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Abstract
This article examines the history, structure and successes of the da'wa system prior to and during the establishment of the Fatimid Caliphate. Early Ismaili da'wa took advantage of the fact that there were many discontented factions among the Abbasid populace. Acquiring the allegiance of these groups facilitated the eventual establishment of the Fatimid Caliphate.

During the reign of the Fatimids, the da'wa structure continued to be refined and expanded. Within the Fatimid state, the da'wa enjoyed unbridled freedom to propagate the faith and expound upon ideological developments. However, the Fatimid's policies of tolerance and freedom of religion prevented Ismailism from ever rooting deeply into the North African population. It remained the faith of a minority for the duration of the Fatimid reign.

Ironically, outside the Fatimid dawla, the da'wa was more successful in establishing significant Ismaili communities across Asia and into the Subcontinent. It is this stability, achieved outside Fatimid territory, which allowed Ismailism's survival and continuation after the decline of the Fatimid dynasty.

Introduction
The protest movements touched upon in Chapter 1 (Part Two) will now be considered in greater detail. Islam heralded a new social order, under whose banner all believers belonging to different races or classes would theoretically enjoy equality. However, during the earlier centuries of Islam when the Islamic empire was really an ‘Arab kingdom’, the Iranians, Central Asians and other non-Arab peoples who had converted to Islam in growing numbers as mawālī, or ‘clients’ of an Arab lord or clan, had in practice acquired an inferior socio-economic and racial status compared to Arab Muslims, though the mawālī themselves fared better than the empire's non-Muslim subjects, the ahl al-dhimma (‘people of the book’). The mawālī, for instance, paid special taxes, often similar to the jizya (poll tax) and the kharāj (land tax) levied on the Zoroastrians and other non-Muslim subjects, taxes which were never paid by the Arab Muslims.
From an early date, the stage was thus set for prolonged antagonism between the Arab rulers and their Iranian and other non-Arab subjects in the eastern Islamic lands. Indeed, the superficially Islamized peoples of the Iranian lands - especially in the remote eastern provinces of Khurasan and Transoxania (called by the early Arab geographers and historians, Mā warā’ al-nahr, or ‘the land beyond the river [Oxus’]), situated far from the caliphal centres of power in Syria and Iraq - did not submit readily to Arab rule or even to Islam for quite some time. Different religio-political currents of thought and sectarian movements, often leading to popular insurrections, persisted until the early ‘Abbasid and later times in Central Asia, Khurasan and other regions of the Iranian lands. They all expressed opposition to the established caliphate, while many of the region's movements manifested anti-Arab or even anti-Islamic sentiment, rooted in Zoroastrianism, Mazdakism and other Iranian traditions.

The Kharijite movement

It was under such circumstances that Kharijism found some early following in Iran. More importantly, the Iranian lands lent support to the 'Alid cause and to Shi’ism, which had itself originated as an Arab party opposed to the established caliphate. All the major branches of the Shi’ites, namely the Kaysāniyya, Imāmiyya, Zaydiyya and Isma‘iliyya, had acquired communities of followers by the ninth century in different parts of the Iranian lands. Other sectarian groups, engaging in armed revolts, were specific to Transoxania, Khurasan, Azerbaijan and a few other areas of Iran. The doctrines of these rather obscure groups, designated generically as the Khurramiyya, were based on syncretistic currents of thought which aimed to amalgamate indigenous Iranian religious traditions with aspects of Islamic teaching, while these Khurrami groups basically remained anti-Arab and anti-Muslim. The activities of many of these insurrectional groups, frequently supported by the peasantry, were also rooted in specific socio-economic grievances of the villages and the smallholders against the dihqāns (large landowners) who had assimilated themselves more readily into the new Arabo-Islamic system, and often acted as the provincial caliphal agents as well. From the second half of the ninth century, when the ‘Abbasids began to lose their firm central control over the outlying lands of the caliphate, Iranian ‘national’ sentiment (if this rather modern concept may be applied in a medieval Islamic context) found more successful channels of expression in the activities of certain dynasties, starting with the Saffarids, which successfully challenged the hegemony of the ‘Abbasids and began to reassert Iranian identity and culture, especially in the Samanid period (see below).

There is little reliable information on most of these sectarian and revolutionary movements, mainly because very few contemporary sources, including the genuine literatures of the sectarians themselves, have survived from this early formative period in Islam. The later Muslim authors, including the historians and the early heresiographers such as al-Ash‘ari (d. 935), al-Baghdādi (d. 1037) and Ibn Hazm (d. 1064), who wrote about several aspects of these religio-political movements, were mostly Sunnis defending the legitimacy of the historical caliphate and the orthodoxy of Sunni Islam. As a result, they treated all of these opposition movements, as heterodoxies or heresies. On the other hand, al-Nawbakhtī and
al-Qummi, the earliest Shi’ite heresiographers who wrote during the final decades of the ninth century and were better informed than the Sunni authors about the internal divisions of Shi’ism, belonged to the Imāmi branch and as such were inclined to misrepresent or refute the claims of the other Shi’ite groups. Indeed, these groups and movements have to be studied mainly on the basis of hostile and ill-informed sources, which freely attribute strange extremist ideas and antinomian practices to the sectarians. As a result, some of the teachings of these sectarians, especially the doctrines of the Khurrami groups, may never be clarified. There are also disagreements among contemporary scholars regarding the precise social composition and economic bases of some of these sectarian movements, though much progress has been made in recent times. It is with these reservations in mind that we shall now take a closer look at the major sectarian movements of the Iranian lands, especially Khurasan, and Transoxania during the late Umayyad and early ’Abbasid periods.

Kharijism, the first schismatic movement in Islam, originated in Iraq in connection with the prolonged conflict between ’Āli b. Abi Tālib (656-61) and Mu’āwiya (661-80). The Kharijite rebels formed a separate Muslim community and stressed Islamic egalitarianism in their doctrinal position, holding that any Muslim believer who was morally and religiously meritorious, including even a black slave, could be elected as the imam, or leader, of the Muslim community. The egalitarianism of the Kharijites proved particularly appealing to the Persian and other mawâli. Indeed, some of the anti-Arab sentiment of the Iranians found expression in their revolutionary movement, which was also opposed to the caliphates of the Umayyads and ’Abbasids. The fundamentalist Kharijite insistence on the correct Islamic conduct, however, led to a pronounced factionalism within the Kharijite community itself, resulting in numerous Kharijite branches and sub-sects.

