

Middle East: studies in social history, London 1982; Hanna Batatu, *The old social classes and the revolutionary movements of Iraq*, Princeton 1978; Musa Çadırcı, *Türkiye'de muhtarlık teşkilatının kurulması üzerine bir inceleme*, in *Belleten*, xxxiv (1970), 409-20; M.N. Danielson and Ruşen Keleş, *The politics of rapid urbanization: government and growth in modern Turkey*, New York 1985; C.H. Dodd, *Politics and government in Turkey*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1969; idem, *Democracy and development in Turkey*, Beverley, North Humberston, UK 1979; *Düstür*, first series, i, Istanbul 1289/1872; *Düstür*, second series, v, 1332/1914; A. Heidborn, *Manuel de droit public et administratif de l'Empire ottoman*, i, Vienna-Leipzig 1908; Kemal Karpat, *The Gecekondu: rural migration and urbanization*, Cambridge 1976; Reşat Kaynar, *Mustafa Reşit Paşa ve Tanzimat*, Ankara 1954; 'Uthmān Khālīl, *al-Tanzīm al-idārī fi 'l-duwal al-'Arabiyya*, Cairo 1957; H.-J. Kornumpf, *Die Territorialverwaltung im östlichen Teil der europäischen Türkei vom Erlass der Vilayetsordnung (1864) bis zum Berliner Kongress (1878) nach amtlichen osmanischen Veröffentlichungen*, Freiburg 1976; B. Lewis, *The emergence of modern Turkey*², London 1968; İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimattan cumhuriyete yerel yönetim geleneği*, Istanbul 1985; Mehmet Zeki Pakalın, *Osmanlı tarih deyimleri ve terimleri sözlüğü*, 3 vols., Istanbul 1971-2; J.S. Szyliowicz, *Political change in rural Turkey: Erdemli*, The Hague 1966; Sıddık Tümerkan, *Türkiye'de belediyeler (tarihi gelişim ve bugünkü durum)*, Istanbul 1946; İbrahim Yasa, *Hasanoğlu: socio-economic structure of a Turkish village*, Ankara 1957; G. Young, *Corps de droit ottoman*, i, Oxford 1905.

(C.V. FINDLEY)

AL-MUKHTĀR B. ABĪ 'UBAYD AL-THAKAFĪ, leader of a pro-'Alid movement which controlled al-Kūfa in 66-7/685-7. He claimed to be acting as the representative of the son of 'Alī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya [q.v.], and his movement is often classified as an early manifestation of extremist Shī'ism. This article, which draws mainly on the detailed narratives given by al-Ṭabarī, al-Balādhurī and Ibn A'ṭham al-Kūfī, concentrates on his life and involvement in the events of his time. For further discussion of the importance of al-Mukhtār's movement in the development of Muslim sectarianism, see KAYSĀNIYYA and KHASHABIYYA.

He is reported as being descended from the Thakafī clan of 'Awf b. Kāsī, one of the Aḥlāf Thakafī, and is said to have been born in A.D. 622. In 40/660-1, however, he is referred to as a "young man" (*ghulam shābb*) and it was suggested by Levi Della Vida that the birth year has been supplied by tradition to provide a parallel with that of his adversary 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.]. Al-Mukhtār's father having been killed at the battle of the Bridge [see p.158] in 13/634 in the early stages of the Arab advance into the Sāsānid empire, he was brought up by his uncle Sa'd b. Mas'ūd, who became governor of al-Madā'in under the caliph 'Alī.

Upon the death of 'Alī and Mu'āwiya's entry into al-Kūfa (40/660-1), it is reported, al-Mukhtār suggested to his uncle that he curry favour with the new authority, and thereby obtain security for himself, by handing over 'Alī's son al-Ḥasan who had been wounded near al-Madā'in and had taken refuge in the house of the governor there. This is said to lie behind the suspicion and hostility which many of the Shī'a felt towards him. According to al-Balādhurī's version, al-Mukhtār was regarded as an 'Uthmānī [see AL-'UTHMĀNIYYA] by the Shī'a. It could be that this story reflects al-Mukhtār's subsequently proclaimed sup-

port for Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya and the hostility towards him felt by the supporters of the descendants of 'Alī through Fātima. It may be noted that, although he himself is not generally portrayed as hostile to the Fātimid line of descent (revenge for al-Ḥusayn is said to have been at the centre of his propaganda), some of the sects associated with him regarded al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn as usurpers of the rights of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya [see KAYSĀNIYYA].

