was his heir, just as 'Alī was with regard to Muḥammad the Apostle of God ¹.

His miracles and signs became manifested, and his dā'īs explained his rights (faḍl). His propaganda appeared in the Yaman, and Maghrib; and intense sorrow disappeared from the hearts of the Muslims when they knew about the approach of his enthronement. When on his way to the Maghrib he reached Egypt, and had acquired fame on his way in different countries, which became filled with talk and rumours about him, astrologers came to the governor of Egypt. He ordered them to prepare a horoscope of different towns in order to discover in which province (jazīra), and in which town he was residing. When

¹ This again clearly implies that al-Mahdī was a temporary "trustee" of the sacred "deposit", belonging to al-Qā'im. All this may be an example of the mystic reasoning in which two mutually excluding statements are both accepted as true.
the Man of God learnt of this, he gave orders to fill a large copper basin with water, set in the middle of it a chair, [68] and sat on it. The astrologers then said to the governor: "Verily, he (al-Mahdī), is in a town with copper walls, in a citadel, surrounded by water". But the governor persisted in commanding horoscopes of different towns, and ultimately traced him. He was seized, together with al-Qā'īm, and thrown into prison 1.

When they were brought into the prison, they found there many people, already confined for a long time. Then al-Mahdī asked them, whether they wanted to get out with him. The people began to sneer, making signs to each other, and said that they wanted to go with him to Syria, but he was referring to something impossible. Thereupon al-Mahdī stepped towards the door, struck it off, took a piece of charcoal, and drew on the door the outlines of a boat. Having completed this, he invited those who wished to escape to take a seat on the door. He sat there with his son, and all the others, except for one, who disbelieved all this. And then he saw the door going up into the air, floating in it; it fell, and broke its base, and landed on the Nile. News of this spread, and those who disbelieved him, were disappointed. The people gazed at the door floating on the Nile, and became certain that the expected Mahdī, who was predicted to them, had arrived. Rumours of this spread, but his enemies left him in peace.

He went to Sijilmāsa, and then to Qayrawān and Raqqāda, accepting the oath of allegiance from converts, who were very numerous. His manifestation at Sijilmāsa took place with the help of his dā'ī, Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh, may God have mercy on him! The latter remained there for some time, until his own brother Abū’l-‘Abbās insinuated himself into his favours, and made him commit an error. He declared that al-Mahdī was not the Mahdī. Abū ‘Abdi’l-lāh ash-Shī‘ī began to come into the

1 This and the subsequent miracle are a valuable addition to the already large collection of secret matters to be confided only to the trusted and fully initiated ones, for whom such esoteric works are intended.
presence of al-Mahdī with his shirt turned the wrong side, for [69] three days in succession, without realising this, preoccupied with his plot against the Man of God, whom he opposed and deceived. May God give us refuge from doing evil after good, and conceiving doubt after sincere faith! Or from apostasy after devotion! We pray Him rather to send us death while we still remain sincerely faithful to Him...

... Then al-Mahdī summoned Abū ‘Abdī’l-lāh ash-Shi‘i, and executed him. But after his death he forgave him, and prayed for him, never undoing what he had done soundly before falling into error. He executed with him his brother Abū’l-‘Abbās, who had become very conceited, and was heading obstinately towards the same thing as Iblīs had done. He took from him his rank in the da‘wat, completely disowned him, informing all the people of this, and of the fact that he had confessed to having committed an obvious error, losing for himself the advantages of this world and the next, by associating with the mischiefmakers.

Thereafter he gave orders to build Mahdiyya 1, and when he had completed it, and made it ready for occupation, he transferred thither his household, making it the dār hijra, i.e. refuge, for al-Qā‘im bi’l-lāh, the Commander of the Faithful. He then ordered someone to shoot an arrow thence, and the arrow fell in the place which he indicated, and al-Mahdī gave orders to build a mosque (muṣallā), saying:—"As far as here will reach the Dajjāl (Antichrist), Mukhliṣ b. Kaydād, may God curse him". And he added, turning towards a Shi‘īte, called Mūsā b. Aḥmad: "O! Mūsā, to-day I feel sure of the safety of the Fatimid women (?)". At that time the accursed enemy of God, Mukhliṣ b. Kaydād, had just been born in the country of Sudan, in the place called Kūkwā (or Kawkawā?).

Al-Mahdī energetically organised his propaganda, and his dā‘īs worked in many countries. [70] The earth became

1 A suburb of Qayrawān, which was later on abandoned.
illuminated with the Light of its Lord, and the lights of God began to come out from behind their screens. He appointed (as his successor) Muḥammad al-Qāʾim bi-amriʾl-lāh, the Commander of the Faithful, instructing his missionaries to proclaim his obvious rights; and he returned to him his trust (amānat), and handed over to him his rank (rubā). He returned to al-Qaʾim the deposit which was entrusted to him by God (waḍīʿat), giving his (whose?) other sons their proper share in it. Thus he deposited the rightful property with its real owner, returning it to its legitimate repository, for the sake of the principle according to which there can be only one Man of God (tawḥīdan li-Waliyyīʾl-lāh), in recognition of his exalted position. In doing this he followed the example of his ancestor, Muḥammad the Muṣṭafā, who appointed as his trustee ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib on the day of Ghadīr Khumm, when his soul gave him a warning of approaching death, and the day of his resting in peace approached. Similarly, al-Qāʾim bi-amriʾl-lāh was the Light of God shining from behind the greatest Veil, and the proof of his high mission was that the Arabs were thrown into commotion by his claims (faḍli-hi). The dāʾīs approached him (obviously al-Qaʾim), and he informed them that al-Mahdī biʾl-lāh was the most excellent example to them with regard to himself.

Al-Mahdī biʾl-lāh accumulated many supplies in Mahdiyya, fortified it, provided it with money and a garrison, which occupied it. He had a slave, called Jawdhar, who was brought

---

1 The appointment of al-Qāʾim as the successor of al-Mahdī (obviously as a measure to insure the continuation of the dynasty in case of a successful attempt on al-Mahdī's life) was made immediately after the liquidation of the conspiracy of Abū 'Abdīʾl-lāh ash-Shīʿī in 298/911. What amānat al-Mahdī returned to al-Qaʾim, and how he surrendered his ruba (= Imamat?), is not explained, but there is little doubt that this refers to the secret wisdom of the Alids. We see that after this act he still ruled undisputed for 24 years, in perfect agreement with al-Qaʾim. And although al-Mahdī had several other sons, there is no mention of any intrigue on their part. Cf. also p. 265.

2 All this again clearly alludes to the difference in the status of al-Mahdī and al-Qaʾim, the latter occupying a higher position.

3 Cf. above, p. 11 sq. As stated further on, p. 265, he died on his way to the newly founded Cairo, in 363/974.
up in the principles of purity and piety, of following the right example of his masters, and their guidance, living a very pious life similar to their own, never forgetting his humble position with regard to them. He was entrusted with finances and superintending the affairs of the palace of al-Mahdī. The latter entrusted all this to him, knowing his perfect piety and devotion in his desire to be clean before the face of God at any moment.

It is narrated that once he was sitting there when one of the servants of the palace [71] went into the presence of al-Mahdī, and then came out, telling him that he had received orders to satisfy the requests of certain people, and referring them to him, Jawdhar. He added that the Lord said to him:—"Go now, may God bless thee". The man came out frowning, and when Jawdhar looked at him, he did not approve of his attitude, and asked what was the matter. He replied:—"I hoped that our Lord would grant something to my request. But I received nothing from him". Jawdhar said to him: "Verily, the blessing that thou hast received from him, and which he invoked on thee is greater than anything in this frail world". The man replied:—"I wanted something more substantial than a blessing". Said Jawdhar:—"And what about selling me this blessing, given to thee by our Lord, for ten gold coins?" The man agreed at once. Whereupon Jawdhar counted him out ten gold coins, demanding from him a formal receipt, for the lawful sale, and handing over the blessing, without the right to cancel the transaction, or its intention, finally, and without any reservation. Thus Jawdhar received what he had bought, and they parted completely satisfied with the deal. Next morning al-Mahdī summoned Jawdhar, asked him about this, and he narrated it. Then the Imam said:—"May the blessing of God be in thee and with thee". And he gave him 100 mithqāls of gold, tenfold of what he paid.1 This his prayer and blessing had a permanent effect on Jawdhar, and he served after al-Mahdī also al-Qāʾim, al-Manṣūr, and al-Muʿizz.

1 This anecdote is taken from the first part of the Sirat Jawdhar.
He travelled with the latter when he went to the East (i.e. Egypt), and died on his way there.

When the laws of the rightly guiding da‘wat (peace of God be upon its Master!) became strengthened in Mahdiyya, and those who were concealing themselves in the cave of religious disguise could come out into the open, there came the day of the death and ended the life of Imam al-Mahdî bi‘l-lâh. He handed over his dignity to his son al-Qâ‘îm, and the sacred trust (wa‘dî‘at wa‘ amânât), which was deposited with him. Then he died, departing to his Lord. [72]

When al-Qâ‘îm wanted to bury him in a side room of his palace, none was present with him at the side of the grave when he had to deposit there the body of al-Mahdi, except for Jawdhar, to whom he said:— "Verily, it is unlawful for an Imam to bury his predecessor without raising a witness for himself. Thus this is unlawful to me also, without such a witness (hujjat), and I have selected thee, in preference to everybody for revealing him". And he recited the āyat of the Coran (XXXIII, 72):— "Verily, we offered the deposit to the heavens, and earth, and hills, and they refused to accept it",— to the end of the verse.

Then he said:— "Come near me". And when Jawdhar came near, he ordered to him to stretch his hand, while Jawdhar was trembling with fear. And the Imam said:— "Verily, we accept from thee the oath of allegiance to God, and the firm promise, that thou wilt keep it concealed (‘an-nî — on my behalf?) what I shall show thee and reveal to thee". Jawdhar replied: "Yes, my Lord, may God bless thee!" Then the Imam said:— "My son Ismâ‘îl, surnamed al-Manṣûr, is my witness (hujjat) and my heir apparent: know his position and rights". Jawdhar duly concealed his secret statement and order, until the time came when God wished this to become public. Then al-Qâ‘îm buried al-Mahdî.

1 Obviously in 363/974.
2 This is also taken from the beginning of the Sirat Jawdhar.
Jawdhar was in the service of the Imams, and devoutly worked for them, as to a certain extent is related in the book of (his secretary) Manṣūr, who described in it his life and service with the four Imams (i.e. Sīrat Jawdhar). Whoever wants to read it, it is well-known and famous.

There is no strength and power except in God, and there is no Imam or hujjat except by His help (ta‘yīd). There is no power for us except in sticking fast to His proof on the earth. And there is no power or strength for us except in God, the High, the Great (al-‘Alīyyu‘l-‘Azīm)! [73]


Then rose the Imam Who ariseth, Muḥammad Abū’l-Qāsim — the prayers of God be upon him, and His blessings and best praises! He was the fifth of the khulafā’ (i.e. the Imams of the second heptade), corresponding with the bones (in the physical evolution of human body), with his ancestor Imam aṣ-Ṣādiq, the fifth of the atimmā’, and the Messiah Jesus son of Mary, the Spirit of God, the Reviver of the dead, and the Purifier of the blind and leprous. He was the Root of Light (aṣlu’n-Nūr), and the second of the Manifest Imams, corresponding with the Commander of the Faithful ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalib, in that he rose after the Prophet Muḥammad, and in what passed over to him, point by point.1 He was the repository of the mystery of God, and His “Word”, remaining in his (i.e. the Prophet’s) progeny, till the day of the Resurrection (according to the well-known hadīth).

The Commander of the Faithful ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalib was the first of those occupying the greatest position, during the period of Muḥammad. And so was Imam al-Qā‘im bi-amri’l-lāh the first qa‘im who rose after al-Mahdī bi’l-lāh. He was endowed with great rights (faḍl), and exalted position, which the majority of learned theologians could not even comprehend. Nobody

---

1 The expression aṣlu’n-Nūr (the real Light ?), and the comparison of the position of al-Qā‘im and al-Mahdī with that of ‘Alī and the Prophet again alludes to the difference in their standing.
knew his real religious position in all its implications (*bi-ḥaṣiqati-hi*), except for the Imam al-Mahdī bi’l-lāh, and the Imams from his progeny, just as nobody knew the real position of the Commander of the Faithful ‘Alī except the Apostle of God, and the Imams from his house.

Jābir b. ‘Abdī’l-lāh al-Anṣārī narrates from Imam Zaynu’l-‘ābidīn, who ordered to him to tell of the appearance of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib to him in his Luminous Substance (*bi’n-nūrāniyyat*). He said: “I was sitting once in the presence of the Commander of the Faithful ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, when there entered Salmān and Jundab,—may God be satisfied with them! They greeted the Amīr, and sat down. ‘Alī returned their greetings, and said:—By my life, verily this (knowledge) is obligatory in respect of every true believer, because a slave of God [74] will not become perfect in his faith until he recognises myself in my (real) Luminous Substance. If he only knows me in this my present form, this is only that in which God tests his heart as to the strength of his faith, and examines his mind. He, the faithful, can only by this become one seeing what he wants to know. The one who fails is he who doubts, and is obsessed by doubts. O, Salmān, Jundab had said to thee this hour:—“Let us go, and ask him (i.e. ‘Alī), about knowing him in his (real) Luminous Substance”. And he (Salmān) said: “Very well, let it be so! Let him inform us about his Luminous Substance, and the knowledge of God”.

‘Alī continued:—You have been only ordered to worship God, in all sincerity towards Him, according to the faith of the *hanīfs*, offering prayers, paying *zakāt*,—such is the religion of the *qiyyāmat*. He (God) means (by this) that the true believers are ordered to profess the oneness of God (*tawḥīd*), and this implies absolute sincerity in obedience to Him. The expression “*hanīfs*” means the acceptance of the Prophetic mission of Muḥammad, because he is the Lord of the *hanīfs*.¹ The expression “offer

¹ As is known, there is much uncertainty about the real meaning of the term *hanīf*, so often used in the Koran. Muslim theologians treat it as
prayers” refers to my walāyat, i.e. sympathy with my claims. Whoever supports these, offers the prayer, as is said in the Koran (II, 42):— “Seek aid with patience and prayer, though it is a hard thing save for the humble”. But God the All-high does not say: both these are hard, because the majority of men accept the Prophetic mission of Muḥammad, but only a few are firm in their affection (walāyat) to me,— only those who are “humble”. And similarly He said (XXII, 44): “a deserted well and lofty palace”. The “palace” here alludes to the Prophet, and the “well” to myself: by God, they have deserted allegiance to me (walāyat-i)! And the expression “pay zakāt” symbolises the allegiance to the Imams from my descendants. This is (the real) zakāt: the one who pays it, follows the religion of the qiyāmat, as I shall explain to you, o, Salmān and Jundab!”

“Muḥammad and myself are One Light, from the Light of God. God has ordered this Light to split into two halves, and said to one half: “Be Muḥammad”, and to the other:— “Be ‘Alī”. This is why [75] the Prophet said:— “‘Alī is from me, and I am from ‘Alī. Nobody can act on my behalf except ‘Alī”.

“O, Salmān and Jundab,— thus Muḥammad has become the Prophet of God, al-Muṣṭafā, and I have become his trustee, al-Murtada. He, Muḥammad, has become the Teacher (Nāṭiq), and I have become the Silent (Ṣāmit); he uttered a warning, and I guide the people. Muḥammad has become the Master of Paradise, and I have become the Master of Hell, saying to it: “That is thine, and this is mine”. Muḥammad has become the lord of mercy, and I have become the lord of terror (rajfa, commotion); he has brought Divine indications (dalālāt), and I have brought miraculous proofs (āyāt). Muḥammad has become the Seal of the Prophets, and I have become the Seal of the Trustees. I have destroyed the earlier generations (qurūn), I am the “Great Message” (an-Nabā’u’l-‘Azīm), in which they were at variance.

denoting the follower of the (hypothetic) “religion of Abraham”. It obviously was an Aramaic word, applied to the followers of a religious sect in Arabia.
Muḥammad took up preaching, and I took up the sword. I am the Command of God, Who makes the spirit (rūḥ) descend by His order upon any of His slaves to whom He pleases to send it (XL, 15). And the authority (amr) is from the Spirit of God, which is not given except to the Prophet and his Trustee. To whomsoever God gives of His Spirit, He makes him different from ordinary men, exalting him above ordinary mortals, and endowing him with supreme authority, so that he can kill and bring back to life, and know what has happened and what is going to happen, by such Spirit, and possess the knowledge of what is in the Heaven; he can ascend there, and again descend upon the earth." ¹

"O, Salmān and Jundab, Muḥammad has become (oral) mention, and I have become writing (al-kitāb), as God Himself has said (LXV, 11):— "God hath sent unto you a Word, an Apostle". And also (XXI, 10):— "We have sent unto you a Book in which there is warning for you". Muḥammad is the Testimony of God to His creation, and I am his proof (ḥujjat) whom God has raised; and He has given to me what He never gave to any one. As God commanded (V, 71): "O, Apostle, deliver the message that was sent down to thee from thy Lord; but if thou wouldst not deliver it, thy Apostleship shall not be accomplished. And God shall defend thee from the people". [76]

"God promised to me, and accepted my oath of allegiance. I am the "Guarded Table" (al-Lawḥu'l-mahfūz), as God has revealed to me what is in it. O, Salmān and Jundab! Muḥammad is the chapter "Ya-Sīn", and I am the chapter "al-Qur'ānu'l-hakīm" (both are expressions at the beginning of the XXXVI-th chapter). Muḥammad is the letter n (mīn), and I am the Pen (galam); he is Tā-hā, and I am "al-Qur'ān" (expressions at the

¹ All this obviously belongs to a very late phase of Shi'ite speculation, not earlier than the fourth/tenth c. The contrast between the Prophet as the manifestation of the Rahmān attributes of God, and 'Ali's of the Qahhār and Jabbār attributes, is known to Persian Sufism. "The sun is the source of light, but it also blinds one who tries to look directly at it",—as this mystical conception is usually explained.
beginning of several chapters of the Coran). He is the yellow ruby, and I am a red ruby. And there is no difference between myself and Muḥammad: I am Muḥammad, and Muḥammad is I, I am from him, and he is from me. As God said (LV, 19-20):—"He has let loose the two seas that meet together; between them is a barrier they cannot pass". Muḥammad is the greatest benefaction of God, and I am the best benefaction of God, as He said (LV, 21): "Then which of your Lord’s bounties will ye twain deny?" O, Salmān and Jundab, verily our dead never die, and those amongst us who are killed, are not killed in reality. We do not become born, and do not give birth."

Said Jābir: "I touched the earth before him out of respect for what I heard from him, and said: "O, my Lord, it is difficult for me to understand what I heard thee say that thou "hast destroyed the earlier generations", and, secondly, thy words about thy people's dead never dying, and those amongst them who are killed, not being killed in reality".

And 'Ali replied: "O, Jābir, I am an Order from God, because He says (XL, 15):—"The Spirit by His command will descend on whomever He pleases, of His slaves". And God made me His Command, according to the verse (XI, 42): "until at length when Our Order came, and the oven boiled (with regard to the salvation of Noah, whom I saved)". And He said (XI, 84): "And when Our Command came, We made what was high in them low". And with regard to what I said that those amongst us who die do not really die, it is because the Spirit is from God; and that those amongst us who are executed are not really killed, the reason is the same. I am the master of every true believer, male and female, of those who have already come in existence, and who are to come in the future. O, Salmān and Jundab! when I helped, as I did, Prophets with the Spirit, I was speaking by the tongue of Jesus in his cradle. Ādam, Seth, Noah, Sem, Abraham, Ismā'il, Moses, Joshua, Jesus, Simon, and Muḥammad and myself—all are one, [77] and who sees myself, sees all of them. But I am one of the slaves of God. Do not call us
“lords”, but say whatever you like in our praise, because we are the “gates” leading to God, His Proofs, His trusted men amongst the people, His lieutenants, and the leaders (Imams) of His religion, His “face”, His “sides”, His Command, and the širāṭ towards Him. Through us He metes out punishment, by us He metes out reward. He has chosen us from His creations, making us pure and clean. And if anyone asks: why has He done this, how? For what reason? For what purpose? — verily, such a man is an infidel: “He (God) is not asked (for explanations) as to His acts, and they ask for these (XXI, 23)”.

“O, Salmān and Jundab! Who believes in what I have said and explained, commented upon, and clarified,— such a man is a believer whose heart God has tested for his faith. And if he distinguishes between my expressions and their hidden meaning, he is a truly intelligent (mustābṣir) and knowing man, understanding and perfect. But those who feel doubts as to what is said, or suspicious, or are negatively disposed, or give up,— those are sinners and defaulters. O, Salmān and Jundab! I bring humanity to life, and I make them die, I create them, and nourish them, and heal the leprous and the blind. I give you what you eat and what you throw out in your houses, by the Command of My Lord. And the Rightful Imams from my progeny are acting in the same way, because all of us are one and the same thing, manifested in all times. We wish if God wishes, and we dislike if God dislikes. Woe to those who deny our rights, and what God has given to us, our mission to increase His might and will. God has given us all that is the highest, the greatest, and the most important of all these. He has given us the Greatest Name, by uttering which we may, if we wish, ascend the Heaven, make the sun, moon, and stars to obey us. But with all this we eat and drink, walk in the market place, and do what we will, by the command of God, our Lord, as is said: “...honoured servants, who do not speak until He speaks, but at His bidding do they act” (XXI, 26-27).
"This is what one must know about myself in my Luminous Substance. Learn this, both of you, be guided by this, and be blessed, by the will of God!" [78]

This is what he said. We have cited this in order that intelligent people may know his position with regard to the Prophet. And this his position was exactly the same as that of Imam al-Qā’im bi-amri’l-lāh with regard to al-Mahdī bi’l-lāh, as light from light, and manifestation (of Divine power), one like the other, one in substance, as the Divine power testifies this. Thus have Divine signs been manifested, and the words of thy Lord became true and justified.

As al-Qā’im bi-amri’l-lāh was similar in his position to ‘Alī at the period of his manifestation, his reign was confounded by the appearance of the accursed enemy of God, Mukhlid b. Kaydād, Abū Yazīd, the Antichrist (Dajjāl), who appeared in his reign just as enemies of God rose in the reign of ‘Alī, Commander of the Faithful. The original place of the accursed Abū Yazīd, the Squinting, was under Abū ‘Ammār the Blind, a teacher. Mukhlid belonged to the persuasion of the Khārijites, the Ḥarūriyya branch. He succeeded in dominating the true believers, introducing impiety into the world. His oppression was on the increase, and his strength continually grew until he approached Mahdiyya, as far as the Muṣallā, which was built where the arrow of al-Mahdī fell (as mentioned above),1 who shot it in his foreknowledge as to where the enemy of God should attain. He was an Ibāḍite who believed in the necessity of cursing the Commander of the Faithful, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, and denying any respect to him. He made it permissible to shed the blood of his descendants, and to abuse them. He came down with his troops to Mahdiyya, and besieged it. Al-Qā’im gave orders to lock the gates. The fighting was fierce, the calamity was great, and the danger was increasing. Then al-Qā’im began to issue the supplies which had been stored by al-Mahdī, dis-

1 Cf. p. 262.
istributing these to his soldiers and the poor citizens in the town. But these supplies began to come to an end. Thereupon the besieged began to come out [79] and escape. The accursed one moved his troops, mostly consisting of Berbers, ordering them to watch the road. They used to kill every one whom they would overpower, looting him, and raping his womenfolk. At last they even began to cut open the intestines of men and women, in search of the concealed gold and precious stones. They even used to buy and sell the intestines. The accursed one became as heretical as the Qarmatians (taqarmaṭ),\(^1\) began to think much of himself, doing all sorts of impious and revolting things, and rebelling against God . . . His authority became strong, and he occupied all the provinces of the Maghrib. He was similar to the enemies of Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq, and the enemies of the Commander of the Faithful 'Ali b. Abi Ṭālib, or those of Jesus, the Spirit of God.

When the hour of death came to al-Qā'īm, and his last moment approached, he gave orders to his faithful and devout slave Jawdhar to produce the testament (made at the time of the burial) of al-Mahdī bi'l-lāh. He (obviously Jawdhar) handed it (the document) over to the religious dignitaries (shuyūkhūd-dā'wat), and Šawlāt (?) read it to them.\(^2\) He was a dignitary of (the highest) degree (amongst those present). Jawdhar came near him, handed over the document to him, and he, the high priest, read it to them, and handed back the document to Jawdhar. The latter then returned it to the Imam. The Imam then again gave the orders to read it to them. Šawlāt (again)

---

\(^1\) It is not clear what is implied by the verb taqarmaṭa, if this does not refer to the proverbial impiety and brutality of the Qarmatians.

\(^2\) The passage is very difficult to understand, unless we suppose that al-Qā'īm was so ill that he could not speak, and expressed his will only by signs. It is apparently a quotation from the Strat of Jawdhar, which is not accessible to me for reference at present. It is not clear whether the word saulat is a personal name, or a technical term. In the Sing. saulat means "rush, violence, sudden attack; authority, strength". Here it is obviously applied to a person. I could not find any other example of this name. Perhaps this may be an early mistake which was ever since blindly repeated in newer copies.
read the document, and returned it (to Jawdhar). Those present
did not understand the purpose of the ceremony, as they did not
know the secret proceedings which took place on the day of the
burial of al-Mahdī, when the Imam had given orders to Jawdhar
(to keep it secret). He, the Imam, entrusted (istawda‘a) Jawdhar
with the (will concerning) the position of his son, al-Manṣūr, and
his appointment of him as his own successor, taking an oath
from him (i.e. Jawdhar) to the former. Thus Jawdhar was
entrusted (mustawda‘) with (the document appointing) al-Manṣūr
bi‘l-lāh (as heir apparent). For this reason it was so that (the
fact of the existence of) the testament was not revealed to any
dignitary except for Jawdhar.

And when the Imam for the third time repeated his orders,
he, Jawdhar, turned towards them (i.e. the dignitaries), and
asked them whether they recognised the high position which he
occupied in the service of his masters, and the extent to which
they trusted him, and relied upon him. The dignitaries then
informed him that they knew about this. Then Jawdhar said
to them that the Imam had given orders to him [80] to produce
the testament in order that Şawlāt should take from them
the oath of allegiance to his son Ismā‘il. Then he, Jawdhar,
produced 1 the document of the will of al-Qā‘im in favour of al-
Manṣūr Ismā‘il. The dignitaries knelt in obedience to his ap-
pointment by al-Qā‘im. The latter (also) ordered to (continue)
the struggle against Abū Yazīd, the Antichrist, the curse of God
be upon him!

Thereafter al-Manṣūr bi‘l-lāh came up with his Divinely
blessed troops, arranged an agreement with the (Berber) tribes,
and chased away Abū Yazīd from the Muṣallā.

1 It seems obvious that what was read at first was only the address
or the label on the scroll, or, perhaps, the seals on the cover. Only after
all these ceremonies Jawdhar opened and read the document itself.
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5. From the Aṣrārū’n-nuṭaqā’.

(For the work and the author see above, pp. 18-19; for the
text see Extract 5.)

[81] ... Then rose the Saint of God, after him (i.e.
Muḥammad al-Bāqir), the Lieutenant of God on the earth, and
the repository of His Light, Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad, by the Com-
mand of God, and His inspiration,1 for the revival of the
preaching of religion, of the practices introduced by the Apostles
of God, and the gathering of the faithful around the formula of
“sincerity” (kalimatu’il-ikhlāṣ).2 His dāʿīs went to different pro-
vinces of the earth. He raised the lighthouse of religion; books
were compiled from his teaching and the tradition related by
him; these spread to every country. And when the Command
of God came to him to hand over (his high office), he summoned
his dignitaries (nuqabāʾ) and specially deserving followers,3 just
as it was done by other Imams and Prophets before him, and
handed over his authority to his son Ismāʿīl, by the Command
of God and His inspiration of him, making them witnesses of
this his appointment.

Thus Ismāʿīl became the Gate to God (Bābu’l-lāh), and His
Praying niche (mīhrāb), the repository of His Light, the link
(sabar) between Him and His creation,— both we and you admit
this.4 And then his body was caused to disappear during the

1 This “esoteric” formula seems to be peculiar to the works of Jaʿfar
b. Mansūrī’l-Yaman; from here it is introduced into some portions of the
Zahrū’l-maʿānī of Sayyid-nā Idris, quoted above.
2 Obviously the formula of taqād, or profession of strict monotheism.
3 It is interesting that here the expression which is used, ʿalāwūn,
really means brethren, members of the confraternity. That it was not
intended to mean Jaʿfar’s real brothers, is clear from other similar passages
further on, in which the term aṣḥāb, associates, is used instead of this.
According to the Umdatū’l-fālūb, 173, Imam Jaʿfar had no brothers.
4 The author all through his work carries on controversy with the
Ithnāʾ-asharīs, apparently having in view some particular work, which he,
however, does not mention by name. His references, if collected out of
the whole of the Aṣrārū’n-nuṭaqā’, might, perhaps, contain interesting
lifetime of his father, as a mystery, intended to protect him from his enemies, and as a test for his followers. As has already been narrated about Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm, God had never done such a thing as He has done with Ismā'īl, making him predecease his father. Both, we and you, accept the tradition concerning aš-Šādiq saying:— "Verily God acts as He wills and pleases in everything except for the matters concerning the Imamat". The slandering of God is the greatest sin which you have committed, by interfering with what God had ordered to happen: "They came up to blow out the Light lit by God with their mouths" (Cor. LXI, 8). You believed in the cancellation of the Divine Command. But you did not know that Ismā'īl never left this world without leaving in his stead his son, who was of mature age, and that the Imamat had been handed over to him by the Command of God and His inspiration of him. And that he, Ismā'īl b. Ja'far, when the desire of God became known to him, received an inspiration to hand over the authority to his son Muḥammad. He then summoned the dignitaries (nuqabā'), and those specially trusted amongst his followers, and handed it over to him in the presence of the chosen ones alone, in secret, in order not to expose him to danger. He acted as did Hārūn with Joshua (Yūsha' b. an-Nūn), when he appointed one of the dignitaries as his lieutenant, to act on behalf of his own son, until

information concerning the evolution of the theory of the Imamat in the Ithna-'ashari doctrine. Here he obviously refers to the fact that the appointment of Ismā'īl as the successor of Imam Ja'far is also admitted by his opponents.

1 Different early works, as already mentioned above, cf. p. 240, invariably state that the son of Ismā'īl, Muḥammad, was not a small child when his father died. Further on it is mentioned that he was 14. There is nothing impossible in this, because, as I have already shown in my paper, "Imam Ismail", in the JASB, 1923, pp. 305-310, from the Ithna-'ashari sources (entirely supported by the 'Uyunu'l-akhbār), Ismā'īl was already an adult in 133/751. It seems that he died soon after this. Thus there is nothing improbable in his having a 14-years old son; therefore it is quite possible that the latter really was about 26 when Imam Ja'far himself died about 148/765. But later esoteric works which present him as a helpless infant simply follow the "standard scheme", which popular sentiment favoured for such occasions. Cf. further on, p. 296.
he came of age.¹ He, Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il, was at that time a
grown up, 14 years of age. At such age witness is acceptable
from a man, according to law. He (Imam Ismā‘il) did this in
anticipation of the calamities and the attack of the infidels which
were to befall him. But you spread lies about God and His
Saints, by asserting that His Command may be revoked! You
have disregarded the words of God, who said (XLIII, 27): “He
made it the word remaining in his progeny”. You treated His
word with disregard of what it portends. And you have made
the Imamat return to Ja‘far aș-Šādiq. Or has not it been already
known from the story of Jacob, that when he received the
Command to hand over his authority to Joseph, both his eyes
became covered with cataract? When Joseph left the country
in search of a refuge (dār hiyra), and misfortune befell him, Jacob
sat in his place, collecting all his men, and sending his other sons
to different places in search of the Owner of the Imamat. And
this is what God expressed in Jacob’s words addressed to his
people (XII, 87): “O, my sons! go and enquire concerning Joseph
and his brother, and despair not of God’s comfort; for, verily,
none need despair of God’s comfort save infidels”.

And Ja‘far aș-Šādiq, in his purity of soul and spirit, is above
any possibility of opposing the decrees of God. But you can
see that when the hour of his death arrived, he appointed in his
stead his own enemy, al-Manṣūr (the Abbasid caliph, 136–158/
754–775), in preference to his own relatives, and even his own

¹ Unfortunately, the name of this guardian is not mentioned. It
all sounds rather vague. As very often in such cases it is not easy to see
whether there is any historical truth in these stories, or it is simply a
case of unceremonious application of the general scheme of parallelism
with the supposed Biblical precedents. The latter is most probably
the case, because, having no details of the events at his disposal, the
author could fill in the blank space with his visualisation of the events
as they should have been, in accordance with pious theories. In all the
references to Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il which we possess, and which are
very scanty, including even the somewhat more detailed, although obviously
legendary account given in the ‘Uyūnu‘l-akhbār (see “Ismailis and
Qarmatians”, pp. 60–63), there is no mention of any guardian except his
grandfather, Imam Ja‘far himself.
son. All this was done as a means of protecting [83] them, and as a means to distract danger from the real Man of God. But you have split after these events into parties and sects, neither recognising the first appointment, nor being loyal to the second. A party amongst you regarded him as the last Imam, expecting him to return to life, and to fill it with justice and light even as much as it has been filled with injustice and oppression. Thus you trod the path of the Christians in their belief about Jesus son of Mary, who think that He sits on the right side of God, being ready to return to this world and show the difference between the True and the Wrong, straightening all that has been made crooked.

On the Sects after the Death of Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq.

Those who split over the recognition of each of his four sons. We must now discuss those sects which became formed after him, disagreeing over his successor, and depriving the rightful one of his right. And every one who deviates from the truth falls into an error,—we can see this as obvious according to the judgement of reason. And when we know that the futility of the claims of three (of the Imam's sons) is proved, then (there remains) the right of the one, the true chosen heir. Then we may give up what is unreal, and return to what is real.

Let us see what was claimed by the Fāṭhiyya (i.e. the supporters of al-Aftāḥ, 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Ja'far), who maintained that he was the Imam, and died many years after his father, or what they say as to his being a silent (Ṣāmīt) Imam. We may see that he died without having left posterity to succeed him in the office, and take charge of the Mystery of God and His wisdom after him. Because the Lieutenant of God on the earth is the repository of His Light, the link between Him and His creation; to him ascend

---

1 Apparently the idea underlying this extraordinary statement is an attempt at reconciling theory with plain historical facts. In theory, of course, all authority belonged to Imam Ja'far, although he did not possess it in practice. Therefore the fact that al-Mansūr possessed, anyhow, this authority, implies the fact that he could have it only with the sanction of the "real master of the authority".

his ḍaʾīs (ḥudūd), as it has been already explained, and as you have seen. To him descends the Divine help (taʿyīd). He helps them (i.e. people) by his acts of justice to recognise him properly, [84] and have no doubts as to his rights; and he is the one who inherits and leaves an heir after him, according to the tradition of the saintly people who relate that God has said that a real Imam does not die childless.

Then let us look into what was claimed by the Muḥammadiyya who regarded Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar as the true Imam. He presented his claims in Mekka,¹ but drew out his sword during the sacred month, in the sacred place, accepted as sacred by the whole of Islam; and it is believed that hostilities in it are forbidden to anyone till the Day of Resurrection. But we see that he rose against the Abbasids in their own dominion, after having lived under their protection. They protected him, and were his kings. Thus he acted contrary to the practice of his ancestor and of the prophets before him who never attacked their enemies in their own house, without finding for themselves a country of refuge (dār hijra), in which they could defend themselves, or launch an attack against their enemy from there. Then they conquered (other countries) after their (original) place of refuge.

As we see him acting contrary to the custom of his predecessors, we may understand that if he had really been the proof of God on the earth, he would not have acted contrary to the example (siyar) of his forefathers. Therefore we must place him in the position of usurpers, similar to himself. And we (really) see that his opponent has overcome him, seized him, placed a rope around his neck (as a sign of humiliation), and carried him about in different towns on the way to Khorasan, making him ascend the minbars of every town that he passed, and renounce his claims, bringing a testimony against himself, recognising his error, and openly admitting that he had committed a sin. All the

¹ As already mentioned above, cf. p. 116, n. 1, special significance was always attached to the fact of claims to the Imamat being presented in Mekka itself, the religious centre of the Islamic world.
Shi'ites completely agree in the belief that the Imam who rises in Mekka cannot err in his profession (ra'y). This community relates from the Apostle of God that he predicted the rise of the Imam "whose name will be my name, and the name of his father as the name of my father". But Ja'far had no other son called Mu'hammad except this one. And it is possible to call Ja'far 'Abdu'l-lāh (i.e. slave of God) because all the people are slaves of God. [85] Thus we may place this sect in a position similar to other erring sects.

Let us now look into the long story of the supporters of Mūsā b. Ja'far. We find them divided into two branches, but cannot see which of these is more erring than the other. We find that they aped the beliefs of their erring predecessors, claiming that he, Mūsā, was still living until our own day, and that he never died, and never shall die. But we know that he died in the prison of the Abbasids, and his body was thrown outside the prison for three days so that everybody could see him. Thereafter he was buried. His opponent had more power than himself, and divided his inheritance; his wives, "mothers of the Faithful", were remarried after his death, being married to his enemies and adversaries. He had no successor who might prevent them (i.e. the enemies) from marrying his wives, and who would protect his family. But the real successor (of Imam Ja'far) from his son, whose rights you suspect, did protect them, and saved them from such fate, as did all his ancestors, because the real Imam stands by the Command of God to protect the weak, and the people who are in need of his protection (fugarā' ilay-hi).

And if your Imam is not present (in this world), and his return is only expected, then of what use is he to those who live after him, and to those who have to refer to (him) concerning what is permitted or prohibited to them, what is prescribed and commanded (in religion)? Who shall enforce amongst them the institutions of God, and decide their litigation? Verily, when we lose the (living) Imam, we are bound to take refuge under his slaves (ordinary mortals), forgetting God, and heading to injustice,
until we all perish. And if we begin to differ concerning any prescription, we fall into the error of accepting as binding legal opinion and analogy. The Ruler (i.e. God) cannot order us to obey one who does not exist. If this were possible, we should have been ordered to obey one who has not yet been born, and expect him to be born, just as we are expecting (to return) the one who disappeared.

This sect narrates that Imam Ja'far said once: “the name of the Imam (after him) [86] is the name of the Owner of the Torah”. And when Mūsā (then a small boy) entered, he said: “welcome, my lord, who is always angry, and does not play”.

Let us now see what is claimed by the other branch. We find that it says:— “Recognition of the Imam rests with us. We may enter under the authority of every Imam, whether righteous or erring, and we may at our discretion remain under their jurisdiction, living with them, and be under their protection, regardless whether (their) enemies may shed their (Imams’) blood, or confiscate their property, take their wives, or rights”.

In accepting such beliefs they go against the practice of all the Prophets of God and Imams of their religion whom we have mentioned above. We may thus see that this talk is utterly senseless, and that those who say such things are the filthiest and vilest of men, because God has ordered us to follow the Prophets, and observe their practice after them, as is said (XXXIII, 21): “Ye had in the Apostle of God a good example”. Or the words of the Prophet uttered by him to the community of the faithful,— and his words are not rubbish for which God does not care. He said (Cor. III, 29): “If you love God, follow me, and God will love you”. And also (XII, 108): “I call unto God, giving a clear example, myself and those who follow me”. And we see the demands of these stupid folk contrary to what he, the Prophet, preached. For this reason we must dissociate ourselves from

---

1 This obviously is not the Ithna-‘ashari theory, but sounds as if it were confounded with some Zaydi principles.
them, and reject their Imams who are such as these. They are in our opinion like the erring leaders who, whenever they miss anything in the prescriptions of religion, resort to legal opinion and analogy. We can see that all these sects, mentioned above, claim that they alone are right, and that the others are wrong, and treat each other as infidels.

Then we find those sects which, after the preceding ones, recognise as the Imam Aḥmad b. Mūsā, surnamed ‘Alī ar-Riḍā, the same whom al-Maʿmūn appointed (as his successor), striking coins in his name, and proclaiming him [87] as his heir apparent, and the caliph after his death. He summoned ar-Riḍā, and none amongst the Alids and their supporters doubted that the authority was going to pass to him after the death of al-Maʿmūn. The latter was disturbed in his mind, just as it happened with Muʿāwiya b. Yazīd b. Muʿāwiya (the Omayyad caliph Muʿāwiya II, 64/683), when he realised that his forefathers had usurped the rights belonging to others (i.e. Alids), and wished to return these to them.

This is why al-Maʿmūn summoned jurists and theologians from different towns, ordering them to hold a disputation with each other on the subject of Fadak and al-ʿAwālī, at last returning these to the descendant of Fatima, after proofs had been produced to support their rights. All this was trickery to lure forth the real Owner of Rights. But he did not succeed in his designs, because the latter was concealed, and could not manifest himself before the decreed time came, meanwhile concealing himself from his enemies, and expecting relief when the proper time and hour arrived. And al-Maʿmūn, when he conceived his suspicions, and saw the Alids coming over to him, intended to make inquiries, and collect information. Some of the Abbasids, fearing for their lives, warned him, recalling what their own ancestors had done

---

1 According to the ‘Umduʿuʾ-ṭalīb, 175, Mūsā had a son, called Aḥmad, but he had nothing to do with ‘Alī ar-Riḍā. It would be very interesting to find out whether this is a mistake, or whether there is something behind all this.

2 Cf. above, p. 252.
to the ancestors of the Alids, expecting that when the latter won, they would take revenge on them. The Alids, meanwhile, had no doubts that authority was returning to them in this way.

The news reached a man who was touring Syria on behalf of the Imam, who had at that time his residence (dār hijrat) in Jerusalem. He wrote to the chief dāʿī of the province, warning him of his arrival, and came to him, offering his life in the desire to please God, to obtain salvation after death, and to wage war for the religious cause when this should be required. He came before the dāʿī, offering himself, and thus stepping out on the warpath for the true religion of God. When he entered into the presence of al-Maʿmūn, the latter said: “When I obtain the proof concerning him (the real Imam) which I hope to find, which is the secret treasure and the great blessing given by God, the gate of His mercy will be found, may God make thee open it to me!

[88] The dāʿī replied: “(As to) the proof for which thou art seeking, (what) I will disclose to thee concerning them (i.e. the Alids) would not merit mercy in thy eyes”. He made (him) hear (this) as if being afraid that he was deaf, arguing emphatically, in the manner of one who fears to commit an error. They had a long talk which would take too much space to report in full here, and would take us too far away from the original subject. And ultimately he (al-Maʿmūn) stretched out to him (the dāʿī) his hand which was accepted in all sincerity, though (in reality) it was extended with an evil purpose. He (the dāʿī) was pleased with al-Maʿmūn, informed him about the existence of (the real Imam) his Master, and conveyed to him (al-Maʿmūn) some of the light of his (the Imam’s) guiding teaching. The caliph treated him as his equal in his audience, promising to give up the restrictions (imposed upon the Shiʿites?) in the past years. He, al-Maʿmūn, (promised to) leave him (the Imam?) free until the hour of his advent struck, his destinee was fulfilled, on a predestined day and the date decreed by God. The dāʿī stayed with

1 For yakhshi read yaḥshi, and for az-zamān read az-zalāl.
the caliph for a long time, being admitted to his private audiences, while he tried his best to please him (the đā'i). The caliph had many discussions with him, on different subjects, until his "education" had become complete. And the đā'i believed that his position became strong, that the caliph's faith was sincere, and that he abandoned all his former ideas. For this reason the đā'i informed him about the position of the one appointed by God, what he is expected to do, and his mission (wadd'). Then he went away.