From early Umayyad times, Iraqi Kharijites began to seek refuge in Persia, spreading their doctrines in different regions of the Iranian lands, especially in Sistan where Kharijism remained the main sectarian movement for quite some time. By the second civil war, Kharijism had become firmly established in Persia, where different Kharijite communities embarked on a prolonged programme of anti-caliphal insurrectional activities.

Initially, Kharijism in the Iranian lands was primarily related to the activities of the most radical Azāriqa branch of the movement. The Azāriqa, who held that the killing of the women and children of non-Kharijite Muslims was licit, had established several communities in Fars and Kerman as early as 686. Later, the Kharijite movement was reorganized in Iran by Ibn Ajarrad, who may have been from Balkh. Little is known about the activities of Ibn Ajarrad, who founded the Ajārida branch of Kharijism. Heresiographers name some fifteen sub-sects of the Ajārida, which were specific to Iran and were more moderate in their views and policies than the Azāriqa. The various Ajārida sub-sects were particularly active, from 724, in Sistan and other eastern regions, where this form of Kharijism acquired some indigenous foundations. The Thaʾāliba, one of the major sub-sects of the Ajārida, contributed to the revolutionary turmoil of Khurasan during the late Umayyad period, also lending temporary
support there to Abū Muslim. Subsequently, several Thaʿaliba splinter groups survived for some time in and around Juzjan.

In the meantime, Sistan had continued to be the main Kharijite stronghold of the Ajārida in eastern Persia. It was in Sistan that in 795 the major Kharijite revolt of Hamza b. ʿAdharak (or ṬAbd Allāh) al-Khārijī unfolded. Hamza, the descendant of a noble Persian dihğān and the founder of the Hamziyya sub-sect of the Ajārida, started his rebellious activities in Zarang, the capital of Sistan. Responding to the financial grievances of the Sistani villagers, Hamza successfully urged them not to pay the kharāj and other taxes due to the ʿAbbasid caliph; he also had a number of caliphal tax-collectors killed in the region. Hamza mobilized his followers into a large army and conducted anti-ʿAbbasid raids for some thirty years until his death in 828.

Hamza al-Khārijī was succeeded by others in the leadership of his movement. The Hamziyya and other Ajārida sub-sects continued their rebellious activities in eastern Persia until around the middle of the ninth century, when Yaʿqūb b. Layth and his successor in the Saffārid dynasty broke the military power of the Kharijite rebels and ended their importance as a sectarian movement. Nevertheless, scattered Kharijite communities survived for about a century longer in Sistan, Khurasan and other eastern Iranian lands. The Ibādiyya - representing the moderate branch of Kharjījīsm, which eventually found its largest popular following in eastern Arabia and among the Berbers of North Africa - also acquired some support in the east, mainly in Khurasan, during the late Umayyad and early ʿAbbasid periods. However, these early Ibādī groups of the Iranian lands were oriented, unlike the Ajārida, towards Iraq; and they do not seem to have been involved in any rebellious activities.

**Currents of Shiʿism: the Kaysāniyya and the Hāshimiyya**

Of the various religio-political opposition movements in Islam, Shiʿism produced the most lasting impact on the sectarian topography of the Persian lands, although the supremacy of Sunni orthodoxy remained effectively unchallenged there through the ʿAbbasid and later times. Shiʿism originated as an Arab party (shīʿa) opposed to the established caliphate. It upheld the rights of the Prophet's cousin and son-in-law, ʿAlī b. Abī Tālib, and then mainly those of the ʿAlid members of the Prophet’s family (ahl al-bayt), to the leadership of the Muslim community. Representing a unified and exclusively Arab party during its first half century, Shiʿism entered a new phase of its formative period with the Kufan revolt of al-Mukhtār, which was launched in 685 on behalf of ʿAlī’s son Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya. al-Mukhtār’s proclamation of this ʿAlid as the Mahdi (the divinely guided saviour imam who would establish justice on earth and deliver the oppressed from injustice) proved very appealing to the discontented mawālī, who were drawn in increasing numbers into the Shiʿite movement. The mawālī, especially the early ghulāt (extremists) among them, introduced many ideas rooted in their Irano-Zoroastrian and other non-Islamic traditions into Shiʿism, which left a lasting imprint on the movement’s doctrinal development.
The Shi’ite movement of al-Mukhtar, which survived him and the demise of his revolt in 687, became generally known as the Kaysânîyya, accounting for the overwhelming majority of the Shi’ites until the success of the ’Abbasid revolution. When Ibn al-Hanafiyya died in 700, the Kaysânîyya split into several groups, each having its own imam and developing its own doctrines. The bulk of the Kaysânîyya now acknowledged the imamate of Abû Hâshim ’Abd Allâh, the eldest son of Ibn al-Hanafiyya. This Kaysânî majoritarian sub-sect, known as the Hâshimiyya, was the earliest Shi’ite group whose teachings and revolutionary stance were disseminated in Persia, especially in Khurasan where it found adherents among the province's mawâli as well as Arab settlers.