Although al-Mukhtār's subsequent opposition to Umayyad rule is signalled by the report of his refusal to testify to Ziyād b. Abīhi against Ḥudjir b. 'Adī [q.v.] in 51/671 and by that of his role in connection with the rising of Muslim b. 'Aqīl [q.v.] in al-Kūfa in 61/680, he was criticised by the supporters of the 'Alids for his weak behaviour in the affair of Muslim. We are told that Muslim, who had come to al-Kūfa to prepare the way for the appearance there of al-Ḥusayn, stayed in al-Mukhtār's house and the latter attempted to mobilise support for him. At the critical time, however, al-Mukhtār was away on his estate at Kḥuṭar-niya, failed to proclaim his support for Muslim, and tamely submitted to the Umayyad authorities. This apparently supine behaviour may perhaps be explained by the fact that Muslim had come out in revolt earlier than had previously been agreed upon and it is hardly consistent with the harshness of the Umayyad governor's reported behaviour towards al-Mukhtār after he had submitted to him. In spite of his denial of any involvement with Muslim, and of the intercession of a number of influential men, al-Mukhtār is said to have been imprisoned and wounded in the eye by a blow from the enraged governor, 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād.

Kept in prison until after the death of al-Ḥusayn at Karbalā' (10 Muḥarram 61/10 October 680), he is said to have been released through the intercession of his brother-in-law, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar, who persuaded the caliph Yazīd I to order Ibn Ziyād to let him go. Thereupon he left for the Ḥijāz, where 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, in Mecca, was publicly proclaiming his opposition to Yazīd's caliphate. Al-Mukhtār is said to have offered to give the bay'a to Ibn al-Zubayr in exchange for a prominent position in his movement, but Ibn al-Zubayr insisted that he would only accept the bay'a from him on the same terms as he was taking it from others. At one point al-Mukhtār is reported to have left Mecca and stayed for several months in al-Tā'if, before returning and participating alongside Ibn al-Zubayr and others in the defence of Mecca against the Syrian army commanded by al-Ḥusayn b. Numayr [q.v.]. He is said to have fought bravely and prominently. After this he returned to al-Kūfa, of his own volition and intending to exploit the unsettled situation there, according to the detailed account reported from Abū Mikhnaḥ. There are, nevertheless, occasional indications that al-Mukhtār might have tried to make it appear that he was co-operating with Ibn al-Zubayr, and al-Mas'ūdi even reports that he was sent to al-Kūfa by Ibn al-Zubayr as his governor. That seems unlikely, but it is credible that al-Mukhtār would have tried to win support from as many quarters as possible and for as long as possible, narrowing his options only when necessary.

Al-Kūfa at this time (Ramaḍān 64/April-May 684) was the scene of the movement of the *Tawwābūn* [q.v.] led by Sulaymān b. Ṣurad, and Abū Mikhnaḥ's account tells us that al-Mukhtār began to compete with Ibn Ṣurad for leadership of the pro-'Alid party there. He claimed that he had been sent by the Imām the *mahdī*, he disparaged Ibn Ṣurad as lacking in military and political acumen, and he appealed for

support as the one most likely to achieve success. The town was under the dual authority of 'Abd Allāh b. Yazīd al-Khaṭmī and Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. Talḥa, both acting on behalf of Ibn al-Zubayr. Al-Mukhtār was only moderately successful in his propaganda and the majority of the 'Alid supporters still backed Ibn Ṣurad, although the latter blamed al-Mukhtār when much of the support he had been promised failed to materialise. Some of the *ashrāf*, nevertheless, are said to have seen al-Mukhtār as a greater threat than the *Tawwābūn* and they denounced him to the two governors. Again he was arrested and imprisoned, although al-Khaṭmī is shown as quite sympathetic to him.