When al-Ma'mūn remained alone, and reflected over the matter, this 'Alī b. Mūsā came to him. The caliph began to ask him different questions taken out from the Coran, from the Torah, Gospels, history of the early prophets, institutions of earlier Apostles of God,—all the matters which he had just learnt from his teacher (the đā'i), and (thus) from the Master of the latter, whose devotion he imposed upon himself, swearing obedience to his command. And when he (the caliph) found in 'Alī b. Mūsā no knowledge which he expected to find, he at once realised that the fame spread about him amongst the masses was futile, and felt opposed to recognising him as his spiritual master. He realised that the wisdom of God is hidden from the enemies of His religion, (even if?) they are participating in the assemblies where the Guidance-giving Imams teach. It is stored in His Men until the time of their Manifestation comes. [89] This consideration has changed the caliph's intentions as to his ('Alī b. Mūsā's) affairs, because he saw that he was not in the possession of the required qualifications, and did not deserve the position which belongs to the real Imam. (He saw) that he would go the usual way of other opponents before him. He reflected on what he had already done to proclaim 'Alī b. Mūsā (as his heir apparent), and this appeared to him wrong. He was afraid that he had missed the real Imam who had the rights, and that he, 'Alī b. Mūsā, would oppress the real Men of God, demanding from them more submission than his own predecessors demanded, thus thwarting his efforts and labours, and making him res-
ponsible for this. Whereupon he executed ‘Ali b. Mūsā ar-Riḍā, making his position known.¹

Meanwhile he himself stuck to what was revealed to him by his teacher and spiritual guide, appreciating what knowledge he heard from him. He left the matter as it was, as the Imam was concealed from people until the proper time to reveal himself. And his organisation was spread, his knowledge preached, his dā‘Īs were working, his Divine signs were clear,² while his own person was out of the reach of all till the time of his manifestation, and the completion of the predestined term.

This is what happened between al-Ma‘mūn and ‘Ali b. Mūsā ar-Riḍā, and the reason of his execution.

A sect after his death recognised as the Imam his son Muḥammad b. ‘Ali. His father, being summoned by al-Ma‘mūn, had left him behind in Medina as a small child in his house. When he, ‘Ali b. Mūsā, died, he left him only five years old. But all the Shi‘ites believe that the (real) Imam never leaves this world without appointing as his successor his grown up son possessing all the rights to act as an imām (in communal prayers), and to receive his father’s inheritance. As is known, a child of five to ten years of age, according to law, cannot issue orders, his witness cannot be accepted (in the court of law), and his judgement cannot be relied upon. Witness cannot be accepted from the man who cannot lead the communal prayer, who cannot be permitted to sacrifice animals. We have not seen any one amongst the ancient kings of Jews or Christians, or others, practicing such things, or accepting these (in principle). [90] You say that his father has

¹ We have seen above (Texts, p. 82) that according to the author Imam Ja‘far appointed the Abbasid al-Manṣūr as his “apparent” successor. Here the story reflects obvious sympathy with al-Ma‘mūn, almost admitting the sincerity of his “conversion”. The author even passes in silence over an important detail of the story: the treacherous al-Ma‘mūn executed his “teacher”, the Isma‘ili dā‘ī (cf. above, p. 252). Such a sympathetic tone towards the Abbasids is indeed surprising in a work composed towards the end of the fourth/tenth c.

² Delete min (beg. of line 8). In another (modern) copy of this work the words ḫın-ḫu are omitted. It is quite possible that the scribe mistakenly repeated twice the ending of the preceding word, awâni-hi.
not appointed either a trustee or lieutenant in charge of him, while he was in the same position as Ḥārūn when he was about to die. The latter appointed Yūshaʿ b. an-Nūn to be in charge of his son. Or as did Ismāʿīl b. Ibrāhīm, who appointed as a guardian of his son a certain dignitary called in the Coran al-Kabsh (sheep), as is revealed (XXXVII, 107): “And we ransomed him with a mighty victim” . . . (XXXVII, 112): “and we blessed him and Isaac”. It is thus clear that the blessing first fell upon al-Kabsh, before being given to Isaac. As Ismāʿīl nominated (according to what is revealed) al-Kabsh, a “sheep”, so Mūsā (Moses) nominated Baqara, “bull” (or cow). When he collected his lieutenants after the death of his brother, he said to them (II, 63): “God bids you slaughter a cow (heifer)”. In other words he said:— “The Imam, who is the lieutenant of God on the earth, orders you to appoint a hujjat, who would stand for your command, being in charge of your current affairs, until the time comes for the real Master to appear, manifesting his authority”. Dost thou not see what the lieutenants of Moses replied (II, 63):— “Art thou making a jest of us?” i.e. are we to slaughter a cow, or you? This has already been explained above.¹

And you say:— “Verily, he (ʿAlī b. Mūsā) appointed him (his son Muḥammad) before he left him behind on his departure”. How could he have appointed as his executor a minor? Both we and you accept the belief that the appointment takes place by the order of God and His inspiration of the parent who appoints his son, as mentioned above, on the basis of reliable testimony. Is it possible to any one in ordinary life to appoint as his trustee his son while he is a minor? Or ought he not to appoint a trustee in charge of his son, and leave to him his property which he should return to the latter as testified by reliable witnesses in the court of law?

After this you became split into sects recognising his son and grandson, up to the birth of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan. He was a

¹ “Above”, i.e. in the earlier part of the work which is not quoted or translated here.
Negro, but you have accepted his being an Imam, entertaining no doubts as to his being the Expected One [91] who should deliver you from the tyranny of the oppressors, the Head of religion and of the state. You even thought that the Prophet predicted his advent, narrating lengthy stories about this, which would be too long to mention here, and which will collapse on being analysed.

When he died, you accepted his son al-Ḥasan. A certain al-Jārūḍ b. Riyāḥ (who served two Imams, of theirs, ʿAlī al-Asghar and his son al-Ḥasan) narrates miracles of this al-Ḥasan, of which the like were never worked. He said: “I was once going for a walk with him, he in front, and I with some friends walking behind him, and carrying on a conversation. And I said [to myself]:—“Wilt thou see that he knows what is in our thoughts, and of what we are talking?” Said a friend of mine:—“If he knows what we are discussing amongst us, let him move his cap (qalansuwa)”. And after some time he did really move it, so that we said:—“Verily, he delayed this as a test for us!” Then he stretched out his hand as if to put it right. Did ever any one work a miracle like this, except for Jesus?”

There are many stories of this kind amongst you,—it would be too long to relate these. But, anyhow, this al-Ḥasan died and left no posterity. You insisted in your advice to him that he should increase the number of concubines; and he increased their number, so that God might give him a son. And he wished this very much, but he died. It is narrated that after him a party demanded that his property should be confiscated and handed over to the department of charities. But others insisted that one of his concubines, named Ṣaqīl, serving in the house, declared that she was pregnant.¹ They threatened her, and tempted her greed, and maintained that the “Expected One” was to be born of her. All this was a design invented in order to seize the property which ought to have gone to the poor. They

¹ According to the ʿUmda, 176, her name was Narjis.
narrated that when he was born, nobody could see him except one born illegitimately. But this is a manifestation of (Divine) wrath to the creature, not a Divine mercy, as the ignorant say. [92] Whoever, being blind, looks upon the grave of the Prophet, he will live to recover sight from his glancing at it.

And when he (al-Hasan?) died, the community was affected with Divine wrath. If there had been a son to al-Hasan, this would be against the word of the Prophet who said that the Imam will not rise as a child, but as a young man, full grown. According to some other tradition, his moustache will be dark (akhdar). But al-Hasan died a hundred and twenty years before our time. Thus his followers worship one who does not exist. It is a lie that God will make me responsible for my sins, as a creation, while He would make His creations worship a non-existent person!

Thus the words of the Prophet:— “Who dies without having recognised the Imam of his time, dies as an infidel”— are rendered futile. And (similarly) the words of as-Sadiq:— “Whoever dies without having recognised the Imam of his time while he is living, he dies as an infidel”. Thus you neither kept the words of the Apostle of God, nor accepted the utterance of one of his progeny. Who then is your Imam to whom you appeal, with whom do you take refuge? Verily, ostrich-like behaviour seems to form a part of your faith! And really, as he does not exist, you say on one occasion that he is in the hills of Raḍwā; on another occasion that he is going to rise in the desert; on yet another occasion that he lives in water, preparing himself to come forth into this world in order to separate the dead from the living. Really, it is not a case of blindness, but of the deafness of the hearts! Or you simply do not know that the Imams,— even if such things happened as happened with Imam al-Ḥusayn, as you know,— adhered to worship, piety and asceticism in this world. They took refuge in the cave of religious disguise (kahfu’t-taqiyya), and gave orders to their followers to do the same thing. And this is what is narrated of Ja’far as-Sadiq, who said:— “Religious disguise (at-taqiyya) is the religious practice of mine, and
of my ancestors; whosoever has no taqiyya (i.e. does not hide his secret beliefs from the enemies), he has no faith”. The Imams sent their plenipotentiary dā'is in different countries, so that they might guide them by their preaching, commanding them to keep secret and concealed (what was necessary), travelling about different provinces until the time [93] of manifestation comes, taking every precaution concerning the safety of the Imams from their powerful adversaries.

The True Imam (Ṣāḥibu'l-ḥaqq) was concealed, observing the practice of disguise (taqiyya), prescribed by Imam Jaʿfar. Their dā'is travelled all over the country, just as Jesus used to do. This they did in search of the “country of refuge” (dār hijrat), in which they, the Imams, would be safe. This was because his (the Imam’s) adversaries have brought under their authority the “country of refuge” (dār hijrat) of the Prophet, and claimed it as their own. It is for this reason that the Apostle of God promised to us “that the sun shall rise over us from its setting place”. Similarly acted Abraham, who was the founder of this law (shariʿat), sending Lot in search of the “country of refuge”, as we have explained above. And when he (Lot) had conquered Syria, he (Abraham) travelled thither, emigrating from the country of his adversary, thus saving the faithful from his domination, and their humiliating position. He then introduced amongst them institutions of the true religion. Those faithful who were converted by his dā'is, heard about this (i.e. his emigration), and came in force to join him, from all sides, renewing their oaths of allegiance to him, and adhering to their Imams. And he, Abraham, when he became stronger, attacked his neighbours. All this happened because the faithful became strong, as he used to divide amongst them the booty, as was also the custom of the Apostle of God. The latter also, when his authority became strong, and his power increased, emigrated to the sanctuary of his ancestors, and took possession of what had been taken from them by force, giving distinction to the faithful who had joined him, and making the enemies of religion, who opposed them,
perish. Is anything more required to make this proof still clearer? Were not the actions of the earlier Imams and former *khalifas* like this? — Give me an instance from the practice of your Imams, if you know such a one!

Thus his (Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl’s?) proofs have become manifest, and Divine signs of his mission have become widely known; his propaganda was organised, [94] his miracles and Divine signs followed one another. Then you have shown enmity and hatred, and began to say:— "God will never send another Apostle after Muḥammad the Prophet",— who, however, himself says that his Lord has promised him that the sun shall rise from the place at which it sets. And the Imams shall be in its womb (or: And the meaning is the Imams whom this allegorises). And when the day dawned, and the light shone, you began to expect, as did common people, who are well known for their spiritual blindness, that the prophecy refers to the real retrocession in the rotation of the spheres. You did not realise that the sun which you see is the symbol for ʿAlī b. ʿAbī Ṭālib and his progeny, the sun of the lieutenancy after the Apostle of God. As mentioned above, it is the same as the "retrocession of the sun" in the story of Yūshaʿ b. an-Nūn after Hārūn. Is it necessary to explain this more?

It is necessary to mention now Ismāʿīl’s acceptance of the authority from his father. We shall only say what no one can deny, except the aggressive heretics who suppress the right belief in their hearts, and advance impious theories in the hope of "extinguishing the Light of God". ... "But God shall make His Light triumph, even if the infidels shall be displeased" (Coran, LXI, 8)... This is why Imam Jaʿfar, when his health became impaired, summoned the most trusted amongst his followers, and those members of his family who were alive, and did what his

---

1 Variant: ḫāṣiṇi-hā. The first, ḫāṣiṇi-hā, seems preferable because ḥā refers to *shams*, sun, which is of feminine gender. The question raised here, of there being no more prophets after Muḥammad, obviously refers to the dogma about Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl being the Seventh *Nātyq*, by virtue of his being the seventh Imam.
predecessors had done, i.e. handed over his authority to Ismā‘īl. Thus Ismā‘īl became the Gate to God, His praying niche, the Abode of His light, and the link (sabab) between Him and His creations, the Lieutenant of God on earth. Both we and you agreed in what was said above about Ismā‘īl. But when he died while his father was still alive, as is also related about Ismā‘īl b. Ibrāhīm, or Hārūn and Mūsā, you began to say that nothing happened to his cause on the same lines as it did (before this) in the case of Ismā‘īl (b. Ibrāhīm). And this is the error in (religious) knowledge, and a schism based on prejudice. [95]

You believe that the authority returned to Imam Ja‘far. But the Command of God can never be reversed. Thus you have erroneously “prevented the mention of his (Ismā‘īl’s) name in the mosques of God, trying to ruin them by this”. By doing this you have committed the crime which God mentions (Cor. II, 108):— “It is not for such to enter into them (i.e. mosques) except in fear, for them is disgrace in this world, (and in the future mighty woe)”. God, when causing Ismā‘īl to be appointed as the successor (to Ja‘far) could not be ignorant of the date on which he, Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far, was going to die. But you maintain that this fact was done incidentally by Him. You have forgotten the words of Imam Ja‘far that God may alter and change His original desire in everything except in the matter of the Imamat. And the words of the Apostle of God, who said: (the promised Messiah shall have) “a name like mine, and the name of his father shall be like that of my father”. According to another tradition, he said:—“My friend Jibri‘il informed me from the Lord of the Worlds that a man, a descendant of mine, shall come forth at the end of the time. His name shall be like mine, and the name of his father like the name of my father. He will call people to the religion of God, the most excellent, in spite of their aversion to the religion of God, and misinterpretation (indirās) of Islam and its law. Such opposition is their crime, from which they will be compelled to come forth by calamities. And the strength of the opposition and doubts shall be such as that from
which I have brought you, when you were immersed in the abject impiety during the period of idolatry. He (the promised Imam) shall be declared by you as wrong, as I was also declared, and oppressed as I was oppressed for my calling you to God. He shall be slandered as impious, just as I was slandered, and will be called pretender and sorcerer, just as I was called so. Just as the early ones were slandering, so shall do those in the future; and as the early ones have been proved to be liars, so shall be the future ones”.

It is similarly narrated from Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq that he said: “Even if some one should come before you with the brains of this my son, do not doubt, nevertheless, that he is to be the Imam after me”. And on another occasion he said, while he, Ismā'īl b. Ja'far, was present:—“He is the Imam after me, and what you learn from him is just the same as if you have learnt it from myself”.

One of his (Ismā'īl’s) associates relates that when Abūl-Khaṭṭāb started his (heretical) preaching, he, the narrator, saw Ismā'īl as he was going out of his school. “I made him sit in my room, and kissed his head, [96] and said to him:— “Verily, I am surprised at what I see of your actions”. And he asked: “What makes thee so surprised?” Said I: “Yesterday thy father said to us that Abūl-Khaṭṭāb was the “mine of our secret knowledge”, and a “kitbag of our wisdom”. And to-day he curses him, ordering us to sever connections with him.” Ismā’īl replied: “When God called the heavens and earth, saying (XLI, 10): “Come, ye two, whether ye will or no! They said:— we come willingly”. Thus they manifested their obedience. Similarly the Prophets, the Trustees, and the Imams obeyed God, sincerely answering the call. For this reason they have become infallible (ma’ṣūmūn), and those who followed them became either mustagarr (normally appointed), or mustawda’ (temporarily entrusted with), because these were obedient (?), but not faultless. Abūl-Khaṭṭāb is one of those to whom God entrusted our knowledge. This is why he preached affection to us (walāyatu-nā). But when
his faith had become erroneous, God seized from him what was entrusted with him, and we dissociated ourselves from him. Thus what strange things hast thou found in all this?” And the child rose, and quickly left the room.

The man exclaimed: “How superior (in wisdom) are the young and the old Hashimites to us!” His friend, with whom he had this conversation, came to Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣādiq, and informed him of what was said. The Imam asked: “And who is talking like this?” — Then he summoned him (Ismā‘īl?), ordering him not to go again to the school. And he, the Imam, began to take great care as to what the people talk, fearing evil from the enemies of his son.

We and you both agree in accepting the tradition that when the son of the Imam (Ismā‘īl, or his son?) completed seven years of age, the Lord of religion at the time declared him (obviously ‘arafa-hu) the Master of religion and his heir apparent, as his next in descent. He guarded him from his other sons, kept him away from the contact with the public, and his education went on under his own supervision.1

As is stated by some saints, God never sends a prophet, or his trustee, or an Imam, without appointing to him a successor who succeeds him still in his lifetime, taking over the charge of the community after his death. [97] The Imam is thus one who preaches (nāṭiq), and his successor one who keeps silence (ṣāmit). This is neither denied by us, nor by you. The first who acted according to this principle was Abraham, when he was sent to his people, and was guided by the Divine help (ta‘yūd). He was childless all his life, and God ordered to him to accept his nephew Lot as his “silent” (ṣāmit) successor, in order to strengthen his authority. So Lot was appointed, and people recognised him. This is an absolutely true story. And when Ismā‘īl was born to him (Abraham), grew up, and reached a mature age, God ordered

---

1 All this sounds very obscure. It is not clear to whom the story refers,— to Ismā‘īl, or his son Muḥammad.
Abraham to appoint him as his asās (i.e. the founder of the line of the Imams). We have already narrated his story, and it is unnecessary to repeat it here.

When Abraham appointed his son Ismā‘īl as his successor, he sent his nephew Lot to Syria, where he had to establish the “country of refuge” (dār hijrat) for him, and ordered him to preach in favour of Ismā‘īl. As God says in His book (XXIX, 25): “and Lot was faithful to him. And Abraham said: I am emigrating to my Lord”.

As Abraham treated his nephew Lot, so did Moses deal with Yūsha‘ b. an-Nūn, appointing him before he received orders from God to appoint his own brother Hārūn. And similarly did Muḥammad act with regard to Ubayy b. Ka‘b.1 We have dwelt on this matter sufficiently for those who understand. Similarly did Sulaymān act, when he wanted to make inquiries amongst his dignitaries. He summoned them to the town called Sabā, and said (XXVII, 38–40): “O ye chiefs! which of you will bring me her throne before they come to me resigned?” . . . “He who had the knowledge of the Book said: I will bring it to thee before thy glance can turn. And when he saw it settled beside him, he said: this is of my Lord’s grace that He may try me whether I am grateful or ungrateful”.

His father David acted similarly when he appointed him (Solomon), and presented him to his dignitaries, when he had acquired great authority over the people. [98] As God says (XXI, 78–9): “And David and Solomon, when they gave their judgment concerning the field, when some people’s sheep had strayed therein, at night; and we testified to their judgment; and this we gave Solomon to understand”. And prophets and Apostles of God, already mentioned above, also acted similarly before him.

---

1 Very little is generally known about this associate of the Prophet except for his being one of those few who could read and write. A reference to him seems to be quite an exceptional event, and it would be very interesting to trace what the allusion really implies.
(Imam) Ja'far b. Muḥammad acted also in the same way. He for twenty-five years had no son except for Ismā'īl and his brother 'Abdu'l-lāh. He never took any other wife so long as their mother was alive, nor took any concubine. So he acted knowing that the Imamat had to be continued in his posterity. He persisted in this until she, his first wife, left this world. And just as Imam Ja'far, so did his ancestor the Prophet Muḥammad himself act with regard to Khadija, and 'Ali with regard to Fāṭima, never marrying again so long as they were alive.

Stick,— may God pity you! — to arguments of this kind, and bring similar proofs and Divine signs concerning your own Imams, if you believe sincerely. When Ismā'īl died, those of the followers of Mūsā (b. Ja'far) claimed, proving the error of their belief, that he, Ismā'īl, appointed him, Mūsā, as his successor. They mentioned as a proof the actions of Muḥammad the Prophet when he appointed al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn (as Imams), saying: "Verily they are both Imams, "whether they stand or sit"; i.e. whether they exercise their authority or not"; and, verily, the verse of taḥfīr in the Koran is (another) testimony to their cause. Both of them were present with the Apostle of God on the "night of imprecation". This is what the Apostle of God said to the Christians of Najrān (III, 54): "Come, let us call our sons and your sons, and our women and your women, and ourselves and yourselves (then we will imprecate and put God's curse on those who lie)".

And the testimony of the Prophet about them (i.e. Hasan and Ḥusayn) is what he said that they are "the lords of youths", and those who will enter Paradise. And also the preference which he gave to their father, adding: [99] "And their father is better than themselves". This is because the Trustee preceded them, and was entrusted with them, and the proof of his priority over them is this testimony (of the Prophet) which proves his position.

It is narrated that the Prophet of God died eleven years after the Hijra, on Monday, the second day of the month of
Rābi‘u’l-awwal. Ḥasan was at the time eight years old, and Ḥusayn—seven. Thus they could not be qualified to be the Imams, and for this reason their father (‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib) was appointed as the trustee in charge of them, just as in the case of Yūsha‘ (b. an-Nūn), the trustee of the son of Hārūn. And when their father (‘Alī) died by the command of God, he appointed first the elder in preference to the younger son, and the younger became the heir of all.

You assert that Mūsā was the trustee (amīn) to Ismā‘īl. But when the latter died, his son Muḥammad was fourteen years old. Thus you have accepted this testimony, siding with those different sects which rose before you, in making the Command of God revocable. You thus disregard what the Apostle of God said (XLIII, 27): “And we have made a word to remain in our posterity”. And just as the Imamat of Ismā‘īl was handed over to him by the command of God and His inspiration of the one who preceded him, so also was it handed over to his son by the order of God and His inspiration,—[the inspiration for which he prayed],¹—as is already narrated concerning how it happened in the past ages, and how the past prophets and Imams acted.

Both we and you admit the tradition that when Ismā‘īl was about to die, he summoned his son and his followers, and handed over the Imamat to him (Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl), in their presence, under the supervision of his father (Imam Ja‘far). He entrusted the testimony concerning the position of his son to one of his ḥujjāts (i.e. dā‘is), as did his forefather Ismā‘īl with regard to the person surnamed al-Kabsh (sheep), appointed before him.² He made him the “veil” for his heir, to distract towards him the attention of the tyrants of the time. And Imam Ja‘far presided over the assembly, as Jacob presided over the assembly of

¹ The words in the square brackets are found in the old copy, but are absent in the modern MS.
² It is significant that the name of this ḥujjat is not disclosed. There is very little doubt as to all this being merely a “reconstruction” of the long forgotten events on the basis of the Biblical parallelism, and that it has nothing to do with the real facts.
Joseph when the latter was on his deathbed. We shall discuss this question [100] in its proper place, if we successfully carry on up to it.

Then came Muḥammad (b. Ismāʿīl) by the command of God and His inspiration of him. His dāʿīs dispersed, travelling in different provinces (jazāʾir), and ordering the local people to carry on the propaganda in his favour. The world became alive with propaganda, and his influence spread. They started to look in their travels for the opportunity to establish the "country of refuge". But his enemies increased their effort in their search for him. And when his authority became stronger, and news about him spread far, when the search for him was intensified, he disappeared from his mother country, and went forth, passing through different lands. Imam Jaʿfar remained in his original place, entering into the cave of taqiyya, as his father called it,—this was mentioned above.

His dāʿīs spread to different places, and he appointed his lieutenant, the high priest, who was with him, as did the son (?) of Hārūn with regard to Yūshaʿ b. an-Nūn. This is why God says, referring to the Ephesian Sleepers (XVIII, 21): "They will say: three, and the fourth of them was their dog. And others will say: five, and the sixth of them was their dog,—guessing at the unseen. And some others will say: seven, and the eighth of them was their dog. Say: my Lord knows best the...

---

1 Such details of the organisation of the Ismaili propaganda obviously have nothing to do with the time of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, and really belong to the author's time. The reference is precious for the historian, because the author refers to this as to something well-known to every one. It obviously indicates the general policy of laying foundations to "cells" through agents sent from the centre, and mobilising local forces to spread the propaganda effort further.

2 If this tradition has any historical substratum, it is very important. It makes Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl leave Medina before the death of his grand-father, Imam Jaʿfar, i.e. before 148/765. This seems to be more consistent with his story. Sayyid-nā Idrīs in his 'Uyūnuʿl-akhbār ("Ismailis and Qarmatians", pp. 60–63), makes him leave his native town after the death of Mūsā b. Jaʿfar (d. in 183/799), probably at the age of 63, which seems quite improbable. This later version is probably invented in order to make him connected with the picturesque names of Hārūnuʿr-Rashīd and his wife Zubayda.
number of them; none knows them but a few. Dispute not therefore concerning them save with plain disputation”.

On the Proofs of the Imamat of Ismāʿīl and his Son.

From what we have seen concerning both of these Imams, they betook themselves to it (dār hiyra)?, with their followers (?), leading them by the path which had never been trodden by any one except for the Imams, proceeding by the Command of God and His inspiration, and legitimate succession (nāṣṣ), as has been explained above. They (the early Imams) made it unlawful for themselves to remain in the kingdom of their enemy, under the tyrannical authority, to live under their power, or have any connection with them, or show submission to them. Verily, none remained amongst the faithful (in such conditions), except the weak ones, whom God has excused from amongst men, women and children, who could not avoid this, and were not given a chance to attain this. The dāʿīs of the Imams were working in disguise in [101] different provinces, calling people (to the right cause), and specially educating their neophytes. When any one was converted to their religion, and they were sure as to his sincerity in faith, they would accept his oath of secrecy, and reveal to him the knowledge about the Imam of the time, his place, name, and genealogy. Those of the converts who could do this, emigrated to him; those who for different reasons could not afford this were ordered to live in disguise and concealment of their religion, or to wander on earth until the time of the manifestation of the Imam should come.²

What also indicated the Imamat of Ismāʿīl was the fact that, as we have seen, factions in Islam differed as to what had been handed down to us from the Apostle of God, with regard to the

---

1 Apparently a portion of the sentence is omitted by an error, and this is why it is so difficult to trace the real relation of the pronominal suffixes. The word rukūba-humā seems to be an error. In the modern copy, instead of ḫamalā there is ḫamalā, and it is not clear, to whom it refers.

2 All this is obviously not historical information, but theoretical "reconstruction".
plain doctrine, and some of them denied the existence of the inner sense (bāṭin) in his injunctions,—this was because they were simply incapable of understanding it. They related false tradition which they falsely attributed to the Apostle of God, or also related the things which he had really said, but of which they could not understand the allegorical significance (taʾwīl). They related in their tradition itself such things as that God said that He created Adam after His own likeness. Or the Prophet's words that he saw His Lord in the streets of Medina, as a handsome looking man with thick, hard, and curly hair. Or what Muqāṭil b. Sulaymān narrated from the Prophet that God consisted of flesh and blood, and had the appearance of a human being! Similar things were narrated also by those who were connected with the Shiʿites, relating different utterances of ʿAlī, dwelling on their literal sense only: "I produced its streams, and made its fruits grow. I am the Master of the revealed mystery, the opener of the Revelation. I was with Mūsā and Hārūn". Listen to what they say! Have not we already explained to you that such things as these are merely a form of expression, and this always requires allegorical interpretation (taʾwīl), as every writing related to them requires this. Similarly all the expressions of prophets, waṣīs and the Imams require it. We have already composed a book, faṣl, teaching you the knowledge of the inner sense and its allegorical interpretation in such matters. And if we refer with you to the taʾwīl, we find that you agree with the common people who [102] are deservedly regarded as blind . . .

Both we and you agree in believing that the Apostle of God said to ʿAlī: "Thou wilt be fought on account of the taʾwīl of the religion (i.e. allegorical interpretation of religious beliefs), just as I have been fought on account of the tanzīl (revealed religious law)". Both of us agree in respect to the letter of this

1 The author probably alludes to his Kitābuʿl-kashf (cf. Guide, no. 50), or Taʾwīluʿz-zakāt (cf. Guide, no. 40). Note the use of the term faṣl, in the sense of "monograph", a work devoted to some particular question (not a general exposition of religion). This seems to be the earliest instance of such use (cf. Guide, p. 101, and Kalāmī Fir, introduction, p. xxix).
expression (zāhir). But you are content with the letter only, taking only it into account, just as the Sunnis accepted the word of 'Umar, approving of it, and taking it as his great service (to Islam). But you and they have forgotten the word of God (VII, 51): "On the day when its interpretation (ta'wil) shall come, those who forgot it before will say: "there did come to us the Apostles of our Lord in truth,— have we intercessors to intercede for us?" etc. You believe that all this is going to happen in the future, and that the revelation of its inner sense must be expected only then. But God said concerning this (LVII, 13): "... door within which shall be mercy, and the outside of it (zāhiru-hu), in front of it, there shall be torment". Such expressions, and similar to these, are too numerous to quote, and their explanation would carry us beyond the limits of this book.

What we have already cited as a proof of our thesis is sufficient for intelligent people, and those who are properly minded. What is in all these six institutions (fuṣūl) which are the pillars of Islam, such as the double testimony, prayer, zakāt, fast, hajj, and jihād,— their source is affection for the Prophet's house (walāyat). If we should demand from you that you should be content with their formal meaning (zāhir), in preference to their inner meaning (bāštih), you would not discharge these duties as they should be in truth, as they should be according to their spiritual meaning (ḥaqīqat). Thus the rite of the ablution which God made obligatory to us, or these 17 rik'ats which are obligatory upon every one. Why does the sunnat of the Prophet precede farīDAT, and the extra devotion (nāfilat) follow it? Similarly, why does the noon prayer have a sunnat before it, and after it a nāfilat? But the afternoon prayer, which has a sunnat before it, has no nāfilat after it? And the evening prayer has a nāfilat after it, but no sunnat before it? Or the night prayer, which is the last, and there are prayers before [103] and after it? And the prayer at dawn which has a sunnat before it, but no nāfilat after it? You would be unable to explain the reason why this is so.
And also amongst those things which prove the Imamat of Ismā‘īl (b. Ja‘far) is the fact that when he (Ismā‘īl) died, Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣādiq let his body remain covered in his house for three days. His face was left uncovered, and the people who came in could recognise him,—the Hashimites and non-Hashimites, the residents of Madīna, and the visitors from elsewhere. Imam Ja‘far himself asked those who came to express their condolence to him:—"Is not this my son Ismā‘īl?" And those who saw him had no choice but to admit this without hesitation. Then he took the signature of the visitor, as to what he had seen. He did this until in Madīna all the Hashimites, local people and visitors, had given their signatures.¹

The body was then taken out to the Baqī‘ cemetery, on the fourth day, still with the face exposed. From time to time the Imam (Ja‘far) caused it to be laid on the ground, kissed it, and said: "By God, the death of Ismā‘īl does not hurt me so much as what I have promised to him". He made the whole crowd which was with him to witness his burial, and even took signatures from those who were not present before the body was carried out. He did this three times, and on the fourth he had the body placed in the grave. He went through the ceremony in the usual way, and those present could give testimony of having seen him (Ismā‘īl) buried in their presence.

The local spies wrote about all this to al-Manṣūr (the second Abbadid caliph (136–158/754–775)).² And Imam Ja‘far also sent a letter to him, informing him of his bereavement. (Before that) the Abbasid sent spies to watch Imam Ja‘far, in order to find out who was appointed as his successor, so that he might be murdered. When the news (about the appointment of Ismā‘īl) came to him, he became worried. And they (the spies) were watching Ismā‘īl,

¹ All this is apparently paraphrased in the Zahrul-ma‘ānī by Sayyid-nā Idrīs, cf. above, pp. 209–213.
² If this tradition can be relied upon, it shows that the death of Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far took place after 136/754. This tallies well with other references indicating that he was still living in 133/751 (cf. "Ismailis and Qarmatians", p. 57, and also above, p. 215).
plotting to seize him. Then came the news of his death, and the caliph was relieved from his anxiety. But only a few days passed before [104] he received a report that a man in Baṣra, a cripple of about sixty years, was sitting once at the door of his shop in the bazars of the town, plaiting a basket of palm leaves, when a young man passed by, in appearance and dress looking like Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far. A crowd of men surrounded him, all greeting him, and asking for protection. When the cripple, who was a Shi‘ite, a follower of Imam Ja‘far, saw him, he began to shout: “O, descendant of the Apostle of God, stretch thy hand to me so that God may stretch His to thee!” The young man returned, seized his hand, and brought him down from his shop. Then the cripple walked along with him a distance, leaving him later, and returned to his place healthy and straight in stature. People began to crowd around him, asking him who it was who healed him. And he replied: “Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far b. Muḥammad”.

Thus the spies of the caliph wrote about Ismā‘īl being dead, and also Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣādiq wrote about his bereavement. And when the caliph read the latest news, he said: “Verily, the trickery of the sons of Abū Kabsha will never cease until they perish to the last man”. Then he immediately summoned Imam Ja‘far, who was brought before him. When he appeared before the caliph, the latter produced his own letter, and the report of the spies, and, showing to Imam Ja‘far his own note, asked him: “Is not this in thy own handwriting, the letter informing me about Ismā‘īl’s death?” The Imam replied: “yes”. Then the caliph produced the report of his spies about the events which took place in Basra. The Imam also produced the testimony of those who witnessed the death and the burial of his son. When the caliph saw these documents, his anger subsided. He then summoned a number of the Hashimites who were with him, and they testified what they had seen, and acknowledged their signatures. Thereafter he gave orders to dismiss Imam Ja‘far, giving him good presents, and permitting him to return home.
This people did not know how the mystery of God acts in His saints; they did not know what God grants them in every period and time. Therefore āṣ-Šādiq returned to the sacred place of his Ancestor, and occupied his seat, just as Jacob sat in the place of Joseph after the latter’s death, or as did Shu‘ayb when he no longer had his prophetic mission to discharge. [105]

Travelling dā‘īs scattered over the earth, while Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il was with him, keeping silent (sāmit) so long as his grandfather lived. But when his death approached, Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il left Medina, before Imam Ja‘far died, collecting those of his dignitaries and “proofs” who still remained (in Medina). He went towards the ḥujjat whom he had sent to seek for him the “country of refuge”, as it has been already mentioned in the account of his predecessors. As we have seen, he and his descendants and successors kept themselves concealed from people. They despatched their dā‘īs to different parts of the world in search of the “country of refuge”, as narrated above. One of the dā‘īs appeared (later on) in the Yaman, starting propaganda there. His authority and position became strengthened. A teacher went by his orders to the Maghrib, about the date of the expiration of the period of satr, and the approach of the time of manifestation, promised by the Apostle of God, who predicted the “rise of the Sun from its setting place”. When his authority had become strong, his propaganda met with complete success, and Divine signs appeared, his lords 1 came out towards him. This was similar to what Lot did for Abraham. When the latter left the country of his father, Lot acquired for him the “country of refuge”. And he (Abraham) cancelled the law (shari‘at) of his ancestor, Noah. Similarly did Moses act, when he left the country of his father Shu‘ayb, and cancelled the law of his ancestor Abraham. He then invaded the country of his enemy, and destroyed him. All this has already been narrated, and does not require lengthy repetition.

1 Obviously al-Mahdī and al-Qā‘im.
And they, the Imams, always remained concealed until there came about what the Apostle of God had predicted to his community, when he was asked about the time of his death: "How long is the world to remain in existence?" He showed them his three fingers. They speculated as to whether this should be three days, months, years, tens of years, or three hundred years..., and added nine. Verily, the Prophet indicated this, and ordered this from the prophecy about the People of the Cave, to which they fled from the oppression of the tyrant. We have already explained [106] the words of the Apostle of God:—"They fled for the sake of their religion, and they will rise with Jesus son of Mary". And he also said: "My descendants amongst you are like a cave, the door of salvation for every one who enters it, or as the Ark of Noah for those who boarded it"...

...The end of the Book called "Aṣrāru’n-nuṭqā‘", by the Glory of God, and blessings to His Saint, and His blessing and protection,—may Peace from Him be on us!
6. From the 117-th Majlis from the “Majālis” of Sayyid-nā Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī.

(For the work and its author see above, p. 23; and for the text see Extract 6.)

[107] Said (‘Alī b. Abī Tālib): “I wish every one, at all times and periods of the world’s existence, may know the truth”. Thereupon rose Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī, and said: “O, Commander of the Faithful! Reveal to us something about this, so that we may console ourselves with this, and live content with what is going on in this world”.

And ‘Alī said: “Know, o, Jundab,¹ that the Apostle of God has authorised me to mention to you the things that follow. He said to myself: “O, Abūl-Ḥasan, when the daughter of the Kīsrā (i.e. Persian king) Hurmuz shall be taken prisoner . . . verily this girl shall become the mother of Imams from my progeny. And it is unavoidable that, after thy death, another misfortune shall befall her, when, after the battle of Kerbelā, she, and other members of the family, shall be badly treated by Ibn Marjāna, the accused, after they shall have killed my (grand-) son al-Ḥusayn. His son ‘Alī (Zaynu’l-‘ābidin) shall be saved. This shall happen 61 years after my “flight” (680 A.D.). And he (al-Ḥusayn) will entrust him (his son ‘Alī) to Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya until his coming to age. He, ‘Alī Zaynu’l-‘ābidin, shall marry Umm Sālim, the daughter of Khālid, and she will bear to him four sons. One of them (Zayd) will be killed and crucified in Kūfa, the second poisoned, the third shall be lost in

¹ In traditions of this mystical kind cases of similar “absentmindedness” are remarkably common,—the story begins in reference to some one, but further on a different person is addressed. This, most probably, is one of the proofs of the very unceremonious handling and adjustment of tradition by esoteric authors, who often combine different traditions into one, to suit their own purposes.
az-Zawrā’ (i.e. Baghdad), and the fourth shall remain alive,—he shall be the Imam, Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn.

He will marry Umm Ja‘far, who shall bear to him a son, Ja‘far, in the town of al-Ba‘d (†). This shall happen in the year after my Hijra 124/742. The Abbasids shall oppose him, but shall be unable to destroy him: God will not permit this to them. He shall marry Salmā, (or: shall marry while remaining safe), and she shall bear to him five children; and he shall have five more [108] by concubines.

(6) The eldest of these shall die in the lifetime of his father, appointing as his successor the Seventh Imam.

(7) The latter shall marry the daughter of his paternal uncle, and

(8) the Eighth Imam shall disappear in the year after my Hijra 134 (i.e. 751-2 A.D.). The Abbasids shall search for him, and he will betake himself from them to the remotest non-Arab country, where God will keep him safe from his enemies.

(9) He shall marry a woman, and she shall bear the Ninth Imam, whom the Abbasids shall also try to seize. He shall leave his original place, and settle in Syria, within the province of Qinnasrin, in the vicinity of Antioch, in the district of Ḥims. He shall settle there, in his house, and news about him shall spread everywhere. He shall send from there his dā‘īs to the

---

1 Perhaps this simply means — in a remote city?
2 Imam Ja‘far’s birth is usually placed in 80/699, approximately, indeed.
3 Both Isma’ili and Ithna-‘ashari sources agree that the name of the first wife of Imam Ja‘far was Fāṭima. According to the Sharḥul-akhbār, she was Fāṭima bint al-‘asan b. al-Ḥusayn (or al-Ḥasan) b. ‘Alī; and in the ‘Umdatu‘l-tādīb (208), Fāṭima bint al-Ḥusayn al-Athram b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī. It is indeed strange to see how such inconsistencies have been permitted to remain in these prophecies.
4 Here obviously Ismā‘il b. Ja‘far is intended. But, according to all sources, the eldest was ‘Abdu’l-lāh, who, as we have seen, died a few months after the death of his father. Ismā‘il was most probably the second son.
5 It is strange to read the term Sūriyya = Syria. It is in common use at present, but, as far as I can see, it is extremely rare in old works. Apparently here it is intended only as the name of a certain district of Syria.
6 Salamiyya really lies about thirty miles from Ḥims.
remotest places in the Yaman and the Maghrib. He shall marry there in the year after the Hijra 190 (i.e. 806 A.D.). The news about him shall spread, reaching also the Abbasids. They shall send their agents, and he shall fall into their hands, as a prisoner, who shall be brought to az-Zawrā' (Baghdad), their capital, in chains, suffering tortures and pain. And he, nevertheless, shall escape from the chains to his own place, after suffering death in appearance at the hand of the Abbasids.  

1 The Tenth shall be born to him in the year after my Hijra 199 (i.e. 814-815 A.D.).

(10) And when the Tenth from my descendants arises, he shall emigrate to the countries of the Maghrib, building there a town called after him. He shall meet many enemies amongst the population of the “Far West”. And he shall be the “Sun rising from the place where it sets”. He shall be the one by the hand of whom God shall conquer the Maghrib, and through him shall be exalted the one who would say: “I belong to my community and to the posterity of the Prophet”. He shall marry a woman, and she will bear him (one son) only in the original residence, from which he shall start to his “country of refuge”.

(11) And she will bear to him the Eleventh, after a strenuous struggle, in which his parent shall become grey. This shall take place exactly at the completion of three hundred years after my Hijra. His authority shall be strong, although his assistants and helpers shall rise against him in arms, and shall besiege him in al-Mahdiyya. But he shall be appointed to his

1 This is a very interesting allusion, although it is quite obscure. It may perhaps have a certain connection with the Iṣṭīʿār, 102. Cf. also above, p. 44.

2 The “Tenth”, i.e. Husayn, the father of al-Mahdi, could not have been born in 199/814, if his son al-Mahdi was really born to him in about 260/873. Note that the next Imam is born in 300/912, i.e. 101 years later. This is only the usual complete disregard of commonsense and reality, so typical of esoteric works.

3 All this obviously reflects the story of al-Mahdi; but perhaps there is the element of “duplication”, between him and his uncle Saʿīd, which comes out more clearly in the later esoteric works.

4 Cf. above, note 2. This is merely the usual effect of superstitious belief in the magic of numbers. The exact date of al-Qāʾīm’s birth is not known, but he most probably was born soon after 280/893; cf. above, p. 32.
exalted office by a (special?) *nass*. And he shall strike as a hammer, smiting the Maghrib as a millstone grinds (corn). This shall happen after his father shall have married him to the daughter of his uncle, his nearest relative and friend.