On Abû Hâshim's death, the Hâshimiyya themselves split into several groups. Two of these groups had a major impact on the Iranian lands. One of the main factions of the Hâshimiyya recognized the imamate of ’Abd Allâh b. Mu‘âwiya, a great-grandson of ’Ali's brother, Ja'far b. Abi Talib. Ibn Mu‘âwiya acquired many followers in the western and southern parts of Persia after the collapse of his Kufan revolt in 744. Receiving broad popular support from the Persian malawi, Kharijites and other groups, Ibn Mu‘âwiya established himself at Istakhr, from where he ruled for a few years over Fars and other parts of Persia. Ibn Mu‘âwiya was eventually defeated by the Umayyads in 748; he then sought refuge in Khurasan and was killed in Abû Muslim’s prison.5

The sectarian followers of Ibn Mu‘âwiya, known as the Harbiyya and later as the Janâhiyya, expounded many extremist and gnostic ideas, which have been attributed mainly to one ’Abd Allâh b. al-Harb. The heresiographers, indeed, ascribe a prominent role to this enigmatic personality for introducing some key doctrines into Kaysâni thought, including the pre-existence of souls as shadows (azilla), the transmigration of souls (tanâsukh al-arwâh) and a cyclical history of eras (adwâr) and aeons (akwâr). Some of the ideas of the Harbiyya-Janâhiyya were adopted by other early Shi’ite ghulât groups, and they were also expounded by some of the Khuramiyya groups.6 It is indeed possible that the Harbiyya-Janâhiyya supporters of Ibn Mu‘âwiya in western Iran may have been partially recruited from among the local neo-Mazdakites, who provided the backbone of the Khurramiyya movement in the Iranian lands.

In the meantime, the main faction of the Hâshimiyya had recognized the ’Abbasid Muhammad b. ’Ali, the great-grandson of the Prophet’s uncle al-‘Abbâs, as Abû Hâshim's successor to the imamate. They held that Abû Hâshim had personally bequeathed his rights to the imamate to this ’Abbasid relative. In this way, the ’Abbasids inherited the party and the propaganda organization of the Hâshimiyya, which became the main instrument of the ’Abbasid movement, and eventually of the overthrow of the Umayyads. The Hâshimiyya-’Abbasîyya party, too, influenced the syncretic doctrines of the Iranian Khurramiyya, while the murder of Abû Muslim in 755 sparked off a long period of insurrectional activity by a host of Khurrami groups in Transoxania, Khurasan and other Iranian Lands.
Heterodox Muslim and neo-Mazdakite movements: al-Muqanna’, Bābak, and others

A few obscure sectarian movements, with possible Khurramiyya connections, sprang up in Khurasan in the milieu of the early ‘Abbasid da’wa (missionary movement) during the final decades of the Umayyad period. Around 729 a dā‘ī (propagandist) named ‘Ammār b. Yazid and nicknamed Khidāsh was sent to Nishapur and Merv to head a new ‘Abbasid da’wa organization in Khurasan. Khidāsh expounded extremist doctrines and was eventually repudiated by the ‘Abbasid imam, Muhammad b. ’Alī; he was arrested and executed in 736. However, Khidāsh had acquired followers of his own, known as the Khidāshiyya, who held that the imamate had passed to him from the time of his repudiation by the ‘Abbasids; they also denied Khidāsh’s death. Some heresiographers report that Khidāsh taught the doctrines of the Khurramiyya and also permitted promiscuity; and they, in fact, identify the Khidāshiyya with the Khurramiyya of Khurasan. The matter is unclear, but it is possible that some of the Khidāshiyya may have been recruited from among the neo-Mazdakites of Khurasan.

There also appeared at this time the movement of Bihāfarid the Magian, who was a native of Zuzan and had a Zoroastrian background. Setting himself up, possibly as a new prophet, at Khwaf to the south of Nishapur, Bihāfarid rejected many of the practices of his contemporary Zoroastrians and preached syncretistic doctrines based on a type of ‘reformed’ Zoroastrianism and on certain aspects of Islam. He also revived Persian, and the sources attribute a book to him written in that language. His ideas and social programmes proved attractive to the peasantry, who rallied to his side, enabling Bihāfarid to launch a revolt around 747 in northern Khurasan. Bihāfarid’s innovative ideas soon became intolerable to the leaders of the traditional Zoroastrian establishment, who complained about his heresy to Abū Muslim. They emphasized that Bihāfarid was destroying both Zoroastrianism and Islam. Abū Muslim had Bihāfarid captured in the mountains of Badhghis and brought to Nishapur, where he and many of his followers, known as the Bihāfaridiyya, were put to death in 749. However, the Bihāfaridiyya, who continued to expect Bihāfarid’s return, survived in Khurasan until at least the end of the tenth century.

It was Abū Muslim al-Khurāsānī himself who had the greatest influence on a number of sects and their rebellions in the Persian lands which can be designated specifically as Khurramiyya or Khurramdiniyya. It did not take the ‘Abbasids long after their victory to disclaim all connections with their Shi’ite and extremist Kaysānī (Hāshimiyya-‘Abbāsiyya) antecedents. Indeed, soon after establishing their own caliphate in 749, the ‘Abbasids became upholders of Sunni orthodoxy, persecuting the Shi’ites and their ‘Alid leaders. They also turned against those dā‘ūs and revolutionary commanders who had brought them to power, including especially Abū Muslim, the founder of the Khurasanian army and the chief architect of the ‘Abbasid victory. The treacherous murder of Abū Muslim in 755, on the orders of the caliph al-Mansūr, provided a unique impetus for the religio-political activities of a number of syncretic Khurrami sects.
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Many aspects of these Khurrami sects and their rebellious activities, which unfolded during early ’Abbasid times in many parts of the Persian lands and in Transoxania, remain shrouded in obscurity. However, modern scholarship has generally corroborated the medieval Muslim authors’ identification of the Khurramiyya of early Islamic times with the neo-Mazdakites - these were the remnants of the earlier Mazdakiyya who had supported the socio-religious revolutionary movement of Mazdak for reforming Zoroastrianism in Sasanian Iran during the reign of Kavād (488-551).

By early ’Abbasid times, there were still many Zoroastrian and neo-Mazdakite communities scattered throughout many parts of Central Asia and the Iranian lands, especially in the inaccessible mountain regions and the countryside of Khurasan, Tabaristan and Azerbaijan. A common feature of these dissident religious groups, comprised mainly of the peasantry and the lower social strata, was their anti-Arab feeling of Iranian ‘national’ sentiment. Thus they provided a suitable recruiting ground for all types of popular protest movements; and they were particularly recruited into the conglomeration of religio-political sects known as the Khurramiyya. The Khurrami groups were also receptive to syncretistic influences; and, in Islamic Iran and Central Asia, they were especially influenced by certain extremist and messianic doctrines caught by the Shi’ite ghulāt belonging to the Harbiyya-Janāhiyya and Hāshimiyya-'Abbāsiyya parties of the Kaysāniyya. As a result, Islamic teachings of an extremist nature came to be fused with Iranian dualistic traditions and anti-Arab motifs, giving the Khurramiyya sectarian movement its distinctive (Irano-Islamic) syncretic nature. The protests of the Khurrami groups, which resisted assimilation into Sunni Islam, were also rooted in conflicts of class interests and in economic difficulties. The sectarians had particular grievances against the existing tax system, especially the assessment and collection of land taxes, as well as the local landowning class of dihqāns who had assimilated more readily into the emerging Arabo-Islamic socio-economic system of the caliphate and often shared many of the privileges of the ruling class.