It is possible that there is some confusion or duplication of the tradition here, for once again we are told that al-Mukhtār owed his release to 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar, who wrote to the two *amīrs* and persuaded them to let him go. While he was still in prison, however, the remnants of the defeated *Tawwābūn* returned to al-Kūfa from 'Ayn al-Warda (late 65/spring 685?), and he is reported to have contacted them and won their support. Evidently his imprisonment was something less than rigorous, for we are told that he was constantly visited by his supporters and could even afford to turn down their offer to release him. His eventual release, on the intercession of Ibn 'Umar, was conditional upon his taking an oath that he had no hostile intentions against the authorities, but he is shown as taking this oath in a cynical manner—if the greater good demanded that he should break his oath, he would do so and perform *kaffāra* [q.v.].

Ibn al-Zubayr replaced 'Abd Allāh b. Yazīd and Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad over al-Kūfa and sent 'Abd Allāh b. Muṭī' in their stead. His arrival in the town is dated Ramaḍān 65/May 658. Opposition to Ibn Muṭī' on the part of some of the tribal notables was manifested on the occasion of his introductory *khuḍba*, when his favourable references to Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān were met with demands that he follow the *sīra* of 'Alī, and support for al-Mukhtār continued to grow. In what again may be a confusion or duplication of the tradition, we are told once more that he was denounced to the governor by some of the *ashrāf*, but this time he managed to avoid the arrest which Ibn Muṭī' planned for him by the simple expedient of feigning illness and so being unable to answer the governor's summons.

By this time al-Mukhtār seems to have been actively planning a revolt. At what stage and why he identified himself as the agent (*amīn* and *wazīr*) of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya is not clear. At one point, we are told, a group of his supporters who doubted the truth of his claims to be acting on behalf of Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya went to the latter to investigate the authenticity of the claim. He gave them an answer which to us seems somewhat less than clear, but it seems to have satisfied the doubters. Al-Mukhtār himself is portrayed as on tenterhooks, awaiting their return and fearing that the news they would bring would cause the desertion of a large body of his followers. When they appeared to confirm the veracity of his claim, his relief was great. As well as support for Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, al-Mukhtār is also reported to have called to the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet and to have appealed for vengeance for al-Ḥusayn and the other murdered members of 'Alī's family.

A decisive stage in the development of his movement was his winning the support of the Hamḍānī leader Ibrāhīm Ibn al-Aṣhtar al-Nakha'ī [q.v.]. The reports about this again indicate a certain amount of

duplicity on al-Mukhtār's part and, again, a recognition of this by the person being duped who, nevertheless, eventually threw his support behind the trickster. A key role in influencing Ibn al-Aṣhtar is ascribed to a letter purporting to have been sent to him from Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya but really written by al-Mukhtār himself. A number of al-Mukhtār's leading supporters testified on oath to the authenticity of the letter, but 'Amīr al-Sha'bī, who is cited by Abū Mikhnaḥ for this episode, did not testify. Ibn al-Aṣhtar himself understood what was going on, but, nevertheless, it did not prevent him from giving his allegiance to al-Mukhtār.

The revolt had originally been planned for Muḥarram 66/August 685. This was then changed to 14 Rabī' I 66/19 October 685, but it seems to have been precipitated a day earlier by an incident in which Ibn al-Aṣhtar killed the chief of Ibn Muṭī's *shurṭa*, Iyās b. Muḍārib. The battle cry of al-Mukhtār and his men is given as "Vengeance for al-Ḥusayn!" and *yā Manṣūr amī!* This last phrase was subsequently to be used by the Hāshimiyya at the end of the Umayyad period. Ibn al-Aṣhtar led the fighting on behalf of al-Mukhtār, while prominent among Ibn Muṭī's commanders were Shabath b. Rib'ī of Tamīm and Rāshid b. Iyās b. Muḍārib of Bakr. The death of the latter in the fighting seems to have marked a turning point.