(12) And she shall bear to him the Twelfth, and he shall see him when still living, just before his death (this apparently refers to the grandfather, not the father). He shall lose his mother in the lifetime of his father, growing under his supervision. His enemies shall be numerous, amongst his subjects and relatives. But, despite this, he shall grow in good health, and develop excellently; when he shall come of age, his father shall marry him to one of his slave girls, a Greek.

(13) She will bear to him the Thirteenth. This shall happen after his father (the 12th) shall become crook-backed, on account of the troubles which the people of the Maghrib shall give him, with his enemies, with numerous sad events, with little reliance on his subjects, with a great task, causing extreme fatigue, and taking long to accomplish, the rising of the Berbers, and the hostility of the population of Irīqiyya. He shall come to Tunis, and add to it the government of Fāṣ (Fez), conquering Sijilmāsa, to the extreme limits of the Maghrib. And his death shall approach him after his being besieged in al-Mahdiyya. But he shall overcome his enemy, and forgive those who resisted him; these shall devour each other, on account of strong dissensions amongst them. Then shall come the time of his death.

(14) He shall leave as his successor the Fourteenth. This latter shall have several brothers who shall claim what God has given to him, each proclaiming himself the Imam at the time. But he shall overcome them, and firmly establish his authority, build a large army, and make public his aspirations. He shall

---

1 There is a feeling of a certain deviation from the normal in this sentence, but it is impossible to grasp its real implications. Does it mean that his *nass* was of a kind different from that of other Imams?

2 According to both the *Istīdār* and the *Sīra* of Ja'far, the mother of al-Qa'im really was al-Mahdi’s cousin, the daughter of his uncle, Muḥammad as-Sa'īd b. ʿAhmad.
move his army, and his advanced units shall enter Egypt and its dependencies. He shall conquer Egypt with the help of his devoted slave,— and woe to the Syrian lands from this! Then he shall move from Irīqiyya to Egypt, ruining (on his way) some of the towns in Irīqiyya, to the confines of Barāwaṭa.¹

(15) When he marries the daughter of his uncle, she shall bear to him two sons, one of them being his successor, the Fifteenth. [110] He shall also have two sons by his concubines, but the elder of these shall die (early). He (the 14th) shall establish himself firmly in Egypt, and when his death shall approach, and the time of passing away draw near, he shall leave it to the youngest of his sons. He shall appoint as the governor of his kingdom during the minority of his son one of his slaves, a common man (?). He shall begin to squander the money of the state everywhere, collecting the revenue on behalf of the one who has inherited the succession. But nobody shall be benefited except his dishonest slaves and concubines. And he shall not benefit anyone except for his slaves of lower standing. The 15th shall marry a woman who shall bear to him the Sixteenth,² about the time when his term has come to its end, his death approaches, and his reign is to expire, after (another?) slave girl of his, affectionate, and of good origin. So that when he shall say: "I begin to win", his death will come. He shall not live long after this.

(16) He shall leave in charge of his kingdom the Sixteenth, who shall be left a minor. Under him war shall start, and women shall make him the object of their intrigues. The Tāghūt (Devil) amongst these shall rise, making him and those with him the tool of intrigues, while he shall think himself that

¹ In these prophecies the circumstances of various events which took place in the reign of different Fatimid caliphs are often mixed up,— perhaps quite intentionally, to preserve the tone of "prediction", which would disappear if everything were perfectly accurate. Most probably the dates suffered most, as their value was less appreciated than that of other elements in those stories.

² The sixteenth Imam was al-Ḥākim, who was about twelve years old when he ascended the throne.
he has attained what he wanted, achieving his aims. But God shall extinguish the fire caused by his enemy, and counteract the evil done by him, destroying his army, and striking him suddenly. But in his stead shall rise another, the Black one, against the Sixteenth from my progeny. He shall be an affectionate friend to my descendant, while intriguing amongst his male and female slaves. He shall seize his kingdom from one end to the other, so that kings in the West and East shall think that he is going to take the position which belonged to His saints. But he, the Sixteenth (?), shall leap upon him as a fierce and enraged lion, and shall slay him, surprising the Egyptians with dismay. The inhabitants of the sacred cities shall be very much impressed by his being killed, and by receiving the news of his having been overcome by such a blow. The lad, my descendant, at the time shall not have reached the age of sixteen. But what difficulty shall that be to you, lad, when you oppose a eunuch! 1 And woe to his descendants! When he (the Sixteenth) shall attain the age, [111] he shall choose an orphan girl, whom his father has brought up. This shall happen in the year after my Hijra 390 (i.e. 1000 A.D.). She shall be from a good stock. When he attains full age, he shall go to Damascus, where he shall appear in Rajab or Sha'bān of 394/May-June 1004. 2 His troops shall move there, and conquer Antioch, with other places on the frontier. He shall make Antioch 3 his "country of refuge".

Meanwhile the orphan girl, mentioned above, shall bear to him the Seventeenth. His name, o, Abū'l-Hasan, shall be like thine (i.e. 'Ali, as it really was in the case of az-Zāhir, 411-427/1021-1036). Wars shall be started under his rule, and great

---

1 All this obviously refers to the assassination of Barjawan in 390/1000. As is known, al-Ḥākim was born on the 23rd Rabi' I 375/13-8-985, and ascended the throne in 386/996.

2 As is known, al-Ḥākim never travelled to Syria, and apparently never left Cairo.

3 Antioch, as mentioned above, cf. p. 120 sq., often figures in esoteric speculations, as the stage of different mystical events. Al-Ḥākim, certainly, never went there, and had no reason to seek for any "country of refuge".
calamities shall happen,—it is difficult to describe what shall befall human beings and the Jinn. And how many intrigues there shall be, engineered by male and female slaves, and wives! But he shall not approach any one except her who shall give birth to his son, the Seventeenth. And there shall be much suffering, a difficult time, there shall be many tears, and much sorrow, grief, and strife. But how much humiliation there shall be to my young descendant when his army shall mutiny! He shall then go to Antioch, which shall become his “country of refuge”. He shall permanently reside in the town of Rām, on the confines of the Bosphorus, in the province of Constantinople.1 Then the Christians shall fall out with him after the Seventeenth shall be born by that orphan girl.2 His sons shall be numerous, and he shall have a large posterity before the proper time comes to have it (!), as many children shall be born to him while he himself shall still be very young, before his attaining majority.3 Through his sons he shall start shedding the blood of the Christians, by murdering them and seizing booty from them, while he, the Sixteenth (here Seventeenth) himself shall be pre-occupied with enjoying pleasures in numerous holidays, resembling the Fifteenth in his actions. The Sixteenth shall decide to slay his determinate enemy and avowed pretender, conquering ultimately his places of refuge and the towns occupied by him. Many women shall become widows, begging in the streets. [112] But (ultimately) different provinces shall flourish again, and merchants shall settle in them, protected by justice and law. And after this he shall be on the point of devastating Byzantium to the limits of Constantinople, when the Christians shall rise in rebellion, attacking him with great might, such that it would

1 It is indeed interesting that Constantinople figures so often in prophecies ascribed to ‘Ali. In some traditions some of the “concealed” Imams are made to reside there. None of the Fatimid caliphs, certainly, went there, or resided there.

2 As is known, aẓ-Zāhir was born on the 10th of Ram. 395/20-6-1005.

3 Only one son, in addition to aẓ-Zāhir, is known to history,—al-Ḥārith, born 19 Rab. II 400/10-12-1009. When he was born, al-Ḥākīm was 25 years old,—not a minor, especially in the East.
justify the belief in the invasion of Gog and Magog. Then the
Sixteenth shall disappear from the community in Byzantium (?).
And how shall his troops and his generals fall into differences after
his disappearance! ¹

(17) Then his son, the Seventeenth, shall occupy his throne.
The Christians shall collect in the vicinity of Constantinople, and
move their troops. The people of the Maghrib shall then com-
bine with the people of ‘Irāq, helping the people of Syria. Egypt
shall be ruined when they shall pass through it. People shall
show the place on which the capital of Egypt stood, and Egyptian
women shall be sold on the markets on Ma’rib (in the Yaman),
while the people of the Maghrib shall offer for sale particularly
delicate women, those who were brought up in seclusion, and slave
girls (from rich houses); and one shall hear women’s ornaments
 tinkling on common pack ponies. This shall happen despite
their coming from the Maghrib to Baghdad to help my descendant.
But Constantinople shall (nevertheless) be conquered, the
Byzantines shall be defeated, the enemy shall be destroyed, and
the people of God shall be victorious, because the people of God
are always victorious, and their troops are Divinely helped.
When my descendant conquers all the Byzantine provinces,
seizing Constantinople, he shall return, and from Byzantium shall
move against ‘Irāq. This shall happen after the death of the
Sixteenth. He shall go from Egypt to the land of the Kisrā (or
the throne, kursī), of Peṭrus (?), whose place is in Syria (Shāmāt),
at the time when seven planets come together in the beginning
of the constellation of Spica Virginis. There shall be great
calamities, deaths of many important men in the army and
provincial government, but people will not pay much attention to
this, being preoccupied with their own sufferings. This shall
begin from the year (three hundred and) ninety-two to the end of

¹ This obviously refers to what was said above about his “residing
in the country of Rūm”, etc. But would it not also mean that he dis-
appeared into Byzantium? Then all these details of his living in Con-
stantinople, etc., would probably embody a belief in certain circles as to
his having gone there after his mysterious disappearance.
400 (1002–1009 A.D.). This shall be hard, many [113] important and lesser men shall be slain, until my Sixteenth descendant shall have no more enemies to oppose him, neither from the members of his house and his relatives, nor amongst those unrelated to him, and his opponents. So it shall be by the time that the Seventeenth comes to the throne. This shall take place in Rajab or Sha‘bān of that year (i.e. 400) — February–April 1010 A.D. Otherwise he shall ascend the throne some time after the year 400. But he shall come to it only after the execution of his enemies and foes from amongst his relatives and dependents.

Later on some people will begin to spread heretical beliefs concerning God. No sooner this will be started by one community than others, from another community will join this (?). Bad news shall begin to spread, and differences shall arise, amity shall become scarce in his affairs, and the affairs of his enemies. But in the propitious time and hour, after the destruction of the enemies of God, and the unbelievers amongst the people of West and East, this shall cease. They shall carry on war by sword and fire, since they will have no other choice.”

1 As is already suggested above (cf. p. 117), apparently all similar esoteric prophecies are the product of the fourth/tenth and the beginning of the fifth/eleventh c. The most remarkable feature of this one is the extraordinarily pessimistic tone which pervades it. It strikingly contrasts with the tone of the earlier prophecies, collected by Qādī Nu‘mān in his work, Shahrul-akhbār, composed about 350/961 (cf. above, p. 99 sq.). It is more than probable that this is due to the great disappointment with the earlier expectations, which flooded the strictly religious Ismailli circles, when, after the reigns of the brilliant Imams from al-Mahdi to al-Mu‘izz, there began a period of decay and political degeneration under weaker successors, accompanied by great calamities and suffering. Perhaps the wild experiments of al-Ḥākim were really intended to placate this section of his followers, and to raise their spirits by the enforcement of various restrictions upon non-Ismailis.
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Abū, b. (= bin), Ibn, K. (= Kitāb), R. (= Rīsāla), the Arabic definitive article al, prepositions, and words within parentheses are not taken into account in the alphabetical arrangement of the entries in this index.
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the letter n, standing after a figure, e.g. 96n, indicates a reference to the footnotes on the page, 96. In case reference is given both to the main portion of the page and footnotes, a comma is inserted, e.g. 96, n, = 96, 96n.
Aaron, see Hārūn.
al-`Abbās (b. `Abdīl-Muṭṭalib), 115; descendants of, 116
Ibn `Abbās = Abbasid caliph, 110, 25, 85
`Abbās b. `Abdīl-lāh, Hashimite in Salamiyya, 173, [101]
Abū `l-`Abbās ʿAḥmad b. `Abdīl-lāh, name assumed by Ḥusayn b. Zarkūya, 92
— — Mḥd. (b. Zarkūya), dāʾī, 61, 80, 163n, (165), [96, 97]
`Abbāsī, al-Mahdī pretends to be an —, [108]
Ibn `Abd, dāʾī in Baghdād, 164, [96]
`Abd b. Maymūn, 144, see `Abdu`l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qadīmān. `Abdu`l-lāh (= plebeian name), 153
— — — — al-Mahdī, q.v., (31), 57, 59, 61, 144, 148
— — — — concealed Imam of the Druzes, 150
— — — — b. al-`Abbās (b. `Abdīl-Muṭṭalib b. Ḥāshim), rāwī, 100, 110, 117n, 185, [108], 17
— — — (b.? ) ʿAḥmad b. `Abdīl-lāh (in Qarmatian epistles quoted by Tabari), 47
— — — — al-Akbar (see `Abdu`l-lāh b. Mḥd b. Ismā`i`l), settles in Salamiyya, 162, [95]
— — — — Ḥabla, rāwī, 109, 19
Abū `Abdīl-lāh al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAḥmad al-Kūfi, see under Abū `Abdīl-lāh ash-Shīrī.
`Abdu`l-lāh b. Maymūn (b. al-Aswad) al-Qadīmān (al-Makki), (22), 29, (48), 68, 76, 76, (94, 104), 127n, 128n, 129-132n, 133, 134, 140-144, 152, 153n, 155, 156, 236, 248n, 250, 256n, 49, 59, 60, 64, cf. under Ibn al-Qadīmān; — asās in the system of the Druzes, 150; — merely a collective name, 132; — three persons under the same name, Druze system, 150-151; — Persian by origin, 129n
— — b. Maymūn b. Daysān, 48
Abū `Abdīl-lāh b. Mḥd b. Ismā`i`l, name assumed by Yahyā b. Zakrūya, 92
`Abdu`l-lāh b. al-Qadīm, Aghlabid official, 221, [132]
— — ar-Raḍī, see `Abdu`l-lāh b. Mḥd b. Ismā`i`l, 241, 248, 54, 58
— — b. ʿṢāliḥ, Hashimite, 161n
`Abdu`l-lāh b. ʿUmar, rāwī, 64, 110, 111, 9, 29
`Abdu`l-Jabbār, historian, 139
`Abdu`l-Mālik b. Mḥd al-Māzīnī, dāʾī in Kirman, 142
`Abdu`l-Muṭṭalib, 100, 115, 10; — descendants of, 107, 10, 24, 28
`Abdu`r-Raḥīm (or `Abdu`r-Raḥmān), Abū`l-Qāsim, b. al-Yās b. ʿAḥmad b. al-Mahdī, heir apparent
of al-Hākim (d. ca. 415/1024), 149n
— — supposed original name of al-Qā’īm, 50
— — (heir apparent of al-Hākim), see under ‘Abdu’r-
- Rahmān.
‘Abdu’r-Razzāq, rāwi, 108, 15, 24
‘Abdān, dā‘ī, 47, 48, 59, 60, 76, 78
Ābi Gargar (= Mashrūqān), canal, 157n
Abraham, Ībrāhīm, 16, 18, 255, 268, 270, 289, 293, 294, 303, 63, 76, 93, 97, 105; — religion of, 268n; — rel. of Abrah. and Mḥd, 118; — shari‘a of, 303
— and Muḥammad, religion of, 118
Abbyssinia, Ḥabash, q.v., 118
Abbyssinians, 117, 118, 124; — jazira of, 21n
Adam, 16, 18, 76, 107, 245, 248, 270, 299, 13, 56, 58, 76, 101
Afghanistan, Eastern, 21n
al-Əfālā, or al-Əfāl, see ‘Abdu’l-
- lāh b. Ja‘far, 237, 50
Africa, N., 6, 58, 94, 133, 149
al-Əfālā, see al-Əfāl, 278, 83
Abūl-Agharr as-Salāmi, Abbasid official, 82, 171, 172, 174n, [101]
Aglibab, bana‘ūl- , or Aghlabids, 12, 190, [124, 132]
nhu‘l-kītāb, 117n
al-Əhm, bana‘ — , 175, [103]
Ahmad, the addressee of the Qarmatian epistles, 47
Ahmad, conceealed Imam of the Druzes, 150
— Mḥd, Ḥusayn, — ancestors of al-Mahdi? 178, [104]
— Abūl-Abbās, b. ‘Abdu’l-
- lāh, name assumed by Ḥusayn b. Zakrīya, 92
— b. ‘Abdu’l-lāh al-Hāsib al-
- Marwazi, astronomer, 250n
— — — b. Maymūn al-Qaddāh, 153n, 256n
— b. ‘Alī b. Mḥd b. Ismā‘īl, 39
Ahmad, Abū ‘Ali, son of al-Mahdi, 45
— al-Ḥakim al-Ḥusaynī, huj-
- jat, 256, n, 64
— b. al-Kayyāl, 33
— al-Mawsīlī, dā‘ī, 158, [93]
— Mḥd, Hashimite in Sal-
- amiyah, 172, 173, [101]
— b. Mḥd (sic) b. Ismā‘īl, 34, 39, 151
— b. Mḥd (or Ībrāhīm) an-
- Naysbūrī, author, 7, 8
— — — at-Tayyī, governor of Lower ‘Irāq, 73
Abū Ahmad Sul‘lūk = Ja‘far, 189, [110, 132]
Ahmad at-Taql, i.e. Ahmad b. ‘Abdu-
lāh b. Mḥd b. Ismā‘īl, Imam, 249–252, 255, 60
— Abū Shalaghali, b. Mḥd
- 46n
— b. Tūlūn, gov. of Egypt, 164, n, [97]
— b. ‘Umar, rāwi, 108, 19
— b. Ya‘qūb, Abūl-Fawwārī, dā‘ī in Syria, 19, 145; — his epistle, 145
Ahwāz, town, 34, 39, 75, 132
Akhhbiyya, or Ukbhiyya, village near Salamiyya, 86, 179, [105]
akhū‘l-Mahdī, 44, 58, 59, 165, 171, 173, 189, [97, 102, 110]; — bana‘ — , 165, [97]
Akhū Muḥsin, historian, 27, 45, 74
al ‘Abbās, 59, see under Abbasids.
al Muḥammad, al-‘immāt min — ,
7, 16, 21, 22, 27, 31, 32
Alamūt, district, 48, 73
Alawites (Alaouites) of Syria, cf. Nuṣayris, 147
al-‘Alawiyya, Alids, 61, 87
al-‘Alawiyyūn, Alids, 87
‘alay-nā sālāmū-hu, 56
Aleppo, Halab, q.v., 82, 84n, 159, 160n, 161, [93, 95, 122]
Alexandria, 5
‘Alī, incarnation of the Deity, with
the Druzes, 148
— the fourt conc. Imam, 23, 57, 58, 61, 151, 153, 36, 37
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'Ali b. 'Abd Manāf = Ali b. Abī Talib (Druze), 148, n, 149
— al-Asghar, Ithnā-'ashari Imam, 287, 91
Abū 'Ali ad-Dāʿī, in Egypt, 194, 196,n, 197, [113-115]; — in Kūfa, 206, [121, 122]
'Ali b. al- Faḍlī, dāʿī in Yaman, 224, 225,n, 40; — al-Jayshānī, 197, [115]
Abū 'Ali al-Ḥakīm, 31, 256n
— — — = Saʿīd ? 59
— b. al-Husayn b. al-Walīd, Sayyid-nā, dāʿī, 20
— — — Zaynu'l-ābidin, q.v., 55, 101, 305, 26, 29, 35, (107)
— — b. 'Isā, Abbas. official, 81, [132]
— — b. Dāʿūd Ibn al-Jarrāḥ, 221,n
— al-Layth (?), 34
— b. Mḥd b. Ismā'īl, surn. al-Layth, 39
— b. Mūsā ar-Riḍā, 33, (237n), 252, 282,n, (284-286), (32, 50), 61, 88, 89; = Ahmād, 282,n
— Zaynu'l-ābidin, q.v., 305, (107); cf. 'Ali b. al-Husayn.
Ali-Ilahis of Persia and Turkey, 147
K. al-'Ālim wa'l-ghulām, 138
Allṣā b. Midrār, Aghlabid official, 202, 204, 205, 209, 210, 213, 219, 228-230, [119, 120, 124, 126, 131], (32, 33), 43-46
'Aliyyun Rukīm, 287, 65
Ailmagest, 281,n, 61
'Alūṣah ar-rāʾīš (trainer, under al- 'Azīz), 203, [119]
al-ʿūdā Mūsā, 16
'Alyā, incarnation of the Deity, with the Druzes, 148, 149
amaḥat wa rūba, handed over, 263, 70
amin = trustee, 296, 99
al-Amīr, Fatimid caliph (495-524/1101-1130), 20, 21, 37; — Ibn 'amīn —, 38
Ibn 'ammi'l-Mahdī, 44, 174, [102]
Abū Ḍammār, 272, 78
Andalus, Andalāsia, 221, 222, [132]; — jāzira of, 27
Antākiyya, Antioch, 120, 121, 306, 310,n, 311, 16, 26, 31, 108, 111
'Aqīl b. Abī Tālib, 48
'Aql-i Kull, 136
— al-'Aqlu'l-Fāʿāl, 244,n
Ibn al-'Arabī, 136
Arabs, jāzira of, 21n; — in N, 211, 220, [124, 131]
Ark of Noah, 252
Aristotle, 135
'aṣā Mūsā, 16, 31
āṣā, in the Druze system, 149, 150
K. Āṣānu't-taʿwil, 19
al-ʿAṣbagh, banāʾ =, 81
Ashnāš, town in Daylam, 33
Ashir, town in N.W. Africa, 220, [131]
Asia Minor, Rūm, q.v., 117,n, 207n
'Askar Mukram, town in Khūzistān, 31, 38, 41, 42, 75, 132, 157, [93]
āšlu'n-Nūr, 266,n, 73
āsrār, 247
K. Aṣrāru'n-Nuṣagā (comp. ca., 380/990), 18, 19, 28, 36,n, 56, 75,n, 180,n, 235,n, 237,n, 248n, 275n, 304, 106; — text of an extract, 87-106; — translation of the extract, 275-304
atimmā', early Imams, 151,n, 246, 248, and passim.
'Aṭṭār, supposed surname of the first conc. Imam, 'Abdīl-lāh b. Mḥd b. Ismā'īl, q.v., 241, 54
— Faridu'd-dīn, Persian poet, 241n
'Aṭr b. al-Karsh al-Aḥmī. "Qarman-{
ion" general, 175, [103], apparently the same person as 'Aṭr b.
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Baṣra, 41, 72, n, 73, 132, 161, 234, 302, 48, 104
Baṣrī = Imam ‘Abdu’ll-lāh, [95] Ibn al-Baṣrī = al-Mahdī, 41, 164, 175, [96, 102], bāṭīn wa ẓāhir, explained, 3 sqq.; — used as substantives, 3 al-Batḥatu’l-uzmā, 54, 55 Baytulu’l-Muqaddas, 87, see under Jerusalem.
al-Buṭḥānī, Zaydī Imam (d. 411/ 1020), 142 Buṭnān, wādī, 82 Buṭrus (Petrus?) Kisrā, 312, 112 Būyids, dynasty in Persia, 118 Byzantine prov. in Africa, 190 Byzantium, Rūm, q.v., jāṣīra of, 21n, 124; — kings of, 117, 118, 311, 312n Cairo, 30, n, 31, 117n, 310n caliph of Baghdad, 161, 171, 188, 190, and passim.
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Ghaylân ar-Rabâḥi, or ar-Rayâḥi, 165, [97]
al-Ghazâlî, 125, 136
Gîlân, 117n
Gog and Magog, 312
Gospels, Injil, q.v., 121, 284, 26, 88
Guirât, 43n
Habash, Abyssinia, q.v., 117, 168, 4, 6
Abû Habasha, house of, 202, 203, [119]
Habîb b. Abî Thâbit, râwî, 110, 25
(Umman) Hâbîb, wife of al-Qâ'im, 44, 189, [110]
Hadîth, prophetical, described, 95–97
Hafnâda gate, in Salamiyya, 171, 179n, [100]
Haifa, 165n
al-Hajjâj b. Yusuf b. Maṭar al-Hâsib, astronomer, 251n
al-Hâkim bi-amrî-l-lâh, Fatimid caliph (386–411/996–1021), 19, 46, 56, 123, 139, 143–151, 309n, 310n, 313n; — incarnation of the Deity (Druze belief), 148; — insaniyati of, 147
Halab, Aleppo, q.v., 82, 84n, 159, 160, 161n, [93, 95, 122]
Hamâ, 77, 83–85, 159n, 160, 163, 165, 170, 171, [94, 96, 97, 100, 101]; = Epiphania, 77n, 159n
Hamdan b. Manṣūr b. Jawshan, daughter of, 33
Hamdan Qarmât, 47–49, 52, 69, 75–78
Hamdêyya, râwî, 128n
Hâmîd b. al-‘Abbâs, dâ‘î in Baghdâd, 164, [96]
Hamza, uncle of the Prophet, 102, 31
— founder of the Druze sect, 150n
— b. Hamrân, 103, 5
hânîf, 267n
al-hânîfî, 74
hâqa‘iq, works on, 4, 54
hâqiqa, 300
Haramcul-Mahdî, 189, 190, 209, 222, [110, 111, 123, 132]
al-Ḥârîth b. aẓ-Zâhir, Fatimid prince, 311n
Abûl-Ḥârr, or Jârûd? 29
— Bilâl b. Furwa, 100, 101
Hârrân, town, 21n, 158; jazîrat of, [93]
Hârûn, Aaron, 233, 276, 286, 290, 291, 294, 296, 297, 299, 38, 47, 82, 90, 94, 97, 99, 100, 101
— b. Khamrûya b. Ahmad b. Tûlûn, gov. of Egypt, 164n
— ar-Rashîd, Abbasid caliph (170–193/786–809), 240, 248n, 297n, 53
Harûriyya, Khariji sect, 272, 78
Abûl-Ḥasan =‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib, 305, 310, [107, 111]
— — — = Imâm? 25
— — — al-Āqghar, Ithnâ-‘ashari Imâm, 287, 288, 91, 92
— son of the sister of Ja‘far al-Hâjîb, 195, [114]
— Kâbirud-dîn, pîr of Sind, 43n
— b. Maḥbûb, râwî, 118, 5
— b. al-Mu‘âdh, serv. of al-Mahdî, 165, 171, [97, 100]
— b. Mhd, Ithnâ-‘ashari Imâm, 287, 91
Abûl-Ḥasan b. at-Tirmanî, dâ‘î, 157, 158, [93]
Hasan b. ukht Ja‘far, 195, [114]
Hâshim, 24
“Hashmite” = Imâm, 116, 119, 120
— = Fatimids, 34, 37, 82, 90, 107, 115, 119, 293
Hâtim b. Ibrâhîm al-Ḥâritî, Sayyid-nâ, dâ‘î (d. 596/1199), 15, 23, 117n, 107
Abû Hâtim ar-Râzî, dâ‘î, 15, 28, 137, 138
Abūl-Husayn b. al-Aswad, dā'ī, 75n, 77, 80, 163-166, 168, 170-172, 175, 177, [99-101, 104]
Abūl-Husayn b. al-Farah Ibn Hawshab, dā'ī, 31, 258, 36, 65;—see under Abūl-Qasīm and Ibn Hawshab.

—b. Ḥamdān, Abbasid officer, 85
—b. Mḥd b. Ismāʿīl, 34, 39
—b. Zakhrūya, 60, 80, 89, 90, 92, 158n;—was young, 89;
—see Abū Mahzūr, Ṣāḥibush-shāma, Ṣāḥibuš-khāl.

Ibādī, 272, 78
ibāḥat, (225), 40
Ibādī, 136; al-Ibādī'ul-aṣfāl, 257, 65; al-Ibādī'ul-awwal, 235, 49
Iblīs, 225, 262, 13, 40
Ibrahīm, Abraham, q.v., 18, 63, 76, 93, 97, 105
—wa Muhammad, millat of, 4;—dh of, 118
—b. 'Abdīl-lāh b. Mḥd b. Ismāʿīl, 39, 162, 165, [95, 97];
—awlād of, 165, [97]
—b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥāmidī, Sayyid-nā, dā'ī (d. 557/1162), 144
—b. Mḥd, Hashimite in Salamiyya, 172, [101]
K. fī ʿibtidī'ī'ī'āt-dā'wa-watī'-Ṭāliẓiya (= Iftīḥā'ī'd-dā'wa, q.v.), 10, (211), [125]

Ibn Idrīs, rūḥī, 110, 25
Idrīs, Sayyid-nā ('Imādūd-dīn, dā'ī, d. 872/1468), 4, 10, 13, 17, 22, 29, 32, 37, 38, 50, 79, 129n, 153-155n, 240n, 241n, 243n, 255n, 275n, 297n, 301n
—b. al-Ḥusayn, 25

Ifrīqiyya, 74, 87, 200, 201, 205, 209, 211, 220-222, 308, 309, [117, 118, 121, 123, 124, 131, 132], 32, 34, 109
K. Iftīḥā'ūd-dā'wa (comp. 346/951), 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 33, 37, 47, 50, 52, 122, 197n, 210-212n, 218n, 227n;—extract from, text, 40-46; translated, 224-231; cf. also (211), [125]
—bīl-Maghrib, 36

Ijmāʿi, giyās, raʿy, 124

Ikhaḥkid dynasty in Egypt, 81, 168n
Ja'far as-Sadiq, 48, 50, 51, see Ja'far b. Mbd.
(Abî) Ja'far Şu'Lük al-Hâjib, 190, 222, [111, 132]
Ja'far at-Tayyar, 102, n, 31
— b. 'Ubayd (al-Jazari?), 209, [123]
R. al-Jâmi'a, synopsis of the Enc. Ikhwânîn's-ṣâfâ, 35n, 258, n, (65)
R. Jâmi'atu'l-Jâmi'a, 35n, 36n
al-Jâmi'a min ar-Rasâ'il = Rasâ'il Ikhwânîn's-ṣâfâ, 65
Jamâiba, town and port in S.W. Persia, 70
Abû Jârûd = Abû'1-Hârr? râwi', 100n, 101, 29
al-Jârûd b. Rayyâh, 287, 91
al-Jawbari, historian, 128
Jawdhar, Ustâdîh, slave, 11, 12, 154n, 233n, 263–266, 273, 274, n, 70–72, 79
jaza'tiru'1-arâd, 100; — 12, described, 20n–21n
Jedda (Jidda), 180n
Jerusalem, Baytu'1-Muqaddas, q.v., 165n, 283
Jesus, son of Mary, see 'Isâ b. Maryam.
Jewish executioner in Salamiyya, 173, cf. Ibn an-Naddâf:
— gate in Salamiyya, Bâbû'1-Yahâd, 173, [102]
— influences in Islamism, 122
Jibân'd-Daylam, 6
Jibrî'il, 115, 291, 28, 95
Jidda (Jeddâ), 180n
Jiyâd (or Jiyâda) b. al-Khash'amî, dâ'i', 158, 159, [93]
jîzâ, 117, 118
Joseph, Yûsuf, q.v., 277, 297, 303, 62, 99, 104
Joshua, Yûsha' b. an-Nûn, q.v., 233, 270, 276, 286, 290, 294, 296, 47, 76, 82, 94, 97, 99, 100
Jundâb, râwi', 267–271, 305, 73–77, 107
Ka'ba, 38, 107n, 116
al-Kabsh, goat, 286, 296, 38, 90, 99
Abû Kabsha, banû—, 235, 302, 48, 104
R. al-Kâfiya fi'r-radd 'alâ'Hârûn al-Rashîd, 19, 142, 144, 155
Kafir Tâb (?), 160, n, [94]
Karabhum (K-f-r-q-w-m), 159, n, [94]
K. Kalâmî Pîr, 10, 299n
Kalb, banû—, 91, 166n
kalimatu'l-ikhâhs, 275, 81
kalimatu'l-lân = Imamât, 239, 53
Kalâwûdâ, village near Baghdad, 48, 59, 76
K. Kanzu't-walad, 144
Karbalâ, Kerbelâ, 305, 107
kashf, 244, 246, 247
K. al-Kashf (li-Jâfar b. Mansûr'îl-Yaman), quoted, 256, 299n, 64
K. Kashfu'l-âstâr, history, by Jawbari, 128
al-kashfu'tul-ulân and ukhrâ, 54
Kashi (K. ar-Rijâl), 128, n, 129
Katâma: country, 198, 200, 205–207, 211, 212, 216, 217, 220–222, 226, [110, 116, 117, 121, 122, 125, 129, 131]; — insurrection, 221, [132]; — tribesmen sent to Salamiyya, 198, 226, [116], 42
Katâmiyyûn, [116, 122, 125, 127, 132], 42
Kawkâwâ, Kûkwâ (?), 262, 69
Kawthar, well, symbol of 'Ali, 239n, 245, 56
Kaysâniyya, sect. 69
Ibn al-Kayyâl, Ahmad, 33
al-Kâzîm, cf. Mûsâ b. Ja'far, 237n
Kâzîrûn, town, 33
Kerbelâ, Karbalâ, 305, 107
Khâbûr, stream, 84n
Khadija (bint Khuwaylid), 102, 295, 31, 98
al-khadra of Palmyra, 181, [105]
khâlat Ja'far al-Hâjib, son of, [110, 132]
Abû Khâlid, râwi', 128n
khâli'fatu'l-lân = Imam, 90
khâlîfas (?), 290, 93
—, three, of Mbd b. Ismâ'îl, Druze idea of, 151
Khalîj, baladu'l-, cf. Bosphorus, 111
Ibn Khalîkîn, 32
al-khalqul-aẖbar, 232, 47, 53
khârîj, [123]
Khârijî, Kharijîte, 69, 70, 107;
— used as an abusive term, 188n, [109]
Kharijites, 272, 10, 11
Khätimu'lu-waṣiyatun, 75
al-Khaṭṭāb, Sayyid-nā (dā‘ī, d. 533/1138), 20–22, 56, 144
Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb, heretic, 292, 95, 96
Khaṭṭābiyya, sect, 69, 128
Khwārīj, Kharijites, q.v., 272, 10, 11
Khazār, 117, 118, 123, 4, 6; — jazira of, 21n
khizānatul-Mahdi, [100]
Khorasan, see Khurāsān.
khums money, 187, [109]
Khurāsān, Khorasan, 241, 279, [93], 84
Khurāsānī, local Mahdi, 111
Khurbatu'l-Bijān, village in Syria, 82n
Khurram-dāniyya, sect, 135
Khūzistān, province, 31, 41, 67, 71, 75, 157n
Khwārizm, 34, 39
kitāb = ʿAllī, 269, 75
al-Kitāb = Coran, 90
Kitāb fi ibtidā‘i‘ dawlati‘-Tālibiyya = Ḥīfatu ‘l-da‘wa, 211, [125]
Kitāb Masnūr (al-Jawdhar) = Strat Jawdhar, 266, 72
Kirmān, dā‘ī in, 142
al-Kirmānī, Sayyid-nā Ḥamdūd-dīn, dā‘ī, 123, 138, 142, 143, 145, 155
Kisrā Hurmuz, 305, 107
knowledge, hidden, cf. al-ʿīmūl-maṣṭūr, 242, 246, 54, 57
Kūfa, 37, 61, 72n, 73, 77, 83, 86, 119n, 128, 132, 163, 164, 206, 305, [96, 115, 121], 2, 107; — dā‘ī of, 206, [121]; — mosque in, 105n;
— Sawād of, 48, 91
Kūkwā, or Kawkāw (?), town, 262, 69
M. Kurd-ʿAllī, Professor, 166n
kuṭub ʿl-Mahdī, lost at Taḥūna, 197, 226, [115], 26, 41
La‘b, slave woman, 176–178, [103–104]
labour, agricultural, in L. Mesopotamia, 72
Abū Lahab, 18
al-Layth = ʿAllī b. ʿAbdī-l-lāḥ b. Mḥd b. Ismā‘īl, 33, (34?)
Abū-l-Layth, son of Mḥd b. ʿAzīz, 195, [114]
Lot, Lūṭ, 289, 294, 303, 93, 97, 105
Lydda, near Ramla, 165n
K. Ma‘dīnī ‘l-Mahdī, 13n, 97
Ma‘arratu’n-Nu‘mān, town in Syria, 84, 158n, [94]
R. Ma‘dīsīmī ‘l-mubāsharātī, 19
— gate in Damascus, 166
Magians, religion of, 77n, 123
al-Mahdī, Abbasid caliph (158–169/775–785), 161n
—cousin, deported to 'Irāq, 44, 174, [102]; — daughters of al-Mahdi, two, 44, 189, [110]; — disguised as an Abbasid, 185, [105]; — disguised as a descendant of 'Aqūl b. Abī 'Ālib, 48; — dress of, 212, [125]; — guardian of al-Qā'im, 23; — haram, family of, 189, 190, 209, 222, [110, 111, 123, 132]; — huwājat of al-Qā'im, 149, 150n; — jāriyya of (La'b), 176, [103]; — mother of, —, 44, 189, [110]; — qaṣr of, 173, 176-177, [102, 103]; — uncle's descendants, 44, 165, [97]; = Sa'idul-Khayr as his real name, 37, 38; — the Seventh Nāṣīq (Druze ideas), 152; — tawātīf (followers) of, 171, 205, [100, 121]; — umm—, see "mother of".

al-Mahdī, Ithnā-'ashari Imam, 98, 238, 51
Mahdī b. Hurmuz, dāʿī, 34n, 35n, 78
Mahdi-ism, 50 sqq.; — = the same as the Imamat, 51, 53, 55
Abū Maḥmūd, or Abū Mḥd, 92, see Zakriyya b. Mahdīyya.
Mahrūya, 77n
Abū Mahzūl, al-Husayn b. Zakriyya, q.v., or Şāhībul-ḵhāl, q.v., or Şāhībul-ḵhām, q.v., or al-Qarmatī, q.v., 44, 60, 80n, 87, 163, 165-175, 177, 179, 182, [93, 96-102, 106]; — denies his being a Qarmatian, 182, [106]; — name explained, 80n
ma'dat Sulaymān, 16
K. al-Majālis li-Sayyid-nā Ḥātim b. Ibrāhim, 23, 117n; — extract, text, 107-113; — translated, 305-313
K. al-Majālis wa,l-muʿāyarat, 12, 13
Majīṣā, see under Biḥārul-anwār, 17n
al-Majīṣā, Almagest, q.v., 251n, 61
K. Majmūʿul-tarbiyyat, 19, 21n, 145
ma'khudh 'alay-hi, [112]
Makhzūm, banū —, 128
Makka, see Mekka.