The widest allegiance among the (neo-Mazdakite) Khurrami communities of the Iranian lands and Transoxania was gained by Abū Muslim. He acquired followers of his own, known as the Abū Muslimiyā or Muslimiyā, who split into several groups over time. Abū Muslim evidently gained numerous neo-Mazdakite adherents during his lifetime; and many heresiographers indeed identify the Khurramiyya with the Abū Muslimiyā, who recognized Abū Muslim as their imam, prophet, or even an incarnation of the divine spirit. As the symbol of Iranian self-assertion against Arab domination, Abū Muslim became the figurehead of the Khurramiyya and his murder led to extended Khurrami revolts.9

Khurasan was the first region of Khurrami revolts after Abū Muslim's murder; these revolts frequently involved the idea of avenging Abū Muslim's death. Some of the Abū Muslimiyā-Khurramiyya there now denied that their leader was dead and began to expect his return to establish justice in the world. Others affirmed his death and held that the imamate had now passed from Abū Muslim to his daughter Fāṭima. Later, Fāṭima’s son Mutathar came to be recognized as the imam and Mahdi by some of the Khurramiyya. In 755 the Zoroastrian Sunbādh (Sindbad), a former associate of Abū Muslim, launched the first of these popular
Khurrami revolts against the 'Abbasids, as reported by many Muslim historians. Sunbâdh led an army of Khurrami rebels from his base at Nishapur to Rayy, where his following increased substantially. He also received some support in Qumis and the Tabaristan highlands. This rebellion was suppressed after seventy days by an 'Abbasid army, but the Sunbâdhiyya movement survived for some time.

According to the later Seljuq author Nizâm al-Mulk, the Sunbâdhiyya comprised Mazdakites, Zoroastrians and Shi’ites. He also implausibly reports that Sunbâd aimed to destroy the Ka’ba. The sources attribute various anti-Islamic and anti-Arab motives to Sunbâd, who evidently predicted the end of the Arab empire, also holding that Abû Muslim would return together with Mazdak and the Mahdi. Sunbâd’s revolt and movement, based on religious syncretism and the anti-Arab sentiment of the Iranians and receiving the popular support of the peasantry, set the basic pattern for the activities of other Khurrami groups.

From early on, Khurrami rebellious activities and syncretic doctrines spread from Khurasan to Transoxania. Is’hâq the Turk, who may have been one of Abû Muslim’s dâ’îs operating among the Central Asian Turks, was the leader of the first of such sectarian movements in Transoxania which, like that of Sunbâd, bore the twin label of Abû Muslimiyya and Khurramiyya. He, too, predicted the return of both Abû Muslim and Zoroaster, and used religious syncretism to unify disparate anti-‘Abbasid groups. Subsequently, Is’hâq’s movement acquired a militant character in Central Asia under the leadership of one Barâzbanda.

Around the year 766 another anti-‘Abbasid revolt of a sectarian nature, with obscure religious motives started on the eastern fringes of Khurasan. Led by one Ustâdhis (Ustâd Sîs), who may have claimed prophethood, the revolt received its main support from the villagers. From its initial base in the mountainous district of Badhghis (now in north-western Afghanistan), where Ustâdhis was joined by some of the Bihâfaridiyya, the insurrection spread rapidly to the regions of Herat and Sistan, receiving further reinforcement from the Sistan Kharijites. This revolt was repressed after a few years by the veteran ‘Abbasid general Khâzim b. Khuzayma, who killed some 70,000 of the rebels. Ustâdhis himself was captured in the mountains of Badhghis and sent to Baghdad, where he was executed on al-Mansûr's order.

The most famous of these early anti-‘Abbasid movements of the Khurramiyya in Khurasan and Transoxania was that of al-Muqanna’, whose followers were commonly designated as the ‘wearers of white’ (see above, Chapter 1, Part Two). The fullest account of al-Muqanna’ and his movement was given by Narshakhi, the renowned local historian of Bukhara. Suffice it to say that all the doctrines attributed to al-Muqanna’ by the heresiographers and other Muslim authors (of course, these are universally hostile to him) are generally anti-Islamic. According to al-Birûnî, al-Muqanna’ even enjoined his followers to observe the laws and institutions of Mazdak. The movement of al-Muqanna’ survived in Transoxania after the suppression of his revolt in 779, and the Mubayyida continued to await the return of al-Muqanna’ until the twelfth century.
The Khurramiyya movement had adherents in other parts of the Iranian lands, outside Khurasan and Transoxania. In 778 the neo-Mazdakite Muhammira, or ‘wearers of red’, of Gurgan revolted, in alliance with the local Khurrami supporters of Abū Muslim, claiming that Abū Muslim was still alive. Led by a grandson of Abū Muslim, they advanced as far as Rayy before the rebellion was suppressed by an army dispatched by the governor of Tabaristan. Later, in the reign of Hārūn al-Rashid (786-809), the Khurramiyya launched insurrections in Isfahan and other localities in central Persia.

