

(*taṭawwaʿū*) in *ghazw* and undertake this last in the lands of unbelief when it is not incumbent upon them nor is an obvious institution in their land”.

As well as the regular troops forming the Umayyad and ʿAbbāsīd army or *djund*, those in receipt of regular stipends (*rizk*, *ʿaṭā* [q.v.]) from the *diwān al-djāyṣh*, sc. the *murtaziḳa* “those entitled to living allowances” [see *DJAYSH*, i. Classical, and *DJUND*], there were from earliest times volunteers who served without *ʿaṭā* but were entitled to a share in any captured plunder [see *GHANIṢMA*]. However, it seems that they might sometimes be asked to make a contribution (*tanāhud*) to the expenses of a campaign out of their subsequent share of the booty. In early times, these volunteers must have included poor Bedouins, *mawālī* [see *MAWLĀ*], and, as time went on, an increasing proportion of those motivated by religious zeal and the desire for a martyr’s death [see *SHAHĪD*]. Thus in the campaign of ʿAbd al-Malik’s commander ʿUbayd Allāh b. Abī Bakra against a local ruler of eastern Afghānistān, the Zumbīl of Zābulistān, in 79/698, volunteers from the Yemeni tribes of Madhhiḍj and Hamdān [q.vv.] are mentioned (al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-aṣhrāf*, cited in C.E. Bosworth, *ʿUbaydallāh b. Abī Bakra and the “Army of Destruction” in Zābulistān* (79/698), in *Isl.*, 1 [1973], 277). Likewise, Yazīd b. al-Muhallab’s army assembled in 98/716-17 for an expedition against Ṭabaristān and Djurdjān included 100,000 Syrian, Irākī and Khurāsānī troops plus *mawālī*, slaves (*mamālīk*) and volunteers (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1318; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, ed. Beirut, v, 29).

There was, of course, a disadvantage to commanders having contingents of volunteers attached to their armies in that these volunteers were less amenable to military discipline and could come and go of their own free will, hence could not be relied upon for sustained campaigning or arduous fighting in remote or inhospitable terrains. During the campaign of al-Afshīn [q.v.] in northern Ādharbāyḍjān against the Khurramī rebel Bābak [q.v.] in 222/836-7, many members of the contingent of volunteers from Baṣra under the command of Abū Dulaf al-Kāsim al-ʿIdjlī [q.v.] melted away from the army when the final assault on the Khurramī fortress of al-Baḡdhā [q.v.] in Suppl. seemed to be unduly delayed (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1209-11, 1214, tr. Bosworth, *Storm and stress along the northern frontiers of the ʿAbbāsīd caliphate*, Albany 1991, 62-5, 67).

Volunteers were especially to be found on the frontiers of the Islamic world, where the opportunities for *djihad* [q.v.] against the pagans were greatest, e.g., along the Anatolian marches against the Byzantines, in the Caucasus against the Khazars, in Central Asia against the steppe peoples and in eastern Afghānistān and the fringes of north-western India against the local idolaters. In the caliphate of al-Mahdī, both regular troops and *muṭṭawwiʿa* were garrisoned at al-Maṣṣīṣa [q.v.] in Cilicia (al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ*, 166). The frontier towns of Transoxania and Khwārazm and their *ribāṭs* had strong concentrations of volunteers within them, and these seem to have been often regarded as a volatile and unruly element, similar in social constitution and function to the *ʿayyār*s [q.v.]. They were ready to rush off and fight wherever the possibilities of holy war and plunder presented themselves, but were not always welcome (Barthold, *Turkestan*?, 214-16). In 355/966 the Būyīd amīr Rukn al-Dawla repelled by military force a group of 10,000 *ghāzīs* from Khurāsān who were ostensibly marching westwards against the Byzantines but who were, he feared, being utilised by the rival Sāmānīd dynasty to destabilise his amirate (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, ed. Beirut, viii, 569-71).

