

‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr and the Mahdī: Between propaganda and historical memory in the Second Civil War*

Mehdy Shaddel

mehdyshaddel@gmail.com

Abstract

The subject of the present paper is a prophetic tradition found in some compendia of eschatological *aḥādīth* which has received considerable scholarly attention since Wilferd Madelung dedicated an article to it in 1981. Whereas Madelung shares the opinion of earlier scholars that only some of the incidents “prophesied” by this tradition are historical, this study aims to show that it is a wholly *ex post facto* composition which, in its various strata, remarkably captures episodes from the Zubayrid war of propaganda against their rivals as well as their later attempts to redeem the memory of their lost cause as a just one. The discussion closes by producing a highly singular Syrian tradition most certainly put into circulation with the intent of countering these Zubayrid propaganda efforts.

Keywords: ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr, Propaganda, Second Civil War, *ḥadīth*, Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiya, ‘Amr ibn al-Zubayr, al-Ḥuṣayn ibn Numayr, *khasf*

The *ḥadīth* of the Mahdī

Perhaps the single most important contribution to the shaping of the Islamic (and in particular Shii) ideas of endtimes has been made by the following tradition, which was later taken to be a précis of the career of the Sufyānī and the Mahdī.¹ This widely attested tradition has been best preserved in Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī’s *Kitāb al-Sunan*:²

* I should like to express my unqualified gratitude to Sean W. Anthony (Ohio State University), Mushegh Asatryan (University of Calgary), Ella Landau-Tasseron (Hebrew University of Jerusalem) and Ian D. Morris (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas) for reading through various drafts of this paper and offering constructive suggestions. My thanks are also due to Hossein Sheikh (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen) for encouraging me to finish this work. It goes without saying that I am solely responsible for all the remaining errors and infelicities.

1 See Wilferd Madelung, entries “Mahdī” and “Sufyānī” in *EP*². Elsewhere he cursorily suggests that this *ḥadīth* might have later played a role in giving rise to the belief in the Sufyānī, but this is doubtful; Madelung, “The Sufyānī between tradition and history”, *Studia Islamica* 63, 1986, 5–48, 9–10; cf. my “The Sufyānī in early Islamic kerygma: an enquiry into his origins and early development”, forthcoming in *JRAS*.

2 My reconstruction is based on two editions: Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (Beirut, n.d.); and Shu‘ayb Arnā‘ūt and Muḥammad Kāmil Qurṭabalalī (Damascus, 1430/2009).

Muḥammad ibn al-Muthannā < Mu'adh ibn Hishām < his father < Qatāda < Ṣāliḥ Abu'l-Khalīl < 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith³ < Umm Salama, the prophet's wife < the prophet

there will be a discord after the death of a caliph, then a man from the people of Medina will flee to Mecca, and a group of the inhabitants of Mecca will go to him and bring him out [of his place of residence] against his will and pledge allegiance to him between the Rukn and the Maqām (*fa-ya'tihu nāsun min ahl Makka fa-yukhrijūnahu wa-huwa kārihun fa-yubāyi'ūnahu bayna 'l-rukṅ wa'l-maqām*).⁴ Then an expedition will be sent against him from (the people of)⁵ Shām, but they will be swallowed up in the Baydā' between Mecca and Medina (*wa-yub'athu ilayhi ba'thun min (ahl) al-Shām fa-yukhsafu bihim bi'l-Baydā' bayna Makka wa'l-Madīna*). When people see this, the righteous ones of al-Shām and the groups of Iraq will go to him (*atāhu abdāl al-Shām wa-'aṣā'ib ahl al-'Irāq*) and offer him their allegiance.⁶ Afterwards, a Qurashī man will arise whose maternal uncles are from the tribe of Kalb. He will despatch an expedition against them, but they will triumph over them. That will be the expedition of the Kalb, and disappointment will be for those who do not share in the booty of the Kalb (*wa'l-khayba li-man lam yashhad ghanīmat Kalb*). He will distribute [equitably] the revenues (*al-māl*) and will act among the people according to the *sunna* of their prophet and Islam will be firmly established on earth (*wa-yulqī al-Islām bi-jirānihi fi'l-ard*).⁷ He will linger (*fa-yalbathu*) for seven years and then die and the Muslims will pray over him. Abū Dāwūd said, “some say, on the authority of Hishām, nine years, and some say seven years”.⁸

This tradition was first brought to scholarly attention by Duncan B. MacDonald, who opined that it is “an echo of the early 'Alid conflicts”.⁹ But it was D.S.

- 3 He is only mentioned as “a companion of Ṣāliḥ” in Abū Dāwūd's first narration; his name, however, appears in other *isnād* chains for the same *ḥadīth*; see also the *asānīd* of the other versions in Michael Cook, “Eschatology and the dating of traditions”, in H. Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins and Developments* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 217–41 (p. 228), originally published in *Princeton Papers in Near Eastern Studies* 1, 1992, 23–47.
- 4 While Madelung has opted to render the verb *yukhrijūnahu* by “they will make him rise in revolt”, I think the translation “they will take him out of his residence” better fits the context since the sentence seems to be primarily preoccupied with locations. Moreover, the fact that the tradition does not refer to the unnamed Qurashī opponent of its protagonist as caliph, whereas it does refer to the equally unnamed Mu'āwiya as such, in addition to the fact that he only shows up after the episode of the *bay'a*, goes against Madelung's construal of the term *khurūj* as “rebellion” here.
- 5 Thus in the 'Abd al-Ḥamīd edition, but not in the Arnā'ūt edition and most other compendia.
- 6 The 'Abd al-Ḥamīd edition again has “between the Rukn and the Maqām” here.
- 7 *ilā al-ard* in the Arnā'ūt edition.
- 8 Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, ed. M.M. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, IV, 107–8; ed. S. Arnā'ūt and M.K. Qurrabalālī, VI, 344–6.
- 9 MacDonald, “Mahdī”, *EI*¹.

Attema who first noticed that the career of its protagonist bears striking affinities to that of 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr,¹⁰ the Medinan Qurashī aristocrat and son of the famous companion al-Zubayr ibn al-'Awwām who refused to pledge allegiance to Yazīd I as caliph after the death of Mu'āwiya ibn Abī Sufyān in 60 AH and fled to Mecca to seek refuge in the Meccan sanctuary. There, in due course, he proclaimed himself caliph and fought a long and bloody civil war against various rival factions, of whom the most formidable were the Umayyads, first under Yazīd, then under Marwān I, and after him under his son and successor 'Abd al-Malik. According to Attema, the tradition was first put into circulation some time between the death of Yazīd in 64 AH and al-Ḥajjāj's ultimate victory over Ibn al-Zubayr in 73 AH.¹¹

After Attema, Wilferd Madelung elucidated the intricacies of this tradition still further:¹² the tradition was "war propaganda", Madelung avers, "in support of 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr". He goes a step further than Attema and states that the first expedition "swallowed up" by the earth was none other than the historical expedition of Muslim ibn 'Uqba al-Murrī and al-Ḥuṣayn ibn Numayr al-Sakūnī, which the caliph Yazīd had sent to subdue Medina and Mecca. This expedition succeeded in bringing Medina back to the fold of Yazīd's caliphate after allegedly committing many atrocities in the battle of al-Ḥarra (63 AH) and went on to besiege Mecca, but, upon receiving the news of Yazīd's death, abandoned the siege and returned to Syria. The second expedition in this tradition is a genuine prophecy, Madelung states, which "must have been made public by [the governor of Basra] 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥārith. . . on the very occasion of his accepting the Baṣrans' oath of allegiance on behalf of Ibn al-Zubayr" in 64 AH. It was, in his view, "meant to stir up support for Ibn al-Zubayr and to prepare his followers for a campaign of the Kalb in support of the caliphate of one of the sons of Yazīd" (Yazīd's mother, Maysūn bint Baḥdal ibn Unayf al-Kalbiyya, was from the tribe of Kalb, traditional allies of the Sufyānid caliphs). Hence, according to Madelung, the first part of the *ḥadīth* is historical, but it becomes prophecy where it begins to talk of the arrival of *abdāl al-Shām* and *'aṣā'ib ahl al-'Irāq*, as "Ibn al-Zubayr was no longer a mere seeker of asylum in the sanctuary but an open contender for the caliphate receiving homage from all parts of the Muslim world".¹³

Madelung thus appears to be basing his dissection of this *ḥadīth* on the well-established scholarly methods for treating apocalyptic material honed by Paul J.