The activities of the Khurramiyya reached their peak in the movement of Bābak al-Khurrami, whose protracted rebellion based in north-western Iran seriously threatened the stability of the ’Abbasid caliphate. As the leader of the Khurramiyya of Azerbaijan, succeeding Jāwidan b. Shahrak, Bābak consolidated his position in the mountainous district of Bādhdh, which served as his headquarters. Bābak then mobilized his largely rural Khurrami following into a formidable fighting force and started his revolt around the year 316. This revolt, lasting for more than twenty years, soon spread from Azerbaijan to the western and central parts of Iran. Numerous ’Abbasid campaigns against Bābak proved futile, until success was attained by the general Afshin, appointed for this purpose in 835 as governor of Azerbaijan by the caliph al-Mu’tasim (833-42). In 837 Afshin finally seized Bābak's fortress of Bādhdh and repressed the rebellion. Bābak himself was captured soon afterwards and sent to Samarra, where he was executed with extreme cruelty in 838. Little reliable information is available on Bābak’s specific teachings, which were allegedly anti-Arab and anti-Islamic. Some of the sources even report that Bābak, too, was expected to restore the religion of Mazdak.10 Scattered groups of the Bābakiyya survived, awaiting Bābak's return, until after the tenth century.

Bābak's rebellion was followed, in 839, by that of the Qarinid ruler of Tabaristan, Māzyār, a recent convert to Islam. Muslim sources accuse Māzyār of reverting to Zoroastrianism and of conspiring with Babak against Islam, while al-Baghdādī states that his rebel followers, the Māzyāriyya, constitute a major branch of the Khurramiyya. However, Māzyār’s anti-’Abbasid rebellion developed out of his financial conflicts with ’Abd Allāh b. Tāhir, the Tahirid governor of the east, although in his rebellious activities Māzyār relied increasingly on the support of the local Zoroastrian and neo-Mazdakite peasantry. Māzyār was defeated by the Tahirids and was then executed at Samarra in 840. Soon afterwards, Afshin, too, was accused of anti-Islamic and treacherous activities and was put to death on the order of al-Mu’tasim. The Muslim sources unjustifiably depict Bābak, Māzyār and Afshin as the joint protagonists of a grand anti-Arab conspiracy.

The later development of Shi’ism: the Twelvers, the Zaydis and the Isma’ilis

Even after the failure of the major Khurrami revolts of early ’Abbasid times, scattered Khurrami communities engaging in lesser and sporadic insurrections survived until later ’Abbasid times in various parts of Iran, especially in Azerbaijan, Tabaristan and Khurasan. It is possible that, during the ninth century, some of the Khurramiyya joined the revolutionary movement of the Isma’ilis, particularly in Khurasan and Transoxania. Despite the claims of
Nizām al-Mulk and other Sunni authors hostile towards the Isma‘ilis, however, Isma‘ilism should nor be viewed as a continuation of the neo-Mazdakite Khurramiyya, although the two movements shared a common enmity towards the ‘Abbasids. Needless to say, as Shi‘ite Muslims, the Isma‘iliyya could not subscribe to the anti-Arab, and more importantly, anti-Islamic teachings of the Khurramiyya.

Indeed, Shi‘ism provided another type (like Kharijism, an Islamic type) of opposition to the established caliphate. By 760 the remnants of the radical Kaysāniyya, who had earlier been mainly aborted in the ’Abbasid da‘wa (see Chapter 1), had either disintegrated or had joined the Imāmiyya branch of Shi‘ism, which had earlier been greatly overshadowed by the Kaysāniyya movement. The Imāmiyya, who traced the imamate through a Husaynī-Fātimid line of imams in the progeny of al-Husayn b. ‘Alī, began to acquire prominence under the leadership of the Imam Ja‘far al-Sādiq (d.765), who firmly established Imāmi Shi‘ism as a distinctive religious community on a quiescent basis.

Prescribing tāqiyya (the precautionary dissimulation of religious beliefs), Ja‘far al-Sādiq further taught that the sinless and infallible Shi‘ite imam did not have to rise against the unjust rulers of the time, as believed by the early Kufan Shi‘a and the contemporary Kaysāniyya and Zaydiyya, even though the caliphate too belonged by divine right to the Shi‘ite imam. Refrainment from all anti-regime activity became the hallmark of the politically moderate Imāmiyya, later designated as the Ithnā ’Ashariyya or the Twelvers.

The legitimist Imāmiyya branch of Shi‘ism, with its anti-revolutionary quietism, had already spread from its original Kufan stronghold to the garrison town of Qum, in central Persia, in the time of Ja‘far al-Sādiq, marking the initiation of the Imāmiyya sectarian movement in the Iranian world. An Arab clan of the Kufan Ash‘ira, or colonists, had settled in Qum in the late Umayyad period, and by the end of the eighth century the local descendants of these Ash‘ira had become ardent Imāmi Shi‘ites. Thus Imāmi Shi‘ism was introduced to Persia by the Arab Ash‘ira, who dominated the religious scene in Qum for some three centuries. Madelung has skillfully described the subsequent development of early Imāmi Shi‘ism in the Iranian world. Qum remained solidly Imāmi and became the chief centre of Imāmi traditionalism in the ninth century. Later, the theological school of Qum played an important role in the development of Twelver Shi‘ism. Qum also influenced the development of Imāmi (Twelver) communities in other parts of central Persia during the ninth century, notably at Rayy, which remained the second most important Imāmi city there until the Mongol times.

In Khurasan, Imāmi Shi‘ism spread during the ninth century. An Imāmi community already existed in Tus when ’Alī al-Ridā, the eighth imam of the Twelver Shi‘a, died and was buried there in 818. The ’Abbasid caliph al-Ma‘mūn (813-33) had appointed ’Alī al-Ridā as his heir apparent as part of his conciliatory policies towards the Shi‘ites and the ‘Alids. Moreover, Nishapur became one of the earliest centres of Imāmi thought in the eastern Iranian lands, due mainly to the activities of al-Fadl b. Shādhān, a learned imam; traditionalist, jurist and theologian, who died around 873. In Transoxania, the Imāmiyya were present from the later ninth century; and by the early tenth century, Imāmi thought of a somewhat independent
nature was propagated in Central Asia, from Samarkand, by Muhammad b. Mas’ūd al-Ayyāshi.