Where a ruler or commander acquired a particular reputation as a successful war-leader and hammer of the infidels, volunteers would be attracted to his standard in large numbers. This was especially the case with the early Ghaznawids Sebūktigin, Maḥmūd and Masʿūd [q.vv.], whose campaigns down to the plains of northern India, with rich prospects of Indian slaves and temple treasures, always included a large proportion of volunteers from all over the eastern Islamic world (see Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 994-1040*, Edinburgh 1963, 114).

The bands of volunteers or *ʿayyārūn* in certain parts of the eastern Islamic world might also turn their energies against internal dissent or heterodoxy. This is clear in the province of Sīstān, where bodies of orthodox Sunnī volunteers or vigilantes were active against local Khārīdīte elements; out of these bands, the Ṣaffārīd brothers Yaʿqūb and ʿAmr b. al-Layṭh [q.vv.] were to rise to power during the second half of the 3rd/9th century (see Bosworth, *Sīstān under the Arabs from the Islamic conquest to the rise of the Ṣaffārīds* (30-240/651-864), Rome 1968, 85, 112 ff.).

From around the 5th/11th century onwards, the term *muṭṭawwiʿa* tends to drop out of use, and such terms as *ghāzī* and *muḍjāhid* [q.vv.] are used more and more for the concept of volunteer warriors for the faith.

A modern formation from this Arabic root is *muṭṭawwiʿ*, lit. “one who compels obedience”, used in contemporary Saudi Arabia to designate the religious police who enforce the closure of shops during the times of public prayer, oversee morals, etc.

*Bibliography*: Given in the article. See also RIBĀṬ. (C.E. BOSWORTH)

AL-MUTAWAKKIL ʿALĀʾ LLĀH, ABU ʿL-FADL DJAʿFAR B. MUHAMMAD, ʿAbbāsīd caliph. He was born in Shawwāl 206/Feb.-March 822, son of the caliph al-Muʿtaṣim [q.v.] and a Khwārazmī slave-girl called Shudjāʿ. There is no sign that he had early political ambitions, and he seems to have lived in obscurity until the death of his brother, the caliph al-Wāthik [q.v.] in Dhu ʿl-Hijja 232/Aug. 847. Al-Wāthik left a young son but no designated adult successor. The succession was decided by a council consisting of the *wazīr* Ibn al-Zayyāt and the chief *kāḍī* Aḥmad b. Abī Duwād [q.vv.], two other bureaucrats and two leading Turkish military men, Aytākḥ and Waṣīf. They rejected Ibn al-Zayyāt’s advice to appoint al-Wāthik’s son and instead chose his brother Djaʿfar, who was duly installed as caliph. They probably hoped that he would prove a pliable instrument like his brother had been, but they soon found out how mistaken they were, and al-Mutawakkil soon showed that he had an independent mind and a clear and decided policy. He was determined from the beginning to assert the independence of the caliph and to break the dominance of the Turkish military and the bureaucracy.

He rapidly removed the leading figures and the old régime, Ibn al-Zayyāt (executed 233/847), Aytākḥ (assassinated 235/849) and Ibn Abī Duwād (dismissed 237/851-2). In their places he appointed new ministers, notably the *wazīr* ʿUbayd Allāh b. Yaḥyā b. Khākān and his personal favourite al-Faṭḥ b. Khākān [q.v.]. In 235/849 he also appointed his sons to take over the vast supervisory governorates held by the Turkish generals, al-Muntaṣir to Egypt and al-Djazīra, al-Muʿtazz to Khurāsān and al-Muʿayyad to Syria and Palestine, intending that the great men of the next generation should be members of the ʿAbbāsīd family as they had been under al-Manṣūr. Only the Ṭāhirīds [q.v.] in Baḡhdād and Khurāsān

were left unchallenged and continued to work in partnership with the caliph.