10 Attema, *De Mohammedaansche Opvattingen omtrent het Tijdstip van den Jongsten Dag en zijn Voorteecken* (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers, 1942; unfortunately this work has not been available to me).

11 Attema, *apud* Wilferd Madelung, "'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr and the Mahdī", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 40, 1981, 291–305 (p. 292).

12 Mention should also be made of Richard Hartmann who, apparently without knowing of Attema's work or having this particular tradition in mind, perceptively observed that "der Feldzug nach dem Ḥiḡāz, ganz unverkennbar – und zwar gewiß schon in der ursprünglichen Gestalt – den Ereignissen des Jahre 63/683 nachgebildet sind, was den Sufyānī . . . als Yazīd redivivus erscheinen läßt". See his "Der Sufyānī", in *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen Septuagenario* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1953), 141–51, 148–9 (citing one of his earlier works).

13 Madelung, "'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr", 293.

Alexander and others during the course of the twentieth century. By the specifications of these methods, “the latest historical element referred to in an apocalypse . . . precedes immediately a passage in which the author shifts from history to eschatology”.¹⁴ However, the glaring fact remains that our *ḥadīth* is decidedly lacking in the eschatological dimension. It does not even allude to the eschaton, references no apocalyptic battles, and the era of equity and justice of which it speaks does not come across as the messianic era of bliss. In sum, there is nothing whatsoever in it to justify its classification under the rubric of “apocalypse”;¹⁵ on the contrary, its matter-of-fact tone indicates that Madelung is right in identifying it as a piece of Zubayrid propaganda. It would thus seem legitimate to ask why a propagandist should have put a genuine prognostication in a piece of *ex eventu* prophecy whose sole aim was to furnish the prophesied event with an aura of prophetic legitimacy. What aim would such a prognostication serve? It is also unclear how the propagandist/apocalyptist who composed this piece intended to “stir up support” for its protagonist without appealing, in what Madelung claims to be the genuinely oracular part of the tradition, to what we may call the “latent apocalypticism of the human psyche”.¹⁶

Even more startling is the titbit of trivia about the despatcher of the second expedition: he is a Qurashī with Kalbī lineage on his mother’s side who dwells in Syria and whose army consists of Kalbīs – descriptions that all fit Yazīd very well. These details, taking Madelung’s thesis to its logical conclusion, would show the Zubayrid propagandist to be preoccupied with a still-tangible threat from the Sufyānids. But why should supporters of Ibn al-Zubayr have thought of Yazīd’s descendants as the real threat to the Zubayrid claim at a time (64

14 Alexander, “Medieval apocalypses as historical sources”, *The American Historical Review* 73, 1968, 997–1018, (p. 999); cf. also Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London, 1982), 248–67. For the particular case of the Islamic apocalyptic tradition, see Cook, “Eschatology”, especially pp. 219–20.

15 For an instructive taxonomy of the content of an apocalyptic composition, see John J. Collins’ editorial introduction to the classic volume *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (*Semeia* 14, 1979), 1–20; and now John J. Collins, “What is apocalyptic literature?”, in idem (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 1–16.

16 Or, in case one wishes to subscribe to the thesis that apocalypse is the literature of the times of crisis, without bearing any trace of having been composed under eschatological pressures. For a survey of the debates over the social setting and function of the genre “apocalyptic”, see Leonard L. Thompson, *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 25–34. As will be seen, the tradition under discussion here actually falls under the category of a genre of great antiquity in the Near East, aptly dubbed “mantic historiography” by Matthew Neujahr; see his excellent monograph, *Predicting the Past in the Ancient Near East: Mantic Historiography in Ancient Mesopotamia, Judah, and the Mediterranean World* (Providence, RI: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012). Unfortunately, the study of apocalypticism in its Islamic context is still in its infancy and the investigation of its socio-historical setting(s) and the likely need for a redefinition of the genre in the light of the Islamic material are major desiderata of the field. Herein I work on the premise that the former is not much different in the case of the Islamic apocalyptic tradition. The following historical analysis, it will be seen, will not refute this premise, but a more in-depth study will be required before we take such paradigms for granted in the case of the Islamic endtimes literature as well.

AH) when the Sufyānid cause seemed all but lost and the Umayyad family had unanimously recognized Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam – the eponymous progenitor of the Marwānid branch of the Umayyads – as caliph? One would have thought, therefore, that if either of these two expeditions is to be identified as historical, it has to be the second rather than the first. Furthermore, as noted by Michael Cook, the tradition's more likely nine-year time of lingering happens to be equal to "the duration of the historical caliphate of Ibn al-Zubayr . . . a fact hardly to be anticipated in 64/684", thus making "the distinction between memory and fantasy . . . blurred".¹⁷ In the light of these problems, Cook has questioned the textual integrity of the tradition as we have it, but one may wonder whether the events alluded to in this *ḥadīth* have been correctly identified to begin with. Could it not be that the second expedition mentioned in the tradition was actually the expedition of Muslim ibn 'Uqba and the first one an earlier, lesser known engagement? By the time Yazīd sent Muslim at the head of an army to quell Ibn al-Zubayr's subversive activities he had been in Mecca, calling himself "a seeker of refuge in the sanctuary" (*'ā'idhun bi'l-bayt*), for some three years and had made no secret of his irreconcilable disagreement with Yazīd in particular and hereditary succession to the caliphate in general.¹⁸ During these three years Yazīd did resort to whatever option he had to force Ibn al-Zubayr's hand.

It is my contention that the incidents recounted in this tradition are all historical, and in the remainder of this article I shall take a closer look at 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr's career after Mu'āwiya's death to match up these allusions with historical events. To recapitulate, the tradition mentions two expeditions: the first is despatched from Syria (or, alternatively, consists of Syrians) which is "annihilated" (lit. "swallowed up, afflicted by *khasf*") at the Baydā' between Mecca and Medina; the second expedition consists of Kalbī tribesmen and is despatched by a Qurashī with Kalbī lineage on his mother's side which is defeated by the tradition's hero and his partisans. These are the main clues provided by our *ḥadīth* which should be followed up in the course of its examination.

'Amr ibn al-Zubayr and the army of *khasf*

The chronology of events in the Ḥijāz following the death of Mu'āwiya is to some extent confused, but we may attempt a reconstruction based on what information the sources supply and with the help of some informed speculation. The

17 Cook, "Eschatology", 230.

18 For the political history of this period, see Gerald R. Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam: The Umayyad Caliphate AD 661–750* (London: Routledge, 2000), 46–50; Julius Wellhausen, *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1960), 71–125 (English translation *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall* [Calcutta, 1927], 133–200); Gernot Rotter, *Die Umayyaden und der zweite Bürgerkrieg (680–92)* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1982), 37–59; Henri Lammens, *Le Califat Yazīd I^{er}* (Beirut, 1921); Buthayna Ibn-Ḥusayn, *al-Fitna al-thāniyya fī 'ahd al-khalīfa Yazīd ibn Mu'āwiya, 60–64 H./680–684 M.* (Beirut, 2013; not consulted); Meir J. Kister, "The Battle of the Ḥarra: some socio-economic aspects", in M. Rosen-Ayalon (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Gaston Wiet* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1977), 33–49.

sources agree that when Mu'āwiya died in Rajab of 60, al-Nu'mān ibn Bashīr al-Anṣārī was governor in Kūfa, 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Ziyād in Basra, 'Amr ibn Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ "al-Ashdaq" in Mecca, and al-Walīd ibn 'Utba ibn Abī Sufyān in Medina.¹⁹ Yazīd dismissed al-Walīd shortly afterwards, presumably because of his failure to exact the oath of allegiance from al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī and Ibn al-Zubayr as he had required. He then appointed 'Amr al-Ashdaq in his stead, while also retaining him in his position as governor of Mecca. 'Amr arrived in Medina in Ramaḍān of 60 and remained in this position until the beginning of Dhu'l-Ḥijja, 61 AH.²⁰ In Iraq, when al-Ḥusayn's envoy to Kūfa, his cousin Muslim ibn 'Aqīl, effectively wrested the control of the town from al-Nu'mān, Yazīd responded by dismissing the latter and appointing 'Ubayd Allāh over Kūfa while retaining him as governor of Basra.²¹ This must have happened towards the end of 60, with al-Nu'mān apparently departing for Syria immediately afterwards. Having dealt with al-Ḥusayn's abortive rebellion early in 61, Yazīd seems to have wasted no time in attending to the threat to his authority posed by Ibn al-Zubayr. He first reacted to the news of the latter's not-so-discreet activities by sending a delegation of ten notables – among them al-Nu'mān ibn Bashīr and 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Iḍāh al-Ash'arī – to Mecca to attempt a conciliation with Ibn al-Zubayr, first by offering material incentives and warning him against the dangers of internal division, and then, if this did not work, by reminding him of al-Ḥusayn's bloody end.²² Not unexpectedly,

19 al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh al-rusul wa'l-mulūk*, ed. Muḥammad Abu'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1387/1967), V, 338; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī'l-ta'rikh*, ed. Abī'l-Fida' 'Abd Allāh al-Qāḍī (Beirut, 1407/1987), III, 377; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa'l-nihāya*, ed. Muḥyī al-Dīn Mastū (Beirut and Damascus, 1431/2010), VIII, 213; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam fī ta'rikh al-mulūk wa'l-umam*, ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aṭā and Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aṭā (Beirut, 1415/1995), V, 322.

