



4c.2.6 Bates
Article

THE CHAPTER ON THE FĀTIMID *DĀ'Ī* IN YEMEN
IN THE *TĀ'RĪKH* OF 'UMĀRA AL-ḤAKAMĪ (d.569/1174):
An Interpolation¹

Michael L. Bates

At the end of 'Umāra's *Ta'riḫ al-Yaman*² there is a passage entitled "Chapter on those who exercised the function of Fātimid *dā'ī* in Yemen."³ The passage includes a brief account of the origins of the schism among the Yemeni Ismā'īlīs between the adherents of al-Ṭayyib,⁴ the son of the Fātimid caliph al-Āmir, and those of the latter's cousin al-Ḥāfiz, as well as a letter by al-Āmir which provides support for the Ṭayyibī position. These matters are referred to nowhere else in 'Umāra's works, nor indeed does any other non-Ṭayyibī writer mention this schism. Moreover, 'Umāra, although himself a Sunnī, was closely associated with important figures in the Ismā'īlī courts of Yemen and Egypt in the mid-sixth/twelfth century. For these reasons it has seemed that the passage has special significance as evidence for the origins of the Ṭayyibī Ismā'īlī movement, not only in supporting the Ṭayyibī version of events, but also (taking its words literally) in providing new information on the schism. However, doubts have already been raised as to the authenticity of certain elements of the passage as genuine products of 'Umāra's pen. In the present study, this doubt will be further extended, in arguing that no part of the passage was written by 'Umāra: That the passage is rather an addendum to his history by a later copyist. Furthermore, the seemingly original information in it, when the passage is correctly read, proves to be nothing more than the result of lacunae or corruptions of the text, or explicable errors by its unknown author.

As it stands, the text of this passage obviously contains some lacunae and incoherencies. It also presents serious conflicts internally and in comparison with the rest of the *Ta'riḫ*. Some of these problems were recognized by the first editor of the *Ta'riḫ*, H.C. Kay, who attempted certain emendations.⁵ He could not realize the full extent of the problems involved because, like other scholars of his time, he knew almost nothing of the historical consequences of the schism. The late S.M. Stern analyzed the passage in conjunction with those parts of it reproduced by the historian al-Janādī, and rejected much of it as an interpolation by a later Ṭayyibī copyist. From the part which he accepted as authentic, he concluded that al-Sayyida appointed the Zuray'id Saba' b. Abī'l-Su'ūd *dā'ī* in Yemen as a public compromise with the official Fātimid caliphate in Cairo, while in private she and her circle remained loyal to al-Āmir's appointed successor al-Ṭayyib.⁶

On the other hand, Ḥusayn al-Ḥamdānī cites the passage only occasionally and without discussing the problems which it raises.⁷ For Ḥamdānī, the passage's quotation of al-Āmir's letter to al-Sayyida is an important confirmation of the letter's authenticity, but at the same time he ignores other statements in the passage which conflict with the Ṭayyibī position. Uncritically (but no doubt correctly in this case) following his Ṭayyibī sources, Ḥamdānī takes for granted that al-Sayyida had nothing to do with the Zuray'id recognition of al-Ḥāfiz or with the appointment of Saba' as Ḥāfizī *dā'ī*.

THE CHAPTER ON THE FĀṬIMID *dā'īs* IN YEMEN

The passage as it stands in the presently known manuscripts of the *Ta'riḫ* can be divided into four parts. It begins with a list of the Ismā'īlī *dā'īs* of Yemen up to 524/1130. Then follows the text, with a brief introduction, of al-Āmir's letter to al-Sayyida announcing the birth of al-Ṭayyib. This in turn is followed by a confused and disjointed passage describing al-Sayyida's reaction to the accession of al-Ḥāfiẓ as caliph. The text concludes with a list of the Ṭayyibī and Ḥāfiẓī *dā'īs* from 526/1132 to the author's own time. Stern believed that only the text of al-Āmir's letter and certain minor clauses were interpolations, and that the remainder of the passage, with some emendations, could have been written by 'Umāra.⁸ It is hoped, however, that the step-by-step analysis which follows, using Hamdānī's *Ṣulayḥiyyūn* and the new edition by *al-Akwa'* of 'Umāra's history (neither of which was published when Stern wrote) will show that the entire passage can be reconstructed as a coherent whole. If this reconstruction is acceptable, then it is not possible to reject some parts of the passage while retaining others; the entire passage must stand or fall *in toto*.

