Published in 2018 by
I.B.Tauris & Co. Ltd
London • New York
www.ibtauris.com

in association with The Institute of Ismaili Studies
210 Euston Road, London, NW1 2DA
www.iis.ac.uk



ISBN: 978 1 78831 133 5
eISBN: 978 1 78672 309 3
ePDF: 978 1 78673 309 2

A full CIP record for this book is available from the British Library
A full CIP record is available from the Library of Congress

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: available

Typeset in Minion Tra for The Institute of Ismaili Studies

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
T.J. International, Padstow, Cornwall

2

# The Baghdad Manifesto (402/1011): A Re-Examination of Fatimid–Abbasid Rivalry

*Shainool Jiwa*

Just over a century after the Fatimids had established their caliphate in North Africa in 297/909, and four decades after the transfer of their capital to Cairo in 362/973, the Abbasid caliph al-Qādir bi'llāh (r. 381–422/991–1031) issued what became known in Muslim historiography as the Baghdad Manifesto. Proclaimed publicly in the Abbasid capital in 402/1011, and subsequently read out across the Abbasid lands, its principal purpose was to invalidate the ʿAlid lineage of the Fatimids and thus their claim to be the descendants of the Prophet, through his daughter, Fāṭima, and ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib; and by these means to render illegitimate their claim to be vested with the sole legitimate, universalist authority and leadership of the Islamic world.

Coverage of the Baghdad Manifesto acquired some prominence in early 20th-century Orientalist scholarship on the origins and early history of the Fatimid dynasty.[1] Limited access to Ismaili sources and an over-reliance on Sunni chronicles written after the 6th/12th century in which the Manifesto had become a valid source on the origins of the Fatimids were among the salient features of the scholarship in this period.[2] However, the discovery of further Sunni and especially Ismaili sources in the course of the 20th century saw scholarship on the early Fatimids base itself primarily on 3rd–4th/9th–10th-century





texts, which were composed before the promulgation of the Manifesto.[3] As a result the Manifesto began to lose its importance in modern scholarship.[4] The fact that it was issued by the Abbasid caliph came to be variously understood as: the reproduction of particular forms of anti-Fatimid defamation which had begun earlier in the 4th/10th century;[5] an example of anti-Ismaili polemic and Abbasid propaganda against the Fatimid *daʿwa* during the reign of al-Qādir;[6] and as an aspect of al-Qādir's own pro-Sunni, anti-Fatimid and anti-Shiʿi strategy.[7]

The reduction of interest in the Manifesto in recent scholarship has left a lacuna regarding the context that led to the issuing of it and its subsequent reception in Muslim historiography. Through a close reading of particular Abbasid and Fatimid sources, this chapter aims to examine the relevant developments that led to the issuing of the Manifesto and its textual specificities. The exploration of the Manifesto will also serve as a vantage point from which to explore the social and religious caché of the ʿAlid lineage in the 4th–5th/10th–11th centuries.

By this time, the charismatic appeal of the ʿAlid lineage had transcended ethnic, social and sectarian divides, enabling the rise of the *ashrāf*, the descendants of the Prophet, as a unique social group across the Islamic world. The ʿAlid lineage also served as the cornerstone of all branches of Shiʿi Islam, and formed the bedrock of the Fatimid claim to the imamate.

## The Historiography and Text of the Manifesto

The so-called Baghdad Manifesto has been provided either in full or referred to in several Arabic and Persian chronicles dating from the 6th to the 9th/12th to 15th centuries. These include the works of Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200),[8] Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233),[9] Juwaynī (d. 681/1283),[10] Abu'l-Fidā (d. 732/1331),[11] Ibn al-Kathīr (d. 774/1373),[12] al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348),[13] al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363),[14] Ibn Khaldūn (d. 784/1382),[15] al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442)[16] and Ibn Taghrībirdī (d. 874/1470).[17] Of these, Ibn al-Athīr, al-Ṣafadī and Ibn Khaldūn, while they

extensively discuss the Manifesto and its signatories, do not quote the text. As Rosenthal pointed out, the earliest extant version of the Manifesto is that in Ibn al-Jawzī's *al-Muntaẓam*.[18]

The sources that quote the Manifesto present what is, by and large, a stable text. However, within these there are significant variations, including two distinct introductory segments and the inclusion of certain key passages which are found in some recensions but not in others. One such version is that of Ibn al-Jawzī, which Ibn al-Kathīr summarises, and al-Dhahabī and Ibn Taghrībirdī follow closely. This introduction ascribes a Khurramī origin to the Fatimids and includes passages that are not found in other versions.

The second version is that of Abu'l-Fidā, which al-Maqrīzī follows closely. Their introductory segment, which begins with the mention of the fourth Fatimid imam-caliph, al-Muʿizz li-Dīn Allāh, does not mention the Khurramīs, while their main text does not include key passages found in Ibn al-Jawzī's version.

The third version is that of Juwaynī, which is written in Persian and which shares the introductory segment found in the version of Abu'l-Fidā and al-Maqrīzī, but which also contains a few, though not all, of the passages from Ibn al-Jawzī's version that are not found in Abu'l-Fidā and al-Maqrīzī.

This suggests that by the 6th/12th century there were two or possibly three distinct recensions of the Baghdad Manifesto. In view of the fact that the Manifesto was reported to have been drafted in Baghdad in 402/1011, and that copies were then sent to adjacent regions, the different versions probably represent variant copies of the document made after its promulgation. The following section provides a translation of Ibn al-Jawzī's recension, as the earliest of the extant accounts, while indicating the differences found in the other versions.

Ibn al-Jawzī's introduction, seems to be an amalgam of a preamble to the Manifesto merged into the document itself.[19] It reads:

> In this month [of Rabīʿ al-Ākhir 402], written declarations (*maḥāḍir*) were drafted in the *dīwān* of the caliphate regarding the substance (*maʿnā*) of those in Egypt, to vilify (*qadḥ*) their lineage (*nasab*) and their *madhhab*.[20] A copy of it was read in Baghdad. Upon it were inscribed the signatures of the *ashrāf*, the judges (*quḍāt*), the jurists (*fuqāhā*), the pious (*ṣālihīn*), the legal witnesses (*shuhūd*), the trustworthy (*thiqāt*), and the exemplary (*amthāl*),[21] as regards their knowledge and comprehension concerning the lineage of the Dayṣāniyya – for their [the Fatimid] lineage is traced to Dayṣān b. Saʿīd al-Khurramī, the party of the infidels,[22] the seeds of the satans.
>
> [This was] a testimony to draw close to God the Almighty and Glorious, one [undertaken] in disappointment, for the sake of religion and for Islam,[23] and in belief [in the necessity] of disseminating what God Almighty has ordered upon the *ʿulamāʾ*, to make it evident to the people and not to conceal it. So they all together bore witness that …



The second introduction to the Manifesto reads more plausibly as the introductory passage to an actual document. It is provided by Abu'l-Fidā and al-Maqrīzī, and is also found in Juwaynī's Persian rendition:

> [In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate][24] The witnesses bear witness that Maʿadd b. Ismāʿīl [the one who seized Egypt was Maʿadd][25] b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Saʿīd descends from Dayṣān b. Saʿīd, from whom come the Dayṣāniyya, [that the aforesaid Saʿīd went to the Maghrib, where he was called ʿAbd Allāh and received the *laqab* of al-Mahdī],[26] that …

Following these divergent introductory segments, the traditions merge into a common text. However, major passages found in Ibn al-Jawzī are omitted from Abu'l-Fidā's recension though two passages are present in Juwaynī. The common text is noted below, with indents indicating passages found in Ibn al-Jawzī's tradition but not in Abu'l-Fidā and al-Maqrīzī or Juwaynī.

> The one who has arisen (*nājim*) in Egypt,[27] is al-Manṣūr b. Nizār with the *laqab* al-Ḥākim (may the judgement, *ḥukm*, of God upon him be one of destruction, annihilation and humiliation, eradication and exemplary punishment), the son of Maʿadd,

the son of Ismāʿīl the son of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān the son of Saʿīd (may God give him no felicity, who having gone to the west was then called ʿUbayd Allāh and took the *laqab* al-Mahdī'), and those who preceded him of his foul and impure predecessors,[28] upon him and them the curse of God and the curse of all those who curse,[29] are false claimants (*adʿiyā'*) and *khawārij*, who do not have lineage (*nasab*) amongst the sons of ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, nor do they have any claim of [filial] attachment to him, and it [the lineage of ʿAlī] is free from their falsehood.[30] What they claim in connection to this [lineage] is void and fabricated.

~ That they [the signatories] have no knowledge of anyone from the noble houses of the Ṭālibids[31] who has ever ceased pronouncing statements that these *khawārij* are pretenders (*adʿiyā'*). [Absent in Abu'l-Fidā and al-Maqrīzī.]

~ That this refutation, concerning their lies and [false] claims[32] is commonly known in the [lands] of the Two Sanctuaries (i.e., the *ḥaramayn*). [Absent in Abu'l-Fidā and al-Maqrīzī.]

~ From the onset of their affair (*amr*) in the west, it was made public (*muntashir*) and spread. [Absent in Abu'l-Fidā and al-Maqrīzī.]

~ [so as] to prevent their lie from deceiving anyone, or [prevent anyone from] embarking on a delusion that would lead to believing in them. [Absent in Juwaynī, Abu'l-Fidā and al-Maqrīzī.]

That this one who has arisen in Egypt, he and his predecessors, are infidels (*kuffār*), libertines (*fussāq*), debauchees (*fujjār*), deviators (*mulḥidūn*), and materialist Manicheans (*zanādiqa muʿaṭṭilūn*).[33] They do not believe in Islam.[34]

~ And [they] follow as their creed the *madhhab*s of the Dualists[35] and the Zoroastrians. [Absent in Juwaynī, Abu'l-Fidā, and al-Maqrīzī.]

They have abrogated the *ḥudūd* [of law], allowed sexual licentiousness,[36] permitted [the drinking of] *khamr*,[37] spilt blood, insulted the prophets, cursed the *salaf*,[38] and proclaimed divinity.

This was written in [the month of] Rabīʿ al-Ākhir in the year 402 [14 November 1011].

Almost all the extant versions mention the names or offices of those who signed the *maḥḍar* of 402/1011. While several different signatories appear in the various accounts, the list of signatories remains broadly consistent, including the mention



of the names Sharīf al-Raḍī and Sharīf al-Murtaḍā. The full list collated across the sources include:

Among the ʿAlids: Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, Sharīf al-Raḍī,[39] Ibn Azraq al-Mūsawī,[40] Abū Ṭāhir b. Abī Ṭayyib,[41] Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿUmar, Ibn Abī Yaʿlā,[42] Ibn al-Baṭḥāwī.[43]

Among the judges: Abū Muḥammad b. al-Akfānī,[44] Abu'l-Qāsim al-Khazarī,[45] Abu'l-ʿAbbās al-Sūrī.[46]

Among the jurists: Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarā'inī,[47] Abū Muḥammad al-Kashfalī,[48] Abu'l-Ḥusayn al-Qudūrī,[49] Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣaymarī,[50] Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Bayḍāwī,[51] Abū ʿAlī b. Ḥamkān.[52]

Among the legal witnesses: Abu'l-Qāsim al-Tanūkhī.[53]

Additionally, Ibn al-Athīr provides the names of Abu'l-Faḍl al-Nasawī and Abū Jaʿfar al-Nasafī.[54] Furthermore, Ibn al-Athīr, Abu'l-Fidā and Ibn Khaldūn also include the well-known Twelver Shiʿi theologian, Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Nuʿmān, Shaykh al-Mufīd.[55]

## The Context of the Manifesto

The Baghdad Manifesto of 402/1011 was a *maḥḍar* (decree) issued by the Abbasid caliph Aḥmad b. Isḥāq al-Qādir bi'llāh and was produced by the court chancellery (*dīwān*) in Baghdad. The *maḥḍar*'s principal message was the categorical public rejection of the ʿAlid descendancy of the Fatimids, who are then accused of heresy and immorality. This is apparent in the references to the Manifesto by authors such as Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn Khaldūn, who do not provide the text itself, but simply refer to it as a document denying the ʿAlid origins of the Fatimids.[56]

The promulgation of the Baghdad Manifesto has been discussed in scholarship primarily in the context of Fatimid–Abbasid rivalry. Central to the circumstances leading to its issuing was the potency of the ʿAlid lineage in the legitimisation of Fatimid claims to authority. It explains the use of lineage as a principal trope by pro-Abbasid sources from the early 4th/10th century onwards. The use of lineage by the Abbasids in the legitimisation of their caliphate and the

emergence of the ʿAlid *ashrāf* as a charismatic social group by the 5th/11th centuries are also germane to this exploration.

### *Centrality of the ʿAlid lineage to the Fatimids*

The establishment of the Fatimid caliphate in North Africa in 297/909 signalled a major shift in the socio-political and ideological dynamics of the medieval Mediterranean world. The move to Egypt in 362/973 placed the Fatimids at a central point in the Islamic world, and gave them a territorial proximity to the Abbasid heartlands of Iraq. Ideologically, the Fatimid claim to ʿAlid descent posed an unprecedented challenge to Abbasid claims of exclusive right to the caliphate, which reverberated long after the Fatimid caliphate had been vanquished.

The Fatimid caliphate was based on the Shiʿi doctrine which held that legitimate authority over the Muslim *umma* was the unique preserve of the divinely chosen imam from the descendants of ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib and Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet. The designation of the Fatimid imam-caliph as the Commander of the Faithful and the Imam of the Muslims thus negated the Abbasids' own claims and represented a direct challenge to their authority.

The activity of the Ismaili *daʿwa* (religio-political mission) which spanned the major regions of the Islamic world in the last decades of the 3rd/9th century, and which culminated in the formation of the Fatimid state, was predicated on the claim that rightful authority belonged solely to the designated imam from the descendants of ʿAlī and Fāṭima. The Ismaili Fatimid caliphate was based on this Shiʿi Imāmī axiom, with the Fatimid doctrine on the imamate receiving systematic exposition during the reign of the fourth imam-caliph al-Muʿizz li-Dīn Allāh.[57] The Fatimid imam-caliphs' right to rule as possessors of the inherent, divinely sanctioned imamate was traced from ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib through Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765) to his son Ismāʿīl, who was succeeded by Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, and then through the four generations of the 'concealed imams' during what came to be characterised as the 'period of concealment' (*dawr al-satr*), until the accession of ʿAbd Allāh al-Mahdī, whose public manifestation (*ẓuhūr*) marked the commencement of the Fatimid state.[58] The declaration of their ʿAlid lineage took a variety of forms, including books on law and doctrine, public orations, coinage and inscriptions on mosques, palaces and city gates, all serving as important features of the Fatimid state.



Inherent to the Fatimid claim of ʿAlid descent, and recognised by their detractors, was their assertion of descent from the Prophet himself. While ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib retained a central position in Fatimid articulations of legitimate authority, equally central was Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet, wife of ʿAlī and the eponym of the Fatimid dynasty.[59] It was through her that all the ʿAlids, the Shiʿi Imams and the Fatimid imam-caliphs in particular claimed descent, and therefore inheritance, from the Prophet Muḥammad.[60]

Reflecting the centrality of the daughter of the Prophet in Shiʿi doctrine, Fāṭima was given prominence in the public proclamations of the Fatimid imam-caliphs. This is evident in many of the transformative moments in Fatimid history. Fāṭima was named in the invocation of blessings upon the Prophet and his household in the first public Fatimid sermon in North Africa;[61] she was praised in al-Muʿizz li-Dīn Allāh's sermon announcing the demise of his father al-Manṣūr and his own accession;[62] and she was similarly invoked in the sermons in Egypt following the Fatimid takeover.[63] Fāṭima's name was also inscribed on Fatimid coinage,[64] and it is after her epithet, al-Zahrāʾ ('the illuminated'), that the Fatimids called the principal mosque in Cairo, al-Azhar which, as Brett notes, was named 'after the mother of the dynasty'.[65]

Based on their descent from Fāṭima, the Fatimid imam-caliphs referred to the Prophet Muḥammad as their grandfather (*jaddunā*), to whose legal, political and religious authority they were heirs, and whose *daʿwa* and commandments they had come to fulfil. Their supporters echoed these claims by referring to the Fatimid imam-caliphs as the 'sons of the Messenger'.[66] Fatimid diplomatic correspondence and dialogue with local notables,

also reflected these claims.[67] The raison d'être of the Fatimid mission was linked to the mission of the Prophet. The Fatimids thus saw themselves as the protectors of their grandfather's community,[68] the revivers of his practices[69] and the continuators of his *da'wa*.[70] Thus polemics against the 'Alid descent of the Fatimids critically entailed the denial of their descent from the Prophet. This denial, therefore, also became a focal point of anti-Fatimid polemic by the Abbasids from the inception of Fatimid rule. Fundamentally, the Fatimid claim to 'Alid descent directly impinged on the authenticity of the Abbasid claims to legitimacy.