20 Khalīfa ibn Khayyāt, *Ta'rikh*, ed. Akram Diyā' al-'Umarī (Riyadh, 1405/1985), 229, 231 (where *thumma nuzi'a 'Amr'an al-Madīna fī sanat sittīn* after the notice on al-Ḥusayn's death should obviously read *iḥdā wa-sittīn*), 233, 235, 254; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, V, 343, 399, 474, 477; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, III, 380, 405, 446–8; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 215 (putting 'Amr's arrival at either Ramaḍān or Dhu'l-Qa'da), 245, 297; pseudo-Ibn Qutayba al-Dīnawarī, *al-Imāma wa'l-siyāsa*, ed. 'Alī Shīrī (Beirut, 1410/1990), II, 5–6 (in spite of an earlier confused report in *ibid.*, I, 227); Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, V, 324, 329; 'Umar ibn Fahd al-Makkī, *Ithāf al-warā bi-akhbār umm al-qurā*, ed. Fahīm Muḥammad Shaltūt (Cairo, 1404/1983), II, 56; Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi, *al-Iqd al-Farīd*, ed. 'Abd al-Majīd al-Tarḥīnī (Beirut, 1404/1983), V, 125. Here it must be noted that despite the insistence of al-Ṭabarī and a few others (al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, V, 477; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 298; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, V, 348; al-Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rikh*, ed. 'Abd al-Amīr Muḥannā [Beirut 1431/2010], II, 169) that in 61 the *ḥajj* was led by al-Walīd, one report indicates that Yazīd's decree arrived late and 'Amr himself led the pilgrimage that year (Ibn Fahd, *Ithāf*, II, 56, citing Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī). The situation at the end of 61 provides a better context for the report that both 'Amr and Ibn al-Zubayr openly bore arms while performing the *ḥajj* rites (Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, V, 325), and this, in turn, lends some credence to Ibn Fahd's statement.

21 K.V. Zetterstéen, "al-Nu'mān ibn Bashīr", *EL*²; Rotter, *Die Umayyaden*, 38.

22 My summary account follows Ibn A'tham al-Kūfī's version which is the least fragmentary and most coherent; Ibn A'tham, *Kitāb al-Futūḥ*, ed. 'Alī Shīrī (Beirut, 1411/1991), V, 150–3; for incentives, see Khalīfa ibn Khayyāt, *Ta'rikh*, 252, who alleges that Yazīd even offered to make him his governor of Ḥijāz (mentioning it after a brief report on

Yazīd's envoys failed to convince Ibn al-Zubayr, who even refused to talk to them after an initial angry exchange with Ibn 'Idāh. Given that al-Nu'mān is a member of the delegation in virtually all accounts that name some of its members, this event, too, must have taken place in 61 AH – that is, after al-Nu'mān's departure from Kūfa at the end of 60.²³

Meanwhile in Medina, the new governor, 'Amr ibn Sa'īd al-Ashdaq, had to find a replacement for his chief of *shurṭa* – the previous chief, Muṣ'ab ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Awf, having resigned his post upon the former's arrival to join

the fire of the Ka'ba); reproduced in Ibn Ra's Ghanama al-Ishbīlī, *Manāqil al-durar wa-manāqib al-zahar*, ed. Khālīd 'Abd al-Jabbār Shayt al-Rāshid (Baghdad, 1429/2008), 71. For the mission, see *ibid.*, 70 (places it after al-Nu'mān's mission to Medina and before the battle of the Ḥarra), 71 (produces three different reports); Khalīfa ibn Khayyāt, *Ta'rikh*, 251–2; al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashraf*, ed. Suhayl Zakkār and Riyād Ziriklī (Beirut, 1417/1996), V, 323–5 (reporting two delegations), 327, 337 (placing it after 'Amr's expedition); al-Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rikh*, II, 161; Aḥmad ibn Dāwūd al-Dīnawarī, *al-Akhhbār al-ṭiwāl*, ed. Muḥammad Sa'īd al-Rāfi'ī (Cairo, 1330/1912), 259–60 (placing it immediately before Muslim ibn 'Uqba's expedition); al-Fākīhī, *Akhhbār Makka fi qaḍīm al-dahr wa-hadīthihī*, ed. 'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Duhaysh (Beirut, 1414/1994), II, 352; Abu'l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Aghānī*, ed. Iḥsān 'Abbās, Ibrāhīm al-Sa'āfīn, and Bakr 'Abbās (Beirut, 1429/2008), I, 37 (placing it exactly one year after al-Ḥusayn's death); Abu'l-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad al-Bayyāsī, *al-I'lām bi'l-ḥurūb al-wāqī'a fi ṣadr al-Islām*, ed. Shafīq Jāsir Aḥmad Maḥmūd (Amman, 1987), I, 98–9; Ibn Sa'd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*, ed. 'Alī Muḥammad 'Umar (Cairo, 1421/2001), VI, 478; Ibn 'Asākir, *Ta'rikh madīnat Dimashq*, ed. Muḥibb al-Dīn al-'Amrawī (Beirut, 1415/1995), XXVIII, 208, 210; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, V, 344, 476; Ibn Fahd, *Ithāf*, II, 55; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, III, 447–8; al-Azraqī, *Akhhbār Makka wa-mā jā'a fihā min al-āthār*, ed. 'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Duhaysh (Mecca, 1424/2003), 295; Ibn Qutayba al-Dīnawarī, *Uyūn al-akhhbār* (Cairo, 1343/1925), I, 196; Mūsā ibn 'Uqba, *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*, ed. Muḥammad Abū Mālik (Agadir, 1414/1994), 350–51.

- 23 Wellhausen, *Das arabische Reich*, 92–4 (*Arab Kingdom*, 148–50), contends that al-Nu'mān only undertook one mission to the Ḥijāz, in the year 63 AH, to dissuade the people of Medina from rebelling, arguing that two distinct missions are unlikely to have taken place in such a short time (though he does accept a different version of the first mission to Ibn al-Zubayr as historical). But if al-Nu'mān's first mission had taken place before 'Amr ibn al-Zubayr's expedition to Mecca, which stands to reason, and if the governor who had despatched the expedition was 'Amr ibn Sa'īd (disallowing the incorrect report in al-Mas'ūdī, *Murūj al-dhahab wa-mā'ādin al-jawhar*, ed. Kamāl Ḥasan Mar'ī [Beirut, 1425/2005], III, 68), both events must have taken place during 61 AH, since 'Amr al-Ashdaq was dismissed from his post at the beginning of Dhu'l-Ḥijja of this year (see n. 20 above). Thus, *pace* Wellhausen, there was a timespan of about two years between the two missions. Furthermore, while most sources mention other people along with al-Nu'mān as taking part in the first mission, we do not hear of anyone else in the context of the second one. Rotter, *Die Umayyaden*, 43–4, on the other hand, thinks that there were two separate delegations apart from that of the year 63, both of which included al-Nu'mān, with the second having taken place “zeitlich kurz vor oder kurz nach der gescheiterten Expedition des 'Amr b. az-Zubair” – which he places at early to mid-681 CE (61 AH). Obviously, this could hardly have been the case, as al-Nu'mān would have had to embark on two missions within a timespan of less than a year, and we still have to set aside some time for his departure from Iraq and the preparations made for 'Amr's expedition. In any case, it is evident that the two missions reported for the year 61 AH in some sources are, in fact, two strands of tradition about the same event.