At the beginning of the passage seven *dā'īs* are listed up to the time of al-Āmir's death, as follows:

1. 'Alī b. Muhammad al-Ṣulayḥī (*da'wa, mulk*).⁹
2. al-Mukarram Aḥmad b. 'Alī (*da'wa, mulk*).
3. al-Awhad Saba' b. Aḥmad, 'Alī's nephew (*da'wa, mulk*).¹⁰
4. Sulaymān al-Zawāḥī (*da'wa without mulk*).
5. al-Qāḍī Lamak b. Malik al-Ṣulayḥī (*da'wa without ḥukm*).¹¹
6. Yaḥyā b. Malik (*da'wa and ḥukm without mulk*).
7. 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Muwaffaq fi'l-Dīn¹² b. Najīb al-Dawla (*da'wa and mulk*, "by authority of al-Sayyida in some of her provinces").

In comparison to the main body of 'Umāra's history, this list contains a number of contradictions. For example, 'Alī b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ṣulayḥī, who, according to the main narrative of the history, was appointed *dā'ī* after Ibn Najīb al-Dawla,¹³ is not in this list. 'Alī possibly was excluded because, unlike all the others in this list, he did not hold spiritual authority (*da'wa*); also, if the author of this passage believed that Ibn Najīb al-Dawla was arrested in 524, as is suggested below, there would be no room for 'Alī b. 'Abd Allāh in his sequence of the *dā'īs*.

Among the names which are in the list, the first two figures, the founder of the Ṣulayhid dynasty and his son, require no comment; their position as *dā'īs* is attested not only by the main body of 'Umāra's work but also by the Ṭayyibī tradition and documentary evidence. The third name, Saba' b. Aḥmad (appearing in only one manuscript) is frequently mentioned as *dā'ī* in the main body of 'Umāra's history, in one case in a quotation from a

letter of the Imām al-Mustansir.¹⁴ He is not, however, included in the list of *dā'īs* according to the Ṭayyibī tradition, which suggests that the passage's attribution to him of both temporal and spiritual sovereignty is not correct.

The fourth name in the list, Sulaymān al-Zawāhī, must (for chronological reasons) refer to Sulaymān b. 'Āmir al-Zawāhī, an important figure in al-Sayyida's court in the late fifth/eleventh century. He is mentioned as *dā'ī* in only one place in the main body of the history, where it is said also that he was poisoned by al-Mufaḍḍal.¹⁵ That passage represents a digression from the account of al-Sayyida's family origins in which it is found, and may well itself be an interpolation, especially since neither Sulaymān's appointment as *dā'ī* nor his poisoning are mentioned in the history at other places where they would be expected. It seems probable that Sulaymān is given the title *dā'ī* in both this passage and in the main body of the history only through confusion with his grandfather Sulaymān b. 'Abd Allāh al-Zawāhī who was the predecessor as *dā'ī* of 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-Ṣulayhī.¹⁶

The major difference between this list and the main body of 'Umāra's history is the mention in it of Lamak b. Malik and his son Yaḥyā, who are found nowhere else in 'Umāra's *corpus*. These two were figures of considerable importance in the intellectual history of Yemeni Ismā'īlism in the fifth and sixth centuries,¹⁷ so 'Umāra, if he were aware of their existence, could have avoided mentioning them at some point in the course of his general history, only by intentions. It is significant that these two were of particular importance to the Ṭayyibīs, for they provide the "apostolic succession," to use Stern's phrase, linking Dhu'ayb b. Mūsā, the first Ṭayyibī *dā'ī muṭlaq*, to 'Alī and al-Mukarram the Ṣulayhids. This may well explain why 'Umāra ignored them; if so, it is also an important argument for viewing this chapter of the history as an interpolation. More probably, however, 'Umāra had never heard of these figures.