The names given of those involved in the fighting on both sides are almost invariably of leading Arabs. Some of the *ashrāf* remained loyal to Ibn Muṭī' while others supported al-Mukhtār. The opposition to Ibn Muṭī' from some of the Kūfan *ashrāf* is expressed in their statements of loyalty to the memory of 'Alī and their demands of vengeance for al-Ḥusayn, but it is open to question whether their revolt was primarily a pro-'Alid movement. The version of the Abū Mikhnaḥ tradition which appears in Ibn Aṭṭam al-Kūfī does tend to portray it in that way, but al-Ṭabari's version of that tradition seems more ambiguous. It may be that the emphasis on support for Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya became more pronounced after the defeat of Ibn Muṭī' but that the tradition anticipates this development. An economic interest is hinted at when Ibn Muṭī' promised not to collect the surplus *fay* [q.v.] without the Kūfans' (i.e., the Arab warriors') consent, but it may be that resentment about this had already developed to such an extent that it could not easily be defused.

Al-Mukhtār is shown as conducting his propaganda in a type of rhyming prose which is grandiloquent and obscure at the same time and is, presumably, intended to convey a claim to some sort of inspiration. Some of the concepts which he used, such as that of the *maḥdī* [q.v.], which were to become so important in pro-'Alid movements, also occur in the propaganda of the *Tawwābūn*, but they seem to receive more prominence and to be developed further in Mukhtār's movement [see AL-MAHDĪ].

Although they are rarely referred to explicitly or by name in the accounts of the fighting, it seems that al-Mukhtār's forces included a significant number of non-Arab *mawālī*, presumably prisoners of war and renegades from the time of the conquests and their descendants. At one point Shabath b. Rib'ī attempted to rally his men by accusing them of fleeing from their slaves, and the story is told of Shabath killing a *mawla* but sparing an Arab of the Banū Ḥanīfa among the prisoners he had taken. In an address to his men, Ibn Muṭī' warned that if they lost they would have to allow a share in the *fay* to those who had no right to it, and he told them that he had heard that al-Mukhtār's forces included "500 of your freed slaves

(*muḥarrarikum*)" under a commander of their own. He continued, "If they increase in number it can only mean the passing away of your power and authority and the alteration of your religion."

The fighting occupied some days. Eventually Ibn Muṭīf and his supporters took refuge in the *kaṣr* of al-Kūfa and were besieged there for three days before the governor, accepting the advice of *Shabath* b. Rib'ī and others, escaped by night, while *Shabath* and the others obtained a safe conduct from Ibn al-Aṣhtar and surrendered. Al-Mukhtār entered the *kaṣr* and next day took the *bay'a* from the *ashraf* and others. The *bay'a* is said to have been given on "the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet, seeking vengeance for the blood of the family, waging *djihād* against the violators of God's law (*al-muḥillīn* [q.v.]), protecting the weak (*al-du'afā'*), and mutual support in peace and war".

Al-Mukhtār then appointed governors over the territories dependent on al-Kūfa: Armenia, *Ādhar-bāyḍjān*, al-Mawṣil, al-Madā'in, *Bihkubādih* (Upper, Middle and Lower), and *Hulwān*. The previous governor of al-Mawṣil on behalf of Ibn al-Zubayr, Muḥammad b. al-Ash'ath al-Kindī [q.v.], fled to Takrīt but eventually came to al-Kūfa and submitted to al-Mukhtār. Baṣra and its territories remained under Zubayrid control in spite of an attempt by one of al-Mukhtār's supporters to win the town over for him. Command of the *shurṭa* in al-Kūfa was given to an Arab of *Hamdān*, but, significantly, we are also informed that al-Mukhtār had his own personal guard (*ḥaras*) of *mawālī* led by a *mawlā*, *Kaysān* Abū 'Amra [q.v.]. Sometimes we find the expression *shurṭat Allāh*, apparently as a designation for al-Mukhtār's active supporters in general.

Antagonism between the different groups in al-Kūfa remained, however, and eventually resulted in conflict. Some of the *ashraf* took advantage of rumours of a defeat of al-Mukhtār's army in Mesopotamia and of the advance of a Syrian army under 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād on al-Kūfa to begin a revolt. They were mainly previous supporters of Ibn Muṭīf, although mention is also made of at least one previous adherent of al-Mukhtār and of a supporter of the 'Alids who had come from Baṣra attracted by the idea of revenge for al-Husayn. *Shabath* b. Rib'ī and Muḥammad b. al-Ash'ath are named among the leaders. The complaints of the rebels centred on what they saw as al-Mukhtār's too favourable attitude to the *mawālī*, his making them recipients of *fay'*, and his freeing of the slaves of Arabs (for inclusion in his own force of non-Arabs). They also denied the truth of his claim to represent Ibn al-Hanafīyya.