Al-Mutawakkil also set about recruiting a new army in order to break the Turkish monopoly of military power, and 'Ubayd Allāh b. Khākān sought to recruit troops from the Kayṣī Arabs of Syria, the *abnā'* of Baghdād and from Armenia. The favour shown to these new elements provoked growing anger among the Turks, who felt their position threatened. Just as al-Mu'taṣim had founded a new capital at Sāmarrā' [q.v.] to house his Turkish army, so al-Mutawakkil sought a new seat where he could establish himself. He tried Damascus briefly in 244/858, but is said to have been deterred by the plague, but probably also because it was too far from the centres of wealth and power in 'Irāk and Persia. He chose instead a site a few miles north of Sāmarrā' in 245/859-60 which he called al-Djā'fariyya. Despite its proximity to Sāmarrā', this was conceived as an independent town with its own great mosque, palaces and urban centre, the outline of which can still be traced on the ground today.

Perhaps the most controversial aspect of his policy was to break with the Mu'tazilī position which had been the official doctrine of the 'Abbāsīd government since al-Ma'mūn had introduced the *miḥna* [q.v.]. In its place, the caliph stressed his adherence to the doctrines of the Hanbalīs and other Traditionists. In part, this was a symbolic rejection of his predecessors' policies, but he probably hoped also to attract to himself the undoubted popular support which the Traditionists enjoyed, especially in Baghdād. He appointed a new *kādi*, Yahyā b. Aktham, who was sympathetic to the Traditionists, introduced discriminatory dress regulations for Christians and Jews [see GHIVĀR], and destroyed the tomb of al-Ḥusayn at Karbalā', which had become an important centre of devotion.

Despite these political upheavals, his reign was in the main a time of peace. There were continuing disturbances in Ādharbaydjan, where Ibn al-Ba'īth rebelled in 234/848-9 and in Armenia in 237/851-2, where a rebellion against increasing 'Abbāsīd pressure was put down by the Turkish general Bughā the Elder [see BUGHĀ AL-KABIR]. Bughā also led successful campaigns against the Byzantines in 245/859 and 246/860, but without producing any decisive results.

The caliph's decisive policies made him a number of enemies, notably among the Turkish military. To these he added his eldest son al-Muntaṣir [q.v.], who feared that he was to be deprived of his position as heir apparent, and they came together to assassinate him in Shawwāl 247/Dec. 861. His death deprived the 'Abbāsīd caliphate of a forceful and effective ruler who might well have re-established the caliph's authority on a firm footing. In the event, his death plunged the caliphate into anarchy.

**Bibliography:** 1. Texts. Ṭabarī, iii, 1368-1471, tr. J.L. Kraemer, *Incipient decline*, Albany 1989; Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rikh*, ii, 591-602; Mas'ūdī, *Murūj*, vii, 189-289 = §§ 2872-2977; Iṣfahānī, *Maḳātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn*, ed. A. Saqr, 597-633; *Aghānī*, *Tables alphabétiques*. 2. Studies. K.A.C. Creswell, *Early Muslim architecture*, ii, Oxford 1940; E. Herzfeld, *Geschichte der Stadt Samarra*, Hamburg 1948; D. Soudel, *Le vizirat 'abbāsīde*, Damascus 1959-60; S.M. Miah, *The reign of the caliph al-Mutawakkil*, Dacca 1969; H. Kennedy, *The Prophet and the age of the caliphates*, London 1986. See also MIḤNA.

(H. KENNEDY)

AL-MUTAWAKKIL 'ALĀ 'LLĀH, IBN AL-

AFTAS, 'UMAR B. MUHAMMAD b. 'Abd Allāh, fourth and last ruler of the Aftasid [q.v.] dynasty in the petty state [see MULŪK AL-ṬAWĀ'IF. 2.] of Badajoz (Baṭalyaws [q.v.]), in south-western al-Andalus [q.v.], in the 5th/11th century.

