

were begun but remained unfinished (Iskandar Munshī, *Tārīkh-i Ālamārā-yi 'abbāsī*, Tehran AHS 1334/1956, ii, 949-50, 959). Work was renewed under 'Abbās II, but again proved abortive as also were later projects. It was not until after the Second World War that the problem of feeding a growing population again brought the plan to divert the headwaters of the Kārūn into the Zāyanda-Rūd to the fore; it was accorded high priority in successive development plans. The diversion was finally accomplished in the 1950s and 1960s by means of a tunnel driven through the mountain ridge which forms the watershed between the Kārūn River and the Zāyanda-Rūd. Various plans were also put forward for the construction of storage reservoirs on the upper reaches of the river. Under the Third Development Plan (1962-8), a dam called the Shāh 'Abbās Great Dam, was constructed, having a height of 95 m and a storage capacity of 450 million m³, enabling (officially) 100,000 ha. to be irrigated in the Iṣfahān area and permitting the generation of 60,000 kw of electricity. By the time the Fourth Development Plan began, the dam was well established and the area it fed was gradually extended.

The basis of the division of the waters of the Zāyanda-Rūd is probably of great antiquity. The distribution in force in the mid-20th century went back at least to Ṣafawid times. The details are contained in a document known as *Shaykh Bahā'ī's tūmār*, which is (or was) held in the Department of Finance, Iṣfahān. Ibrāhīm Bāstānī Pārīzī mentions an edition published by the Department of Agriculture, Iṣfahān (*Sipāsāt wa iktisād-i 'asr-i Ṣafawī*, Tehran AHS 1348/1969-70, 89). The present writer has not been able to obtain a copy of this. The authorship and date of the *tūmār* are uncertain. The document contains the words "Written in the sealing office of the late Shāh Tahmāsp in 923/1517". This is clearly an anomaly. Shāh Tahmāsp did not ascend the throne until 930/1524; and *Shaykh Bahā'ī*, to whom the document is attributed, was not born until 953/1546-7. He became *ṣadr* of Iṣfahān under Shāh 'Abbās I and may have been responsible for a revision of the traditional regulation of the river water. Among other anomalies in the document there is mention of various *mādis* which had no share assigned to them in the original distribution. According to the *tūmār*, the water of the river was regulated in detail from the Kalla Bridge in Āydughmish to Warzāna in Rūydasht, having regard to the cropping needs of each *bulūk* or district [see *mā*]. 6. Irrigation in Iran, at Vol. V, 873-4].

The present writer was told by an official in the Department of Agriculture, Iṣfahān, in 1938 that the regulation of the river water as laid down in *Shaykh Bahā'ī's tūmār* had some years previously fallen into disuse but that in 1928-9 local people had requested that it be re-activated and, in due course, the system, with some modifications, was again brought into force. She was also told that a *mīrāb* was not invariably appointed and was not necessarily from among the *kadhkhudās* of *Djāy* as *Shaykh Bahā'ī's tūmār* had laid down; if he was appointed, his wages were fixed on a daily basis and paid locally. If no *mīrāb* was appointed, each *bulūk* sent a representative to oversee the division of the water within that *bulūk* when its turn came. Ibrāhīm Tahwīldār states that this was the case in 1877 (*Djughrāfiyā-yi Iṣfahān*, 128). The *mādisālār*s (those in charge of the major canals leading off from the river) were appointed locally and paid (in most cases) by the landowners. In recent years, with the increased flow of water after the construction of storage dams in the upper reaches of the river, major

modifications have been made in the distribution of water.

Bibliography: Given in the article, and see A.K.S. Lambton, *The regulation of the waters of the Zāyanda Rūd*, in *BSOS*, ix (1939), 663-73.

(ANN K.S. LAMBTON)

ZAYD B. 'ALĪ B. AL-ḤUSAYN, great-grandson of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib and Fāṭima and leader of the revolt that gave rise to the Zaydiyya [*q.v.*] branch of the *Shī'a*.

He was born in Medina in 75/694-5 according to his son al-Ḥusayn. This date seems more reliable than the year 79/698 or 80/699 usually mentioned by the *Sunnī* sources. He was thus at least 18 years younger than his brother Muḥammad al-Bākīr, who became the head of the Ḥusaynids after the death of their father 'Alī Zayn al-'Abidīn in 94/712-13 and was widely recognised as the *imām* by the *Shī'a*. Zayd's mother was a woman of slave origin from Sind named *Djāyda*, who is said to have been presented to his father by the *Shī'ī* rebel leader al-Mukhtār or was bought by the father. Zayd acquired a high standing in religious learning in his family and in Medina and is known to have transmitted from his father, his brother Muḥammad, Abān b. 'Uthmān, 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr and 'Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Rāfi'.

