

BOGDAN SKŁADANEK

The Khārijites in Iran

I

Division into Sects

The importance of the Khārijite question in Iran is in part due to the fact that as early as the mid-VIIth century the Khārijites, as the group which was most ruthlessly persecuted by the caliphate because they themselves would not consent to any terms, sought refuge in the territory of Iran, where they could easily survive far from the centre of the world of Islam. The Khārijites found the atmosphere in Iran favourable to them. After the battle of Nahrawān in 658—this was the first great defeat and pogrom in the history of Khārijism carried out by 'Alī—some of those who escaped took refuge in Iran. They fled to the distant provinces, to Kirmān and Sīstān. According to a Khārijite legend, which was later repeated by Shī'ite and orthodox literature, only nine of the conspirators escaped from this pogrom and of these two reached Sīstān. These were the founders of the Sīstānian Khārijites¹. Shahrastānī expressed himself more generally, writing that the Iranian Khārijite' sects stemmed from these fugitives².

The first to seek refuge in Iran were the Muḥakkima. The next influx of Khārijites, from the Azāriqa faction, overran Fārs and Kirmān. There were 20000 of them³, but the strongest group were the 'Ajārīda who were active in Sīstān and Khurāsān

¹ Al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh-i mudhāhib-i islām* (per. trans. of *K. al-farq bain al-firaq*), ed. M. Jawād Ma'shkur, Tehrān 1344, p. 46.

² Ash-Shahrastānī, *K. al-milal wa'n-nihāl*, ed. W. Careton, London 1842, p. 87–88.

³ Al-Malaṭī, *K. at-tanbih wa'r-radd*, ed. S. Dederling, Leipzig 1936, p. 41. S. Dederling, the editor of Malaṭī, accepted the Fatāa version of this name. According to Ash'arī, 'Amr al-Qanā, together with 'Ubaid b. Hilā and the two 'Abd Rabbihi, one of the four who came forward with doctrinal criticism ('ātū) of Qaṭarī. Cf. Ash-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn wa'l-ikhtilāf al-muṣallīn*, ed. H. Ritter, Istanbūl 1929, p. 87. The date of Nāfi's death is given according to Ibn al-Kathīr, *Al-bidāya wa'n-nihāya fī't-tārīkh*, Cairo 1932–39, IX, p. 30.

and in the southern districts of Kirmān and Makrān⁴. Further fragmentation rapidly took place among the Khārijites in Iran: they split up into many warring sub-sects with a complicated pattern of relationships and contacts. The classification and sub-division of the Khārijite sects active in Iran which has used with only small corrections down to the present day, is derived from A s h ' a r ī ' s analysis in his *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn*. As a scholar he had great authority and was the spiritual leader of the Nīshāpūr school of philosophy. A s h ' a r ī ' s law, which was later accepted by B a g h d ā d ī and S h a h r a s t ā n ī, was based on two principles: the basic assumption is the differentiation of doctrines according to their principles and this gave rise to the next—division into further sub-sects according to chronology. Studies in comparative religion by B a g h d ā d ī⁵, S h a h r a s t ā n ī and A s h ' a r ī, with the exception of some fragments dealing with the earliest factions, do not give precise historical information and enable events in the history of Khārijism to be dated only roughly.

The Muḥakkima were the first of the very many Khārijite sects to appear. Later, the Azāriqa, Najadāt, Šufriyya (Šifriyya) and 'Ajārīda sects made an appearance. These were the first four of the sects, according to a l - M u b a r r a d⁶. S h a h - r a s t ā n ī places the Baihasiyya sect between the Najadāt and 'Ajārīda, but B a g h d ā d ī counts this as part of the Ibāḍiyya, arguing that the Baihasiyya were derived from the Ibrāhīmiyya, who were led by a member of the Ibādī group called I b r a - h ī m. Both S h a h r a s t ā n ī and B a g h d ā d ī however name the 'Tha'ālibiyya and Ibāḍiyya, after which S h a h r a s t ā n ī ends his list with the Šufriyya, while B a g h d ā d ī mentions two more sects: the Shabībiyya and Šālibiyya⁷.

The internal sub-division of the Khārijites into sects (or groups) was almost certainly just as unclear to the contemporary observer. In his *Murūj adh-dhahab*, M a s ' ū d ī, who was generally well-informed, mentions the Khārijite sects in completely haphazard order: Ḥamziyya, Ibāḍiyya, Mahriyya, Khalqīyya, Šufriyya, Najadāt⁸. M u ṭ a h h a r includes names which were completely unknown to earlier authors in his long list of the Khārijite sects in his *Kitāb al-bad' wa't-ta'rīkh* (*Book of creation and history*). He mentions the following Khārijite sects: Ḥamziyya, Azāriqa, Najadāt, Raisibiyya, Ibāḍiyya, Baihasiyya, Ḥazimiyya, Khalafiyya, Qaṭawiyya,

⁴ M a l a ṭ ī, p. 41.

⁵ B a g h d ā d ī, often refers to the opinion of K a ' a b ī, a theologian who is known by the name of B a l k h. Cf. EI 2, s.v.

⁶ A l - M u b a r r a d, *K. al-kāmil fī'l-lughā wa'l-adab*, Cairo 1308 [1890], II, p. 170.

⁷ B a g h d ā d ī, pp. 67–68; S h a h r a s t ā n ī, *Milal*, pp. 86–103. M a l a ṭ ī gives still other divisions (pp. 38, 43, 135 ff), which are mutually contradictory. For him the basic sect is the Ḥarūriyya, which is at times used as a synonym for khārijism and at times as one of the Khārijite sects. Cf. also H. L a o u s t, *La classification des sectes dans le Farq d'al-Baghdadi*, "Revue des Études islamiques", 1961 XXIX, p. 19.

⁸ M a s ' ū d ī, *Murūj adh-dhahab*, ed. C. Barbier de Meynard, P. de Courteille, Paris 1861–1877, V, p. 440.

Mibhūtiyya, Ṣifriyya, 'Ajārīda, Kīziyya, Ibādiyya, Bid'iyya, Sabiyya, Tha'ālibiyya. And therefore even in the Middle Ages general names were used to describe all the Khārijites, without trying to define their interior sub-divisions, in order to bring some order to this confused situation. They were thus called Ḥukmiyya, Ḥarūriyya, Khawārij (ar. pl. of Khārijī) and Shurāa. And the pejorative name for them was al-māriqa (those who have broken loose, apostates)⁹.

The sub-division of Khārijism into ever more factions and streams was a symptom of changes within the movement. The 'Azraqites originated in the Najadāt group, but as a break-away faction were regarded as infidels (*kāfir*) by their mother-group¹⁰. Furthermore, as a result of the dispute between two prominent 'Azraqites, Maimūn and Shu'aib, this faction split completely as follows: the Khazimiyya and 'Ajārīda ('Ajārīda orthodoxy?—B.S.) supported Shu'aib; the Ḥamziyya and Qadariyya supported Maimūn. It is worth noting that Maimūn, like 'Ajarrad came from Balkh¹¹. This split did not mean that the Azraqa group was now divided only into two factions around these leaders. The fact that the Azraqites later split into four sub-groups—we learn of this from A s h' a r ī—shows that at the time when these two large groups were formed around the persons of Maimūn and Shu'aib there were already at least five sub-sects in existence among the Azraqites: for the Maimūniyya must be added to the four already mentioned.

Subsequently, further sub-division led to the Aṭrāfiyya splitting off from the Ḥamziyya group which was formed in about 795¹²; both of these groups were active in Sīstān. The Aṭrāfiyya, a doctrinally weak sect, numbered Muḥammad b. Zarak among its members. He later left this sect and joined Ḥusain b. Rukād¹³. The founder of the Ḥamziyya, Ḥamza b. Adrak, also supported Ḥusain b. Rukād¹⁴. This would seem to indicate that there was some very early group which was in existence within the Azāriqa sect at the time when the four first groups mentioned above were being formed, and certainly before the formation of the Ḥamziyya¹⁵. If, as is suggested by the sources referred to, the Aṭrāfiyya took a dissident line together with Ḥamza, they could not have developed into a separate group earlier than the last five years of the VIIIth century.

The Khārijites Khalafiyya, led by Khalaf who came from the Maimūniyya faction,

⁹ Muṭaḥḥar, *K. al-bad' wa't-ta'rīkh*, Paris 1899–1919, V, pp. 134–135. According to L. Massignon (EI 1) shurāa meant "irreconcilables". The shurāa Khārijite sect which operated in the Harāt, Iṣṭakhr and Kirmān regions and did not recognise A b ū B a k r or 'U m a r, was, according to M a l a ṭ ī, p. 43, exceptionally mild and harmless to others.

¹⁰ A s h' a r ī, p. 89.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 95.

¹² *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, ed. M. B a h ā r, Tehrān 1314, p. 156.

¹³ S h a h r a s t ā n ī, *Milal*, p. 97.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 96.

¹⁵ S h a h r a s t ā n ī, *Milal*, p. 97; B a g h d ā d ī, p. 56; A s h' a r ī, p. 96. The founder of the Khāzimiyya was K h ā z i m b. 'A l ī. Cf. S h a h r a s t ā n ī, *Milal*, 97.

were operating in Kirmān and Makrān. In Sīstān this faction was represented by the Ḥamziyya, who were close to the Shu'aibiyya. The majority of Khārijites in Harāt, Kūhistān, Bushang and Sīstān, and in Khurāsān and Makrān, as far as the Kirmān and Sind borders, belonged to the Ṣufriyya and Ḥamziyya at the end of the VIIIth century¹⁶. This then was the situation at the situation when the followers of Ḥamza split away¹⁷. At the beginning of the caliphate of Yazīd (720–724) the influence of the Ṣufriyya extended only to Khūzistān, where they were in competition with the Shabībiyya although some believe that the Shabībiyya were a faction of the Ṣufriyya, and others that they were a faction of the Azāriqa¹⁸.

We have concluded that the Khārijites of East Iran belonged to a faction of the 'Ajārīda. To some degree their influence extended as far south as Khūzistān. In West Iran, and also in the North in Gurgān, Nasā and Armenia, the Shaibaniyya Khārijites of the Tha'alibiyya faction were found¹⁹ and they also stretched into the Khurāsān region where the 'Ajārīda were active. The Shaibaniyya were not a typical Khārijite faction: they were driven out of the Khārijite movement for taking the part of Abū Muslim and giving him assistance²⁰.