'Umar al-Mutawakkil came to power as a result of intrigues against his brother Yahyā in 461/1068-9 (the date emerges from two passages in the *Dhakhira* of Ibn Bassām, iv, 650 and v, 252); Yahyā himself appears to have reigned for some four or five years (the chronology of the dynasty still presents problems). From this time on, al-Mutawakkil played an important political role in peninsular affairs, one consonant both with the (relatively) great size of his kingdom and with its isolation from the main cultural and economic centres further to the east in the Iberian peninsula. A number of well-known littérateurs served him as viziers (e.g., Ibn 'Abdūn, one of the Banū Qūzmān and one of the Banū Kabturnu [q.v.]). In 472-3/1079-80, he occupied Toledo (Ṭulayṭula [q.v.]), but although he had come at the invitation of the city's inhabitants, who were anxious to be rid of the incompetent and dangerous Dhu 'l-Nūnids [q.v.], he was unable to establish a durable régime there, and left after only ten months. In the succeeding years, as the general position of Islam in the peninsula worsened, he adopted a policy, much like those of his peers, vacillating between temporising with regard to Christian demands for tribute (*parias*) and appealing for help to the rising power of the Almoravids (al-Murābiṭūn [q.v.]) in North Africa. His attempts to play each side off against the other came to nothing, however; despite his presence in 479/1086 at the battle of Zallāka [q.v.], which took place in his own territory, and his participation in the struggle against the Christian advance, he was in the end, like virtually all the other *taifa* monarchs, deposed, in 487/1094 or 488/1095, and put to death, together with two of his sons, on the road to captivity. A third son is said to have spent some time in Christian Spain and may even finally have been converted to Christianity. His dynasty was the subject of a famous *marthiya* [q.v.] or lament by Ibn 'Abdūn, on which Ibn Badrūn later wrote a well-known commentary (ed. Dozy).

**Bibliography:** Makkārī, *Analectes*, index; Ibn Bassām, *Dhakhira*, index; 'Abd Allāh al-Zirī, *Ti-byān*, ed. and tr. E. Lévi-Provençal, in *And.*, iii, index; tr. Tibi, index (useful notes); Lévi-Provençal, *Alphonse VI et la prise de Tolède (1085)*, in *Islam d'Occident, Études d'histoire médiévale*, Paris 1948, 109-35 (originally publ. in *Hespéris*, xii [1931], 33-49); A.R. Nykl, *Die Aftasiden von Badajoz*, in *Isl.*, xxvi (1942), 16-48; H.R. Idris, *Les Aftasides de Badajoz*, in *And.*, xxx (1965), 277-90; M. Terrón Albarrán, *El Solar de los Aftasidas. Aportación temática al estudio del reino moro de Badajoz: Siglo XI*, Badajoz 1971; D. Wasserstein, *The rise and fall of the Party-Kings. Politics and society in Islamic Spain, 1002-1086*, Princeton 1985, 84-5 (with references); on the coinage: A. Vives y Escudero, *Monedas de las dinastías árabe-españolas*, Madrid 1893, nos. 1001-21; A. Prieto y Vives, *Los Reyes de Taifas. Estudio histórico-numismático de los musulmanes españoles en el siglo V de la hégira (XI de J.C.)*, Madrid 1926, nos. 377-93; G.C. Miles, *Coins of the Spanish Mulūk al-Ṭawā'if*, New York 1954, no. 546.

(D.J. WASSERSTEIN)

AL-MUTAWAKKIL 'ALĀ 'LLĀH, ISMĀ'IL B. AL-MANŠŪR BI'LLĀH AL-ḲĀSIM (b. ca. 1019/1610), the first Ḳāsimī Zaydī imām to rule Yemen completely independent of the Ottoman Turks.

Ismā'īl's claim to the imāmate, following the death

of his brother, Imām al-Mu'ayyad bi'llāh Muḥammad [q.v.], at *Shahāra* in *Radjab* 1054/September 1644, was challenged by three other aspirants, most seriously by his older brother, Abu Ṭālib Aḥmad b. al-Kāsim (1007-66/1598-1656). Despite some initial regional support for the latter, Ismā'īl's claim ultimately won acceptance among the *'ulamā'*, owing to broad recognition of his predilection for scholarship and his knowledge of the principles of Zaydī governance. Once the succession had been resolved after at least one test of arms (1055/1645), the *imām's* family closed ranks behind him; his brother Aḥmad accepted to become his governor of the important northern city of Ṣa'da, while several nephews served him well as commanders.