Another important discrepancy between this list and the main body of the history is the distinction drawn in the list between the secular, religious, and judicial powers of the *dā'īs*. This distinction is not mentioned elsewhere in the history, where only the secular aspects of the history of the Ismā'īlī *da'wa* are narrated.¹⁸

The list of *dā'īs* is followed by a few sentences, beginning "Then, when the letter of Our Lord al-Āmir came.....,"¹⁹ which introduce the text of al-Āmir's letter to al-Sayyida announcing the birth of al-Ṭayyib. As Stern emphasizes,²⁰ these introductory remarks (which include a reference to "Our Lord al-Ṭayyib") and the letter which follows them cannot have been a part of 'Umāra's original text. 'Umāra dedicated his history to al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, who was at that time (563/1167-68) a high official in the court of al-Āḍid, the grandson of al-Ḥāfiz.²¹ Elsewhere 'Umāra says that the history was composed for Shāwar, al-Āḍid's wazīr.²² With this audience in mind, 'Umāra would hardly have been likely to refer to al-Ṭayyib so respectfully, or to have quoted this letter, which, as documentary proof of the birth and designation as heir of al-Ṭayyib, severely damages the Ḥāfizī claim to legitimacy.

Following the text of the letter, a concise narrative of events in Yemen following

THE CHAPTER ON THE FĀTIMID DĀ'IS IN YEMEN

al-Āmir's death is presented. The narrative is extremely corrupt, with a major lacuna, a phrase duplicated and inserted in the passage before its proper place, and some difficulties in the text's use of conjunctions. To facilitate understanding of the emendations which will be suggested, it is convenient to provide first a translation of the passage. It will be as strictly literal as possible, for Stern and Kay in their translations have obscured some of its difficulties by attempting to produce a version literate in English.

"Then command was transferred from Our Lord al-Āmir and al-Ḥāfiẓ governed; so the first letter from him to the noble queen (al-Sayyida) was 'from the heir to the Caliphate' (*walī 'ahd al-muslimīn*); and in the second year of the Commander of the Faithful; so the noble queen appointed the Dā'ī al-Ajall Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥāmidī; then she transferred (*naqalat*; but *nuqilat*, it was transferred, is also possible) the *da'wa* of al-Ḥāfiẓ to the family of Zuray' and she said "Sufficient for Banu'l-Ṣulayḥi is what they know about the affair of Our Lord al-Ṭayyib;" then the *da'wa* went to his son Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm.....until this period; so it was transferred (*intaqalat*) to the family of Zuray'; so among them was... Saba' b. Abī'l-Su'ūd..... who joined spiritual and temporal authority (*da'wa and mulk*); then his son..... Muḥammad b. Saba', who joined spiritual and temporal authority. We have completed in this synopsis all of the reports on the kings in the province (*jazīra*) of Yemen, and the *dā'is*."²³

This translation is admittedly barbarous, and for this very reason it accurately reproduces the state of the text as it appears in both editions. The first problem it presents is the clause following the name of Ibrāhīm al-Ḥāmidī, which implies that al-Sayyida transferred the Ḥāfiẓi *dā'wa* to the Zuray'ids (had this clause stood elsewhere in the text, it would be read "the *da'wa* was transferred"). This clause should be struck from the text: it is only a redundant repetition of the later clause referring to the transfer.²⁴ Once this excision has been made, the quotation attributed to al-Sayyida immediately follows the reference to her appointment of Ibrāhīm and serves to explain the appointment and the rejection of al-Ḥāfiẓ which it implies; the Queen refers to the knowledge the Ṣulayḥids claimed of the survival of al-Ṭayyib in hiding.²⁵ When the transfer of the Ḥāfiẓi *da'wa* to the Zuray'ids is mentioned again at its logical place in the account, the verb used (*intaqalat*) is inherently passive and impersonal. The difficult problem of explaining why al-Sayyida should have had anything to do with the Zuray'ids' appointment is thereby eliminated.