Thus in Iranian Khārijism, there were three main streams: the Azāriqa, 'Ajārīda and the Tha'alibiyya. The first Khārijites in Iran were the Muḥakkima, who were sometimes called the Muḥakkima al-awwālī²¹, but they were only the nucleus of the movement and themselves disappeared among the numerous Khārijite sects shortly after their arrival in Iran. The moral and doctrinal problems which then brought with them has developed in the conditions of the Arabian desert among the nomads under the influence of a long war between 'Alī and Mu'āwiya in Ṣiffīn in 656.

Changes in the Khārijite teachings

The world of the desert Arabs was dominated by inter-tribal strife. In the period when the Arabs first came into the historical limelight, the first stage of tribal integra-

¹⁶ R. Rubinacci, 'Ajārīda, EI 2; Mas'ūdī, *Murūj adh-dhahab*, V, p. 231.

¹⁷ *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, p. 156.

¹⁸ Baghdādī, p. 70; Ash'arī, p. 118; L. Massignon, *Shabīb*, EI 1, IV; H. Laoust, *Les schismes dans l'islam*, Paris 1965, pp. 38, 40.

¹⁹ Shahrastānī, *Milal*, p. 99.

²⁰ Baghdādī, pp. 62–63.

²¹ Ash'arī, p. 103. The Ibāḍiyya, one of the great Khārijite factions, seem to have had little influence in Iran. Their chief fields of operations were Africa and the Yemen. But there were also some Iranians among them: we can find Hilāl b. 'Atiyya al-Khurāsānī among the ibāḍite missionaries and one of the well-know ibāḍite doctors was Abū Ghānim Bishr b. Ghānim al-Khurāsānī, the author of the *al-Mudawwana*. The ibāḍists appeared in Fārs at the beginning of the VIIIth century (cf. T. Lewicki, *al-Ibāḍiyya*, EI 2,) but we may conclude from the fact that there were not many references to this that their influence was minimal. Of the three most important Khārijite sects, the Azāriqa, Ṣufriyya, Ibāḍiyya (cf. Хаубахти, *Шийтские секты*, Москва 1973, p. 199), only one attained a leading position in Iran: the 'Azāriqa.

tion was being carried out, and the division into southern and northern genealogy of the links between the tribes²². This broad division of the Arabs into zones was a portent of social development to come, and also of the related conflicts which were to absorb a great deal of the Arabs' social energy. Moreover, these conflicts did not die out when they had lost their earlier significance. After the tribes had moved North to Syria or Khurāsān, outside the area of Arabia, in completely different economic and cultural conditions, these conflicts remained one relic of the old tradition, an anachronistic pattern of behaviour. At one time, the tribal struggles had fitted very well into the system of the desert nomads' world²³. War had divided the Arabs²⁴, but pan-Arab holiday had united all of them equally and maintained the whole of the Arab world in equilibrium. However, the unifying forces were the first to die out. The pan-Arab holidays ceased to be observed but the wars continued. This led not only to political disarray among the Arabs, and inability to unite all their forces, but also to growing enmity between the former opponents. They became enemies, and this made it impossible to pour oil on conflicts as they emerged. At one time, the longterm desert wars had not weakened the Arabs, but in the mid-VIIth century relations between various camps and tribes became so much aggravated that it seemed that their aim had become mutual extermination or even that this was the only way to end the conflict. Islam did not subdue the conflicts among the Arabs, but only changed the banners under which they were fought. We have ample evidence that the Arabs were unable to come to peaceful terms to end their disagreements and struggles ; beginning with the first conflict which spread beyond the frontiers of the peninsula, the conflict of 'Alī with the Umayyads, and continuing through the struggle of the Khārijites, the revolt of the Yemeni Arabs in Khurāsān and the revolt in Mecca in 692 AD which was put down by Ḥajjāj. There was nowhere where they could meet, where custom would dictate armistice, as in the days of the old holidays. This was their tragedy. In every early Muslim conflict there was an inner contradiction between the traditional tendency to end it peacefully, and lack of opportunity for this to take place for now conditions in which these wars were being fought did not make provision for this. Members of other ethnic groups do not seem to have understood this split within Islam and did not understand how to adapt to the inner contradiction mentioned. And thus they did not take part on one side or other in purely Arab conflicts, or even if they were responsible for stimulating conflicts, they then stood aside. The Arabs themselves did not in fact admi

²² J. O b e r m a n n, *Early Islam*, in: *The Ideas of History in the Ancient Near-East*, New Haven-London 1955, pp. 246, 247.

²³ J. O b e r m a n n gives a list of these holidays (op. cit., pp. 255 ff). For further information on this subject see W. C a s k e l l, *Aiyam al-arab*, "Islamica" 1930, III, fasc. 5, pp. 59 ff.

²⁴ Wars within the groups were remnants of earlier systems which had existed before the formation of these groups. O b e r m a n n (op. cit., p. 284) discusses the conflicts between the following tribes: Bakr and Tamīm, Tamīm and Azd, Taghlib and 'Āmir b. Ṣa'sa'a, Kalb and Fazāra and between the Qays 'Ailān and Kalb-Quḍā'a confederations.

non-Arabs to their circle. They attempted to resolve their conflicts within the context of the clan or tribe, or as though they were clan-genealogical conflicts this was for example the case when the Khārijites broke away, although in fact the essence of the conflict over Muḥammad's successor, which was the basic theme of early Muslim conflicts, was settled as though it had been a clan or tribal conflict. Genealogy was an exceptionally significant matter for the Arabs, and was their way of looking at history. J. O b e r m a n n took the evolution of the jihād as the basis for his analysis of the question of the change which took place in conflicts which had originally been pan-Arab, at the stage of the early caliphate²⁵. In the days of Muḥammad and Abū Bakr there had been an internal war among the Arabs: Mūslims fighting against pagans. In the succeeding period, under 'Umar, this changed into a war of the Muslim Arabs against the unbelievers, who were mainly non-Arab. After the death of 'Umar, the jihād became a war conducted by the Muslim Arabs among themselves. The non-Arab subjects of the caliphate, the mawālī, did not take an active part in these conflicts, At this stage, the jihād became again an internal Arab institution as a struggle amongst Arab tribe, and non-Arabs were in no way interested in its continuance. J. O b e r m a n n believes that the mawālī wars were the last stage in the development of the jihād, that is, war between Muslims of non-Arab descent and Arabs²⁶. Although they had accepted Islam, the mawālī were not granted full rights and privileges by those of the Arab race and it was therefore in these circumstances difficult for them to identify with the Muslim community. Even the very radical Khārijite programmes were not attractive to the mawālī if they maintained the same principles on their status. For this reason, the principles of Shī'ism were much more beneficial for them, although they were in general less radical. From the very beginning, the background of Shī'ism was a struggle for power, with the degree of relationship to the Prophet accepted as the decisive argument which would settle the question of the right to the caliphate. But because from the very beginning 'Alī's group contained people from outside the Arab world, and therefore people who were fortuitous in a dispute where the two sides were aligned according to genealogy, characteristics developed in the movement which could be accepted by people of other tribes. There were serious inner contradictions in the succession struggle itself. There was a gap in the evidence. Equal rights were accorded to two opposing parties using two arguments: family affinity in the case of the 'Alids and tribal affinity to support the Umayyads. This made it possible—and later essential—to interpret and debate the values and rights of the claimants who had come forward, and also the correctness of each of the two standpoints of the 'Alids and the Umayyads according to the principles of legitimism. During these debates, a third possibility was created, which reconciled the other two: granting the right to rule Muslim communities not on the basis of clan or tribal rights but on the basis of moral qualifications and evaluation made by society without entering into questions

²⁵ O b e r m a n n, p. 282.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 282.

of charisma and the resultant ability to hand down from generation to generation. This solution to the conflict put forward by the Khārijites in theory refuted the principle of the priority of the Arab element in the caliphate, although in practice, due to the xenophobia which can be detected in the Khārijites particularly in Iran, this pattern was not shaken. It was only under the influence of members of other tribes which found expression in Shī'ism, that the Khārijite concept of the Prophet's successor lost its hermetic, in-group character and became an open principle, in practice giving access to this highest honour in Islam to representatives of other nationalities. However, the formulating of these egalitarian slogans was not in itself enough to ensure their acceptance by all opposition groups. Those same principles which became to a considerable degree in theory universal among the Khārijites, were understood among the Shī'is to mean that enthronement was dependent on appropriate origins. Although in theory this assumption avoided the question of the dependence of the right to rule a community on the genealogy of the candidate for leadership, this slogan was understood in different ways by Arab and non-Arab converts. Especially the latter which included the very influential and powerful Iranian community adapted it to their traditional customs. The monarchical tradition in the Iranian state was also reflected here in the form of seeking for charisma in the leader. This meant that the circle of those who qualified was very small. We may thus conclude that the way in which the principles for appointing the successor to the Prophet were understood did not depend on their literal meaning, but on the extent to which these principles influenced, or could influence, the current position of the converts, and the influence they could have on their position in the future. Shī'ism, both in the doctrinal and political sphere, was to a considerable degree formed by an ethnically non-Arab, extraneous element which had immigrated to the Arab, Muslim core area, *dār al-Islām*, and it was adapted to the needs of these newcomers. Khārijism did not have these opportunities, for in its original pure form it was a movement which carried on the law of the desert and could not create any possibility for converts of adapting to its principles, because it was a doctrine which was attempting to settle general Muslim conflicts, and those which extended beyond the natural frontiers of the Arab world, through the means that were available to the early desert stages of Islam. This explains why such a radical movement as Khārijism was an isolated movement in Iran, which was the target of both sides: of the Khārijites struggling with the caliphate in Iran, and of Iranians, who were lending support to the struggle, but not taking part in it to the extent might have been expected in view of the fact of their long struggle against their Arab conquerors.