As head of the Ḥusaynids, his brother Muḥammad entrusted him with the litigation on their behalf in the long-standing dispute between the families of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn over the control of the endowments (*ṣadaqāt*) of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. The case was pursued before the Umayyad governors of Medina Ibrāhīm b. Hishām (106-14/724-32) and Khālīd b. 'Abd al-Malik (114-17/732-5). The Ḥasanids were at first represented by *Djā'far* b. al-Ḥasan and then by his brother 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan, who was in fact in control of the endowments after the death of his father. The case evidently involved the leadership of the descendants of Muḥammad through Fāṭima and thence their potential claim on the caliphate. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan, who harboured ambitions, at first for himself and later for his son Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya [see MUḤAMMAD B. 'ABD ALLĀH], is reported to have accused Zayd before the governor of aspiring to the caliphate although he, as the son of a non-Arab slave woman, was not qualified for it. When Zayd complained to his aunt Fāṭima bt. al-Ḥusayn, the mother of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan, about the insult to his mother, she encouraged him to answer by insulting herself. Zayd then took revenge by casting aspersions on his aunt's undignified conduct toward an earlier governor. As it became evident, however, that the governor Khālīd b. 'Abd al-Malik was using the dispute to discredit the Family of the Prophet in front of the public of Medina, Zayd broke off the litigation, assuring 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan that he would never again raise the case before the governor. Reports that the dispute was further pursued before the caliph Hishām do not seem to be reliable. According to another report, Zayd vainly tried to raise it before the caliph, who refused to receive him. A letter of Hishām to the governor Yūsuf b. 'Umar confirms, however, that Zayd was engaged in litigation against 'Umar b. al-Walīd, son of the caliph al-Walīd b. 'Abd al-Malik, before Hishām (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 682). No details are known about the case.

When Khālīd al-Kasrī was replaced as governor of 'Irāk by Yūsuf b. 'Umar in *Djumādā* I 120/May 738, he claimed, under torture by his successor, that Zayd and several other men of *Quraysh* were in possession

of deposits of his. According to some accounts, it was Khālīd's son Yazīd or his *ghulām* Tārīk who made the claim, but it must, in any case, have concerned deposits belonging to the deposed governor. Yūsuf b. 'Umar informed the caliph Hishām, who sent for the Kurashīs. That Zayd was already present at the caliph's court, as some reports state, is unlikely. All of the accused denied the claims against them. Hishām cleared them of suspicion but insisted on sending them to Yūsuf b. 'Umar in al-Ḥīra in order to confront them with their accuser. Zayd's son 'Isā was born in al-Ḥīra. As their accuser withdrew his charges, they were freed. While most of the Kurashīs returned to Ḥijāz, Zayd stayed in Kūfa together with the 'Abbāsīd Dāwūd b. 'Alī. The caliph now sent a letter to Yūsuf b. 'Umar instructing him to send Zayd forthwith to Ḥijāz and not to let him tarry. He had, so he wrote, observed Zayd in his dispute with 'Umar b. al-Walīd to be argumentative, loquacious, apt to forge and to distort in his discourse, and to beguile men by the sweetness of his tongue. If he were allowed to stay among the Kūfans, who believed in the superior religious status of his family, he would incite them to rebellion, thus splitting the Muslim community.

Yūsuf ordered his deputy in Kūfa, al-Ḥakam b. al-Ṣalt, to press Zayd to leave, but the latter, offering various excuses, remained four or five months in the town. When he left and reached al-Kādisiyya or al-Tha'labiyya, Kūfan Shī'īs caught up with him and urged him to return, promising him massive support. They said they hoped he would become the Manṣūr who would overthrow the Umayyad régime. Dāwūd b. 'Alī warned him of the fickleness of the Kūfans and continued on to Ḥijāz, but Zayd decided to return. He stayed secretly, moving from tribe to tribe, for over ten months, interrupted by a two months' visit to Baṣra. He married two women of the tribes of Sulaym and al-Azd in order to strengthen his ties with them. His summons to the people called for *jihād* against the wrongdoers, redress of grievances and support of the Family of the Prophet in general against their enemies. Twelve or fifteen thousand men are said to have pledged allegiance to him in Kūfa. He also sent his summons abroad and gained followers in the Sawād, in al-Madā'in, Baṣra, Wāsiṭ, Mawṣil, Upper Mesopotamia, Ray and Djurdjān. Support for him was nevertheless patchy. Some 'ulamā' actively backed him, but others, while offering sympathy, expressed doubts that the Kūfans would stand up for him. Abū Ḥanīfa is said to have sent him money but to have excused himself from fighting. The Banū Ḥāshim, 'Alids and 'Abbāsids, also failed to show solidarity, in part probably because of ambitions of others among them. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan is reported to have warned him in a letter of the well-known treachery of the Kūfans. Muḥammad al-Bākir's son Dja'far al-Ṣādiq is said to have advised his followers to pledge allegiance to Zayd. Most of them withdrew their backing, however, when Zayd refused to condemn the conduct of the early caliphs Abū Bakr and 'Umar. The sources stress this incident, describing it as the cause of the schism between the radical Imāmiyya and the moderate Zaydiyya.