A second problem is posed by the sentence reading "the first letter which came from him (al-Ḥāfiẓ) was from the heir to the caliphate (*Walī 'ahd al-muslimīn*)."²⁶ Standing alone at this point the sentence makes little sense and does not seem relevant to its context. A sentence with similar import, however, begins a seemingly relevant anecdote from the *Uyūn* (quoted by Stern and Hamdānī)²⁶ which goes as follows in Stern's translation "He (viz. 'Abd al-Majīd [al-Ḥāfiẓ]) formerly used to prefix to his letters to al-Malika al-Sayyida the formula: 'From the *walī 'ahd* of the Muslims and the cousin of the Commander of the Faithful.' Then he wrote: 'From the Commander of the Faithful.' At this she said: 'I am the daughter of Aḥmad'²⁷ (today, as I was yesterday).²⁸ Yesterday he was the *walī 'ahd* of the Muslims and today he is the Commander of the Faithful! He is entering

a field that is not his and usurping a station from which he is remote!"

This anecdote would fit very appropriately at this point in the text. It describes concisely al-Sayyida's reaction to the assumption of the imamate by al-Ḥāfiz, and forms a logical preface to the reference to her appointment of Ibrāhīm (for which the appointment of Dhu'ayb as *dā'ī mutlaq* should be understood; see below). The reference to al-Ḥāfiz's title can only be understood in such a context, and must in the original form of the interpolation have been the beginning of an anecdote similar to that found in the *'Uyūn*.

If, then, the sentence referring to Ibrāhīm's appointment is seen as immediately following the anecdote from the *'Uyūn*, the particle *fa* which introduces that sentence is made intelligible, for "Ibrāhīm's" appointment was a direct result of al-Sayyida's rejection of al-Ḥāfiz as *imām*. As the passage stands in the present texts of the *Ta'rikh*, the particle *fa* ("so") makes nonsense, leading both Kay and Stern to ignore it in their translations.

So far so good; but the appearance of Ibrāhīm's name in the text at this point is itself a third problem. How can the text's statement that Ibrāhīm (the second Ṭayyibī *dā'ī*) was appointed by al-Sayyida, and its implication that this occurred in the "second year of the Commander of the Faithful," i.e., in 526,²⁹ be explained? Kay³⁰ tried to solve this difficulty by following al-Janādī's version of this passage, according to which Ibrāhīm was appointed after the departure of Ibn Najīb ad-Dawla, and died not long after, about the same time as al-Āmir's death. He would then, according to Kay's interpretation, have been succeeded by his son Ḥātim, who was soon displaced by the appointment of the Zuray'ids (Kay ignores the statement in the text that Ḥātim was still *dā'ī* when the text was written). Since Kay knew that Ḥātim reappeared in history forty years later (in his conflict with the Ḥātimids), he assumed that Ḥātim was a child at this time (ca.526), which would explain his brief tenure as *dā'ī*. In fact, Ḥātim, who died in 596/1199, was either an infant or as yet unborn, and could not in 526 have possessed the prerequisite knowledge of Ismā'īlī learning for appointment as *dā'ī*.

Stern³¹ also follows al-Janādī in placing Ibrāhīm's first appointment before the schism, but hypothesizes that he failed to shift with the changing winds of doctrine quickly enough and was replaced by Dhu'ayb when al-Sayyida founded the Ṭayyibī *da'wa*. When Ibrāhīm then belatedly joined the Ṭayyibī party, he had to work his way up through the hierarchy before he could be reappointed *dā'ī* when Dhu'ayb died.

Stern and Kay have attempted to explain away the text's dating of Ibrāhīm's appointment in 526. It would seem simpler to explain away Ibrāhīm. Since 526 was the year in which Dhu'ayb was designated *dā'ī mutlaq*, it would seem most probable that the interpolator had this appointment in mind, but was unaware of Dhu'ayb's existence. The first Ṭayyibī *dā'ī* known to him was apparently Ibrāhīm, so he naturally dated his appointment to the year of the foundation of the Ṭayyibī *da'wa*. The appearance of Ibrāhīm's name at this point in the text should not be regarded as historical evidence but simply as a mistake by the author.