The Khārijites, who formed one of the streams in early Islam, did not accept the principle of legitimism. According to their beliefs, anyone, even a slave, who had been chosen by a Muslim community could become an *imām*. The moral value of the candidate was the decisive criterion, rather than his descent. The Khārijites were the group of 'Alī followers who had left him when he consented to the proposals made by Mu'āwiya. He had acted as arbiter in settling the succession struggle after the death of Muḥammad. Khārijism must have suddenly become

a very important problem, a serious phenomenon affecting the whole state, if the caliph enters into negotiations with them, if special military detachments made up mainly of volunteers (*al-muṭawwi'a*) were used to combat them, and if hired mercenaries were used to deal with the problem²⁷. The first sign of the Khārijite revolt was the uprising in the Helmand delta and in Zarang in 656²⁸, led by Hasak b. 'Attāb. Four years later al-Ashja'a (Farwa b. Nawfal) was responsible for the outbreak of further disturbances, which in some sense developed into the Shahīb rising in 663²⁹. The last decades of the VIIth century brought a great increase in the number of Khārijite uprisings. They broke out over part of Iraq, often originating in the Kūfa and Kirmān. Bahrain was also affected by these uprisings³⁰. Some of these movements, like the Khārijites rebellion in Basra led by Qarib and Zakhāf were basically terrorist and directed against the population, and for this reason the 'āmil of Basra, 'U b a i d a l l ā h b. A b ī B a k r a, tried to use political weapons against them by going among the people with anti-Khārijite agitation. This attempt to use methods of this kind is in itself significant even though it did not yield the required results and the 'āmil of Baṣra had to call in the army to help³¹. The next Khārijite uprising, led by Mutarrif b. al-Mughīra in 695, was more clearly political in character, for it was directed against the policies of Ḥajjāj and his armies in Iṣfahān³². The Khārijites sent emissaries to Iran in an attempt to shape this local movement into a form which would be useful for them³³.

The dogma of the imamate and the method of electing the imām were central in their teaching. When they opposed the Quraishis' claim to the sole right to secession to Muḥammad, they were not yet operating in the same conditions of bitter struggle which characterized the strife between the Khārijites and the caliphate in later years. The Muḥakkima did not exclude the members of the Quraishī clan from among the possible pretenders to the succession. They deprived them only of priority in the contest for the imamate. In their view, the imām should be a man who lived according to the law of the Prophet and thus could be anyone at all, even a slave or in theory a Christian, or a Quraishī. The classification of this clan with Christians and slaves is the only evidence available of the political struggle carried on by the Khārijites against the leaders of Islam in those years. This was their first heresy. The second was their failure to recognise the court of arbitration in the matter of the imamate³⁴. It is surprising that this was considered an error in religious doctrine. Malaṭī reduces

²⁷ Y a ' q ū b ī, *Ta'rikh*, ed. M. Th. H o u t s m a, Lugduni Batavorum 1883, II, p. 386–387.

²⁸ B a l ā d h u r ī, *K. futūḥ al-buldān*, ed. M. de G o e j e, LB 1863, p. 395; B. S p u l e r, *Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden 1952, p. 21.

²⁹ A s h ' a r ī, p. 129; Y ā q ū t, *Mu'jam al-buldān*, ed. F. W ü s t e n f e l d, Leipzig 1866–1873, II, p. 325.

³¹ Ibid., p. 275.

³² S p u l e r, p. 23.

³³ H a m z a a l - I s f a h ā n ī, *Ta'rikh sinī mulūk al-arḍ wa'l-anbiya*, Beirut 1962, pp. 160–161.

³⁴ S h a h r a s t ā n ī, *Milal*, p. 87; A s h ' a r ī, pp. 103, 127, 128.

their beliefs to the thesis: "There is no law but God" (*lā ḥukm illā'llāh*), and adds that they did not agree to arbitration³⁵. The Muḥakkima were not able to develop their scholarship, for their group did not survive long enough, and moreover, because of constant persecution they did not have suitable conditions for theoretical discussions. The Muḥakkima (the real Muḥakkima), who were led before the appearance of Nāfi' b. Azraq al-Ḥanafī by Yazīd b. Unaisa³⁶, were not able to find any territorial base which would accept them. As nomads, they had only loose links with the countryside, and they terrorized the towns. (They also probably terrorized the countryside). M a l a ṭ ī calls them the "bellicose faction"³⁷. From the beginning, the Khārijite doctrine developed in the context of constant confrontation with both the Muslim and non-Muslim world, and the Muḥakkima may serve as an example of the behaviour of a group which because it feels threatened and deprived of allies shows aggression to everything in its environment. Initially, the Khārijites recognized only one division of mankind according to moral worth, but as time passed they became more severe in their attitude to the outside world. The Muḥakkima regarded their opponents in the same way as non-believers (*kāfir*), while the later Azraqites treated them as pagans (*mushrik*)³⁸ which was a higher degree of censure.

When the Azāriqa split away, their first leader was Nāfi' b. Azraq al-Ḥanafī, who died c. 684, but A s h ' a r ī, B a g h d ā d ī and M a l a ṭ ī mention other figures who preceded him: A s h ' a r ī—Yazīd b. Unaisa; B a g h d ā d ī—'Abdallāh b. Waḍīn. M a l a ṭ ī links the Azraqites together in one sub-group with the 'Amriyya, founded by 'Amr b. Qanāt al-Khārijī³⁹. As the reasons for the break-up, he gives differences of opinion on the question of permissibility of spilling Muslim blood, robbing Muslim property and also the custom of taking Muslim children into slavery⁴⁰. After Azraq, of whom I b n R u s h t added that he left no descendants, the leadership was taken over by 'Ubaidallāh b. al-Māḥwaz (Māḥwar) al-Khārijī, who was killed at Ahwāz in battle with the Umayyad general al-Muhallab. Al-Muhallab had been specially brought from as far away as Khurāsān to fight against the Khārijites⁴¹. His full name was Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra. In about 684 the Khārijites overran Khūzistān and the Baṣra region. At that time one of the outstanding Khārijites was Qaṭarī b. al-Fujā'a al-Māzinī. He inherited his name F u j ā ' a from his mother who came from the Tamīm tribe⁴². Q a ṭ a r ī took over the leadership from 'Ubai-

³⁵ M a l a ṭ ī, p. 38.

³⁶ A s h ' a r ī, p. 103.

³⁷ M a l a ṭ ī, p. 38.

³⁸ B a g h d ā d ī, pp. 47–48.

³⁹ A s h ' a r ī, p. 81; M a l a ṭ ī, p. 41; al-Mubarrad, II, p. 171; Y ā q ū t, II, p. 623, III, p. 110.

⁴⁰ M a l a ṭ ī, p. 41.

⁴¹ I b n R u s t a ḥ, *K. al-a'alāq an-nafisa*, ed. M. Goeje, Leiden 1850, P, 217; al-Mubarrad, II, p. 192–240.

⁴² M a s ' ū d ī, *Murūj adh-dhahab*, V, p. 314; I b n Q u t a i b a, *K. al-ma'ārif*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1850, p. 210; al-Mubarrad, II, p. 202 ff.

dallāh⁴³. Before he joined the Khārijites, Qaṭarī had been one of the greatest Arab leader during the march through Iran. He had taken part in the Sīstān campaign in 662⁴⁴. In his youth he had served under ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Samura, and later under Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra al-Azdī. In his description of the conquest of Sīstān, B al ā d h u r ī mentions Qaṭarī as a member of the group of high command (*ashrāf*). It appears that he was then of equal rank to Muhallab with whom he is mentioned on the same footing⁴⁵. In Sīstān he also apparently became friendly with the local inhabitants and formed close relationships with them. The *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* says directly: *bā mardumān-i Sīstān urā dusti-o-ṣuḥbat būda būd*⁴⁶. Only a few individuals had accepted Islam in Sīstān in that period. And so with whom did he become friendly, and with whom did he make contacts? The easy with which Qaṭarī formed “friendships” in Sīstān is surprising in view of what we know of him. I b n a n - N a d ī m mentions him as an orator, which does not tell us much about his character, but A s h ‘ a r ī heard unfavourable reports about him and refers to him as vulgar. Thus these friendships were evidently not ordinary social contacts. For the anonymous *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* notes that when Qaṭarī rebelled in Iraq and was forced to fight “he fought greatly and later sent men to Sīstān who described in detail the course (of the uprising) which he had made in Islam. Both the lords and ordinary people joined him”⁴⁷. It is true that Qaṭarī’s rebellion broke out 27 years after the capitulation of Sīstān but it would be premature to speak of serious success in the spread of Islam in these territories at this time, and the fact that many people joined him, if we are thinking of Iranians, indicates that it was not concern for Islam which motivated them. Therefore these remarks about Islam must be treated as an embellishment made by the chronicler, or we must accept that they referred to the Arabs.

Eloquent testimony to the fact that Sīstān aided this rebellion is provided by the striking of coins of the Arabian-Pahlavi type with the name of Qaṭarī in 694. These were minted in the Sīstān capital of Zarang⁴⁸. The emission of these coins would not have been possible without suitable financial support from Qaṭarī’s Sīstān supporters, nor without the agreement of the Arab authorities who supervised the activities of the mints. In this context it thus seems that there was no mass support

⁴³ I b n a l - K a t h ī r, IX, pp. 30–31.

⁴⁴ M. S. S h a b a n, *The ‘Abbāsid Revolution*, Cambridge 1970, p. 28.

⁴⁵ B al ā d h u r ī, *Futūḥ*, p. 396.

⁴⁶ *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, p. 110.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 110. A l - M u b a r r a d (II, p. 213) states that 70 000 Zoroastrians (majūs) joined the Khārijites, but from the context it appears that this took place before the uprising spread to the eastern regions of Iran.

⁴⁸ E. C. B o s w o r t h, *Sistan under the Arabs*, Rome 1963, p. 52. Coins were struck for Q a ṭ a r ī in the mints at Ardashīr—Khurra, Bishapur, Darābjird, Zarang. Cf. G. C. M i l e s, *Some New Light on the History of Kirman*, in: *The World of Islam. Studies in Honour of Phillip J. Hitti*, London 1960, p. 92. According to A. D. M o r t - m a n n (*Zur Pehlevi — Münzkunde*, ZDMG, 1879 XXXIII, pp. 87–89), the Arabian—Pahlavi coins were struck at Darabgird, in Kirmān and Zarang.

for Qaṭarī from the Sīstān non-Muslims, but rather aid from the local Muslims, of whom the majority were Arabs sent to Sīstān by the caliphate.