Ibn Abī Malāḥīf al-Yamanī, dāʿī, 211, [125]
Abū'l-Malīḥ, rāwī, 24
Mālik, banū —, 166, [97]
— b. Şāhḥār al-Hamdānī, rāwī, 119, 6
al-Maʿmūn, Abbasid caliph (198-218/813-833), 33, 35, 36n, 250-252, 252-255n, 60, 61, 86-89
K. al-Manāgīb bi-ahl būyūt, 13
Mani, hereesiarch, 136
Manichean influences in Isma'ilism, 137n
Manicheans, 135
Maṇṣūr = Mahdī (in the Yaman), 94, 111
al-Mašūr, Abbasid caliph (136-158/754-775), 234, 277, 278n, 301n, 82, 103
— Fatimid cal. (334-341/ 946-953), 64, 65, 109-111, 114, 139, 139n, 187, 190, 196, 203n, 222, 246, 274, 285n, 8, 71, 72, 79, 80; — incarnation of the Deity, Druze idea, 148; — measures against Shi'ite extremists, 139; — name — Ismā'īl, 265, 274, 72, 80
— = Ibn Ḥawshab, q.v., 36
Maṇṣūr al-Jawdarī, 11, 266, 72
— b. Mḥd b. 'Azīza, Abūl-Layth, (195), [114]
Maṇṣūrīn al-Yaman, Ibn Ḥawshab, q.v., Abūl-Qāsim, q.v., 13, 47, 88, 196, [115]
Maṇṣūriyya, town, 203, [119]
Maqâm Ibrāhim, in Mekka, 116
maqāmāt, spiritual ranks, 244, 55
Ma'rib (town in Yaman), 312, 112
ma'rīfat bi'n-nūrāniyyat, 73, 74, 77
ma'rīfatul-[hījāb], 62, 63
Ibn Marjāna, 305, 107
al-Marwa, in Mekka, 107, 13
al-Marwardi, 220, [131]
K. al-Maṣābīth fi 'ithbāṭi-l-Imāmat, 19, 143
Mashriq, 110, 113
Mashriqān (= Abī Gargar), canal, 157n
al-Mašiḥ = Jesus, q.v., 73, 93
masjidul-Mazāz in Damascus, 166n
Masonic lodges, 133
ma'sūmīn, 292, 96
Mas'yaf, village, 159n
al-Mawāṣ, rebellion of, 207, [122]
“mawlāy as-sayyid”, surname of Abū ‘Abdīl-lāh ash-Shi‘ī, 217, [129]
al-Maymūn, epithet of Iṣmā‘īl b. Ja‘far, 232, 47
Maymūn b. Ǧhaylān b. Ǧīdar b. Mīhrān b. Ǧalmān al-Fārī, 233, 47
— al-Qaddāḥ, 133, 153, 155, 233, 236n, 47, 49
Māzandarān, 39, 117n
Mazdakite influences in Islamism, 135, 137n
Mazza, village near Damascus, 166n, [98]
Mazzatu‘l-Abā‘ī, village near Damascus, 166, [98]
Medina, Madīna, q.v.
Mekka, Makka, 39, 70n, 72n, 107n, 116n, 128n, 148, 206, 211, 237, 279n, 280, [122, 125], 84
M-F-H-S, 256, 64
men of God = Imāms, 284
Mesopotamia, 19, 39, 44, 59, 76, 132; — Lower, or Southern, 41, 60, 71, 72, 74; — Upper, or Northern, 80, 81, 158n, 159. Cf. ‘Irāq.
Ibn Midrār, 32, 33, see Alīsā‘ b. Midrār.
Mihmāf ‘b. ‘Abdīl-lāh, rāwī, 115, 23
mihrāb of God = Imam, 275, 291, 81, 94
Mihrawa‘īh, Mīhrūsya, Mīhrwā‘īh, 77n
minbar of Sulaymān, 120, 16
Miṣr, see under Egypt.
— capital of Egypt, 194, [113];
— sāḥib of, 194, 225, [113], 41
mīthāq, 298, 101
Mithra, 77n
Monastery of Sparrows, Dayr ‘Aṣfūrin, q.v., 159, 160, [94]
Moses, Mūsā, q.v., 120, 121, 233, 260, 270, 286, 291, 294, 299, 303
Mu‘āwiyah, Umayyade caliph (41–60/661–808), 148
— (II) b. Yazīd b. Mu‘āwiyah, Om. cal. (64/683), 282, 87
al-Mubārak al-maymūn, epithet of Iṣmā‘īl b. Ja‘far, q.v., 232, 47
al-Mubā‘i‘l-Awzayl, 136
— ‘l-Ḥaqq, (247), 57
Mudīlīj, 34
al-Muhallab, 120, 12
Muḥammad, the second and the fifth concealed Imams of the Druzes, 150
— valad La‘b, 176, [103]
Abū Mḥd = al-Mahdī, 202, 227, [119], 43
— — the brother of al-Mahdī, 44, 49, 58–61, 79n, 165, 171, [97, 100]; cf. under al-Mahdī, brother of.
Abū Mḥd (al-Kūfī), dā‘ī (beg. iii/ix c.), 158, [93]
— — —, or Abū Mahmūd, q.v., Zakariyā b. al- Mahdī, q.v., or Zakrūya b. Mahdūya, q.v., 60, 92, (158), 163, 164, [93, 96, 97]
— — ad-Dā‘ī (of Fāṭimiyūn), in Abū Mahzūl’s forces, 169, 177, [99, 104]
Mḥd b. ‘Abdīl-lāh, as the Druzes call the Prophet, 149
— — — b. Mḥd b. Iṣmā‘īl, the second concealed Imam (as in al-‘Azīr), 46; — name claimed by Yaḥyā b. Zakrūya, 92
— — — Abū‘l-Qāsim, 32, 66, see under al-Qā‘im.
— — — b. Sa‘īlī, desc. of Abbāsids, 161n, [94, 95]
— — — b. Yaḥyā, name claimed by Yaḥyā b. Zakrūya, 92
Mḥd b. Ahmad = Abū ‘Ali al-Ḥakim, 31
— — — “shaykh”, 176n, [103]
— — — (= Sa‘īd), 256n
— — — = Sa‘īd al-Khayr, 32n, 37, 38n, 40, 41n, 42, 43, 48 (?), 49, 57, 59, 61, 153
Mhdb. Abi 'Ali ad-Dā'i, Abū'l-
-Husayn, dā'd-phā't, 196. [114]
— 'Ali b. al-Husayn, al-Bāqir,
Imam, q.v., 306, 107
— — — Mūsā b. Ja'far, 285,
286, 89
— b. 'Ali, al-Qā'im, sic, 37
— — 'Azīza, 176–178, 189, 193,
195, [103, 104, 110, 112, 114]
— Abī Bakr Ībrāhīm, Abū
Hāmid, Farīdu'd-dīn 'Aṭṭār
Nīshāpūrī, Persian poet, 241n
— al-Bāqir, Imam, 68, 117n, 121,
128n, 129, 133, 235n, 254n,
260, 275, 306, 62, 63, 67, 81,
107
— Bāqir b. Mḥd Tāqī Majlisī, 62,
97, 98
— b. Dā'id b. al-Jarrāḥ, 74
— b. ad-Dayraji, Abbas. official,
180, [105]
— b. al-Ḥanafīyya, see Mḥd b.
'Aṭṭar.
— b. al-Ḥasan b. Mḥd b. 'Ali
ar-Riḍāli, 280, 90
Mḥd b. Ismā'īl b. Ja'far, Imam, 9,
10n, 28, 30, 32, 38, 39, 46, 48, 49,
54, 55, 67, 68, 70, 78, 91, 92, 94,
128–130, 133, 141, 144–146, 149–
151, 154n, 155, 232–234, 236n,
237, 240–248, 276n, 277n, 290n,
293n, 296, 297n, 303, 36, 47,
49, 53–58, 82, 99, 100, 105;
— hujiyat of, 296, 99
Mḥd b. Ja'far, 237, 279, 280, 50, 84
Abū Mḥd al-Kūfī, dā'd, early iii/ix c.,
138, [93]
— — — 158n, 163, [96], see under
Zakrūyya b. Mahdī.
— sons of, 165, [97]
Mḥd b. Mḥd al-Yamānī, author of
the Sīra of Ja'far, 10, 184, 185,
203, 220, [119, 131]
— al-Qā'im, 263, 70, 73, see under
al-Qā'im.
— as-Sa'id, uncle of al-Mahdī,
176n, 308n
— b. Salām, rūsī, 121, 16, 18
— b. Sulaymān, Abbasid general,
83, 86, 90, 174n, 175n, 176,
179–181, [102, 103, 105, 106];
— his report, 84–85
— b. Ṭāhir al-Ḥārithī, Sayyid-
nā, dā'd (d. 584/1188), 19
— b. Zakrūyya, Abū'l-Abbās,
dā'd, 61, 80, 163n, 165, [96, 97]
Mḥd b. Zayd, dā'd, author of K.
al-Balāgh, 249, 59
Muhhammadīyya, sect, 279, 84
Muhisn, Akhū-, historian, 27, 45,
74
Mu'īl, incarnation of the Deity,
Druze idea of, 148, 149
al-Mu'izz il-dīni'l-lāh, Fatimid
caliph (341–365/953–975), 27n,
102, 140, 151, 187, 190, 196, 203,
205, 238, 245–247, 264, 313n,
[109, 110, 114, 119, 121], 20, 51,
56, 57, 71; — epistle to the dā'd
of Sind, 155; — incarnation of
the Deity (Druze idea), 148; — as
a rūsī, 102, 20
R. al-Muṣīzatul'l-khiṣa, 7
Mukhid b. Kaydād, Abū Yazīd,
Dajjāl, rebel, 64, 139, 262, 272,
274, 8, 69, 78, 80
al-Muktafi, Abbasid caliph (289–
295/902–908), 82, 86, 89, 172n,
180n
Mu'mir b. Sa'id b. Abī 'Arūfa,
rūsī, 24
K. Muntaṣa'u'l-akhhār, 14
Mūqān, district, 117n
Mūqātīl b. Sulaymān, rūsī, 299,
101
al-Murūd, Messiah, 102, 22
Murūdī, banū —, 166, [97]
Murtaḍā (= 'Ali), 268, 75
Mūsā, cf. Moses, 16, 47, 67, 76, 90,
94, 97, 98, 101
— b. Abū Ḥamīd, a Shi'ite, 262, 69
— b. Ja'far, 7-th Ithna-'ashari
Imam, 55, 233n, 236n, 237n,
238, 239, 280, 281, 282n, 295–
297n, 49, 50–52, 85, 86, 99;
— hijāb for Mḥd b. Ismā'il, 236,
49; — surnamed al-Kāzīm, 33;
— surnamed ar-Riḍāli (?) [237n,
50
— Tābbī, physician to al-Man-
ṣūr and al-Mu'izz, comes from
Wārī in Maghrib, 190, [110]
—, Abū Tālib, son of al-Mahdī,
45
Ibn Abū Muṣāḥhīf, merchant in
Salāmiyya, 177, 178, [103, 104]
muṣallā in Mahdīyya, 262, 272, 69,
80
al-Musayyib, rūsī, 110, 25
Muslim, slave, 207, 208, 214, 215, 218, 219, [122, 127, 130]
Abū Muslim (Khurāsānī), 53n
Muṣṭafā (the Prophet), 263, 268, 70, 75
mustahqiq, Imam —, 259, 68
al-Musta'īl, Fatimid caliph (487–495/1094–1101), 5
Musta'īlians, sect, 21
al-Musta'īr bi'l-lāh, Fatimid caliph, (427–487/1036–1094), 4, 5, 23, 38n, 38
mustaqa'ir wa mustawda', 54–56
mustawda', 233n; — mustawda' amīrī-hi, explained, 154n, 233n, 47;
— mustawda' li'l-Mahdī, (162), [96]
Mu'tadd b. Mḥd b. Jazār, rebel, 64, 8
al-Mu'taddid, Abbasid caliph (279–289/892–902), 86, 172n, 173, 180n, [101, 105, 106]
Mu'tazilite leanings of al-Ma'mūn, 250n
mutimm, 244, 55
an-Nābā'ī, 268, 75
Ibn an-Naddāf at-Tadmūrī, Jewish executioner, 173n, 179, [105]
Ibn an-Nadīm, historian, 74
Naṣaf kull, 136
Nahrayn, district, 75
Najrān, Christians of, 295, 98
nāqa, she-camel of Yahyā b. Zakrūyā, 91, 169, [99]
R. an-Naqīd 'l-khaft (Druze), 150n, 151n
Nārjīs, slave woman, 287n
an-Nasafi, dāt, 138
an-Nāṣir, surname of Imam 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Mḥd b. Ismā'īl, 30
Nāṣirī Khusrīw, 10
Nāšīru'd-dīn Tūsī, 117n
Nāṣrānī, 4
Nāṣrāniyya, Christians, q.v., 111, 112
Nāṭiq, the Seventh, 17, 149, 232n, 243n, 244, 290n, 49, 55; — potential Qā'im, 246, 57; — Sixth, 149; — al-Mursal, Mḥd, 49
Naysābūr, Nishāpūr, q.v., 30, 241n, 54
Negro slaves (Zinj), importation of to Ṭīrāq, 72; — insurrection of, 72
Negroes, jāzira of, 21n
Nīḥāwand, town, 33, 241n
Nīl, Nil, 261, 68
Nīshāpūr, Naysābūr, 30, 241n, 54
Nizār b. al-Musta'īn, 5
Nizārī, 56
Noah, Nūh, 18, 239, 245, 250, 252, 270, 303, 304, 56, 60, 76, 106;
— Ark of, 304, 106; — sharti'at of, 303, 105
Nuṣārā, banū —, 168, [99]
Ibn Nuṣayfī, rāwī, 24
Nūḥ, see Noah.
Nu'mān b. Akhī Ismā'īl b. an-
-Nu'mān, dāt, 84, 85
— b. Mḥd, Abū Ḥanīfa, at-
-Tamīmī, "Qaḍī" (d. 363/974),
6, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 28, 33, 37,
51, 62, 63, 66, 97–102, 104,
106–109, 111, 115, 116, 119,
120, 122, 139, 141, 211, 224n,
228n, 231n, 313n, [125]
nuqābā' — dignitaries, 275, 276
nūrānīyyat, 267, 272; cf. ma'rīfat.
an-Nāru'l-auwbal, 62
Nāru'l-lāh, 74
Nusayri beliefs, 234n
Nusayrīs, 147; cf. Alawites.
Nuwayrī, historian, 48, 49, 78
Obolla, port, 72n
Omayyads, 107, 110, 114, 115, 117
"One flock and one shepherd",
Fatimid ideal, 115, 118, 119, 121n
Orontes, river, 77n
Palestine, Filisṭīn, q.v., 165, [97]
Palmyra, Tadmūr, q.v., 173, 179, 181, [102, 105]
Papacy, 133, 135
Persia, 19, 21n, 44, 48, 49, 67, 70,
140, 147, 158; — jāzira of, 21n;
— South —, 49; — SW, 70; —
Western, 19, 44
Persian Gulf, 72n
— "influences" in Ismailism, 136
— nationalistic movement, 129n
Petros (?), Buṭrus, q.v., — Kisrā (?),
312, 112
Plato, 135
Prayers, esoteric (for Saturday), by al-Mu'izz, quoted, 245, 56
prolongation of the Last Day, for the sake of the Mahdi, 114
Ptolomy, 251n
Pythagoras, 16
"al-Qaddafi" (the father or the son?), 141, 153, 154,n, 38
Ibn al-Qaddafi, 22, 94, 104, 127n; see 'Abdu'l-lah b. Maymün.
Qadi Nu'man, see under Nu'man b. Mhd.
Ibn al-Qadim, 'Abdu'l-lah, Aghlabid official, 221, [132]
Qadisiyya, 78
al-Qahraman, see Abū Ya'qūb.
qā'id, in the troops of Abū 'Abdul-lah ash-Shī'ī, 218, 219, 219
Qā'im (generally), 41n, 50, 51, 101, 106, 107n, 110, 119n, 232, 239, 240, 243, 244n, 245, 247, 52;
— explained, 101n; — al-'a'immat min-hu, 24-25; — al-Muhammad, 7, 31; — min-nā, 3, 5, 16, 29;
min wadad Fā'ima, 6; — Qā'imun
al-Qā'im bi-amrīl-lāh, Abūl-Qāsim Mhd b. 'Abdullāh, Fatimid caliph (322-334/934-946), 12, 20, 31, 32, 45, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 58, 61, 68, 101, 144, 145, 151-
Rahmān, 50; — not the son of al-Mahdi, 23-24; — son of 'Ali, the fourth concealed Imam, 37; — his wife, Umm Ḥabib, 44, 189, [110]
al-Qā'im bi-Miṣr = hujjat? 206,n, [121]
al-Qā'imul-kulli, 243, 54
— 's-Sābi', 232, 47
Qā'im yaqumi'l-giyāma, 246, 56
Qarafa, 30n
Qarāmiṭa, Qarmatians, real, 70,n, 86; — supposed to be, [98, 106]
Qarmat, Ḥamdān, 47-50, 59, 132
Qarmāṭ, used as an abusive term in Isma'ili works, 70n
al-Qarmaṭī = Abū Mahzūl, q.v., 177-181, 188-190, [102, 104-
106, 109-111]
Qarmatian = Kharijite, 188
— brothers, sons of Zak-
rūya, q.v., 47, 52, 59
Qarmatians, Qarāmīṭa, 68-70, 86, 87, 170n, 273
— of Baḥrayn, 49, 69n, 70, 147
"Qarmatians", supposed to be, 38, 40, 42, 44, 45, 50, 58, 71, 73, 81-87, 89-91, 166n, 167, 170n, 173, 174n, 177n, 180n, 187n, 193n
Qarızī, b. as-Sahm al-Āẖmī, officer, 175, [103]
Qarqisīyā', Circeiium, 84n, 86, 181, [106]
Qārūn, river, 157n
al-Qarwān, village, 84
Qarvatul'sayl, village, 175n, [103]
Abū'l-Qāsim b. Ḥassān, 182, 202n, [106]
— (al-Husayn) b. al-
-Farāh, Ibn Ḥawshab, q.v.,
dā'elle, Manṣūrīl-Yaman, q.v.,
37, 196, 197, 206, 211, 224, 225,
[115, 121, 122, 125], 40, 41
— — = al-Qā'im, q.v., 50,
164, 172, 183, [97, 101, 107, 111,
126-128]
— — b. al-Mustanṣīr, cf.
al-Mustafī, 38
— — b. al-Muṭṭalīb, 209, 211, [123-126]
— — Yahyā (q.v.) b. Zak-
rūya, surnamed "Shaykh",
q.v., or Šahibu'n-nāqa, q.v.,
77, 163, 165-169, [96-98]
Qāshiyyūn, a mistake for Fāṭimiy-
yūn, 80n, 166, 168, 170-172, 181, [97, 99]; — dā'īs of, 166;
— masdā'ik of, [99-101, 105]
Qastīfīyya, province in N. Africa,
182, 198, 201, 227, [106, 116,
118], 42, 43
Qatāda, ṭāwī, 64, 100, 9, 24
gawlū's-ṣīdq, 114
Qayrawān, town, 6, 108, 200, 202,
203n, 205, 207, 220, 222, 261,
262n, [116-119, 121, 122, 131,
132], 33, 42, 68; — gate, in Raqqāda, 201
Qimnasrīn, district in Syria, 306, 108
Qiyām, final, 246, 57
Qiyāmat, 99, 101n; — great, 243, 55; — Resurrection, 246, 56
al-Qiyāmatu'kubrą, 54, 55
Qiyāmat = spiritual ranks, 243, 55
qiās, iqānāt, rā'y, 124
qumus, "shirts", manifestations of the Imamat, 256, 64
Quaraysh, Quarayshites, 100, 251, 24, 26, 30, 61
Quss Bahrām, district, 75
Qustantina, town, 33
Qustantīniyya, Constantinople, q.v., (119, 120, 311, n, 312, n, 6, 7, 12, 111, 112
Qutb Burhānpūrī, author (end xii/ xviii c.), 14
R. ar-Radd 'alān-Nuṣayrī (Druze), 150n
ar-Radż, surname of Imam 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Mḥd b. Ism., 30, 33, 241, 248, etc.
Radwā, hill, 288
rādīf, 201, [118]
K. Rāḥatu'l-aql, 19
Raqqā, town in Upper Mesopot., 81, 161, 187n, [95]
Raqqāda, town, N.W. Africa, 12, 184, 190, 201, 205, 207, 209, 218n, 222, 261, [107, 111, 118, 121-123, 132, 133], 68
"ar-Rasā'il" i.e. Rasā'il Ikhwānī's-saṣāfā, 4, 33, 35, n, 36, 40, 46, 250-252, 60, 61, 65
ar-Rashīd, Hārūn, Abbasid caliph (170-193/786-809), 240, n, 248, n, 297n, 53
K. Rauḍatu't-tasli'm, 117n
ra'y, iqānāt, qiyaṣ, 124
Ibn Razzām, or Rizām, 74, 127, 155
religion (dīn, q.v.) of Abraham and Muḥammad, 118
— of the Māgi,ans, 77n, 123
Renaissance, 123
restoration of piety, all-Shi'ite ideal, 104
"revolutionary" spirit of Isma'ilism, 134
K. ar-Riḍā, by Khashi, 128
K. ar-Riḍā, 138
Ibn Rizām, see Ibn Razzām.
Roman Catholic Church, 133
Rūdbār, district in N. Persia, 73
rufuẓ-zāhir, 40
ar-Rukn wa'l-Maqām, bayna —, 30
Rūm, aṣlāb —, 28; — balad —, 311, 312n, 110-112; — jazira of, 21n; — murūk of, 4, 6
Rūmī, ghulām, [122]
Ruṣāfā, town, 80, 81
ar-rubūtu's-Salsaliyya, 62
Sabā, town, 294, 97
sabaniyya, veil? 187n
"sābī min-ni", Imam, or Qā'im, 98
ās-Ṣādiq, see Ja'far b. Mḥd.
Abū Ṣādiq, rāwi, 120, 12
Sa'dūn b. Da'laj, leader of banū Mālik, 166, [97]
ās-Ṣafā, hill in Mekka, 107, 13
Ṣafwān al-Jammāl, rāwi, 101, 30
— b. Yahyā, rāwī, 128n
Ṣaḥibu'l-khāl, cf. Abū Mahzūl, 61
— 'n-nāqa, cf. Yahyā b. Zak-riyya, 60, 70n, 77
— 'r-rutba, high dignitary, 154n
— 'sh-shāma, cf. Abū Mahzūl, 44, 61, 70n, 82, 83, 87, 158n
— 'z-zamān, Mawlā-nā, the 4th conc. Imam? 66
Sa'id, 58, 59, 307n, 308n; — al-mulaqqab bi'l-Mahdī, 37; — = Mḥd b. Ahmad b. 'Abdīl-lāh, q.v.; — = Sa'idu'l-Khayr, q.v.
Sa'id b. Ahmad = al-Mahdī, q.v. (Druze idea), 150n; — = Seventh Nāṭiq (Druze idea), 151n; — = Mḥd b. Ahmad, 150n
Abū Sa'id, Qarmatian leader, 34n
— al-Ḥadharī, rāwi, 108, 15
Sa'idu'l-Khayr = Mḥd b. Ahmad b. 'Abdīl-lāh, 31, 37, 42, 57, 162, 258, [95], 38, 66; = al-mulaqqab bi'l-Mahdī, 38; — usurps Imamat, 162, [95]
Sa'id b. al-Musayyib, rāwi, 100, 24
Abū-Sa'idīs, name for the Qarmatians of Baḥrayn, 70
Ibn Salām, or Mḥd b. Salām, 108, 18, (121, 16, 18)
Abū Salāma, dā'ī, 157, [93]
Salamiyya, town in Syria, 10, 30, 31, 34-40, 42, 44, 47-49, 57-61,
K. Sharḥu‘l-akhbār, 12, 13n, 14, 33, 36, 47, 50, n, 61, 97, n, 122, 185n, 210n, 228n, 237n, 306n, 313n; — text of an extract, 1-34
sharī‘atayn = tanzil wa ta‘wil (Druze idea of), 149
Sharīk b. Ḍabd-l-lāh, ṭawī, 121, 26
Shayba, banū —, 107n
“ash-Shaykh”, 60, 77, 81, 92, 93; — cf. under Ḍabd-l-Qāsim, Shāhīn-nāqa, Yahyā b. Zakryā)
Shayṭān (?) Shabūn (?), Shabūn (?), 160, n, 94
Shi‘at = Ismailis, 189, 96, 48-51; — bi-asrī-hā, 84; — shī‘atu-nā, [102]; cf. Shi‘ites.
Shī‘ī, Shi‘ite (= Ismaili), 174, 202, 206, 235, 236, 299, 302, [121]; — all the —, 279, 285
Shi‘ite risings, 87
Shim‘ūn, Simon, 270, 76
“shirāts”, qumus, i.e. manifestations of Imams, 256, 64
Shith, Seth, 270, 56, 76
Shu‘ayb, 303, 104
K. ash-Shumā‘u’s-ẓāhirā, 15
Shustar, town, 157n
Sičili, 21n
ṣīfr, 239, 52
Sūjūl, epistle, of al-Mu‘izz to the dā‘ī of Sind, 27n, 140
Simon, Shim‘ūn, 270, 76
Sind, or Sindh, dā‘ī of, 27n, 140; — jāzira of, 21n
Šīrāf, port on Persian Gulf, 70
ṣīrat (= example) of ‘All, 106, 3
K. Sīrat Ibn Ḥawshab, see K. Sīrat Manṣūrī‘-Yaman.
K. Sīrat Ḫafr al-Hājīb, 7, 8, 10-12, 32n, 37, 38, 40-42, 44, 45, 51, 52, 70n, 79, 80, 91, 164n, 165n, 167n, 176n, 182n, 224-227n, 231n, 248n, 308n; — full text of, [107-133]; — translated, 184-223
K. Sīrat Jawādir, 11, 12, 41n, 154n, 264n, 265n, 266, 273n
K. Sīrat Manṣūrī‘-Yaman, or Ibn Ḥawshab, 33, 37, 47, 50, 74, 94, 211n, 36

68, 73, 77, 79, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 90, 93, 132, 158-162, 164-167, 170-175, 179-182, 184-190, 193, 195, 198, 218, 306n, [94-98, 100-103, 105-112, 114, 116, 130, 133]
Salhab, village near Salamiyya, 165, [97]
Ṣāliḥ b. Mḥd, Hashimite in Salamiyya, 172, [101]
Saljuqs, 241n
Salmā (?), 306, 107
Salma, Umm-, 100
Salman al-Fārsi, 110, 117, n, 118, 129n, 233n, 234n, 254n, 267-271, 4, 6, 24, 47, 62, 73-77; — symbolized by basmala, 254; — = Salsal, 254n
Salsal = Salamān, 254n; — al-karim, 62; — Salsalīyya, ruba, 62
Sām, Sem, 270, 76
aṣ-Ṣamānī, Yahyā b. al-Mahdī, 34n
Samarrqand, 241n
Samarrā, town, 34, 39
Samātē (?), 198, [116]
Ṣānit, Imam, 268, 278, 293, 303, etc., 75, 104, etc.
Ṣanā‘, malik of, 225n, 258, 65
Ṣandal, slave of al-Mahdī, 207, 208, 214, 215, 217, 218, [122, 127-130]
Ṣanhāja, province, [131]; — jafal—, [131]; — al-mushrikīn, 213, [126]; — al-muslimīn, 213, [126]
Ṣaqāliba, Slavs, jazira of, 21n
Ṣaqlī, slave woman, 287, 91
K. Sarā‘i‘u’n-Nuṭaqā‘, 18
Ṣatāq, town, 200, [117]
Ṣatpanth, 43n
Ṣawād of Ṭraqā, 181
Ṣawlat (?), — name or title? 273n, 79, 80
Sem, Sām, 270, 76
Seth, Shith, 270, 56, 76
ash-Sha‘bi, ṭawī, 119, 120, 6, 16
Shabīn (?), or Shaybūn (?), town, 160, n, [94]
ash-Shākir, surname of Mḥd b. Ismā‘il, 30
Abū Salalghalgh Aḥmad b. Mḥd b. ‘Abd-l-lāh, 46n
Ṣhām, Syria, q.v., [96], 16, 30, 68, 87, 93, 97, 108, 112; — sāhib —, 30; — Shāmāt, 312, 109, 112
Ṣhāmī = local Messiah, 111
ash-Shamsu‘u’t-fāli‘a, surname of al-Mahdī, 38
K. as-Siratul-mustaqīma (Druze), 151n
K. Sirat Ustādāh Jawāhar, see J. S. Jawāhar.

as-sirru' maktūm, 54
"ibn sittā" (the promised Messiah), 98, n
Solomon, see Sulaymān.
Spica Virginis, Sunbulā, constellation of Zodiac, 312, 112
Subīk, or Subuk ad-Daylami, or as-Salāmi, Abbasid official, 80, 81, 187n
Sudan, 262, 69
Ṣūffī, Abū 'Abdīl-lāh ash-Shīfī, 206, [121]
Sufyān ath-Thawrī, rāwī, 63, 7
Sufyānī, Messiah, 111
Sulaymān, Solomon, 294, 16, 97, 98; — mā'idat of, 16; — minbar of, 16
Su'ūlāk, Abū ʿĀhmād, slave, 189, 190, [110, 132]
Sumāq, jābal —, 159, [94]
Sumāqa, village, 159n
Sunbulā, Spica Virginis, q.v.
Surhāf (= Suhrāb?) b. Rustam, dāʾī, 34
Sūriyya, 306, 108
Syria, cf. Shām, 21n, 31n, 34n, 38, 42, 71–74, 77n, 80, 81, 87, 89, 116, 132, 147, 164, 165n, 166n, 261, 283, 289, 294, 306n, 309, 310n, 312; — dāʾī of, 145, 149; — desert of, 132
Ṭabarīyya, Tiberias, town, 165n, 191, 192, [111, 112]; — dāʾī of, 191, [111]
Ṭabaristān, province, 120, 12
tabīliš-sharī'at, [118]
Tables of Moses, 120
Tadmur, Palmyra, q.v.; — Sāqiyyat of, 179, [105]
tafwīd, 130
aṣhāb'u't-taṣfīr, 28
taghabūn, 246n, 56
Ṭähart, town, N.W. Africa, 220, [131]
Ṭāhir, cashier, wazzān, under al-'Aziz, 203, [119]
Abū Ṭāhir, Qarmatian leader, 142
Ṭāhirids, dynasty in Khorasan, 241n
Ṭāhūna, village in N. Africa, 7, 197, 226, [106, 115], 41
Abū Ṭālib, 234, 48
Ṭāliqān, district, 48, 73, 132
 Ibn Ṭalāt al-Qurashi, pretender, 53
Tamām, Mu'tārik al-Asjāni, with-Nā'ilī, Abū Zākī, official, 209, [123]
at-Ṭamāni, or as-Ṣamāni, Yaḥyā b. al-Mahdī, 34n
"Tamania", see Tamānā'
Tamīm ad-Dārī, rāwī, 120, 16
Tamana' = Tamania on modern maps? 84, n
Tanaṣṣūr, 136
K. Tanbūhul-hādī wa'l-mustahdī, 19, 46, 143
at-Taqī, surname of ʿĀhmād b. ʿAbdīl-lāh, Imam, q.v., 31
Taiqiyya, 229, 288, 289, 297, 92, 93, etc.
Ṭarābulusul-Gharb, Tripoli in N. Africa, 53, 182, 195, 197, 198, 226, [106, 114, 116], 34, 42; — sh-Shām, in Syria, 165n, [97]
Ṭartūs, town in Syria, 159n
Taḥayyūr, 101
taḥbīb, 247, 57
taḥfir, āyatu't, 295, 98
ta'fil, 247, 57
jawfīfu'l-Mahdī (= followers of), 171, 205, [100, 121]
tawīl, 138, 299, 300, etc.; — compared with ījmā, etc., 124
K. Ta'wilu'z-zakāt, 131, 299
at-Tawrāt, Torah, 121, 281, 284, 16, 26, 31, 88, 86
ta'yīd, 279, 289, 97, and passim.
at-Ṭayyib, Imam, 20–23, 246, 57
Tell Afer, 159n
"temporary Imam", explained, 233n
Thābit, historian, 93
— rāwī? 101, 31
theocratic Alid state, ideal of Ismailism, 135
Tiberias, see Ṭabarīyya.
Torah, see Tawrāt.
Trinity, 136
Tripoli, see Ṭarābulus.
Ṭughj, — or Ṭughuch? — b. Juff, gov. of Syria, 81, 166n, 169, [98, 99]
vision of Jābir b. ‘Abdīl-lāh al-
-Anṣārī, 256 sqq.
wadī‘= mission, 284, 88
wa’dū‘-l-lāh, 20
wadī‘at, 263, [98], etc.; — wa
amānat, 265
al-Wafi, surname of Imam Ismā‘īl
b. Ja‘far, 30
wahy, as explained by al-Mu‘izz,
238, 51
Waki‘b. al-Jarrāḥ, rāwī, 120, 7
waladu‘-l-‘Abbās, = Abbasid caliph,
[112], 84, 87
walad ‘Ali, 14, 16
— Zaynī‘-l-‘abidīn = Mahdi, 26
— Fāṭima, 250, 252, 6, 15, 24,
25, 87
waladu‘-l-Husayn = Imam, 32
— ‘l-Mahdi, Imām min —, 4,
6, 16, 17, 20, 27, 29
wa‘l-ahdī-‘l-muslīmīn, 38
Waliyyu‘l-‘immat wa‘l-Imamat wa
ṣāhibu‘r-Risālat wa‘d-a‘wat =
Prophet, 4
walīyyu‘l-amr, 51, 61
walīyyu‘l-‘aṣr, 249, 59
walīyyu‘l-lāh, = Imam, 258, 263,
83; — = al-Qā‘im, 66, 70
walīyyu‘l-haqq, 61
walīyyu‘hu = al-Mahdi, 33
walīyyat al-mansūba bi-jazirāt-nā
(i.e. Yaman), 37
waqīfa, or waqfyya sects, 49, 67, 70
Wāri, town in W. Africa, 189, [110]
al-Warq, district in Upper Mesopot.,
179, [105]
al-Warqā‘, ancient Uruk, 179n
Wasīf b. ‘Sawārtaqīn, 78
wife of al-Qā‘im, see Umm Ḥabib.
Wulūtu‘-l-amr, 250, 60
Yahūdī, 4; — min ahl Tadmur, exe-
cutioner, [102]
Yahyā b. ‘Abdīl-lāh b. Mḥd (b. Ismā‘īl t), 92n
— b. al-Mahdi at-Ṭamāmī or
aṣ-Ṣamāmī, 34n, 78
— b. Mḥd b. Salām, rāwī, 115,
28, 29
— b. Salām, 110
— the “Shaykh”, see Y. b.
Zakriyya.
— Abū Zakariyyā, b. al-Mahdi
at-Ṭamāmī or aṣ-Ṣamāmī, 34n,
78?
Yaḥyā b. Zakrūya (Zakariyā b. al-Mahdī), 47, 60, 77, 78, 80, 88, 89, 91, 92, 93; — cf. Abū‘l-Qāsim, Shāykh, Shāhi‘u’n-nūga
Yaḥūj wa Mājūj, Gog and Magog, 112
Yaman, 13, 15, 18, n, 21, 24, 31, 32, 37, 38, 41, n, 47, 52, 57, 71, 73, 74, 94, 118, 124, 132, 142, 189, 190, 194–196, 206, 211, 224, 225, 260, 303, 307, [93, 111, 113–115, 121, 125, 36, 37, 40, 41, 65, 67, 105, 108; — da‘wāt in, [115, 121]; — sāhiḥ of—, [125]
al-Yamānī, local Messiah, 111, 140
Ya‘qūb, Jacob, 277, 296, 303, 82, 99, 104
— — as-Sījzī, dā‘i, 138
al-yāqūtūl-ḫamrā wa‘ṣ-ṣafrā, symbolic, 270, 76
yawmu‘l-Qiyāmat, 17, 52, 56
Abū Yazīd, see Mukhlīb b. Kayyād.
Yūṣuf b. an-Nūn, Joshua, 233, 270, 276, 286, 290, 294, 296, 47, 76, 82, 94, 97, 99, 100
Yūsuf, Joseph, 277, 297, 303, 82, 99, 104
Yūsuf al-Qahramānī, 182, [106]
Zādān, rāwī, 110, 118, 24
az-Zāhir, Fatimid caliph (411–427/1021–1036), 23, 310, 311
zāhir wa bāṭīn, explained, 3 sqq.
zāhir sharī‘at Mīdī, 57
R. az-Zāhira fi ma‘rifat ad-dārīl-ḥākira, 7
K. Zahrul-ma‘ānī, 4, 12, 17, n, 50, 153, 154n, 180n, 233n, 241n, 275n, 301n; — influenced by the Ghayatu‘l-mawālīd, 22; — should it be pronounced Zuhru‘l-ma‘ānī? 17n; — extract, text of, 47–80; — translated, 232–274
Abū Zakariyā, incarnation of the Deity (Druze), 148
Zakariyā b. al-Mahdī, see Zakrūya b. Mahdīyya.
az-Zaki, surname of Imam Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad, 31, 36
Abū Zāki, Tamām b. Mu‘ārik al-Aṣjāni an-Nā‘ili, official, 209, [123]
Zakrūya b. Mahdīyya, i.e. Zakariyā b. al-Mahdī, Abū Mādh or Mahmūd, q.v., al-Kūfī, dā‘i‘ in Kūfā, 34n, 48, 60, 76–78, 80, 89–93, 158n; — son-in-law of, 74; — sons of, claiming Imamat, 91, 93
zandāqa, heretics, 4, 6
zandaga, 117, 136
Zayd b. ‘Ali Zaynul-‘Abidin, 305, 107 (?)
Zay dial principles, 281n
Zaydīs, sect, 145
Zaynul-‘Abidin, ‘Ali b. al-Husayn, q.v., 54, 55, 101, 153, 255, 256n, 267, 64, 73
Zayrī, or Zīrī, 213, [126]
Zayrīs, dynasty in Tunis (362–543/972–1148), 213n
az-Zij, astronomical tables compiled for al-Ma‘mūn, q.v., 250, n, 60
Zikrūya, Zikrwaib, 77n
K. az-Zīnā, 138
(Zinj), Negroes, insurrection of, 72
Zīrī, see Zayrī.
Ziyād, banū —, 166, [97]
— b. Bashshār, rāwī, 24
Ziyādatul-lāh (III), Aghlabid ruler, 198n, 201, 211, 221, 226, 227, [116, 124, 132], 34, 42–44
Zoroaster, 136
Zoroastrians, 135
Zubayda, wife of Hārūn ar-Rashīd, 297n
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Note Errata on the Reverse.
ERRATA

Page 2, line last but one: last word = بلاء

— 3, last line: read صفوا
— 9, sixth line: read فتادة
— 20, third line: read المزر
— 22, third line from the bottom: read مولياً for موليا
— 24, third line from the top: read وسنَه و أصله
— " fifth " " " " " " فتادة " " " " " " المyen
— 27, third line from the bottom: read حق for تمحر
— 30, top line: read دعوا الى
— 32, second line from the bottom: read قض
— 40, third line from the top: read a damma over ليكم
— 51, sixth line from the top: read last word ليكم
— 62, top line: read قور for قور
— 63, eighth line: cancel the reference to Cor. LXXII, 26.
— 79, tenth line: cancel (؟) بلاء
— " last line: read إن for إن
— 88, second line: read يبسط و يبسط for الزمان الزال و يبسط and الزال
— " twelfth line: read يبسط و يبسط for يبسط و يبسط
— 89, seventh line: put و أنه into square brackets.
— " eighth line: cancel the initial من
— 98, fifth line: read خمس for خمس
— 103, eleventh line: read خروجه for عيش
— 109, fifth line: read عيش for عيش
المنتهى ببعضً كتب الإشاعية

من الجزء الخامس عشر من كتاب شرح الأخبر

(1) وعن أبي بصير قال: سمعتًا عبد الله بن جعفر بن محمد يقول إن الإسلام بلغه وسمى غريبًا كما بدأ فظيع للغوراء.

وهنا reprehif تزويد عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم.

لما والأعدم، وإنما كانوا جعفر بن محمد الصادق موضع عليه وترك أبنائه الله:

قال أبو بصير: فلما تناوله، فلما شدد في هذا، قال: هذا يا ابن رسول الله:

قال: نستخرج الدعاء معًا دعاً حاجيكما دعا رسول الله، وكذلك أعد من:

استنف دعاً أخداً إلى الله لتلمع القلب الساق، وكثير الطاعة، وغلب:

ائمة الضلال واندرس ذكرائم الهوى الذين انفرض أئمة تطيعهم على:

المبادئ، واستمر للإذاعة عليهم، فإنَّما إنذار الله بالدعاء لائمة ما يهم:
رسول الله عندما مقتل لحسين صل الله وصلى الله عليه وسلم، وعند الفتنة على البطل، فبقاء الله وصلى الله عليه وسلم في البطل، حتى لم يسيئ من المؤمنين إِلَّا لنا فعَّالٍ إِلَّا معنَّى إِلَّا لما ينالون منهم أو غيرهم ثم، فعند ذلك تأتى ابن خيبر، فعند ذلك ابن خيبر، لِللهِ ابن رسول الله، فقتل من عاداء الله، رضي الله عنه، من وصلت اليه ذي الله، وعند ذلك كله من ولده منهم، إلى جانب صلى الله عليه وسلم على الرسول، فبرنف المفتاح، كما قال عليه عليه وسلم، ولم يقُل عليه، فإن ذلك إنهما أخبر به رسول الله، وسلم عليه على ما يكون من مثل ذلك وغيره، وذلك من مساعدة، وبرهينه عمد.  

وعن جعفر بن محمد، فأنه قال: «وأنواع الناس أما أتام النجاة على الطلاق!»، ووعود كان ذلك لم يكن بالسماحة على بطن، وكم كان الأمير، فقام المهدي، نعم الناس على الطلاق، وإلى السماحة إلى مضايقة، فصلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وقطع طلاقه البديعة. وكلا ما أتَّبَعه المهدي، على الذين، والحكم، والقول في الحلال والحلال، وأقام الناس بالسماحة على السماحة على عين التي ساربه الهناء، على ما معاً، أتامه المهدي، من أحكام الدين، وقطعوا يبيع المتبوعين، ولاتزال ذلك حتى يعود الذين جدداً إِلَّا كله، أما بدأ في الإسلام، محفزاً كامنوا، كما نشأ.
صلِّ عليه وسلم بالدعاء:宫殿

(6) وعن أمير المؤمنين عم أنه خطب الناس في الكوفة رجاء
الجهاد ورحب الفضل وما يتقي من سوء عواقبه، فلما أنغ من خطبته
قام إليه رجل فقال: يا أمير المؤمنين، نحن ذاً نشينا وأنت نينا استروا لله
صلبه وإبن عممه وصبه، ومنزلاء رسول الله ورايته، ومنا بنا رسول
الله الخمس والعشرين سيّدنا عائشة اهْلَ الْجَهَّاَثُ، فجَمُّعت الْجَمَّالِ
عليها الماظون، فقال له علي م: كيف يكون ذلك ولم يستدّ البلا منظور
الجاهية وتستبي الذرية وليستكم بخسر الرحي بقالها حتى لا يبقي إلا بانفع
لهم أو غير ضار لهم، فacock أن ذلك ابتعث الله خير هذه اللاتة داو
قال البرية: فيقتلهم جزاءً جزاءً جزاءً بقي الله حتى يقول ترشى
والعرب والله أطهان هذا من عا محمد كرمنا، ويئمون أنهم آوين
ساعةً من نها لا يشفع لهم الله، فقام إليه رجل فقال: يا أمير المؤمنين
ومني يبلغ رضي الله، قال يفذف الله في قلبه الرحمة تيزَنَفَ السيف عنهم;
 فقال له م: كيف يكون ذلك، قال إن شاء الله، قولا على الرحمن بقالها،
البقال خرِفَة ارجلدها تلقى تحت الريح، إذا كانت تقي، قوله جزاءً جزاءً
القتال، والاختلاف فيه، وكذاك لم يقم المهدي حتى استداكسبة
ظهرت الجاهية من بني المباش ومن بني أمية وسُبيَّتَ الذرية ذريةٌ
إذًا، رأوا حمزة بن حرب عن أنه قال: "قد أدخلت عليه الامامة بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأدخلت به أيضًا. وشهد أن الله تعالى فرض طاعتهم، فلما سمعت ذلك أو رأى بيده إلى أن أسكت نسكت، فأنا كنت الأمة على جالب مذهب الله نبيه ﷺ، وسأنت أول الناس بالناس. ثم قال: إذا دلتكم رجل من أشبئ به لا يكون فيها فلما يبينه فهوكاً في ولده من بعده.

فهذا يا بن سفيان ما ذكرت ومصادقته وقبول ذلك ويشاهده يقول:

قول الله تعالى: محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم وطاعته، النبي بعثه بإمامة وردد الدينيين علية الله وليخشي الله والمعتوقون، هؤلاء الذين آلوه صلى الله عليه وسنجزذ تلك ويزبيه عليهم أيدي الأئمة من ذريته.

ومن ذلك ما رواه للحسن بن حبيب باسناده عن إبن الله محمد جميعهم:

أتمت إذا أنتم قائمًا ومتاعبًا، لايكون عليه أن ينصب، وإن دخل فيه بحقيقة وتلابسه عنده، ويبعد عن هذه السنة.

اليوم، ويدعُ على سهبة الصبيان وبيطرهم من المصارئ السواد.

وهذا المأمون بعد مسند مضى من الأمة وهم من يقوم منهم.
ويكون الدين لله كما وعد تعالى في كتبه به ونظره على كل دين كما رجب فيجاهه.
ويكون ذلك على أبدي اثنتين دينيه وأولئيه، وينسب إلى الهدية أولهم.
اذكان سبب ابتدائه وعنده تفرع ما يتفرع فيه إلى غاية انتهائه، كما ينسب ذلك وصاحبته المجاهد النبي صلى الله على شرعته وملكه وأهل دعوته، وأمه وعلى يد الأئمة من ذريته،
(2) ومساءله متأثرة بذلك متآهوف في معناه ما روي عن مسلم.
الفارسي يُح مدآٌّ أثرة عن رسول الله صل الله عليه وعِلَّم أنه ذكر الهدي عٌم وقال إنه لقتَّل القادة والإخوان، ولا يقتٍل منهم قوة ولا يأخذ منهم جزية ولا يدع في الأرض أفراداً يعدون الإسلام إلاّن فكروه، ويملك الترك ولفظ والدابي وفقه ويدع إلى سلوك الروم مصونين في الجهد لا يدع يومهم فانصراني وليوجب لهم دمته، وبرده التأسيس جميعًا على الله إبراهيم وتُحَميتهم،
فهذا متأثرة أنّه يجري شيئًا بعد شيئ على يد الله تعالى والائمة من ولده، وينسب إليه اذهواؤلاً في فقه وتمامه وإلى رسول الله رجحه الشرعية والمهلة وإلي النائمة والمأمة، والصاحب الرسالة والدعوة، كما تبين أنه يكون لبعض الإئمة لم يكن فيه حقي قيض وهويون في رأيه،
من بعد وينسب إليه،
كما يقال، فإن الشيء المحتمل من قبل الله تعالى، نقال

قد خيّر النبي ﷺ والمجرّ والقسطنطينية رجل من بني هاشم، فتح الله الأمر بهم، فاختارهم الله ﷺ في هذه المواضع وغيرها فلابد

أن يفتحه القسطنطينية والقسطنطينية، ولبئس الأمر بيهم ولتبئس الجيش ذلك الجيش، والقسطنطينية بعدم فتح، والقسطنطينية بعدم فتح، والذي يفتحها كأناجا في الفجر قبل هذا تأثير من أئمة من آله

محمد صلّم

(11) ومن حديث سفيان الثوري يرفع إلى رسول الله ﷺ أن他说

قال الله وله الجهر رأيا وجهه كالكوكب الدُّرّي اللون، لونه في

والجسم إسرائيل، كذلك كان المهدى صلّم وسيّبً من جمل الرجال رجاءً كان وجهه

كوكب دُرّيٍّ كما قال رسول الله تصفته، وكوكب الدُّرّي هو الليل من

الكوكب وجمعاً، كذلك كان وجه المهدى صلّم شرفاً أمضيّاً
اذادان العالم غيري أمر و كان الدين واحداً كما وعد الله تعالى:

(7) ومن رواه زادان عن سلمان الفارسي بح ومن ذلك مثا أثر عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لا أبدي من تأكد من ولد فاطمة بقية للغز
يفت للزنانة و يملك الترك والعرو والديلم والجيش ويؤفع بلوك الروم مصيدين في الحديث ولا يقوم رأية الإدراوية الأئمة، وهذا من معنى ما تقدم ذكره وشرحاه.