The Ispahbadiyya Bawandids of Tabaristan were the first Iranian dynasty to adhere to Imāmi Shi’ism from the middle of the eleventh century. However, the Iranian Imāmiyya found greatest protectors in the Buyids, who were originally Zaydis but in later times perhaps leaned towards Imāmi Shi’ism. By the end of the Buyids’ tutelage of the ’Abbasids in the eleventh century, small Imāmi (Ithnā ’Ashari) communities of minority status were widely dispersed throughout the Iranian lands and Central Asia. Mainstream Imāmi Shi’ism achieved its greatest success in the predominantly Sunni Iranian lands when, in 1501, it was imposed as the official creed on Safavid Iran, while Sunni orthodoxy continued to prevail in Central Asia.

The Zaydiyya, another major branch of Shi’ism, appeared as a sectarian movement in the Iranian world during early ’Abbasid times, though its impact there proved to be somewhat marginal. Zaydi Shi’ism arose from an anti-Umayyad revolt that Zayd b. ’Alī, an uncle of Ja’far al-Sādiq, had staged at Kufa in 740. The supporters of this abortive revolt, the earliest Zaydiyya, retained the politically militant but religiously moderate stance of the early Kufan Shi’a. Thus the Zaydiyya, by contrast to the Imāmiyya, developed into a revolutionary movement and the pretenders to the Zaydi imamate were expected to rise, sword in hand, against the illegitimate rulers of the time.

The earliest activities of the Zaydiyya in the eastern lands, including the insurrection of Zayd’s son Yahyā (d. 743) in Khurasan, did not lead to any lasting sectarian results. The later spread of Zaydi Shi’ism in northern Iran was greatly helped by the emigration of a number of ’Alids to the coastal region along the southern shores of the Caspian Sea, where they sought refuge from ’Abbasid persecution both in the coastal lowlands and in the mountains. In early ’Abbasid times, Tabaristan (Mazandaran), the most populous of the Caspian provinces, was inhabited mainly by the Daylamites, who had not yet converted to Islam. And it was in Ruyan and other areas of western Tabaristan that Zaydi Shi’ism, based on ’Alid rule and Daylamite aspirations for autonomy, began to spread from around the middle of the ninth century. Many of this region’s ’Alid rulers in time came to be acknowledged as imams and dā’īs by the Caspian Zaydi community, which developed independently of the Zaydi community of Yemen, another major stronghold of Zaydism.12

In 864 the people of western Tabaristan revolted against the fiscal exactions of the Tahirid governors of the eastern lands, and they invited the Hasanid al-Hasan b. Zayd (d. 884) from Rayy, to become their leader. Al-Hasan soon seized all of Tabaristan and established Zaydi ’Alid rule in the Caspian provinces, adopting the tide of al- dā’ī ila ’l-haqq (He Who Summons to the Truth). The subsequent attempts of the ’Abbasids and the Tahirids to regain Tabaristan were repelled by al-Hasan with the local help of the Daylamites. However, al-Hasan’s brother and successor, Muhammad b. Zayd, was killed in 900 in a battle with the Sunni Samanids, who temporarily extended their rule over the region.
In 914 Zaydi `Alid rule was restored in Tabaristan by the Husaynid al-Hasan b. `Alī al-Utrush, known as al-Nāsir li 'l-Haqq. Al-Nāsir converted to Zaydism large numbers of people who had not yet even embraced Islam; and, with their support, he reconquered Tabaristan from the Samanids. Al-Nāsir came to form a distinct community of the Caspian Zaydiyya, known as the Nāsiriyya. These were separate from the Qāsimiyah adherents of the school of the Medinan Zaydi imam al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhim (d. 860), whose teachings had earlier been transmitted to northern Iran. The division of the Caspian Zaydi community into the Gilite Nāsiriyah and the Daylamite Qāsimiyah proved permanent, also splitting `Alid rule into two branches there. The Iranian Zaydiyya had their golden age under the Buyids, who patronized the Zaydi `Alids of the Caspian provinces. It was also under the Buyids that Rayy became an important centre of Zaydi learning. Zaydism does not seem to have had any lasting success in Central Asia, while in Khurasan it acquired some temporary support among the `Alids of Bayhaq. Indeed, the Caspian provinces remained the main Iranian stronghold of Zaydi Shi‘ism. By the early Safayid decades, the surviving Zaydi communities of that region, too, had all gone over to Twelver Shi‘ism.

Isma‘ilism, another major and revolutionary branch of the Shi‘a, had a greater and more far-reaching impact on the Iranian lands than the Zaydiyya movement, though its success there was ultimately checked by Sunni orthodoxy assisted by the arrival of the all-conquering Mongols. The Isma‘iliyya, retrieving much of the revolutionary zeal of the earlier Kaysāniyya and Khurramiyya, split off from the rest of the Imāmiyya on the question of the Imam Ja‘far al-Sādiq’s succession. Led by a line of imams descended from al-Sādiq’s eldest son Isma‘il, the Isma‘ili da‘wa was organized as a secret and revolutionary Shi‘ite movement bent on uprooting the ‘Abbasids.

The central leadership of the early Isma‘ili movement soon came to be based for a while in Khuzistan, in south-western Iran, from where dā‘īs were dispatched to various localities. The efforts of these central leaders to transform the original Isma‘ili splinter groups into a greatly expanded and united movement began to bear fruit around 873. It was at that time that numerous Isma‘ili dā‘īs began to appear in many regions of the Arab and Iranian worlds; and their converts soon attracted the attention of the ‘Abbasids and Muslim society at large as the Carmathians or Qarāmita, named after Hamdān Qarmat, the chief local leader of the movement in southern Iraq. However, the name Qarmati came to be applied indiscriminately also to the Isma‘ili communities outside Iraq. At that time, the Isma‘ili da‘wa was preached in the name of the absent Muhammad b. Isma‘il b. Ja‘far al-Sadiq, the seventh Isma‘ili imam, whose return as the eschatological Mahdi was eagerly awaited.

