

were killed for having accused Moses of the murder of his brother, but they were afterwards brought back to life and became prophets.—At Ṣalkhad [q.v.] a footprint of Hārūn was shown.—In the historiography worked out by the Ismā'īliyya [q.v.], Hārūn is a *ḥudūdī* or a *waṣī* together with Muṣā.

Bibliography: The verses of the Qur'ān listed in the index of R. Blachère, *Le Coran*, s.v.; Ibn Kutayba, *Ma'ārif*, ed. 'Ukāsha, 43-4; Ya'kūbī, *Historiae*, i, 40-1 (G. Smit, *Bijbel en Legende*, 49-50); Tabarī, i, 448, 473-93, 502; idem, *Tafsīr*, new edition, xiii, 80-152 (old edition, ix, 31-53); Mas'ūdi, *Murūdj*, i, 93-5 (trans. Ch. Pellat, i, 39, §§ 87-89); *K. al-Bad' wa 'l-ta'rīkh*, iii, 92/95; Bal'ami, *La Chronique de Tabarī*, i, 296, 317 f., 345, 358, 391, 395 f., 543; Tha'labī, *Arā'is al-madījālīs*, 100, 123-5, 146; Kisā'i, ed. Eisenberg, 222 f., 238; Ibn Ḥazm, *Fīṣal*, Cairo 1317, i, 161 (1317 impression, i, 140); Kāḍī Nu'mān, *Asās al-ta'wīl*, ed. A. Tamer, Beirut 1960, 196; Corbin-Mo'in, *Commentaire de la Qasida ismā'īlienne*, Tehran-Paris 1955, 109; Harawī, *Guide des Lieux de Pèlerinage*, ed. J. Sourdel-Thomine, 17, trans., 43; J. Horowitz, *Koranische Untersuchungen*, 149; A. Jeffery, *The foreign vocabulary of the Qur'ān*, 283 f.; D. Sidersky, *Les origines des légendes musulmanes...*, 81, 102; H. Speyer, *Die Biblischen Erzählungen...*, 260 f., 323-6; M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *Mahomet*, index, s.v. Aaron/Hārūn; Jewish sources summarized by A. Marmorstein, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, i, cols. 13-16; H. Schwarzbaum, *Jewish, Christian, Moslem and Falasha legends of the death of Aaron, the High Priest*, in *Fabula*, v, 185-227.

(G. EISENBERG-[G. VAJDA])

HÄRÜN B. KHUMARAWAYH [see TULUNIDS].

HÄRÜN B. YAḤYĀ, a person known only from an account left by him and inserted in the *Kutāb al-A'lāk al-naṣī'a* of Ibn Rusta (ed. De Goeje, in *BGA*, vii, 119-30). Nothing is known of his origin. According to J. Marquart, he was a Syrian, and a Christian—a fact which would have hastened his release during his stay in Constantinople (*Streifzüge*, 207). Taken prisoner in Palestine by the Byzantines, he was transferred across Asia Minor, to Constantinople, and was probably placed in one of the prisons reserved for Muslim prisoners (for these prisons cf. *REI*, 1947, 49 n. 1). Released by the authorities and awaiting his final liberation, he had time to visit parts of the town and to study closely the famous monuments there. His description contains archaeological information of the highest interest and can be considered one of the most—if not the most—important of all accounts left by visitors to the Byzantine capital in the Middle Ages. After the ransom of the Arab prisoners Hārūn b. Yahyā left Constantinople for Salūkiya (Thessalonica), from where he travelled to Venice and later Rome, of which too he left a description.

The date of his stay in Byzantium is disputed. According to Marquart and Vasiliev it took place between 267/880 and 276/890. G. Ostrogorsky thinks it was during the winter of 912-3, during the short reign of the Emperor Alexander (*Zum Reisebericht des Hārūn-ibn-Jahja*, in *Sem. Kondakov*, v (1932), 254), a date accepted also by H. Grégoire (*Un captif arabe à la cour de l'Empereur Alexandre*, in *Byzantion*, vii (1932), 666-73). As for V. Minorsky, he places it at about the year 900 (*Hudūd al-'ālam*, 419, n. 2).

Hārūn b. Yahyā's account was translated and commented upon for the first time in German by J. Marquart (*op. cit.*, 206-37) then, in English, by A. A. Vasiliev (*Hārūn-ibn-Yahya and his description of*

Constantinople, in *Sem. Kondakov*, v (1932), 149-63); there are three French translations: the first by Mehmed Izeddin (*Un prisonnier arabe à Byzance au IX^e siècle: Hārūn-ibn-Yahyā*, in *REI*, 1947, 41-62), the second by M. Canard (in Vasiliev's *Byzance et les Arabes*, ii/2 (1950), 382-94) and the third by G. Wiet, in Ibn Rusteh, *Les atours précieux*, 134-46.

Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned: V. Minorsky, *Hudūd*, XVII, 418 ff.; Mzik, *Beitrag zur historischen geographie*, Leipzig-Vienna 1929, 88 f.; J. Sauvaget, *Chronique de Damas d'el-Jazari*, Paris 1949, 29.

(M. IZZEDIN)

HÄRÜN AL-RASHĪD, HÄRÜN B. MUḤAMMAD B. 'ABD ALLĀH, the fifth 'Abbāsīd caliph, is, thanks to the "Arabian Nights", an almost legendary figure, so that the "good Hārūn al-Rashīd" of the "golden prime" of the 'Abbāsīds has obscured his true historical personality. His reign, which saw many incidents of critical importance, was a turning point in the history of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate; it marked the decline in administrative efficiency and initiated the political disintegration of the Islamic empire.

He was born in al-Rayy in Muḥarram 149/February 766 (another account in Tabarī, iii, 599, puts it as early as *Dhu'l-Hijja* 145/March 763). He was the third son of al-Mahdī, and his second son by al-Khayzurān [q.v.], a slave girl from the Yemen who, being freed and married by al-Mahdī in 159/775-6, played an influential role in the reign of both her husband and her son. The 'Abbāsīd Court at which Hārūn spent his carefree and serene youth surrounded by eunuchs [see *KHĀṢI*] and *Mawālī* [q.v.] was beginning to show signs of laxity and splendour. His early upbringing rendered him susceptible to influence, especially that exerted by his mother and by his secretary-tutor Yahyā b. *Khālid* [see *AL-BARĀMIKA*]. Early in his youth, Hārūn was appointed the leader of two expeditions against the Byzantines, in 163/779-80 and 165/781-2, when he was accompanied by high ranking officials and veteran generals. The former culminated in the capture of Samālū, the latter was a marked success, in that the 'Abbāsīd army reached for the first and last time the coast of the Bosphorus. It cannot be assumed that Hārūn, hardly more than a boy, played a leading role in these expeditions. However, he was appointed governor of Ifrīkiya, Egypt, Syria, Armenia and *Ādharbaydjan*, with Yahyā b. *Khālid* in charge of the actual administration, and second in succession to the throne in 166/782, ostensibly on the strength of these victories, but in reality because of the instigation of his mother and Yahyā b. *Khālid*, in order to enhance his prestige and pave his way to the throne. In the struggle between various political groupings, each identifying itself with an *amir* through whom it sought to achieve absolute power, intrigues were a common weapon at al-Mahdī's court. These intrigues showed their effect when al-Mahdī ultimately decided to nominate Hārūn the first in succession; but he died in obscure circumstances in 169/785 before fulfilling his wish. Under al-Hādī [q.v.], Hārūn, ill-treated and humiliated, would have renounced his claim to the Caliphate but for the encouragement of Yahyā b. *Khālid*.

However, Hārūn was proclaimed Caliph, after the mysterious death of al-Hādī which was due to a court conspiracy, on 15 Rabi' I 170/14 September 786. He was then in his early twenties, and his accession to the throne was due to fortuitous as well as fortunate circumstances in which he had no real

share. It was therefore a matter of course that the grateful Hārūn should bestow the right to govern on Yahyā b. Khālīd who, together with his two sons al-Faḍl and Dja'far, remained in power for about 17 years. Their downfall in Muḥarram 187/January 803 marked, more or less, the end of the importance of the viziers as initiators of policies and not merely heads of the administration. Political necessity drew al-Rashīd to rely more and more on his *mawālī* and eunuchs, who were entirely dependant on the Caliph and therefore loyal to him. They, in fact, proved equal to their task in many decisive moments (Ṭabarī, iii, 678, 682, 705, 716, etc.) and played an important rôle in controlling other political groupings.