(8) ومن رواية الشعبي عن حذيفة بن يزيد بن اليمان مما أثر عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن قال لا ينفع بالجبر ولا ينفع بالديلم ولا القسطنطينية الإرجال من بيض هاشم، يعني إمام ذلك الزمان من ولد فاطمة، ولم يكن ولا يكون إمام من بيض هاشم لا عليه ولا الثقة من ذريته نسل رسول الله صلى الله صلعم رضي الله عنه من ناظمة الزهراء سيدة نساء العالم كامają ذلك فيما تقدم ذكره من هذا الكتاب ولا يفتق منذ الموضع الالحيم.

(9) ومن ذلك أيضًا ما رواه الشعبي أنه قال أخبر في مالك بن
صحار الصدفي قال يعرأنا بالجبر في خلافة عثمان فقال لنا يرجى أن يخفف عهده
بين بديجية، وتفادينا للعنة لا يسير به يا أدركني رجل من خلفي
 느رب ظهرى بسوط في يده، فالتفت نازع الجذبة الإيمناء، د ابن
اليمان، نسلمت عليه فقال من هذا بع InputStream: 8136554292656148016
عن راحدهمها بالعذابية ويا كنا نقل ذلك رأياءه، والعرب تقول في مثل هذا
في بعض مشاهايهم لأمغيق القمر.
12) وروى عبد الله بن عمر ذاك متأثرًا، ونقله عن رسول
الله تعالى بخط المهدي ثقة عشرا،
كذلك كان المهدي عم قويًا يَا مصروعًا، بذلك من جتلنة فيَّته،
13) ومن جديد تتواتر الدعوة إلى النبي، سلم. أنه قال له الله
اللهم أبقى الفينادم فلا أرض تسخ، وعُدَّلَ كلاميَتُ جبرُولِ تُئم،
كذلك كانت صفة المهدي عم أقوى أثرة، ويتان الله الصغائر
من حسن صفات أبائيه، والأئمة، مَلَّة يَذِي له ما وصل إليه صلى الله عليه وسلم نهيه
الأرض، فيَّهَا أن يحسNOI بتأته إلى بعده، وقيل لبعض الأئمة الماضين، إن المهدي
تاليف، كأن المهدي ورد بِدْنَة من السِّنَةِ ما تورِن، وأخذ سعة شعُدجا،
قال المهدي لا ينفعه بالركاب.
14) وقيل: يحفف به، يعلّم يأَتِي بالمهدي، يشم
في رأسه ملتها قبض الشام.
كذلك كان المهدي عم لمأقم بالباقورة، وسلمها إليه إمامًا
الذي كان في بصوره، ونصر عليه بائنه في سبيل الأمة، وكرهت بذلك الله
دعاته، وله بعده حديث السَّدَرِين المتقبل، من الفتى أن أحسَّن الشبان.
كَامَا هُوَ نَوْبَتُهُ مِنْهُ لِسَنَّةَ النَّارِ يُؤْلِفُهَا لَوْلَا لِيَلَوَّنُونَ اللَّوْنَ لَعَلَّكَ تَكُونَ حَرْثَكُمْ، فَأَذَاعَتْهُ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ مَعَالَةَ الْأَرْبَعِةِ الْفُلْحِ وَالْوَحْشَةِ وَيَشَوْبَهُ حَرَثَهُ، وَهُوَ الَّذِي يُقُولُ لِهِ بَعْضُهُمْ بِبَلَدَةِ الْمَرْجَةِ بِالْأَرْبَعِيَّةِ. وَلَا يُشْتَكِي أَيْضًا فِي الْبَيْتِ النَّاسِ تِنْفِضُ لَوَانَ النَّاسِ عَنْ أَلْبَارِهِ وَهُوَ أَكْثَرُهُمْ أَشْرَافُهُمْ، وَقُولُهُ الْجَمَّ مَجَالِسَ إِسْرَائِيلِي، وَإِصْحَابُ نَيْكِ إِسْرَائِيلِ إِجَاجِيَّةَ، وَهُمْ فِي الْأَكْثَرِ مِنْهَا الْأَقْصَرُ مِنْ أَجْسَمِنَ الْأَرْبَعِيَّةِ. وَلَا يُشْتَكِي أَيْضًا فِي الْبَيْتِ النَّاسِ تِنْفِضُ لَوَانَ النَّاسِ عَنْ أَلْبَارِهِ وَهُوَ أَكْثَرُهُمْ أَشْرَافُهُمْ، وَقُولُهُ الْجَمَّ مَجَالِسَ إِسْرَائِيلِي، وَإِصْحَابُ نَيْكِ إِسْرَائِيلِ إِجَاجِيَّةَ، وَهُمْ فِي الْأَكْثَرِ مِنْهَا الْأَقْصَرُ مِنْ أَجْسَمِنَ الْأَرْبَعِيَّةِ. وَلَا يُشْتَكِي أَيْضًا فِي الْبَيْتِ النَّاسِ تِنْفِضُ لَوَانَ النَّاسِ عَنْ أَلْبَارِهِ وَهُوَ أَكْثَرُهُمْ أَشْرَافُهُمْ، وَقُولُهُ الْجَمَّ مَجَالِسَ إِسْرَائِيلِي، وَإِصْحَابُ نَيْكِ إِسْرَائِيلِ إِجَاجِيَّةَ، وَهُمْ فِي الْأَكْثَرِ مِنْهَا الْأَقْصَرُ مِنْ أَجْسَمِنَ الْأَرْبَعِيَّةِ. وَلَا يُشْتَكِي أَيْضًا فِي الْبَيْتِ النَّاسِ تِنْفِضُ لَوَانَ النَّاسِ عَنْ أَلْبَارِهِ وَهُوَ أَكْثَرُهُمْ أَشْرَافُهُمْ، وَقُولُهُ الْجَمَّ مَجَالِسَ إِسْرَائِيلِي، وَإِصْحَابُ نَيْكِ إِسْرَائِيلِ إِجَاجِيَّةَ، وَهُمْ فِي الْأَكْثَرِ مِنْهَا الْأَقْصَرُ مِنْ أَجْسَمِنَ الْأَرْبَعِيَّةِ. وَلَا يُشْتَكِي أَيْضًا فِي الْبَيْتِ النَّاسِ تِنْفِضُ لَوَانَ النَّاسِ عَنْ أَلْبَارِهِ وَهُوَ أَكْثَرُهُمْ أَشْرَافُهُمْ، وَقُولُهُ الْجَمَّ مَجَالِسَ إِسْرَائِيلِي، وَإِصْحَابُ نَيْكِ إِسْرَائِيلِ إِجَاجِيَّةَ، وَهُمْ فِي الْأَكْثَرِ مِنْهَا الْأَقْصَرُ مِنْ أَجْسَمِنَ الْأَرْبَعِيَّةِ. وَلَا يُشْتَكِي أَيْضًا فِي الْبَيْتِ النَّاسِ تِنْفِضُ لَوَانَ النَّاسِ عَنْ أَلْبَارِهِ وَهُوَ أَكْثَرُهُمْ أَشْرَافُهُمْ، وَقُولُهُ الْجَمَّ مَجَالِسَ إِسْرَائِيلِي، وَإِصْحَابُ نَيْكِ إِسْرَائِيلِ إِجَاجِيَّةَ، وَهُمْ فِي الْأَكْثَرِ مِنْهَا الْأَقْصَرُ مِنْ أَجْسَمِنَ الْأَرْبَعِيَّةِ.
كذلك رآه الله تعالى أهلاً لاصراً عليه ورأى ذلك بتوقيع في كأنه أمر
الباعمة إليه في وقت قليل فقيل، فسلف مراحله في ليلة وحذاراه
الله ذلك فيها وذكر كان قبل ذلك أهلاً غيرها فلا أهل لذلك أحد إلا
مأت لثائر الأذان تعالى من مصيرها مستحقة، ولذلك تبر أن الإمام
الذي سلمها إليه يمثل في وقت تسليمها إليه، فقال عند ذلك الله
اعطاك التي لا وفيها، وكم إعادراحها وعوتها لك ويا في الله اثركمها
اليغتى طوقك، طوقكها.

(20) وعن عبدالله بن معمر أنه قال: سمعت رسول الله
يقول: لا أسفض في الدنيا حتى يد آمه النص، وي tamanho

(21) وعن رواية عبدarrièreزاق يرفع إلى إبراهيم، أنه قال
ذكر قول الله تعالى بلاءً يصيب هذا النص حتى لا يصير الرجل مأله أبيه
من الظلم، ثم قال: شجيع الله بلاءً يصير من لأهل بيته في مكال الأرض تسطع،꽃
كما ينفه جل الأفولم أرضه يشيده سكن السماء وسكن الأرض لابن أبيه
من بحره مدرار الأذان إذ تأتيه حتى تبجيءه حتى يستملاها،
والاموات.

قوله: عترتي إلهي يا من عترتي في لغة العرب القرائية من ولد الوثيداء
وينبعون: يا من ولد يا من قرابة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وتقاطع.
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كما ألف بنابين تلوههم بعد عهود الشرك,
فهناستنهاد مناكير وننتشرت الأخبارية من أن المهدى من
ذرية محمد النبي صل الله عليه وسلم، ولديه بن ولد بطل صل الله عليه.
يُفختم الدين كما فتح بينه، فأفتح الدين كان رسول الله، ويبقى بلسانه
عليّين بقيمتهما تباينه منهما، وكذلك يغمر بالمهدى ع، بالآية
من ولده حتى يكون انقطاع الدين وقيمتهما فقير في عصر إمام منههم
يجمع الله الأتم بحدها على من محمد صل الله عليه وسلم إلى
كما أخبر رسول الله صل الله عليه وسل الله عليه وعليه
وليته كامير كمامير أن الله تعالى يلمع بهم بين قلوب عباده
بعد عهود القيامة كامير بين قلوبهم بعد عهود الشرك، وذلك قول الله
تعال ياأيها اللاتين من آمنوا أن عمة الله على عمة الله
اذكتكم أعداء
كالفين قلوبكم فأصبحت بينهم إخواناً
(19) وعن عليه ع أن رسول الله صل الله عليه وسلم إلى
يُصليه الله فهيلة واحدة
قيله يُصليه الله فهيلة واحدة ليس لي كأنه كان فأسائر صلته
ولكنه، فقول القائل فيлан يُنصي يأيمرنا، كأنه آللذلك الأمر.
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الجالس به، ورجله هو أحدكم آتاه الله سلطاننا؛ فقلنا بсерين عطاءٍ فقديلاً
الله ومن عصاني فقديصي له، وذاك ليس بخروق طاعة في عصيمي الفقان
الآراء لا بد من حكمة سلطان يقيم عليه؛ فلما قام عصيمي الفقان
لأطمن رؤياً، وفان رؤية حدثت، وعلى الله فكها الوراء اطئب ارومي،
ورأي عليه حكم الناس صغرًا وأعلم الناس أكبارًا؛ فإن أيها النور الله
وبنابت الأذى، وآتاه بنبيته من حكم الله حكمنا، وقيل صدق
سمعنا، فإن تبعوا أذائنهما واصصناه، فإن نهيدونهما وأعلنه وراء
وماهما الأذى، وينفع الفرح، ورخى، كيف خليفة غير تستخف يقتاله
خليف الخلف، والله لولي ولي من الدنيا اللدائم واحد طوله الله الحسن حجيم وسنًا.
رجل يقال له المهيدي يجلبها قسطًا وعلا كما لمثله جورًا وظلمًا،
فقوله أمهامها يقول أمدها يجيبها بعده يقال من ذلك تكلم فمظ
حاجته يدته، قوله ونهر يعني هو أحدكم آتاه الله سلطانًا، فقال أطنى
فقد طاعنا الله만 خليفة من سرافلناس بيتين أتين من اطاعا طاعنا الله وقصاه
علوه رجل هو أحدكم يعني من سرافلناس بيتين أتين من اطاعا طاعنا الله وقصاه
عده كذب ولم يقل أول نبي لواء، ولما أنبياء الله رائمة دينه امن
اطاعهم فقد طاعنا الله من عصاهم فقد عصى الله تقوله تعالى: "من يطيع
فقوم طاع الله وقوله أطيعوا الله وأطيعوا التسول وأولى الأمواتكم مرشنا
طقفو طاعنا الله من عصاهم فقد عصى الله تقوله تعالى: "من يطيع
فقوم طاع الله وقوله أطيعوا الله وأطيعوا التسول وأولى الأمواتكم مرشنا
بعد النية، والثوب، وينبض ذلك اليهود إبتداؤه، ومفتاح صوبه.

ولأي لائم به،

(286) سمحت الإمام المعز لدين الله عبد الله بعجوبته، ومنه لما كان من أمر المهدى، وقيل لبعض شيوخ الأولياء، ولماذا أنت المهدى، للنظر، الذي يجمع الله المجد، ويديك الأرض، وكم لك الدين إباحة، فقال له المهدى: إن فضل الله تعالى كشريعاً وناماً، من قسم جزيل، لمن يأتي في بنن تابع فضله، ولما فضل الله باع إذا وصل إلى ناميناه شتيتم، ثم قال المعتز، المهدى، مفتاح فضل البحر، والبكرع، والنامة، فيه فضل الله تعالى ذلك للمجد، ذلك يıklı عليه من ذريته حتى يتهم لهم عند الله الذي فيه، إياه بفضله ووقوفك، وقول له، عم ليخرج الإسلام نادأ من أدي الناس فاندخلا الشرديك، ومنه نبأ البعير إذا اشتر بولق، ووقع، إذا ذافك.

(290) ومن رواية ابن عطوان، ياسبادة، على عم أنه قال: أهدي، على ترككم، لرباب harassment، لله القرآن، وكان بدير الإسلام، عبر ذلك على الله، ثم نصلح ونبيذ وراء ظهره ورسليفة عليَّ، وروحه، بالآشرة قالوا بإدارتهم، فانها أولها، قال الراعي، ورجلًا سقطت الهيئات، وكما وضع إليه كذب، وانقطعت أثاثاً لا أطول منها أن بدارك.
هذا ما أقتل عليه القول في أنه يكون من ذرية المهدي في الأئمة من يجمع الله العبادات على طاعته وتقطع الجموع ويلكين الدين كله للكثير عظام يفظيردها على الذين كله

(33) ومن رواية محسن بن عبد الله بأسناده عن رسول الله ﷺ قال للهديئه من نسل فاطمة سيدة نساء العالمين، طال الأشام مقتراً ينجه فیما وقع من الأرض قسطًا وعدلاً كمالاً جرأرها ارظً، ويطيب العيش في زمانه ويسجع صاحب بلدة برنيعيته وشيعتهم والصلاة عليه وبدرها على رشيته، فيمتزج من أناس كله اجتمعون

هذا ما ذكرنا أنه يكون بعض الأئمة من نسل الهديء رزقيه لأنه سببه ومفتاحه، وأول من قام من آل محمد كما يكون ذلك أيضاً

الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم الأئمة وصاحب الشريعة والملة، وقد قال
هناك شاخص مأخوذ من الباحة في الخلافة الحميمية، يقول له أحد المهاجرين في سلطان يعمق يزف بال괄ال عليه امر ورحمة يحب مثلاً ذلك لله عليها
دار رجا (الرحمة) للحبيب الجويته ورحيمه انت في موقعه، قال الشاعر
والناس في غفلة تهم وركي المنية تطحن
وقال إن أطهها روافم، الرواف المرا نسبياً، حديثها بجيزة القرن، وعليم
فَكَّاه يقول أن الله سيفكت ذلك القد، وقوله إن أطهها روافم.
العهود تصل إلى شجرة إصاب من النسب، يعني بروعته الله وتعبرت ولده
ولد وله، وقد شرعتنا ذلك فيما تقدِّم، يعني بالخليفة الذي استخلفه
الناس، فبذلك استبعد، فتقلوا فرواً بالجبل يعني من وتمن من شقته
والحلف الخَصَرِي الصالحة بفط اللم، والحلف بجزم اللم الخَرَين السوء،
وقال الله تعالى خلفهم من بعدهم خلف أضاغوا الصلاة وأتباعهم الشهويات.

60)
ومن درب ارلين في الأساش، على على الله تعالى
َميَّت رجولا، باقلمهما من الآخرين قالا إنهما المهدى، والآخر الرضى،
فالهدى مقدماً، والملام يكون من ذريته كأظل على الله ميعه،
12) وفِي رواية أخرى عن على على، إنه قال كأظل إلى أن يقال
َيحسص بن بنيه ليس بغير كريم منه شئ حتى يرده الله علهم بשלום.
وقول بيحسص بن بنيه شبه الدين إذا ذهب من أيدي الناس بعدين
ال нужامه يقوم من الغرب فيشركه الابتداع، ويقتل الظلمين،

وكذلك تام المهمة، ومن الغرب وهم يد عاملة، ومما جاءت

به الروايات من هذا كاف بنواحيس من أدراس بن الحسين لсыام الليل.

وابلغني أن سمعتهم، وقد ذكرت خبر فيما مضى، وكأنوا ذلك كلا ذات الله
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(37) حبيب بن أبي ثابت عن ابن ديني قال كنت تأكد وقلت

المسجد في السبب، فسمعت يقول سمعت علامة يقول الأخبر

عن أهل بيتي، اما عبد الله بن جعفر صاحب لهم، وامام متى

جفنة في خاير ووفقا للتنفيس بطلق، لبطن مسح عنكم في الحرب جماله

عصفور، وامام ابن عباس فلاولكم، وامام اللحية، فنعت منكم أنت مَا

ونهبة القوم سيدلون عليك مبصوعين وهم سيدلوا في الهوى ونعتهم، ويبالنونكم

في البطل ويسعدكم في أرضه وصراحهم في أرضهم، وينجذبونا عليهم

حتى لا يبقى منكم إلا نافع أو غير ضار، حتى يكون نضركم منهم نصره العدد

من سيده، اذاره، وطاعته، واذا الواب عنه شته، وتحيي يكون الناس يلين

بالا لبك على دينه بالا لبك على دنياه، وتحيي لا يدعوا الله

استقلوه، وتحيي يخاطره كل بيت شعر مدر، فإن أتاه حكم الله
الله تعالى هوا الذي نزل رسوله بالهدي هدينا حتى نلتقيه على الترنيم تك.

بعض الأثاث من ولده كنا قدمناه ذكر ذلك وبيانه في هذا الخبر فيما جاء قبل.

وينسب ذلك اليمين إلى أن يكون أول من قام بذلك وسنة وأصله.

(32) وحديث عبد الله بن ميمون في سعيد بن إبن عوفة

عن تهامة قال قلت لسعيد المهدية حفظ الله تألق، فلقت مين، قال عن قريش،

قلت متى قوتيت، قال عن قريش، قلتها من ابن هاشم، قال عن بني عبد الله.

قلت من ابن بني عبد الله، قال عن ولد نافطة،

ولوساء من ابن ولد نافطة، هو أخوه من ولدمسين لاتئة.

قد كره ذلك، ولسنذكر، ولم يقل سعيد هذا بل كتبه سأله سمعه.

(45) وروى أبو الطفيل عن زياد بن بشارة عن ابن تفيل عن سعيد.

بالمسيب عن يام سلمة أنها قالت، سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

عن قوله قلت رضي الله عنه:

نماجة فيما تقدم ذكر فيه أن المهدى أن بني هاشم،

روى ذلك على مسند مالك فيه عن سعيد بن المسيب، ولم يذكر السائل.

من روى ذلك للعامة بعد، ولوساءなくなる لا توقيف عليه، وسنذكر بعد.

هناك أوقف عليه النص إن شاء الله.

(3) وروى زادان عن سلمان الفارسي أنه قال لا بدر من قائم من
يعلوه أحد قبله ولا يعلوه أحد، بعده اسمه اسم يملأ الأرض طلماً كملت،
فنهما نكرانه يكون لبعض الأئمة من أهل وصية، وليست لهم.
وينسب ذلك إلى الله الذين أنزلوا منهم، فماكملهم،
وهمواباه وحُصّنوه يرفعه إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه أن تأتي
بني أمية على نبرالرضا وسياكم من فجر، وهم أرباب سوء رؤى، وأخلاقه
سفهانهم، فذاشلت أئمهم أرتدوا على أعقابهم لا يتقون فتقًا إلا
فقه الله عليهم أعظم منه حتى يخرج هدينا،
واهتم رسول الله بالرؤيا التي آهانها فنانى المشاعل، واصقلت
الرؤيا التي أرينك إلاافتيتة للناس والشجرة المعلومة، في القرآن، فقول
أنهما أمية لا يزالون يملكون حتى ينتظم فسهامهم، فذاشلت أئمهم
على أعقابهم حتى يخرج المهدى هو فيما قدمنا ذكر تعبيره المهد.
خرج من يملك الأرض من ذريته، ونقا أمية، وإن انقطع ملكهم من
الشرق وثبتت لهم بقية المغرب مجزرة الأندلس، وسيكون أمرهم
على وصفه رسول الله صلى الله وسلم وزعمه، في كتابه المبين، من أئتم
الأرض باء الصالحين،
وقيل لا يتقون فتقًا إلا فنون الله عليهم أعظم منه، الرب لحم.
بالعانية بالعمل ناصبه، وإن بثت ناصبه، فإن العاقبة للمسيرين غلبت
خلق الحياة وهذا العالم لهم يلبق عن الدنيا إلى يوم واحد بعد أن لهم رقيهم
كأسًا يصبُّ حتى ينون أن أكون فيه نافعين لهم عنده، حتى يقول القائل
بالغو: أكان هنام قريش لرحمانا،
قوله. حبالة عصفور الحبالة الشرك الذي يصادبه الطائر وغيره
من الصيد، وقوله: إن هؤلاء القوم سيدون علىكم فينفي إيمانية ونبوءاتي
يماً على لكون لهم الدولة، والباقي على دينه لما يراه قد يتناقص فيهم والباقي
على دينه هولانيدونا فيه، وأيحذرون منهما بيه،
(6: 60) ورأي عيسى بن مجنود عليه السلام اللدوي،
أنت السُّئل عن المهدى، فقال هوي بن رلدى،
(6: 60) ورأى شريك بن عبد الله عن جابر بن المغفر عن عائشة
ابن علي بن الحسين، وإن قال فيهم: إن ألاه البيت قسم بالسوية يعدل
وفعل الرحمن البرزمن، والقرون منهم، من إطاعة نعم الله وربصاه
عسقيه، نستخرج التوراة والإنجيل، سأركب الله نطاكيه، فيكم
بين أهل التوراة بترفيهم، وبين أهل الإنجيل، بإنجيلهم بين أهل القرآن
بقرواهم، وتحج الأرض نورها من الذهب والفضة، يقول الله تعالى:
هلموا كُنتم، فقد كُنتُم مسكتين في الدماء، وطمطمت في الأرجام، ومطيعاً
روتله صوب الغمام، الصوب المطر الغمام الحساب أحق،
(10) وعن علي بن الحسين ع، أنه قال: يقوم القائم سبناً (بنيه المهدى).
ثم يكون بعدما اشاعونه، يجدون من الأثناء من ذريته،
(13) وعن أبي السلمة بن غالب من رواية يرفعه (الي النجشي). أن قال أن
تبلغ هذه الأمة حتى يليها أشاعون خليفة كلهم من أهل النبأ، كلهم
عمل بالحق ودين الله، منهم رجاءان يملك أحدهما دينين سنة
والأخيرثين سنة، وهما على الحديث الذي قاله،
(86) ومن رواية يحيى بن سلام يرفعه إلى عبد الله بن عمر.
قال: أبشرنا فيوشك أيام الجبارين أن تنقطع، ثم يكون بعدهم الجباران
يجبالله أنه أمعنة صلعل المهدى، ثم النصارى ثم عدائم محمد بن عونه
فهذا مللاً يقبله عبد الله المتناسمه عن رسول الله ﷺ صلعل وعهد
(165) ومن رواية المحققين يرفعه إلى عبد الله بن عمر في عين من
الله تعالى، وقد كان لهدي والنصور ولم، كان بعدهما ويوه
كذلك آمنة مهديين، ويتجزاه لبهم ووده في كتابه وغير لسان
رسوله ﷺ وقومته.
(19) ومن رواية العشقي يرفعه إلى إبن الحارث (الماردود) أنه
قال: يكون لهدي وسبعة من بعد يبنيه، يبدا كلهم صلى الله صلى الله عليهم.
النبي وإسماعله حتى يعود يجعل ما كان قبل أن يفتقد، وكذلك قال أصحاب التفسير.

في قول الله تعالى، السموات والأرض كانتا رقفا، ففتقنها هما، قالوا فكانا القابثين.

السماء انقطع والأرض استنبت فقعت الله السماء فامطرت رقق الأرض.

إم: ومن رواية يحيى بن محمد بن سلام يرفعه عبد الله بن مسعود أنه قال، قال لي رسول الله يومًا انطلق معي بن مستوع مفتيتًا.

معه حتى تتابعت تدغض بني هاشم، فقال لهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: من ينظر في قومه من كان معهم من غيرهم حتى لم يبق إلا بنيهاء بحاسة بن عبد اللطخ بن يعال العباس، فقال لهم النبي صلى الله عليه ورحمة الله، منذ أن استغفرت، فأردت أن أرجع، ربي لا تأبه على قال كأنا ولديك ولا بني

أميمة يقصدون وهم الضرورة يلمعون بمك المشقة، ثم تكون دولابين إليه العباس يعملون فيهما العمل الجبارين، فاللّه لطرقاً لاهل البيت، ولبنى أمية مسألون من بنى المعاس، ويتراب من بنى أمية رجل فيghanون بانقلاق مراقبة فيستحلون فيه المنام زمانًا، ثم يخرج رجل من ترقبه غضب الاله قال إني

وعترق مسألة الأرض علما، أملاً، أملاً، يسقيه الله الماء الغام.

فقال الناس بنى المعاس يرسل الله أتباعه هذا وحنا أحياء، فنظر رسل الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لماقته لهم ثم قال والذين أفسى بيد، لن تصلب فأخ光纤ه

اجل عنده لأهل بنيه من بنى المعاس.
ومن الهادئ ومن المهدي ومن الهتدي ومنان يهتدي به ومنان تغريب
الشمس على رأسه وتقطع من مغريها تخلع نجدة الله، ونَّاسًا أَنْدَرُ خَرَان.
الله يأتَبَّ ما خَرَانَة على ذهب ولا فَضَّة ولكن على الملكون من عمه. فنحن
دعائم الله، خن ذَخيرة الله ورسله، بُنُوَّانَ السَّترِ على بُنُوَّانَ الصغر وفظيمة
أَتُّن بحدقة بُنت خويلد والدته، وجُفَّة الطيار على الجْزى عمنا جزء سيد
الشهداء عم بنته. فنلزم الله (من الله)، حسب حسبت، فنسب السبب
الله سوز وُجَّننا على شعبيه وعله وانطلقنا كِنا بِهذِها حَلَا عنده
فالذين سَمَّاه إنسة منهم تَهَضَ في ومنهم من بآيت عينهم لصفاقم
واعانهم وقيلوه خن نجدة الله، النَّخلة في غابة العرب، الجَماعة، بِطالب
الرجل جماعة يعني أنهم أهل خاصة عندهم تَمَاَي البَيْلَون الذين أخذهم بفضله
(وهم) عن بِجَفْر محمد بن علي آدم، قال إذا دَم آدم مَد وَقَر
عُص موسي وعجم العمر، من أنطاكية، ونزع الله الرب عقله بِشجر
والذي في قلوب أهله بكون قلوبهم على اللَّه، حتى يَبِعَ جل
فِيَر عَقْه، Spears. فيقال فيما قالته فلا يكون تحذيره.

ومن الجزء الخامس عشر من كتاب شرح الاخبار أيضًا
وعلى الله اخلاصهم عليه وبركة وسليمة الله أن تجلب بريجاساء.
وهذا أيضًا مما تهنى إليه من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: "هذا قدر من عين البقرة، فيغيب صاحب الشرع، وربى هامل بن البحار بن الراكن، ثم يسرىهم، ويهلك الله تعالى عدوه كما وعده، فعليه أن ينهي آثارهم، ثم يفعل آثاره، ويدلك الله تعالى عدوه كما وعده، فعليه أن ينهي آثارهم، ثم يفعل آثاره.

(167) وعند الرفعه، عبد الله بن مسعود أتاه قال: "بين النجع جالس في جماعة من أصحابه ادّعى نزعة من أشدّه، فلما وجدته، قال له بعض من حضره بالسير، والشهداء، ونسبة اسماء رأيناه، وديك، إنّه إذا اختلف الله لهم الآلهة على الدنيا، وسُنّت لهم، بعد تطريل وبناء، وتشريده، حتى يخرج ثور من شكله، وآؤري وجهة الشروق، ومعهم رؤيات سودينيك، لله، فلا يطعونه، شدّوه إلى الجيّ، إنّه مثلي في مثلي، عالٍ.

(168) وصيّف الله جمالة فقال: "الظاهرين للإبادة لله، جفراً، مجمّدين تأكّدون أمك، نصّم، نصّم، ألف مال، ثمّ قال يأبب منًا: نصّم، نصّم، يا أشني النفاخ ومنا الصدّيق ومنا الفاروق، لماً.

(169) وصيّف الله جمالة بالآباد الله، جفراً، مجمّدين تأكّدون أمك، نصّم، نصّم، ألف مال، ثمّ قال يأبب منًا: نصّم، نصّم، يا أشني النفاخ ومنا الصدّيق ومنا الفاروق، لماً.
لمرء عليه واصبح رأظاهر قبته، فلما أُقبر أبو عبد الله منته كتب بخبر تأتيه إليه جاء ونَسَأَله تَرك التمثيل له ربي عليه بالجبل، فقالاً رَسَل ابن عبد الله من نَكَبَه وظاهر الغضب والانفه مَأَكَتِبُ بِهِ الله رَبُّ الْحَيَاةِ وَالْمَمِيتِ. قَامَ كُلُّ مَهَيِّنِهِ بِهِ وَأَذَارَ كُلُّ مَهَيِّنِهِ بِهِ عَن أَن يُبِتِّيهِ بِكَرَو. حَتَّى نَزلِ إِبْوَعَدِ اللَّهِ عَلَيْه بِبُطَّائِسِهِ، ورَجَحَ بِجَمِيعِهِ إِلَى وَحَيْرَة، فَغَلَبَ إِبْوَعَدِ اللَّهِ عَلَيْه وَرَأَى حَيَاةً وَأَذَارَ كُلُّ مَهَيِّنِهِ بِهِ بَعْدَ أَخْرَجَ المَهَيِّنِهِ وَلَقَاءَ أَرْبَيِهِ، وَأَنْمَرَقَل الفَاسِقِ عِنْ مَدْرَائِ بِكَفُّ يَدٍ عَنْهُ وَهُنَفَجَزَهُ، وَقَدْ أَصَلَّ مَعِيْهِ لَشَقَوَتِهِ آَيَةً وَعَبَرَ وُسْعَانِ الْمَهَيِّنِهِ.

وَذَلِكَ أَبُو عَبْدُ اللَّهِ يَقُولُ لَاصِحَابِهِ الَّذِينَ يَسْتَهْبُونَ دِعَوَتِهِ أَنَّ اللَّهُ سَجَانَهُ يَخْفَظُ المَهَيِّنِهِ وَيَقِيهِ وَيُضْعِفُ عَنْهُ حَتَّى يُظْهَرُ وَيَعْزِزُهُ نَفَاطِرَهُ أَلْلَهُ أَلْلَهُ أولئك يُقرُبُ أَمْرَهُمُ رَخَصَتُ نَيَا قُسُمُهُم، كَانَ إِبْوَعَدَ الْبَاسَ إِتْرَاحُ إِبْوَعَدِ اللَّهِ أَكْبَرُ مِنْهُ يَحْلُقُ بالوَلَادَيْنَ تَمَتُّ. قَدْمَيْنِهِ أَنْ يَقُدْ دِعَوَتَهُ إِبْوَعَدَ اللَّهِ، وَرَأَيْنِي أَنْ يَفْرَحُهُ ذَلِكَ يَهْبُ إِبْوَعَدَ الْبَاسَ الْقِيْرَاوَانُ وَأَقْرَأَهُ إِخْوَانِ إِبْوَعَدِ اللَّهِ وَأَنْ يَقُدْ دِعَوَتَهُ إِبْوَعَدَ اللَّهِ ذَلِكَ يَرْجِحُ الْجَهَّةِ قَطَنَتِينَ، فَلَمْ يَفْرَحَ قِدَمَيْنِ إِبْوَعَدِ اللَّهِ خَوَّةَ عَلَى إِبْوَعَدَ الْبَاسَ أَنْ يُقُدِّمَ بِلِتَّبَّقَيْهِ مَرْفُوقَ يَقِسُنُ، فَخَلَّ فِي نَفْسِهِ الْكَرَوَة، وَسَارَ إِبْوَعَدَ الْبَاسَ كَبِرَتُ إِبْوَعَدِ اللَّهِ بَذِلَكَ، كَانَ إِبْوَعَدَ الْبَاسَ رَدُّ
كان كلما حل بلدا فضل على الحامل عليه وإوصله وأهداه إليه، فإنهم لم يعرفه وروموه لذلك ومنهم من عرفه وترك التعرض له لما كان من إنهاء ومنهم من عرفه ذلك وجذره وأخبرهم بذلك. حاولوا ذكره، وذلك كله لما ألقاه الله في قلوبهم حتى إذا أدخل السجينة عامل إليها رضوانها بذلك، وكان يخصه ويركيه ويجيب حقته إلى أن وصلت رسل صاحب يداعة وصاحباً من جهات كثيرة بان هو الذي يدعوا إليه أبو عبد الله، وأثر القبض عليه وحذره من أن يفوت عليه أو أن يطبع في أمره، فسار على نفسه فهو أنه قاتل المصلحة فقال ولم أتوجه بذلك قيل: هذا. فقال ما كان لجح حدا إلى دحر ولا سأتزعنيه، فإذا قد أسلمتزعنيه لم يفغي أن انتهى من نسيت ورأان أتنمه ناططبناه على سأتزعنيه، فقال له: هذا الرجل الذي ظهر بقلادة رجل على نواحي أفريقية. قال: يدعو، فقال: ما رأيت هذا الرجل ولا أعرفه، وكر ذلك كان لم يكن صعل رأس كما أذاكر كما قد، متئمنه، قال ولكنه بلغيه أنه يدعوا إلى رضي من آل محمد، قال: فأنه فأخذ من ذاكرة، وقال بسكته، ويا يدعوا للاهل، قال: هل النسب بالغرب كثير، وإن كان يدعوا للفتك عنه ولم أضرك، فإن كان الغير لم يكن على في ذلك مقال فيم الشق، حظه منه وغلب الشقوة عليه، واختطفه وجل
الباب الرابع من كتاب غاية المواليد

وقام إملأ اللؤلؤين بالترتين حتى حضرته غيبة فأنظرها

نخص بقية النبوة على عبد الله بن خليفة فيما كانت مالاً لله في الكساء، فكان

الله في رحمة رسوله. وقد قال في المسند: إنما نص على ما بقوله الله تعالى:

"وَلَا تَلُبِّقُوا الْهَيْبَةَ فَيُطْرَفَ إِلَىٰ النَّارِ"، وقوله:

"وَلَا تَصْنَعُوا مَنْصَبًَٰ عَلَىٰ نَّارٍ إِلَّاٰ نَّارُ الْجَحَنَّمِ".

منهما،

فلما قضى المسلمين سلم النبي للحسين جمعت الرتبان في

الحسين وقامت بحماقة أظهر الغيبة على القضايا المعلومة كاظمة ها الباب،

وكله على عبد الله بن خليفة الطفولية، فأدرع له أخاه محمد بن حنفية

واسكت له 메هاء وإرضاه إليه أن يسلم إليه دعوةه، وردته، ورده، وردته,

نقم محمد بن علي بن الحروف بإيذاء الطفولية بأمر الله وبيث دعاه، وثوم دعوةه

الي، فأناه عن ابن الحسين يطلب تسليم ورده، فقال لملموك المواليب

عنده، فقال هي فارس حكيمة فيها قوطي أبيض وهي فارقة ليس

فيها الأخرى، فأنذرت ذلك جمع محمد بن علي الدعا والنقباء وسلم إلى مهارم

وميظاح القارورة وفتشها على المحسن بحضورين، حضرولا مكان فيهما

القوطاء أبيض، كانت تلك بعض آياته التي أظهرها ليقع الأقرار به

والتصديق، وكان إياه للحسن بن علي سلام الشذاعة على القارورة الفارقة.
السيرة، ولما تابعه على زيادة الله أخرج أهل السجن خرج وتوجه رجاء إلى الشرق فلم يفعله زيادة الله في وقت هربه بطربلس وقبض عليه، ثم خذاه، ولما جمع مع إبن عبد الله حدث نفاقًا واستفسد رجال الدولة بعد أن صار للهدى إلى أفريقية وسوس إلى أخيه إبن عبد الله واستفسد، وأراد أن يكون الأمر بالنفي والتصدر والإبلاغ للهداه دون المهدى وأن يكون المهدى كالمولى عليه معهما.
اظهر الله به دعوة الحق وكان على يديه طول النهار، 
وذلك إنه لما ظهر النور باليمين وبلاد المغرب سار على الله فاضم 
على بن الحسين صلى الله عليه وسلم بلاد المغرب حتى كان في بعض رؤيته 
فاظهرت القيامة واستخففت جناته سعيد الملقب بالمهدى على الله عليه 
فثبت قواعدها الدعوة ورجو علىهما من ضعفهما بحكم سماحة مرافع عال 
الغرب ماجري، وروى الشافعى صلى الله عليه وسلم من سماحة الله عليه 
يُبدع الله عليه وظفره واستجوابه وفِّي النصارى صلى الله عليه من سماحه، 
فلم أحرضت للهدى والنيل حسناً الوديعة المستقرها وتسلّمها 
محمد بن علي القائد بأمر الله تعالى رجوت الإمامة في عقبه صلى الله عليه 
حتى نُشِئت الإمامة إلى مستقرها ومعدنها وأطْلَمَانَا بوضعها من 
الأمام المنصور في الأسر بحكم الله إن شاء الله هم المولمين بالنص عليه كما 
قد دُنى في هذا اللباب فقام صلاوات الله عليه بالأمم رواية الأمر نفسه 
وعليه، ثم إنه لما أراد أطهارها القيامة بالاظهار بإنه قد أكمل النص قبل 
ذلك وأمر بإشاعةه في كافة الجزائر، ورويت بذلك أفراد العباد المجهولين 
في سجلاتهم الموضوعة عليها العلامة الشريفة بخطاها عالية الحفظة 
وليلته المنصوبة بجذور تناسق قبل أئمة الإمامة الطاهرين صلى الله عليه 
اجمعين بسبب متأثر وقتون بين يديهما إياهاها ذلك لنا وشهدتها الصبر.
والقرطاس الأبيض إشارة إلى الخروج من الإمامة وكان المرجع هولوسماً يعّقده الآباء الغاليون، وذلك مازراً عن الإمامة جعفر بن محمد الصادق عليه السلام للصديق الأيمن في سلسلة الأمر إلى لواء الساعي بن شجراً، وغيبة الفصولية وولد محمد بن ساعد فخدّمها وناب نجحه من جميعه، فأوعّه حجته المنصوبة بين يديه قاماه توليه وأقاماه يستمرّ عليه وظيفته بين يديه واستكمله إياه إلى بلغه أشده سلام الله عليه، فلمّا بلغ أشده تسلم ودعته، ثمّ نصح المرأة غوصاً على سلف حتى استقلّ الأمربه على البحر بن أحمد بن عبد الله بن محمد بن ساعد، صلوات الله عليهم جميعهم، وكان أبوه كان من أرسله دعاته الخمين بين فروع عروب المعروف بالنصور، وأقال القب بذلك لانفتاحه من النصر باليمن، في خليفة بني عبد الملك بن معاذ، وكان بديعة الخليفة الموتى وله كشف الله عزّوجل عن الأوراس الغفّة وناحجاناً تألّمة قديماً الله له ويرّقة شفاءه، ثمّ اتصل أبو عبد الله صاحب دعوة المغرب عن أمرامه على الحسين، فأقام عنه في اليمن، وشهد معه وقائع كثيرة وجاهد بن يديه، ثمّ جمعه من أرض الحسين إلى أرض الحبشة، نفّس إلى يها وساهم خبره في سبعه ماضيّه كتاب افتتاح الدعوة بالغرب، و...
العالم عليه، ونحن كمن كفر بالله وصديقنا ومستسننا باشرعنا نسرأ حسناً.

۱۰۵ يهتمٕ ئ لنفسهِ، ومن ضلال فإنما يضلُّ عليها، وما أنتِ أنا) عليهِ.

۱۰۶ يُجَكِّب، فل هذٔ وسيلة أدعوُ إلى الله علٔ ٔ بصيرٔ أنا) ونابعيِ،

۱۰۷ وسبحان الله، وما أنا من الشِّرِكِينِ، فإنْ تولوا فعلٔ خَّسيِّي اللهِ.