### *Abbasid legitimisation: From 'Alid to Abbasid primacy*

The revolution that toppled the Umayyads in 132/750 had as its slogan 'the chosen one from the family of the Prophet Muhammad' (*al-riḍā min āl Muḥammad*) which was in effect a call for legitimate authority over the Islamic world to be restored to the Hāshimid clan. While the term encompassed all those who claimed to be of the family of the Prophet, in actuality it led to the establishment of the Abbasid dynasty after the assumption of power by the first Abbasid caliph, Abu'l-'Abbās al-Saffāḥ (r. 132–136/750–754).

Therefore, Abbasid legitimacy was originally positioned in a proto-Shi'i belief in the primacy of 'Alid succession. The earliest legitimisations of Abbasid authority held that rightful rule after the Prophet passed to 'Alī, his sons and their successors, but was ultimately bequeathed to their Abbasid cousin in the well-known testimony of Abū Hāshim, a grandson of 'Alī. It was following the aftermath of a major 'Alid rebellion in 145/762–763 during the reign of the second Abbasid caliph, al-Manṣūr, that the Abbasid model of authority moved away from implicit articulations of 'Alid legitimacy. Thereafter, the Abbasid claim was legitimised through legalistic, meritocratic and tribal notions of inheritance which proclaimed that the Prophet's uncle, al-'Abbās b. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib (d. ca. 32/653), the progenitor of the Abbasids, was the rightful successor to the Prophet, while



rejecting the concept of inheritance through Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet. Subsequently, Abbasid claims that al-'Abbās and his descendants were the divinely sanctioned successors of the Prophet were based on traditions ascribed to the Prophet.

While the Abbasid model of legitimacy returned briefly to the notion of 'Alid pre-eminence during the reign of al-Ma'mūn (r. 170–218/786–833), the concept of Abbasid primacy and succession remained dominant, despite the fact that 'their very rise to power had undermined the ideology by means of which they had risen'.[71] Central to this dominance was a compromise with the religio-juridical establishment whereby the *'ulamā'* remained authoritative as expounders of law and doctrine, while the caliph retained his status as head of the *umma*. Following the failure of various attempts by different 'Alids to overthrow Abbasid rule in the 2nd/8th century, the 'Alid challenge to the Abbasids remained marginal for the following century, although scattered 'Alid claimants secured political power in peripheral areas, such as the Zaydī imamates in the Caspian and Yemen.

The rise of the Fatimid caliphate in 297/909 proved, therefore, to be a major challenge to established Abbasid authority. For the first time, a large-scale and viable state positioned in the central Islamic lands legitimised its authority through 'Alid claims to succession. Given that any refutation of 'Alid legitimacy per se would need to be circumspect, the main thrust of the Abbasid anti-Fatimid propaganda over the next century sought to deny instead that the Fatimids were 'Alids at all.

Ironically, it was the violent persecution of the 'Alids following the Abbasid acquisition of political power that had compelled the descendants of Ismā'īl b. Ja'far al-Ṣādiq to withdraw from public life. The concealment of the names and hiding places of the Ismaili imams for some 150 years before the Fatimids came to power, known in Ismaili history as the *dawr al-satr* (period of concealment), provided the Abbasids with their allegation that the Fatimids were upstarts whose 'Alid ancestry could not be proved incontrovertibly with complete credence.[72]

Anti-Fatimid propaganda was produced by several parties that felt threatened by their rise.[73] These included Sunni theologians and heresiographers often patronised by the Abbasids, the Umayyads of al-Andalus, and the Ismaili Qarmaṭīs, who rejected the Fatimid claim to the imamate.

Pivotal to the framing of anti-Fatimid polemics were the works sponsored by the Abbasid caliphs or initiated by their supporters.[74] With one layer building upon another over the course of the 4th/10th century, their principal accusation was that the Fatimids were not of ʿAlid descent, and this eventually turned into defaming them as arch-heretics who harboured an enmity to Islam. One major milestone in the anti-Fatimid tradition was the accounts of Ibn Rizām and Akhū Muḥsin which began to circulate in the 4th/10th century. Their anti-Fatimid vitriol included the ascription of an alternative non-ʿAlid lineage to the Fatimid imam-caliphs, which were compounded by accusations of heresy as drafted in the Ibn Rizām-Akhū Muḥsin narrative, and these subsequently gained state validation in the Baghdad Manifesto.

### *The first anti-Fatimid alternative lineage*

In a cursory mention of the rise of the Fatimids, which took place in the final decades of his life, Abū Jaʿfar b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923) refers to the first Fatimid imam-caliph, al-Mahdī bi'llāh, as Ibn al-Baṣrī.[75] Al-Ṭabarī's label indicates the first accretion of an alternative lineage in the pro-Abbasid circles of Baghdad which implicitly denied the validity of the ʿAlid origins of the Fatimids.

This early layer of anti-Fatimid accounts, propagating the notion that the Fatimids were not ʿAlids and that al-Mahdī was the 'son of a Basran', can be traced to investigations that were supposedly initiated in Baghdad by the Abbasid caliph around 301/914.[76] As reported by the Andalusī chronicler, ʿArīb b. Saʿd, after the first Fatimid campaign in Egypt, which took place in that same year, the Abbasid caliph al-Muqtadir (r. 295–320/908–932) set out to 'investigate the lineage (*nasab*) of ʿAbd Allāh al-Mahdī, who is called ʿUbayd Allāh al-Shīʿī', a derogatory diminutive that became customary among most later Sunni historians.[77] ʿArīb cited as his source the well-known Baghdadi scholar, Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Ṣūlī (d. 335/947), who related it from Abu'l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Sirāj al-Miṣrī, known as a memoriser of reports (*akhbār*) regarding the Shiʿa. The Abbasid caliph's investigations concluded that:

> ʿUbayd Allāh, the one who has arisen (*al-qā'im*) in Ifrīqiya, is ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Sālim – from the people of ʿAskar Mukram – Ibn Sindān al-Bāhilī, the chief of Ziyād's police and from his *mawālī*. Sālim, his grandfather, had been killed by [the Abbasid caliph] al-Mahdī because of his *zandaqa* (heresy).[78]

As noted by Madelung, in the literary biographical dictionary of the Andalusian Ibn al-Abbār (d. 658/1260) a similar version of this alternative lineage is traced to another Baghdadi scholar of the same period, the chronicler ʿUbayd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Abī Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr.[79] The son of a literary figure, Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr (d. 280/893), ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr continued his father's history of Baghdad (*Akhbār Baghdād*) before his own death in 313/925–926.[80] He was, therefore, a contemporary of both al-Ṭabarī and al-Ṣūlī, and a witness to this early version of an alternative Fatimid lineage circulating in the Abbasid court circles in Baghdad. ʿUbayd Allāh b. Abī Ṭāhir's alternative lineage approximates to that given by al-Ṣūlī.[81] Notably, this version omits the accusation that the grandfather was executed for *zandaqa*, which appears in al-Ṣūlī's later version.[82] The conjunction of an accusation of heresy among their forebears with an alternative non-ʿAlid lineage would, over the following century, become the staple features of anti-Fatimid Abbasid propaganda, culminating in the Baghdad Manifesto.

### *The Ibn Rizām/Akhū Muḥsin insertions*

Writing in the first half of the 4th/10th century in Baghdad, the anti-Ismaili and anti-Fatimid Sunni polemicist Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Rizām (or Razzām) al-Kūfī, composed the

*Kitāb al-radd ʿalā'l-Ismāʿīliyya* (or *al-Naqḍ ʿalā'l-Bāṭiniyya*), a work that professed to be a history of the Ismaili movement which had culminated in the Fatimid state.[83] Ibn Rizām's influential account posited another genealogy for the Fatimids that was traced to Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ and his son ʿAbd Allāh.[84] According to Ibn Rizām, both father and son were *dayṣāniyyūn* (Bardesanians, who followed a form of dualism), the latter a trickster and charlatan with pretentions to prophecy. ʿAbd Allāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ, succeeded by his son Muḥammad, is alleged by Ibn Rizām to have spearheaded the Ismaili movement which spread across the Islamic world and culminated in the emergence of a person he calls Saʿīd b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Maymūn, that is, the Fatimid imam-caliph al-Mahdī bi'llāh.

Ibn Rizām added that ʿAbd Allāh b. Maymūn initially pretended to be a descendant of ʿAqīl, a brother of ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib,[85] but that this claim was altered when Saʿīd [i.e., al-Mahdī] went to Egypt and took to 'propagating the claim that he was descended from ʿAlī and Fāṭima, with the name 'Ubayd Allāh'.[86] Ibn Rizām recounts that seeing that his own claim was unsuccessful, Saʿīd then conjured up a young man, who he claimed was a descendant of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, and who was to be his successor Abu'l-Qāṣim al-Qā'im.

Ibn Rizām's account served as the basis for another major anti-Fatimid treatise by the *sharīf* Abu'l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, more commonly known as Akhū Muḥsin.[87] Writing shortly after 372/983, Akhū Muḥsin asserted that his concern was to elucidate 'the matter of Ismāʿīl b. Jaʿfar … and his descendants, as much is being said about his son and he is being credited with descendants who do not belong to his family'.[88] He repeated the allegation that the Fatimids were, in fact, descendants of a non-ʿAlid by the name of ʿAbd Allāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ, a Dayṣānī dualist and the founder of their creed, all of whom were 'heretics' of the highest order who sought to destroy Islam from within.

In this same period, as Stern points out, the fraudulent publications and anti-Fatimid pamphlets that circulated in the Abbasid lands had a powerful influence on the shaping of anti-Ismaili public opinion.[89] They were alleged to be 'secret works' of the Ismailis and thus contained the 'hidden truths and goals' of the Ismaili *daʿwa*. Prominent among them was the *Kitāb al-siyāsa*, the work of an 'able forger disseminated as the product of the cynical libertism of an Ismaili teacher'.[90] Though apparently based on an intimate knowledge of Ismaili doctrine, the work sought to portray how the *daʿwa* instructed its adherents to 'capture souls' through seven steps of initiation that ultimately led to atheism.



The *Fihrist* of Ibn al-Nadīm, the famous book cataloguer of Baghdad, provides a snapshot of the layers of anti-Fatimid propaganda circulating in Baghdad in the last decades of the 4th/10th century. Though he disassociates himself from the calumny, Ibn al-Nadīm reproduced extracts from Ibn Rizām as well as other accounts circulating in this period which cumulatively claim to prove that the Fatimid imam-caliphs were descendants of Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ, a Bardesanian, who had 'contempt for the *sharīʿa* and the basic teachings of prophecy', and whose secret books sought to beguile the naive into a system of initiation that led to atheism, which vilified the prophets and religion.[91] In the *Fihrist*, anti-Fatimid accusations also include claims that the founders of the Ismailis were aided by Magians who sought to restore the Sasānian state by means of figures such as the Persian anti-Muslim rebel Bābak Khurramī, who wanted the 'return of the government of the Persians and their religion as foretold in the stars'.[92] While the anti-Fatimid allegations of Ibn Rizām and Akhū Muḥsin gained credibility in Abbasid circles, it was al-Qādir who was instrumental in giving them the official Abbasid seal of approval by the reproduction of central elements of their polemic in the Baghdad Manifesto.

## The Caliphate of al-Qādir: The Manifesto and the Abbasid Restoration

Thought to be a malleable replacement for his predecessor, the caliph al-Qādir was appointed by the Shiʿi Būyid amir, Bahā'

al-Dawla after he had unceremoniously deposed al-Qādir's cousin and predecessor, al-Ṭā'iʿ (r. 363–381/974–991).[93] The reign of al-Qādir is recognised in scholarship as a signal feature of what has been termed as the eastern Islamic world's 'Sunni revival', in which al-Qādir himself emerged as the champion of Sunni orthodoxy.[94] As summarised by Kennedy, al-Qādir was able to 'create a new and lasting role for the Abbasid Caliphate', for just as the Shiʿi Imam Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq showed it was possible to be an imam without political power, 'al-Qādir showed that there was a religious role for the Abbasid caliphs, a role which they could fulfil even if their temporal power was non-existent'.[95]

The promulgation of the Baghdad Manifesto proved to be a pivotal moment not only in Fatimid–Abbasid rivalry but also in the resurgence of the Abbasid caliphate itself. Thus the Manifesto served a number of functions. First, it turned the accretions of a century of anti-Fatimid propaganda into an official document which, in addition to having the caliphal seal of approval, was allegedly endorsed by both leading Sunni and ʿAlid figures in Iraq. Moreover, through its co-option of leading ʿAlids in Iraq, the Manifesto deflected the potential for Fatimid-*ashrāf* alliances for which there were already precedents in Egypt and the Ḥijāz. Similarly, it sought to halt the spread of the Fatimid *daʿwa* and stem the recognition of Fatimid authority, particularly by local Iraqi rulers, such as the 'Uqaylids. Finally, the Manifesto became a major symbol of al-Qādir's own caliphal authority, through which he asserted his leadership over individuals and religious groups who were potential rivals by assembling their signatures in an official caliphal edict.

The manner of al-Qādir's accession in 381/991 exemplified the decline of Abbasid power, a process that had begun in the previous century. From the late 3th/9th century, endemic political instability and factional rivalries in Iraq saw the succession of five caliphs between 289 and 333/902 and 944, and this facilitated the arrival of the Būyid (or Buwayhid) dynasty in 334/945 in Baghdad, a Shiʿi dynasty of Daylamī chieftains whose power-base lay in northern Iran.[96] Yet while the Būyids eclipsed the Abbasids for half a century, relegating them to their palace complex to be deposed at will,[97] the caliphs nonetheless retained the critical function of legitimising the emerging model of the Būyid amirate.[98]



By al-Qādir's time, Būyid rule in Iraq had begun to unravel owing to a multitude of factors, presenting him with an opportunity to manipulate the web of religious and military factional alliances in Iraq such that he could assume power.[99] Amid the swift rise and fall of Būyid viziers, Sunni–Shiʿi urban riots, conflicts between the Shāfiʿī and Ḥanafī *madhhab*s for the judiciary, and between Daylamī and Turkish commanders for control of tax farms, the caliph al-Qādir remained 'the one stable figure in the politics of the era' and was gradually accorded 'increasing power that came to him as mediator in the fights of city factions and as court of appeal for army disputes'.[100]

The evolution of al-Qādir's caliphate over the four decades of his reign saw the gradual positioning of the Abbasid caliph as the spokesman of Sunni Islam and especially of its Ḥanbalī school of law.[101] This was finally realised with al-Qādir issuing *al-Risāla al-Qādiriyya*, which was read out from the Abbasid palace in 409/1018, and reinforced further by three public letters issued in 420/1029.[102] These represented al-Qādir's 'profession of faith', a pro-Ḥanbalī assertion which condemned Shiʿi, Muʿtazilī and Ashʿarī standpoints, while affirming veneration for the Prophet's companions and the first four caliphs.[103] The cumulative legacy of these pronouncements was an assertion of the truth of Sunni Islam as opposed to any form of Shiʿi Islam or Muʿtazilism.[104] While the period of the *miḥna* of the 3rd/9th century saw the Abbasid caliph al-Ma'mūn's endeavours to assert himself as the source of doctrine against the power of the Sunni *'ulamā'*, including Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, al-Qādir's reign in the 5th/11th century saw the caliph refashioned as the defender of doctrines that had been outlined earlier, particularly by the Ḥanbalī *'ulamā'*.[105]

Al-Qādir's reign was thus marked by the evolution of religious and political policies through which the caliph consolidated his authority. The production and promulgation of the Baghdad Manifesto of 402/1011 can arguably be read as a testing of the waters by this redefined caliphate which served

as the precursor of the public declaration of creed noted above. Yet the issuing of the Manifesto was motivated by an imminent concern to stem the rising Fatimid-ʿAlid influence in Iraq, and was fuelled by the potential for the Iraqi *ashrāf* to recognise the Fatimids as the true caliphs. In addition, concerns such as the pro-Fatimid turn that the Shiʿi-Sunni conflict of the urban population in Baghdad had taken, and significantly, the proclamation made in the Friday *khuṭba* by the ʿUqaylids that it was the Fatimids who were the rightful caliphs, which occurred in places as far apart as Mosul and Kūfa, also played an immediate role in the Manifesto's promulgation.