As Zayd's presence in Kūfa was betrayed to Yūsuf b. 'Umar, he was forced to call the revolt before the date originally set. On Yūsuf's order, al-Ḥakam b. al-Ṣalt had summoned the Kūfan leaders and warriors to the great mosque and detained them under a guard of Syrian soldiers. Thus less than three hundred men followed Zayd's call to revolt, though the number then swelled to around a thousand. They were fought

mainly by a force of Syrians whom Yūsuf had brought to Kūfa. On the third day, Zayd was hit in the evening by an arrow penetrating his brain. He died when a physician or a cupper extracted it. Various dates are mentioned for his death. The most likely is Thursday, 2 Ṣafar 122/7 March 740. His followers sought to hide his body by burying him at night in a spot that they drenched with water. The location, however, was betrayed the next day, and his body was exhumed. His head was sent to Hishām in Damascus, who exhibited it and then sent it to Medina. His body was crucified on the Kunāsa in Kūfa and left there until after the death of Hishām some three years later, when his successor al-Walīd b. Yazīd ordered Yūsuf to burn it and scatter the ashes in the Euphrates. Revenge for Zayd became one of the slogans of the 'Abbāsīd revolution and, after its success, Hishām's remains were unearthed in Damascus, crucified and burned.

Zayd's activity as a scholar and his religious opinions are largely obscure. He was given the honorary title *ḥalīf al-Kur'ān* and numerous readings of his Kur'ān codex are cited in the Sunnī works on *kirā'āt*. They do not reflect a notable Shī'ī tendency (see A. Jeffery, *The Qur'ān readings of Zaid b. 'Alī*, in *RSO*, xvi [1936], 249-89, and *Further Qur'ān readings of Zaid b. 'Alī*, in *ibid.*, xviii [1940], 218-36). Zaydī tradition has preserved various theological treatises ascribed to him. These are too disparate in style and doctrinal positions to be the work of a single author and may mostly be seen to represent currents in the early Kūfan Zaydiyya. A compendium of religious law attributed to him was collected by the Zaydī Ibrāhīm b. al-Zibrikān (d. 183/799) on the basis of the transmission of the Kūfan Abū Khālīd al-Wāsiṭī who claimed to have heard it from Zayd while visiting Medina as a pilgrim in five years. The work, first published by E. Griffini as *Corpus Iuris di Zaid b. 'Alī* (Milan 1919), reflects Kūfan legal tradition and it is unlikely that Zayd had any significant part in it. Abū Khālīd also transmitted a commentary on the difficult (*gharīb*) words of the Kur'ān (ed. H.M. al-Taḳī al-Ḥakīm, Beirut 1992). In these texts, Zayd appears as an anti-Kadārī supporter of predestination and as upholding a moderately anti-anthropomorphic concept of God. This agrees with the views of the early Kūfan Zaydiyya. Late Zaydī tradition describes him as agreeing with Mu'tazilī teaching.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, v, 239-40; Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, ii, ed. M. al-Fardūs al-'Azm, Beirut 1996, 520-41; Ya'qūbī, 390-1; Tabarī, ii, 1667-88, 1698-1716; Mas'ūdī, *Murūj*, ed. Pellat, §§ 2220-25; Abū 'l-Faraḡ al-Iṣfahānī, *Makātil al-Talibiyyin*, ed. A. Ṣakr, Cairo 1949, 127-51; Abū Ṭālib al-Nāṭiq bi 'l-Ḥaqq, *al-Ifāda*, ed. M.Y.S. 'Izzān, Ṣan'ā' 1996, 61-7; C. van Arendonk, *Les débuts de l'imamat Zaidite au Yemen*, Leiden 1960, 28-33, 307-12; R. Strothmann, *Das Problem der literarischen Persönlichkeit Zaid b. 'Alī*, in *Isl.*, xiii (1923), 1-52; W. Madelung, *Der Imam al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm*, Berlin 1965, esp. 53-61; Sezgin, *GAS*, i, 552-60. (W. MADELUNG)

ZAYD B. 'AMR b. Nufayl, a so-called *ḥanīf* [*q.v.*] and "seeker after true religion", who lived in Mecca before Muḥammad's mission (though some pronounced him a Companion of the Prophet). In a major battle before Islam Zayd reportedly led the Kuraysh [*q.v.*] clan to which he belonged, the 'Adī b. Ka'b. The cycle of reports about him in Islamic historiography all but presents him as Muḥammad's precursor. Some scholars even went as far as declaring him a prophet who received revelations, and a