While Ibn al-Aṣhtar was away on campaign in the north, al-Mukhtār was forced to temporise with the rebels, but when, having been called back, Ibn al-Aṣhtar arrived in al-Kūfa, he was able to crush them in fighting which centred on the *Djabbānat al-Sabīf*. Many of the defeated leaders, including *Shabath* and Ibn al-Ash'ath, escaped by fleeing to Baṣra, where they took refuge with Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubayr. The fighting at *Djabbānat al-Sabīf* is dated to 23 or 24 *Dhu 'l-Hijja* 66/21 or 22 July 686.

The victory over the dissident *ashraf* was the opportunity for a purge to be carried out in al-Kūfa. Several men who had been, or were alleged to have been, involved in the killing of al-Husayn and his family at Karbalā' were seized and killed, the most prominent of them being 'Umar b. Sa'd b. Abī Wakkaṣ in spite of a written promise of safe conduct which he had obtained from al-Mukhtār. As well as a means of liquidating possible sources of hostility in al-Kūfa, the

purge was used by al-Mukhtār to demonstrate his loyalty to Ibn al-Hanafīyya, to whom the heads of some of those slain were sent. Ibn al-Hanafīyya's attitude to his self-proclaimed *wazīr* and *amin* seems, however, to have remained distant and non-committal. He is said to have been willing to accept help from al-Mukhtār in the form of money and men when the latter sent the *Khashabiyya* to Mecca to deliver the *mahdī* from the confinement in which Ibn al-Zubayr had put him. But, having been released by the coming of the *Khashabiyya*, he proved unwilling to go to al-Kūfa to join the man who claimed to be his representative and he retired, instead, to al-Ṭā'if.

Following the defeat of the rebellion in al-Kūfa, Ibn al-Aṣhtar was again sent to the north to meet the Syrian army which, with 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād by now having established some control in Mesopotamia, was marching south to attack al-Kūfa. At the battle on the river *Khāzīr* [q.v.] near Mawṣil, al-Mukhtār's army defeated that of the Syrians, and 'Ubayd Allāh, who is portrayed in the tradition as the man ultimately responsible for the killing of al-Husayn at Karbalā', was killed along with many others. Tradition often dates the battle to the very anniversary of Karbalā', 10 Muḥarram 67/6 August 686.

In the accounts of al-Mukhtār's seizure of power and his domination of al-Kūfa, there are frequent references to ideas and practices which would appear to be invalid from a later Sunnī or *Shī'ī* point of view. Not only are there the many allusions to the belief in Ibn al-Hanafīyya as the *mahdī*, but there is at least one tradition which seems to indicate that al-Mukhtār himself was regarded as *ma'sūm* (whatever that might mean in this context [see 'iṣmā]) by some of his followers, and other reports which say that he claimed to be visited by the angels Gabriel and Michael. In the prelude to the battle on the *Khāzīr* we find various stories concerning an empty chair which some of al-Mukhtār's partisans transported on a mule and venerated in the manner, we are told, of the Israelites and the Ark of the Covenant (*al-tābūt*) or, more derogatively, the Golden Calf. In the way in which this information is presented, some of it could be dismissed as an attempt to portray al-Mukhtār as a trickster and his followers as credulous "extremists". However, taken together, such reports convey the impression that the movement led by al-Mukhtār was one with distinctive but not easily analysable religious ideas. Presumably, in preparing the way for the coming of the *mahdī*, al-Mukhtār and his followers saw themselves in an apocalyptic role, and this view of his movement was shared by the contemporary Christian Syriac writer, John of Phenck (Bar Penkaya), who saw the rise of the ethnically diverse *shurṭa* as an act of God intended to overthrow the rule of the Ishmaelites and usher in the end of time.