## *The role of the ʿAlid ashrāf in the Manifesto*

In all the medieval Sunni chronicles that provide the list of signatories to the Manifesto, Sharīf al-Raḍī and his brother Sharīf al-Murtaḍā appear at the top of it. This is because it was the signatures of these two leading ʿAlid Shiʿi scholars, above all others, which, well into the 9th/15th century, were deemed to lend weight to the Manifesto. Accordingly, Sharīf al-Raḍī's career and his supposed expression of pro-Fatimid sympathies are discussed in several of these chronicles as an integral part of the immediate context of the Manifesto. While the presence of the ʿAlid *ashrāf* as signatories to the Manifesto has been mentioned in scholarship, the factors leading to the rise of the *ashrāf* in the 4th/10th century, and the impact on Fatimid-*ashrāf* relations of the proclamation of the Manifesto, remain to be explored.[106]

The ʿAlid *ashrāf* had, by this time, settled throughout the major regions of the Islamic world and they professed a cross-section of all the *madhhabs*.[107] Forming a distinct local nobility, they served as leaders, diplomats, mediators and local patricians who had the ability to span various social and religious groups. Their religious status was predicated on the belief in their blessed descent, which often led to their receipt of state pensions, as the certified inheritors of the Prophet's unique prerogative of receiving the *khums* (the one-fifth tax).[108] Moreover, the *naqībs* ('over-seers' or 'martials'), as the heads of the *ashrāf*, became the public guardians



of the Prophet's lineage.[109] By the 5th/11th century, the regional *naqībs* had acquired the prerogative of publicly confirming a true ʿAlid descent and denouncing a false one by issuing a *maḥḍar*. So, for the Abbasids, the affirmation of the Fatimid ʿAlid lineage by the *ashrāf* would have been detrimental to their sustained propaganda effort. Conversely, co-opting the *ashrāf* to deny the validity of the ʿAlid lineage of the Fatimids gave the Manifesto a crucial seal of legitimacy.

There were precedents for Fatimid-*ashrāf* alliances in Egypt and the Ḥijāz, which had proved vital for buttressing Fatimid authority in the region. The symbiotic relationship between the Fatimids and the elite Egyptian and Ḥijāzī *ashrāf* had reinforced the Fatimid claim of being the ʿAlid imam-caliphs of a Shiʿi empire, and therefore, the champions of Shiʿi law and practice.[110] It also positioned the pro-Fatimid *ashrāf* as the privileged, state-patronised interlocutors with the various segments of the populace. The results of the Fatimid-*ashrāf* alliance are clearly evident in the relatively peaceful conquest of Egypt by the Fatimids,[111] as well as in the mention of the name of the Fatimid imam-caliph in the Friday *khuṭba* in Mecca and Medina from 362/973 onwards, displacing the Abbasids from the pulpits of the *ḥaramayn* for over a century.[112] Viewed in this light, al-Qādir's co-option of the ʿAlids was a necessary prerequisite for the reinforcing of the Manifesto's credentials, and for forestalling any potential reconciliation between the Fatimids and the Iraqi *ashrāf*.

## *The Mūsawī naqībs of Baghdad*

Among the prominent *ashrāf* of Iraq during the reign of al-Qādir were the Mūsawī *ashrāf*, descendants of the seventh Ithnāʿasharī Shiʿi imam Mūsā al-Kāẓim b. Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. At the turn of the century, the head of the Mūsawīs of Iraq was Sharīf Abū Aḥmad Ḥusayn b. Mūsā al-Mūsawī al-ʿAlawī (304–400/916–1009), the father of Sharīf al-Raḍī and Sharīf al-Murtaḍā.[113] Abū Aḥmad al-Mūsawī's life illustrates the growing influence of the *ashrāf* in the region, and their own tussles of power with both the

Būyids and the Abbasids. Abū Aḥmad al-Mūsawī's appointment in 354/965 as the *naqīb* of the *ashrāf* by the Būyid amir Muʿizz al-Dawla marked the family's century-long ascent in Baghdad.[114] His appointment as the leader of the Pilgrimage for Iraq was significant, as the office was generally held by someone from the extended Abbasid family.

So substantive was Abū Aḥmad's social, political and economic standing that the Būyid amir ʿAḍud al-Dawla, coveting his wealth and fearing his growing power and prestige, had him imprisoned in his fortress in Shīrāz in 369/979. Following ʿAḍud al-Dawla's death in 372/983, Sharīf Abū Aḥmad was released from prison, reinstated as the *naqīb* and, in addition, appointed in charge of the *maẓālim* courts. The final years of his career proved to be ones in which he enjoyed unparalleled status and popularity. After being briefly dismissed, Abū Aḥmad was reinstated to the *niqāba* in 394/1004, with the exceptional honour of receiving an official title *al-Ṭāhir al-Awḥad Dhu'l-Manāqib*. In 397/1006, when Sharīf Abū Aḥmad was 93 years old, the office of the *niqāba* was bequeathed to his son Muḥammad, who came to be known as Sharīf al-Raḍī.

## *Sharīf al-Raḍī and the pro-Fatimid verses: Debate and reception*

The life and legacy of Sharīf al-Raḍī exemplifies the charismatic role that the *ashrāf* fulfilled for all classes of society during this period.[115] Both al-Raḍī and his brother al-Murtaḍā were widely recognised as Ithnāʿasharī Shiʿis.[116] Yet al-Raḍī, like his father before him, often occupied a middle ground between various religious and factional groups in Iraq.

Thus accounts pertaining to the pro-Fatimid verses attributed to Sharīf al-Raḍī and the reactions that they provoked at the Abbasid court under al-Qādir provide an important angle in understanding the production and historiography of the Baghdad Manifesto.

The younger of the two brothers, Sharīf al-Raḍī, enjoyed unrivalled prestige during his life, which continued to reverberate



through the centuries, owing in part to his distinct position but mainly because of his literary works. Having been educated under noted Arabic grammarians, as well as Mālikī and Muʿtazilī *ʿulamāʾ*, al-Raḍī's production of verses from an early age led his contemporaries to call him the greatest poet of the Quraysh.[117]

Al-Raḍī's political career began when he was given responsibilities over the *niqāba*, the *maẓālim* and leadership of the *ḥajj*. For two decades his stature grew and the Būyid amir Bahāʾ al-Dawla granted him several titles, including *al-Raḍī Dhu'l-Ḥasabayn* in 396/1005, hence his sobriquet Sharīf al-Raḍī.[118]

Sharīf al-Raḍī is known to have presented himself as a viable candidate for the caliphate in his earlier years.[119] Although he wrote eulogies to the caliph al-Ṭāʾiʿ,[120] he also wrote 'audacious, impertinent, and provocative' verses against al-Qādir, including those that deny any difference in station between himself and the Abbasid caliph.[121] It is against this backdrop that in Abbasid circles the allegations were made that he had written pro-Fatimid verses.

At some point before 400/1009–1010, a series of verses, allegedly written by Sharīf al-Raḍī and in circulation in Baghdad, came to the attention of al-Qādir. These verses praise the Fatimids, hint at his possible migration to Egypt and affirm the ʿAlid lineage of the Fatimids. The commonly reproduced extract of the longer poem declaims:[122]

> [Why should] I bear humiliation in the land of the enemy, when in Egypt the Caliph is an ʿAlid
>
> His father is my father, his friend (*mawlāhu*) is my friend (*mawlāy*),
>
> if the distant stranger bears malice for me
>
> That which ties my neck to his neck, is the sayyid of all men, Muḥammad and ʿAlī.

Ibn al-Jawzī, Ibn al-Athīr and al-Maqrīzī report al-Qādir's reaction to these verses attributed to al-Raḍī, Ibn al-Athīr's version being nearly identical to that of Ibn al-Jawzī. Al-Maqrīzī uses excerpts from Hilāl b. al-Muḥassin al-Ṣābiʾ (d. 447/1055), thus

providing a contemporary rendering of the event. Hilāl al-Ṣābiʾ and Ibn al-Jawzī's accounts share an identical narrative frame. Yet they also have notable variances, revealing some disagreement in the broader historical tradition concerning the Abbasid al-Qādir, Sharīf al-Raḍī and the signing of a *maḥḍar*.[123]

According to both versions, after al-Qādir became aware of these verses, his spokesman confronted al-Raḍī's father, Abū Aḥmad al-Mūsawī.[124] Among the issues that the spokesman raised was that if al-Raḍī were to go to Egypt, his status would be considerably reduced.[125] Abū Aḥmad later denied that the verses were composed by his son.[126] There is a notable variation between the two accounts that follows this denial. In Hilāl's version, al-Qādir said that if this denial was true, then 'let a *maḥḍar* be written denying the lineage of the rulers of Egypt, and let Muḥammad [i.e., al-Raḍī] sign it', at which point those in attendance at the Abbasid court, including Abū Aḥmad and Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, signed it.[127] Ibn al-Jawzī's account, however, has Abū Aḥmad promising al-Bāqillānī, who is acting as the caliph's spokesman, that he will secure an apology from al-Raḍī. Later, Abū Aḥmad asks al-Raḍī to write a letter in which the latter will deny the ʿAlid lineage of the Fatimids.[128]

The two accounts reconverge when Abū Aḥmad confronts his son, al-Raḍī, and the latter denies that he is the author of the verses. In both narratives, al-Raḍī refuses to publicly deny the validity of the Fatimids' ʿAlid lineage, either by refusing to sign the *maḥḍar*, as in Hilāl's version, or by not writing the letter, as in Ibn al-Jawzī's one.[129] Abū Aḥmad confronts his son's refusal to do this, upon which al-Raḍī professes that he is fearful of the *dāʿī*s of Egypt.[130] A bitter argument ensues between father and son, and the father swears an oath to either not speak to his son, as per Hilāl,[131] or not reside with him, as in Ibn al-Jawzī.[132] The matter ends with al-Raḍī swearing an oath that the poem was not his composition, and Hilāl adds that al-Qādir nonetheless had him removed from the *niqāba*, and replaced him with another *sharīf*.[133]

Several elements in the two narratives raise further questions. Although the narrative frames are identical, the variation in incidental details suggests a considerable reworking of traditions concerning al-Qādir, al-Raḍī and the *maḥḍar*. The supposed breakdown of relations between al-Raḍī and his father seems suspect in view of al-Raḍī's well-documented affection and reverence for his father, which can be seen in the fact that his earliest poems were written in praise of him and also that he wrote his biography.[134] One must also question why, in the contemporary version of Hilāl, Sharīf al-Raḍī is said to have refused to sign a *maḥḍar* produced at the Abbasid court, while in the later version of al-Jawzī the narrative has al-Raḍī refusing to write a new letter denouncing the Fatimids. Could it be that Ibn al-Jawzī's version is retrospectively adapted to validate the accounts in which Sharīf al-Raḍī is said to have signed the Baghdad Manifesto?

Between the accounts of the pro-Fatimid verses of al-Raḍī and those about the Baghdad Manifesto, two somewhat conflicting narratives present themselves in the extant sources. The first seeks to detach al-Raḍī from the pro-Fatimid verses, while also emphasising his refusal to sign a manifesto/letter. The second, on the Baghdad Manifesto itself, simply attaches al-Raḍī's signature to the Manifesto of 402/1011. Why al-Raḍī would sign the Manifesto, a year after his father's demise and despite his resistance to do so earlier, remains unanswered. The question therefore remains open to further exploration as to whether the pro-Fatimid verses were written by Sharīf al-Raḍī and whether or not he actually signed the Manifesto of 402/1011. Conversely, al-Qādir's motivations for securing al-Raḍī's denial of the pro-Fatimid verses, and his affirmation of the Manifesto, are evident.

While the validation of the Manifesto depended on the compliance of the *ashrāf*, its actual issuance was inextricably tied to the burgeoning influence of the Fatimid *daʿwa* in Iraq.

## *Al-Kirmānī, the Fatimid daʿwa in Iraq*

Iraq had served as the crucible for Ismaili *daʿwa* activities during the *dawr al-satr* and into the 4th/10th century.[135] Conditions

in the Abbasid heartlands were not conducive to preserving a detailed record of the Fatimid *daʿwa*'s activities there in this period. However, accounts of the diplomatic negotiations between the Būyid ruler ʿAḍud al-Dawla and the Fatimid imam-caliph al-ʿAzīz bi'llāh around 367–368/977–978, indicate how widespread in Iraq the *daʿwa* was during the last decades of the century.[136] The proscription of a prominent Fatimid *dāʿī* from Baṣra whom ʿAḍud al-Dawla accused of overstepping the mark, and who was consequently held to ransom at the Būyid court, pending the outcome of the Būyid-Fatimid overtures, is a case in point.[137]

The writings of the Fatimid *dāʿī* Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī (d. after 411/1020) provide an insight into the Fatimid *daʿwa* in Iraq during the years surrounding the issuance of the Baghdad Manifesto.[138] Known as *Ḥujjat al-ʿIrāqayn*, al-Kirmānī occupied the most senior position in the Fatimid *daʿwa* in the region. His works such as *al-Majālis al-Baṣriyya wa'l-Baghdādiyya* are also indicative of his activities for the *daʿwa* in Iraq.[139] However, it is his *al-Maṣābīḥ fī ithbāt al-imāma*, probably composed soon after the Baghdad Manifesto, which provides an insight into the approaches to belief and their expression in the Fatimid *daʿwa* at this time.[140]

Written for Fakhr al-Mulk, the Būyid vizier in Baghdad during this period (401–407/1010–1016), the principal aim of this work was to convince him of the veracity of the Fatimid claim to the imamate. That al-Kirmānī could compose such a work in a heightened anti-Fatimid environment, and address it directly to the Būyid vizier, suggests he may have had some patronage among the upper echelons of the Iraqi bureaucracy.[141] In his *al-Maṣābīḥ*, al-Kirmānī sets out to provide a series of cogently argued premises, so as to prove:

> the absolute necessity of the imamate and to indicate what it is as precisely as he could, all the while affirming the Fatimid position, and that of his imam, al-Ḥākim.[142]

In so doing, he disparaged the Abbasid al-Qādir as 'blatantly unqualified for the imamate'.[143] This is particularly significant



because the Būyid vizier Fakhr al-Mulk was effectively in charge of relations with this caliph.

Al-Kirmānī delineates the criteria required for a valid claim to the imamate, the foremost of which is descent from al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. Consequently, he dismisses the claims of all the other contemporary Muslim rulers, beginning with the Abbasid al-Qādir and including the Zaydī and Khārijī imams of the time.[144] Al-Kirmānī reiterates the authentic ʿAlid lineage of the Fatimid imam-caliph al-Ḥākim:

> He is from the offspring of prophecy and is a descendant of al-Ḥusayn … He has been designated by pure forefathers back through ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, to Muhammad, the Chosen.[145]

Notably, al-Kirmānī makes no direct reference to the Baghdad Manifesto, which indicates that at the time of the issuing of the Manifesto, it may not have held any particular importance for the Fatimids.[146] Yet the fact that the entire work is concerned with affirming the imamate based on ʿAlid lineage reiterates its inviolable centrality for the Fatimid *daʿwa* in Iraq.