We know of earlier examples of participation by Iranians in uprisings led by Arabs. 500 Iranians, probably from the auxiliary detachments of the garrison, took part in the Mukhtār uprising in Kūfa (686–688); this town housed one of the largest Arab garrisons. Later, in 700, the massive uprising led by ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān resulted in the death of 130 000 conspirators, according to Ṭabarī, ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ash‘ath rose against Ḥajjāj and his new fiscal policy. He gained the support of the mawālī, who joined in the revolt. The mawālī insurgents were led by Fīrūz Ḥusain, a great feudal lord who had already converted to Islam. Fīrūz was taken prisoner by the Arabs during the battle for Sīstān, and later in Iraq was still a rich man. The mawālī and dhimmī took the lead in ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān’s rebellion, perhaps because of their higher social standing: they were probably the richest of the Persian rebels. The predominant group among these people were those who had gone over to the Arab side as early as 638 together with their commander at that time, Sijāh al-Uswārī, but who had not in consequence accepted Islam. For transferring their allegiance to the Arabs they had gained some privileges in the capitulation agreement. But in the opinion of the authorities they had broken the condition of obedience to the caliphate by joining in ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān’s rebellion, and Ḥajjāj therefore withdrew these privileges⁴⁹. If they had been Muslims, the law allowing withdrawal of privileges could not have been applied to them, and therefore we may conclude that they had the status of dhimmī. According to the author of the *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, another of the insurgents, ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Amir al-Mujashī, was one of the local notables, an Arab who had fled from the governor of Sīstān, ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān. This involved an internal Arab dispute. The financial aid⁵⁰ which Qaṭarī received from Sīstān may therefore have come from the Arab opposition, which was strong. This is indicated by the fact that when Bū Barda‘a, the lieutenant governor of Sīstān, asked his superior, the governor of Khurāsān for aid in 690, he wrote that there were many Khārijites in Sīstān⁵¹. From the context in which this information appears, we may conclude that he was thinking of the Arabs. Mass support for the rising would have led to disturbances in Sīstān itself—to war and an anti-Arab uprising—but we hear nothing of such things. Moreover, if Qaṭarī had had the support of the masses in Sīstān he would have taken refuge

⁴⁹ *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, p. 115; Balādhurī, *Futūḥ*, pp. 373–374; Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh ar-rusul wa’l-mulūk*, ed. M. de Goeje, Leiden 1879–1901, II, pp. 1015, 1120–1123; E. C. Bosworth, *Sistan under the Arabs*, pp. 17, 60; al-Mubarrad (II, pp. 212–213), calls him Fīrūz Ḥusain.

⁵⁰ There were similar reasons for Mutarīf b. Mughīra’s uprising in Iraq. Cf. Ṭabarī, II, pp. 908–1003; Ya‘qūbī, *Tārīkh*, II, p. 348; W. F. Tucker, *Rebels and gnostics: al-Mughīra, Ibn Sa‘īd and the Mughīriyya*, “Arabica” 1975 XXII, pp. 33–47.

⁵¹ *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, p. 113. Al-Mubarrad writes that Qaṭarī helped the dihqān, who were decidedly hostile to ‘Umar, and hence to the policy of the caliphate in the first years after the conquest of Iran (II, p. 236).

there rather than in Kirmān, a province with which he had not previously maintained close contacts. If we accept that it was only a handful of local Arabs and converts who supported Qaṭarī in Sīstān, then it is easier to understand why he moved to Kirmān. The decisive factor here was the character of the terrain. In Kirmān, the mountains provided suitable conditions for carrying on a guerilla war, which would not have been possible in the flat steppe of Sīstān. When his forces were crushed by Muhallab in Iraq, he first took refuge with his remaining troops in Fārs. Only a handful of his men — about 600 — remained in Iraq under the leadership of Shabīb b. Yazīd, the same commander who was operating until 696 in the Kūfa area, often with success in battle against Ḥajjāj's forces⁵². Qaṭarī remained in Fārs for 19 years and later retreated farther East. Qaṭarī's Azraqites settled in Kirmān in the Jiruft district. This is the version given by B a g h d ā d ī, although Kirmānī claims that they operated only in a narrow strip between Sīrgān and Masir⁵³.

After a few years in Kirmān, they split into three groups. About 10000 remained with Qaṭarī — that is, almost half — while 7000 followed 'Abd Rabbihi al-Kabīr and a third group of about 4000 supported 'Abd Rabbihi aṣ-Ṣaghīr. This information comes from Baghdādī, and it is true that he speaks of "people" who joined one or other of the groups, leaving us uncertain as to what is meant by this term — soliders, believers or sympathizers? However, judging from the long-term war waged between the caliphate and Qaṭarī's Azraqites, there must have been a number of soldiers among them. Qaṭarī and his supporters went to the North, to Ṭabaristān⁵⁴. His stay in this region led the Ispahbad to complain to the Arab authorities, and these complaints suggest that there were Arabs among his Khārijites forces. We know that there were mawālī among his followers, both local Iranians and immigrants from elsewhere⁵⁵. The Arab Khārijites almost certainly had their families with them,

⁵² K e r m ā n ī, *Tārīkh-e Kermān*, ed. B ā s t ā n ī P ā r i z ī, Tehrān 1342, p. 35; Y a ' q ū b ī, *Ta'rikh*, II, pp. 316–317.

⁵³ B a g h d ā d ī, p. 50; I b n a l - A t h ī r, *Al-kāmil fī't-ta'rikh*, ed. C. J. T o r n b e r g, Leiden 1851–1876, IV, p. 112; I b n I s f a n d i y ā r, *An Abridged Translation of the History of Tabaristan*, ed. E. G. B r o w n e, London 1905, pp. 101, 104 ff; a l - M u b a r r a d, II, pp. 236, 237. This sect was found in Sīstān, Khurāsān, Kirmān and Kūhistān. Cf. S h a h r a s t ā n ī, *Milal*, p. 92; Ṭ a b a r ī, II, pp. 387 ff., 583, 753–765; B a l ā d h u r ī, *K. al-ashraf wa akhbārīhim*, ed. W. A h l w a r t d, Grefwald 1883, IV, pp. 112 ff., 158 ff., V, pp. 252, 332, XI, pp. 110–114, 135; S p u l e r, p. 122.

⁵⁴ G. L e v i D e l l a V i d a, *Qaṭarī b. al-Fudjā'a*, EI 1; Y a ' q ū b ī records that they were acting in Kirmān under the leadership of Azraq, which is a mistake (*Ta'rikh*, II, p. 325). Cf. K e r m ā n ī, *Tārīkh-e Kermān*, p. 35. According to the *Mujmal at-tawārīkh wa'l-qīṣṣa*, (ed. M. B a h ā r, Tehrān 1318, p. 303), the Azraqites returned in about 687 from Fārs and Kirmān to Iraq.

⁵⁵ After the collapse of the Khārijites, Muhallab first defeated 'A b d R a b b i h i a ṣ - Ṣ a g h ī r, and next 'A b d R a b b i h i a l - K a b ī r (Y a ' q ū b ī, *Ta'rikh*, II, p. 329). A l - M u b a r r a d records only one: 'A b d R a b b i h i (II, pp. 236, 237). We may conclude that he was thinking of 'A b d R a b b i h i a l - K a b ī r since he states that more than half of the azraqites, about 8000, the majority of whom were mawālī and Persians, followed this 'A b d R a b b i h i.

but the mawālī who were recruited locally probably left them at home. In all, Qaṭarī gathered about 10 000 followers about him ; there may have been a higher proportion of mawālī than Arabs among the Khārijites in Kirmān. This might explain why after the break-up of the Khārijites forces in Kirmān, Qaṭarī left the area and the two dissident leaders remained. Probably it was the local people who remained with the latter, while the Arabs supported Qaṭarī. The Kirmān mountains were a good refuge for people who knew them, or who had local guides. This had for many years been a place of refuge for restless elements. Shabīb b. Yazīd ash-Shaibani, for example, who was operating in Iraq in 695–696 when Qaṭarī was already in Persia, took Kūfa twice and when he was forced to withdraw took refuge here, only to emerge from the Kirmān desert after a certain period of time and return to Iraq⁵⁶.

Qaṭarī's forces were attacked by the Arabs in Ṭabaristān and thrown into disarray. Qaṭarī was killed and the rest of his supporters were defeated at Qumis.

We have well-found reasons for believing that there were Iranians in the Azraqite groups, but there are no data at all on their numbers or role in the movement. If the majority of the mawālī were Iranians, then there should somewhere be some mention of this, but even the correspondence between Ḥajjāj and Muḥallab on combatting the Khārijites in Iran gives no information about this⁵⁷. Neither is there any evidence that the Azraqī uprising in Iran took on the character of any Iranian uprising.

There is a great deal of controversy about many problems concerning the Azraqites. They were undoubtedly attacked by orthodoxy, and it was all the more difficult for them to defend themselves in that they had created a closed organization, which isolated itself from its surroundings, and thus behaved in the same way towards both enemies and sympathizers who were prepared to co-operate with them. Sympathizers could only become members of the sect by passing an examination in politics and after the sincerity of their intentions had been checked. Azraqite novices were brought a prisoner and ordered to kill him. If the novice killed the prisoner then it was accepted that he truly desired to join the sect, but if he hesitated to commit the murder, then he was considered a pagan and fraud, for which he was put to death. The Azraqites developed the uncompromising principle—which later spread to other extreme Khārijite factions—that the death penalty should also be applied to the wives and children of their enemies. And according to Azāriqa beliefs, the children of their enemies were destined for eternal damnation in hell. People who recognized the taqiyya both in words and deeds were also removed from the circle

⁵⁶ 'A b d a r - R a ḥ m ā n first withdrew from the Kūfa region to Baṣra, thence to Fārs, next to Kirmān and then on to Sīstān (*Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, p. 116). I ṣ ṭ a k ḥ r ī states that the majority of the inhabitants of the Qafs mountains in Kirmān were Arabs (op. cit., p. 142).

⁵⁷ Ṭ a b a r ī, II, p. 972–976; I b n a l - A t h ī r, IV, p. 348; B a g h d ā d ī, pp. 68–69; I b n a l - K a t h ī r, IX, pp. 12–14, 17–20; B o s w o r t h, p. 47; L a o u s t, p. 40.

of the faithful⁵⁸. In discussion of the succession question, the Azraqites pronounced—still within the Arab context—that ‘Uthmān, Ṭalha az-Zubair, ‘A’isha, ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Abbās and their followers were unbelievers and as such were condemned to eternal damnation. We can therefore observe a clear move towards increasing rigour in relation to opponents. For at first, only the Quraishī were condemned and deprived of their privileged position. Later, when discipline was increased and the principle of isolation from their surroundings began to be wholeheartedly enforced, others were also denied equal rights. When one Arab girl in the Azraqite sect wanted to marry a mawālī the group did not consent to the marriage and instead married her to one of her own race, against her will⁵⁹. As isolationists, the Azraqites were opposed to conversion by force⁶⁰, which was not a symptom of tolerance but stemmed from the principle of division of mankind into better and worse. And moreover, for those of their own circle who broke their oath, they had only one punishment—stoning, a punishment which did not figure in the Qur’ān. This punishment was also to be applied, according to Azraqite beliefs, to those who behaved disrespectfully towards respected persons or was affronted the dignity of women etc. Their intolerance was also seen in the punishment laid down for theft: the cutting off of thief’s hands.