Despite the glorious picture of the golden age, Hārūn's reign was, in fact, a long sequence of political disturbances flaring up in the eastern parts as well as the western parts of the empire. Syria, a province inhabited by unruly tribes with Umayyad sympathies, never ceased to be the bitter enemy of the 'Abbāsids. Frequent fights between the two rival factions, the Yamanīs and the Muḍarīs, eventually developed into a war with the 'Abbāsīd army, because governors used to take sides with one faction against the other. The feuds continued with brief intervals until 180/796, when the situation became so serious that al-Rashīd had to send Dja'far b. Yahyā, who succeeded in quietening the situation and disarming the tribes. Al-Rashīd's move to al-Raḡḡa [q.v.] at about this time was partly due to the disturbances in Syria (Ṭabarī, iii, 706). As to the Egyptian risings of 172/788 and 178/794-5, they were mainly due to maladministration and arbitrary taxation, as Egypt had to subsidise the 'Abbāsīd army fighting in Ifrīkiya. But Harthama b. A'yān was able to restore peace to Egypt. Instability in Ifrīkiya started after the death of the competent governor Yazīd b. Ḥātim al-Muḥallabī [q.v.] in 170/786, and successive governors failed to restore order. Harthama b. A'yān [q.v.] was able to subdue 'Abd Allāh b. al-Djārūd's rebellion in Kayrawān in 178/794-5, but disturbances blazed up again in 180/797 and al-Rashīd consented to bestow the governorship of Ifrīkiya on Ibrāhīm b. al-Aghlab [q.v.] only in return for an annual payment of 40,000 dinārs. The process of disintegration, which had already started in Spain with the establishment of the Umayyad dynasty (138/755) and in al-Maghrib with the foundation of the Idrīsīd dynasty (172/788), was aggravated in Ifrīkiya by the foundation of the Aghlabīd [q.v.] dynasty (184/800), alleviated in the last case however by financial benefits to the central treasury. Finally the Yemen was a place of unrest owing to its remoteness and its mountainous nature; al-Rashīd's governor and Mawlā Ḥammād al-Barbarī employed a harsh policy towards the people of the Yemen, who therefore revolted under al-Hayṣam al-Hamdānī in 179/795. Thanks to local support, the revolt lasted for nine years and resulted in al-Hayṣam and many of his followers being sent to al-Rashīd, who had them strangled. The lot of the Yemenis improved only when Ḥammād was dismissed after 13 years of governorship.

The causes of the unrest in the eastern part of the empire were more complicated. The unrest was partly due to the disappointment of the lower classes, whose condition was not improved by the advent of the 'Abbāsids. Moreover, the 'Abbāsids had to contend with a population more attached to their old local tradition than to Islam, and sometimes, as was the case with large parts of Daylam and Ṭabaristān, completely unaffected by it. Al-Rashīd

himself converted 400 Ṭabaristānis to Islam in 189/805 (Ṭabarī, iii, 705, 1014-15). The dissatisfaction manifested itself in the form of 'Alid or Khāridjī risings. It was as early as 176/792-3 that the Ḥasanīd Yahyā b. 'Abd Allāh al-Maḥdī [q.v.] rebelled in Daylam and won considerable support from the native princes and the people. Al-Rashīd sent al-Faḍl b. Yahyā al-Barmakī, who through diplomacy and promises of amnesty persuaded Yahyā to give in. But Yahyā's submission did not entirely satisfy al-Rashīd, who a little later found a pretext to have the amnesty annulled and threw Yahyā into prison (*Maḳātīl*, 309-22). The number of the Khāridjīs was considerable in Kirmān as well as in Fārs and Sīstān; they continued in their hostile attitude towards the new régime, and during the reign of al-Rashīd seem to have recovered from the heavy blow inflicted upon them in the late Umayyad period. There was a series of revolts, the most serious being that of al-Walīd b. Ṭarīf al-Shārī [q.v.], and that of Ḥamza b. 'Abd Allāh al-Shārī. The former, with headquarters in Naṣībīn, took place in 178/794 in the entirely tribal province of al-Djazīra and defeated successive 'Abbāsīd armies. Then al-Rashīd sent Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī, of the same tribe as al-Walīd, whom he killed in 179/795. The latter broke out in Sīstān when Ḥamza occupied Harāt in 179/795 and extended his authority to Kirmān and Fārs, and al-Rashīd was unable to subdue the rebels (Sadighi, *Les mouvements religieux* . . ., 52-5). Khurāsān became the scene of a series of local risings due to the incompetence of the successive governors with the exception of al-Faḍl b. Sulaymān al-Tūsi and al-Faḍl al-Barmakī (Barthold, *Turkestan*, 203.). The situation worsened when 'Alī Ibn 'Isā Ibn Māhān was appointed governor in 180/795-6. His notorious deeds caused two serious revolts, namely that of Abu 'l-Khasīb Wuhayb b. 'Abd Allāh in 185/801 at Naṣā, and that of Rāfi' b. al-Layth b. Naṣr b. Sayyār [q.v.] in 190/806 at Samarḳand.