While al-Kirmānī's work demonstrates the prominent position of the leading Fatimid *dāʿī* in Iraq in the upper echelons of the Būyid administration, it was the manifestations of pro-Fatimid sentiment among the ordinary Shiʿi population of Baghdad, and especially the pronouncement of al-Ḥākim's name in the Friday *khuṭba* in several places around Baghdad, that may well have been the proverbial final straw which provoked al-Qādir's promulgation of the Manifesto.[147]

## *The proclaiming of al-Ḥākim by the Shiʿis of Baghdad*

Kennedy has noted that the Būyid period was one of continuous crisis in Baghdad.[148] As a result of the breakdown of the Abbasid political order, a decline in trade and the emigration of wealthy families to Egypt, Baghdad had turned into a battleground for various military factions seeking control over the limited resources of the region. Clashes between rival Turkish and Daylamī contingents for supremacy produced 'the emergence of

the Shīʿa and Sunnī as armed political groupings and the division of the city into Sunnī and Shīʿī quarters'.[149]

While the first signs of popular violence were evident in the anti-Shiʿi attacks by the Ḥanbalīs, which the Abbasid caliph sought to halt by a decree in 323/935,[150] the arrival of the Būyids in Baghdad was a catalyst for social rupture.[151] Then, in the aftermath of the political conflicts of 361/972, when Turkish regiments rebelled against the Būyids and their Daylamī regiments, there appeared what Donohue has termed a 'loose alliance' between the Turkish guards and the Sunnis on the one hand, and the Daylamī soldiery and the Shiʿis on the other.[152] Yet, though the political quarrels ended, as Kennedy notes, the 'arming of both factions and increasing division of the city into fortified quarters, each with its own sectarian character' became a permanent feature of the social landscape of the city until 'Baghdad was firmly divided between the adherents of the two rival sects, each armed and defending its own areas'.[153]

While various prominent figures, Sunni, Shiʿi and Būyid, sought to calm the violence, urban conflict became an endemic feature of 5th/11th-century Baghdad.[154] The eruption of Sunni–Shiʿi violence in 398/1008, however, took on new symbolic proportions when Shiʿi protestors publicly proclaimed their allegiance to the Fatimid ruler al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh.[155] Citing several reasons for these clashes, Ibn al-Jawzī relates:

> The People of Karkh spoke about the one who was executed, for he was a Shiʿa. Then a battle ensued between them and the people of Bāb al-Baṣra, Bāb al-Shaʿīr and al-Qalā'īn. The people of Karkh assaulted the home of Abū Ḥāmid (al-Isfarā'inī) so he went to Dār al-Quṭn. There they [the people of Karkh] proclaimed: Yā Ḥākim Yā Manṣūr.[156]

The proclamation of loyalty to al-Hākim bi-Amr Allāh in the Abbasid capital appears to have jolted al-Qādir into action. In a seemingly unprecedented intervention, he instructed his palace guards to assist the Sunni partisans. This weakened



the Shiʿa, whose leaders were compelled to seek the caliph's clemency.[157] While al-Qādir was increasingly recognised as the spokesman for the Sunnis, he sought to distance himself from the Sunni–Shiʿi fray. His personal intervention in this confrontation thus highlights his sensitivity to the growing success of the Fatimid *daʿwa*, which came to the fore some three years later in both northern and southern Iraq.

## *The khuṭba of Qirwāsh and the noose around Baghdad*

It was recognition of Fatimid authority by the two major Bedouin Iraqi principalities in 401/1010 which provoked the issuing of the Baghdad Manifesto. The dynastic chieftains of the 'Uqaylids and the Mazyadids emerged as increasingly powerful among the array of factional leaders in Iraq and Syria during this period, and their recognition of the imamate of the Fatimid al-Ḥākim in 401/1010 proved to be a seminal moment in the history of Fatimid–Abbasid rivalry.

Following the decline of Ḥamdānid rule in Mesopotamia, the chieftains of the Arab tribe of 'Uqayl established their foothold in Mosul around 380/990. Six years later, their chieftain Qirwāsh b. al-Muqallid (d. 442/1050) extended their rule over the Jazīra (northern Iraq and eastern Syria), with Mosul as the capital for the next half-century.[158]

In southern Iraq, another Bedouin dynasty, that of the Banū Mazyad, established its rule following the waning of Būyid authority there. By 393/1003, 'Alī b. Mazyad, the chief of the Mazyadid clan of the Banū Asad, had emerged as the unrivalled chieftain in the regions around Kūfa and south of Baghdad. In 397/1007, he was given the title Sanad al-Dawla in recognition of his stature.[159]

These two Bedouin principalities had large and cohesive nomadic armies upon which their polities had been built, and which gave them a distinct advantage over their factional rivals.[160] Though part of the Abbasid system of patronage, they had a notable affinity for Shiʿi Islam. Mazyadid patronage of Shiʿi scholarship at al-Ḥilla, originally their military encampment,

eventually led to the emergence of the Ḥilla school of Ithnaʿasharī jurisprudence.

In 401/1010, the ʿUqaylid Qirwāsh b. al-Muqallid, publicly pronounced his allegiance to the Fatimid imam-caliph al-Ḥākim in the Friday *khuṭba* in Mosul on 4 Muḥarram/18 August.[161] Two months later, recognition of the imamate of al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh was also declared in the sermon at Anbar, north of Baghdad. A week later, the same proclamations were made at al-Madāʾin (Ctesiphon) and Qaṣr Ibn Ḥubayra, south of Baghdad, and soon thereafter in Kūfa, the ancient bastion of Shiʿi Islam. Almost simultaneously, ʿAlī b. Mazyad, the chieftain of the Mazyadids, made similar public pronouncements in al-Ḥākim's name in southern Iraq.[162] Qirwāsh's change of allegiance effectively created what Walker has termed a Fatimid noose around Baghdad, placing the Abbasid caliph al-Qādir in a perilous position.[163] The ʿAlid descent of the Fatimids was declared in an unequivocal manner in the *khuṭba* of Qirwāsh:[164]

> O God, bless your radiant guardian and your greatest friend, ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, the father of the rightly guided imams … O God extend all Your blessings … [to] the imam of the age, fortress of the faith, master of the ʿAlid *daʿwa* (*ṣāḥib al-daʿwa al-ʿalawiyya*) and prophetic religion (*al-milla al-nabawiyya*), Your servant and guardian on Your behalf, al-Manṣūr Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh, Commander of the Believers, just as You blessed his rightly guided forefathers.

The aftermath of this public declaration highlights the fact that despite al-Qādir's growing authority in Baghdad, he was compelled to turn to the Būyid military lords to repulse the pro-Fatimid stranglehold now around Baghdad. Following entreaties for aid from the Abbasid caliph, the Būyid amir Bahāʾ al-Dawla compelled Qirwāsh to rescind his recognition of the Fatimid *daʿwa* through threats and enticements.[165] Al-Qādir's military limitations being thus exposed, he turned in the following year to the soft power of propaganda and issued the Baghdad Manifesto.



## The Baghdad Manifesto

Soon after the Baghdad Manifesto was issued from al-Qādir's court in 402/1011 it was read out publicly in Baghdad and Basra, as well as in other areas.[166] Seeking to definitively place the Fatimids outside the ʿAlid fold, the Manifesto placed them outside Islam altogether. It dredged up the central elements of the accumulated anti-Fatimid polemic of the 5th/11th century, especially as recounted in Ibn Rizām and Akhū Muḥsin, and gave them caliphal sanction. Most importantly, the attestation of the claims of the Manifesto by the prominent signatories in Baghdad set the seal on its validity.

The influence of the Manifesto lay as much in the fact that it was issued by the Abbasid caliph, as it did in the stature of the signatories underwriting its authenticity. An investigation of the key signatories as well as those whose names are absent from it, reveals that the Manifesto was conditioned as much by the dynamics of power in Baghdad, and al-Qādir's manipulation of them, as it was about forestalling the influence of the Fatimid *daʿwa* in the region.

### *The ʿAlids*

In addition to Sharīf al-Raḍī and Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, whose significance to the signing of the Manifesto has been discussed above, there were several other major ʿAlid figures who were given as signatories. One of those listed by Ibn al-Jawzī and Ibn al-Athīr is Abū Ṭāhir b. Abiʾl-Ṭayyib. A survey of the genealogical sources indicates that this is a reference to Abū Ṭāhir Aḥmad b. Abiʾl-Ṭāyyib al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Ashtar, a descendant of the early Shiʿi Imam, ʿAlī Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn. Sharīf Muḥammad al-Ashtar is known as the progenitor of the Banū ʿUbayd Allāh, a large family of *ashrāf* whose predominance in Kūfa gave rise to the adage, 'The sky belongs to God, the earth to the Banū ʿUbayd Allāh.'[167] Over the 5th/11th century, major members of the *ashrāf* from this family held the *niqābas* of Wāsiṭ, Kūfa, Baghdad and Mosul.[168] Furthermore, Muḥammad al-Ashtar's grandson, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Aḥmad (d. 398/1007) was

close to Abū Aḥmad al-Mūsawī, the father of Sharīf al-Raḍī.[169] The signatory, Abū Ṭāhir Aḥmad b. Abu'l-Ṭayyib al-Ḥasan, was another grandson of Muḥammad al-Ashtar and a cousin of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Aḥmad.[170] His signature on the Manifesto would have therefore served as a corroboration from one of the eminent *ashrāf* families of Iraq.

Also noted among the ʿAlid signatories is Ibn al-Buṭḥāwī. In so far as this *nisba* is seemingly missing from the works of the genealogists, it is probably a transcription error for the *nisba* al-Buṭḥānī. The Buṭḥānīs were Ḥasanid ʿAlids who had gained prominence as Zaydī imams and local notables generally throughout the eastern Islamic world.[171] Pre-eminent Buṭḥānīs included the two Zaydī imams, Abu'l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad al-Mu'ayyad bi'llāh (d. 411/1020) and his elder brother Abū Ṭālib Yaḥyā al-Nāṭiq bi'l-Ḥaqq (d. ca. 424/1033), both of whom, as Madelung notes, gained 'universal recognition among the later Zaidīs as Imams for their outstanding rank in religious scholarship'.[172] Notably, both studied in Baghdad before claiming the imamate.[173] Other Buṭḥānīs included the patrician families of Nīsābūr and Hamadhān.[174]

The possible mention of an anonymous Ibn al-Buṭḥānī in the Baghdad Manifesto can be linked to the career of another leading Zaydī in Baghdad, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (d. 359/969) known as Ibn al-Dāʿī, who came from a collateral branch of the ʿAlids. He came to Baghdad with the Būyid amir Muʿizz al-Dawla who had considered Ibn al-Dāʿī as a viable candidate for the caliphate, but appointed him instead as the *naqīb* over the *ashrāf*.[175] Thus there was a distinct Zaydī presence in Baghdad to be seen among the *naqīb*s. The signature of an anonymous Buṭḥānī on the Manifesto would have represented its validation by a distinguished Zaydī family in Iraq.

Among the other ʿAlid signatories was Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿUmar. Known as Abu'l-Ḥārith al-ʿAlawī, he was a *naqīb* of Kūfa who expended much of his wealth on leading the *ḥajj* caravans for over a decade.[176] Despite the Kūfan link and the mention of wealth, it is unclear if this figure is connected to the distinguished Iraqi *sharīf* who had died ten years earlier, Muḥammad b. ʿUmar.[177] If that is so, then the signature of his son, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿUmar, on the Manifesto represented an endorsement by another major ʿAlid family in Iraq. Ibn Azraq al-Mūsawī and Ibn Abī Yaʿlā are also found among the ʿAlids, but little is known of them.



### *The judges*

The signatories included also eminent judges. Qāḍī Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh al-Akfānī al-Asadī (316–405/928–1014) was the leading Ḥanafī judge of Baghdad at the time.[178] A major patron of traditionists, Ibn al-Akfānī served as the chief *qāḍī* of Baghdad after 396/1005–1006. After him is listed Abu'l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Abīwardī (d. 425/1034), a *ḥadīth* narrator and poet, who later became a leading Shāfiʿī judge in Baghdad, under the patronage of his Shāfiʿī master al-Isfarā'inī, as discussed in the section 'The jurists', below.[179]

The identity of the third judge remains uncertain, partly because of the variants of the name in the sources, either Abu'l-Qāṣim al-Khazarī or al-Jazarī.[180] There are seemingly no prominent contemporary *qāḍī*s with the *nisba* al-Jazarī or al-Khazarī of Baghdad in this era. It is likely, however, following Ibn al-Athīr's identification of him as Ibn al-Khazarī, that this *qāḍī* is the son of, or connected to, another eminent judge of Baghdad in the previous generation, who belonged to the Ẓāhirī *madhhab*, known as Qāḍī Abu'l-Ḥusayn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Aḥmad al-Khazarī. This *qāḍī* was appointed as one of the four deputy judges in Baghdad in 369/979 after ʿAḍud al-Dawla 'broke with tradition' and appointed a Ẓāhirī scholar from Shīrāz as the chief justice of Baghdad.[181] The contemporary Ibn al-Nadīm noted in his listing of Ẓāhirī jurists that ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Isbahānī al-Khazarī was still serving as a judge in Baghdad in 376/987.[182] This al-Khazarī died in 391/1001, ten years before the Manifesto. While the connection of Abu'l-Qāṣim al-Khazarī with ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Khazarī remains to be established, it would have fitted with the varied purposes of the Manifesto to have a leading Ẓāhirī's signature on it.

### *The jurists*

The jurists listed as signatories to the Manifesto can be divided into Ḥanafīs and Shāfiʿīs with one exception, a major Shiʿi jurist. Foremost among the Shāfiʿī signatories is Abū Ḥāmid Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Isfarā'inī (345–406/957–1016), the leader of the Shāfiʿīs of Baghdad from the end of the 4th/10th century and one of the capital's 'most important religious figures'.[183] Another Shāfiʿī signatory was Abū ʿAlī b. Ḥamkān (d. 405/1014).[184] Ibn al-Athīr also lists the Shāfiʿī *faqīh* Abu'l-Faḍl al-Nasawī.[185] The identities of two other listed jurists remains uncertain. It is likely that Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Bayḍāwī, listed in Ibn al-Jawzī, was Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Bayḍāwī al-Baghdādī (d. 424/1033), a Shāfiʿī jurist whose *nisba* may indicate the inclusion of a distinctly Baghdadi element.[186] One signatory, Abū Muḥammad al-Kashfalī, remains unidentified, though his *nisba* displays a Shāfiʿī connection.[187]

The Ḥanafī jurists who signed the Manifesto are named as Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Qudūrī al-Ḥanafī (d. 429/1037), the 'head of the Ḥanafī school of Iraq', a highly respected *faqīh* and teacher of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī whose works are well known. Another leading Ḥanafī signatory was al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Ṣaymarī (d. 436/1044), a leader of the Ḥanafīs of Baghdad as well as an important *faqīh* and judge. Ibn al-Athīr adds the name of an ascetic Ḥanafī scholar, Abū Jaʿfar al-Nasafī (d. 414/1023).[188]

Finally, included by Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn Khaldūn, and the only name of any signatory given by Abu'l-Fidā, is that of Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Nuʿmān, the pre-eminent Ithnāʿasharī Shiʿi jurist of the era, Shaykh al-Mūfīd (336–413/948–1022). Regarded as 'a leading theologian and spokesman of the Imāmiyya', whose authority was widely recognised by Ithnāʿasharī Imāmīs beyond Baghdad, Shaykh al-Mufīd was a prominent figure in the intellectual life of Baghdad itself. Madelung adds that 'virtually all the leading Imāmī scholars of the following generation were his students', including Sharīf al-Raḍī and Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, the latter leading the funeral prayers over him in 413/1022.[189]



### *The legal witnesses* (shuhūd)

Among the remaining figures listed as signatories can be found the legal witness Abu'l-Qāsim ʿAlī b. al-Muḥassin al-Tanūkhī (365–447/976–1055), a son of Abū ʿAlī al-Tanūkhī (329–384/941–994), the famous littérateur and judge, who was the secretary and confidant of the Būyid amir, ʿAḍud al-Dawla. Ibn Khallikān says that, in addition to his scholarly endeavours, Abu'l-Qāsim ʿAlī was known for the soundness of his legal testimony before he became a *qāḍī*.[190]

An overview of the signatories highlights the point that the legitimacy of the Manifesto was conceived of strategically as a collectively signed legal testimony, with the signatories serving as public guarantors of its anti-Fatimid pronouncement. Moreover, their varied backgrounds reflect the three major sources of authority regarding the subject matter and claims of the Manifesto – genealogical, legal and doctrinal. The Iraqi *ashrāf* served as the genealogical validation of the document, the judges and *shuhūd* as the legal sponsors, and the representatives of the various legal and religious schools as the doctrinal verifiers.