The Isma‘ili da‘wa was extended during the 870s to the Iranian lands. And there, the da‘wa was initially established in Jibal or western Iran. Khalāf al-Hallāj, the first dā‘ī of Jibal, set up his headquarters at Rayy, from where the da‘wa spread to Qum, Kashan and other areas of central Iran under Khalaf’s successors. Meanwhile, the da‘wa had become active in Fars and southern Iran under the supervision of Hamdān Qarmat and his chief assistant, ‘Abdān. The da‘wa was officially taken to Khurasan during the first decade of the tenth century, although earlier it had been introduced there on the personal initiative of Ghiyāth, one of the chief dā‘īs
of Jibal. Abū ’Ābd Allāh al-Khādim, the first chief dâ‘î of Khurasan, established his regional headquarters at Nishapur. The third dâ‘î of Khurasan, al-Husayn b. ‘Alī al-Marwazi, who had earlier been a prominent commander in the service of the Samanids, transferred the regional seat of the da‘wa to Merv al-Rudh, also spreading Isma’iliism to Talaqan. Herat, Gharchistan, Ghur and other eastern areas. Al-Marwazi’s successor, Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Nasafi al-Nakjshabi, a native of the Central Asian district of Nakshab, settled in Bukhara and spread the da‘wa throughout Transoxania, also penetrating briefly the inner circles of the Samarid court. Al-Nasafi, a brilliant philosopher, was also responsible for introducing a form of Neoplatonism into Qarmati-Isma’ili thought.

In the Iranian lands, the Ismaili da‘wa was originally addressed to the rural population, and the first dâ‘îs in Jibal concentrated their efforts on the villagers around Rayy. By contrast to their positive response to the neo-Mazdakite Khurramiya movement, however, the peasantry of the Iranian lands was not attracted in large numbers to the Shi’ite Islamic message of the Isma’ilis during the ninth century. The early realization of the movement’s failure to acquire a large popular following which could be led in open revolt against the local authorities, as had been the case in the Arab lands where villagers and tribesmen had converted to Isma’iliism in large numbers, led to a new da‘wa policy for the Iranian world. According to this policy, implemented especially in Khurasan and Transoxania, the dâ‘îs henceforth directed their efforts towards the elite and the ruling classes. This policy, too, failed to have any lasting success, although Abū Hatim al-Razi (d. 934), the fifth dâ‘î of Jibal, did manage temporarily to win the allegiance of several amirs and rulers of Jibal and the Caspian region; and, in Khurasan and Transoxania, numerous notables were converted, including the commander al-Marwazi, who himself became a chief local dâ‘î there. The brief success of this policy in Central Asia reached its climax in the conversion of the Samanid amir, Nasr II (914-43), and his vizier through the efforts of the dâ‘î al-Nasafi. This success could not be tolerated, however, by the Sunni ‘ulamā’ (religious scholars) and their Turkish military allies in the Samanid state. They reacted by deposing Nasr II, under whose son and successor, Nūh I (943-54), al-Nasafi and his chief associates were executed in 943 and their followers massacred.

Meanwhile, the unified Isma’ili movement had experienced a major schism in 899. It was at that time that the movement’s central leader, ‘Abd Allāh (‘Ubayd Allāh) al-Mahdi, the future founder of the Fatimid caliphate, openly claimed the Isma’ili imamate for himself and his predecessors, the same central leaders who had organized and led the movement after Muhammad b. Isma’il. ‘Abd Allāh also explained that the movement had hitherto been spread on the basis of Muhammad b. Isma’il’s role as Mahdi merely to protect the true identity of the central leaders who were continuously sought by the ‘Abbasids. The declarations of ‘Abd Allāh split the movement into two factions. One faction, later designated as Fatimid Isma’ilis, accepted ‘Abd Allāh’s claims, upholding continuity in the Isma’ili imamate. A dissident faction, based in Bahrain and southern Iraq and lacking a united leadership, refused to recognize ‘Abd Allāh and his predecessors, as well as his successors on the Fatimid throne, as imams; they retained their original belief in the role of Muhammad b. Isma’il as Mahdi. Henceforth, the term Qarāmita came to be generally applied to these dissident sectarians, who
never recognized the Fatimid caliphs as their imams. Within the Iranian lands, the Isma‘ilis of Jibal mainly joined the Qarmati faction, which had adherents also in Azerbaijan and western Persia. In Khurasan and Transoxania, both wings came to be represented, though the Qarmatis predominated until the middle of the eleventh century. The d’ais al-Rāzi and al-Nasafi, who engaged in a complex scholarly discourse, were Qarmatis. These dais of the Iranian lands, and Abū Ya’qūb al-Sijistānī who later led the da’wa in Khurasan and his native Sistan, played an important part in developing the Isma‘ili-Qarmati thought of this early period, which left a lasting influence on the intellectual activities of the later Isma‘ilis.

By the final decades of the eleventh century, the Qarmati communities of the Iranian lands had either disintegrated or joined the Fatimid Isma‘ili da’wa. In 1094 the Persian Isma‘ilis became the main supporters of the Nizāriyya branch of Isma‘ilism, severing all ties with the Musta‘liyya branch, which continued to be led by the Fatimid caliphs. The Nizārī Isma‘ilis of the Iranian lands were soon organized by Hasan-i Sabbāh into a revolutionary force with numerous inaccessible mountain strongholds, reminiscent of the strategy adopted by some of the earlier Khurrami groups. Being opposed to the alien rule of the Seljuq Turks, the Iranian Nizāris launched an armed revolt against the Seljuq sultanate and succeeded in asserting their control over various parts of Iran, especially in Daylam and Kuhistan in south-eastern Khurasan, until they too, like the ’Abbasids, became victims of the Mongol invasions and irrevocably lost their political power in 1256.

The beginnings of the disintegration of the ’Abbasid caliphate in the east

Unlike the Ḥashimiyya-’Abbāsiyya sectarian movement which succeeded in supplanting Umayyad rule, none of the other religio-political movements of the eighth and ninth centuries discussed here could successfully challenge the hegemony of the ’Abbasids in the eastern lands of the caliphate. Moreover, none of the early anti-’Abbāsid insurrections resulted in the separation of any territory from the caliphal domains for any extended period of time. As a result, the territorial integrity of the ’Abbasid caliphate remained intact until after the middle of the ninth century. In the meantime, important developments were taking place, both at the centre of caliphal power in Iraq and in the provincial peripheries, which eventually brought about the fragmentation of the ’Abbasid caliphate. It was under such circumstances that independent dynasties, devoid of any specific religious affiliation, starting with the Saffarids, appeared in the eastern Iranian lands, also initiating the revival of Iranian sentiment and culture.