Following the great victory on the *Khāzīr*, the collapse of al-Mukhtār's power seems to have been remarkably swift. Incited by the *ashraf* who had fled to Baṣra, and taking advantage of an apparent estrangement between al-Mukhtār and Ibn al-Aṣhtar who now remained in Mawṣil, the governor of Baṣra, Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubayr, launched an attack on al-Kūfa. The Baṣran forces were led by al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra [q.v.] who had proved so effective in combatting the *Khāridjites*, and he achieved a major victory over al-Mukhtār's army at al-Maḍhār on the Tigris. This was probably in the late summer of 686. The advantage gained there was pressed home and al-Mukhtār's forces were subsequently virtually destroyed at *Harūrā'*, al-Mukhtār himself being forced to take

refuge in the *kaṣr* of al-Kūfa. There he was besieged for some months and deserted by most of his followers. Eventually he and a handful of remaining supporters came out to fight and he was killed. His hand was cut off and hung at the gate of the mosque, one of his wives who refused to condemn him as an impostor was executed, and many of his followers were slaughtered by the victorious Zubayrid authorities and the returning *aṣhrāf*. The most generally accepted date for al-Mukhtār's death is 14 Ramaḍān 67/3 April 687, but variants are given in the sources.

Questions about sincerity and motives are probably unanswerable, and any general interpretation of al-Mukhtār and his movement is difficult, given the nature of the source material. The importance of the man and the movement seems to lie in three main areas, however. In the first place, it seems clear that this was the first episode since the establishment of Arab rule in which the *mawālī* played a decisive role. One must distinguish between the nature of these *mawālī* and those who were to become a problem later for the Umayyad caliphate, and one should not portray the support for al-Mukhtār as coming only from them. But that they constituted a major and distinctive element in the movement which he led seems clear and confirmed by the witness of Bar Penkaya. Secondly, there appear to be links between, on the one hand, the movement led by al-Mukhtār and, on the other, the Hāshimīyya which was eventually to overthrow the Umayyad caliphate. These links consist in the fact that the 'Abbāsids claimed to have inherited the imāmate from a son of Ibn al-Hanafiyya, Abū Hāshim [q.v.], who had the support of a part of the movement which al-Mukhtār had led and which survived his death, and they are evident in the use by the Hāshimīyya of some of the same ideas and terminology which occur in the sources in the accounts of al-Mukhtār's career. Finally, it seems that it was among the supporters of al-Mukhtār that some of the ideas which were to become regarded as typical of Shī'ī Islam, and not only in its "extremist" (*ghuluww*) forms, were first manifested. There has sometimes been a tendency to regard this as the result of the corruption of a pure Islam by the influence of the non-Arabs from diverse religious and cultural backgrounds, but this begs many questions about the nature of Islam before the time of al-Mukhtār. Perhaps one can say, however, that his movement was an important part of the background from which a more clearly definable "classical" Islam would eventually emerge.

Bibliography: The most detailed historical sources for al-Mukhtār are Ṭabarī, ii, 520-37, 598-695, 699-750 and index; Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-aṣhrāf*, v, Jerusalem 1936, 214-73; and Ibn A'ṭham al-Kūfī, *Kitāb al-Futūḥ*, vi, Haydarābād 1972, 53-8, 73-6, 87-200. For other sources in Arabic, see Caetani, *Chronographia islamica*, 64AH §13, 65AH §6, 66AH §5-7, 9-12, and 67AH §§ 2, 4, 42, and the secondary literature given below. For references in the heresiographical literature, see the articles KAYSĀNIYYA and KHAṢHĀBIYYA and Wadād al-Kāḍī, *al-Kaysāniyya fi 'l-ta'riḫ wa 'l-adab*, Beirut 1974. For a translation of the contemporary references by Bar Penkaya, see S.P. Brock, *North Mesopotamia in the late seventh century. Book xv of John Bar Penkāyē's Riš Mellē*, in *JSAI*, ix (1987), esp. 63-67, 73. H.D. van Gelder, *Muhtār de valsche Propheet*, Leiden 1888; G. van Vloten, *Recherches sur la domination arabe, le Chiiisme*, etc., Amsterdam 1894, 38 ff.; J. Wellhausen, *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien*