B a g h d ā d ī draws attention to the evolution of these doctrinal changes. Initially, the Azraqites were a relatively tolerant sect, above all towards the Muḥakkima from whom they stemmed⁶¹. But soon two groups took shape among them. The first group, which was more conciliatory and tolerant, was led by one of the first Azraqites, Nāfi’ b. Azraq. Azraq probably took over the leadership of the Azraqites after the death of ‘Abdallah b. Waḍīn in 679. His pronouncements about other Khārijites branches were moderate. The extreme wing, which was formed after the disintegration of the Azraqites, was led by ‘Abd Rabbihi al-Kabīr (The Elder) and ‘Abd Rabbihi aṣ-Ṣaghīr (The Younger). The first of these leaders was responsible for the thesis that it was necessary to differentiate two groups of non-Azraqite foreigners and to treat them differently: those who stayed at home during war should be forgiven for the fact that they did not join the Azraqites, but those who fought against the Azraqites should be condemned⁶², which obviously implied the necessity of taking up arms against them.

In this period, at this stage in the development of Khārijism, the Azraqites were receiving help from the local Iranian population which is what kept them in existence, for they were mainly active in Kirmān, far from their home territory. The local

⁵⁸ B a g h d ā d ī, p. 48; A s h ‘ a r ī, pp. 86–87, 88, 89.

⁵⁹ A s h ‘ a r ī, p. 88.

⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 86, 88–89.

⁶¹ B a g h d ā d ī, p. 48; A s h ‘ a r ī, pp. 86–87. The law that women should during menstruation cease to pray and observe a ritual fast (R. R u b i n a c c i, *Azariḳa*, EI 2) is taken over from other religions. This was preserved in a similar form in late Ismailism. Cf. N ā ṣ i r - i K h u s r a w, *Wajh-i dīn*, Tehrān 1343, p. 249.

⁶² A s h ‘ a r ī, p. 86. A l - M u b a r r a d presents N ā f i ‘ as an extreme Khārijite (II, pp. 180–181).

non-Muslim population either joined with them or co-operated with them. This is confirmed by a very interesting comment in the sources that the Azraqites persecuted those who thought that they were Jews, Christians or Zoroastrians. They must therefore have come into contact with these groups and have acted in concert with them. These unavoidable broad-scale contacts forced them to enclose themselves more strictly within their own sect in order to retain their own specific character, and at the same time forced them to treat with greater tolerance those from outside their own group who did not want to make war and so maintained neutrality. This latter group may have been made up of local people, as has been indicated by the later development of Khārijism. In this context the Azraqites split into those who refrained from taking part in war, and their opponents. The leader of this new schismatic group, Najda b. 'Āmir al-Ḥanafī al-Khārijī⁶³ was himself uncompromisingly ruthless on this question, and was in favour of killing opponents. He led a group of warriors away from the Azraqites. He was later renowned for the fact that his soldiers robbed and murdered, but that he at the same time gained considerable influence can be seen from M a l a ṭ ī's account, although this does not state in which circles Najda was popular. He had military ideas which were suitable for a military camp but not for a partisan group. He tried to introduce strict discipline in his group, believing that any deviation from Khārijite principles was reason for exclusion from the body of the faithful—and the making of any kind of mistake was regarded as deviation from Khārijite principles, as was also the telling of even the smallest lie. However, Najda also took the point of view that it was not the formal sin committed that decided the degree of guilt, but the intention of the sinner. And this could be measured by the attitude of the sinner to the mistake that he had made. Thus a minor sin which was constantly and stubbornly committed entailed more guilt than a more serious sin which was, however, committed by chance. The drinking of wine, adultery, dissolute living and theft were forbidden, but were punished according to the frequency with which the sinner committed them.

This provides an example of highly social active sects which took shape under the threat of further disintegration. Opinions about them are divided. The information about their ruthlessness is widely confirmed. M a l a ṭ ī's writing on the subject supplements A s h ' a r ī's text; the latter states that the Khārijites from these sects spilled the blood of the local settlers (*ahl al-maqām*), and considered that it was a permissible act to take the property of these people (*dār at-taqiyya*)⁶⁴. The Najdiyya, like the Azraqite, also had xenophobic tendencies however it seems that Najda himself did not support such an idea. In Najda's teachings we can find indications of changes that were to come later, and a more tolerant attitude to heretics. This teaching is basically on the concept of major and minor sins, and its proponents attempted to classify guilt according to the attitude of the sinner himself to his sin. The principle

⁶³ Ibid., pp. 176–177, A s h ' a r ī, p. 89. A l - M u b a r r a d (II, p. 177) gives the correspondence between these two heresiarchs.

⁶⁴ A s h ' a r ī, p. 89.

of relativity was introduced, without application of the principle of *badā'*, and this permitted heretics to be treated more leniently if they showed a desire to become converts, for it was not in itself making of mistake that entailed the greatest guilt, but only stubborn persistence in the sin.

Najda abandoned his liberalism because of the hostile attitude of the opposition within the sect; he demanded that his opponents do the same, but they remained intransigent. An internal struggle began and Najda was killed in a coup carried out by Abū Fudaik. Najda's group now split into three: the followers of Najda, who called Najdiyya, the Fudaikiyya, taking their name from Abū Fudaik and the 'Aṭawiyya⁶⁵. The exact time at which this split took place, which is of fundamental significance in the history of Khārijism in Persia, is practically impossible to pin-point. According to *Baḡh dā dī*⁶⁶, Najda himself carried out the division before his death, but the writings of *Shahrastānī*⁶⁷ and *Ash'arī*⁶⁸ indicate that it took place only after the death of Najda. Other sources, which have unfortunately not been identified⁶⁹, give Abū Fudaik as the successor to Najda; that does not accord with the sources cited above. *Ash'arī* (loc. cit) records that after the assassination of Najda, the followers of Abū Fudaik recognized him as their leader, but these were never the whole of the Najdiyya. It was only the Fudaikiyya faction. The 'Aṭawiyya did not join the Fudaikiyya.

'Aṭiyya b. Aswād was a *'āmil* of Najda and the differences between him and Fudaik were derived from tribal question and probably for these reasons there was no place in Arabia for the 'Aṭawiyya. This group had to move to the Iranian shore of the Persian Gulf and take refuge in regions which were by now the traditional sanctuary of Khārijite emigres. The appearance of this further anti-caliphate group in Persia did not result only from the influence of the Iranian world on Khārijism, but from internal Arab conflicts. *Malatī* writes that tribal differences lay at the bottom of the split. If this is true, then the large numbers of the population of East Persia who, according to *Shahrastānī* (loc. cit) joined the 'Aṭawiyya, must have been basically local Arabs, and the causes of the conflict and split within the Najdiyya were identical with those leading to the split among the Arabs in Khurāsān in the mid-VIIIth century. However, for no apparent reason, the sources do not give information on the beliefs of the 'Aṭawiyya or give details of what differentiated them from the Fudaikiyya, or their attitude to Najdiyya orthodoxy. If Abū Fudaik was the leader of a military group, we may perhaps assume that in contrast the 'Aṭawiyya might have been less military.

The first phase of Khārijite agitation ended during the reign of 'Umar II (717–

⁶⁵ *Baḡh dā dī*, pp. 50–53; *Shahrastānī*, *Milal*, pp. 91–92; *Ash'arī*, p. 92.

⁶⁶ *Baḡh dā dī*, p. 51.

⁶⁷ *Shahrastānī*, *Milal*, p. 92.

⁶⁸ *Ash'arī*, p. 92.

⁶⁹ *Bosworth*, p. 88.

720), and is marked by the Baṣṭām Khārijite uprising which occurred after the death of Shabīb and the fall of Najda⁷⁰.

In 724 'Abū al-Karīm b. 'Ajarrad was arrested on the orders of the governor of Iraq and condemned to 14 long years in prison. We do not know much about him. He was born in Balkh, which does not mean that he must have been of Iranian nationality. He belonged initially to the 'Aṭawiyya faction of the Najdiyya; Shahrastānī emphasises that he had been a member of the group led by Abū Baihas, the Baihasiyya, but had left it for doctrinal reasons. Ash'arī maintains that this split resulted from the question of the purchase of slaves (*bai' al-ama*). This problem permeated Khārijite doctrine in that period. According to some sources, Abū Baihas al-Haisam b. Jābir, who lived in the reign of the caliph Walīd (705–715), was originally a member of the Ṣufriyya or Ibrāhīmiyya⁷¹, and according to others, of the Maimūniyya⁷². His sect was very tolerant, and recognized the authority of the civil powers, which embraced a variety of the principle of *cuius regio eius religio* unknown in Islam apart from this. They believed that if the imam was found to be a sinful man and unbeliever, then the odium of this fell on all his followers and subjects⁷³. The question of whether someone was a believer or unbeliever was to be decided by a local, official lieutenant, the wālī, before whom the accused was brought and before whom the sinner should acknowledge his guilt⁷⁴. In this they resembled the Ṣufriyya, who called on the authority of the civil powers in judgement on sin (*ilā's-sultān*)⁷⁵.

The Baihasiyya were not a sect of nomads and men living by the sword, but were producers who attracted people from the lowest strata of society in the countryside and also, perhaps, to towns. They believed that faith was a state composed of knowledge (*ilm*), acceptance (*iqrār*) and work (*amal*). The essence of faith was complete devotion and complete acceptance, shown not in the observance of external forms but in total spiritual devotion. They did not believe that unbelief was a sin. This belief made it possible for them to draw closer to and make contacts with the dhimmī, because their criterion in moral classification was not knowledge in itself but questions about what is the truth from those who were still in a state of unbelief. In this way, their neighbours were obliged to recognize their authority and they in turn were to co-operate with their neighbours. However, the commission of a sin could not be excused on the grounds of ignorance. For God does not steer man in all his actions but leaves him free choice. Only children are not responsible for their deeds. On the question of children, they took the same view as the Tha'ālibiyya sect, assuming that children belonged to the same category as their parents: that

⁷⁰ Ash'arī, p. 92; Ibn al-Kathīr, IX, pp. 187–220; Laoust, p. 41.