۱۰۸ لَإِنَّهُ إِلَّا هُوَ عَلِئ ٔ تَوجَكِّب وَهُورُ الْعُرْشِ العَظِيمِ،
ما ورد عليها وقيام الأدلة المظاهرة والإبراهيم الباهرة على عقّة ذلك بانتقلت ذكرى هذه القصص التقدم ذكرها،
وأوصى إلى بن عيسى ولعبه المسلمين كما فعل من تقدم من آبائه
صوائر الله عليهم إجمعين واستودعه لهما الذي نصّ عليه وإقامته بين يديه.
واستغفله أيما كقصة الشريفة فيما تقدم به القول، فأوصى إليه برجله
اللقب بولعهد المسلمين مثلما كان أوصى من قبل له إلى وصائفهم.
تقول أن رمضان الدحيحة الله الأمة الامرأة القاسم ابن الإمام المستنصر
بناه، الأمر المؤمنين وى صرح بالسبتيّة رضي الله عنهان الساقط الكبير بالكبد.
ليست حقيقه يعني هارون النقيّ عنه بالبقرة، ولما استخفه محمد بن علي
المعروف بالخليفيّة يعني الحسن، ولما استخفه رضي الله عنهان الساقط.
لم يكن في رجل، ولما استخفه سعيد الله المستنصر بالله، لكنه عن كل من
الطالعة، وإن جبل الإمامة مستقل لا ينقطع وواجب لا ينقطع، وأول الأئمة
نرى لهما أخوهم ولهم.
رئد أخوهم كان إخاناحمًا باب مولاته ومارتقاته علائمه.
وأعطى الله حكمة وعمري، وهذا مارعن أكبشفه وإليه وعلومه، ولولا سمعه
حال الأئمة من اختلاف الآباء، وخطابه أننا معرفه ما كشفناه
وكان تدور عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أنه قال لنا أنظروا للبعن فأتينا في جُلّه.
منك إلى أخاف الله رب العالمين، خارب بالقاسم كان له أمور يبول ذكيا، ويات على ذلك من تزية رضالة نعود إلى الله من الفذلان والضلالة والغضار، ونصل ما كان من ذلك بالإمام عم فكير دخول الذين على هذه الحال وأقام استنفر في زي التجار، فأنت الكتب من بعدها إلى صاحب مصربيفته وال أمر ريطبه والقبض عليه، وال合う على ما كان بعض مخلص ذلك العمل وليام قامًا نآسرن إلى المهدى، فإن أمره بالاسترخ وبرس في أمره إن خرج من مصر معه أبنه القائم م وبعض أسبده ومعه موال في الاحمال كثيرة، نامت شبيهًا، يجعل الاموال لها في الاحمال وسواري رّغبة في زي التجارة أحق إلى الطاحنة تخرج على الرّطقة اللّوسيفية كأبضارها، دهبت بعضها كأنه كيت فيها، وكان عظام ما ذهب له الكتب كانت فيها، فعليهم علوم اللّه صلى الله عليه، فلماخيق القائم بالرشيد مع المصر الشريعة الأولى التي غزاها، أخذ الذين قطعوا على الرّطقة بعدما استهبوه واسترجعوا الكتب بينها، وكان المهدى يقول، لولم تكن هذه الأخيرة سوارًا، هذه الكتب لكان ذلك فتحًا عظيمًا ورسالة إبرجتها وسيرة إجبارًا، وجزي يوم ذلك السبب مع المهدى عم ابن الأحباس محمد بحمد بن
رس من كتاب افتتاح الدعوة

ذكره جمهور المهدي، في ذكره بالشرق، ووصوله المصالحة.

لما انتهت الامامة إلى المهدى، فجرى البلاء بعد له فرحته.

وقد قال: {هاء ملأه وشهدته، ولاقية الله، وقام المهدي بإلامة بالبادية من زاوية}

ذكر وفسخه إلى دعوى آلهة، ثم تزويج الناس علماً، وخرج في البادية.

بفشي الله تعالى، وكان له في ذلك دعوى بديلة شرفة وذكرها محمد.

وعده الإمام، من قبل صلة بها، فخرج بنفسه بالإمام ابنه القائم من بعد.

ومعده وهم يمتهنون حره السفن، وهم يخدعون شباباً.

فانتهى مصراً أن يقصد إلى להם، وكان قد فصل بعض عقده فنصت عليه.

قبل وسد أمره فلق إلى بإلمام صاحب دعوة الله في ألا أن يستمر في

فوجدوا باتباع أمه، فانصرف عنه المطلقين الفضل صاحبه.

وكان نضجة من إلهم ناستماله، ونادر، فكان يقال في ذلك الوقت أن عباً للأُراقِيَ

يطلب أن يسأله من فلما بسطه ذلك، فأول المثالي نوعه، فاحسن عليه.

ففضل من أمر الله، أمرأوليته، واستعمله جميع ورفض الظاهرة والناس.

إلى اللافهات، فاتشهي ذلك تبرأ أنه ذلك الذي أصدقه، فكان كما

قال من شأن البليين، إنما قال إلِّى الإنسان أحسَّنْا نَكَّرُوا، فَأَقِلْنَا بِيَبِكَ.
إلى مقدم الرفعة فأقرأ الله سلامه وقٍل له تفضينا صلواته عدننا ونحن مساري، ووافقنا من طريقنا مهني، فإن رأيت أن تجل بنا اللعبة فانعل كأنه مخطئاً يصله ويضطه، فلما جاء رسول الله قالROOT الله إن هذا الشيء على الناس ركنت مأجورة إببى محمد فيما سأله، فضرب الطبول ورجل ورجال الناس فلتكن من غير ولي البرين زيارة عدالة ورجل تطعيم سنة بطليه، فأصابه فزخ من عمله، وحیم الله عزوجل منهم رضوًى عنه بأسهم لابارادة الله من تمام أمر وبلغ الكتاب إلى أجله، فصا رقى وصل إلى مساحة فأقام بها، وكل ذلك تظه المعيون فيها ورجوع إلى منزل وفظى مدينة دخل ونقول كل من دأ ومثن له تفعیلي صيرة والله ماهو لunistdمcomecee نستقل وملك من السلك، كذل背كان يقظ فيه كثير من رآه من أهل المساحة كأن مضايد لعليه افضاله علم يصفه أو يتبث وما أنزل الله من اللهجة والجلالة في عينين من رآه، كان صاحب المساحة يومئذٍ يبيّن بن مدرى وكان المهدى يصل ويهدٓ اليد وكان لذلك يوجب حقه وتعظيمه إلى أن تأتيب زيارة الله لمٓا أنصل به مصيره إليه يخبره هوالذي يدعوا وعبدا لله الراه، فخير ذلك من علبه، وسندكر أناصب بالله إن شاء الله،
يؤمنه من جانب ويتلفع له فيه وينكر أن إساحم معاذة ولم يقدم للحرب وويدم الجميل من نفسه ورائع الإكرام وأدرك ذلك له وبلغ فيه فلم توصل الرسل كتابه إليه رمي به بعد أن علم ما فيه وامركتهم فقتلوه وأتصل ذلك باب hüد ان فعاذه ولاطفه خوفًا من أن يكون منه إلى المهدى ما بيدهه وأعرض له عن ذكر تقيته عليه وكان آخرًا مثل ما كان لأولئك في طفقيه نحاوه ثالثًا فأحرى تدائي لمغيبه، استعان بالله وعبأ أعصاكرو، ودان من المدينة، نخرج إليه أتسع ابن مدرارين، معدهم البث أن أخذهم المخل في المدينة بعد أن ناوحها ساعةً وتبتوا من أصحبه جماعة، وكان ذلك بقرب المساء فاختطف الظلم ربيع السكون فذل، حيث كان، فاشتاق لن ليل هرب ابن عبد رفعة عليه واهل بيته، رياست ابن عبد الله من مكة تلك الليلة غنم فيهم لا يعرفون ما يعمل بالمهدي ولم يكنهم دخل المدينة في الليل ولم يعرفوا بهرف الفاسق حتى أصروا الخرج إليه جوه أهل المدينة علىهم بذلك ودخلوا معهم إلى الملك الذي كان فيه المهدى فاستخرجوا واستخرجوا القائم، كانت في الناس سورة عظيمة استقررتهم وكادت تطيح لها عقولهم وقرب لى ما 휐سات تركهما يجمّع المؤمنون بهما والتزاعة يمشون حولهما وأبو عبيدة يشي بين بيد أمام ويقول هذا مولاى
ذكرى إصرار ابن عبد الله بالحملة وخروج المهدية من بعثة ابن مدرارة صاحب أمرها أطهه الله قصد، وقد كان زيادة السكينة بيطرد المهدية مSex من وصفته، وأنه الذي ينعويه ابن عبد الله، فلم يخيب في ذلك إله مكوه، فلا ترب منه ابن عبد الله أرسل إليه لنطله عن نفسه وجالسه وهل إليه قدص ابن عبد الله، فاعترف لهم بالنسب إفام يبعيه إكار وقلق له في ذلك إثر إهذامة سفوقه مارته ود أرفعه، وكذل ذلك كان لم يربه، وفتم كونا كيف كان ابن أمه، وأمره وقال له إنهما ناحج راجرا بذلك أنه خاف عليه رأوى عنة ابن الكرارقدوم إلى ابن عبد الله وانفثا من دخول بلده نظر في القول في ذلك تلمز كلما الله الأول، فاتنزل الله باكتضالة الجاهزة في تلبية لجلالة في عينه فلم يباح أنه أكثر من أن يجلبه في دار حجاه عليه حسبى، وجعل ابنه القائم بأمره كذلك في دار أخرى ليفرق بينهما ويجليمهم كل راحلي منهما، وكان قوليهم واحدا، واتتم رجلاً كانوا معهم، بالمنابه لبقاً عليهما فلم يكن منهم الإما طالاء.
واتصل أخبار ابن عبد الله معظم ذلك عليه وكان يقول من يجاه
من الناس أن الله يرى ابنه، يظهره لابن إمامه، ينظره،
وأرسل رسوله الحمد إلى أبييس بن مدرارة كتب إليه كتاباً
وبه
رغم من العدد العشرين من كتاب زهر المعناني
وقام إسحاق بن جعفر صواب الشهيد بالبكاء على نفسيه، وفي هذه المسألة، من حيث المفهوم في الروحانية، مثالية بين أبيه وهو محمد، الرسول، والأربعون النبي، وعلى الاماممؤمنين للخلق الآخر والروح والمخلص المخلص الطاهر، وذلك إسحاق بن جعفر، هو رجل، وهو من أهل العلم والخلق الرفيق، مخلص، مفتاح لنهر الكمال، وهو في رتبة القائم السابع من النطقاء صل الله عليه، رحمة الله على إسحاق الأجل، تلبس على الضد لصدمة حسنه، ونغمه وحصري، في إطفاء نور الله، والله تعالى، مثمن نوره، يجعله إياه الله، وأوصى إسحاق والده الصادق، عم الأمين، أن يقيم الله جنباً جنباً ومستودعًا، كما أوصى هارون موسى أن يقيم الله كفيلة فأقام له يشعرون النور، نورًا عليه وحجاباً، فصلبه، أعطى مولانا محمد بن إسحاق، الذي بن بن غيلان بن بيدري مهران بن سلمان الفارسي، قدس الله رحمه، قرته، واحترى شخصه صلمه، وهو من أهل العلم والخلق الرفيص، وهوكيل له مستودع أمره، ومسيمن من أولاد سلمان وسماهم رحبًا، ورجل إسحاق بن جعفر، وقد كان مهيدًا صلله في كشف صاحب
يؤمنون، ويعظم الله ويشكر ويكي من شدة الفضيحة حتى
صل الإمام إلى الفضاء قد فرضت له فلا يدخل وأمر بنبل بأيصر على مدار
نفرج العسكر في طليبه، وإمام صلوات الله عليه إلى أن راح النهاية
إلى المؤمنين وفرش لهم ماء الفضاء وخلفه، فاستمعون قوله ويبكون
يجمع الله عليه بلغهم آية من كثيبته، ولهذا نذكر عليهم وينكر
فضلهم وسائر نبلهم من جزيل ترايه وبعدههم بالفضل ويبشره بدرك
نيل الدنيا والآخرة، إلى أن أراني المؤمنون بصلوة الله فقامت فصلاً
بهم، فقرأ في الأولى بوفاة الكتاب وسورة القدر وفي الثانية غزارة
الكتاب وسورة كل هو الله أحد، واتتم صلاة ودخل إلى الفضاء وانصرف
الناس.
كان مأظهره اساعيل عليّاً في الصلوات من النبوية والظهور.

ذلك كما فعل ذلك جدها النائب المرسل عليه وعلى عقبة الأفضل

مأظهر الصلاحتين عائط أمير المؤمنين في اخترقته، فأظهر الإمام

اساعيل مأظهره اعضاًً للخلائق بظهوره القدر من الشهادتين في رحمة

الكعبة وعقبة الطاهر الست، من بينه أي نظم الحكمة وتتصل إلى الخلاص إلى

وكم لعظمة وتتم النعمة.

ومن هذه الجعرات العظيمة التي تقصرت معروقتها العقول فيها

فيماع السائل المستوي يظهر لها العقل أولو الذي هو والẫع الأول بهم

فظاهر القوة للعازرين وبيقي في تحتهم العادون لأولى، ليس للسديعيين

ولا solução الأعجان، ولا يذكر الله إلى أولى الطالبين،

ثم إن الصادق عليه السلام تزام رضي الله بعلاء محمد بن

اساعيل وعلى جعله بالذوي هوايكون الست عليه والكفل، وكان له

دارسة في التأويل لقيقة واجتمع عليه كثير من الشيعة الخالفين للطريقة;

فقصد والاسمكون السمي وتنعبوا باللفظ دون المعنى، وكتب الصادق

منزلة ابن ابنه وأقام له ميمون الفذاح وابنه عبد الله الميمون للفذاح، وكم

أمر ذلك عن الخاص والسعي على الخلاصين المازرين أنجب الله له الولد;

وسارعين بولده وطلب أهرمي لولؤ الأمراديها ونقمidual وله درع.
إذن بطلب صلات الله عليه فانظر إسلام بن رضوان الصدر، معاصرة العوامين، وذكرهم، ونستشهد بأبن موسى وصل إليه ذلك وكتب شهادتهم، فلما ظهر نقلته سجاة ثلاثة أيام وهو بجده، ذلك شهادة من وصل إليه يعززه فيه من بين هاشم وغيرهم. فلما كان في اليوم الثالث أمره إليه إلى القمر، كشف من وجهه وقال إلينا حضر الله، هذا أولى إسلام بن يعقوب بن، مجددها دتهم على ذلك، ثم دفنه وراح كتب إلى أبو الدواين ورسوله خبره، ووصل إليه رأى الأخبار بعلم ذلك فسأله وقطع الخاطئ وعثاك أن ينوبه ورضاه. فلما كان بعد ذلك ظهر إسلام عليه السلام بالبصيرة، وأقبل إليه الناس برهون، وهم يقولون هذا إسلام بن جعفر، حفص، أي أن مرضعه، زمن على نبوته من الشيخين والولان كما، فقال له يا بن بنت رسول الله، قد تلمس أنك مبروك، فأظهر إليه وسمعه الله بالبكرته فتجلل، وبره عليه وشاهد الخليل ذلك، وثبت عنهم فلما سمع بذلك ابند الدواين، قال إن سمعت به إلى كتبة أعظم، فأمر بعلي إسلام به السلام، ولهام يصل البعنتيه في ذلك، خاطره الصادق، مكتبه، النهاد، كان والمحكم كثيرين شهد فشهد وأذن ذلك نسخ عنه خيظه وراح الصادق.
شهر سيفه في الجرو وقطع من أسسة الجرو وأمر الله به فقف يردد وجعلوا
حبل الفيديقه وأجراه في البلدان وأطلعوا المناوريمز وابن التامة وهاذا
على رحمة بالحظاء في الجرو والاعلام، والائمم لايتم في كنثة الله ورسوله
بل يستسلم القلاد فعلي الرحبه على السلام وصلوة وبخس سماه
الطاهر من أولاده في كهل ستره،
وموسى ملَّ قلم يجمعه الصادق عليه السلام عهدي ورقبة الإبراهيم
أموٍّ عن الأضداد ورثًّ للاطيع على الحَرَّيم به أهل العدوان والعدل، فدَّعى
موسي الأزد لويلده من بيده وقال أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
عشر من أعياله، فجعلوا جمعه عليه السلام السدر بن علي صلوات الله
عليه، وموسى أول السدرات الثانية رؤوباً واعتقادات الفاسدة والأقوال
الواهية نكل بهم قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن الشمر تطلع من مغزها وانه لا
نكس رأية الفيده عليه السلام يهمها بما تقولوه ظهر أمره وبرى
الأمر صاحباً محبسات وبين الآيات المهملة بالمصلات الله عليه الذي
طلم من الغرب، وقام قيام النهر والثعلب مهلكاً بين ناسبة الحرب وذهب الزبد
جفاء وأشرفت الأرض بنورها فاتاراً وضياءاً، وبطل ما مولى به موسى اتقانه
فظهر في الأمة من روية اسعايلة السلام نوراه.
وقد سُلِّم مولانًا المعرفة على الله من الجري فقاى رضاه.
فيها والشيعة في اعتقادهم مختلفون، والفضلاء البالغون منهم لولٍّ
أوهمه عارفين أعلمهم ولي الله بمقام صاحب أمرهم فعلموا وأمرهم
أن يكونوا ذلك استغفر الضلّ فكمبوا،
واعتقدت نظرًا أن الإمامة رجعت الظهري، وفرقة تعتقد
امامته موسى بن جعفر وإذًا للايمان بل الله سيترأى ولده إنصار مستتراً;
ثم اعتقدت نظرًا أخرى إمامته الأشعث (الأخير) عبد الله بن جعفر فمات في
عصر أبيه وظلّ يقطع الولد فبطل ما الفقه فيهم التراثات، وفرقة اعتقدت
إمامته محمد بن جعفر تفرقت بغيرية أساعيل وذهب بهم أهؤامهم
كل ذهب إلى البابا، فلما أن للصادق عليه السلام الجبل وإنقصم في
لبس على الضدّ إلى اللام غسر أُترأى وللله وصيانيتُه. لمجرود دينه،
وأما أهلهم من تبعه لهم...
فقام موسى بن جعفر الفشخ واعتقد أكتر الشيعة عليه، ومالك
أهواء عامةهم إليه، وكثير من أولاد جعفر رأوا الإمامة لنفسه، وإنكم
ولى الله بهذا التلبين عن الضدّ من أنيابه من بناء نفسه، وكان أولاد
جعله والدين بالريح والتأويل... وهما من عصم الله منهم يتبنون
ولي الله...
فكان خُلْوَة الله عن الإمامة لا تبتاري عقبه، ومحمد بن جعفر
بَغْلِيَهمْ صَغْرِي طَفْيَانِ الضَّلَالِ والشِّهَاباتِ، فَنَمَ شَاءُ تَفَيْؤُون منْ شَكِّيْفُ
فَقَرَّتْ أَمَامَة إِسْمَاعِيلٍ بِجَفْرِيِّقِ كُلِّهِ اللهُ وَعَلَيْهِ رَقِيَّةَ
كَلِّ اِمْامٍ مِنْ دَنْيَتِهِ إِنْ تَنْهَارُوا وَاسْتَنْتَ، وَيَبْطُلُ مَا ذَهَبِهِ الْمَفْتُورُونَ وَخَابُ
الْإِسْتِقْيَاءِ البَطُولُونَ، وَلِلَّهِ يَرْبِدُ أَنْ يَتَّبِعُ نُورَهُ وَلَوْ كُنْتُمْ كُلُّ كُفَّارٍ، لِيُلْبِثُ
بِلَغَ مُحَمَّدٌ بِإِسْمَاعِيلٍ عَلِيِّهِ السَّلاَمُ أَشْدَدَهُ زِلَالَةٌ عَنْهُمْ أَهْلُ الْقَلَمُ أَنْ
لِيَرْجِعُوا جَلِّه تَسْوَاتُ اللهِ عَلِيْهِ عَلَى هُمْ إِجْمَاعِ
وَقَامَ مُحَمَّدٌ بِإِسْمَاعِيلٍ صَلَاوَاتُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ وَهُوَ وَسَاسُ الْاِسْتِحْتَامُ
وَقَايٌ مَّقَافِيِّهِ عَلَى أَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ تَمَامُ الدُّورَ الْرُّجَاءِيَّةِ إِلَى خَلْقِ الْأَخْرَ
الْذِّي هُوَ قَرْشَانِيُّ وَرَجُحُهُ وَمِنْهُ، وَهُوَ تَسْمَاءُ الدُّورِ الْأَرْوَازِ وَمِنْهُ أَتْبَدَا
الْدُّورُ الْثَانِيَ،
وَكَانَ بِالْمِدْنَةِ فَقَامَ بِهِنَّ اللَّهُ سَبَيْحَانَهُ رَبِّيَةَ الدِّعَائِةَ وَتَفَصِّلَ الْعُلُومَ وَأَرْسَ
ذَلِكَ بِطَلِبِ دَارِ حِيْرَةٍ مِّنْهَا، وَكَانَ فِي عَصْرِ الرَّشِيدِ، فَلَمَّا بَلَغَهُ عَلَى هَيْبَةٍ
اِسْتِنَادُ دِعَاةِ الْآخِرَةِ قَبْضَةَ عَلَيْهِ وَأَنْ يُؤْدِيَهَا أَلِيَهُ، وَكَانَ اِمْامَ قَدُعَّدَ بَدرِيَّةً
يَكُونُ مِنْهَا الْبَدْنُ، فَلْلَّهُ وَسَالُ الرُّسُلُ مِنْ الرَّشِيدِ إِلَى الْمَدِينَةِ مَدِينَةَ الْأَرْشِيَّ
خَيْرٌ عَلَوِّلَهُ، وَلَمْ يُهْدِى الطَّلِبُ سَارًا إِلَى مَأْمَرِهِ فَلَمْ يَرْجِحُهُ وَخَلَفُ مِنْهُ
اللهجة تتجلى بالنور والرضا في جعفر بن منصور اللذي نصر الله وجهه، وعلى قدسه ندمامة لا مشترية ولا نباهة. بأيامه مع مورالده، فاللهجة ممتلئة، وبيسرون إلى دار كلمته وملح رضوانه بغيره أشخاصهم وقيام أخفض منهم في مقام السلف حاضرة الإمام اللงาม، ونامهما في الإقامة فصغيلهم يتوارثون بالنافقتين الإصلاح ما خلف عن سلف كأن عرش السلا loạn لا يزل... للهانقتعبة في موسي ووائلة الدُرُبة كانت الجهة عليه قراءة أذهب عرويين من لاب تلك الرتبة السنية لأن التبرع قد قال الناس أخلف فكيف إن تُسكبت به الْنُضْرُ بحذى كتاب الله وعترق أهل بيتي، فذُهبا لينببذاج على الجهد، ونحوز هيقول صلوات الله عليكم لذا لا يزال الإمام ممثلاً يلمع، ولذا يذكرون أمير المؤمنين مرجع أغاثه من أمارة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من ذلك المعوض يوم القيامة، وهو الذي يتناوله على الاحترق يذكى أوامره ولهجته الله والرسالة والوصية والإمام، وجميع أهل الفضل الذين أماهم الله الكرامة صاحب الحقائق والعلم الباهي التي تسريعه وإلا لا يدوع بينه كاتبه مظاهر وتمازج، ونصاراته وهم ينتجزون إلى النور من الظلمات
الكربور، لأن القيامات كثيرة أو لها أحد دون الكفوف، ثم لا دون المطلق، ثم الداعي الحري، ثم الداعي المطلق، ثم داعي البلاغ، ثم الجمعة وغايتها اللباب، وإنما كانت هذه المحددات قيامة كثيرة كل واحدهم بما يتعلبه من الصور الجريدة المفارة للإجسام الصارئة إلى أفقه المعروفة به، ويتلو هذه القيامات قائم قيامة كبرى وهولمقدم إلى هولبا مع ليه أفضل للسلام، فهؤلاءم القيمة ونهاية النهات، وكيلد من كرتبائم بنسبة إلى درونه ويتلوا جميعًا قائم القيمة الكبري مبسطة العظمي المجمعة عند جميع المقامات وهولهم غابة النهات الشريفة للجامع لها من أول الثلاثة آلاف السنة التي الاخرة وركشف إلى آخر و مجيدا للحلا على آل الميت، ويهب رضوانا والسيل المومنين على بن ابطال بعلي بقوله لثرة آلاف سنة تقوس بصورة إشارة إلى هذا المقام العظيم للجامع لقيامات الادواري مسلى عليه التنظيم، وهو الذي يختلف العقل الباهر بدقتله، ويقوم مدعّلا للعالم في ربيته وانما رفع عليه اسم الناطق السابع لنطقه بالأمرالله، وجمعه للفضل الذي هواليه متناهي، وليس بطني ولا رسوله بل هو منفرد برقعة الوحدة، وقد تمّ التلمام واسق الانتظام.

فانا خصّ محمد بن معايل بذلك للاستظام في سلك مقامات.
ولديك خليلي من الإمام، وهما أسماعي رجعتني وخشيت إلى الرب. فنفسك مكتشأً عضيذه، وهم يبدو وما بينهما وبين الدليل، وترجع بنيتياً بأمره فولدت له ولدًا فسُمِّه عبد الله كناء الرضى، وعرف عبد الله الإمام بالطاركتما القامة وأخفى الله، ونصب لحِجَةٍ وأمر بها عن الحج والحجج أن تسمى باسم الإمام، فمن أخذ المهدي على حجته يبلغ له أحد أهل الكُنَّة الحجيج يتضى الهم إليه يستراع على صاحب الإسْبَنْج، بذلك السنة والقضية في الأئمة المستورين الثلاثة، فلما أن الدعاء في أرض اعثواهم يسمون هولا الإئمة بأسماء مختلفة ما الفرق.

منهاني خلاضان،

فقام محمد باللسان ومضت عنه السيف إلى بلوغ كتاب أجله

 فأظهر العلم وبين الحقائق وكشف خصائصه منها السرالكدم، نُظهرت مند حقائق ومجازات ودلائل وآيات لم يظهر في الأئمة من قبل ولا قام أحد الأئمة كمثله لأنه السابع صاحب القوة، والظهور والضياء والذوق

ومبين العلم المستور، وكان محمد بن سلماي متمنى الدور والنهج، إلى الله، ضياء السلف، ثم حَفِظَ أبا عبد الله الشافعي، على رتب محددة فดวงها تبهرت

وهوالقائم بالقوة صاحب الكشفة الأول، فإن القائم بالفعل هو القائم

كلما ذُكر هواصاحب الكشفة الأخرى، والنشوة العظمى تابعت القُوَّة.
ابن سمايل ومبنية العبرة الشريف الجليل إذ هو سايع الإمام البخاري المعني، وله سابع قوة تكون ليس أمين تقضمه، ولذلك كانت قوة القائم صلح لما كان سابع النظائر، والذا كان الإمام محمد بن سمايل كان سابع الخلفاء الذي هو المختار من الإمارات الدائمة، سابع أشرعين ورابع أربعة، وكذلك لمولانا الإمام الطيب ومبنية ما كان سطوعاً ومالم سريجاً لما تحت الشمس شديد، ولأنزل كبر الأسابيع بكون سابع السنة أقومهم واجمهم للعلم وكثرهم بيناً ونجمهم بها حتى يكون الانتهاء إلى لقيان الاختصار أكترهم أفعواناً، ومبني السطور، واكتشف هوا مشاريعه من فواضله، وإنها تحقيقاً، فإن بلغ إلى ذلك فهوا أهل دار الكشف وتعزف القائم فإن للفضل والجزاء، بلغ المباديء ذات أهل ذلك الدورلينة الأعالي والكشاف الاسترنجلياً، محمد بن سمايل صلى لم يظل شيفاً من ظاهر شريفية محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم، بل أخذها وأمر بالعمل بها، وعلى ذلك سنة الأمة الطاهرة من أبنائه التابعين لهم قيامًا بالتكليفات وحافظة على المفتيات من غير تخصيص ولا اهلاً ولا ترك ولا طالبًا، رأيتنا الإمام المعرّقبة وعطلت بقياسه ظاهر شريفية محمد لما كان معناه بعينيًا ولا ساراها كما شافها ومجرّباً، فأزلين أتباعه وأشيعه اعتقاده الظاهر على ما فيه من تطيل ونشبيه للشريعة على مبناها، وبشيل وتعليم للملاكمة الروحانية، واعتقلذ ذلك على ما موجود في هذه
دُرَّرُ الرَّسُولُ ﷺ إذاعاتَهُ أَنَّهُم قد أَفْدَأْتُم رَضِيَّتهِ وَانْتِظَارَةِ دَورَكَان خَاتِمَهُم النَّاطِقُ رَحْمَةُ عَلَيْهِ الْسَّلَامُ ... وَإِذَا عَايَدَتُم عِشْيَةً رَضِيَّتهِ وَانْتِظَارَةِ دُورَهُ كَانَ مَحْمُودًا مَتَّالُهُم رُحَوُّ النَّاطِقُ لَخَاتِمَهُ لِلنَّطَاقِ، كُانَ رُضِيَّهُ عَلَيْهِ الْسَّلَامُ الْفَضْلُ مُفَرِّدًا، وَإِذَا عَايَدَتُم الأَئِمَةَ فِي دُورَهُ كَانَ مُحْمَّدًا مَهْيَةً رَاحِلًا لَلْبَشْرَيْةِ وَلَلْخَاتِمَةِ عَلَى مَن تَقَدِّمَهُم، فَلَذِلك سَارُ النَّاطِقُ أَرْهَبًا لِلْإِشْعَالِ وَقَاتِمًا، وَهُوَ نَخْجُعُ شَرِيعَةُ صَاحِبُ الدُّرُّ السَّادِسُ بَيْنَ مَا عَلَى وَأَظَهَّرَ بَاطِنَهَا الْمَبْطُونُ فِيهَا،

رَبَّ ذَلِكَ نَطْقُ وُلُودَ الامامِ الحُكَّامِ الْمُذَلِّلِينَ اسْتِدْلَالَاتٌ التَّحْكِيمِ يَقُولُ: "فِي دَعَاءِ يَوْمِ السَّبِتِ، وَوَقَاءِ الْقَامِ بِالْحَقِّ النَّاَطِقِ بِالسَّلَامِ بِالْتَسَاءِلِ مِنْ جَمِيعِ الْوُلُودَ الْمَهْيَةَ وَالْبَشْرَيْةَ بِحُكْمَهُ وَالْخَاتِمَةِ عَلَى مَا أَبَاهُ وَاسْتِلَامِهَا، سَاحِرُ الْرَّسُولِ عَلَى آدمٍ اسْتَمِحَّهَا وَقَسَمَهَا وَرُكَّنَهَا وَخَلَطَهَا بَعْدُ الْبَشْرَيْةَ عَلَى سَاحِرِهَا، وُلَّاهَا أَهْلُ الْجَمِيعِ، الْعَبَّاسُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْوَقَاءِ الْقَامِ بِالْبَيْنَ، الْحُكُّمُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْخَاتِمَةِ عَلَى مَا أَبَاهُ وَاسْتِلَامِهَا، سَاحِرُ الْرَّسُولِ عَلَى آدمٍ اسْتَمِحَّهَا وَقَسَمَهَا وَرُكَّنَهَا وَخَلَطَهَا بَعْدُ الْبَشْرَيْةَ عَلَى سَاحِرِهَا، وُلَّاهَا أَهْلُ الْجَمِيعِ، الْعَبَّاسُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْوَقَاءِ الْقَامِ بِالْبَيْنَ، الْحُكُّمُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْخَاتِمَةِ عَلَى مَا أَبَاهُ وَاسْتِلَامِهَا، سَاحِرُ الْرَّسُولِ عَلَى آدمٍ اسْتَمِحَّهَا وَقَسَمَهَا وَرُكَّنَهَا وَخَلَطَهَا بَعْدُ الْبَشْرَيْةَ عَلَى سَاحِرِهَا، وُلَّاهَا أَهْلُ الْجَمِيعِ، الْعَبَّاسُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْوَقَاءِ الْقَامِ بِالْبَيْنَ، الْحُكُّمُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْخَاتِمَةِ عَلَى مَا أَبَاهُ وَاسْتِلَامِهَا، سَاحِرُ الْرَّسُولِ عَلَى آدمٍ اسْتَمِحَّهَا وَقَسَمَهَا وَرُكَّنَهَا وَخَلَطَهَا بَعْدُ الْبَشْرَيْةَ عَلَى سَاحِرِهَا، وُلَّاهَا أَهْلُ الْجَمِيعِ، الْعَبَّاسُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْوَقَاءِ الْقَامِ بِالْبَيْنَ، الْحُكُّمُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْخَاتِمَةِ عَلَى مَا أَبَاهُ وَاسْتِلَامِهَا، سَاحِرُ الْرَّسُولِ عَلَى آدمٍ اسْتَمِحَّهَا وَقَسَمَهَا وَرُكَّنَهَا وَخَلَطَهَا بَعْدُ الْبَشْرَيْةَ عَلَى سَاحِرِهَا، وُلَّاهَا أَهْلُ الْجَمِيعِ، الْعَبَّاسُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْوَقَاءِ الْقَامِ بِالْبَيْنَ، الْحُكُّمُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْخَاتِمَةِ عَلَى مَا أَبَاهُ وَاسْتِلَامِهَا، سَاحِرُ الْرَّسُولِ عَلَى آدمٍ اسْتَمِحَّهَا وَقَسَمَهَا وَرُكَّنَهَا وَخَلَطَهَا بَعْدُ الْبَشْرَيْةَ عَلَى سَاحِرِهَا، وُلَّاهَا أَهْلُ الْجَمِيعِ، الْعَبَّاسُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْوَقَاءِ الْقَامِ بِالْبَيْنَ، الْحُكُّمُ الْعَلَّامُ، الْخَاتِمَةِ عَلَى مَا أَبَاهُ وَاسْتِلَامِهَا، سَاحِرُ الْرَّسُولِ عَلَي
الخلفاء كَانَ لَهُمُ المَهْمُ بن عَلِيَّةَ السَّلَامُ أَوْلُ الْأَرْضَاءَ، فَكَفَتُ نَفْسَهُ وَبِسْتَر
الجُمْحُ وَجَدَّمَا كَانَ بِجَنَّةٍ وَجَبَّةَ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ بْنِ يُسَيْمَ بن رَجَاءْ السَّلَامُ وَلَمْ يُظَهَّرَ عَلَيْهِ إِلَّا أَحْدُد
وَلَا أَطْلَعَ عَلَيْهِ وَلَا عَرْفُهُ الْأَحْيَةِ العَرَشَ الْغَيْمُونَ بِأَمْرِ اللَّهِ أَمْ نَأَمَّة خَلْقِهِ وَفَضْلَاءَ جَهَّدَهَا المَنْصَوَبَةَ فِي دَعْوَتِهِ، كَانَ إِسْتَتَاَنَّ
kظْمَةَ الْلَّيْلِ الشَّدِيدِ، وَذَلِكَ مَا غَلِبَ الْبَاطِلَ عَلَى الْحَقِّ وَلِشَدَّةِ دُولَةَ
الْوَمَامَةِ السَّلَامُ إِذَا أَخَذَ أَحَدُهُمَا جَوْدُهُمُ الْمَهْمُ الْمِهْدُ عَلَى مِسْتَجِبَينَ
الْحَرُوفِ يَقُولُ لِهِ وَأَنَّهُ مَسْمَعُ وَطَائَعَةً لِوَلِدَ النَّاصِرِ، وَلا يَغَفُّو بِبَاسِمَةٍ
وَذَا تَرْشَحُ فِي الْعَلَمِ عَلَّتُ فِيهِ دُرْجَةً وَارْتَفَعَ مَنْزِلَةَ الْكَتِبِ لْعَامِلِهِ
وَلَا كَشَفَ لِهِ اسْمَ وَمَهْمَةَ وَلَا بَيْنَهُ بِشَأْرِهِ وَلَا عَبْرَةِ فِي كَلَّامِهِ الْمُهْجَٰدُ
تَدْبِلُ الْأَطْلَاقَ وَأَسْتَحْقَّ كِشْفَ مَعْرُوفَةٍ إِसْمَهُ بِسَتِّيْجَابِ وَأَسْتَحْقَّ قَبْلَ
وَجُرَى ذَلِكَ مَدَّةً الْأَشْتَرِيْنَ حَتَّى عَلَّتَ شَمْسُ الْحَقِّ مِنْ مَغَرْفَهَا
وَأَنَّا آتِيْاً الْأَدْبِيْنَ لِكُلِّ مَسْتَيْسِكَ بِالْعَرْقَةِ الوَثْقِيَّةَ
ظَهَرَ ذَلِكَ الدَّعْوَةِ مُحَمَّدٍ نَّيْدَةَ تَدِسُّ اللَّهَ رَحْمَةً وَكَانَ بِالْبِلَاغِ
عَنْدَا لِالْمُصَادِقَةِ أَنَّهُ قَالَ بِحَاضْرَتِهِ بِتَغْوَايَةٍ إِلَى الْأَسْمَاءِ سَلَّمَةً تَحْيَيْنَ أَعَمَّلَيْنَ
فَقَالَ أَحَدُهُمَا وَمَا ذَلِكَ الْسَّلَامُ إِسْمَ وَمَولِيَّةٍ، فَقَالَ مَرَاتَبُ الْعَلَمِ بِرَقْيِ
الْبَرْقِيَّةِ الْيَوْمِ إِلَيْهِ يُلْعَمْ وَيُبْيَحُهُ عَبْرَةً وَفَهْمَ...
الدين فنصبه ذلك الاعتقاد إلى القيم المتكونة للواقعين، وأيضا إلى القياس.
وتبقى بذلك التأويل الذي طور في التوجيه الصحيح، ورثة البازجية عن صفه
خليقة وعرفت الملائكة بجهرة اللطف وربي الثواب والمحاسب على ما يعتقد
اهل التجربة والتكشف،
وداذك كفعل أماير المولى، على ابن إبراهيم صلوات الله عليه فإنه
أول قائم بكشف المعنى، وربين الباطن، الشريف الأنصاري، والأمامة الظاهرة
فانهم بذلك تأثروا على الحافظة عليه داهمون، نقادوا والقوة لأهل التصوف
الذي يعنتم بمكانة كونه مستور، وقاموا بالفعل لأهل الحقائق
الخريجية كشفوا لهم كما نراه معرفته وتفاحين، فإنهم إياهم أزليت
من الحكمية، وإعلم فضائل أولياء الله الأئمة وتلقى ما أزليت كمن
الثوابن واستمسك بالعروة الوثقى والهجل المتنين،
وألت ملائمة محمد بن سعيا صلوات الله عليه نقلته وردت
 غيبة سالل الأرض إلى وليه عبد الله الرازي وجلبه لمخل والوجي،
نقم عبد الله الرازي المستور صلى الله عليه، وهو أصل عليه
الأئمة المستور بأمتر الله وروحه، وثمرة الرتبة من بلده، وخلفه في
شريف مقامه، وهو كشكالة مقابل لآلهة درار الولائمين، وهكذا.
ذلك مصينون بأن لا زينب عليهم ولا عيب ينسب إليهم في مثل هذه النبوة
قضاءً أبماطلٍ من دماء قريش،
فلعل الله بالحق ذلك صنيف الوسائل وأظهر فيها ما أظهر من علم
الفلسفة الأربعة ما هو عاجزون، وشتاؤا كأن الشرواجة وربط توازينها
بالمقابلات والشواهد أن لا تختل ولا تستجلع من المعاني، ولم تكبت
نشرها في وحي كشفت راشهيرت نظرها أمن منها ناهرا وعجرها
وحيٌّ وровер المتضمنين على ذلك ناهزه وما بهم على اشياء غائبة عنيهم
وعلهم على علم المجسطى وجلد عليه إذ لم يصنف فيه شيئا، فعدد تلك
علم المأمون أن ولد الأمير مكي وأن الأرض لا تقول من جماعة، فرجع عزديما
نوه وترصف على ولي الأمر على الحلوية ورسل إلى القضاء والفقهاء من البلاط
وركل الفاطميين ذلك والعولى، وخصه في ذلك فنجل وأمر بالنداء والبلد
من كان من نسل فاطمة استصل إلى المأمون لقسطه من ناهز ومعوله
وخصه من ناحية بذلك، وباب الحجة بأن ناهز والعولى هبة من رسول
الصلح لفاطة... فوصل اليعمجاء من الفاطميين وكان فيم رضى
الله على بعثهم، وعليه الثاني من الأمية الاستاذة عند الأمامية الأثريءية
وكانت معجزته كمعجزة الثاني من المنطقة، وباكر في زمانه من
الطوفان على الملك الأول العبدان، والموارد لهم بالله، ومعجزات وعليه
ولما أنهنت مدته رهبت دعوته أمام ولدها أحمد النقي وصعد إلى القاعلا
الشريفة التي في عالم الملكت تتزقق

فقام الإمام أحمد بن عبد الله النبي عليه صلوات الله وسلم بأنه
ورحية وهو الثاني منخلفاء، وحكم عبد الله بن يحيى، وأحمد بن
علي السلكم مشجع النفاية في دورهم مقابل أنه كان انتهى من نقاطه ومجدد الحسين
ابن علي الثاني الانتهاء فنشر العلم ظاهرًا بفضل الرسول وجعلها على
العلم الأربعة...