Ibn al-Zubayr in Mecca.²⁴ In his lieu al-Ashdaq appointed a half-brother of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr, ‘Amr by name,²⁵ notorious for his violent and brusque manner and his antipathy to his brother.²⁶ His animosity towards ‘Abd Allāh was so strong that as *sāhib al-shurṭa* he would arrest people on the slightest suspicion of harbouring Zubayrid sympathies and subject them to lashing – among them one of his own brothers, al-Mundhir, the latter’s son Muḥammad, and ‘Abd Allāh’s son Khubayb – leaving them with no alternative but to flee to Mecca.²⁷

When Yazīd’s delegates returned to Shām and reported the situation in Mecca to him, he entrusted ‘Amr ibn Sa‘īd with the task of arresting Ibn al-Zubayr and sending him to the caliphal court in Shām, in chains if need be.²⁸ The duty to arrest Ibn al-Zubayr fell to ‘Amr ibn al-Zubayr. Some sources inform us that he even volunteered for the task, citing the longstanding vendetta against his brother and reassuring ‘Amr ibn Sa‘īd that “you would never find anyone who is more averse to him than me to send against him” (*wa-lā tuwajjihū ilayhi rajulan abadan anka’ a lahu minnī*).²⁹ Having found a volunteer to command the expedition, ‘Amr al-Ashdaq was now looking for troops. But pro-Zubayrid sympathies ran high among the population of Medina and no one would have willingly served in this army. After his dismissal, al-Ashdaq would describe to the caliph the situation in the Ḥijāz and the strict measures to which he had to resort in revealing terms:

O, commander of the believers! The present sees things that the absent cannot see. The majority of the people of Mecca and Medina were inclined towards him [viz. Ibn al-Zubayr] and had given him their unanimous approval [for the caliphate] (*wa-a’ṭawhu ’l-riḍā*),³⁰ with some calling for others [to pledge allegiance to him] secretly and others openly. And I did not have troops at my disposal to overpower him if I were to fight him, while he avoided me and was watchful of me. So I tried to be lenient

24 Muṣ‘ab had retained this post since Marwān’s second governorship under Mu‘āwiya (54–7 AH); Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayrī, *Nasab Quraysh*, ed. É. Lévi-Provençal (Cairo, 1953), 268.

25 An Umayyad on his mother’s side and a second cousin of ‘Amr ibn Sa‘īd; al-Zubayrī, *Nasab*, 214–5; Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamharat ansāb al-‘Arab*, ed. ‘Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn (Cairo, 1382/1962), 81.

26 It was said of him that “‘Amr is not spoken to; anybody who speaks to him will regret it” (*‘Amr lā yukallamu, man yukallimhu yandam*); al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 328; see also al-Dhahabī, *Ta’rikh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa’l-a’lām*, ed. Bashshār ‘Awwād Ma‘rūf (Beirut, 1424/2003), II, 689.

27 al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, V, 344; Ibn Ra’s Ghanama, *Manāqil*, 71; al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 328; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 215–6; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, III, 380; Ibn Fahd, *Ithāf*, II, 49; Ibn Sa‘d, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, VI, 479.

28 Ibn A‘tham, *al-Futūḥ*, V, 152–3; al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 327; and al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, V, 344, imply that Yazīd ordered Ibn al-Zubayr’s arrest immediately after the delegation returned from Mecca.

29 al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rikh*, V, 344; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, III, 380; cf. Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 216; Ibn Fahd, *Ithāf*, II, 49.

30 In translating *riḍā* as such I am following Patricia Crone, “On the meaning of the ‘Abbasid call to *al-riḍā*”, in C.E. Bosworth et al. (eds), *The Islamic World, from Classical to Modern Times: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lewis* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1989), 95–111.

towards him and tolerate him in the hope of luring and overcoming him (*wa-kuntu arfaqu bihi wa-udārīhi li-astamkira minhu fa-athiba 'alayhi*) – having already severely restricted him and deprived him of many things that would have otherwise ended up in his hands (*wa-mana'uhu min ashyā'a kathīratin law taraktuhu wa-iyyāhā mā kānat lahu illā mā 'ūnatan*) – posting around Mecca and on the routes leading to it guards who would not allow anyone in without first reporting to me his name and that of his father, his city of residence, and the reason for his trip and what he was after. If he was one of his partisans or those who were inclined towards him I would send him back unachieved (*radadtuhu ṣāghiran*), but if cleared I would allow him in the town.³¹

This being the situation, the governor and his chief-of-police had particular problems convincing the regulars from the army stipends (*ahl al-dīwān*) to join the expedition. Reports indicate that the majority of the *ahl al-dīwān* refused to join and hired men to go in their place (or they were forced by 'Amr to send hired men instead).³² Al-Ṭabarī further informs us that no more than a few dozen (*'asharāt*) of the *ahl al-dīwān* were present in this army.³³ Al-Ashdaq was thus left with no choice but to raise troops from among the considerable number of Umayyad *mawālī* present in Medina.³⁴ That the backbone of 'Amr's one-thousand-strong army was comprised of Umayyad *mawālī* is indicated by a report produced by al-Balādhurī concerning the composition of 'Amr's army. According to this report, 'Amr left Medina “with four hundred soldiers, a group of Umayyad *mawālī*, and others not enrolled in the *dīwān*” (*wa-kharaja fī arba' mi'a min al-jund wa-qawmin min mawālī banī Umayya wa-qawmin min*

31 al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, V, 478–9; cf. also Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 303; al-Bayyāsī, *al-I'lām*, I, 101; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, VI, 6.

32 Pseudo-Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, II, 6: *fā-ḍaraba 'alā ahl al-dīwān al-ba'th ilā Makka wa-hum kārihūna li'l-khurūj fa-qāla lahum immā an ta'tū bi-badalīn wa-immā an takhrujū*; the same is reported by Abu'l-'Arab al-Tamīmī, *Kitāb al-Miḥan*, ed. Yahyā Wahīb al-Jabbūrī (Beirut, 1427/2006), 130; Ibn 'Abd Rabbīhi, *al-'Iqd al-Farīd*, v, 126 (where *bi-adillā'* [?] should read *bi-budalā'*). Cf. al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 328, who reports that *wa-kāna akthar al-jaysh budalā' min al-'a'ā' wa-julluhum yahwana 'bna al-Zubayr 'Abd Allāh*. On the practice of hiring substitutes for participating in campaigns, see Michael Bonner, “*Ja'ā'il* and holy war in early Islam”, *Der Islam* 68, 1991, 45–64, especially 47–9 (where the aforesaid passage from al-Balādhurī has been misconstrued and misplaced in the reign of 'Uthmān).

33 *fa-akhraja ['Amr ibn Sa'id] li-ahl al-dīwān 'asharāt wa-kharaja min mawālī ahl al-Madīna nāsun kathīrun*; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, V, 344.

34 A rough estimate of the number of Umayyad *mawālī* in Medina at the time is provided by the reports that al-Walīd arrested 300 of 'Amr al-Ashdaq's *mawālī* and *ghulāms* shortly after Yazīd reinstated him as governor of Medina at the end of 61; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 303; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, VI, 6; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, V, 478; cf. also Kister, “Battle of Ḥarra”, 44–7 (see p. 46 and n. 67 thereto on this particular episode). Some accounts of the Median uprising of 63 indicate that the number of Umayyads and their *mawālī* besieged in Marwān's residence was well over a thousand, perhaps even as much as three thousand; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, III, 455; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 308; Abu'l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, *al-Aghānī*, I, 39; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, VI, 12; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, V, 483; Ibn Ra's Ghanama, *Manāqil*, 72; al-Bayyāsī, *al-I'lām*, I, 107, 109; cf. also al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 345–6.

ghayr ahl al-dīwān).³⁵ Furthermore, al-Ṭabarī's statement that "a large group" of *mawālī ahl al-Madīna* accompanied this army must probably be read as a reference to the *mawālī* of those Umayyads who were resident in Medina.³⁶ Piecing together all the accounts, we may conclude that 'Amr had 400 men – apparently mostly from the *dīwān* or hired men – under his direct command, with some 700 more – apparently mostly Umayyad *mawālī* – in another contingent under the command of Unays ibn 'Amr al-Aslamī.³⁷ This latter contingent of Umayyad *mawālī* was "completely routed" (*huzima aqbaḥa hazīmatin*)³⁸ in an ambush by 'Abd Allāh ibn Ṣafwān ibn Umayya al-Jumaḥī and a ragtag band of Zubayrid sympathizers.³⁹

Still other reports assert that this army was a Syrian army (*jaysh min ahl al-Shām*).⁴⁰ This is quite significant inasmuch as the tradition's statement that its first army would be Syrian (*min al-Shām*) was the most important consideration in Madelung's identification of it with the expedition of al-Ḥuṣayn ibn Numayr.⁴¹ Yet 'Amr ibn al-Zubayr's army could hardly have been raised in Syria, for elsewhere we hear Yazīd reprimand 'Amr al-Ashdaq for failing to ask for reinforcements to be sent from there.⁴² This divergent report, nonetheless, is of some import for our analysis as it does not seem to be simply erroneous. Rather, it indicates that people thought of Umayyad *mawālī* as "Syrians". In this connection it is also important to remember that, as Gerald Hawting observes, "the Umayyad armies are constantly referred to as *ahl al-Shām* while their opponents are usually called ... *ahl al-Ḥijāz*" in the context of the Second Civil War, an observation seconded by John Haldon and Hugh Kennedy.⁴³ This brings us back to the minority variant *min ahl al-Shām*

35 al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 330.