In his religious policy al-Rashīd stressed the religious character of the Caliphate, and continued the anti-'Alid and anti-*sandaqa* policy of his predecessors. He initiated his reign by a general amnesty, but the potentially dangerous 'Alids and the *Zindīks* were excluded from it. His suspicions included even the politically inactive and pious Mūsā al-Kāzīm [q.v.] who was suddenly arrested and sent to Baṣra, then to Baghdād. Although it was alleged that al-Kāzīm was killed by al-Rashīd's orders (*Maḳātīl*, 335; *Uyūn akhbār al-Riḍā*, 66, 71 ff.) it seems more likely that his death in 183/799 was natural (Ṭabarī, iii, 649). Al-Rashīd's attitude towards the *dhimmīs* seems to have been stricter than that of his predecessors. In 191/806 he ordered churches along the Muslim-Byzantine frontiers to be demolished, and ordered the *dhimmīs* of Baghdād to wear different clothes from those of the Muslims and to ride different animals (Ṭabarī, iii, 712-3; *Ṭabaḳāt al-Mu'tazila*, ed. Arnold, 31-2; Fattal, *Le statut* . . ., 66). His motive in so doing may have been to win over Muslim public opinion or else the necessity to be on guard against foreign spies.

A great part of al-Rashīd's fame was due to his interest in the wars against the Byzantines. In waging *djihād* against the infidels, Hārūn was in fact fulfilling one of the important duties of the Caliph in the eyes of Muslims. Border attacks and counter-attacks occurred with almost annual regularity, but the interesting aspect of al-Rashīd's expeditions was his personal participation in a number of them. He organized the border area as a separate adminis-

trative unit called al-ʿAwāṣim [q.v.] with a centre in Manbij. In 181/797, al-Rashīd profited by the Byzantine internal troubles as well as their conflict with the Bulgarians, and took the fortress of al-Ṣafṣāf, while a division of his army penetrated as far as Ancyra. The empress Irene (better known in Muslim sources as ʿUghusta [i.e., Augusta]), then already the real ruler of the Byzantine State (797-802), demanded a peace treaty which al-Rashīd first refused and subsequently accepted because of the Khazar menace. But when Nicephorus ascended the throne in 802, hostilities were resumed and al-Rashīd himself led the Muslim army in 187/803 and 190/806. In the second expedition al-Rashīd met with considerable success, taking Heraclea and Tyana. Nicephorus, threatened by the Bulgarians from the east, had to accept a very humiliating peace-treaty by which he had to pay personal poll tax on behalf of himself and his son.

Having chosen ʿIrāk as their residence, the ʿAbbāsids had lost interest in the Mediterranean fleet. Al-Rashīd was the first ʿAbbāsīd Caliph to pay attention to naval power. Successful raids on Cyprus in 190/805 and Rhodes in 192/807 had no lasting effect. It might seem surprising that by the end of al-Rashīd's reign the situation on the frontiers was virtually unchanged; the campaigns were, in fact, bedevilled by many problems such as difficulties of supply and the harshness of the weather. Encouraged by the weakness of the central government in Armenia, where a slow process of Arab colonization was in progress, the Khazars made occasional raids on Muslim territories. Only the efforts of Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī and Khuzayma b. Khāzīm succeeded in controlling the situation. An exchange of embassies and gifts is alleged to have taken place between Hārūn al-Rashīd and Charlemagne, which resulted in giving Charlemagne rights of protection over Jerusalem. Nothing has yet been found in Arabic sources to substantiate this allegation, and although they may have had political interests in common, there seems to be no truth in it.

The later period of al-Rashīd's reign reveals a certain lack of competence in him as a ruler. Some of his decisions, such as the covenant of the Kaʿba (186/802), make him at least partly responsible for the civil war and the disintegration of the empire. It was again in Khurāsān that the trouble started. Al-Rashīd did not heed the reports of ʿAlī b. ʿIsā b. Māhān's misrule and contented himself with the precious gifts he sent; but when Rāfiʿ b. al-Layth's revolt became dangerous, ʿAlī was finally disposed of in 191/806. This did not put an end to the revolt of Rāfiʿ, whose authority had increased by 192/807-8. In spite of ill health, al-Rashīd, accompanied by his two sons al-Maʾmūn and Ṣāliḥ, marched against the rebel with a considerable ʿIrākī army (Gabrieli, *La successione di Harun al-Rashid*, in *RSO*, xi, 349), but he had to halt at Tūs in Ṣafar 193/November 808, as his health began to deteriorate. Meanwhile the Khurramiyya [q.v.] came out in his rear in several areas, especially in Ispahān. Al-Rashīd died on 3 Djumādā II 193/24 March 809.