THE CHAPTER ON THE FATIMID *DA'IS* IN YEMEN

Still, it would seem that a gap of six years exists in the text's list of *dā'is*, from the end of Ibn Najīb al-Dawla's authority (which is known to have been in 520) until the appointment of a Tayyibī *dā'i muṭlaq* in the second year of the Commander of the Faithful, i.e., 526. The interpolator, however, probably would not have been aware of this implicit gap, for the Tayyibī writers erroneously place the arrest of Ibn Najīb al-Dawla in 524.³² This still leaves a gap of two years in the list, but it is understandable that the interpolator might overlook such a brief period. In reality, Ibn Najīb al-Dawla was succeeded in political authority by 'Alī b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ṣulayhī. The interpolator is seemingly wrong in attributing to Ibn Najīb al-Dawla spiritual authority as well as political; in his time the spiritual head of the *da'wa* was Yaḥyā b. Lamak, who died in 520 and was succeeded by Dhu'ayb b. Mūsā.³³ Thus in the second year of the Commander of the Faithful, it was not Ibrāhīm who was appointed, but Dhu'ayb; and the appointment was only to the new position of *dā'i muṭlaq*, that is, as head of the thenceforth independent Tayyibī *da'wa*, for Dhu'ayb had been *dā'i* for the Egyptian caliphate already for six years.

With the changes suggested, the entire chapter becomes a coherent and unified whole, with its parts arranged in a logical succession. It begins with a list of the pre-schism *dā'is*, mentioning only those who held spiritual authority; this restriction corresponds to the practice of the Tayyibī writers³⁴ who emphasized this line because it provided the "apostolic succession" (to use Stern's terms) for their own *dā'is*. The interpolator interrupts the list after Ibn Najīb al-Dawla to tell of the arrival of the notification of al-Tayyib's birth and to give the text of the letter. He then tells what happened after al-ʿAmir's death: control of affairs passed to al-Ḥāfiẓ (it can be assumed that the writer was not aware that al-Ḥāfiẓ was only a figurehead, or that he was shunted aside soon after al-ʿAmir's death), and al-Ḥāfiẓ then wrote to inform the Yemenis of his position as regent, with the title *walī 'ahd al-muslimīn*. Following the words "in the second year of the Commander of the Faithful" the original text of the interpolation must have run something like this: "a letter came from the Commander of the Faithful." Al-Sayyida rejected the right of al-Ḥāfiẓ to this title, and therefore appointed "Ibrāhīm" (for which read Dhu'ayb), saying "Sufficient for the Banu'l-Ṣulayhī is what they know about the affair of Our Lord al-Tayyib." Since the interpolator had erroneously made Ibrāhīm the first Tayyibī *dā'i*, it is natural that he next mentions the accession of Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm as the second *dā'i*, thereby bringing the list down to his own time. Finally he turns to the Ḥāfiẓī *da'wa*, listing Saba', Muḥammad, and (in one version) 'Imrān.

If this restructuring of the passage is accepted, it becomes impossible to reject parts of it as interpolations while accepting other parts as authentically 'Umāra's, as Stern did. The passage must stand or fall as a whole, and since the Tayyibī references in it cannot have come from 'Umāra's pen, all of it must be rejected.

Although it is not possible to suggest an identification of the interpolator, his date and milieu can be limited to some extent. Since the author says that Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm was *dā'i* at the time of composition, the interpolation must have been made between 564/1169, when 'Umāra's *Ta'rīkh* was completed, and 596/1199, when Ḥātim died. A later date within this period would be appropriate to allow time for 'Umāra's text to reach Yemen from

MICHAEL L. BATES

Egypt.

It seems evident that the author was somehow connected with the Ṭayyibī movement and knew something of its historiographical tradition. It is, however, very improbable that he was among the central figures in the movement or was fully initiated into its lore, because of the numerous discrepancies between his list of *dā'īs* and that of his contemporary the *Dā'ī* Ḥātim, who must be regarded as authoritative on the officially accepted line. It is remarkable also that he designates the Zuray'id by almost their full titulature, including (for Muḥammad) the title *dā'ī amīr al-mu'minīn*. Only a hopelessly ignorant adherent of al-Ṭayyib could have granted such recognition. At most the unknown author might be placed on the fringes of the Ṭayyibī movement.