Although Imām Ismā'īl lacked the martial qualities often associated with Zaydī *imāms*, it is nevertheless the case that in his time the *imām's* authority was carried to perhaps its widest extent ever in modern history. Most of this expansion occurred in the south and east, where successful campaigns were conducted against Aden and Lahj (1055/1645), al-Bayḍā' and Yāfi' (1065/1655), Ḥaḍramawt (1069-70/1659-60) and even Zufār in 'Uṣmān (1073/1662-3). In these and other military operations the *imām's* principal commander was his nephew and successor, Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Kāsim [see AL-MAHDĪ LI-DĪN ALLĀH AḤMAD].

Imām Ismā'īl died on 5 *Djumādā* II 1087/15 August 1676 at *Djabal Dawrān*, south of Ṣan'a', to where he had transferred the *imām's* residence from *Shahāra* in the north. Essentially a scholarly and religious personality who preferred the company of the *'ulamā'*, he composed numerous works on Zaydī jurisprudence and dogma, of which at least 23 have been identified as extant (al-Ḥibshī, *Mu'allafāt*, 140-3). Reflecting this personal preoccupation with religious concerns were his dispatch of an unsuccessful mission to convert the emperor of Abyssinia to Islam (1057/1647) and his revival of the office of *amir al-ḥajj* for Yemen, a position which had not been filled since before the expulsion of the Ottoman Turks in 1045/1635.

**Bibliography:** 1. Unpublished sources. An unpublished partial biography covering the years 1056-72/1646-62 is that by *Djurmūzī* (d. 1077/1666-7), *Tuḥfat al-asma' wa 'l-ahsā'*. Other ms. sources include Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn (d. ca. 1100/1689), *Bahḡat al-zaman*, the continuation to an earlier work (*Anbā' al-zaman*) chronicling events in Yemen between 1046/1636-7 and 1099/1687-8; the *Sīrat al-Manṣūr bi'llāh al-Kāsim*, a work of unidentified authorship described as a history of Yemen 985-1085/1577-1674 (A. Sayyid, *Maṣādir ta'rikh al-Yaman*, Cairo 1974, 332); al-Ḥasanī (d. 1104/1692-3), *Takmilat Kitāb al-ifāda*; 'Amir b. Muḥammad al-Raḥīd (d. 1135/1722-3), *Bughyat al-murīd*.

2. Useful published accounts are Ibn al-Wazīr (d. 1147/1734-5), *Ṭabaḡ al-halwā*, ed. *Djāzim*, Ṣan'a' 1405/1985, a general chronicle focussing on events in Yemen 1045-90/1635-79; Muḥibbī, *Khulāṣat al-aḥṣar*, Cairo 1284/1867-8, i, 411-16, iv, 122 f.; Aḥmed Rāshid, *Tārikh-i Yemen*, Istanbul 1291/1874-5, i, 258 f.; Wüstenfeld, *Jemen*, Göttingen 1884, 63-71; Zabāra, *Ithāf al-muhtadīn*, Ṣan'a' 1343/1924-5, 82; *Shawkānī*, *al-Badr al-īlālī*, Cairo 1348/1929-30, i, 146-9; 'Arshī, *Bulūgh al-marām*, ed. al-Karmalī, Cairo 1939, 67 f.; *Djuraḥī*, *al-Mukhtaṣaf*, Cairo 1951, 156-66; Kaḥḥāla, *Muḥḍam al-mu'allifīn*, Damascus 1957-61, ii, 287; Bayḥānī, *Ashī'at al-anwār*, Cairo 1391/1971-2, ii, 246-51; *Hibshī*, *Mu'allafāt ḥukkām al-Yaman*, Wiesbaden

1979, 139-43; R.G. Serjeant and R. Lewcock (eds.), *Ṣan'a', an Arabian Islamic city*, London 1983, 80-2. (J.R. BLACKBURN)

AL-MUTAWAKKIL 'ALĀ 'LLĀH, *SHARAF* AL-DĪN YAḤYĀ B. SHAMS AL-DĪN B. AL-IMĀM AL-MAHDĪ AḤMĀD, 10th/16th century Zaydī *imām* in whose time the Ottoman Turks first became established in Yemen.