⁷¹ Baghdādī, p. 54.

⁷² Ash'arī, p. 113.

⁷³ Baghdādī, p. 67.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 68; Shahrastānī, *Milal*, p. 94.

⁷⁵ Ash'arī, p. 119.

is, believers or unbelievers⁷⁶. Abū Baihas was supposed to have been honoured as a prophet⁷⁷, but this information seems hardly credible.

A new stream in the Khārijite movement was begun by 'Abd al-Karīm b. 'Ajarad, and factions of this were later active in Iran, in Sīstān and Kirmān. The 'Ajarida sect differed from all the others found in Iran in that it absorbed many elements of Iranian tradition. There was conflict and war among the 'Ajarida factions. They formed groups which fought relentlessly, and denoted for themselves zones of influence which they guarded jealously. This could not have been caused by doctrinal differences, since they were not such a large group that it would have been impossible to find common ground for agreement. Rather, the regionalization of their activities reflects the growth of the political ambitions of the 'Ajarida leaders, and their desire to define their influence in terms of territory. This was as yet immature substitute for a state organization. From military activities which had been initially undefined in territorial terms and which could develop in any place (the Khārijites were not connected with their field of activities but with doctrine), they were now becoming more permanently linked with the local population and the Khārijites must to some extent have come under their influence. Wars broke out between the Khārijites of Sīstān and the Khārijites of Kirmān. These were areas which had for centuries been at odds with each other, but not in the history of the Khārijite movement. These wars show that elements of the Iranian tradition had passed into the Iranian Khārijite movement.

Relations with non-believers formed one of the fundamental theses of 'Ajarida doctrine. Formerly, the Azraqites, who were the forerunners of the 'Ajarida, had stated that the property of an enemy should be taken. This was linked with the constant problem of the Khārijites: their attitude to the children of unbelievers. On both these points, the 'Ajarida view was more tolerant than that of the Azraqites. According to 'Ajarida ethics, it was only possible to take the property of enemies after their death—and therefore before stealing anything it became necessary to kill the owner. This was not a cruel thesis leading to wholesale slaughter. On the contrary, it made the seizure of property more difficult, since it set a certain condition before it could be effected. The 'Ajarida did not say that the enemy had to be killed. As might be expected from knowledge of the development of Khārijism, the 'Ajarida were also more tolerant than their predecessors in their attitude to the children of unbelievers and in fact to the whole group of unbelievers in general, in contrast to the Azraqites who had said that they should be treated uncompromisingly. The behaviour of Qaṭarī b. al-Fujā'a in Ṭabaristān may serve as an example here. The Khārijites gradually made Iran their home. In Sīstān they took up weaving, and traces of this could still be found at the beginning of the present century⁷⁸. In these circumstances, a distinction between a group of warriors and those remaining at

⁷⁶ Shahrastānī, *Milal*, p. 94.

⁷⁷ Malatī, p. 137.

⁷⁸ G. P. Tate, *Seistan. A Memoir on the History, Topography, Ruines and Peoples of the Country*, Calcutta 1910, p. 209.

home was ever less realistic, and they had to abandon the concept ; they had also to replace enmity towards the native population with a desire for reconciliation. They began to preach that there was a moral obligation to explain their faults to the unbelievers, and to tolerate their incomplete subordination⁷⁹.

The 'Ajārīda had come into contact with the teaching of the Greeks and Aristotelian logic, on the evidence of the anecdote about the dispute between Maimūn and Shu'aib about the return of a debt. Shu'aib, who was in debt to Maimūn, supported the concept that God steered the actions of man refused to return the debt, arguing as follows: since God steers all the actions of man, the fact that he did not wish to return the debt meant that it was the will of God that he should not return it⁸⁰. This is a syllogism derived from Greek teaching which had come to Islam indirectly from the Syrian or Egyptian community and next the Mu'tazilites. Khārijism was subject to Mu'tazilite influence, and this was the origin of the Khārijite teaching that Muslims were condemned to eternal damnation for major sins. This concept was introduced to Khārijism by Wāṣil b. 'Aṭā' (died c. 750). This heresy founded by him rejected the attributes of God, and believed in free will and eternal damnation. It also made it as duty to rebel against a false imām, and imposed acquiescence in what was right⁸¹.

It is impossible to establish the exact order in which the various currents within the 'Ajarida developed. The sub-sects had no uniform structure. One of the most tolerant 'Ajarida groups were the followers of the teachings of Ṣalt b. 'Uthmān called also Ṣalt b. Abī Ṣalt. This group split away from the main 'Ajarida movement because of disagreement on the question of unbelievers. Ṣalt pronounced that it was possible to maintain friendship with every one who considered himself to be a Muslim or intended to become one, but considered that it was necessary to keep clear of the children of unbelievers until they had come of age and decided to join the Muslim community. This led to the formation of a group among the followers of Ṣalt who believed that these children could be neither enemies nor friends, but that when they grew up they should be converted to Islam⁸². Another group, however, went further, claiming that it was obligatory to maintain a friendly attitude even to the children of pagans until such time as they came of age and decided whether or not to accept Islam⁸³. Although the Ṣalt group did not develop great influence, it is of great significance for us : for their teachings indicate the contemporary trends in Khārijite teachings. These show a tendency towards greater tolerance in relation to neighbouring communities and to new members who had been recruited among the recently converted.

The majority of the 'Ajarida could be divided into followers of Maimān and

⁷⁹ B a g h d ā d ī, pp. 55-56 ; S h a h r a s t ā n ī, *Milal*, p. 95 ; p. 95; A s h ' a r ī, p. 92.

⁸⁰ B a g h d ā d ī, p. 57; A s h ' a r ī, p. 94.

⁸¹ L a o u s t, p. 52.

⁸² B a g h d ā d ī, p. 58; A s h ' a r ī, pp. 93, 97.

⁸³ S h a h r a s t ā n ī, *Milal*, p. 96; cf. also A s h ' a r ī, p. 97.

followers of Shu'aib. The latter split away from Maimūn's group apparently as a result of discord between the leaders. The distinction between good and evil was linked for the Maimūniyya with their attitude to their ruler. This was later to lead among the Ḥamziyya to the evolution of the question of class conflict and the categorization of the enemy environment according to religious and class criteria, but for the Maimūniyya it produced a weakening of the importance of the criteria of religious faith because of the greater emphasis placed on social problems: the Maimūniyya believed that the children of unbelievers went to paradise, and they were tolerant towards other sects. We do not possess data on the exact social composition of the Maimūniyya, and therefore the distinction that they made between the ruled and the rulers is not entirely clear. Their opponents accused them of heretical opinions on the question of free will and ability to act (*qadar*). These were the accusations levelled by the followers of Khalaf when they left the ranks of Maimūniyya. They stated that this teaching excluded the Maimūniyya from being considered a Muslim sect. Although the Khārijites very frequently declared anathema against each other, this particular pronouncement seems to be significant. According to A s h ' a r ī, Abū Baihas accused Maimūn of heresy (*Maimūnan kafara*) because he forbade the purchase of white slaves (*bai' al-mamlūka*) in the lands of unbelievers (*fī dār kuffār*). A s h ' a r ī repeats this again elsewhere which suggests that it is not merely chance information. This accusation at first seems incomprehensible as the crowning evidence of incorrect thinking, but it looks somewhat different in the context of political and social practice. In this light, Maimūn appears as the protector of the Iranian population, for it was the Iranians, still Zoroastrians on a mass scale, who lived in the lands of the unbelievers. Maimūn, as we have already noted, was born in Balkh. Maybe he was an Iranian? This hypothesis receives a certain degree of confirmation from the fact that exceptionally interesting early Iranian, pre-Muslim influences can be traced in the Maimūniyya marriage law. There is no discussion of Maimūn's teaching on this point in the literature, but the character and source of his heresy are indicated by what S h a h r a s t ā n ī, B a g h d ā d ī and A s h ' a r ī write about him. It is not, however impossible that part of the account of Maimūn's activities given by these authors came from one source and is thus simply a three-fold repetition of the same information. B a g h d ā d ī calls this teaching "the religion of magians". Perhaps what Maimūn was accused of by other Khārijites in fact concerned exactly this question, which seems to have been linked with the question of the purchase of slaves. Maimūn permitted certain amendments to the marriage law of the Qur'ān. He allowed marriage with brothers' daughters, of daughters and the children of the latter and even with the daughter of man's own daughters⁸⁴. This is B a g h d ā d ī version. A s h ' a r ī gives a version with an even more tightly-knit circle: the Maimūniyya allowed marriage with the daughter of sons, and with the daughter of brothers (of sisters—accord. to H. R i t t e r) and the daughters of brothers' sons. However, marriage with daughter, brothers (or sisters) daughters

⁸⁴ B a g h d ā d ī, p. 205.

was forbidden⁸⁵. This changes in the Maimūniyya sect⁸⁶ could have resulted from the conscious policy of the leader, or more probably, from influence exerted by Iranians who transferred their own tradition to their new surroundings. This need not necessarily have been brought by newly-converted Zoroastrians for behavioural norms in this field are long-lived.

The majority of the Sīstānī Khārijites belonged to the Khāzimiyya until Sistan was conquered by Ḥamza b. Adrak at the turn of the VIIIth and IXth centuries. The Khāzimiyya took the same line as the Sunnis on the matter of free will and ability to act (*qadar*), believing that if there was one God, then this meant that nothing took place save from him, as the one Creator, and that everything was dependent on his will. As would be expected from the history of the development of Khārijism in Persia, they were more tolerant than their predecessors and took a relative viewpoint even on so fundamental question as their attitude to unbelievers: the opinion of one man about another has no value in terms of God's judgment, for He may raise a slave and damn a believer. This may happen at any point in life, and therefore the last moments of life and last acts are decisive. A good act wipes out former sins, and an evil act cancels former good deeds. Conversion to Islam wiped out everything evil which had been committed in life, that is the whole period before conversion. The Sunnis did not acknowledge this, and the behaviour of the caliphate towards the mawālī also rejected it. In the eyes of the authorities, the acceptance of the faith did not wipe out the sin of unbelief, for the newly-converted non-Arab was not a Muslim with full rights. Although this viewpoint was not formulated in Sunnism as a dogma, nonetheless its social implications were the same. However, the Khāzimiyya believed in the perfectibility of man and the preponderance of good characteristics over evil, which entailed the possibility of wiping out sins at any moment. It is in this that the influence of early Iranian ethics can be seen⁸⁷. The fundamental thesis of the doctrine of the Khāzimiyya, that there is no God but Allāh, opened up the way to logical speculation. The Mu'tazilites tried to broaden the narrow framework of the Qur'ān with the help of Greek logic⁸⁸. The followers of Maimūn borrowed this method from them, and this was one of the accusations levelled against them by Khārijite orthodoxy⁸⁹. The traces of the influence of logic have already been emphasised by an example, at the literal level an anecdote. God has created all possible acts, from which people choose those which are suitable for themselves⁹⁰.