Equally important in contextualising the relevance of the Manifesto is an analysis of the dynamics operating among the signatories. The most prominent figures noted in the Baghdad Manifesto were often at loggerheads with each other, and at times with al-Qādir. As leaders of the highly fragmented Sunni and Shiʿi communities of Baghdad, the Shāfiʿī Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarā'inī and Shaykh al-Mufīd found themselves as the de facto leaders of hostile Sunni and Shiʿi communities in Baghdad. A case in point is the urban violence in which the Shiʿi protestors invoked the Fatimid al-Ḥākim. Kindled by attacks against Shaykh al-Mufīd, the conflict culminated in an assault on the house of al-Isfarā'inī for the role he played in effecting the burning of the *muṣḥaf* of Ibn Masʿūd.[191]

Relations between the Sunni signatories are similarly pertinent. The period of the signing of the Manifesto saw three of the major signatories pitted against each other in a dispute

which also drew in Sharīf al-Raḍī and the Abbasid al-Qādir. As detailed by Donohue, a struggle for control of the office of *qāḍī* of Baghdad in the same year as the Manifesto led the Ḥanafī chief judge al-Akfānī to reject the attempt by the Shāfiʿī, al-Isfarāʾinī, to have his protégé al-Abīwardī appointed as the deputy.[192] When al-Akfānī rejected the caliph's order, al-Isfarāʾinī used his connections with al-Qādir to have him dismissed and replaced by al-Abīwardī. The appointment divided the *ʿulamāʾ*. Al-Akfānī was supported by the Ḥanafīs and by Sharīf al-Raḍī, while al-Abīwardī was upheld by the caliph's court and the Shāfiʿīs. The conflict spread beyond the city when al-Afkānī wrote to Maḥmūd of Ghazna complaining about al-Qādir's persecution of the Ḥanafīs. After the Būyid vizier, encouraged by Sharīf al-Raḍī, lent his weight to the Ḥanafīs, al-Qādir relented by reappointing al-Afkānī and dismissing al-Isfarāʾinī from the court. While its connection to this particular event is unclear, elsewhere potential Shāfiʿī hostility to al-Qādir is reflected in a story that claims Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarāʾinī reputedly warned al-Qādir that he merely needed to write to Khurāsān to have the caliph removed from office.[193]

That al-Qādir was able to get these mutually hostile figures to sign the Manifesto reflects the fact that his attempts to position himself as the sole leading figure in Baghdad were ultimately successful. Just as later, in 408/1017, al-Qādir was to demand that the Ḥanafī Muʿtazila publicly renounce their creed, the Baghdad Manifesto of 402/1011 can be understood as a precursor to this success because he was able to persuade these rival factions to publicly denounce the Fatimids.

The fact that the Manifesto served a dual purpose, of anti-Fatimid propaganda and of reining in the leading figures in Bagdad under the authority of al-Qādir, is corroborated by the absence of one important segment of the Baghdadi leadership from the list of the signatories, namely, the Ḥanbalīs. This is significant considering their vociferous hostility to the Shiʿis, including the Fatimids, and their increasing affinity to al-Qādir. He could be sure of their support. A similar case is the absence of the signature of the Ashʿarī *qāḍī*, Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī. A



critical figure in the return of Qirwāsh to the Abbasid fold after his pro-Fatimid turn in 401/1010, al-Bāqillānī died three years after the production of the Manifesto. However, as the author of an anti-Ismaili tract his credentials were not under question, and therefore his signature on the Manifesto was perhaps deemed superfluous.

## The Manifesto of 444/1052

Just over four decades after the promulgation of the Baghdad Manifesto of 402/1011, a second manifesto was issued from the court of al-Qādir's son and successor, al-Qāʾim (r. 422–467/1031–1075), in 444/1052.[194] While a detailed review of the historical context of this second manifesto falls outside the purview of this chapter, it is noteworthy that it was issued during a time of great instability in Iraq and Iran, one which saw the end of Būyid rule and the westward advance of the Saljūq Turks across the Iranian plateau. Just as in the prelude to the first Manifesto, the period in which the second one was issued witnessed the growing influence of the Fatimid *daʿwa* in Iraq. Some six years after it appeared, the Turkish general Abu'l-Ḥārith Arslān al-Basāsīrī entered Baghdad and ordered that the Friday sermon be given in the name of the imam-caliph al-Muṣtanṣir bi'llāh (427–487/1036–1094), which then occurred for 40 weeks in 450/1058.[195] The chief Fatimid negotiator in Iraq at the time, al-Muʾayyad fi'l-Dīn al-Shīrāzī, who was instrumental in winning the Turkish general to the Fatimid cause, recounts at length in his autobiography the political manoeuvrings of the *daʿwa* leading up to this historic moment in the broader context of Fatimid–Abbasid rivalry.[196]

That the Manifesto of 444/1052 seemingly receives only cursory mention in the major sources indicates that it was essentially seen as a reproduction of the previous one of 402/1011, with two notable exceptions. First, this Manifesto, as preserved in Ibn al-Jawzī's recension, names Fāṭima, alongside ʿAlī, as the progenitor of the Fatimids. Secondly, while the first Manifesto reiterated the Dayṣānī accusations of the Ibn Rizām/

Akhū Muḥsin tradition, it left out the Qaddāḥid ancestry of the Fatimids. The Manifesto of 444/1052, however, added the attribution of Qaddāḥid origins to the existing anti-Fatimid polemic, giving these accusations validity in an official Abbasid proclamation. As a result, Ibn al-Jawzī's entry for the year 444/1052 reads:

> In this year, there were written *maḥāḍir* in the *dīwān* mentioning the ruler of Egypt (*ṣāḥib Miṣr*) and those who came before him from his forebears, rejecting the lineage which they claim and repudiating their link to the Prophet of God, and to ʿAlī and Fāṭima, and [instead] attributing them to the Dayṣāniyya of the Magians and the Qaddāḥiyya of the Jews. [It said] that they are outside [the fold] of Islam. And there occurred similar to what we had mentioned in the days of al-Qādir bi'llāh, whereby signatures were taken of the *ashrāf*, the *qāḍī*s, the witnesses and the *ʿulamā'* in regard to this.[197]

## The Sunni Reception and Ibn Khaldūn's Critique

The Baghdad Manifesto of 402/1011 was to be regularly deployed by medieval Sunni historians and polemicists from the 6th/12th century onwards as proof of the Abbasid claim that the Fatimids lacked ʿAlid descent. Its presentation as an authoritative document can be seen in works such as Juwaynī's *Ta'rīkh-i jahān-gushā* where the author employs it as part of his account of the advance of the Mongol ruler Hūlāgū (d. 663/1265) against the Nizārī Ismailis of Iran, in order to highlight the heresy of the latter and their belief in the 'false Mahdī'.[198] Meanwhile, Ibn al-Kathīr, in his own polemic against the ʿAlid origins of the Fatimids, gives the names of al-Isfarā'inī and al-Qudūrī as signatories of the Manifesto in order to justify his rejection of the Fatimid lineage.[199]

The potency of the Baghdad Manifesto in medieval Sunni literature is most apparent in the fact that Sunni historians who accepted the ʿAlid lineage of the Fatimids felt it necessary to question the validity of the Baghdad Manifesto itself. Ibn al-Athīr, who affirms the ʿAlid descent of the Fatimids,



rejects the validity of the Baghdad Manifesto because duress was employed to get individuals to sign it and because they included people who were not genealogists.[200] A sustained criticism of the veracity of the Manifesto was later offered by the renowned North African historian, Ibn Khaldūn. Writing some two centuries after the fall of the Fatimids, Ibn Khaldūn's assessment of them reflects his historian's cast of mind as well as his temporal and doctrinal distance from the Abbasids. His principal discussion of the Manifesto of 402/1011 occurs in his illustrious *Muqaddima*, which serves as his critique of Muslim historiography. In speaking about the 'eastern' Sunni historians' attitude towards the Fatimids, he points out: 'They deny their [i.e. the Fatimids] 'Alid origins and attack their descent from Imam Ismāʿīl, son of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq' because they base their narratives on 'stories that were made up in favour of the weak Abbasid caliphs.'[201]

Ibn Khaldūn does not dwell on the religious considerations of lineal affinity, an angle which some 'eastern' Sunni historians invoked in declaring that the Fatimids could not be ʿAlids because of their supposed heresies. For Ibn Khaldūn, whose antipathy to several Shiʿi groups is evident in other parts of his work, this was an irrelevance because, as he argued, denying their descent would not invalidate any heresy they might have adhered to, nor would establishing their descent 'help them before God' if they were indeed heretical.[202]

Instead, Ibn Khaldūn's affirmation of the Fatimid lineage emerges from a pragmatic and rational exposé of the reaction of the Abbasids to the Fatimid venture. He points out that the empire of the Fatimids lasted for 270 years, that it spread from North Africa to the Ḥijāz and that 'they shared the realm of Islam equally with the Abbasids'; and he poses the question: 'How could all this have befallen a fraudulent claimant to the rulership?' He adds that the partisans of the Fatimid imam-caliphs 'showed them the greatest love and devotion … [E]ven after the dynasty had gone and its influence had disappeared, people still came forward to press the claims.'[203]

For Ibn Khaldūn, it was the inability of the Abbasids and their supporters to resist the Fatimid advances that initiated the production of anti-Fatimid polemic in order to 'make up for their inability to resist and repel the Kutāma Berbers, the partisans and propagandists of the 'Ubaydids (Fatimids), who had taken Syria, Egypt, and the Ḥijāz away from the (Abbasids)'. It is in this vein that Ibn Khaldūn questions the validity of the Manifesto:

> The event took place on one memorable day in the year 402 [1011] in the time of al-Qādir. The testimony (of these witnesses) was based upon hearsay, on what people in Baghdad generally believed. Most of them were partisans of the Abbasids who attacked the 'Alid origin (of the 'Ubaydid-Fatimids). The historians reported the information as they had heard it. They handed it down to us just as they remembered it.

Ibn Khaldūn concludes his critique of the Manifesto by reflecting on how the vagaries of political circumstance affect the acquisition of knowledge:

> Dynasty and government serve as the world's market place, attracting to it the products of scholarship and craftsmanship alike. Wayward wisdom and forgotten lore turn up there. In this market, stories are told and items of historical information are delivered.[204]

## Notes

1 For an overview and interpretation of the question of Fatimid origins in 20th-century scholarship, see Michael Brett, *The Rise of the Fatimids: The World of the Mediterranean and the Middle East in the Fourth Century of the Hijra, Tenth Century CE* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 29–49. The prevalence of the Manifesto as a document informing Fatimid origins culminated in Mamour's work, the motive of which was to refute the validity of the claims made in the document. See Prince P.H. Mamour, *Polemics on the Origin of the Fatimi Caliphs* (London, 1934; repr. Karachi, 1979). Mamour reproduces commentaries by earlier orientalists regarding the Manifesto, including those of Margoliouth, Quatremère and Donaldson (ibid., pp. 21–22). See also Brett's comments on Mamour's defence (Brett, *Rise*, p. 34). For the label 'famous Baghdad Manifesto', see, for instance, Nabia Abbot, 'Two Būyid Coins in the Oriental Institute', *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, 56 (1939), pp. 350–364, p. 356; Bernard Lewis, *The Origins of Ismā'īlism: A Study of the Historical Background of the Fāṭimid Caliphate* (Cambridge, 1940; repr. New York, 1975), pp. 3, 8; Farhad Daftary, *The Ismā'īlīs: Their History and Doctrines* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 2007), p. 102; Farhad Daftary, *Ismaili Literature: A Bibliography of Sources and Studies* (London, 2004), p. 87; Paul E. Walker, ed. and tr., *Orations of the Fatimid Caliphs: Festival Sermons of the Ismaili Imams* (London, 2009), p. 5.

2 Lewis, *Origins*, p. 8, notes the pervasiveness of the Baghdad Manifesto in medieval Sunni chronicles.

3 For a sustained discussion on the progress in studies on the Ismailis, especially over the 20th century, see Daftary, *Ismā'īlīs*, pp. 1–34.

4 For an exception, however, see Lewis who views the Manifesto as a milestone in what he characterises as three stages by which 'true knowledge' of Ismaili doctrine filtered to the Sunni world. The first is marked by knowledge based only on public activities, the second is based on some 'inklings', and the third on 'detailed' but not always accurate knowledge of the Ismailis and their origins. For Lewis, 'the third stage is marked by the famous Baghdad manifesto, denouncing the Fāṭimid caliphs as impostors and schematics': Lewis, *Origins*, pp. 1–3.

5 See, for example, Daftary, *Ismā'īlīs*, p. 102.

6 See, for example, Hugh Kennedy, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphate: The Islamic Near East from the Sixth to the Eleventh Century* (London, 1986), pp. 241–242; Farhad Daftary, *The Assassin Legends: Myths of the Isma'ilis* (London, 1994), p. 24; Paul E. Walker, 'The Ismā'īlī Da'wa and the Fāṭimid Caliphate', in M. W. Daly, ed., *The Cambridge History of Egypt*; Volume I, *Islamic Egypt, 640–1517*, ed. Carl F. Petry (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 145–146. Sadik A. Assaad, *The Reign of al-Hakim bi Amr Allah (386/996 – 411/1021): A Political Study* (Beirut, 1974), p. 16. Brett takes the Manifesto as an example of al-Qādir seeking to win the support of the Twelvers (as well as the Sunnis) of Baghdad against the Fatimid claim. See Michael Brett, "Abbasids, Fatimids and Seljuqs', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, Volume IV.

*c. 1024–c. 1998 Part II*, ed. D. Luscombe and J. Riley-Smith (Cambridge, 2004), p. 687.

7 See, e.g., D. Sourdel, 'al-Ḳādir Bi'llāh', *EI2*.

8 Ibn al-Jawzī, Abu'l-Faraj 'Abd al-Raḥmān, *al-Muntaẓam fī ta'rīkh al-mulūk wa'l-umam*, ed. Muḥammad A. 'Aṭā and Muṣṭafā A. 'Aṭā (Beirut, 1412/1992), vol. 15, pp. 82–83.

9 Ibn al-Athīr, 'Izz al-Dīn Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī, *al-Kāmil fi'l-ta'rīkh*, ed. Muḥammad Yūsuf al-Daqqāq (Beirut, 1407/1987), vol. 6, pp. 447–448.

10 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Aṭā-Malik Juwaynī, *Ta'rīkh-i jahān-gushā*, tr. J.A. Boyle as *The History of the World-Conqueror* (Cambridge, MA, 1958), vol. 2, pp. 658–659.

11 Abu'l-Fidā, al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad 'Imād al-Dīn Ismā'īl b. 'Alī, *Mukhtaṣar ta'rīkh al-bashar* (Cairo, 1325/1907), pp. 142–143.

12 Ibn al-Kathīr, 'Imād al-Dīn Ismā'īl b. 'Umar, *al-Bidāya wa'l-nihāya*, ed. Ṣalāḥ Muḥammad al-Khaymī (2nd ed., Damascus, 2010), vol. 13, p. 9.