im alten Islam, Berlin 1901, 74-89 (Eng. tr., *The religio-political factions in early Islam*, Oxford 1975); W.M. Watt, *Shi'ism under the Umayyads*, in *JRAS* (1960), esp. 162-5; 'Alī Ḥusnī al-Kharbūṭlī, *al-Mukhtār al-Thakafī mir'at al-ṣaṣr al-umawī*, Cairo 1963; K.A. Fariq, *The story of an Arab diplomat*, New Delhi 1967; 'Abd al-Ameer 'Abd Dixon, *The Umayyad caliphate 65-86/684-705 (a political study)*, London 1971, 25-82; G. Rotter, *Die Umayyaden und der zweite Bürgerkrieg (680-692)*, Wiesbaden 1982, 93-106, 187-92, 217-18; M. Fishbein, *The life of al-Mukhtār b. Abī 'Ubayd in some early Arabic historians*, Ph.D. thesis, UCLA 1988, unpubl.

(G.R. HAWTING)

AL-MUKHTĀR B. 'AWF AL-AZDĪ, Kharijite agitator, also well-known by his kunya ABŪ HAMZA.

A native of Baṣra, he carried out part of his activity in Mecca, where he used to go in order to stir up revolt against the Umayyad caliph Marwān II b. Muḥammad [q.v.]. At the instance of Abū 'Ubayda Muslim b. Abī Karima, alias Karzīn, a traditionist who was the leader of the Ibādīs of Baṣra, he became, from 128/745-6 onwards, a supporter of 'Abd Allāh b. Yahyā, surnamed Ṭālib al-Ḥaḳḳ [q.v.], whom he met in Mecca, followed to Ḥaḍramawt and recognised as *Imām*. When the latter decided to occupy the Holy Cities, he sent to the north an army of a thousand men commanded by Abū Ḥamza. The sequence of events is not clearly established, but it seems that the rebel occupied Mecca easily by taking advantage of the ceremonies of the pilgrimage (129/August 747). It was in these circumstances that he pronounced a famous *khutba* in which he summarised, according to the Kharijite perspective, the history of the beginnings of Islam, made an apology for the Prophet and the first three caliphs, showed himself rather tepid with regard to 'Alī, then attacked violently the Umayyads and Shī'īs before eulogising his own companions (see al-Djāhīz, *Bayān*, ii, 122-5, who calls him Yahyā b. al-Mukhtār; cf. al-Ṭabarī, ii, 2009; the *Aghānī*, ed. Beirut, xxiii, 135-9, places this *khutba* in Medina and, in comparison with the *Bayān*, gives an appreciably different text of it, which was translated by G. van Vloten, *Recherches sur la domination arabe, in Verhandelingen der Kon. Akad. van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam* (1874), app. iv, 75-8, and reproduced notably by Ibn Abī'l-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ Nahḍ al-balāgha*, i, 456; the version of the *Bayān* was translated by Ch. Pellat, *Milieu*, 212-13; the *Aghānī*, xxiii, 130-4, contains further sermons of Abū Ḥamza).

Once master of Mecca, Abū Ḥamza dispatched one of his lieutenants, Baldj b. 'Uḳba al-Azdī, to Medina, which he eventually seized. It is probably at this time that Abū Ḥamza pronounced at least one of the *khutbas* which the *Aghānī* ascribes to him. Marwān II was not slow to send a strong army of Syrians, under the command of 'Abd al-Malik b. Muḥammad b. 'Aṭīyya al-Sa'dī, who encountered the rebel troops in the Wādī 'l-Kurā and cut them to pieces (Djumādā I 130/January 748); Baldj remained on the field of battle. As for Abū Ḥamza, he moved to confront Ibn 'Aṭīyya, was killed and hung on the gallows, while his head was sent to Marwān II b. Muḥammad.

Bibliography: Djāhīz, *Bayān*, ii, 122-5; Ṭabarī, ii, 1981-3, 2006-14; Ibn Kutayba, *Ma'ārif*, 108, 224, 589; Ṭabarī, ii, 2009 and index; Maṣ'ūdī, *Murūdj*, §§ 1994, 2205, 2290, 3640; Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, *ʿIkḍ*, ii, 393-5; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, iii, 285-6, 297-8; *Aghānī*, ed. Beirut, xxiii, 115, 130 ff.; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, v, 267, 285-6, 297-300, 308; Ibn Abī'l-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ Nahḍ al-balāgha*, i, 455 f.; Pellat,