36 al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, V, 344 (see n. 33 above).

37 For the number of men in Unays' contingent, see al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, V, 344 (the number of 2,000 in *ibid.*, 347, seems to be a confusion with the rounded-up number of all the men in 'Amr's army); Ibn 'Asākir, *Ta'rikh*, XLVI, 9; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, III, 380; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 216; Ibn Ra's Ghanama, *Manāqil*, 71 (who adds that Unays' troops were cavalrymen); Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, V, 324; Ibn Fahd, *Ithāf*, II, 49. By taking the figures reported by ancient authorities at face value the historian is always at risk of sounding credulous, especially since the publication of Lawrence I. Conrad's "Seven and the *tasbī'*: on the implications of numerical symbolism for the study of medieval Islamic history", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 31, 1988, 42–73, but it must be noted that my argument does not hinge upon the exactitude of these figures – the only thing of importance here is the appreciable presence of Umayyad *mawālī* in this army.

38 al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, V, 345; cf. Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 216.

39 al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, v, 330; Ibn Sa'd, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, VI, 480; VII, 184; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, V, 344–5; Ibn 'Asākir, *Ta'rikh*, XLVI, 9–10; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, V, 325; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 216; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, III, 380; Ibn Fahd, *Ithāf*, II, 52; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rikh*, II, 690.

40 Ibn Sa'd, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, VI, 479; VII, 184; Ibn 'Asākir, *Ta'rikh*, XLVI, 10; Ibn Fahd, *Ithāf*, II, 50; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rikh*, II, 689.

41 Madelung, "'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr", 296.

42 al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, v, 334; *contra* Patricia Crone, "Were the Qays and Yemen of the Umayyad period political parties?", *Der Islam* 71, 1994, 1–57, 38, n. 211, who thinks they could have been raised in Syria.

43 Hawting, "The Umayyads and the Ḥijāz", *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies* 2, 1972, 39–46 (p. 42); Haldon and Kennedy, "Regional identity and military

recorded for our tradition in some manuscripts of Abū Dāwūd’s *Sunan* as well as in Ibn Abī Shayba’s *Muṣannaḥ*⁴⁴ – a variant of which Madelung does not show awareness. In the light of these reports on the composition of ‘Amr’s army, we can now safely give preference to this minority variant. To paraphrase, this army of Umayyad *mawālī* was probably referred to as “Syrian” by some,⁴⁵ as the testimony of several medieval historians suggests, and that is almost certainly why the *ḥadīth* describes it as “an expedition *min ahl al-Shām*”.

We must now turn to the last piece of information supplied by the *ḥadīth* concerning the first expedition – to wit, its location. According to most sources, upon his arrival in Mecca Unays stationed himself in Dhū Ṭawī while ‘Amr entered Mecca with some of his men to negotiate his brother’s surrender. ‘Abd Allāh, who had no intention of giving himself up to be ignominiously hauled off to Damascus, tried to play for time and at the same time connived with ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ṣafwān to rid himself of his brother. ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ṣafwān then gathered Ibn al-Zubayr’s supporters (and, of course, ‘Amr’s enemies) and fell upon Unays and his men at Dhū Ṭawī.⁴⁶

This Dhū Tawī, according to Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, “is a well dug by ‘Abd Shams ibn ‘Abd Manāf, situated on the highest point of Mecca, near the Bayḍā’ [adjacent to] the dwelling of Muḥammad ibn Sayf” (*bi’run ḥafarahā ‘Abd Shams ibn ‘Abd Manāf wa-hiya ’llatī bi-a’lā Makka ’inda ’l-Bayḍā’ [sic] dār Muḥammad ibn Sayf*).⁴⁷ Under “al-Bayḍā’”, he informs us that it is the same place as the pass (*thaniyya*) of Tan’im in Mecca,⁴⁸ and *sub verbo* “al-Thaniyya al-Bayḍā’” we read that “it is a pass *near Mecca* that leads down to Fakhkh when coming to Mecca from the direction of Medina; [it is]

power: Byzantium and Islam ca. 600–750”, in W. Pohl, C. Gantner, and R. Payne (eds), *Visions of Community in the Post-Roman World: The West, Byzantium and the Islamic World*, 300–1100 (Farnham, 2012), 317–53 (p. 344).

44 Ibn Abī Shayba, *Muṣannaḥ*, ed. Abī Muḥammad Usāma ibn Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1429/2008), XIII, 258.

45 Very possibly in a contemptuous vein, given the high level of regional antagonism between the Syrian metropolis and the regions relegated to peripheral status at this time. The palpability of such regional rivalries in this period may be surmised from the circulation of early traditions glorifying certain cities (Damascus, Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem, Kūfa) – on which see Meir J. Kister, “‘You shall only set out for three mosques’: a study of an early tradition”, *Le Muséon* 82, 1969, 173–96 (note especially the traditions underscoring the primacy of the Meccan sanctuary on the authority of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr cited on p. 188); Nancy Khalek, *Damascus after the Muslim Conquest: Text and Image in Early Islam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 135–65; cf. also Mehdy Shaddel, “Yazīd I b. Mo’āwiya”, *Encyclopaedia Iranica*.

46 al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 330; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, V, 344–5; Ibn Sa’d, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, VI, 479–80; VII, 184; Ibn Fahd, *Ithāf*, II, 50–51; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, III, 380; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 216; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, V, 324; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh*, XLVI, 10; al-Dhahabī, *Ta’rīkh*, 689–90. In the prelude to the campaign, al-Ṭabarī (reproduced almost verbatim by Ibn Kathīr and Ibn al-Jawzī) also states that “‘Amr encamped in al-Jurf”, either a place in the north of Medina or somewhere near Mecca. In any event, the significance of this report is unclear to me. Al-Balādhurī also mentions al-Ḥajūn, which, per Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Mu’jam al-buldān* (Beirut, 1977/1397), II, 225, is the highest point of Mecca, and thus could be a place adjacent to Dhū Ṭawī.

47 Yāqūt, *Mu’jam*, IV, 51, s.v. “al-Ṭawī”.

48 Yāqūt, *Mu’jam*, I, 530.

the lowest point of Mecca, overlooked by Dhū Ṭawī” (*‘aqabatun qurb Makka tahbatuka ilā Fakhkhin wa-anta muqbilun min al-Madīna turīdu Makka; asfal Makka min qibal Dhī Ṭawī*).⁴⁹

Yāqūt thus implies that this Baydā’ was not part of the town itself. This is corroborated by what we can glean from a *ḥadīth* on the authority of Nāfi’, the *mawlā* of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar. According to Nāfi’, on trips to Mecca, Ibn ‘Umar “would always spend the night in Dhū Ṭawī, then ritually wash himself in the morning, and enter Mecca in the midday” (*lā yaqdamu Makka illā bāta bi-Dhī Ṭawī ḥattā yuṣbiḥu wa-yaghtasila thumma yadkhulu Makka nahāran*), purportedly following the example of the prophet.⁵⁰ Dhū Ṭawī thus seems to be the last stop outside the sacred precincts of the Meccan sanctuary. In the light of this tradition, ‘Amr’s rationale for leaving Unays in Dhū Ṭawī and entering Mecca with only a handful of his men becomes evident: he wanted to avoid marching on the holy city and desecrating it as far as possible, and was therefore simply trying to threaten his brother by show of force. This is in harmony with the *ḥadīth*’s report that the place of the first engagement is “between Mecca and Medina”. Nonetheless, it records the name of this place as Baydā’ and not Bayḍā’, but it is not hard to imagine how a tradent could have mistaken the two orthographically and metrically similar terms, especially given that there actually was a place called Baydā’ located on the route connecting Medina to Mecca.⁵¹ It must also be borne in mind that, semantically speaking, *baydā’* and *bayḍā’* could both signify the same thing, namely, “a barren piece of land”,⁵² and this might have further helped with the confusion. It may, however, be objected that, if really so, at least one of the variants of this tradition must have recorded it as al-Bayḍā’, but it must be pointed out that the tradition has come down to us through a partially single chain of tradents. In such a case, an error committed by one of the single-chain tradents is the only thing that gets passed down the line of transmitters.⁵³ Finally, we must also take notice of Ibn A’tam’s words which, revealingly, characterize the location of the incident as “between Mecca and Medina”, thereby putting to rest the (due) reservations expressed by Michael Cook.⁵⁴

Needless to say, the expedition of “Abū Yaksūm”⁵⁵ ended in disaster. Unays was killed along with, in Ibn A’tam’s words, “a great number of his men”

49 Yāqūt, *Mu’jam*, II, 85.

50 Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. Muḥammad Fu’ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī (Beirut, 1412/1991), II, 919; under “bāb istiḥbāb al-mabit bi-Dhī Ṭawī ‘inda irādat dukhūl Makka wa’l-ightisāl li-dukhūlihā wa-dukhūlihā al-nahār”. The *ḥadīth* could be found in most other compendia under similar headings. I must emphasize that the authenticity or otherwise of the *ḥadīth* could barely have any bearing on the accuracy of the information it imparts with respect to Meccan geography.