⁸⁵ Shahrastānī, *Milal*, p. 96; Baghdādī, pp. 57, 200–201; Ash'arī, pp. 93, 95; N. B. E. Baille, *A Digest of Moohummudan Law*, Lahore 1965, I, p. 23, II, p. 12; A. A. A. Fyzee, *Outlines of Muhammadan Law*, Oxford 1960, p. 88.

⁸⁶ Ibn Miskawayh, *Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate*, ed. H. F. Amedroz, D. S. Margoliouth, Oxford 1920–1931, II, 357, V, 330.

⁸⁷ G. Windegren, *Les religions de l'Iran*, Paris 1968, p. 231.

⁸⁸ H. A. R. Gibb, *Mahometanism*, Warszawa 1965, p. 87.

⁸⁹ This is confirmed by Ash'arī, p. 93.

⁹⁰ This was taken from Shu'aibiyya doctrine, cf. Shahrastānī, *Milal*, p. 97; Baghdādī, pp. 56–57; Ash'arī, pp. 94–95.

This joining together of free will with the omnipresence of God represented a limitation of the free will of man to the will of God. This gave rise to a tautology that all creation is subject to the will of the Creator, and therefore man, as a created thing, is subject to the same. This tautology poses the basic question: do all deeds, including evil deeds, stem from God? Shu'aib's extremely consistent standpoint on this question was not supported by the chief doctrinarian, 'Ajarrad⁹¹. Maimūn and his group rejected these Sunnite beliefs on the very point of free will (*qadar*), which was held by the Khālafīyya as well as the Khāzīmīyya, that is, the Khārijites of Kirmān and Makrān. They were involved in uncompromising combat with the disciples of Ḥamza who acknowledged similar teachings to those of Maimūn on the question of free will. The split of the Khāzīmīyya into the Ma'lūmīyya and Majhūlīyya is confirmed only by the influence of Iranians on the doctrine of the Khāzīmīyya. These two sects differed from the main stream of the movement in one rather exceptional belief. The Ma'lūmīyya defined unbelievers as those who did not know all the names of God, while the Majhūlīyya were less relentless and did not require that all the names should be known. Both sects made the choice of the imām dependent on his leadership abilities, but they adopted an understanding attitude to those who stayed at home instead of going to war⁹².

The accession of Iranians to the movement made Khārijism conservative. The Ḥamza sect, which proclaimed social equality, a struggle with the authorities and officials, and an anarchist programme to disorganize the administrative apparatus of the caliphate in Eastern Persia, became ever more a Sistani sect as it became more Iranianized, and this local particularism again led the East Iranian Khārijites into an isolated position. Ḥamza fought with the Khālafīyya Khārijites in Kirmān, with the Khāzīmīyya in the Harāt district, and with the Tha'ālībīyya in the Nīshāpūr region. And in Khurāsān and Sīstān, Ḥamza was persecuted and unrelentingly tracked down by the Arab authorities and local feudal nobility⁹³. Ḥamza's political platform encouraged activity among the Iranians. Ḥamza believed, clearly following Maimūn, that it was laudable to kill those who submitted to the authorities. This was a step forward in the struggle with the caliphate from the position adopted by Maimūn. Ḥamza tolerated those who maintained friendly neutrality, and he did not persecute opponents of his teaching if they did not combine this with support for the civil authorities (*sultān*). Theft of property and the killing of Muslims were forbidden⁹⁴. The Azraqites did not apply this to Muslims from other groups. Malatī's opinion seems to have been closest to the truth which can be found in the chronicles of *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* and *Tārīkh-i Baihaq*: that the followers of Ḥamza accepted the concept of the Ḥarūrīyya, and did not allow property to be taken while

⁹¹ B a g h d ā d ī, p. 57.

⁹² Ibid., p. 58; A s h ' a r ī, p. 96.

⁹³ B a g h d ā d ī, p. 59; *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, p. 162. The Tha'ālībīyya, were a large faction within Khārijism, cf. S h a h r a s t ā n ī, *Milal*, p. 98; A s h ' a r ī, p. 97; B a g h d ā d ī, pp. 61-63.

⁹⁴ A s h ' a r ī, pp. 93-94.

the owner was alive, and that in order not to break this commandment they sought out the owner of property, killed him, and were then able to take his property in accordance with their own code of ethics⁹⁵.

Ḥamza operated outside the big towns; he controlled agricultural regions. It was the lower classes of society who joined him. If this meant Iranian peasants (although there were also Arabs among the Ḥamziyya), then the Maimūniyya probably recruited townspeople, in contrast. Apart from a different attitude to work, which was a problem not brought up by Ḥamza, these sects also disagreed expressly in their later stages on doctrine. Ḥamza led the Khārijite uprising in Sīstān for many years. His doctrine, as understood and studied by the experts on religion and theologians cited, reveals some perplexing points. Some contradictions can be found which may be explained as the result of a series of changes. Ḥamza in general agreed with Maimūn on the question of free will, but he believed that God punishes men for the very acts which He himself laid down should be carried out. According to the Khālafiyya, this was a contradiction in Ḥamza's teaching. It seems that this point in Ḥamza's teaching was the result of successive changes in viewpoints on the matter. The Khāzimiyya, the sect to which he belonged initially—that is, before proclaiming his teaching on free will—excommunicated him when he accepted the principle of qadariyya (ability to act) which had been proclaimed by the sect of the same name. After breaking away on his own, Ḥamza proclaimed a new thesis on the fate of the children of pagans, whom he condemned to eternal damnation. This led to a further excommunication—he was now expelled from the Qadariyya, who called him an unbeliever. Ḥamza replied to that with the following thesis: anyone who did not follow him and did not accept that all enemies from other Muslim sects should be killed, was himself an unbeliever and pagan. This was obviously in retaliation to the repression practiced against his sect on all sides: by the Khārijites, non-Khārijites and caliphate, as well as the police authorities. For Ḥamza was aiming at the destruction of the state authority by sporadic raids and disorganization of the administrative apparatus. We can find no indication in the *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, which provides the most exhaustive record of the history of the sect, that Ḥamza had any constructive plan for the structure of the state during his struggle with the caliphate. For Ḥamza appealed to the poor rural population, who had no desire to construct a great state organization which might cover an area larger than their immediate neighbourhood. And it appears from the *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* that Ḥamza's original plan was the same as theirs.

Two factions developed within the Ḥamziyya in the years 810–820 after the first military failures: a conservative and an innovatory faction. Both factions recognized Ḥamza's authority and he was able to keep them on his side by agreeing both to social radicalism—which was a concession to the conservative wing—and to plunder,

⁹⁵ M a l a ṭ ī, pp. 142–143; S h a h r a s t ā n ī, *Milal*, p. 96; B a g h d ā d ī, p. 59; A s h ' a r ī, p. 93–94; M a q r ī z ī, *Al-khiṭaṭ*, Kair 1270, II, p. 355.

which was advocated by the newcomers to the sect⁹⁶. This compromise was also reflected in his teachings. Ḥ a m z a maintained that for a certain period of time before the enemy was defeated and it became possible to proclaim the teaching freely to the faithful, it was possible for two imāms with equal rights to co-exist simultaneously. This may be explained as admitting the possibility of the existence of two leaders for two factions within the sect.

Ḥ a m z a's deeds were recorded during his lifetime or shortly thereafter by the Sistanian Khārijites in the *Kitāb-i maghāzī-yi Ḥamza* (*Book of the marches of Ḥamza*). This idea was put forward by M. B a h ā r in *Sabkshenāsī*. In this work Ḥamza figures as a relative of the Prophet. In the person of Ḥamza thus conceived there were in fact two different figures with similar names, one of whom contributed the deeds. Ḥamza's deeds—those of the Khārijite leader and of his namesake from the heroic Arab epoch—were so intermingled in the one story that their actual historical pattern is lost and it is impossible to separate history from myth⁹⁷.

Particularly in the initial phase of the movement, the Ḥamziyya were mainly Arabs; or at least Arabs dictated the whole character of the group⁹⁸. The conflicts between the Sīstān and Kirmān Khārijites were not based exclusively on doctrinal issues. In Kirmān and Makrān, the Khārijites' movement clearly did not accept Iranian elements. The Maimūniyya, who were doctrinally a superior sect to the Ḥamziyya, rejected the killing allowed to kill opponents who behaved passively and said nothing ill of the Maimūniyya. And once again, in a similar context, we meet with the problem of work as a moral category. For the Maimūniyya, this was a criterion for evaluating the worth of an individual, but they understood it differently from the Baihasiyya. Work was not a component of faith (*imām*), which had made it possible for the Baihasiyya to relate the activity of man. This is popularly described as work to the sphere of mystical fulfilment. The purpose of work and its usefulness in itself may be completely divorced from its material, physical aim. The Baihasiyya understood that this need not be real work, or transformation of the environment, but could be a stage in progress towards a higher level of spiritual perfection, a higher degree of faith. It was only in the teaching to the Maimūniyya that work and its function was made concrete. With them, work became a source of knowledge and a means of liberation. It was a productive activity and was therefore numbered among economic activities⁹⁹.

Questions of the organization of the community of the faithful were predominant in the early phases of Khārijism. It was the local communities which decided on such earthly matters as the imamate. The Khārijite groups living in Iran in isolation, at a lower level of civilization than surrounding society, were not concerned with social matters. When they lived in isolation, they built up their structure without

⁹⁶ *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, p. 178; *Tārīkh-i Baihaq*, al-Baihaqī, ed. Bahmān y ā r, Tehrān 1318, p. 267.

⁹⁷ M. B a h ā r, *Sabkshenāsī*, Tehrān, I, p. 284.

⁹⁸ *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, p. 159.