Opinions on his character are contradictory. He has been represented by various chroniclers as pious and dissolute, statesmanlike and incompetent at the same time. In fact, politically, his reign was not a period of ideal stability. Moreover, he virtually dismembered the empire by the unwise decision to apportion it between his sons al-Amīn [q.v.], al-Maʾmūn [q.v.] and al-Muʾtamin, and thus initiated its decline. This move by al-Rashīd may have been

inspired by the wish to safeguard not only the succession of his direct descendants against the ambitions of many ʿAlid and ʿAbbāsīd contenders, but also to ensure ʿAbbāsīd authority over all the provinces; but this can hardly have been the right approach. Economically, the commercial activities, which reached as far as China, made al-Rashīd's name known to the whole world of the time, and increased the splendour of his court, which was a centre of art and culture.

Bibliography: The chief source is Ṭabarī, iii, 599-764; Ibn al-Athīr gives a summarized version of Ṭabarī with fresh information here and there (al-Kāmil, vi, 65-152); Other sources are Yaʿqūbī, ii, 491-524; Balādhurī, *Futūḥ*, ed. al-Munajjid, 1956 (index); Djaḥshiyārī, Cairo 1938, 177-288; Masʿūdī, *Murūdj*, vi, 287-414; Iṣfahānī, *Maḳātil*, ed. Naḍjaf 1934, 308-36; and *Fragmenta Historiarum Arabicorum*, ed. de Goeje, 1871, 278-80, 290-319. Information will be found in other later histories, and also in al-Dhahabī's *Taʾriḫh al-Islām*, MS. British Museum Add. 23,278 with incomplete chronological sequence, fols. 36 a, 36b, 40a-70a; some local histories are useful in this respect such as al-Azrakī's *Aḫbār Maḥka*, 1859; *Taʾriḫh-i Sistān*, ed. Malik al-Shuʿarā Bahār, Tehrān 1314 (where the author's sympathies are strongly against the central regime); al-Narshakhi's *Taʾriḫh-i Bukhārā*, Tehrān 1939; Makrizī's *Khitaṭ*, ed. 1853; and Kummī's *Taʾriḫh-i Kumm*, etc. Modern works: Apart from the general works on the Caliphate: see E. H. Palmer, *Haroun al-Rashid*, London 1881 (in many ways out of date); H. St. J. B. Philby, *Haroun al-Rashid*, Edinburgh 1933 (dependant on secondary sources and intended for the general reader); N. Abbott, *Two Queens of Baghdad*, Chicago 1946 (exposing the role played by Khayzurān and Zubayda on the political scene and at the court); A. Jourard, *Haroun al-Rashid*, 2 vols, 1956 (an attempt to present the reign of al-Rashīd as an ethnic struggle between Arabs and Persians); L. Bouvat, *Les Barmécides*, Paris 1912; F. Gabrieli, *La successione di Harun al-Rashid e la guerra fra al-Amin e al-Ma'mun*, in *RSO*, xi (1926-28), 341-97; D. Sourdel, *La politique religieuse du calife ʿAbbāsīd al-Ma'mun*, in *REI*, xxx (1962), 28-30; On relations with the Byzantines see: *Cambridge Medieval history*, iv, 124-127; E. W. Brooks, *The Byzantines and Arabs in the times of the early ʿAbbāsids*, in *EHR*, xv (1900), 728-47, xvi (1901), 84-92; G. Ostrogorsky, tr. J. Hussey, *History of the Byzantine State*, Oxford 1956, 162-9, 173; A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 1961 (see index); idem, *Byzance et les Arabes* (introduction). On the relations with Charlemagne see: F. F. Schmidt, *Karl der Grosse und Harun al-Rashid*, in *Isl.*, iii (1912), 409-11; E. Joranson, *The alleged Frankish protectorate in Palestine*, in *AHR*, 1927, 241-61; H. B. Bittermann, *Hārūn al-Rashid's gift of an organ to Charlemagne*, in *Speculum*, iv (1929), 215-7; Buckler, *Hārūn al-Rashid and Charles the Great*, 1931 (see Appendix and bibliography); S. Runciman, *Charlemagne and Palestine*, in *EHR*, 1935, 606-19; M. Khaddūri, *al-Ṣilāt al-dīblāmāṭīkiyya bayn al-Rashīd wa Shārlamān*, Baghdad 1939. See also Le Strange, *Baghdad during the ʿAbbāsīd Caliphate*, Oxford 1924. (F. OMAR)

AL-HĀRŪNIYYA (in modern Turkish Hārūniye) was in the Middle Ages a fortress town of the marches of the *Djazīra* (al-thughūr al-djazarīyya) between Marʿash and ʿAyn Zarba, to the east of the middle