51 Yāqūt, *Mu’jam*, I, 523, states that it is closer to Mecca, *contra* Cook, “Eschatology”, 230, who thinks it is located “just south of Medina”.

52 Lane, *An Arabic–English Lexicon*, s.v. “b-y-d” (“a desert, a plain wherein is nothing”) and “b-y-d̄” (“smooth land, in which is no herbage”).

53 See the analysis and diagram in Cook, “Eschatology”, 226–8.

54 Ibn A’tam, *al-Futūḥ*, V, 153; cf. Cook, “Eschatology”, 230.

55 This is the epithet given to ‘Amr by his brother ‘Abd Allāh in Ibn Sa’d’s account, after he was captured in Mecca, in an evident reference to Abraha, the Aksumite king of South Arabia who, per the tradition, led an expedition to Mecca in the year of Muḥammad’s

(*fa-qutila min al-qawm maqtalatan ‘azīmatan*),⁵⁶ and ‘Amr himself, deserted by those accompanying him, was taken captive. He was first sheltered by his other brother ‘Ubayda, but ‘Abd Allāh handed him over to those who had suffered at his hands in Medina to exact their revenge on him. Al-Mundhir and his son forwent their right to revenge, so we are told, but others did not show much magnanimity towards him. He was beaten up and then thrown into a prison that came to bear the epithet of one of his own troops, a recalcitrant *ghulām* of the aforementioned Muṣ‘ab ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān⁵⁷ known as ‘Ārim – so called because of his wickedness in defecting to the side of his master’s enemies – who was killed there in an ingenious manner.⁵⁸ Untreated, ‘Amr perished in prison as a result of his wounds, and his corpse was gibbeted on ‘Abd Allāh’s orders.⁵⁹

Al-Ḥuṣayn ibn Numayr and the expedition of the Kalb

The second attempt by the Umayyads to quash Ibn al-Zubayr is very well known, but a few words about it are in order before closing our historical analysis. First, it is important to note that the mild tone of our *ḥadīth* when narrating this episode (*fa-yazharūna ‘alayhim*, “they will defeat them”) is a far cry from the triumphalist language it uses of the first expedition (*fa-yukhsafu bihim*; figuratively, “they will be wiped out”), in what seems to be an unmistakable allusion to the miserable fate of Unays’ detachment. This is consistent with what is reported for the expedition of al-Ḥuṣayn ibn Numayr: the Syrians had reduced Ibn al-Zubayr and his supporters to the Holy Sanctuary and its immediate environs by the time the news of Yazīd’s sudden demise arrived, but with the death of their favoured contender there was no longer any point in fighting over the

birth but was defeated by a swarm of birds which rained stones on his army; Ibn Sa‘d, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, VII, 185; see also Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh*, XLVI, 11. A similar pejorative reference is made to Muslim ibn ‘Uqba upon being appointed commander of the army that was to attack Medina and Mecca in pseudo-Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, II, 14, 15; Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad al-Bayhaqī, *al-Maḥāsīn wa’l-masāwī*, ed. Muḥammad Abu’l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1380/1961), I, 59, 61; and al-Bayyāsī, *al-Īlām*, I, 128.

- 56 Ibn A‘tham, *al-Futūḥ*, V, 153. Cf. al-Ṭabarī, *fa-qutila Unays ibn ‘Amr wa’l-Muhājir mawlā al-Qalammas fī nāsīn kathīrīn*; *Ta’rīkh*, V, 346.
- 57 Or, according to al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥārith; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, V, 346 (who mistakenly calls him Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith); al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 331.
- 58 Sean W. Anthony, “The Meccan prison of ‘Abdallāh b. al-Zubayr and the imprisonment of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya”, in Maurice Pomerantz and Aram Shahin (eds), *The Heritage of Arabo-Islamic Learning: Studies Presented to Wadad Kadi* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 3–29 (pp. 5–10).
- 59 al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 328–33; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, V, 344–7; Ibn A‘tham, *al-Futūḥ*, V, 153–4; Ibn Sa‘d, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, VI, 480–1; VII, 184–5; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntazam*, V, 325; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, III, 380–1; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, VIII, 216; Ibn Fahd, *Ithāf*, II, 52–3; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh*, XLVI, 9–11; al-Dhahabī, *Ta’rīkh*, 689–90; Ibn Ra’s Ghanama, *Manāqil*, 71. Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayrī knows of ‘Amr’s demise in his brother’s prison but, as befits a descendant of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr, not of its cause; al-Zubayrī, *Nasab*, 178.

caliphate and they had to abandon the siege.⁶⁰ They were thus defeated in the strategic sense of the word, but far from wiped out.⁶¹

Second, the *ḥadīth* boasts of the “booty of Kalb”. After hearing of Yazīd’s death, al-Ḥuṣayn ordered a retreat towards Medina, but order in his army soon began to disintegrate and the stragglers were attacked and killed by bands of vengeful Ḥijāzīs.⁶² Pseudo-Ibn Qutayba produces a report according to which the people of Medina took prisoner more than 400 men from this army. They were held captive in Medina until Muṣ‘ab ibn al-Zubayr arrived with orders from his brother ‘Abd Allāh to execute them all in al-Ḥarra, in an apparent retaliation for their sack of Medina in the aftermath of the battle of al-Ḥarra the previous year.⁶³ With morale at a low ebb, the breakdown of order in the retreating army was so complete that, as one eyewitness put it, “a baby girl could take away a horseman’s belongings” (*wa’llāhi in kānat al-walīda la-takhruju fa-ta’kHUDHU al-fāris mā yamtanī’u*).⁶⁴ The Syrian army thus seems to have been not only raided, but also looted upon this retreat of 1812.

Third, the tradition speaks of a Qurashī man with a Kalbī mother and an army comprised of the Kalb. That Yazīd’s mother was the daughter of a powerful family of Kalbī kingmakers is a well-established fact,⁶⁵ neither is there any question as to the prominent role the Kalb played in Syrian politics and in the Syrian army at this time.⁶⁶

To sum up, our *ḥadīth* retails the saga of a Medinan who goes to Mecca after the death of a caliph and receives the allegiance of (some) Meccans, then has to face two expeditions sent against him – the first consisting of Syrians to be “swallowed up” in the Baydā’ between Medina and Mecca, the second consisting of Kalbīs and sent by a Qurashī who is a Kalbī on his mother’s side. The *ḥadīth*’s protagonist will receive support from Syrians and Iraqīs alike, “linger” for nine years,⁶⁷ and die. On the other hand, as we know from narrative sources, Ibn al-Zubayr fled Medina for Mecca upon the death of Mu‘āwiya and, received the allegiance of many Meccans, “some secretly and others openly”, around the same time.⁶⁸ Then his partisans “soundly routed” the army of Umayyad *mawālī*, called “Syrian” by some and led by his own brother, in Dhū Ṭawī, just outside

60 Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, *al-Iqd al-farīd*, V, 141–2; Ibn Fahd, *Iḥāf*, II, 61, 63; cf. al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 362–3; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, V, 501; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, VI, 23.

61 Pace Madelung, “‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr”, 297.

62 al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, V, 503; followed by Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, III, 468; and Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, VI, 24.

63 Pseudo-Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, II, 17. These, however, may have been taken prisoner during the incident at Rabadha the next year; see al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 374; VI, 292–3.