⁹⁹ A s h ' a r ī, pp. 95, 113.

taking into account the possibility of stabilization, but their gradually increasing contacts with the region where they were living led first to dreams of stabilization and renunciation of war, and next to union with the neighbouring society, which brought with it an increase in the authority of the rulers, and an intermingling of their secular power and their dogmatic and normative role in ethics. The problem of attitude to authority appears in the teachings of Maimūn as a new criterion for evaluating a man. Maimūn in this case used the term "sultān", which covered the whole administrative apparatus of the caliphate and its local agencies. The power of the Umayyad governors was so great, and their policies so troublesome that when we read about the authorities in the teachings of a local sect leader we should understand primarily the local authorities: governors, lieutenants and their deputies¹⁰⁰, and also the very unpopular 'āmils¹⁰¹. Maimūn ordered that the close associates of the sultan should be combatted, which in this context probably referred primarily to the authorities in the province where he was operating. His discussions, carried out in the spirit of Mu'tazilite teaching, on the attitude of God to good and evil deeds and on predestination as a result of obedience and the submission of man to the will of God, came from the assumptions of the Qur'ān and were far removed from current social and political matters.

In the VIIth century a local element took part in many of the anti-Umayyad uprisings in Iran, but this participation was on rather a small scale. Either there were few Iranian participants, or those who took part in the uprisings could be described as renegades. It is impossible to find a slogan which might have galvanized the Iranians among the uprisings of the VIIth century, whether Khārijites or those like 'Abd ar-Raḥmān's uprising. The idea of a struggle to ensure the purity of Islam and its accordance with the original principles, which is what Muhtar and 'Abd ar-Raḥmān were fighting for, was an internal Arab problem, or at the most, an internal Muslim problem.

The dhimmī brought to Khārijism—already at the Azraqite stage—a belief connected with tolerance and opposed to Umayyad legitimism. This allowed a great deal of freedom in choosing a religious leader. For they proclaimed that God could entrust the mission of Prophet even to a man whom he knew would become unbeliever after the expiry of his mission, and would commit minor or even major sins. According to Shahrastānī, this was their seventh heresy¹⁰². When they totally refused to acknowledge everything that existed in the caliphate, and considered Muslims to be their enemies, the Khārijites became the natural allies of all those who were in conflict with the caliphate even for reasons different from their own,

¹⁰⁰ The successful assassination of the Sīstān governor Ma'n in 769 by the Khārijites may serve as an example of this. Cf. Ya'qūbī, *Tārīkh*, II, pp. 462–463; Ya'qūbī, *K. al-buldān*, ed. M. de Goeje, Leiden 1891, p. 285; *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, pp. 144–147. After the assassination of Ma'n, pogroms were organized against the Khārijites, initiated by the son of the victim, Yazīd b. Mazīd b. Akhihi (Ya'qūbī, *Tārīkh*, II, p. 463).

¹⁰¹ *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, p. 159.

¹⁰² Shahrastānī, *Milal*, p. 90.

like for example, the *mawālī* and *dhimmi*. It was not the doctrine of Khārijism which decided the attitude of these two groups, but the active approach of the members of the sect in the fight with the representatives of the caliphate. At times, the Khārijites had behaved in a hostile fashion towards the Iranians, as had other Arabs¹⁰³. The Khārijites programme could only appeal to the *dhimmi* if they accepted the domination of Islam, and thus the domination of the conquerors. Khārijism, which in Islam was a great social reform movement and grew to draw in the oppressed, in Iran clearly adapted to requirements of the local opposition in order to survive and gain the support of the local population. This adaptation of Khārijism to the needs of the Iranian environment only began to occur in the majority of factions of the sect in the second decade of the VIIIth century. At this point the Khārijites became more elastic and their influence increased. It was due to just this ability to adapt that the 'Aṭawiyya sect, founded by 'Aṭiyya b. Aswād al-Ḥanafī and probably the source of all the Sīstān Khārijites, managed to bring over many of the inhabitants of Sīstān, Khurāsān, Kirmān and Kūhistān to its teaching¹⁰⁴. *Shahrastānī* does not give clear information about which inhabitants of Eastern Iran became Khārijites: were they Arabs or Iranians? B. Spuler takes the view that the Khārijites attracted adherents from wide sectors of the population, and next takes this as evidence of the increased of the Iranian thought in the Iranian Khārijism¹⁰⁵. Although coins of the Sasanian type were also struck for the 'Aṭawiyya sect in Iran¹⁰⁶, it is difficult to accept this as evidence that the sect was highly popular. It seems rather, on the basis of the information we have on the activities of the Khārijites in Iran and their behaviour there, that the transformation of the movement into Iranian organization was being effected only just before its downfall and disappearance¹⁰⁷, which occurred at the end of the IXth century, while the process of uniting Khārijite doctrines with

¹⁰³ G. Levi Della Vida, *Ḳaṭarī b. Fudjā'a*, EI 1.

¹⁰⁴ Baghdādī, p. 51; Malaṭī, p. 137; Ash'arī, pp. 92-93; *Shahrastānī*, *Milal*, pp. 92-93. According to Malaṭī, p. 136, 'Ajarrad also belonged to the 'Aṭawiyya. The 'Aṭawiyya broke away from the Azraqites and moved to Sīstān for reasons which are not clear and in Sīstān they were mercilessly tracked down (*min manzīl ilā manzīl*) until they left the province. 'Aṭiyya was killed in one of the numerous skirmishes that took place (Ya'qūbī, *Tārīkh*, II, p. 329). The plan of distribution of the Khārijites in Iran was very varied. Khārijites lived in the South, in Sīstān, and in particular in the districts of Harāt, Karūh and Astarbiyān (Muqaddasī, *K. aḥsān at-taqāsīm*, BGA, Leiden 1906, p. 323; Iṣṭakhrī, *Masālik wa mamālik*, ed. I. Afshār, Tehrān 1340, p. 211). In Khurāsān, the Asbuzār town o settlement complex was Khārijite (Iṣṭakhrī, p. 92) and also some villages, including Istarbiyān (*ibid.*, p. 211). However, according to Minor-sky (*Hudūd al-'ālam*, London 1937, p. 327), the Khārijites lived only in the town of Kashkān.

¹⁰⁵ Spuler, p. 23.

¹⁰⁶ Bosworth, p. 47; G. C. Miles, *Some new lights on the history of Kirmān*, p. 90.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, pp. 180, 205-207.

Persian traditions and aims was carried out primarily in far-flung parts of Iran, like Sistan, Badghes or East Khurāsān from the mid-IXth century onward¹⁰⁸.

The attitude of Khārijism to its non-Arab neighbours was one of the obstacles confronting the movement in Iran and preventing its development. Khārijism shut itself off from the possibility of recruitment from among the indigenous population, and had to rely exclusively on successive waves of emigrants from Arabia for reinforcements. Xenophobia and intolerance in matters of behavioural norms went together. Thus all the changes which took place within this movement failed to arouse serious interest among the *dhimmī* and *mawālī* while the attitude to these non-Khārijite groups remained unchanged for they were waiting for more fundamental changes. As awareness that there was a need for greater elasticity can be found first in the teachings of the 'Aṭawīyya group, and later often appeared in Khārijite discussions and arguments on the fundamental question of their attitude to the women and children of unbelievers. "Unbelievers" was for the Khārijites an extensive category which could be extended at will. After the Khārijites had agreed to the presence of converts, their social ideas were in part accepted by the Iranians and some drawing together of opinions took place, for the Arabs living in Persia also began to become Iranianized. Clear progress in Iranianization was made at the end of the VIIIth century. At that time, the Arabs adopted Iranian customs, and began to drink wine, wear trousers and celebrate the early Iranian holidays of Naurūz and Mihrgān¹⁰⁹. The acceptance of Khārijite movement by the Iranians was a long drawn out process. The Khārijite sect gradually adopted even extremely conservative attitudes after they had become "Iranians". They now had new enemies, and the distinction between enemies and friends was not now made, as formerly, in the context of the Arab ethnic group. As Iranians joined the movement, Khārijism abandoned its original anticaliphate stance and linked itself with local currents expressing the aims of nations who had been forced into submission for liberation from the yoke of the caliphate. Various elements may have gathered under the Khārijite banner, for their political assumptions were vague and their social plans utopian, like, for example, the abolition of taxes¹¹⁰.

M a s' ū d ī wrote that the Khārijites had rejected 'Uthmān and 'Alī as unbelievers, and spoke out against any imām who had been placed on the throne by force¹¹¹. This was a very generalized statement, as also was the prediction of the sending of Persian Qur'ān¹¹², and could unite representatives of both lower and higher

¹⁰⁸ Spuler, p. 23.

¹⁰⁹ T a b a r ī, II, p. 1530.

¹¹⁰ This was one of the points in the doctrine of Ḥ a m z a b. A d r a k.

¹¹¹ M a s' ū d ī, *Murūj adh-dhahab*, V, p. 318.

¹¹² B a g h d ā d ī, p. 200; A s h' a r ī, p. 103. One of the first theoreticians on the recitation of the Qur'ān was A b ū 'U b a i d, a Persian, of Fārs who died in 208-210/824-826 was probably a Khārijite. (I b n a n - N a d i m, *Al-fihrist*, Kair 1348, pp. 79-80). The raising of the rank of the Persian language in the Muslim liturgy was important. In the IXth to Xth centuries it was believed that the early

social classes. Everyone could understand here what he wanted to understand, Mazdakism, did not provide such an opportunity for achieving a "social contract".

The change in the nature of Khārijism in Iran was not an isolated phenomenon. It was clearly linked with the development of the 'Abbāsīd opposition in Persia in the second quarter of the VIIIth century.

prophess up to I s m ā' ī l had spoken Persian. In the XIIth century it was believed that A b r a h a m had proclaimed his teachings at the court of the Persian emperors B. Б а р т о л ь д, *Культура мусульманства*, Москва 1966 (Собр. сочин. IV), p. 178.

¹¹³ *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, pp. 193 ff.; Y a' q ū b ī, *Ta'rīkh*, II, p. 605; I ṣ ṭ a k h r ī, p. 197; B. S k ł a d a n e k, *Powstanie Ḥamzy al-Ḥārīgī w Sīstanie*, PO 1960, 1, pp. 25-37; B o s w o r t h, pp. 91-98. Khārijism was a serious internal problem in East Persia. The Ṭāhirids, for example 'A b d a l l ā h (828-843) aimed at the total destruction of Khārijism in Khurāsān and Gurgān. Cf. J u z j ā n ī, *The Ṭabaḳatī Nāṣirī*, trans. H. G. R a v e r t y, London 1881-1899, pp. 13-14; Ḥ a m z a a l - Ṭ ṣ f a h ā n ī, p. 161.