13 Al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, *Ta'rīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa'l-a'lām*, ed. 'Umar 'Abd al-Salām al-Tadmurī (Beirut, 1413/1993), vol. 28, p. 11.

14 Al-Ṣafadī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl, *Kitāb al-wāfī bi'l-wafāyāt*, ed. Aḥmad Arna'ūṭ and Turkī Muṣṭafā (Beirut, 1420/2000), vol. 19, p. 243.

15 Ibn Khaldūn, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad, *al-Muqaddima*, tr. Franz Rosenthal as *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History* (2nd ed., Princeton, 1980), vol. 1, p. 45. The Manifesto is also mentioned in the main body of Ibn Khaldūn's historical work. See his *Kitāb al-'ibar*, ed. Khalīl Shaḥāda and Suhayl Zakkār as *Ta'rīkh Ibn Khaldūn* (Beirut, 1431/2001), vol. 3, p. 547.

16 Al-Maqrīzī, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. 'Alī, *Ittiʿāẓ al-ḥunafā' bi-akhbār al-a'imma al-Fāṭimiyyīn al-khulafā'*, vol. 1, ed. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl (Cairo, 1387/1967), pp. 43–44.

17 Ibn Taghrībirdī, Abu'l-Maḥāsin Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf, *al-Nujūm al-zāhira fī mulūk Miṣr wa'l-Qāhira* (Beirut, 1413/1992), vol. 4, p. 229.

18 Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima*, tr. Rosenthal, vol. 1, p. 45, n. 129.

19 Ibn al-Kathīr's introductory passage is a summarised version of Ibn al-Jawzī as he himself notes at the end of his report on the Manifesto. It reads:

> And in Rabī' al-Ākhir of this year, written-declarations (*mahāḍir*) were composed in Baghdad affirming the defamation (*al-ṭa'n*) and public vilification (*qadḥ*) of the caliphs, that is, the kings (*mulūk*) of Egypt. They claim that they are Fāṭimiyyūn, but they are not so. Their lineage is from Dayṣān b. Sa'īd al-Khurramī. This was undersigned by a group of *'ulamā'*, *quḍāt*, *fuqahā'*, the *ashrāf*, the *amthāl*, the *ḥadīth* transmitters, the legal witnesses, and the pious ones.



See Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, pp. 9–10. The editors of this volume note that manuscripts of the *al-Bidāya* give 'Ubayd b. Sa'd al-Juramī instead of Dayṣān b. Sa'īd al-Khurramī. As it is unclear who this refers to, the editors corrected it to Dayṣān b. Sa'īd based on Ibn al-Jawzī's original. Ibid., vol. 13, p. 9, n. 2.

20 Al-Dhahabī's version begins: 'From the *dīwān* there was written a *maḥḍar* as to the substance (*ma'nā*) of the caliphs who were in Egypt, to publicly vilify their *nasab* and their creed (*'aqā'idihim*).' al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 11. Ibn Taghrībirdī states: 'and in this year, in the month of Rabī' al-Ākhir, the 'Abbāsid caliph al-Qādir wrote a *maḥḍar* as to the substance of the Egyptian caliphs, to publicly vilify their *nasab* and their creed.' Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 229.

21 Al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 11, and Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 229, only state 'and upon it were the signatures of *al-quḍāt wa'l-a'imma wa'l-ashrāf*'.

22 Al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 11 and Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230, have *ikhwān* (the brothers of) rather than *aḥzāb* (the party of) – the orthography of *ikhwān* and *aḥzāb* without dots is similar, and these variants are probably a scribal error.

23 Al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 11, and Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230, only have: 'A testimony through which one seeks nearness to God.'

24 This *basmala* is found only in Juwaynī, *Jahān-gushā*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, p. 659.

25 This addition about al-Mu'izz and Egypt is only noted in Juwaynī, ibid.

26 In this specific location, this segment is found only in Juwaynī, *Jahān-gushā*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, p. 659. However, it is found in the main body of the text in Ibn al-Jawzī et al.

27 Boyle's translation from Juwaynī's Persian has 'this upstart in Egypt': Juwaynī, *Jahān-gushā*, tr. Boyle.

28 Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 10, omits 'of his foul and impure predecessors'.

29 Al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 11, and Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230, only have 'curses upon him and them'.

30 Only Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83, and Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 10, have 'nor do they … falsehood.'

31 Al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 11, and Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230, only have 'of the Ṭālibids'.

32 'Concerning their false claims' is not in Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 10. Similarly, 'concerning their lies and false claims' is not in al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 11, and Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230.

33 *Mu'aṭṭil* here refers to the denial of God and of His attributes. See Juwaynī, *Jahān-gushā*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, p. 660, n. 9. It is thus a shorthand for 'materialists' who deny God.

34 The order of invectives changes slightly across the variant sources though remaining generally stable. Abu'l-Fidā, *Mukhtaṣar*, vol. 2, p. 142, Juwaynī, *Jahān-gusha*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, p. 660, and al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āẓ*, vol. 1, p. 44, omit *fujjār*. Al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12, does not have *fujjār, mulḥidūn, mu'aṭṭalūn*, while Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230, omits only *mulḥidūn*.

35 The editors of this edition of Ibn Taghrībirdī note that their manuscripts of the *al-Nujūm* have *Yahūdiyya* (Jews) instead of *Thanawiyya* (Dualists) but they adjusted it to correspond with Ibn al-Jawzī. Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230, n. 6.

36 Literally 'made available the orifices'.

37 'Permitting drink' is omitted in Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230.

38 Abu'l-Fidā, *Mukhtaṣar*, vol. 2, p. 142, Juwaynī, *Jahān-gusha*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, p. 660, and al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āẓ*, vol. 1, p. 44, omit 'cursed the *salaf*'.

39 Both al-Murtaḍā and al-Raḍī are mentioned in Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 448; Juwaynī, *Jahān-gusha*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, p. 660; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 9; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12; al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfī*, vol. 19, p. 243; Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima* tr. Rosenthal, vol. 1, p. 46; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230.

40 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 448; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 9; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230.

41 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 9.



42 The editions of the extant sources differ as to whether Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. 'Umar and Ibn Abī Ya'lā are two separate persons, as in Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, pp. 9–10, or if Ibn Abī Ya'la is the name of father of the former, as in al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, pp. 230–231.

43 Only given in Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 448 and Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima* tr. Rosenthal, vol. 1, p. 45.

44 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 448; Juwaynī, *Jahān-gusha*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, p. 660; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 9; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12; Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima* tr. Rosenthal, vol. 1, p. 45; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 231.

45 Ibn al-Jawzī, Ibn al-Athīr, Ibn Kathīr, al-Dhahabī and Ibn Taghrībirdī oscillate between al-Khazarī, al-Jazarī and even al-Ḥarīrī. For a discussion of the possible identity of this individual, see the section on the signatories of the Manifesto above.

46 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83. Other sources call him al-Abiwardī. See Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 448, Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 10 and Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima* tr. Rosenthal, vol. 1, p. 45.

47 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 448; Juwaynī, *Jahān-gusha*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, p. 660; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 9; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12; al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfī*, vol. 19, p. 243; Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima* tr. Rosenthal, vol. 1, p. 45; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 231.

48 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 448; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 9; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 231.

49 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Juwaynī, *Jahān-gusha*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, p. 660; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 448; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 9; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12; al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfī*, vol. 19, p. 243; Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima* tr. Rosenthal, vol. 1, p. 46; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 231.

50 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 448; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 9; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12; Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima* tr. Rosenthal, vol. 1, p. 46; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230.

51 Only in Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Juwaynī, *Jahān-gusha*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, p. 660; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 9.

52 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 9; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 230.

53 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 9; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 231.

54 Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, pp. 448–449.

55 He is referred to as Abū 'Abd Allāh b. al-Nu'mān, *faqīh* of the Shi'a. See Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 449; Abu'l-Fidā, *Mukhtaṣar*, vol. 2, p. 141; Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima* tr. Rosenthal, vol. 1, p. 46.

56 See the introductory segments to the Manifesto in Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 447 and Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima* tr. Rosenthal, vol. 1, p. 45.

57 For a masterly survey of the evolution of doctrines on succession and the Imamate in early Ismaili history, see Wilferd Madelung, 'Das Imamat in der frühen ismailitischen Lehre', *Der Islam*, 37 (1961), pp. 43–135; reprinted in his *Studies on Medieval Shi'ism*, ed. S. Schmidtke (Farnham, Surrey, 2012), article VII.

58 More extensive expositions on the Fatimid notion of the imamate are provided in Daftary, *Ismā'īlīs*, pp. 163–167; Brett, *Rise*, pp. 176–219; Heinz Halm, *The Empire of the Mahdi: The Rise of the Fatimids*, tr. M. Bonner (Leiden, 1996), pp. 346–355.

59 The question of the name of the dynasty and whether or not the Fatimids identified themselves by that appellation have been discussed in recent scholarship. Fierro's survey indicated that the term 'Fāṭimī' was not readily used by the leading authorities of the dynasty. See Maribel Fierro, 'On *al-Fāṭimī* and *al-Fāṭimiyyūn*', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 20 (1996), pp. 130–161. Walker points out that more recent scholarship has established that the term came into progressively increasing use during the history of the dynasty, so that 'by the end of the dynasty it was fairly common to call it *al-dawla al-fāṭimiyya* ("the Fatimid state" or "the Fatimid dynasty"), and thus later authors grew quite accustomed to the term.' He also adds that the terms *al-imām al-fāṭimī* and *al-fāṭimiyyīn* also appear in some early pro-Fatimid poetry, and in an occasional *khuṭba*. *Orations*, pp. 69–72.

60 Wilferd Madelung has argued that it was Fāṭima who was regarded as the true legal heir to the Prophet in the earliest phase of Muslim history. He bases his argument on Qur'anic regulations where the 'universally binding laws of inheritance' gave 'unconditional precedence to direct descendants', and according to which, 'in the absence of a son, a daughter or daughters were sole primary heirs and could not be excluded by any rights of male kin'. 'Introduction', in F. Daftary and G. Miskinzoda, ed., *The Study of Shi'i Islam: History, Theology and Law* (London, 2014), pp. 3–16, p. 4. Considering the Qur'anic outlawing of adoption and the recognition of only blood relationships, Madelung argues that 'under the divine law of the Qur'an, Fāṭima was the Prophet's prime heiress and successor' (ibid., pp. 4–5). He adds that the crisis after the Prophet's death was brought on, 'by the exceptional circumstance that the legitimate successor to supreme leadership was a woman' and that the 'Caliphate of the Quraysh must be judged to have been a *coup d'état* in which the ruling house was overthrown'. 'Alī's position in this schema of succession was of a potential, though not confirmed, executor (*waṣī*) of the Prophet's will (ibid., pp. 5–7).



61 Qāḍī al-Nu'mān, *Iftitāḥ al-da'wa*, tr. Hamid Haji as *Founding the Fatimid State: The Rise of an Early Islamic Empire* (London, 2006), p. 178, p. 205.

62 Al-Mu'izz pronounced prayers for the 'rightly-guided imams' from the Prophet's family, who were elevated by their 'forefathers Muḥammad, the lord of the messengers, and 'Alī, the best of the legatees, and through their mother, the foremost of women, the fifth of the Companions of the Cloak'. Idrīs 'Imād al-Dīn, *'Uyūn al-akhbār*, trans., p. 71.

63 For Jawhar's inclusion of Fāṭima's name in the invocation of the public sermons of Egypt, see Idrīs 'Imād al-Dīn, *'Uyūn al-akhbār*, trans., pp. 230–231; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āẓ*, vol. 1, p. 117. See the translation of al-Maqrīzī's chapter on the reign of al-Mu'izz in the *Itti'āẓ* by Shainool Jiwa as *Towards a Shi'i Mediterranean Empire: Fatimid Egypt and the Founding of Cairo* (London, 2009), pp. 83–84.

64 For the Fatimid coin which declared "Alī b. Abī Ṭālib is the nominee of the Prophet and the most excellent representative and the husband of the radiant chaste one (*zawj al-zahrā' al-batūl*)', see W. Kazan, *The Coinage of Islam: Collection of William Kazan* (Beirut, 1983), no. 446.

65 Brett, *Rise*, p. 316.

66 See, for instance, al-Mahdī described in Abū 'Abd Allāh's message from Sijilmāsa to Qayrawān as 'son of the Messenger of God (*ibn rasūl Allāh*)'. Al-Nu'mān, *Iftitāḥ*, trans., pp. 199–200. Note also, for

instance, the verses of Ibn Hāni' referring to the Prophet Muḥammad as al-Mu'izz's grandfather. Idrīs 'Imād al-Dīn, *'Uyūn al-akhbār*, tr. Jiwa, p. 225.

67 On al-Mu'izz's reference to 'our grandfather, Muḥammad' in his correspondence with the Egyptian ruler Kāfūr al-Ikhshīdī see Idrīs 'Imād al-Dīn, *'Uyūn al-akhbār*, tr. Jiwa, p. 184. In his first audience with the Egyptian notables, al-Mu'izz declared that he wanted to 'act upon what his grandfather had commanded' (ibid., p. 261).

68 In his eulogy to his deceased father al-Manṣūr, al-Mu'izz promised to safeguard the community 'of your grandfather, God's Messenger' (ibid., p. 73).

69 See, for example, al-Mu'izz's pronouncement on the eve of the state-sponsored circumcision ceremonies in North Africa that he wanted 'to revive the practise of our grandfather, His Messenger' (ibid., p. 172). Note elsewhere al-Nu'mān stating that al-Mu'izz was the 'reviver of his grandfather's practice' (ibid., p. 83).

70 In al-Mu'izz's audience with the Idrīsids, he said: 'Who will you substitute for us? Whose *da'wa* will you choose over ours, for this is the *da'wa* of our grandfather Muḥammad?' (ibid., pp. 149–150).

71 Patricia Crone, *Medieval Islamic Political Thought* (Edinburgh, 2004), p. 89.

72 On the *dawr al-satr* and the Ismaili *da'wa* activities during this period, see Daftary, *Ismā'īlīs*, pp. 87–128.

73 For an overview of the origins and evolution of anti-Fatimid and anti-Ismaili propaganda, see Daftary, *Ismā'īlīs*, pp. 7–10 as well as the introduction in Daftary, *Assassin Legends*, pp. 1–8.

74 Daftary argues that, as the most revolutionary wing of Shi'ism, the Ismailis 'from early on aroused the hostility of the 'Abbāsid-Sunnī establishment of the Muslim majority'. Subsequently, 'the 'Abbāsid Caliphs and the Sunnī *'ulamā'* launched what amounted to an official anti-Ismaili propaganda campaign' whose aim was to discredit the Ismaili movement as heretics and deviators, a campaign which saw the participation of 'Muslim theologians, jurists, historians and heresiographers'. See Daftary, *Ismā'īlīs*, p. 7.

75 Al-Ṭabarī's entry for 302/914–915 states that 'Ibn al-Baṣrī's man Ḥabāsah' entered Alexandria. See, *The History of al-Ṭabarī: Volume XXXVIII; The Return of the Caliphate to Baghdad*, tr. F. Rosenthal (New York, 1985), p. 205. Similarly, his entry for the year 301/913–914, states that 'in this year, Ibn al-Baṣrī's Maghrībīs entered Barqah' (ibid., p. 202).



76 As noted by Madelung, 'Das Imamat', pp. 67–68.

77 'Arīb b. Sa'd, *Ṣilat ta'rīkh al-Ṭabarī*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden, 1897), p. 51.

78 Ibid., pp. 51–52.

79 See Madelung, 'Das Imamat', pp. 67–68. For the account, see Ibn al-Abbār, *al-Ḥulla al-siyarā'*, p. 49.

80 F. Rosenthal, 'Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr', *EI2*. On the more famous father, see Shawkat M. Toorawa, *Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr and Arabic Writerly Culture: A Ninth-Century Bookman in Baghdad* (London, 2005).