64 Pseudo-Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, II, 20.

65 For the family, see Patricia Crone, *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 93–4.

66 See, *inter alia*, Patricia Crone, “Qays and Yemen”, 44–9.

67 As Cook has observed, mistaking nine for seven is “a familiar graphic confusion” in Arabic and “it is even odds that nine is the original figure”; Cook, “Eschatology”, 230.

68 Note ‘Amr al-Ashdaq’s words above. There are in fact a whole host of reports stating that allegiance was pledged to Ibn al-Zubayr, albeit behind the doors, during Yazīd’s lifetime. I hope to take up this issue in a future study.

Mecca, and later withstood the predominantly Kalbī army of al-Ḥuṣayn ibn Numayr sent by Yazīd – who was a Qurashī on his father’s side and a Kalbī on his mother’s. He was subsequently recognized as caliph in all Iraqi and most Syrian garrison towns.⁶⁹ ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr was eventually killed after nine years of openly contending for the caliphate in 73 AH. Therefore, it now seems safe to assume that the episodes recounted by our tradition are, *pace* Madelung, entirely historical.

Appendix I: The Zubayrid propagandist

Confident that the tradition stems from the Basran milieu of 64 AH, Madelung identified the ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith in its *isnād* – who must have been its original disseminator – with ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith ibn Nawfal ibn al-Ḥārith ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, the man who was elected as Basra’s interim governor when ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Ziyād had to flee the town after Yazīd’s death.⁷⁰ In that capacity he recognized Ibn al-Zubayr as caliph and received the pledge of allegiance from the Basrans on his behalf in 64 AH. But now it seems indisputable that the tradition in its present form postdates Ibn al-Zubayr’s demise, and this poses a problem for Madelung’s identification: not only is this ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith not known for having been an ardent supporter of Ibn al-Zubayr, having recognized him merely because he was the only contender left on the scene at the time, he was thrown into prison by his successor – Ibn al-Zubayr’s appointee – and extorted of the money he had allegedly embezzled while governor.⁷¹ This could hardly have made him daydream about his ephemeral and lukewarm association with the Zubayrid cause in later years and, therefore, we do not seem to stand on firm ground with regard to the identity of the propagandist responsible for the initial circulation of this tradition.⁷²

Be that as it may, a case could be made for another of Ibn al-Zubayr’s governors of Basra, but this would require his given name and patronymic to have been transposed in the process of transmission. Al-Ḥārith ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Rabī‘a al-Makhzūmī was among the very first to offer his allegiance to Ibn al-Zubayr in the year 64⁷³ and remained one of his closest confidants throughout the duration of his reign. He was perhaps the only one in Ibn al-Zubayr’s inner circle (setting aside his extended family) to survive the final Umayyad attack on Mecca in 73 AH.⁷⁴ In some reports, he is even said to

69 For his base of support, see A. Dietrich, “al-Daḥḥāk b. Ḳays al-Fihri”, *EP*²; Sandra Campbell, “‘Abdallāh b. al-Zubayr”, *EP*³; as well as the works cited in n. 18 above.

70 On the circumstances surrounding his election, see Patricia Crone, “*Shūrā* as an elective institution”, *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 19, 2001, 3–39, 23–4.

71 For his life and career, see Madelung, “‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr”, 297–305.

72 In his entry for the “Mahdī” in *EP*², V, 1232, however, Madelung backtracks on his earlier view and concludes that, in the light of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith’s political nonchalance, “it is in fact unlikely that he was responsible for this *hadīth*”.

73 *Wa-kāna ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ṣafwān asra’ al-nās ilā bay’atihi, thumma ‘Ubayd ibn ‘Umayr wa-‘Abd Allāh ibn Muṭī’ al-‘Adawī wa’l-Ḥārith ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Rabī‘a; al-Balādhurī, Ansāb*, V, 371.

74 The date of his death is not known but he is not mentioned among those killed during the attack, is said to have had an audience with ‘Abd al-Malik sometime after the civil war,

have defended Ibn al-Zubayr against the charge of mendacity before ‘Abd al-Malik shortly after the latter’s rebuilding of the Ka‘ba⁷⁵ in 75 AH.⁷⁶ Above all, his name appears in compendia of apocalyptic *aḥādīth*, along with a number of prominent associates of Ibn al-Zubayr, in connection with traditions recounting the “swallowing up” of an army marching on the Meccan sanctuary.⁷⁷ In short, al-Ḥārith appears to have remained deeply committed to the memory of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr and his own role in what later became known as the “second *fitna*” to the very end. By his last act of tribute to this memory he unintentionally cast the future Mahdī, the awaited redeemer of Islam, in the mould of the “pious” caliph Ibn al-Zubayr.⁷⁸

Appendix II: The refugee at the sanctuary: a war of propaganda

In his analysis of this tradition, Madelung brought to light traditions of a similar texture which shared some basic elements with it. These traditions, which speak of the march of an army on the sanctuary in pursuit of a man of the Quraysh, an *‘ā’idh*, who has sought refuge there, “were first put into circulation by ‘Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr and some of his most prominent backers at the time of the Syrian campaign against Medina and Mecca under Yazīd” and, Madelung argues, were incorporated by “‘Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥārith ... in his own *ḥadīth*”.⁷⁹ If we replace the words “the Syrian campaign against Medina and Mecca” with “the expedition of ‘Amr ibn al-Zubayr”, there will be nothing in Madelung’s conclusion with which we may not agree. There is, nevertheless, one element common to most versions of these “prototype” traditions that merits our further attention, and that is a preoccupation with those in the “army of *khaṣf*” who are accompanying it “against their own will” (*kārihan*) and will be killed in the event. These traditions invariably end with the narrator enquiring about the fate of this group and the prophet replying that they too will be killed, “but will be resurrected in the hereafter [and judged] according to their intent” (*‘alā niyyatihi*).⁸⁰ As we have seen, there were people in ‘Amr’s army who sympathized with ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr and

and, according to one report cited by al-Balādhurī, al-Walīd broke the news of his death to his father ‘Abd al-Malik, to the latter’s regret; see n. 75.

75 al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, X, 187–8 (fails to report the context of his defence of Ibn al-Zubayr); al-Dhahabī, *Ta’rīkh*, II, 927; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh*, XI, 437–47; ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan‘ānī, *Muṣannaf*, ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-A‘zamī (Beirut, 1392/1972), V, 127–8; al-Azraqī, *Akhbār Makka*, I, 306–7; Muslim, *Ṣaḥīh*, II, 971–2.

76 A hugely significant recent epigraphic find dates the event to the year 78 AH. The otherwise mundane inscription thus reads in the last three lines: *kutiba ḥādthā al-kitāb / ‘āma buniya ‘l-masjid al-ḥarām / li-sanat thamān wa-sab‘īn*; see Nāṣir ibn ‘Alī al-Ḥārithī, “Naqsh kitābī nādir yu’arrīkhu ‘imārat al-khalīfa al-umawī ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān li’l-masjid al-ḥarām”, *Ālam al-makhṭūṭāt wa’l-nawādir* 12 (1428/2007), 533–43.

77 Madelung, “‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr”, 295; see also Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh*, XI, 438–9. Madelung, rightly, identified these traditions as further pieces of Zubayrid propaganda.

78 For more insights into the Zubayrid art of the construction of the past, see Sandra S. Campbell, *Telling Memories: The Zubayrids in Islamic Historical Memory*, unpublished PhD dissertation (University of California, Los Angeles, 2003).

79 Madelung, “‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr”, 296.

80 See, for example, Muslim, *Ṣaḥīh*, IV, 2209.

were forcibly recruited, and at least some of these must have also been killed in Dhū Ṭawī. This element of the *khasf*-narratives hence seems to be an attempt to absolve these “collateral casualties” of any wrongdoing in having unwillingly accompanied ‘Amr’s army and violating Mecca’s sanctity.