As one of the few sixth/twelfth century sources on the schism which are presently available, the passage might still have some value as evidence even though it is not by 'Umāra. When correctly understood, however, it contains no new information not already known from 'Umāra or the Ṭayyibī authors. The interpolator's assertion that Ibn Najīb al-Dawla held spiritual as well as temporal power calls into the question the Ṭayyibī tradition of direct transmission of spiritual authority from Yaḥyā b. Lamak to Dhu'ayb, but given the mistakes of the interpolator on other points, this evidence must remain doubtful. Other than this, the interpolator can be credited only with providing another text of al-Āmir's letter to al-Sayyida, one which, like all the others, emanates ultimately from the Ṭayyibī milieu.

The interpolation is also of interest as proof of the transmission of 'Umāra's history, written in 563-64/1167-69, from Egypt to Yemen before 596/1199. Probably it was brought to Yemen along with one of the Ayyūbid expeditions there, possibly even by 'Umāra's patron Tūrānshāh. Could he have brought it along as background reading for his campaign?

THE CHAPTER ON THE FĀTIMID DĀ'ĪS IN YEMEN

NOTES

1. This study appeared in a slightly different form as an "excursus" in the author's doctoral dissertation, *Yemen and Its Conquest by the Ayyubids of Egypt (A.D. 1137-1202)* (University of Chicago, 1975), pp. 91-102.
2. The *Ta'riḫ* was first edited by Henry Cassels Kay in *Yaman : Its Early Mediaeval History, by Najam ad-Din 'Omārah al-Hakamī.....* (London, 1892; reprinted London, 1968), with an English translation and notes, from an undated manuscript copied after 1258/1842. A manuscript dated 723/1323 was used for an edition by Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Akwa' al-Ḥiwālī (Cairo 1387/1967); this edition was withdrawn from sale because of numerous typographical errors, but thanks to the courtesy of al-Qādī al-Akwa' and Prof. Wilferd Madelung I have been able to use a copy of the work with handwritten corrections by the editor. The two editions will be cited respectively as *Ta'riḫ K* and *Ta'riḫ A*; notes by the editors will be cited by their names.
3. *Faṣl fī man walā al-da'wa al-fāṭimīyya bi'l-yaman*, *Ta'riḫ K*, pp. 100-02; Kay's translation, pp. 134-37; notes, pp. 297-300; *Ta'riḫ A*, pp. 253-56.
4. Briefly, the origins and consequences of that schism are as follows:
 Shortly before the death of al-Āmir (reg. 495-524/1101-30) a son was born to him whom he designated as his heir with the title al-Ṭayyib. A letter announcing the birth and designation was sent to the Ṣulayhid queen al-Sayyida Arwa, head of the Fāṭimid Ismā'īlī *da'wa* in Yemen. When al-Āmir was assassinated only a few months later, the officials who held power ignored his designation of his successor and even the existence of al-Ṭayyib. Instead, al-Āmir's cousin 'Abd al-Majīd, grandson of al-Mustansir, was set up as regent for the child with which one of al-Āmir's wives was pregnant. When the child proved to be a girl, 'Abd al-Majīd was displaced (in favour of nominal allegiance to the hidden Ithna 'Asharī imam), but after some vicissitudes, he was finally made caliph in his own right in 526/1132, with the title al-Ḥāfiẓ. In Yemen, al-Sayyida and those who followed her refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of al-Ḥāfiẓ. They maintained that al-Ṭayyib, as the son of al-Āmir and his explicitly designated heir, was the only possible legitimate imam; that he was alive; and that they knew where he was and were in communication with him, or rather with his guardians. Dhu'ayb b. Mūsā, the spiritual head of the *da'wa* (subject to al-Sayyida), was appointed by her *dā'ī mutlaq*, that is, *dā'ī* with unrestricted autonomous authority until al-Ṭayyib or one of his descendants should publicly reappear. The intellectual leadership of the Yemeni Ismā'īlīs was thenceforth severed from the Fāṭimid caliphate in Cairo. On the other hand, the Zuray'id ruler of the hinterland of Aden, Saba' b. Abī'l-Su'ūd, who had up to that time acknowledged al-Sayyida's authority, agreed to be appointed as *dā'ī* in Yemen for al-Ḥāfiẓ. This position became hereditary in his family until they, like the Ḥafizī Fāṭimid caliphate in Cairo, were swept away

MICHAEL L. BATES

by the Ayyūbids. For fuller accounts, see Bates, *Yemen and Its Conquest*, pp. 77-120; S.M. Stern, "The Succession to the Fatimid Imām al-Āmir, the Claims of the Later Fatimids to the Imamate, and the Rise of Tayyibī Islamism," *Oriens* 4(1951), pp. 193-255; and Ḥusayn al-Hamdānī, *al-Ṣulayḥiyyūn wa'l-ḥaraka al-fāṭimiyya fi'l-yaman* (Cairo, 1955), pp. 182-93.