وشرعت الأئمة الشريعة وثبت قوامها بالمقابلات من لأنفس الآخرين.
وقبل الحجم وراربي حت أقبلت الأمية على حدوده تداهروهم وحدها المجوهر
وهلTextLabel: unemployment مكون، وسب ذلك أن العموم جمع المنتجين وأنفق
عليهم الأموال الجمعية لعمل النص الذي يشمل، وكدلا الإمكانيون خلق
في كفوف النفي، رضن العموم أن الفاطميين نفذوا وما بقي لشريعة من
يقيهم ودائما ويرفع مراسمةها، وطبع في إطار شريعة بحسينيصول، وأراد أن
يظهر الفقيه يجع الله فضوه الدين، وأأن الله هو السماء والهدوء دفع
المصباح والعقاب والذواب ليبرع أو يخلق أن الذي جاء به محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم
لدوان الصحابة لمأتي ثم انعذوب عملوا بجليله السلام ماعملوا وأنهم في
الرجم، فأتاحتحمل الإبصار عنك وقبل شعوبك بعين ضيائه، فرأيته منه ماحملت،
وبرأى الدخانة منه ما أقابل فيه، فتوضق بين أطرفيك، وتبقل مقاله بك، ونحن
من رؤاه وناولنا ظاهر نمتى حلت منه ماحملت مكاكناً فخو بكمكنه
ناصره في كشف ما بيننا وبيينك أحد ماغه عندك، وما ذلك عليه يجري
فهذا أفضل وإن فيه الباقص عم معرفة الحجاب الأعظم الذي وقع
الجُرِبُ، وأشرفتها وأعلاها أثرها، فذاك كان ذلك الحجاب كيف المجتهد
إذا الأبراص نظره للكليلة والصارعن، لمعرفته قصيرة غير طويلة، ولك
قلح حيث ماظهر الونوز يتجه، فذاك ناكر ذلك نخير يد بع نظهور من علمه
صلح مايهم الألباب، ويدلب العقول أن لم تصل إلى معرفة معاني الأسبا
كانت مجزرة ثانية لخلفاء عظيمة، والطريقية المعرفته قوية
ذلك أحمد الحموديما ألما الظلم بعأسه وأخفاه، من نور ظهرت
الأنوار، وبعرفته عرف السلام اليوم المهمين العزيز لجانر.
وأما تنقلته وردت إلى الدار الكرامة زعيمه سلم الأمر، وله
الحسين بن أحمد رجله بيت نور الشرف المجد،

نقام للحسين بن أحمد المقتدى الهادي مسؤولياتهم،
وهو الوثاث من الخلفاء ممثلان ولعلة في الدور مقالب لا يبرهم
ال伝えية، آياتهم قد سببت كرودية لأن نورهم من نور الولاء، الذئب من الازدرع تستلمت في معرفته طرق العقول انستثمت، واضافاتها أُولى الباب إلى الوقف دون معرفة الحجاب الذي هو قريب الحجاب وعلى الرتب، وهو الباب الذي رفعت دونه الحدود، وذلك دون رتبة الجمع الحظى التي هي منتهى الرتبة غايتها، وذلك هي الرتبة السلفية العالية الجداً، كذكر جابر بن زياد الذي غاص في الباطن قال دخلت على مولانا عليه السلام، وبيته مسبح من زيتون، وهو يقول سبحان أن كلما رفعت عنه جماهير النكفت إلى منهباب، وكلما فوست عليه أبا ظهير منهجاب، سبحان من مستهط وبليه إليه ومسيرين تصدده إلى نوره، فقُلَّت فخاطرى إنه لعظمى، فرفع رأسه إلى وقال إن العظيم من أنباه عظيم والعليم من أنباه عظيم، بما بدا لي منه، ان عبد الله يوجي إلى أن لا عبد ولا الآللء عزر جاراً، فأضاقت في رنه هذا الحاجب كيف المحتسب، فرفع رأسه إلى وأنفُض، ورعى»، وهو يقول إن هذا بعض أوليائه الكريمين، وقال له أزيدي، فقلت حسبي، فقال يأجاب إبْنِ يُصْحِبْيُهُ، إن لم يذهب، رفع من نوره يبربه منك سُلال الكرم، يأجاب سلماً متى الهل لبيت ظاهر مسلم طيب».
الكلام وصار إلى غاية الآمال ونهاية الأسباب، والله تعالى بهي من أشرك
به غيروه واتخذ ألهًا دونه وعبد شهدته ونفسه واتخذ دمًا يرفعه، فهذا
على الله فدسه،
فالعين العظيمة العقل الأول والإبداع الأفضل الناظراً شرف
الجُبج. والباطن بجيب مبديه الذي ليس له غيره إلى ذكره مذهب. وعين
العظيمة على الذي عاب الشعوب بقوله وآتِه في أثام الكتاب آدمين على جهم;
ومن ورد مقامه الذي فهم مقام الوحدة فذالك الاسم واقع عليه، ولا يبد
كل مقام من حُججٍ شريفة لكون أعلاها وأساهها حججته التي هي أرفع الحجج;
ودون مقام العماة الأعظم، وهو غيبة للحدود ورضيه الموجود ولحق الغض
وابن، فأفهم بائدة جمعة التجاب وصاحب به تعلق باستنسل بك من سبيله
للكون من الناجين ونتمح مع أولياء الله في لحوم الأmins،
والآن نرجح إلى مكانته من ذكر الإسلام في العصر المقتدي على السلام;
فقام مُستَملاً وضغاء إبيه وعلمه وأحكامه، نفخ من الرسالة كتاب المجامع
 ذات الفوائد النافعة، وبث دعائه وكفر الاستضافة إلى دين الحق لذبب ظهور
الهديد سلم وأخذ الحديث من الفجر بن خويش النصوري إلى ليمن، وكان أهل
الجهم واللصابة يذكرون ظهور المهدى بالله وديشرون بدولته، ثم إن الملوك
والأضداد أينوا بذل حتى أن كثيرون منهم تبرون من الأرض كله، كغير
الطاقم، والعلماء الذين في الاستماع في وجوه الموظفين والتلبيض، المعجزات لقرب ظهور الزمان שהحضر، والجاهزية. ثالث المتلفة أتحمل الملف بالحكم من ولي أمرنا المعين:
على بن أبي طالب صمّم تمرّضه من جد أدهم بن الميهم وقاسه الله رحمة
وهذا الجميل قد ردها، العظيم خطراً ورداً لرحب وأسماءه وألفتها رؤتها.
وأعثامه، وهو الذي ظهر مهيئة لأولئك وابتعاده لتصفيتهم كما ظهور زمان العبد
لأبي عبد الله الانصاري في صورة المي وفقاء ولاء والتعليم، وعاد الاصغر
المين، وقال: أعلق حكمة هذا إجابه، هي نصوص في كوكب زمان على التمادي
القصص ولا تتمادي بالتنبيه والأنباء هم هياكل الزمان المتجلي بهم الحق.
عن ظهور
كما قال الداعي جعفر بن نصير راعي الله قدس الله، في كتاب الكشف
حيث قال العين عظيمة غاية كل غاية يشارة بها إلى السبب، عظيم القدر
لاقتدرك صفات الخلق والأنفس، والأنبياء زمان، بل هو مقصد الزمان ومنعني
كلاصروا على وحقيقة كل دهر، فجعل مدها هوروقاضي يواصل جر
الزمان الذي لدري في الأرض محرّاً في لهو الازمان وموضوعاً في جميع
سبيته باشارة جميع أشكاله، منفردًة، كم زمان قضائه، ولا غالبجع من عرفه.
مرجواً عندمن وصفه سجنه بل من عرف المجاب فقد امرأه باليهاء.
كان المهدى بإله صللم رابع الخلفاء مسؤوليّة صغرى في الدار، بل جهده الباقورة للتمويه ولم يكمل إله معصوب الغص وربين الآيات وظاهر البينات كانت معجزاته باهرةً وأبيه تظاهر ووجه لملأ الخلق الشمس الرابعة من الاملاك التي لها قوة الأمان دائماً لم تغل ولها دقة مما لها الطلبية و확ير يجاوته، بحى جلته رحيل خلفه ورسائد الأصفياء وينتهي من الشهيرة أموراً من أثر رفع مواقف عدّة واشارات حمة، وفمال وهب التلميذة من هجري تطلع الشمس من غربها، فكان شمس الله الطالعة والآية الصالعة، والجبر الأعظم والباب الأشرف الأكرم حامل إمامة الله وديعته وأجسدها إلى القائم في الآخر، ولدى اليد الجلية وفادته وهو خليفته، الكتاب منه كتيل جدّه أمير المؤمنين من محمد رسول الله الاميين صلوات الله وركلاه وطهيه عليهم إجماعين، وكانت تظهر معجزاته وقامت آياً فيه وابنت فضله وعادة فظهرت دعوتها في اليتيم والغرب والجزيرة والمؤمنين لما علمنا من دنو تثير شدة الكرب، ولهما تתופه إلى يد وفهو ذا لقدر في سفر وجد في سيره وللاقطار همّت من ذكره وخبره، واذى بعض المنتظمين يعيبهم مصر وأمران تقدم البلدان ليعمل فيهم الجزار، في بلدهم مسكونه، فذاكعلم ذلك وله المسلم أمير طبيعة صفر فعل فيه منبر في ماء ذاك.
فحملت دعوته في النافذة وعُرِفت بِفُضْلِهِ عَلَى وادي العين، وهو صاحب الدعوة بالغرب بِصُمَّامَة سَوِه، ومعه الإمام العبد بأمر الشيخ عبد الله المستجيح بِعَدَّة إلى الخلافة، والهدي بالله، فأقبل في كلامه، ومشير بالوقت، بالله، فظهرت لِيِهِنَّ اليوم، ومن أهل دعوته، حتى تأثر فيهم، بِكَانَة مَن هُدَى إِلَى الْمَغْرِبَاءِ، وَاشتهر بالثمار، وَلِيَهْدِي إِلَى الْمَغْرِبَاءِ، وَاشتهر بالثمار.
ثلثة أيام وهكذا يعجل أمرتميصة إذ أُنهِت أتى يثبت محالًا على أن يكون على
ولى الدين المحافظًا ينفرد بالله من الجور بعد أركوز والشك بعد الأيقان
والنكران بعد أمان، ونسلم أن يجعل مرضًا وخشى يجلبه محتصمون، ويُحرِّر
المفتيغ لم أمرنا الله بطاعتته متزعم غير مستنكفين ولا مستكبرين ولا
مليونين عن قبالة الحق ولا موميَّ يجمع محمد والله الظاهر
تأمرُنا الله تعالى بعبد الله الشهيد يظهر بالقتال صلى عليه
رتجم ولم يبطل صلاح عمله لأحدث من زلله، وقيل معه إخوه بايباس
المستكبران يصرُّون على البلاس، وظهر منه دعوته وتبهر منه معلماً بذل كافاهة
الناس فإنا بالخمران المبين وحمري الدنا والدين وارك كماظالين
ثم أن ينصلم أمرعبارة المهدية، فلتتأثَّرها وأكملها استقر
اليها جلها داهرية الإمام القائم بأمره، أمير المؤمنين وأمر من يجري
منها البسهم، فوقع السهم في موضع قد أشار إليه فأمرني ببني على الموضع
الذي انتهى إليه السهم موصِّل، وقال إلى ها هنا يصل اللواء بن كيدل
لعنزة، وقال لرجل من سمعته ليسين موسى بن أحمد، ياموسى يوم
امنت على الفاطميات، وكان الذاكر لهم بن خالد بن كيدل، دقدول، في بلاد
السعود في موضع ليسعي كولوا
وقام المهدى بدعوته أحسن قيام وأمتي دعاة في سائر البلدان.
الطاش وجلس عليه، فقال المنجم ابنه في مدينة سورها صفر وهو في قلعة في المدينة حولها بالماء، فنزال يقسم المدينة حتى أظهر فقيضوا عليه وعلى القائم بأمر المدينة وسجنه، فلم يصار بالسجن، وفيه قوم سجنه منذ سنة طويلة، فقال لهم تجنب أن تخرجوا من السجن، فتغامزوا مستهزئين وقالوا خيرونهم الهويه به إلى الشام، وهو يعيد نفسه بالآكلين، فهيم إلى أبيه من أبواب السجن فقله، وأخذ الفحص وختن في الباب صورة مركب، فلما أكمل الصورة قال صاحب منكم الخروج كلى معي على الباب، وجلس على الباب هو ورَّده، وجلس معه الجمع على الباب. وحصنهم كذب ذلك، فلما رأى الباب ارتفع في الهواء تعلقه في سقطناد ساقه، ووقع الباب على النيل، واشتهر الضربوخاب من كُثْرُ، ونظر الناس إلى الباب على البحر🌍 كأنها الهوى المنتظر المثير، وشاعت الأخبار إذا نصرفت الأضلاع دعوته، وخرج إلى السُّجِّ اعسًا ثم إلى القبران ورُيادة، فأخذ العاهود والمؤذنين وكثير الاستجابه إلى دين الحق، وكان خروجه من السُجِّ اعسًا على يد داعيه ابن عبد الله سرجة، هم عليه، فاقام مدتى حتى دخل في عقل الشيخ أبدها أخوه أبو العباس واستنذِله وقال له ليس هذا الجهاد وكان الشيخ بيد خليه على ولي الله وتمييته مقولة، وملك على ذلك
بينخل إلى المولى ونخرج ويبلغ عن قومه بقضاء حلايبهم وأبلغهم إليه، فقال
له المولى: رح برك الله فيه، فخرج الرجل م буквًا جرجر نظر إليه، فنظر إليه، عن خبره، ناكنت أرجوم وأنا أذهب إلى شيخك أشربه، بدلاً ملوقة في لم يقل شئٌ مضافاً إليه، فما كان إلا أن يبكيك، إنك يا بك، أعظم من كل ما عل من الدينان حظام. قال له المولى، الذي أمره أبو الحكيم من البركة: قال لمجودرهملك
إلى أن تنبس إلى البركة، التي دعيك بها بشارة مشاقي، قال خبي، فقال له
البشرة المشاقي واستبق عليه في تسليم البركة فجاجأنا فأدرج على
له في شئ منها ولائية ولا ما بينك،月至 جودره، مشتري وافتقرات
منهما، فلما كان النهار الثاني، أمره المهدى برسالة بجودره، ندرك تأبه
فقال له برك الله فيه، على وأعطاه مائه من يثاقين، بعد النهار، استقرت ذلك الدعاء، وتلك البركة في جودره. خدم بعد المهدى القابض
والمنصور والمرصع، واستحبوا له باباجي الفرير.
واستقبل في الطريق بقدس الله��وء،
وألف تواتركت قران نار الدين، وإصابة، سلام على ربي، بالطيبة
وهبلغ وهب من كهف الفقه، وكان الأجل وتخص أن الفقه سدّ الإسلام
المهدى، باب الله إلى القائم رتبته وآدى إليه وديبه وامانته وأظهر
الفقبة وانتقل بجارته والنبد، عليه،
تأشِّرت الأرض بوربيتها وظهرت أنوراتها من حُجبها، وباشر الله في
بناء مسجده النور، وأمره بعثته وأسلمه لموته وتربيته وإعطائه ورعيته
الżaيب ليجعل لساوره الإسلام فيها فضلًا بل أتوحده في مقربته وجعله في
مستقره توجيه لولي الله وتعريفًا لشرف مقامه، واقتيد بجده محمد
المصطفى في نصبه على وصيته على ابنه يطلب يوم الغدير ينعيه
نفسه، وآتي قربه أيضًا، وكان القائم بأمره نور الإسلام الذي تجلّي
الحجاب ورفعه إلى الأعراب بفضل ندمه، فأدت لحد ورد الدعوة
وعرفة أن الهادي بإله له أبدى فضل قدرة صلواته وحريصًا علی
ابنائيهما، والهادي بالله يجمع الحجاب الكثيرة إلى المهدية وحصنها
بالإموال والرجال فصحتها كان لعبد يسعي حُجابه وضيعه على إلهة وفضل
مقدمًا أبوه صلى الله عليه وسلم وأسبارهم وغير استنكاف من ولايته،
كانت على يديه إماءه وأمره أن لا يلمد الهادي ونهيهم، فقلد جميع ذلك
الهادي ليس في من البركة وطاعتهم واصداره، ووجه الله العظيم في
السكون، والحركة.
وقد روى أنه في بعض الأيام كان تأعدًا ويرجى من خدم القصر.
قام الإمام القائد محمد بن القاسم صلى الله عليه وبكاه راجح عليه، وهوناسين لخفضة مسئول النظام فيهم مقابل جزء الصادق خامس الامام، والمتين عابي بن مريم عليه السلام روح نحوه أموات ومبني الأكيد والمرة، فكان أصل النوروثاية لائمة الظهور مقا بلأمير المومنين على ابن ينبل بع فما ناقمه به بعديث محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم ووضع سنة، وكلمته الباقية في عقبه اليوم القريب.

كان أمير المومنين علي ابن أبي طالب صلى الله عليه وسلم أول القائمين في المقام الأعظم في كربة محمد صل الله عليه وسلم، وكان الإمام القائد بأمره أول 타ئم لما تلقه المهدى بإمكالات الله عليه، كان له الفضل العظيم للمقام الكرم الذي جزأ أكثر العالم عنين دركاه، فإما يعرف بحقيقة دليل الإمام المهدى بالله والأمة من ذريته فما أطول ليعرف أمير المومنين على حقيقة معرفته غير رسل الله صلى الله عليه وسلم والأمة من ذريته.

ربني رجلي الجابر ابن عبد الله النصاري مولانا الإمام زين العابدين، وقد أمر أن يذكرظهور أمير المومنين على ابن أبي طالب صلى الله عليه وسلم.

كنت جالسًا عند أمير المومنين على ابن أبي طالب صلى الله عليه وسلم، فجند رضوان عليهما، فنالنا جلبنا فقال مرحباً يا أهل السهلا.
فلما قال الناس في جنازة القصر لم يحضره أحد على نداء القبر
حين أراد أن ينزل إلى الله ورد عليه الجبروت، وقال له يا جبروت إذا لا يعلم أن يدعون الإمام الإمام الذي قبله حتى يسمع نفسه وليست في ذلك لكي يسمع أمه جمعت، وقد أرسلت له هذه الأمة دون جمع
فلق وليل والإسراءPokemon GO إرفعه إذ أعرضنا الأمة على السموات الأعلى
وأوكلت TaskForce1444 أنا من أجعلها إلى الخير الأعلى، ثم قال أدن مني، فأدعوا منا海军
قال هات يبلاك نفست دعه وهو مشغوب لهبيته، وقال إن أخرجنا عليه عهد الله وغطية ميثاقه، إنك تكثّب عن مأكوله وآكله لك، قال نعم بإمكاني صلى الله عليه، فقال له ولد إسحاق النصر هو وحّد
وعود يوسف يعرض حقه وقدره، وأكمل أمر ورسى حقه أظهره في الوقت الذي يبدأ فيه ظهوره، ثم دفن فيهما في البصة، وقُدِّن في جوز من القيام والغذمة والكون، بعدد لا شأن ما بعضه مذكر في كتب منصور
الذي يشرح فيه سيرته وقيامه مع الإمامة الأربعة صلوات الله عليهم وعلى سلفهم خلقهم، فمن أراد الوقوف عليه فهو معرّف مشهور، وحول وراءه إلى الله، وإمامنا لا يخليده ولا يق 오�و لنا الإجحاج
فجعّه في أرضه فلا يحول لنا ولا يحول إلا بالله العليم الاعظم.
رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، لا يُرى عيني إلا على الإسلام وياجلبه نصارى مهد المصلفين وصبرت انواري أحمد الرضي، وصار محمد الناطق وصبرت الصامتة، وصار محمد النذير رضي الله عنه، وصار محمد صاحب الجَنَّة وصبرت صاحب النار، أقول للنار لك هذا وهذالى، وصار محمد صاحب الراحة وصبرت صاحب الرجفة، وصار محمد صاحب السُئل، وصار محمد خاتم النبيِّين وصبرت خاتم النبيِّين، ان أهلَّكَ القرآن الأول وان الله تعالى العظيم الذي هن فيه مختلفون، وصار محمد صاحب الدعوة وصبرت صاحب السيف، وان الله أَمَرَنَ الله بِلطين من أمرَنا على من بَشَار من عباده، فأَمَرْنَ روح الله، ولا يُطَلَّب هذَال الدُّنْيَا والرَّابِئَة، فنُن أَعْطَاه الله من رُوحه، أَبَاه من الناس رفعه فوقَ الحَيَاة وفُوض فيه القدراً، فأَحَيَ أَمَام وَلَمْ يَكِن بِالرَّحْل وَلَمْ يَكِن بِالسُّمَاء رُجَحَ إلى السما ونزل إلى الأرض، بإسلمان ياخي بِرَحْل وصار محمد الدُّنى وصبرت انجال الكتاب لقول السعريزج، قد أَنُزَلَ الله إِليُكمُ، يا أَرْسُولِ اللَّهِ، رَبِّ قُلْ أَنْزِلْ إِلَيْنَا لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا أَنتَ، وَمَعَكَ رَبِّ إِنَّنَا نُفَعِّلُ مَا بَلَغَتْ رِسَالَتُهُ، وَلَا تَعِصِمْكُمَا مِنَ الَّذِينَ يَعْقُوبُ بِمِثْلِهِ، خ٧٨١٥.
إنّه لابدَّكم عبد حقيقة الإيمان حقّيّي يعرفن بحقيقة معرفته بالنورانية فإذا
عرفت بِهذه الصفة فقد أضمنت لك مصلب الإيمان وشرح صدره وصار
عازمًا مستبئًا، ومن تصريح ذلك فهو شهادَّة رَبَّك، يا إسلام نقل لك
جَنَّتُه في هذه الساعة ثمّ بِناء الله عن معرفته بالنورانية وقال لِطيب
كذا نحن فِرْعَان النورانية وعرفنا الله نقول صلاً وامَّا أَوْرِي الإِلَيْبِدُو
أَلله مُخلِصين لَهُرَبِّين حَنَّاء وَقَيْسِيَ الْصَّلَاة وَبَيْنَ الْرَّحْمَة
ودّك ذَينَ الْفَيْقَة، يقول وما أَمَرْوُا الْعَبْد وَهَوَاء الأعْيَان
حَنَّاء، بِنِعْمَ الْقَرْنِيَّة أَمَامَ السُّعْاَنَة، وَقَيْسِيَ الْصَّلَاة
هي وَلِيَّي بِنِعْمَهَا الْصَّلَاة وَأَقْمَهَا الْبَيْنَة لَا تُنَافْسَحُ حَنَّاء
وَأَقْمَهَا الْبَيْنَة لَا تُنَافْسَحُ حَنَّاء وَأَقْمَهَا الْبَيْنَة لَا تُنَافْسَحُ حَنَّاء
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة
فَيُهَوَاء الْأَمَامَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْنَة وَالْبَيْn
ف إنما فقد رأى جميعهم، وأن عبد الله صبي الله، فلا تُحضرون أبدًا وقولوا
في فضلنا ما يضيعُ لنا أبناء الله ونجيه، وسائره على خلقه ويُخْفَفُهُ، وإنما
دنه وزوجه وجبته وأمره وصراطه، فلديكنا في ذلك تأويل لم آتيهم وعلمكم أشياء
من بين خلقه، وظهرنا، واصطفانا، فناقل في ذلك تأويل لم آتيهم وعلمكم أشياء
عِنَّا. كفَّرُوا الله لا يملع ما يفعل هم يُشْتَلُون، يا إسلام يا جَنْبُبكم، إنما
كلب وأضحت وشرحت فترى فهمكم من إخْتِيَر أبَدًا! إله قبِه للأيمان،
إذاممي نظركم ورباطكم فهم عارف مستبشر بالكامل، ويشكل فيهم
ورتبد وثواب رفقة فهم ضال مقصر بإسلام وحالن بانته أنيج أنت
رخف وأرذق وأبير الأكب وأقرب وأنت كله ب ظانون وما تخرَّرون
في مَيْتكم إذا ركب، وكذلك الإشارة النحْف من وادي إذا أتاكناش رأده.
يظهر فكَّل زمان، ناذاشاء الله شنَّنا إذا أدركنا كثرنا الفؤاد، والثيل ابن إنكر
فضلنا وما أعطا لنا رسالته ليستكترات رده ومشتهه فينا، ولقد أعطا
انه ماهوعل وجل وأكبر من هذا كله، أعطانا النام الاعتزاز الذي أنكر
أغناهنا إلى السما، واطعتنا الشمس وقمر النجم، والدرب، ومع
هناك تأكل ريشر ونجده في الأسواق ونعمل ما نشأ بأمره، رُبِّنا
يحب دمك كهنون لا يسنَّقونه بالقول وهم بأمر وعمولون بهذا معنًى
بالنورانية فتقسا كناها تشرد وتسعد إن شاء الله تعالى،
تعقل وأخذ بيتي واتصال الذهب الحفوظ وآل البيت إسماعيل إسلام
وإجذب محمد بن أبا الغرمان الحكيم، ومحمد بن أبا الغرمان، ومحمد بن أبا الغرمان، ومحمد بن أبا الغرمان.
وأحمد بن أبا الغرمان، وأناهاه وتيم، بقوله: "مر diner "البحر" ينفي الآلهة
بناه الله جبريل، وعلى الله الحمد، وعلى الله الحمد، وعلى الله الحمد، وعلى الله الحمد، وعلى الله الحمد.
ثاني المؤسسات الأثرية في الفن، إسلام وناجح بن عناس السرياني، وغَيْرُه: لم يقتل، وإنك ولد.
قال: "أبقيت الأرض بين يديه إعظامًا لصاحبه، رقت
أملياً نباشتك على مسحوم من كلم به تقول أنا أهلكت القران أولًا؟
وقولك في إلاب الغانان أنك لنتمت رقتيلنا لنقتل، فقال يا حاجاً!
الإمّ كان الساكنة عزروجه بقولته: "أرْبَعَة" من أريوكل من يعلم من
بعضهم، فإن المرفوع الحفل، فإذنا، أمرنا أولاً والثالثون، بنية نوح عُدَّة.
رَجِلَهُ، فتلقاه أفرادنا وفقًا لها، ولنا قول أن ميتنا لم يميت
الله من بني إسحاق، وناجحنا لنقتل، وإنما كله موجود ومجموع مسي
مسج، نبت، إسلام وناجح، نبت ملتهب بناءً بسلاسل عليه:
من الإله نطق على لسان علي بن عمرو في المهد، قاد رشيد روحنا
رابه، وعِسْعَان وعِسْعَان وعِسْعَان وعِسْعَان وعِسْعَان وعِسْعَان وعِسْعَان
وإذ الرحلين عسكره، وكان أكثرهم البربر، أن يجرسوا الطريق، ومرتفعاً به قتلوا ونهبوا واستباحوه، حتى انتهوا بهم الأمرا إلى شح بطن الرجال وأرجم النساء يطلبون الغبايات من ذهب ووراثة، حتى آل بهم الحال إلى بيع الموارشانة، ثم قرموالمالين الديسية وعلي وراضي ودبوخ وتمد، فيكان بيتي نساعة الواحدة بالأخوات الإبراهيمات الثلاثين والثاني، ردواً أمر وصل بلاد العرب اجمع وقابل أضداد الصادق وأضداد أمير الأُملتين ما ابن طالب رلَّي الده، وأضداد عيسى روح الله،
فلما أن الأجل، وانقضى إله أمر والان القيام ابن الخواص المطيع
جود ربه في الدمرى بسيط صع، فاسلمه الشهود الدعوة وقرأ عليه صولات،
كان صاحب الرتبة فنقد جود ربه وسلم إلي (عليه) صولات فقرأ عليها وردَّه، ثم ردد جود رأى مولانا وأمه، فين أحرى مولاه به الله، فقرأ صولات وردَّه، ولم يعلموا عرض مولانا في ذلك ولاالي الذي تقذمه إلى جود ربه في الدمرى باستعليه، واستودعه رتبة ولده المنصور ونض عليه وعاهده، فكان جود مستعود المنصور بالله ومن سبب ذلك لم يكن ليظهر العهد إلا أحد ودجر جود فين كان في المرأة الثالثة أمر رسول الله يمه سألهم جود عن حالته عند مواليه واعتقادهم فيه، ورئيهم به، ناخبروه بما يبرونه له من الحق عن مواليه، فقال لهم أن مولانا أمرني
لهذا توكله صل الله عليه وسلم نداءً ل يعرف المأمون قيامه مع النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم.

كتمام الإمام القائم بأمر الله مع المهدى بن البصائر أمه، يشهدا جميعاً.

إلا أن التوريدين النور والظهور كالظهور، والذات واحدة، والقدرة على ذلك

شاهد، فظهرت آيات الله وشهد كلمات الله صدقاً ونوراً.

ولما كان القائم بأمر الله صل الله عليه وسلم نداءً لأمه، المأمونين على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في الظهور، فكانت دولة مشوية بالكبد، فيظهر علامة المأمونين بني عبد الله بن زياد، والذين لقي ونجا ناحية ما ظهر الإثارة في زمن أمير المؤمنين، وكان يريدهم للدجل، ولهنائه، وكماظه الإضرار في زمن أمير المؤمنين، صلى الله عليه وسلم.

وكان مرادتله في زياد الع两条، لما، فلله العلم، مبايعًا، وعبد الله بن إسماعيل، وعند الله على القيام أي عبث، أو عباد، وأظهروه في الأرض الفاسدان ولم تزل ظلمته تشمل، وفوقه، أو تظهر.

حتى انقى إلى القرب المهدية، ومعصلتها حيث، وتبعتهم المهدي صلى الله عليه وسلم.

وكان على ابن طريقي، وعليه البضائع، وليحلس، وليحن، وما ذكرت، وليست، وليست.

فخفاً، ما، لعليه، وعليه نور، وأمر الشاب، بالله، وعليه السلام، وإغفال المارب.

واستمرت الفتنة وحصده، وانتقلت إليه، وأمرت تأيدهم، والآباء، والشام، من المهدية، يحضرون، ومر، الطاعون، الذي أعده هو، وهم يضرب، والدين، ويفتش عن العكر، على السفوا، من أم الهدنة، حتى أقل الطعام، وريح الهداية.
(5) من كتاب أصول التناقل لجعفر بن منصور الباجي...

وكان أبا النبي محمد بن الباقر خليفة الله في ارضه وبيت نوره، جعفر بن محمد بن أبي جعفر، صلى الله عليه وسلم، وكان رضي الله عنه من الولائم، وكان له من أخلاقه، وفرقة دعائه في جزاير الأراضي، وكان من أولاده وكتب عنه العلماء والاريخاء سراً كأعظم البلدان، فلم تأت أمراءه في التسلية، أو تقبلاً وأخلاقه، وخروجهم حسب مفعول الأمهة، والنظام قبلته، ورسوله، وإلى الله ولده إسحاق، بأمره، وجيهه عليه، ويهيمه، على نفسه،

نصار إسحاق، باب الله وحجابه، وبيت نوره، والسرب بهبته، ودهله، وخلقه، واجتمعناه، وانتمى إلى ذلك، فنُحِيب شخصه في جيدها، وفي أعقابه، وربط نزوله، كما نقله القول في إسحاق بن إبراهيم، صلى الله عليه، ما بآله في شيء كأنه أتى إسلامه، إذ قضية في جيدها، وقد رويت عن

رأتي عن الصادق عليه السلام أنه قال، إن الله، والمشيئة به في كل شيء إلا الامامة، فمُعظمهم الغربة على الله ومقدمة بأمره، أنه نسيب، ليطوفوا نورآباه بآوارههم، ورجلهم بالامراء، القهرى، ولم تعلموا أن إسحاق عليه السلام لم يف عين الدار، خلف ولد كاملاً، وإن الأمر قد رجع إليه بأمر الله، وحية الله، وأنه لم يحضره، أورده ابته من أمره.
بِهِذَا العِيْدِ لَا أَخْفِصُ شُرُوطَ عَلَيْكَ وَلِدَ اسْمَاعِيلٍ، أَخْرِجْ عِيْدَهُ بِالقَّامِلِ
مُولاهُا المنْصُورِ السَّاعِيِّ، فَجُدْ لِإِبْرَاهِيمَ وَأَطْعِهِ نَصْرَ الْقَامِلِ عَلَيْهِ، وَأَمِّيْقَانَةٌ إِلَيْكَ
الْيَتِّجَالُ لَعْنَاهُ اسْمَاعِيلَ، وَظُهْرُ المنْصُورِ بِسَلْحٍ بِالْعَسْكَرِ السَّيْمِيِّ وَحُجَّةٌ لِّلْعَشْبِ
وَطُورُبَابِيٍّ مِنَ الصَّلِّيِّ.
لهم وسباعاً على ولي الصلاة عليه، ثم تقرئهم شعوبي وبكال فلا الأول عرفتمو ولا الثاني صدّت نفسه، وفرقة منكم قطعت عليه وقالت أنه سيعود إلى الذين فلا يزعمون أو يقولون كلامت ظلمًا وجبرًا، فتكرت طريق النصارى في عيني بن مريم الذي زعمت أنه تعالى عليه السلام مستعد الرجوع إلى الدنيا يفصل بين الحق والباطل ويقوم كل معنى.

القول في الفرقة بعد جغرالصادرة: "صلوات الله عليه الذين اتخرتنا في أولاد الأربعة، والآن فقد وجب علينا التحقق في أمر هذه الفرقة التي انتشرت بعد فو ركده إجادة الحق على، وذلك أن كل من حاول الحق وقع في الباطل، فنضرب في القضية الموجبة بالعقل، فالفعلان أنه من بطل أمر الثلاثة ثبت أسلاف واحد الأبحار فتركنا العقل، و私たち عليه موجودًا، ننظرنا فيها دعوت الفطحية بقولها أنه أنا الاسم، وأنت قد مات بعجي لنين كثيرة، وقولها أنه كان إمامًا أصامًا، ورأيناه ومدومات وما يعقب بوليك في خليفتا بعض يستودعه ينسله وحكيته أن خليفة الله في أرضه هو بيت نور أو السبب بينه وبين خلقه، وينصرف إليه حدده، كما أقدم القول ب: في نظره، وينقل عليه التأييد في مديهم بأقسامهم لزياروني عين العريقة.
أجمع إليه أن يسلم الإمارلي وليه محمد، دعي نقبائه وخصائص أصلبه وسماً إليه بمحضرم خاصته ستراً عليه كما فعل هرون بيوشع بن النون لذا جعله خليفة على يهودا إلى أن كان أمره، وقد كان هذا جليلًا كلام الله أربع عشرة سنة، وصاحب هذا العصر خالق القول مقبل الشهادة، وانفصل ذلك لوقت الفترة وجبان الفراعنة، وأعظمته الغربة على الله وعلى أولئك وجعلهم أن الشرير المعكر، وتركتم تقول السجل عزو رحمة كلمته باتية في حقيته، ورجعتم إلى قوله بالنكوس على الاعتقاب، فور دتم الأمارلي جعفر محمد الصادق صلوات الله عليه، أوليس قد تقدِّم قضية عقوب عليه السلام أنه لتأمر بالتسليم إلى يوسف أفيضت عيناه، وأتهب أتباع يوسف عن الدارطلب دارهمجة ونقضي للحجة تعد عقوب مجلسه وهو جمع صمُّله وكان ينادى أولاده في الإفاقة يطلبون صاحب الأمر وهو ملحابة له جمل وعزم قولي لهم: يا بنى أذهبتُ نتاجتُوا من يوسف راخي وراكنتُ ويا رزق الله إبناني إن الله لا ينضِّم من رزق الله إلأ أن أُقوم أكابرُ،

وجعفر الصادق صلوات الله عليه فأظهر نفسه وأدرك روحًا في أن يتعبد حدود الله، وتزودون أن جعفر الصادق صلوات الله تعالى حضرته النقلة استخف النصوص ضدّه على أوله وليل، كل ذلك صيانةً.
هذه الطائفة مقام غيرها من الضلال،
ثم نظراً إلى الصعب الموتى إلى أصعاب موسى ببعض نجاة هم أنت
لأنما أهله وصل حَبَّةٌ، ومَرَّ بهما كيماً وسَنَةً من كان تقبلهم، وسرقة
أنت جميع إلى رقيقها وراحت، لم يخب في لابوه، فقد رأيناهما في سيَّةَ بن
العباس، وهو خارج البيتين ثلاثة أيام حتى عاينه جميع الناس، ثم دفَّن
بعد ذلك، وقَدْ قَطَرَهُما ضُرًاءً وقَسَمَ ميراثه، وكتبنا لهما أَنْهَا أَمْهَاتَ الْمُؤْمِنَين
بعده ونَشَيَّهَا عادتها وأرادها، ولم يكين للخليفة تخلصهم من نكراء الحرام
يجمع شملهم وуйل الخليفة من رجل الذي عتمته تُنهِيُهُ السياسي أمام ستهر ومنع
عنهم ذلك كما فعل سأَرَابِي آنَهُ، فإن الإمام القائم بالأمر والنصوب (منصوب)
للخلق والخلق فقراء الله، وإذا كان مفقوداً في الأعماق من الأعماق من أن يُعَدُّ
من بعده باللَّيِّن من يجِون في الأزحاس مبجلين وفرائضهم ولِكْهُم، وئِن
يقينهم حُدُوده سنة تُفْرَج بِنِعْمَتِهِ في الأفكار، وآتى فقدما يوجد بِنِجَا
عبده ورَجَّا بنَبايى جَلَّ يَرْتَزِق للظلم، فإنه تعالى عليه، ومثى اختلفنا
في حكمهم ونُقِيَانُ اللَّيْل إلى النهار، وليس هذان فعلاً هكذا إن يُبِرِّي
والطاعة لشخص مفقود، ولوجز لناذل ذلك أَمْهَاتُهُ بِجِبَادَةِ مِنَ الْمَلَكِ لِلَّذِينَ
تحت يدنا أَرْتَضَى الغائب،
وقدْ رَوَى هذه الفرقة أن الصادق عليه السلام قال أن اسم الإمام
لايشكون فيه، وكان وارثاً وموارضاً مع روايات الصادقين عن أساتذة الإمام لايموت عقیمًا،

ثم نظرانيماً دعته المحمدية التي دعت أن محمد بن جعفر الإمام
والله ترهيبنا جريد صفتنه في شهر الحرام في البلد الحرام الذي اجتمعت
الأمة بأسره أن الخرج نهيه محرم على الخلق إلى يوم القيامة، ورأيناه خرج
على ولاد العباس في دارهم بعد أن عاش في كنفهم وحفظه وهم حكّام عليه
غلف فحل جده والأبئه قبله لم يبد أحد اضدادهم في دارهم حتى
أخذهو وألفهم بهجرة فتعصمت بهما وتحادر دون أيديها، ثم غفل
إذا ذلك دارة حرة، وإذا ناداه رأيناه صهته وغفل عنه ليسنى هولا بالتمدد
علمانة أنه لوكان جهّة الله على أرضه لم تعلّم السيّار بها، فأقمنا ما تمكن
من أشباهه، ثم إذا ناداه جنّه سنة معظمها وأخذ إلى عنقه جنّة رولاب
به البدان ورجوه به الخراسان، وأنه ماهد ريلة من النور الناصد
فيه منيرا وتينان من دعوته، وشدد بذلك على نفسه ويفوق بهل حقه يذيب
نفسه إلى الجلال، والشيء بأنها يجمعون عليه أن الثامن الذي يقوم بتلك
إيذال له رأيه، وبيّنت هذه الطائفة عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
أنَّ التقيُّين اسمه، فسمى، ابن أبي اسم أبي، وإن جعفر لم يكن له ولدًا يسمى
محمد صغير، ويعودان يقال جعفر بن عبد الله الخلق كلههم عبده الله، فأتما
ولثِّقَةُ العِلَّامَةِ الامامِ بِهِ، وَأَقامَ بِنِزْهَةٍ وَبَقِيَ بِهِ بَعْدَ مَدَنَتهِ، وَلَمْ يُشَكِّ لَهَا احِدَمْ عَلَى
الْعِلَّامَةِ وَالشَّيْعَةِ أَنَّ الْأَمْمَيْنِ ضَرِّفُ الْيَدِ بِهِ بِأَوْلىَمْ مَنْ، وَذَلِكَ عُمْلَ مُشْتَرَكَ
فَعَلَهُ كَافِلَهُ مُمْكِنَةَ بِمِنْ ذِيِّ بِمِنْ ذِيِّ مُهْيَاءً لِكَأَنَّ آبَاهُ غَصِبَ الْحَيْثَ مَنْ أَهْلُهُ;
فَأَرَادَ بِجُعُهُ الْيَهِمَ، وَذَلِكَ أَنَّ الْأَمْمَيْنِ جُمِعَ الْقَبَأَةُ، وَالْعِلَامَةُ مِنْ بَعْدِ الْبُنْدِ;
وَنَظَرُوا بِهِمْ فِي ذَلِكَ وَالْوَالِدَاتِ رَأَى رَأَيْهَا وَلَدَ فَاطِمَةُ بِعَارِضَةً بِبُعْثُ اِسْتِقْلَالَهَا عَلَى مُعْلُوَةِ أَنْ
كَلَّ ذَلِكَ حَيْثَ عِلَيْهَا كَافِلَةَ الْأَمْمَيْنِ لَمْ يُعْلِمُ أَنْ آبَاهُ غَصِبَ الْحَيْثَ مَنْ أَهْلُهُ;
وَأَرَادَ بِجُعُهُ الْيَهِمَ، وَذَلِكَ أَنَّ الْأَمْمَيْنِ جُمِعَ الْقَبَأَةُ، وَالْعِلَامَةُ مِنْ بَعْدِ الْبُنْدِ;
وَنَظَرُوا بِهِمْ فِي ذَلِكَ وَالْوَالِدَاتِ رَأَى رَأَيْهَا وَلَدَ فَاطِمَةُ بِعَارِضَةً بِبُعْثُ اِسْتِقْلَالَهَا عَلَى مُعْلُوَةِ أَنْ
وَلَدَ فَاطِمَةُ بِعَارِضَةً بِبُعْثُ اِسْتِقْلَالَهَا عَلَى مُعْلُوَةِ أَنْ
وَلَدَ فَاطِمَةُ بِعَارِضَةً بِبُعْثُ اِسْتِقْلَالَهَا عَلَى مُعْلُوَةِ أَنْ
وَلَدَ فَاطِمَةُ بِعَارِضَةً بِبُعْثُ اِسْتِقْلَالَهَا عَلَى مُعْلُوَةِ أَنْ
وَلَدَ فَاطِمَةُ بِعَارِضَةً بِبُعْثُ اِسْتِقْلَالَهَا عَلَى مُعْلُوَةِ أَنْ
اسم صاحب النورانية وأن موسي دخل عليها. فما كان منزلاً يضليبه
ثم نظرنا فيما أنعمته الفرقة الثانية فوجدناها تقول: علينا معرق
الأمام ويوسع علينا الدخول تحت كل إمام. كُنا أوفاجان والنزول تحت
رابعهم وملعقتهم في أوساطهم. والكون تحت كفيفهم. نحكم الإذاء في دمائم
يهوائهم وفروجهم واحكامهم. فالفواجي ذلك سُمِّيت ديميمة. نذكوا من أئمة
الله وأنت في دينه. فعلمون أن هذا القول أعظم محل. وإن القائل بعثاء
الناس وداهمتهم في النافع وجل آمنا باباً أئمة النبي وركوب سُكينهم
بعدهم لقوله: لقد كان لك في رسول الله أسوة حسنة. وقيل: الرسول
أَلْمَة الأمواتين به لا الغاة. الذي لا يعبأ أن يفهم. إن كنت تتبعون
الله تعالى في حقكم. فجعله أليم إلى أن يوعى بصيرته أن وأمن
أنتِ. ورأيناه دعاة هولاء الجهال. إلى خلف مادناعانيه. فوجب علينا
تركهم ودغع أمثالهم الذين بإباحتهم مثل هذا. يصار عند نافقاء إثنتي
الضلائل الذين إذا دعائهم شئ من الأحكام جوازه إلى الرأي. والقياس. يجد
جميع هذه الفرق السُنة. ادعت الحق لذنها. والعدم لغيرها. وفر
بعض بعضاً.
ثم رجعنا للفرق الذين يُعطى هؤلاء. اجتمعت على وله أحمد بن مُؤ
وهولستى إجتُاليه. الذي نصبه الأمام. كتب. أنه دلهم. وجعله
نعت ذلك قلب الرأي في أمر واعترافاً خالياً وقاطعبه فيه وغير استحقاقًا لما أهله له. فأن سبيله سبيل من تقدّم مه من الخالفين، ونكره فيعمله في
من إشراك ئامره وتقديمته على نفسه فنان أن يقع به بعد (من) استحق ما
عقد له فيغلب على أولياء الله ويطلب منهم أكثر مطالبته بأبهsteam
فيهلك للحور والنسل، فكون هو أصل لأئل ذلك، نعت ذلك صلة وأشهر أرمه;
وتمسك بماوصل إليه من شيخه ودليله وتغري ماسمه من
علمه وترك الأمر في مكانه إن كان الإمام مستوراً على أن يقل إلى أونه، وإن ته
من إسبابة مبسطة وعلمها مثبتة ودعانه قاية واعلامه نبرة وشعوره
غير مقصود إلى أوان الظهور وتتم المقدور، فهذا سبب ماجري صهير
المؤمن مع علي بن موسى الرضا وقلته له،
وقامت فرقه بعد علي رضي الله عنه، ودعت فيه الإمامة
وكان على ما اعترفت إليه الأئمة خلفه بالمدينة، فكل صغير في حجاتها، ويات
خلوه ابن خمس سنين، وتفاجعت الشيعة أن الإمام لانغب عن الدار
حتى يخلف ولداً كلاً مستحق الإمامة ومريرات أبيه، ويدعمنا أن ابن خمس
سنين إلى القوة لا يجري عليه الحكم ولا يجوز لها دينته ولا يرضعه، وذهب لا
يجوز لها هذه من لم تجب الصلوة خلفه ولا تكون دينيتها ولا أينو أحدم
المليك المقدمة من اليهود والنصارى وغيرهم قد مثل هذا ولا أرضي به، ورد
فقال له تعالى: "الحج الجليلة المطلوبة فلا يتجاهل رحمة فتحت لك نفسي، فأنا
استماع من مخفي الصم، يثبت تثبت من نتفخ الزمان، ولقد جرى
بينهما ما يطول شرحه ان تقضي عهده الكتب، حتي ان به بسط
اله، بل كأنه ممتهن مثلا، وفي الجواب مبسطة، وأنعمه عليه وعرفه
بولاً وفاضاً من نورهداه، فساراه في مجلسه فضجه له ماجرت به السماي
الماضية. وتركه على الجاهل أوان الظهور، وتم المقدور بالوقت المعلوم
والجلب الملمع، وأقام معه مدة طويلة، تدل له في خلقه، يذهب نفسه في
مرضاته، ولم يزل يطارجه شياً بعد شياً، استكمال رضاوء، وأكتفى بما
أخذه منه، ورأى التنغيم قد قوى أمر وحسن مذهبه وانصرف عما كان
عليه. فانعدم ذلك عرنه في حال المنصوب وما يكون منه وردهه ورسار.
فلما خلا الأمن، فإنه ما في أمره كنان إذا على ابن موسى هذا
يبيط له مسأله ينتزعهما من القرآن، وانتزعهما من النزهة، بالإضافة إلى
الماضي، وسكت الروس، بما تدعاه وحفظه عن شيءه، ونفي أمره الذي
عقد عليه ولائه، وبايعه فيما أمره، فلما لم يجي به على ابن موسى،
شيئاً من تلقى المطلب عرنه عند ذلك أنه صارت برسالة العامة حوله
وصم عرفته موراه، دعى حكمة الله المستورة عن أعمال الدين،
وليسين مجالس الأئمة المهديين، ومنهورية في أولها فله أوان الظهور"
يبلغكم من ذلِّ الفراغنة، وأنتَ صاحب الدين والدنيا، وزعمتم أنَّ النبي ﷺ
اختلفه وأله أشاراليه، ورويّم فيه أخبرًا يطول شرحها لفظًا، وأثنى عليه;
فلم يمضى أقتمل على رأي للحسن، وقد أخذ الجارود بن رباح، وكان قد
خدم إمامين منهم على الأصنور بائدة للحسن، يذكران في السير مجزية ما كان لهما
مثلهما.
قال كتب أسارة في بعض طرقتاه وجماعة معه، ونخص تأكيل من ورائه:
فقلت في نفس أتى به لما يمضى ونما أختردت به، قال صاحبي إن كان م
ماهين في نفسي فليحيد، فلكيّته مكرّهًا به، فولدت حتّى ناقة لا أتلاقى ما آخر ذلك
اللا، فثُمّ يذكره إليها كأنّ يُصلحها، فهل أنا أحد بِمثَل هذه المجلة؟
عليه السلام،
وبيت هذا من مقالتك مبتدأ يطول شرجه، ومغضّ، ولم يعقب، تذكرت تنقّل
له يا ابن رسول الله أكثرك من الإيمان، وقلت للتربيت نقصي أن يرفعك الله والدًا;
راني كترني في مثل ذلك حقًا، فهل أنت مانعًا بعد أن توافت بلجاء بالألواح وللصول إلى أموال الإمام معدة الإدارية له تمسح فقيل تأوِلها دارًا، فذرّت
على أدعى المحل واجعلوا عليها سدًا، وحوصًا، وقلاً، وأنه لا منظور في جواهرها، كَذَلِك
بِجاء الوافدين، وتوصل إلى أجود مال الضفعة، وذكر أنّه متي ظهر لا يراه إلا
ولد زين، فمهابة خطة على الخلق، وليست هذه رجمة كما يرويه العامة، أنه من نظر
قلت: أبا، لا تعجل، أريد أن أذكرك بكيفية إخراج هؤلاء الناس من القول.