These pro-Zubayrid traditions find an exceptionally noteworthy Syrian counterpart in Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād al-Marwazī’s collection which was undoubtedly put into circulation with the specific aim of nullifying their effect. It goes as follows:

al-Walīd ibn Muslim⁸¹ < Ṣadaqa ibn Khālid⁸² < ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥumayd⁸³ < Mujāhid⁸⁴ < Tubay’⁸⁵

a seeker of refuge will take refuge in Mecca, but he will be killed. Then some time will pass until another one will [arise and] take refuge [there]. If you live until that time do not fight him, for it [viz., the army that fights him] will be the army of *khasf* (*sa-ya’ūdhu bi-Makka ‘ā’idhun fa-yuqtalu; thumma yamkathu ‘l-nās burhatan min dahrihim thumma ya’ūdhu ākharun, fa-in adraktahu fa-lā taghzuwannahu fa-innahu jaysh al-khasf*).⁸⁶

This tradition, as we can gather from its chain of tradents, has its provenance in pro-Umayyad circles of Syria and would have done the Umayyads a twofold service, first by reassuring their supporters (as well as their enemies) that Ibn al-Zubayr would eventually be killed,⁸⁷ – a genuine prophecy which came to

81 Damascene, a *mawlā* of the Umayyads (d. c. 194 AH); see Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh*, LXIII, 274–95. For his exact date of death, see *ibid.*, XLIII, 27 (in any event before the revolt of Abu’l-‘Amaytar ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Khālid ibn Yazīd al-Sufyānī in 195, about which *ex eventu* prophecies were spuriously disseminated on his authority – certainly because of his reputation as a pro-Umayyad visionary).

82 Damascene, a *mawlā* of the Umayyads (d. c. 180 AH); Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh*, XXIV, 9–16.

83 Misidentified by Suliman Bashear, “Muslim apocalypses and the hour: a case-study in traditional reinterpretation”, *Israel Oriental Studies* 13, 1993, 75–99 (p. 89), as the grandson of the celebrated companion ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf and the originator of the tradition. However, this ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, according to Ibn Sa’d, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, VII, 466, had died at the beginning of al-Manṣūr’s reign and, hence, before the events Bashear envisages as the tradition’s historical context (see n. 88). The tradent remains unidentified.

84 There is some confusion with regard to his identity, arising from the similarity in the patronymic of the celebrated Meccan *qāri’* and *mufasssir* Mujāhid ibn Jabr and a certain Mujāhid ibn Jubayr of whom nothing is known (Ibn Sa’d, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, LVII, 17 ff.). The death date of 130 AH recorded for Mujāhid by Ibn ‘Asākir (Ibn Sa’d, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, LVII, 24) apparently belongs to this latter, for there is another tradition in Nu‘aym related from Tubay’ on his authority which “foretells” the demise of the Umayyad dynasty and decidedly originates from the chaos of the Third Civil War (126–9 AH). With Tubay’ having died long before, this tradition must go back to Mujāhid himself; see Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād, *Kitāb al-Fitan*, ed. Samīr ibn Amīn al-Zuhayrī (Cairo, 1412/1991), 196 (with a mutilated version on p. 132).

85 Stepson of the Jewish rabbi Ka’b al-Aḥbār and hence a magnet for apocalyptic prophecies. He dwelt in Syria after the Muslim conquest of that territory, moved to Egypt in his later years, and died in Alexandria c. 101 AH; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh*, XI, 26–35.

86 Nu‘aym, *al-Fitan*, 327–8.

87 Ibn al-Zubayr’s self-designation of “a seeker of refuge in the sanctuary” (*‘ā’idhun bi’l-bayt*) is too well known to allow for the identification of the tradition’s first character

materialize over a decade later when al-Ḥajjāj's troops stormed the sacred precincts of the Ka'ba after a months-long siege – and then by proclaiming that the refugee at Mecca, predicted in the Zubayrid traditions, who would enjoy divine favour and whose enemies would be blotted out by divine wrath was not Ibn al-Zubayr, but another person, a second 'ā'idh, who was yet to appear.⁸⁸ It was, in all likelihood, first propagated by Tubay' not long after the debacle of 'Amr's expedition.⁸⁹ The testimony of pro-Syrian traditions related on his authority leaves little doubt as to where his sympathies lay.⁹⁰

The Second Civil War was not just about claims to the caliphate. It was also about claims to precedence in religion, closeness to the prophet, and ostentations of religious zeal. It was at this time that unequivocal professions of Islamic faith – including the name of Muḥammad – first appeared on a coinage, that of the Zubayrids.⁹¹ Likewise, in our case it is only the Zubayrid tradition that attempts to include the prophet in its *isnād*, a pattern also to be observed in other Zubayrid propagandistic *ḥadīths*⁹² – though, of course, they were not

with any other person, a fact which could not possibly have been lost on its disseminator (s) and their audience.

- 88 The tradition has been misidentified by Bashear (“Muslim apocalypses”, 89) as echoing the events of the rebellion of Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Nafs al-Zakiyya, a strange identification given that he rebelled, and was killed, in Medina. It goes without saying that he never called himself, and was not called, an 'ā'idh, nor did he ever went to “take refuge” in Mecca. On him, see Amikam Elad, “The rebellion of Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan (known as al-Nafs al-Zakīya) in 145/762”, in James E. Montgomery (ed.), *Occasional Papers of the School of 'Abbasid Studies: Cambridge, 6–10 July 2002* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 147–98; and now Amikam Elad, *The Rebellion of Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya in 145/762: Ṭālibīs and Early 'Abbāsīs in Conflict* (Leiden: Brill, 2016).
- 89 It must be conceded that Mujāhid remains a candidate, though if so he must have had a floruit spanning well over six decades. It is also possible that the *isnād* is wholly spurious, but in that case Tubay's name was most likely used to serve as the emblem of pro-Syrian factionalism – as well as because of his reputation as a seer. In any event, the tradition's provenance in circles close to the Umayyad court could hardly be disputed.
- 90 See, for example, Ibn 'Asākir, *Ta'rikh*, I, 207, 287 (on Mujāhid's authority).
- 91 Stefan Heidemann, “The evolving representation of the early Islamic empire and its religion on coin imagery”, in A. Neuwirth, N. Sinai and M. Marx (eds), *The Qur'ān in Context: Historical and Literary Investigations into the Qur'ānic Milieu* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 149–95 (pp. 166–9).
- 92 A tradition on the authority of 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr himself has the prophet pronounce, “the eschaton (*al-sā'a*) will come about after the appearance of thirty impostors (*thalāthūna kadhdhāban*), among them Musaylima, al-'Ansī, and al-Mukhtār. And the most nefarious (*sharr*) of all Arab tribes are the Banū Umayya, Banū Ḥanīfa, and Thaḳīf” – the last two being the tribes of Musaylima and al-Mukhtār; recorded by, among others, Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, ed. 'Abd al-Mu'ī Qal'ajī (Beirut, 1408/1988), VI, 480–81. After Ibn al-Zubayr's death al-Ḥajjāj went to visit his bereaved mother, Asmā' bint Abī Bakr, as a gesture, only to be told by her that she heard the prophet say, “there shall come from the Thaḳīf an impostor and a butcher” (*mubīr*). She then continued, “we have already seen the impostor”, meaning al-Mukhtār, “as for the butcher, it is you!” Al-Ḥajjāj confirmed, “butcher of hypocrites!” See, among others, al-Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, 481–2. Ibn al-Zubayr also ascribed traditions on the authority of 'Ā'isha to the prophet so as to

the only, or even the first, group to do so.⁹³ The new paradigms thus brought about would remain in place for long after the close of the civil war, and the legacy of the Zubayrids thereby lingered on centuries after the defeat of their cause.⁹⁴

legitimize his rebuilding and restructuring of the Ka‘ba, on which now see Gerald Hawting, “‘A plaything for kings’: ‘Ā’isha’s ḥadīth, Ibn al-Zubayr and rebuilding the Ka‘ba”, in Majid Daneshgar and Walid A. Saleh (eds), *Islamic Studies Today: Essays in Honor of Andrew Rippin* (Leiden, 2017), 3–21, especially 20–1.

- 93 A Syrian tradition has it that during the siege of ‘Uthmān’s house it was suggested to him that, among other options, he could flee to Mecca, but he rejected it because he had heard the prophet say, “a man of the Quraysh shall commit indecency (*yulḥidu*) in Mecca and [because of it] he shall carry the burden of half of the sins of the world”, and that he did not want to be that man; Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, ed. Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Qādir ‘Aṭā (Beirut, 1429/2008), I, 210; see also Wilferd Madelung, “‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr the *mulḥid*”, in Concepción Vázquez de Benito and Miguel Ángel Manzano Rodríguez (eds), *Actas XVI Congreso UEAI* (Salamanca: CSIC, 1995), 301–8 (pp. 307–8). The bestowal of the epithet of *mulḥid* upon Ibn al-Zubayr by his enemies was evidently motivated by Quran 22:25.
- 94 For more on the developments of the Islamic *cultus* in the immediate wake of the Second Civil War and the possible influence of Zubayrid experimentations on it, see Chase F. Robinson, *‘Abd al-Malik* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2005), 90–128 *et passim*.