5. Kay, pp. 297-300; W.R. Smith, in "Remarks on Mr. Kay's Edition of 'Omārah's History of Yemen," *JRAS* 1893, p. 214, offered further emendations.
6. "Succession," pp. 214-19.
7. *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, pp. 183, 185, 218.
8. "Succession," pp. 217-19.
9. The text specifies for each *dā'i* whether he held temporal authority (*mulk*), spiritual and doctrinal authority (*da'wa*), legal authority (*ḥukm*), or a combination of these.
10. This figure is omitted from the list in Kay's manuscript.
11. This *dā'i* and the one who follows are omitted from the list in Kay's manuscript. Instead, Kay's text has "al-Qāḍī.....Ibn Malik," which, as Kay rightly suspected, contains a lacuna now filled by al-Akwa's manuscript. The latter, on the other hand, omits the title *al-Qāḍī*. After combining the two texts, two errors still remain: Yahyā was Lamak's son, not his brother as the text might indicate; and these two were not Ṣulayhids.
12. This title is omitted in al-Akwa's manuscript.
13. *Ta'riḥ* K, p. 45; *Ta'riḥ* A, p. 170. Both texts at this point have "'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh, "but 'Alī b. 'Abd Allāh is correct, as in *Ta'riḥ* K, p. 56 (*Ta'riḥ* A at the corresponding point, p. 193, has 'Abd Allāh). The correct name is given by Stern, "Succession," p. 215, on the authority of the *'Uyūn al-akhbār* of the fifteenth century *dā'i* 'Imad al-Dīn Idrīs, and is confirmed by the earlier writers al-Ashraf 'Umar b. Rasūl, *Ṭurfat al-aṣḥāb* (ed. K.W. Zettersteen, Damascus, 1949, p. 115), and Ibn Samura, *Ṭabaqāt fuqahā' al-Yaman* (ed. Fu'ād Sayyid, Cairo, 1957), p. 123. Cf. Hamdānī, pp. 174-75.
14. *Ta'riḥ* K, p. 35.
15. *Ta'riḥ* K, p. 28; *Ta'riḥ* A, p. 137.
16. The name of the senior Sulaymān's grandfather is given as 'Āmir by Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, pp. 57, 60, on the authority of the *'Uyūn*; this in itself could have

THE CHAPTER ON THE FĀṬIMID DĀ'IS IN YEMEN

led to confusion of the senior and junior Sulaymāns. 'Umāra's text further confuses the issue by calling the senior's grandfather 'Āmir b. 'Abd Allāh, and by inserting this name into the genealogy of 'Āmir b. Sulaymān, step-father of al-Sayyida and father of the junior Sulaymān (ed. Kay, pp. 14, 28, ed. al-Akwa', pp. 92-93, 136). It should also be pointed out that there is no evidence that the younger Sulaymān ever held the office of *dā'i* except these two suspect passages. In the letters of the Fāṭimid *Imām* al-Mustanṣir (*al-Sijillāt al-mustanṣiriyya*, ed. 'Abd al-Mun'im Mājid, Cairo, 1954, letters XXII, p. 81, and XXXVI, p. 120) he is called *Ṣultān*. The Ṭayyibī historians state that Lamak b. Malik succeeded al-Mukarram al-Ṣulayhī as *dā'i*, but without secular authority, and was followed by his son Yaḥyā and then by Dhu'ayb b. Mūsā (Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn* pp. 179-81; Stern, "Succession," pp. 219-21). Also according to Hamdānī, p. 237, presumably on the authority of the *Uyūn*, the younger Sulaymān was not poisoned, but was killed in battle in 511/1117-18.