For almost seven decades after the establishment of the ’Abbasid dynasty, Iran was governed by various eastern governors appointed from Iraq. These governors remained unswervingly loyal to the caliph at Baghdad, citing his name on coins and in the khutba (Friday worship oration) and sending him taxes and tributes. Starting with the appointment in 821 of Tāhir b. al-Husayn, four generations of the Tahirid family ruled for some fifty years from Khurasan as governors of the lands east of Iraq. Many Tahirids also held office in Iraq itself. Contrary to the views of some modern scholars, however, the Tahirids cannot be regarded as the first
autonomous dynasty of the Iranian world in their time. As Bosworth has explained in many of his studies, the Tahirids, too, remained loyal servants of the ‘Abbasids, respecting the constitutional rights of the caliphate. They were also highly Arabized in culture and outlook, like many other landowning aristocratic Persians who had fully assimilated into the Arabo-Islamic culture of the period. Nevertheless, it may be admitted that the hereditary rule of the Tahirids, who were of Persian dihqān origins and tolerated the Persian language in their entourage, did at least indirectly encourage the resurgence of Persian language and culture in their entourage. It was an altogether different matter with the Saffarids, the next dynasty to appear on the political scene in the eastern Iranian world.

As a result of the problems created by the Turkish slave soldiers and their commanders who had come to play an increasingly important role in the central affairs of the caliphate, especially during the anarchy of the Samarra period, caliphal control over the outlying provinces had become seriously weakened by the middle of the ninth century. This allowed new political powers, based on military force, to assert themselves on the fringes of the caliphate. It was also at this time that Zaydi ‘Alid rule was established in Tabaristan, and the Isma’īlis and the Zanj (black slaves) launched their insurrectional activities in Iraq itself. But the Saffarids, based in Sistan, were the first of such major military powers to appear in the Iranian world, establishing a dynasty and separating vast territories from the ‘Abbasid domains. The disintegration of the ‘Abbasid caliphate and the rise of independent dynasties, which revived Iranian ‘national’ sentiment, had now begun.

Ya’qūb b. Layth (867-79), known as al-Saffār (The Coppersmith), who founded the Saffārī dynasty, was of plebeian origins and lacked specific religious convictions, though he was accused of Kharijite leanings; the later author Nizām al-Mulk depicts him also (on dubious grounds) as a crypto-Isma’īlī. He had gradually risen to a leading position in the ‘ayyār16 bands of Sistan, which drove out the Tahirid amir. In 861 Ya’qūb himself was proclaimed amir of Sistan. He thereupon proceeded to consolidate his position within the province before conducting, a number of military campaigns in what is now Afghanistan and against the Kharijites. Subsequently, Ya’qūb directed his attention against the caliphal territories in Iran. In 873 he entered Nishapur and ended Tahirid rule in Khurasan; then he seized Fars in 875 and came close to taking Baghdad itself. Ya’qūb died in 879 in Khuzistan. Saffārid power reached its zenith under Ya’qūb’s brother and successor, ‘Amr (879-900). ‘Amr was eventually defeated, in 900, in Transoxania by the Sāmānids and sent to Iran where he was executed. Henceforth, the authority and the territories of the Saffārīs diminished rapidly, eventually becoming largely restricted to Sistan.

Another development of great importance that occurred during the final decades of the ninth century was the revival of New Persian literature and culture, initiated through the efforts of Ya’qūb b. Layth and his brother ‘Amr, who had court poets composing Persian verse for the first time since the Arab invasion of Iran. Soon, the plebeian Saffārīs were also equipped with a royal Iranian genealogy. The early Saffārīs, indeed, pioneered the renaissance of a specifically Irano-Islamic culture based on the ‘national’ aspirations of the Islamized Iranians,
who had continued to be aware of their Iranian identity and culture during the centuries of Arab domination.\(^\text{17}\)

The 'Abbasids survived as the spiritual heads of the Islamic world, over which they no longer exercised any political control. The rise of the Buyids in western Iran and in Iraq, and their subsequent internal and dynastic strife, permitted the formation of a number of Turkish dynasties in the east; dynasties like the Ghaznavids, the Karakhanids and, most significantly, the Seljuqs, who now established their own rule over the Iranian lands. When the Seljuqs entered Baghdad in 1055, ostensibly to liberate the 'Abbasid caliph from the Shi'ite Buyids’ tutelage, a new Turkish period had started in the Islamic history of the Iranian world. The Seljuqs became the new champions of Sunni orthodoxy and sought caliphal approval in order to legitimize their own rule. Thus the 'Abbasids were once again permitted to survive.

The appearance of Turkish dynasties in the eleventh century also checked the rapid resurgence of Persian culture. This renaissance had, however, become irrevocable by that time. Nāsir-i Khusraw, the renowned Isma’ili philosopher and Ḍā‘ī in Khurasan and Badakhshan during the late eleventh century composed all his works in Persian. He is also ranked among the foremost Persian poets. Moreover, the highly Islamized Iranian Nizārīs of the Alamut period from early in the 1090’s adopted Persian as the language of their religious writings, an unprecedented choice for a medieval Shi’ite community. Indeed, the antecedents of the anti-Seljuq revolt of the Iranian Nizārīs can be traced not only to the Shi’ite and anti-'Abbasid movement of the earlier Isma’īlis but also to the Iranian ‘national’ elements fostered by the Saffarids and other Iranian dynasties. The Turkish rulers themselves were soon influenced by aspects of Persian culture; thus the learned vizier Nizām al-Mulk composed his Sīyāsat-nāma [Book of Statecraft] for the Great Seljuq sultan Malik Shah in Persian. The Seljuqs were superseded by other dynasties in the Iranian world, whereas the 'Abbasid caliphate enjoyed a revival of power and survived in Baghdad until 1253, mainly due to the importance of the caliph’s moral authority for Sunni Muslims. Yet in the end, the 'Abbasids of Baghdad, too, succumbed to the all-conquering pagan Mongols.
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