Born in northwestern Yemen on 27 *Ramaḍān* 877/25 February 1473, *Sharaf* al-Dīn announced his claim (*da'wa*) to the imāmate during *Djumādā* I 912/September 1506, after years of study to achieve the necessary recognition as a Zaydī *mudhiḥid*. It was another three decades (ca. 941/1535), however, before he was able to impose his religious and political authority upon the majority of Zaydī communities, particularly upon the rival northern tribal confederations of the Āl al-Maḥmūd (Āl Ḥamza) and Āl al-Mu'ayyad. Aided by his sons, principally the eldest, al-Muṭahhar [q.v.], a proven commander, Imām *Sharaf* al-Dīn succeeded in reuniting the Zaydīs and in restoring the ascendancy of the imāmate after a protracted period of weakness. He further regained for the Zaydīs control over much of the southern highlands and of the northern Tihāma from a succession of pretenders to the Sunnī Ṭāhirid sultanate (ca. 858-923/1454-1517 [see ṬĀHIRIDS]), and from the Egyptian Mamlūks based in the southern Tihāma since 922/1516. Subsequently, he contained for eight years the tiny Ottoman *sandjakbeyilik* established by *Khādīm* Süleymān Paṣṣa at Zabīd in 945/1539 (and shortly elevated in status to a *beylerbeyilik*).

At the close of 953 or the beginning of 954/February or March 1547, Imām *Sharaf* al-Dīn, who forever favoured religious and scholarly pursuits to attending to administrative demands, lost *de facto* control of the imāmate to al-Muṭahhar. Following his deposition at a time when the Zaydīs, threatened by an Ottoman thrust into the interior, needed a general more than a jurist as their leader, *Sharaf* al-Dīn went into forced retirement. Stripped of power, but not of influence, he remained opposed to al-Muṭahhar's leadership and ambivalent towards the Ottoman Turks. His death from plague occurred on 7 *Djumādā* II 965/27 March 1555 at *Zafir*, where he had proclaimed his imāmate half a century before. Despite his lifelong devotion to scholarship, none of his compositions concerned with the Zaydī rite achieved any lasting repute.

**Bibliography:** *Sharaf* al-Dīn's life was the subject of at least four biographies (*sīras*). The oldest, that by al-Zuraykī (d. 960/1553), goes only as far as 940/1533-4. Another, that by al-'Alafī, begins with the year of the *imām's* *da'wa* (912/1506). The remaining two were composed by Ibn Dā'ir (the father of the author of *al-Futūḥāt*, see below) and by *Djamāl* al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 1085/1674-5), *al-Sulūk al-dhābiyya*. Other ms. sources are Firūz (d. after 970/1562-3), *Maṭālī' al-nirān*; Ibn Dā'ir (d. after 1010/1601-2), *al-Futūḥāt*; al-Mawza'ī (d. after 1031/1622), *al-Iḥsān*; 'Isā b. Luṭf Allāh (d. 1048/1638; the *imām's* great-grandson), *Rawḥ al-rūḥ*; al-Sharafi (d. 1055/1645-6), *al-La'ālī al-muḍiyya*; al-Shillī (d. 1092/1681), *al-Sanā' al-bāḥir*; al-Ḥasanī (d. 1104/1692-3), *Takmilat al-ifāda*; and al-Shahārī (d. 1153/1740-1), *Ṭabaḡāt al-Zaydiyya*.

Two printed sources of primary value are *Nahrawālī* (d. 990/1582), *al-Barḡ al-Yamānī = Ghāzawāt al-Djārākisa*, ed. al-Djāsir, Riyad 1967, 60-8, and Yahyā b. al-Husayn (d. ca. 1100/1688), *Ghāyat al-amānī*, ed. 'Ashūr, Cairo 1968, ii, 634-717. Other printed sources include Aḥmed Rāshid,