17. See Hamdānī, *Ṣulayhiyyūn*, pp. 179-81 *et passim*.
18. One may legitimately wonder, in fact, whether this distinction was actually made in the period before al-Āmir's death, or whether it was not a creation of later Ṭayyibī thought. Were Lamak and Yaḥyā "spiritual *dā'is*," or were they merely chief *qāḍis*? Whatever the case, the contradiction remains between the passage's perspective, akin to that of the Ṭayyibī tradition, and that of the main body of 'Umāra's history.
19. These introductory remarks, as well as the preface of the letter itself, are omitted in al-Akwa's edition. Instead, the list in al-Akwa's edition is continued by a passage almost identical to that which ends the chapter in both editions, beginning with the words "then the *da'wa* was transferred to the family of Zuray". The listing of the Zuray'ids at this point in the chapter interrupts its logical sequence, and the text as in Kay's edition is to be preferred. The list of Zuray'id *dā'is* at this point in al-Akwa's manuscript included the third *dā'i*, 'Imrān; the list at the end of the chapter in both editions omits him.
20. "Succession," p. 216.
21. *Ta'rikh* km p. 1.
22. 'Umāra, *Kitāb al-nukat al-aṣriyya* (ed. H. Derenbourg, in *Oumāra du Yēmen : Sa vie et son oeuvre* [Publications de l'Ecole des Langues Orientales Vivantes," Vols. X-XI; Paris, 1897-1904], 1, 91.
23. The first phrase of the translation follows al-Akwa's text, which provides a necessary correction to Kay's text which Kay himself had already suggested (*Ta'rikh*, p. 102, n. 2). The last sentence is not in al-Akwa's text at this point, but appears after the first list of Zuray'id *dā'is* in the middle of the passage. Ellipsis marks

(.....) indicate the omission of full titles and extended genealogies of certain persons.

24. Kay, p. 298, has already pointed out the necessity for this deletion.
25. Stern, "Succession," pp. 216-17, prefers al-Janādī's version of this quotation, which substitutes *'amilū* for *'alimā*, and *mawālīnā* for *mawlānā al-Ṭayyib*. The quotation would thus be translated: "Sufficient for the Banu'l-Ṣulayḥi is what they have done on behalf of Our Lords (i.e. the Fatimids)." Stern believed this version was 'Umāra's original text, which was modified by the interpolator of al-Āmir's letter to read as in the present texts of the *Ta'rīkh*. He paraphrases al-Janādī's version as follows: "..... the time of the Ṣulayḥids is past; the Fāṭimid *da'wa* is in need of fresh forces — hence the appointment of the Zuray'ids." The arguments presented here — that none of this passage was originally written by 'Umāra, that the phrase referring to the appointment of the Zuray'ids is a corruption of the original interpolated text, and that al-Sayyida had nothing to do with the appointment of the Zuray'ids — render unnecessary Stern's rather contorted interpretation.
26. Stern, "Succession," p. 226 (text and partial translation); Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, p. 191.
27. Hamdānī's manuscript of the *'Uyūn* in his private library, read "I am Arwa bint Aḥmad."
28. Stern's gloss.
29. The "Commander of the Faithful" must presumably be al-Ṭayyib, whose hypothetical reign began in 524.
30. *Yaman*, pp. 299-300.
31. "Succession," p. 228.
32. 'Umāra's date 520 for Ibn Najīb al-Dawla's arrest, *Ta'rīkh K*, p. 48, is confirmed by Ibn Muyassar's notice (*Ta'rīkh khalā'if Miṣr*, ed. H. Masse, Cairo, 1919, p. 70) of Ibn Najīb al-Dawla's arrival in Cairo 10 Muḥarram 521; cf. Hamdānī, *Ṣulayḥiyyūn*, p. 173, where the date 524 is given, probably on the authority of the *'Uyūn*.
33. Stern, p. 236; Hamdānī, pp. 181-82.
34. Cf. al-Hāmidī, *Tuḥfa*, in Stern, "Succession," pp. 234-36, and p. 221.



مطبعة مطبوعات

البريد
البريد
البريد
البريد

مطبعة مطبوعات الرياض