81 'Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Ṭāhir's version, as given in Ibn al-Abbār, says: 'The name of the one who emerged in Qayrawān is 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh b. Sālim, *mawlā* of Mukram b. Sindān al-Bāhilī, the chief of the police of Ziyād and the one after whom 'Askar Mukram is named. 'Abd Allāh b. Sālim went to Salamiyya. He was an agent for merchants there, and it is said that he used to sell stones and [manifest] Shi'ism. When the Qarmaṭīs revolted in Syria, he was affected by him, seeking him out. So he ['Ubayd Allāh] went to the Maghrib and was known as Ibn al-Baṣrī.' See Ibn al-Abbār, *al-Ḥulla al-siyarā'*, p. 49.

82 Notably in al-Ḥimyari's (d. ca. 8th/14th century) *al-Rawḍ al-mu'ṭār fī khabar al-aqṭār*, another quotation directly from al-Ṣūlī is provided in which the accusation that his ancestor was executed for *zandaqa* is given. Thus al-Ṣūlī is quoted as saying: 'His father is 'Abd Allāh b. Sālim b. 'Abdān al-Bāhilī: his grandfather Sālim was crucified by al-Mahdī al-'Abbāsī because of his *zandaqa*, as was said by those people who had investigated (*faḥaṣū*) his affair.' See, *al-Rawḍ*, ed. Iḥṣān 'Abbās (Beirut, 1980), p. 308.

83 Ibn Rizām's work is not extant, but segments of his work are found in the *Fihrist* of Ibn al-Nadīm, and it also served as the main source for Akhū Muḥsin's work. See Daftary, *Ismā'īlīs*, pp. 8–9.

84 For a detailed exposition of the legend of Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ as the progenitor of the Fatimids and the role of Ibn Rizām and Akhū Muḥsin in propagating this myth, see Wladimir Ivanow, *Ibn al-Qaddah (The Alleged Founder of Ismailism)* (2nd ed., Bombay, 1957). Ivanow notes: 'One of the most extraordinary products of

anti-Ismaili propaganda is what may be called the myth of 'Abdu'l-lāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ' (ibid., p. i). He continues that the story of Ibn al-Qaddāh 'in its innumerable versions ... is nothing but an aetiological myth' (ibid., p. 2); but one that while 'incidentally invented' was 'later on gradually developed and polished in the course of long oral or written transmission, in the service of anti-Fatimid propaganda' (ibid.).

85 Ibn al-Nadīm, Muḥammad b. Isḥāq, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, tr. Bayard Dodge as *The Fihrist: A Tenth Century Survey of Muslim Culture* (New York, 1970), vol. 1, p. 463.

86 Ibid., p. 465.

87 On Akhū Muḥsin, see Daftary, *Ismāʿīlīs*, pp. 8–10; Samuel M. Stern, 'The "Book of the Highest Initiation" and Other Anti-Ismāʿīlī Travesties', in his *Studies in Early Ismāʿīlism* (Jerusalem and Leiden, 1983), pp. 56–83; Wilferd Madelung, 'The Fatimids and the Qarmaṭīs of Baḥrayn', in F. Daftary, ed., *Mediaeval Ismaʿili History and Thought* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 42.

88 Madelung, 'Das Imamat', p. 58.

89 Stern, 'The Book of the Highest Initiation', p. 57.

90 Madelung, 'Das Imamat', p. 113.

91 See, Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, tr. Bayard Dodge, p. 466.

92 Ibid.

93 The stigma of having been thus placed in the caliphate by a Shiʿi amir had plagued al-Qādir's early caliphate especially in lands outside Būyid rule. Ardent Sunni dynasties such as the Sāmānids and the Ghaznawids continued to produce coinage for al-Qādir's deposed predecessor al-Ṭāʾiʿ until around 390/1000. See K.V. Zetterstéen [C.E. Bosworth]), 'al-Ṭāʾiʿ Li-Amr Allāh', *EI2*. The Fatimid *dāʿīs* in Iraq also capitalised on this to undermine al-Qādir's credentials.

94 John J. Donohue, *The Buwayhid Dynasty in Iraq: 334H./945 to 403H./102 – Shaping Institutions for the Future* (Leiden and Boston, 2003), p. 279. For an overview of the impact and legacy of the reign of the Abbasid al-Qādir, see Kennedy, *Age of the Caliphates*, pp. 241–242; Donohue, *Buwayhid*, pp. 277–288; D. Sourdel, 'al-Ḳādir Bi'llāh', *EI2*.

95 Donohue, *Buwayhid*, p. 279.

96 Kennedy, *Age of the Caliphates*, p. 242.

97 For an overview of the fractiousness of the post-3rd/9th century Abbasid polity, see Kennedy, *Age of the Caliphates*, pp. 187–212.



98 Note, however, Donohue's assertion that this isolation of the Abbasid caliphs by the Būyid amirs ultimately gave individual Abbasid caliphs security and a long reign as contrasted to those who preceded them. See Donohue, *Buwayhid*, pp. 262–263.

99 For a summary of the role of the Abbasids in the legitimisation of the Būyid system, which included the Abbasid official investiture of Būyid amirs, the granting of their titles and the approval of treaties see Donohue, *Buwayhid*, pp. 264–267.

100 Ibid., p. 278.

101 Ibid., pp. 278–281.

102 Kennedy notes that while the people of Baghdad 'might not fight to restore the political power of the 'Abbāsid caliph but many of them would support the Sunni cause against the pretensions of the Shia': Kennedy, *Age of the Caliphates*, p. 242.

103 Kennedy, *Age of Caliphates*, p. 242; Sourdel, 'al-Ḳādir', *EI2*.

104 Kennedy, *Age of the Caliphates*, p. 242. Kennedy here argues that Abbasid caliphs before al-Qādir cannot be described as Sunni 'in the modern sense' because of their emphasis on legitimisation through the *ahl al-bayt* and their Muʿtazilī leanings.

105 Ḥanbalī ideology became orientated to support the caliph. See Donohue, *Buwayhid*, p. 286.

106 Recent scholarship has explored the dynamics that gave rise to the 'Alid *ashrāf*, the name given to the collective descendants of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, as a defined social group with institutional leadership. For a recent overview of this, see Shainool Jiwa, 'Kinship, Camaraderie and Contestation: Fāṭimid Relations with the Ashrāf in the Fourth/Tenth Century', *Al-Masāq*, 28 (2016), pp. 242–264. This article examines, in particular, the dynamics of Fatimid-*ashrāf* relations in 4th/10th century Egypt and the Ḥijāz.

107 The religious leanings of the *ashrāf* remained diverse, belonging to the varied Shiʿi and Sunni traditions. They included several notable Sunni scholars, and many belonged to the Zaydī Shiʿa. See Jiwa, 'Kinship', p. 247.

108 The Qur'anic verses adducing this prerogative of the Prophet are discussed in Roy Mottahedeh, 'Qurānic Commentary on the Verse of the Khums (an-Anfāl VIII:41)', in K. Morimoto, ed., *Sayyids and Sharifs in Muslim Socities: The Living Links to the Prophet* (London, 2012), pp. 37–48.

109 See Jiwa, 'Kinship', p. 245 and the references cited there.

110 For a detailed examination of reasons underpinning the alliances as well as rivalries between the Fatimids and the *ashrāf*, see ibid., pp. 247–249.

111 Ibid., pp. 252–259.

112 Ibid., pp. 251–252.

113 Abū Aḥmad's full lineage was Abū Aḥmad Ḥusayn b. Mūsā b. Muḥammad b. Mūsā b. Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā al-Kāẓim b. Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. See the entry on Sharīf al-Raḍī in Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, ed. Iḥsān 'Abbās (Beirut, 1967–1972), tr. M. de Slane as *Ibn Khallikān's Biographical Dictionary* (Paris, 1842–1871), vol. 3, p. 120.

114 Donohue, *Buwayhid*, p. 309.

115 As a Shi'i Imāmī scholar and renowned literary figure of the 5th/11th century living in Iraq, Sharīf al-Raḍī has received extensive coverage in medieval Sunni and Shi'i, as well as in contemporary scholarship. For major primary and secondary accounts, see the bibliography in Moktar Djebli, 'al-Sharīf al-Raḍī', *EI2*.

116 Both brothers were placed under the tutelage of the pre-eminent Iraqi Shi'i scholar Shaykh al-Mufīd. Among the prose works of Sharīf al-Raḍī is his famed and widely reproduced *Nahj al-balāgha*, an anthology of sermons and sayings attributed to 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. Sharīf al-Murtaḍā was an eminent Ithnā 'asharī scholar and teacher of his age. See C. Brockelmann, 'al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā', EI2.

117 See al-Tha'ālabī and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī as cited in Ibn Khallikān, *Wafāyāt*, tr. de Slane, vol. 3, pp. 119, 121 and Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 116. Cross-sectional support for al-Raḍī is manifest in the highly eulogised and almost hagiographic coverage of his life by Sunni contemporaries. Ibn al-Jawzī, for instance, recounts al-Raḍī's piety and scholarship, provides anecdotes on his moral rectitude and generosity, before recounting praise for his poetry. See Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓām*, vol. 15, pp. 115–116. Ibn Khallikān follows suit, and praises al-Raḍī's work on the literary features of the Qur'an: see Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, tr. de Slane, vol. 3, pp. 118–123.

118 On the granting of this title as well as that of al-Murtaḍā to his brother, see Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 8, p. 36. His other titles include al-Sharīf al-Jalīl granted in 388/988, and al-Sharīf al-Ajall in 401/1001. See Djebli, 'al-Raḍī', *EI2*.

119 As repeatedly asserted by his biographers, including the famous Mu'tazilī scholar and litterateur Ibn Abi'l-Ḥadīd (d. ca. 655–656/1257–1258). Djebli notes that this aspiration is expressed 'unequivocally' in Sharīf al-Raḍī's verses. 'Al-Raḍī', *EI2*. Donohue notes, however, that this question has 'prompted discussion on how an Imamite could ambition a position in direct conflict with his tenets'. See, *Buwayhid*, p. 312, n. 1490 for further references on discussions on al-Raḍī's ambition.



120 Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 8, p. 24.

121 The verses read: 'Alas, Amīr of the Believers! We are equal, at the summit of glory … Only the caliphate, of which you hold the reins, separates us': Djebli, 'al-Raḍī', *EI2*. De Slane in his translation of Ibn Khallikān's entry on Sharīf al-Raḍī provides an alternative translation of the same verses: 'I crave indulgence, Commander of the Faithful! We are not borne on different branches of the tree of glory! On whatever day we may vaunt our honours, no difference shall appear between us: we are both firmly rooted in our illustrious rank. The khalifate alone makes a distinction between us; you wear that noble collar, I do not': Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, tr. de Slane, vol. 3, p. 119.

122 For the fuller verses, see Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 118 and Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, pp. 446–447. Notably the 7th/15th-century Yemeni Ismaili historian and Ṭayyibī chief *dā'ī* Idrīs 'Imād al-Dīn also recounts a variant of these verses (note the term Fāṭimī instead of 'Alawī), attributing them also to Sharīf al-Raḍī. See Idrīs 'Imād al-Dīn b. al-Ḥasan, *'Uyūn al-akhbār*, tr. Jiwa, p. 263.

123 The variations mean that both the Hilāl al-Ṣābi' and the Ibn Jawzī/Ibn al-Athīr versions are relying on a common source or, as is more likely, they are based on a major rewriting of the Hilāl al-Ṣābi' original. Sharīf al-Raḍī was known to have been a particularly close friend of Hilāl al-Ṣābi''s grandfather, Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm. Djebli, 'al-Raḍī', *EI2*.

124 Al-Ṣābi''s account states that in a *majlis* of al-Qādir attended by Abū Aḥmad al-Mūsawī, his son al-Murtaḍā and other *ashrāf*, as well as judges and jurists, al-Qādir brought up the verses of al-Raḍī after which Abū Aḥmad was directly addressed by the court chamberlain (*ḥājib*). See al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āẓ*, vol. 1, p. 33. In the later account of Ibn al-Jawzī as closely followed by Ibn al-Athīr, al-Qādir is informed of the verses and then becomes incensed, dispatches Qāḍī al-Bāqillānī with a letter to Abū Aḥmad al-Mūsawī, al-Raḍī's father. See Ibn al-Jawzī,

*al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 118 and Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 447.

125 In both accounts the spokesman (whether a *ḥājib* or al-Bāqillānī) rejects points raised in the pro-Fatimid verses of al-Raḍī, namely, what kind of humiliation was al-Raḍī referring to, had he not been given stewardship of the *niqāba*, the *ḥajj* (or as in Hilāl) the *maẓālim*. In Hilāl's version, the chamberlain says to Abū Aḥmad: 'We do not doubt that if he (al-Raḍī) were to reach him [the ruler of Egypt], he would merely have the status of one of the sons of the Ṭālibids in Egypt.' See, *Ittiʿāẓ*, vol. 1, p. 33. In Ibn al-Jawzī's version, al-Bāqillānī's letter asserts: 'If he were in Egypt, he would not be raised from the ranks of the subjects (*al-raʿiyya*)': *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 118.

126 Al-Ṣābi' has Abū Aḥmad denying al-Raḍī's authorship and mentions that his son's enemies may have done so, and ascribed them to him. *Ittiʿāẓ*, vol. 1, p. 33. Ibn al-Jawzī's version has a similar denial with a more elaborate admission of his son's recognition of the rights of the 'blessed *ḥaḍra*', that is, the Abbasids and their own blessings stemming from them. *Al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 119.

127 Al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāẓ*, vol. 1, p. 33.

128 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 119; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 447.

129 In al-Ṣābi', al-Raḍī writes a letter saying that it is not his poem (see al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāz*, vol. 1, p. 34), while in Ibn al-Jawzī he says, 'I did not say these verses, nor do I know them': Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 119.

130 Thus: 'I fear the *dāʿīs* of the ruler of Egypt' in al-Ṣābi' as quoted in al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāẓ*, vol. 1, p. 33. Ibn al-Jawzī has al-Raḍī saying: 'I fear the Daylamīs, and the people of the *daʿwa* in his land.' *Al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 119. Ibn al-Athīr has: 'I fear the Daylamīs, and from the Egyptian I fear from the *dāʿīs* in this land.' *Al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 447. Both versions also project Abū Aḥmad's surprise that al-Raḍī fears the one who is distant (that is, al-Ḥākim), but not the one nearby (i.e., al-Qādir).

131 Al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāẓ*, vol. 1, p. 34. Al-Ṣābi' adds here, however, that both al-Raḍī's father and his brother al-Murtaḍā did so in precautionary dissimulation (*taqiyya*) due to their fear of al-Qādir.



132 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 119; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 447.

133 Ibn al-Jawzī adds that this was realised upon the intervention of al-Bāqillānī and al-Isfarā'inī. *Al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 119.

134 Al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāẓ*, vol. 1, p. 34.

135 Southern Iraq was particularly receptive to the Ismaili *daʿwa*, from where major early Ismaili *dāʿīs*, including Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Shīʿī and Ibn Ḥawshab, entered the movement. The *sawād* region of Kūfa was also the locus of the Qarmaṭī Ismaili *daʿwa*, from where Ḥamdān Qarmāṭ led the movement. For a broader overview of *daʿwa* activities beyond the Fatimid realms, see Farhad Daftary, 'The Ismaili *Daʿwa* Outside the Fatimid *Dawla*', in M. Barrucand, ed., *L'Égypte Fatimide: Son art et son histoire* (Paris, 1999), pp. 29–43.

136 For an overview of this correspondence in the broader context of Fatimid-Būyid relations, see Shainool Jiwa, 'Fāṭimid-Būyid Diplomacy during the Reign of al-Azīz Billāh (365/975–386/996)', *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 3 (1992), pp. 57–71.

137 Varied accounts highlight the continued presence of pro-Fatimid *dāʿīs* in the 4th/10th century. In 315/927, as reported by Thābit b. Sinān, a Shīrāzī inhabitant of Baghdad declared his support for the Fatimid imam while on trial for Qarmaṭī links. See Madelung, 'Fatimids and the Qarmaṭīs', p. 41. Also see Donohue, *Buwayhid*, pp. 73–76.