استقصوا، وتنصرفوا لندعو الله ونجلىهما ملاكًا، كما استقصى إسحاق بن
ابراهيم عليه السلام في الكتاب على ولده، وهو ما جاء الكتاب عنه، بقوله:

"وقد وقعت بال=<تحويل> عظيم، وتركت علىٌّ، وأركان أنت عليه، وعلى إخوته، فنقلوا أنه وقعت بال=<تحويل> قبل سقيه، Roland أسعدًا، كتبنا لك بذلك سعيٌّ من بقرة، وذلك لم تجمع موسى نقيبه بعجينة أخرى، قال لهم إن الله يأمركم أن تذبحوا بقرة، يقول إن الامام الذي هو خليفة الله في أرضه يأمركم يذبحوا بقراة يقوم بأمركم ويتوكل قسمة البحر على النفي قيام صاحب الأمور كما يشتركون أمرهم، ويروي إلى قول النفياء، استخدموا هُزوراً في النفياء، إلى ناج نج الثمرة أيضًا، وقد تقدم القول في موضعه.

وانتَفقولون أنه أوصى إليه قبل أن يفارقته، كيف يوصي الأخ
لايجوز عليه الحكم، والنصية عندنا وعندكم بأمر الله ووجيه إلى السلف ينصب الخلف كما تقدم القول به شهود دول ورحل يجوز لأحمد ظاهر أحمد أن يوصي وله إذا كان لم يجري عليه الحكم، وهل يجوز أن يسيّر إلى وصية ولده ويتخلفه عليه أن يسرّ إلى نفيه ماله حتى ينهى عليه وعمله.

شهادة النصرة للقضاء، ثم تقرّ tộc شعوبي ولده ولوده، لأن الله محمد بن الخنس، وكان موضعًا، فتملك بعضه إمامته ولم تشكّلته المنظورات إلى
الكشف خوفًا عليهم من راعيَنة الزمن،
وإِلَّا نَعَظُّهُم حتَّى يُنَقِّيَ النَّطَائِح كَمَا قالَ الصَّادِق علَى السَّلاَم:
وَدِعَاهُمْ لَمْ يَسَى فِي الْأَرْض كَسِيَّةَ النَّسَب علَى السَّلاَم، كَلَّذٌ لَّكَ لِتَلْبِيَ دَار
هَيْرَةٍ بَلْوَى إِلَيْهَا، وَذَلِكَ عِنْدَ مَلِكَ الصَّدَقُّ دَارِهَا الرَّسُول، وَإِذَا هَوَيْنَا، وَكَنْتَ
وَعِنْدَ نَارِسُولِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ بِقَوْلِهِ أَنَّ الشَّمس يَطْلُع علَى نَاسٍ مِنَ الغَرْب، وَكَفَّ أُعْرِف
إِبْرَاهِيمَا بِأَنَّهُ كَانَ الأَصِلُ لِهذِهِ الْشِّرْعَةِ فِي تُوْجِيهِ لَوَطٍ طَلَبُ دَارَهُجَرَةٍ
وَقَدْ قَدِيمَ الْقُولُ بِهِ، وَأَنَّهُ لَمْ يَفْحِتِ الشَّامُ سَنَارِيَهَا وَرَجَع مِنْ دَارِهَا هَجَرَةَ
وَخَلَصَ المُؤْمِنِينَ مِنْ دَارَ الضَّلْلِ، وَالقَمَّة عَلَى الدِّلكَ، وَأَتَمْ فِيهِمْ أَحْكَامِ الْرَّيْبِ
وَتَسَاءَلَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ الَّذِينَ كَسِيرُهُمُ الدُّعَاءُ فَأُتِوْمُ جَمِيعُ الأَلَافِ، وَجَدَّ دِوَا
عَلَى هُمْ عِهْوَهُمْ وَتَمَكَّنَوا بِأَنْتَشِهِم، وَأَتَسِرُّهُم مَا وَقَوْيَتِ يَدُ مَجاهِدِهِنَّ كَمَانَ
كُلُّ ذَلِكَ رَفِقُوا الْمُؤْمِنِينَ يَقِسُوْهُمْ عَنْ أَنْشَاهُمْ كَأَنَّ سَنَةَ الرَّسُول
عَلَى السَّلاَم، وَأَنَّهُ عَلَى السَّلاَمُ لَمْ تَقُرُّ أَمْرُهُ وَهَلَّ الْسَّلَاطِينُ هَاجِرَةَ جَرَةٍ
فَمَلِكَ بُيَتِهِ المَغْضُوبِ وَخَلَصَ مِنْ لِحْقٍ (لَحْقَهُ) مِنْ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَهَلَكَ مِن
نَازِغِهِ مِنْ أَعْنَابَ الْمَيْنِ، فَهَلَّ عَلَى هَذَا الْبَيْهَانِ مَنْ مَزْيَهُ، أَلَى هَذَا عَلَى
الْأَئِثَاءِ الْمَنْتَقِمِينَ وَالْحَفْفَاءِ الْبَقِينَ، انشأَب مِثْلَ هَذَا انتِكُمْ إِنَّ
كَنَّتمُ تَعْمَلُونَ،
فَإِنّهُ لَسَأُظْهِرُهُ دَلَّالًا وَنَشْرِت أَعْلَامِهِ وَقَامَتْ دِعَوَتِهِ وَظْهِرَت
إلى تبريؤ نور المؤمنين نورًا نورًا،
فلما حصر النورات فصحت على الإيمان، ولَّبَّا ينحدر فيهم وَلَّدَا يبطله قول رسول
الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على أن الإمام لا يقوم وهو جاهل حتى يكون يعلم ذلك.
فِي رواية أخرى أخبرناه عليه وسلم، ولم يسمع له ما تناوله في غيابه.
فإن الناس يجدون على غيره، أخبرنا أن آدم جَلَّ وَلَوْ أنَّى، لِيُوعَدُ على نور المخلوق الأحمر
على عسومٍ لَلأَمَام، وقد بُصِبِرَ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على حسن ملائمة ونَجْمَة وثورة سنة.
من أعيانهم غمانة مَعْصِمٍ مَتَابٍ يَدُورَ نَيْشَاءٌ، وَتَوَلَّى الصادق عليه السلام
من مات ولم يعرف أبا عصبة دُعيَتْ جَاهِلِيَةٌ، وَتَوَلَّى الصادق عليه السلام
موثوق وصاحب عصبة على جاهلي، نَروَيْنِ إِلَى رَفْعِهِمَا.
لولا الذي أخذت من نور، فمن الإمام الذي تعبى به، هُمُون توجون لَتَتَمَكَّن
الثاني عليه كأمثال من أمر بكم، إِذاً أنتم مع العدوَّ مَجَالِمٍ، فَأَخْرَجُوهُم من ابنو،
الشَّمْسِ، وَمُثْلِهِ يَقِيمُ في الصَّحَابَةِ، وَمَثْلِهِ سُكَّانِ في الدَّيْنِ، وَالْمَسْتَنْدُعُ للْخَزَىِّ،
لَفَضْلِينَ الأَيْمَاتِ، وَالْأَعْيَانِ، يُبَقِّيْنَ الْإِبْسَارِ يَكُونُنَّ تَحْيَى لَقَلْوُبَيْنَ أَيْنَ
ذُبِعُوهُمَا، فَمَعْلِمُهُمَا أنَّ الدِّينَةَ، لَبَكَّ من أَلْمِهِر صوَاتَ الصَّدَاقَةِ
عَلَمَتْهُمَا، لَبَكَّ الْعَبْدَةِ، وَالْحَضَوَةِ، وَالْعِلْيَادَةِ، وَالدِّينَةِ، وَالْمَهْدَوَفُ لَلْمَفْتَرَىِّ، أَمَّرَوا
أَشْيَاءَهُمَا لَبَكَّ فَمَعْلَمُهُمَا، وَهُمَا رَوَى عَنَ الصَّدَاقَةِ عَلَىَّ السَّلَامِ أَقَالَ النَّقْلَةَ
دَينَى يَدَى أَيْنَ، فَمَعْلَمُهُمَا لَبَكَّ فَمَعْلَمُهُمَا، وَرَأَيْنَهُمَا، فَمَعْلَمُهُمَا
يَعْوَرُونَهُمَا لَبَكَّ فَمَعْلَمُهُمَا، وَأَمُرُونَهُمَا بِالْإِسْتِرَارِ، وَالْإِسْكَامِ، وَالسَّيَاهَةِ، فِي الْمَيْتِ، لَبَكَّ
جُمعت بالأمر المجمل عليه السلام، والأمر يوجب إلى الفقهاء دمَّرمنعتهم
سأجَّل أني أن يذكرونها باسمهم وسمعتهم في خصائصها، فنصبت كمال السمـٍّ.
ما كان لهم أن يدخلوا الخلفين، لهم في الدنيا الخويض الآية، ولم يكن له
عُرْجَةِ لِمَ تُكاَّلِدِ أُسِاعِيلِ خلافته لم يعلم أنه يميت حتى قتلته إنه بدأ له فيه،
دميت قول الصادِق عليه السلام أن البدء بالشريعة ينطلق إلى كل شيء في الابتداء،
وقول رسول الله ﷺ: اسمه اسمه ﷺ، واسم أبيه اسمه ﷺ، وفي رواية أخرى أن
حبني جبريل عن ربي العالمين أن رجل من أهل الكتاب يخرج في آخر الأيام، اسمه
كاسم وأبيه اسمه أبى، يتعالناس إلى دين ابن الزهير، ويدافعون
دين ابن الزهير للإسلام والشريعة، وذلك الاختلاف ضلتهم يخجج
من ضلال الفتنة وكرة الاختلاف، والشريعة كما تُخرجت أنا، فضل الله الشرك
في الجاهلية، وربّد كلاً كلاً نزوله كم أريدت في الدعوة إلى الله. ويدف
بالكردكما، ثم يسبيكما وما ساهرا كاستناث، وكأن كلذ في الدعوة إلى
كذلك كونين في الآخرث، وكذلك كلذيب في الدعوة إلى كذلذبه في الآخرث،
مع مارونا عَقْدَة المُداَقِرِ، أم يَعَاكِم أحد بدماغ إني هذا في ضلعة فلا
تتكَّلَّوْا أنتم بعد، وتقول وحوبين بربي هذه هوا الأمام بدي، فأخطأتو
عنده فهموني، وقد جا، من بعض أصحابه وكان من دعوة إني خطأ بآية قال:
رأيت أسماعك عند منصريه من الكتب تجلسته فيجلي وقيلت رأسه
آياته وبراهينه يتلاو ببعضها بعضًا، واضح أن العالِم القدير وجزء اليس تبت على غيرها.

والراحل الذي تعلم لهما بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم، للفلك ينقلب على عقبيه،

وماعنون أن الشمس التي تردد أن لها رجعت إلى أصلى باب الإطارات،

الله العلي وال님، إنها شمس الخالعة بدل الرسول صل الله عليه وسلم.

وعبد الله بن دينار، بل هنالك هذا الإلهان من مزيد.

يجب القول في اسماء صلوات الله عليه في تقلبه الأمر من أبنه

صلوات الله عليه، وحُن أتى بالبهينك إلا أبا من ميعان الدهر ستُبَر

عقيدته وأدعا إلى أن كل الشيء يملأه ليطيرنا نور الله،

وأنت مقيم في فناء، وحَبُّ وَكِلَّفَ في، ومن ذلك أن جفهر صلوات الله عليه، لله تعالى.

الله نفسه جَعَل خواص اعتابه، ومن كان يحترسه من حريته وفعل فَنَّى فَتَعَصَّم

وسلم العمال إلى سمايل، نصار سمايل، ياب الله واجرحبه، وبيت نوره، واللّه

بيته وبيت خلقه، وخلفية الله في أرضه، وقد أتّفقنا معه ونتم عن ذلك بانقتم.

القول في، نمايحسَّته المقدمية في حياة أبيه مما أتّفقنا القول في السمايل.

ابراهيم وهمرون، وموسى قلما بدأ به، في شيء كما بدأ به في السمايل، وذلك

نضل في المرى وأختلف في الهواء،
والله ناطق والمليئة صامته، ولهذاَ قَالَ النَّاسُ أو أنتِ، وأنتِ أول من فعلنا ذلك إبراهيم، وأنه لما عبَّثَ به الخلق، وطرقته التأسيد، وإمام بوهمة، وبرَزَق ولداً فأمره الله أن يتَّبعَه إخِي لوط مُكتَتِ يَقُودُهُ، وبه يَدِعَه نَصَبَة ورَأَاهُ الناس، وهذه الأخبار الصادقة، ثم انتشرت زريئة اسماعيل، وكثيراً أن بلغ أشده وكُل أموره أن يَنَصَبِه اسْمَاعِيل، وقد فتَّم، من قول فيه ما يَكِفُّنَا عَنَّا، وإنها أن نَصَبَاء إبراهيم ابن أخيه لوط إلى الشام يطلب له دار الجمرة وامرأه بالدعوة إلى اسماعيل، ومن ذلك حكاية الله عز وجل عنده بقوله فآمن لوط وظل في مهاجرة ربي، كما فعل إبراهيم ابن أخيه لوط، فقد فعل هو موسى بيوش بن النتن اذًنَصَبَاء بين يدّيه قبل تأسيده، إخِيه هورون، كذلك فعل محمد صلِّم بآيبان كعَب، وقد تقدم من ذلك ماحية كافية لأولى الألباب، كذلك فعلاً كما أردت استخار نفسهَ، أن يجمعهم في قصة سبأ، وقال لهم أتَلِم إذنِيَّ شربة قبل أن يأتيون مسلمين، وتوال الذين عَمَّده من الكتاب، أتَلِمْ مُنلَك، فلم ير مَكُونَه مستقرَّاً، وفَلُم، فهلدَى من نصل رفيق ليizophren في أشياء أكثر الهيبة، كذلك فعل إبراهيم دار أرضانصبه بين يده واذهب إلى نقبَه، وإنما كان محكم في الناس بحضَرهم، وهما حاكاه وصفته.
وملتم ما أنصح بإماركم وأعيبكم منكم، فقال بعده الأموار أن تجيب بإفلان، فقلت:

يقول لنا أبوك في الأمس إن أهلكب معدن س onData، وعيني علماء وإليكم بلغتمه

وأمرقنا بالبر منه، فقال بإفلان وسمحه إن الله جليل وعليم على السموات

والانض، وذ لك قولوه أي نبا، وعليها، فأنا أنتين طالعين، كنتا مطيعين

هكذا: وذلك النوُطِقِة والأوراسية والأئمة كنا مطيعين في إجابةهم، فلذ للصبارا

معصومين رسايل الأتباع لهم مستقر ومثبت، لأنهم منا بين (؟) ولي وا

معصومين، فإن باب الخطايب ومن استوطنه استمتعنا، فلذ ذلك هلا إتنا

فلما أسفه في دينه قض الله ورعيته متبرأ منه فأي هذى الأمور أن

تجيب، ونهض الصبي من حجره مسرعًا.

قال الرجل مالى الصغيرين هاشم كبره، ودخل الرجل لوقت م

الصادق كأخبره بأبيه، وبيته، فقال (من) يتكلم مثل هذا، ثم أحضره

وأمره، كان لا يدوم إلى الكتاب وصار صابره من كلام الناس خوفا عليه من ضده،

وقد روى نموذج أنه إذا ثم ولد الإمام مبع سنين ورتب صاحب

الوقت صاحب الأم والوارث له ورد في صوبه عن سائر ولده وعزده عن

خاطبة الناس ورابعه الده،

وسماع عن بعض الأولياء أن السجل والدرة، بعد تبعه، وراغي

امامًا وله وصبه لمخليةً في نفسي، وينص بمراهمة بعد وفاته،
وإيدهما خيرها، فذلك تقدّمهم الوصي وصار وصيًّا عليهمما، وابنهم.

عليهما هذه الشهادة التي تقدّمت له.

وقد جاء في الرواية أن رسل الإسلام ترقى في إحدى عشرة سنة من هجرته في يوم الامامين ليلتين خلاً من شهر عين الأول، وكان لحسن بن شاذان سنين وهما، إن سبعة سنين، وإنهمما استحقاق الامامة، ولذلك صار أبوهما وصيًّا عليهما، كما كان يشع ويلى هرود، وأنهما لا yüzden، أمر

الله قدّم أعلى الصغر وصار الصغير وارتل، وشهدت بان مواكين الإمامة على أساييل، وفيما أساييل

ور لديه محمد مرير شوقيسناً، فلحقت بهما الشهادة من مضى تكاس من الفترية المختلفة نزدتم الأموي الفهري، وتركتم مألاً رسل الإسلام، وجعلها كمالية في عقيدتها، وكلاها إمامية أساييل بأمر الله ووجيهه إلى صلح الله.

ليه كل ذلك كان تسليمه إلى ولده بأمر الله ووجيهه، في عذرته كما قدّم القول.

في القرون الغالية، وما فعلته الأنظمة والأشعة صرعت اساطيرهم جميعاً، وقد رويت أن بانت باماك أساييل أضطر يرده وجاعة صبحه وسَلهم إليه بعضهم في مجلس أبيه، واستودع منزلة جمته كافعل أبوه أساييل بالكثير من النصوب بين يديه قبله، وجعله يستر على نزوعه، وبِلله الصادق مجلس كأجليس بعقوب مجلس يوسف، عند غيته، وفيها:ً
بقوله، وداوود ورسليماً إذ جمعاً في الحريث إذ نفست فيده عصم
المؤمنين كلاً من كلهم شاهرون ففجلناها سليمان، وكم نمل قبله
النبي ورسول ونحن نقد القول به
كذلك نعلم سيدنا الحفرين فحص صلاوات الله عليه، فلكل بقية
خمسة وعشرين سنة لم يرضى ولنا غير اسماعيل وابنه عبد الله، وإله
لم يتزوج على أمهما ومنه ولي تزوج عليها جارية حتى غابت، وذلك لما علم
أن الإمام في عقبه وأنه أصاب على ذلك حتى غابت عن الدار، كرماً للصالح
كذلك نعلم جد الله محمد بن خديجة وعلى بطائعة صلاوات الله عليهم جميع
وعلماً لم يتزوج عليهم حبيه إيمان البنات عن الدار.
نارجوا أن تحمك الله إلى مثل هذين جمع والبراهين، وأшибка متملها
فأحكامكم إن كنت صادقين، ثم إنه لتانابيب اسماعيل إتقان أنتم من ذاك
موسى بن عدي عقيدة أن اسماعيل استقلبه فأورد ذلك شاهدًا يأخذ به
كما فعل محمد صلى الله عليه وآله لما نصبه الحسن والحسين وقال إنهما
املاء من أмин وتأخذ ولن أيه التظهير شهدت لهما، وإنهم احترام رسول
الله في ليلاً جاءته، وياتى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لمصارى جيران، فقالوا:
أتينا وابننا كوكوعاً وناكناك وناكناك وناكناك وناكناك وناكناك وناكناك
الرسول لهم أنهم استيأوا أشياب أهل الجنة، وتقديم إبهم عليهم بقوله
سأعلمك أن يدعو الناس وفيقصون للمستجيبين إليه، وإن كل من إجاب
دعوتهم وزعموا بدينهم أخز وأعلانه الميثاق وأعلموا بأمام زمانه وموضوعوا
وبنيه. فرحل اليد من استطاع منهم وأمرهم من لم يستطع بالستر والكتمان
والسياحة في الأرض إلى أوان الظهور.

ومناился على امامه اساعيل أيضاً وأتأباجعة الأمة مختلفين فيها
أدا لينام رسول الحكم في ظاهر أمره فيهم تكنين لباطهن وذلك لست
بلغه عقولهم، وإنهم برون اخباراً كاذبةً، ويسندونها إلى رسول الله صلى الله
وأيضًا أشياء تتفاقمها وانثيرون تأويلها. تقبلون في ذلك في نفس الخشباء قل
الله عزوجل أن امتدخل آدم على صورته، وقوله رأيت ربي في أرض المدينة بوفرة
جند انتقل ويوهباً مقبول الشباب، وما رواه مقالاً ابن سليمان عن أنه
كره ودم وأنته صورة كصورتهم، ومثل ذلك ماراذي المنسوبون إلى التشجع عن
على صورت الله عليه وآله وẉائله في ظاهر كلامه، أثارتهم أنهارها، وإناسفت
أشارها، وانصحب نهج أئناظف النجاح وانكات مع موبي وفرون. اسم كلامهم
ألم قد وافتناك على ظواهر هذه الأشياء كلها قالنا ظاهر ألفاظهم صولت: سمعوا
يجعل إلى تأويل كأن الكتاب المقرر به ي تعالى، كذلك قول الابنياء
والرسام والاسمائه ي تعالى إلى تأويل يقوم به نصائر الفصل فيكم معرفة باطنها
وتؤولها، وإنما بنجعمكم إلى التأويل وجداول كمتفقين مع السنة الآتية
يا في وضعه اذانه تهيناليه،
فقام محمد بآمر الله ووجهه إليه، وفرق ذاته السيارة في جزائر
الأرض، وأمره لجزائر بإقامة الدعوة باسمه نصرت الأرض وانتشار الأمر،
واقبلوا الساحة لنصب داره، واشتد طلب الظالمين عليه، وناشدت
أمر وقوى خبره ولكن الطلبة عليه عقب شخصه عن داراً، وخرج ساحقاً في
البلد، وقفي الصادق في داره وقارىء ودخل كهف الحقيقة كما قال أبو سعيد
القوم. ورق دعاة وقام لجليسة المتقدم بين يده كمافع وليه ورعين
وللذك بقول السعد بن زهاج، سيقولون ثلاثين رياضهم كلههم وليقولون حصة
ساردهم كلهم جماهير الغلب، وليقولون سبعة وثامنهم كلهم مثل رفيق أعلم
بتعتدهم ولا يفتنهم الاقليل نما أثارهم أمير ظاهر.

ومعادي لك أتاب على امامه اسماعيل ولد صلحات اسمه، وعمر رياص
حبا انشاعماعليه ركوب لهم، وسكتهم طريقة لم يستكملوا الاالتمتنك
بأمره وجهه والقص من القادم ذكره، وحرم على أنفسهم المقام في أ팔د.
وعم سلطان جابر والمعيشة تحت كل نافهم والقعياد لهم والمطيع لهم،
والله لم برق منهم إلا من عذره الحسن المستضعفين من الرجال والنساء وولاد
الذين لايستطعون حيلة ولا يهبون سيلة، وصارت دعاتهم مستورين.
وبعد هما، رَأى الصادق رضي الله عنهما الجزء الذي قبله في وجها، وليست بالقليل
هنا كله، ومِن أثوابه، على إمام السنيم، إضافة إلى أصوات رضي الله عنه:
صلوات الله عليهما المأمون، أقامه في مجلسه يصلي ثلايحة أيام وهو مَكْذَّب
والناس يدخلونه في زعمته، من بنى حاشم وغيرهم، وسائرهم الذين يذكر
إنه يقول: من دخل إليه وادعاه فهذا أليس هذا؟ وله وضع إمام اللواء، ولايستنالسمن قول: إن في كل ما أرى ماره، فقد ذلك يؤخذ منه في خصوصية، ولهما، وستاولد
على ذلك حتى، أخذ خطوة كل من في المدينة، من بنى حاشم وغيرهم من الزوار، وعلى
المدينة، رأيت خُبَه في اليم، الرابع إلى البُقَر، وهم كثاف في وجهه، واتكلت عليه
وُمَّنَّه، وقصدها ما أنسى على موت السنيم، أنسى على ما ودعته وانها
جمعته من بعد وياخذ بذلك خطوة بمجرد، وليست على ذلك
مَرَأَة، ودفعته بمجرد، وكتب أعصاب الإخبار بذلك الأنسور، وكتبت أيضاً الصادق
الذي يطيب فيه، وكأنه تمجرد على الصادق حتى ان
المجرد الأمر لا يقبله، فتنة لتأمل الاعتقاد الباليان، وهما في
البيئة الطبيعية، وفي آثام موتته، فسكت ما كان يجل منهما، ثم أدركه لم يتزلد إلا أنا باحث.
فُطِّلَ لهم اسم اسمي... 
رَتَّبَ أَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ أَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ وَأَنْ تَنْتَفَقَنْ}
ولا ترى الدعاء السجدة في الأرض، والحالة من سبريف، بين يديه
صامتًا، نعم حياته، وانها لم تحيض النفلة خرج محمد عن مدينة قباء.
وجمع من بئر من نقباته وجنبته، وسار توجيه الذي أشار له ليطلب
داره، كما تقدم القول في نظراته، وقد كاد ناظرًا هو ونجله من بعد. ويستور
أنفسهم من الخناق، ويتبعها، هم في سارًا قام الطريض طلب دارهم الذي
تقدم به القول حتى يظهر بعض دعاة اليم معそも الدعوة بها، وقويت به
عليهم، وسار المعجم من تحت يده إلى المغرب عند وقت الكمال ورأى أن
ويتم وعهد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من معرفة ومعرفة، وإنها لا تقوى أمره
وكلمت دعوته وظهرت آياته وكانت موالبة بالسراجيدة كما فعل لوظ
باباهيم أن لَتَمْسا فوء داربيه نصف لنفسه داره، يخرج بشريت ابيه
باباهيم، وسافر إلى داربه واهل كهف، وقد تقدمه من هذين ما تُعَزَّذَب
التطور في الإعادة له،
وانهم لم يزالوا مستورين كهفهم حتى تام(iv) رسول الله، صلى الله عليه
و وسلم.
٦٠٠٠ ما سأله عن حسناء، ومما تك من عمر الدنيا، تأشار إلى اصابعه
فحسبا ثلاثة أيام وثلثة أشهر، ولما ستين وثلثين سنة وثلاثمئة
سنة، وأزادوا تسعة، وان الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم هذا ما أشار ومشاهدة
نص عليه من بناء هل الكهف حيث قرر رامج عن الظابة، وقد تقدمه
يكفي له أن يجعلكان بالبشرة زمانًا له سنتين سنة، وأن يكون تاعادًا على أبي كنانة يعمل أخوس، وإنه مريح، وشفه من صفته وصفته، والنساء يهروهن حوله، ويقومون، وأن الزمن لما مر به كان يتشتت ليصبح ناداه يا بن رسول الله، خذني نحذري الله بيدك، فتوجه يا نذر Babe، إنزلي من مكانه ثم سار به ساعة وخلاه فرجع إلى موحلة محسومًا، فاجتمع إليه الناس وقيل من مرتين، قال أساعيل بن عفر بن محمد صلوات الله عليه، كتب أصعاب الإخباروث ورسل كتاب الصادق بالغزارة، فيه، ثم تأهَّل إلى أن لا ينزل سوى أبي كنانة، مهماً حتى يفندوان آخر، ثم إربيه، ارسل ليوته إلى الصادق وبشريبه، فلما وصل، بين يديه، أخرج إليه كتاب أصعاب الإخباروث وتحريته وقال له الله هما خطيبين، لتكوين في اساعيل، تلا نعم، فنهى فأول أخرج إليه كتاب أصعاب الإخباروث من قئته بالبيرة، فعند ذلك أخرج الصادق على السلام والهنجرة الكبيرة، بيوته وجهته نقل، ثم وقف على ما فيه من النهي، وقين ما فيه من الغضب. فأحضر جمعة من بني هاشم، وعند فشته، رأبازه، ربت على خطوطهم، فعند ذلك أمر بعزل الصادق، وأوقفه وربد إلى وضعه، وسلم لابن عيسى ستر فيديف يجري في أربائه وحكله، هكذا، وراجع الصادق إلى Gerry، جدته، وحكله، وكتب في مجلس يوسف بعد، وشفعه، لا أنقطع التأديبه عليه.
من المجلس السابع عشر والمائة من مجلس السيد ناجي
ابن إبراهيم الحامدي
قال:(على يد إبني بوعليه) أرجو حلفًا يعينه كل من كان في كل عصر
وزمان ودين ولذان، فقامت إليه أبو زرعة الفقاري، فنفقت قلماً في المرأةيمنن أن
علياً. فين من ذلك فإنه مرتاحاً لله لو كان جزءاً من هذه الدنيا،
فقال عليه نعم، فعصم ياً جند بأن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم.
أدرك كرم في هذا الأمر، قال لي يا إسلام إنك إذا أخذت ابنتك كنت
فإن هذه البيارة تكون لأم الآية من عشر، ولا بد أن تعور عليها
من بعد أخذك لها كي تجعله آخر في يوم كيكل عند النبي ابن زراعة للهم،
لعن الله، بعدد ولد في الصين,
وهي ولده على رؤوين العبدين، وذلك يقررت بعد هجري باحد خمسة
سنة، وكيلته محمد بن الحضرة إلى وقت بلاغه، فيتزوج بأم سالم بنت
خالد فريلة أبنت أحمد رزق، يفتك، وليصpk في الكفوة والآخر
فيضقي سما والثالث يفقد في بلد الزرواء والرابع أي رهونا أحمد محيك
على ابن الحسين، فيتزوج أم جعفر فريلة جعفر في بلد البند، وذلك من
هجري في سنة مائة وأربع وعشرين، ويقوم عليه بحالك فلا يقدر
عليه ولا يحبس البصمة، فيتزويج سلاماً (رضي الله تعالى به)
فيعطى خمسة، ينيد.
القول: بقول رسول الله ﷺ الفائزون بدينهم وغيشرون مع عيى ابن مريم، وقيل: أهل بني نسيم، كلهاء باب حطة لس دخله، وکشفت نوح من ركبها الخ... تَمْ كَتَبَ أَسْرَ الأَنْطَقاءِ بِحَمْدِ الله وصَلَّى وَسَلَّمَ على وَحْسِ نَظَرِهِ مَه.
وذلك في تمام سنتين مائتي حرم، ويستطع له الأمر وثور عليه أنصاره بعجار
أعوانه يحجزه في الأندلس، ويقص عليه بالنص، ويتعليمه بالفهريج بن المنجر
كطاح الديش، وذلك بعد أن زاره أبو إبنة عمه وأقرب الناس إليه،
ويلدهما الثاني عشر ربيعا، فحياته وقبل وفاته، وتفقد أمه
في حيوة أبيه ويقوم له ويكون أعمده كثيرة من أهل أطرافه ويستوعب
وينقل به أحسن من يعلق في إناءي البلوط زوجته أبو إبنة إمامه من ولد الرؤم,
وإلى الثالث عشر يريهم بدمغاساته أنه مغارة الأندلس
وكرمة الإ райف، وقلعة الإشلاف، والأمر المطلق عند الشديد، والأمر المديد
وثوره البربر بقيادة أهل الأندلس، ويأتي تونس وبليهما المجرة، يلبس في
سيجا مساجبة إلى أقصى الغرب، ومدن وحالتها بعد حصارها في الأندلس، ويقريرها,
ويقعن أضاده بكل بعضهم بعض憂 سد الشح يثبتر، ويدورة، يقعن
وتخلط بعد الرابع عشر، وله خاصية يدعون ما في جزائه، وك
يتبكي أناته صاحب الوقت، فيلهمها بعد ذلك ويستعم لهم الأمريكيز بعيدا,
وينكشف أمره ويجيش جيوش دبس البلوك التي أرض كفر ومايلها فيفتح
كفر بالبلاد الناصف، وتفر فتح الشامات من ذلك، ويرفع من الأندلس.
ويعمر ويعبر بلد الأندلس، إلى آخره، يوها، رواية
وبعد أن يزوج ابنة عمه ويلدها ذكرى أحدهم الخمس
من إمامه خمسة

(٦) وبيوت منهم الأكبر في حياته، وتيفيذ الإمام السابع,

(٧) نيتيزوغ ابنة عمده رخٍ يفقد الطاس في سنة مائة واربعثنين

من هجري ويطيلبه بنو الحباس حتى بعد منهم إلى أقصى بلاد الحجم، وديماه يسلم،

(٨) نيتيزوغ امرأة ويودالتاس، ويطيلبه بنو الحباس وتخرج من

هناك حتى يسترقي بلاد الشام في ألم قسري، وجُد值守شريبان ناحية أطلاتية

عمل خصص حتى تستقر هنالك داره وديثوفي النافذة أحيانه وتنفذ من هنالك

دعوته إلى أقصى الغرب واليمن، نتزوغ هنالك في سنة تسعين ومائتين

مجرز ويثيلبه ويشبع بني الفباس دلوق ويوهرون إليه ويقع في أيدهم

كالسنين في الانتفاض في ذكرائهم في داركمهم ونافذتهم بمنطقهم وأفكارهم من فنونه،

ويخرج من الانتفاص إلى مستقره بعد فوت الطاهر في بلاد البس، فيلدله

العاشرة سنة مائة وثمان وتسعين من هجري،

(٩) فإذا أقام العاشرون ولد هاجر إلى أرض الغرب وديل بحائت

تسبا باسمه، بل paciente هاجر إلى رحب الغرب وديم بحائت

من المغرب، وهو الذي يعذب النافذة في بلاد الغرب، ويادية في دار الحر

ويتزاول، ويتيزغ امرأة ولا يلدها إلا في المستقر الذي يخبأه إلى دارجبرته،

(١٠) نيشهدها المأذية عشر من بمجردة جهاد الذي يرضيه من الله:
حتى يحتوي على البيئة التي رُوّا أبوه، وذلك من الهجرة في ثلث مائة وتسعين سنة، وهي من أولاد العقين، فذاذو المساحة، وسارى إلى يوشق ركين دُهموه في رجب سنة أربع وتسعين وثلاثمائة، وفيما شعبان من هذه السنة الحجرية فجينذ تسير جيوشه حتى يقطع أنتاكية وسوبانثغور، ويجيب أنتاكية دار هجرته، وليده. هذه البيئة الستة عشر من هذه السنة، وبكون اسكي بإبابة الحسن، رزقت د zun الحرير وجبلت الحظوظ وكلت عن رشف مالهن الانت وحف، فناتخنو ما يصنع من الإمام والعبيد والنساء وليقبر الأثري دلالي، أولى هاهاالساع عشر ولأيكون ذلك الليم كريب طويل وامريجحى مكرمة العبيرة والخراج والقصبة والاختلاف في الإهلاء من بلديه وليليار من مزيتة على ولد إلى الأصغرها داحت بحلقة الجيوش، وحصل في أنتاكية وحبلت دادر هجرته، واندلع الرحم إلى حدر وبد الخيف من أنف القسطنطنية، فإن ذلك تنصِّب النصارية من بعد ويل السبع عشر من هذه البيئة، ورارلاه كثيرة ونسب قبل ارائه حتى إذا ورلله ألاكتشير في أياً صغرسته وقيل أن ياهج الكبى ويشتغل من أولاده بسفك دم النصارية والقتل المُتى، وذلك أن السبع عشر في رجاء من العيش والسرو وكره الأحبور، وبيت لكل الفاسر عشر في أعماله، وذلك أنه قد احتوى على مقتل الحلفاء أشقو والمنافق الدعي حتى إذا أفعى المعامل والبلدان وعاشت الأرامل من النساء، وعمريت
عشر ويلهاب بعده السادس عشر وهو وصغير السن، وقد قامت دوته العرب، وهمت به النساء وقام طاغوته بين يديه وهم به يعبر عنه، وانتقلت إلى بنيته وعزم على خروجه من بيت أحمد بن عبد الله وشمر، وهما وكريسته، وقام مقامه الأسود الثاني بين بده السادس عشر، دُرِئيَ، وهوى ذُرَى شقيقه وذهب في قائمة بعد اصطحابه الإسماعيل والجبيَّ، وآساه الملكة بإطرافها حتى يقول جميع الملوك في الشرق والمغرب أنَّهُ تدعى محمد بوضع أولته، ويئب عليه رتبة الإنسا الآن الأزر وضاءغ العقوبة، وينقله في اضطراب المصريين، وينزل على أهل الهيئين من عظيم قتله ومأكدة هموته، ولم يبلغ الصبي من ربع عشرين سنة في تعب الصبي إذ أتقلت الخصائص،Erreur de transcription
القتل في الأكابر والأصغر حتى لا يبقى لإبى السادس عشرة ولا إنه لأهل والقرآن ولا إمام الأقاصي والأعداء في حين ظهوره السابع عشر وذلك أن أول ظهوره في رجب وشهر من هذه السنة، والظهر ظهوره بعد ذلك إلى SCRIPMRACINY، ولا يظهر إلا بعد تمر الأضداد والاندا عين أوبري والده، وبعد أن يظلون بالله الطفولة، وليس له من أمة حتى ظهوره من غيوراً، وكثير الأعجيف وريق الاختلاف والأساطير في أمر وامبروده، وذلك بعد أن خبر عصرنا بعد هلاك الأضداد واهل الأفكار أهل المغرب والشرق، وضرب بالسيف أداه لا يبرون الخروج من ذلك سبيلاً.

تمّ الكتاب بعون الملك الوقاب على يد الجد الرازي إلى الرحمة الله الفقار لله حاج محمد جويب أحمد بن حمود رضي
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الاثنين من سائر الاقطاع وبدأت في ذلك التجار في النياجي من العدل والانصف، وبعد قرب من السادس عشر، بعد ذلك، بعد أن يملك بلاد الروم إلى حدود القسطنطينية، تنحى ذلك طور النصرانية وتغطى أكثر من جزءه حتى إذا هتفت باجيج، واجيج اقترب الوعد الحق، ففي السادس عشر من الأعوام في بلاد الروم، في اختلاف الجوهر، ونهاية الأولاء لخليجها، حتى يجلس وله السابع عشر، وكان حكم النصرانية في نواحي القسطنطينية، وشّيّقت إلى الجوهر، وسرا أهل المغرب مع أهل العراق لإهلال الشام، يعترف بوضوح أن المجرم التي، إذا كان هاهمانديين، يقال لهم، يرغم الناس في سوق مأرب حتى يجلب أهل المغرب من رتب النساء ورجالات الدهاء، حتى يبيع جملهن على البرادين الشهب، ونانك، في وقت سنهم من المغرب إلى نصرة، ولي في بلاد الزوراء، وتفتح القسطنطينية، زخرفها رومية، وحيل الازدهار، يغلب حزب الله إلا أن حزب الله هزم الغالبون، بل جندهم النصارى، فإذا أُتاح إلى أقصى بلاد رومية، حرب قسطنطينية، رحم وله في سيرها، فزعمت، يطلب العراق، وذلك بعد السادس عشر من أرض مصلى أن ركبت يبترس ورقمته في الشمس، عندما اقترنت الكواكب السبعة، في أول سنة، وظفوا المصا، وقتل الأكبرا، كن تلقوا وديه على الناس من ذلك ماجروهم من الفضيلة، وأول ذلك من سنة اثنين وسعين إلى رأس أربعين سنة، عظم ذلك وكثير
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