138 The pre-eminent *dāʿī* of the era of the Fatimid imam-caliph al-Ḥākim, Ḥamīd al-Dīn Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kirmānī was of Iranian origin and following his successful career as a leading *dāʿī* in Iraq was summoned to Cairo around 405/1014–1015 by the head of the *daʿwa*. Among the most prolific philosophers and theologians of the Fatimid age, al-Kirmānī's works cover a range of topics pertaining to Ismaili doctrine and philosophy. As well as his work on the Fatimid doctrine of the imamate discussed below, al-Kirmānī's works include *Mabāsim al-bishārāt bi'l-imām al-Ḥākim* and *al-Risāla al-wāʿiẓa*, written to articulate Fatimid doctrines on the imamate, but also to assert the official doctrines of the *daʿwa* in the light of claims made by dissident preachers who led the Druze movement. His magnum opus, *Rāḥat al-ʿaql*, composed after he returned to Iraq in 411/1020, provides a distinct metaphysical system, and is a milestone in the

development of medieval Ismaili cosmology. For a comprehensive biography of his life and scholarship, see Paul E. Walker, *Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī: Ismaili thought in the age of al-Ḥākim* (London, 1999). For a listing of his published works, see Daftary, *Ismaili Literature*, pp. 124–128. Also see Daniel de Smet, 'al-Kirmānī, Ḥamīd al-Dīn', *EI3*.

139 Walker, *al-Kirmānī*, p. 10.

140 De Smet, 'al-Kirmānī', *EI3*.

141 See Ḥamīd al-Dīn Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kirmānī, *al-Maṣābīḥ fī ithbāt al-imāma*, ed. and tr. Paul E. Walker as *Master of the Age: An Islamic Treatise on the Necessity of the Imamate* (London, 2007).

142 See Walker, *al-Kirmānī*, pp. 14–15.

143 Al-Kirmānī, *al-Maṣābīḥ*, tr. Walker, p. 15.

144 Ibid.

145 Ibid., pp. 124–126.

146 Ibid.

147 Walker notes that on the subject of the Manifesto, 'al-Kirmānī seems to say nothing. In truth, the manifesto itself made so improbable a claim it was hardly credible. Those who signed could also insist they were coerced. It was in al-Kirmānī's interest not to make a point of it, especially as many leading Shi'i authorities such as al-Raḍī and al-Murtaḍā were involved.' See al-Kirmānī, *Maṣābīḥ*, p. 17.

148 Kennedy, *Age of the Caliphates*, p. 225.

149 Ibid., p. 227.

150 Ibid., p. 229.

151 As Kennedy has demonstrated, integral to this rupture were the policies of the Būyid rulers which promoted the emergence of a distinct Shi'i identity in the public sphere and the reaction of hostile Sunni elements to this. New elements in the public manifestation of Shi'ism in Iraq, as catalysed by Būyid rule, included notably the public performance of Shi'i festivals such as 'Āshūrā' on 10 Muḥarram and Ghadīr Khumm on 18 Dhu'l-Ḥijjā; the public cursing of the early caliphs and the development of public pilgrimage rituals around the tombs of the 'Alids. See Kennedy, *Age of the Caliphates*, p. 228. In 351/962 Mu'izz al-Dawla gave orders that the public cursing of the first caliphs was to be painted on the city walls. In 353/964 he supported the performance of 'Āshūrā' and Ghadīr Khumm ceremonies.



152 Donohue, *Buwayhid*, pp. 270–280.

153 Kennedy, *Age of the Caliphates*, pp. 231–235.

154 'Aḍud al-Dawla forbade 'inflammatory preaching', while Bahā' al-Dawla placed 'special stress on the abolition of provocative activities' and had the leading 'brigands' of the Abbasid and 'Alid factions executed. See Kennedy, *Age of the Caliphates*, pp. 236–237.

155 For varied accounts of this event, see Donohue, *Buwayhid*, p. 284; Walker, *al-Kirmānī*, p. 14. For a description of the event as described in a survey of the life and scholarship of Shaykh al-Mufīd, see Martin J. McDermott, *The Theology of al-Shaikh al-Mufīd* (d. 413/1022) (Beirut, 1978), pp. 18–19.

156 Ibn al-Jawzī accounts for two major flashpoints in the lead-up to the confrontation. First was an attack against the leading Iraqi Shi'i jurist, Shaykh Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Nu'mān [Shaykh al-Mufīd] which led to an angry reaction by his Shi'i supporters in Karkh who, in turn, led attacks against two Shāfi'ī scholars al-Akfānī and al-Isfarā'ini. Notably all three are listed among alleged signatories of the Manifesto. Secondly, these events were compounded by the burning of the *Muṣḥaf* of Ibn Mas'ūd, a variant Qur'anic recension, and the execution of a Shi'i who had publicly decried the burning, which further incensed the Shi'a in Baghdad. See Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, pp. 58–59.

157 Ibn al-Jawzī reports: 'This [matter] reached the caliph, who was angered. He dispatched the guards at his gates to go in aid of the *ahl al-sunna*, and so the *ghilmān* helped them. The people of Karkh were weakened and the area beside Nahr al-Dajāj was set alight. Then the *ashrāf* and the merchants gathered at the gate of the caliph seeking forgiveness for what the rabble had done so he forgave them': *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, pp. 59–60. As Donohoue notes: 'It is easy to imagine the fright which seized the Caliph' upon hearing the 'shibboleth of the Fatimid ruler': Donohue, *Buwayhid*, p. 284.

158 See C. E. Bosworth, 'Uḳaylids', *EI2*.

159 Kennedy, *Age of the Caliphates*, p. 295. On the political history of the Mazyadids, see C.E. Bosworth, 'Mazyad', *EI2*.

160 As Kennedy notes, with their 'power dependent on their tribal following' the rulers of the Bedouin principalities 'remained first and foremost Bedouin shaykhs even when they acquired the rights to collect taxes from settled areas and cities': Kennedy, *Age of the Caliphates*, p. 285.

161 The transfer of Qirwāsh b. al-Muqallid's allegiance is widely reported to have taken place in the year 401 [1010]. See Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, pp. 74–77; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 8, pp. 63–66; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āẓ*, vol. 2, p. 88. For discussion of Qirwāsh's allegiance also see Daftary, *Ismā'īlīs*, p. 185; Walker, *al-Kirmānī*, p. 14; Walker, *Orations*, p. 3; Assaad, *al-Hakim*, pp. 111–112.

162 See Daftary, *Ismā'īlīs*, p. 185; Assad, *al-Hakim*, pp. 111–112.

163 Walker, *Orations*, p. 3.

164 Ibid., p. 141. For the full text of the *khuṭba* of Qirwāsh, as transmitted, see Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, pp. 74–77, and for an English translation, see Walker, *Orations*, pp. 138–141.

165 Al-Qādir reportedly dispatched Qāḍī al-Bāqillānī to the Būyid ruler Bahā' al-Dawla to deflect the threat. Bahā' raised a sum of 100,000 dinars either as a reward for Qirwāsh for renouncing the *khuṭba*, or to raise an army. Walker, *Orations*, p. 4.

166 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83 and Juwaynī, *Jahān-gushā*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, p. 660.

167 Ibn 'Inaba, Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad b. 'Alī, *'Umdat al-ṭālib fī ansāb āl Abī Ṭālib*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭāliqānī (Najaf, 1380/1961), p. 323. The fullest lineage of Muḥammad al-Ashtar thus extracted from Ibn 'Ināba would be: Muḥammad al-Ashtar b. 'Ubayd Allāh al-Thālith b. 'Alī b. 'Ubayd Allāh al-Thānī b. 'Alī al-Ṣālih b. 'Ubayd Allāh al-A'raj b. al-Ḥusayn al-Aṣghar b. 'Alī Zayn al-'Ābidīn. Ibid., pp. 318–323.

168 Ibid., pp. 323 ff.

169 Abū 'Abd Allāh Aḥmad is said to have led thirteen pilgrimages as *amīr al-ḥajj*, the deputy of Abū Aḥmad al-Mūsawī, and also served as the *naqīb* of Kūfa. Ibid., p. 328.

170 On him and his descendants, see ibid., p. 326.

171 The progenitor is Muḥammad al-Buṭḥanī b. al-Qāsim b. al-Ḥasan b. Zayd b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. See ibid., pp. 72 ff.

172 See Wilferd Madelung, 'The Minor Dynasties of Northern Iran', in Richard N. Frye, ed., *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Volume 4: *The Period from the Arab Invasions to the Saljuqs* (Cambridge, 1975), p. 219.

173 See ibid. From 380/990 al-Mu'ayyad bi'llāh sought to establish a Zaydī imamate in the Caspian region with varying degrees of success until his demise in 411/1020. Both he and his brother al-Nāṭiq bi'l-Ḥaqq were also noted as having studied under the important Baghdadi Ḥanafī and Mu'tazilī theologian Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Baṣrī. See, Gregor M. Schward, 'Abū 'Abdallāh al-Baṣrī', *EI3*.



174 Richard W. Bulliet, *The Patricians of Nishapur: A Study in Medieval Islamic Social History* (Cambridge, MA, 1972), p. 234ff; Teresa Bernheimer, *The 'Alids: The First Family of Islam, 750–1200* (Edinburgh, 2013), p. 32.

175 Ibn al-Dā'ī left Iraq to pursue the Zaydī imamate in the Caspian region, with the title al-Mahdī li-Dīn Allāh. See Donohue, *Buwayhid*, pp. 307–309.

176 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 95; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 8, p. 78. Also see al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfī*, vol. 1, p. 109.

177 Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. Yaḥyā (d. 390/999) was a descendant of Imam Zayd b. 'Alī Zayn al-'Ābidīn and undoubtedly one of the most influential *sharīf*s of the era, noted as the 'wealthiest man in Iraq', whose fortune was 'truly extraordinary' (Donohue, *Buwayhid*, p. 248), and which Ibn 'Inaba remarked was greater than that of any other 'Alid: Ibn 'Inaba, *'Umdat al-ṭālib*, p. 278.

178 See J.J. Witkam, 'Ibn al-Akfānī', *EI2* and Donohue, *Buwayhid*, pp. 295–298.

179 Al-Akfānī's patronage of traditionists is noted in Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 107. Only Ibn al-Jawzī has him listed as Abu'l-'Abbās al-Sūrī, while Ibn al-Athīr, Ibn Kathīr and Ibn Khaldūn have him as Abu'l-'Abbās al-Abīwardī.

180 Though Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 83, has Abu'l-Qāsim al-Khazarī, the editors of this edition note that variant manuscripts of the *Muntaẓam* have al-Jazarī instead (ibid., vol. 15, p. 83, n. 2). Ibn al-Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 10 has Abu'l-Qāsim al-Ḥarīrī, but is the only source to have this and it could be a transcription error. Al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 28, p. 12 adds the *kunya* and thus gives al-Qāḍī Abū Muḥammad Abu'l-Qāsim al-Jazarī. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 446, gives Ibn al-Khazarī while Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm*, vol. 4, p. 231, has Abu'l-Qāṣim al-Jazarī.

181 On the establishment of the Ẓāhirī chief judgeship, see Donohue, *Buwayhid*, p. 295.

182 See Devin Stewart, 'The Structure of the Fihrist: Ibn al-Nadim as Historian of Islamic Legal and Theological Schools', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 39 (2007), p. 371.

183 On al-Isfarā'inī's career, see Donohue, *Buwayhid*, p. 323.

184 On Abū 'Alī al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥusayn b. Ḥamkān al-Hamadhānī, see Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 106, who does not recommend him as a *ḥadīth* narrator; see also Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 13, p. 22.

185 Al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfī*, vol. 1, p. 97, calls him Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, Abu'l-Faḍl al-Nasawī, and says he lived and studied in Baghdad and narrated from al-Ṣāḥib b. 'Abbād, and narrated to Abu'l-Qāsim al-Tanūkhī, placing him therefore at the turn of the century.

186 Yaḥyā b. Abi'l-Khayr al-'Imrānī, *al-Bayān fī madhhab al-imām al-Shāfi'ī*, ed. Qāsim al-Nūrī (Beirut, 2000), vol. 1, p. 42. Note also a Shāfi'ī jurist by the name Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Bayḍāwī was active during the reign of the Abbasid al-Muqtadī. See al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfī*, vol. 1, p. 213.

187 A certain Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Ṭabarī al-Kashfalī (d. 414/1023), known as a Shāfi'ī jurist of Baghdad who taught in the mosque of 'Abd Allāh b. Mubārak after the death of Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarā'inī is mentioned in Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Bāb fī tahdhīb al-ansāb* (Baghdad, n.d.), vol. 3, p. 99.

188 M. Ben Cheneb, 'al-Ḳudūrī, Abu'l-Ḥusayn/al-Ḥasan Aḥmad', *EI2*. Donohue, *Buwayhid*, pp. 326–327. See Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 162.

189 See Wilferd Madelung, 'al-Mufīd', *EI2*.

190 On the father al-Muḥassin b. 'Alī, see H. Fähndrich, 'al-Tanūkhī', *EI2*. Ibn Khallikān, tr. de Slane, vol. 2, pp. 567–568.

191 For the role of al-Isfarā'inī in this affair, see Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, pp. 58–59.

192 See Donohue, *Buwayhid*, pp. 297–298.

193 Ibid.

194 See Daftary, *Ismā'īlīs*, p. 209.

195 On Abu'l-Ḥārith al-Basāsīrī, see Daftary, *Ismā'īlīs*, pp. 195–197; Marius Canard, 'al-Basāsīrī', *EI2*.

196 Al-Mu'ayyad fi'l-Dīn al-Shīrazī was a leading Fatimid *dā'ī*, an influential Fatimid statesmen and diplomat of the mid-5th/11th century. Born in Shīrāz in the last decades of the 4th/10th century, the rising influence of al-Mu'ayyad at the Būyid court in Fārs culminated in the conversion of the Būyid amir Abū Kālījār, which unleashed hostility against him from the Sunni establishment in Baghdad, and ultimately provoked his banishment. Arriving in Cairo in 438/1046, al-Mu'ayyad was appointed to the Fatimid chancery in 444/1052–1053. Two years later, he began to galvanise al-Basāsīrī to defeat the Saljūq army in 448/1057, which culminated in the conquest of Baghdad. In Cairo, al-Mu'ayyad eventually became the Chief *dā'ī*, whose *majālis al-ḥikma* ('sessions of wisdom') as well as his poetry continued to be venerated by the adherents of the Ismaili *da'wa* in the centuries that followed. For a comprehensive outline of his biography and scholarly works, see Verena Klemm, *Memoirs of a Mission: The Ismaili Scholar, Statesmen and Poet al-Mu'ayyad fi'l-Dīn al-Shīrāzī* (London, 2003). See also, I. K. Poonawala, 'al-Mu'ayyad Fi'l-Dīn', *EI2*.



197 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 15, p. 336.

198 Juwaynī, *Jahān-gushā*, tr. Boyle, vol. 1, pp. 658–660.

199 Ibn al-Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, vol. 12, p. 113.

200 Ibn al-Athīr initially rejects the aspersions against the 'Alid lineage of the Fatimids through the alleged attestation of al-Raḍī's signature upon the Manifesto. He notes that: 'there is no proof (*ḥujjā*) in what he [al-Raḍī] wrote in the *maḥḍar* which repudiated the lineage of the [Fatimid] caliphs, for fear brings forth [this and] even more': *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 447. He subsequently states: 'Those who claim the truthfulness of the [Fatimid] lineage say: the scholars who wrote in the *maḥḍar* did so out of fear and *taqiyya*, and [there were] those who had no knowledge of lineage. As to the pronouncement [of the correctness of the lineage] there is no protestation': *al-Kāmil*, vol. 6, p. 448.

201 Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima*, tr. Rosenthal, p. 41.

202 Ibid., p. 44.

203 Ibid., p. 43. Subsequently, he notes: 'The partisans of the Abbasids made much use of this fact when they came out with their attack against the lineage of (the 'Ubaydid-Fatimids). They tried to ingratiate themselves with the weak (Abbasid) caliphs by professing the erroneous opinion that (the 'Alid descent of the 'Ubaydid-Fatimids was spurious).'

204 Ibid., p. 47.