

²⁹ For the conquest of Georgia and the stratagem involved in the capture of Tiflis see; Cambridge History of Iran, vol. IV, p. 328.

³⁰ Summarized in M. Minovi's introduction cited above. Or see Corbin, *La philosophie shi'ite*, Bib. Iranienne 16, Paris 1969. Also Meier, introduction to Die Fawā'id..., also cited above.

³¹ F. 6a.

³² F. 9b.

³³ F. 8b.

³⁴ Ibid.

Bogdan SKŁADANEK

ELEMENTS OF CHRONOLOGY
OF THE KHĀRIJITE INSURRECTION OF ḤAMZIYYA IN SĪSTĀN
(8-th — 9-th CENTURY). ITS OUTBREAK AND FALL

For many years, under the three 'Abbāsīd caliphs: Ḥārūn al-Rashīd and his two successors: al-Amīn and al-Ma'mūn, south-eastern Persia was the field of activity of insurgents belonging to the khārijite sect of ḥamziyya, called thus by later Moslem theologians after Ḥamza ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Khārījī¹, its founder, leader and ideologist. Though if considered in terms of the whole nation the insurrection of Ḥamza was an event of lesser importance in the period when almost the whole caliphate was shaken by anticaliphate and anti-Arab risings, it had an unquestionable influence upon the subsequent events in Persia in the 9-th century, especially on the establishing of the Ṣaffārids' state, being the first independent state in Moslem Persia. It left also an indelible imprint upon Persian literary and religious tradition².

Nowwithstanding the considerable importance the insurrection of Ḥamza had for the studies concerning the restoration of the sovereign state rule in Persia, lost by this country in the result of the Arab invasion, the topic had not been researched thoroughly yet. This particular situation results from incompleteness of the records, certain divergence of opinion on the subject in Persian and Arab sources, as well as from the fact that the insurrection took place not in the central territories but in the eastern borderland. The date of its outbreak is unknown and the time of its fall has not been determined even approximately.

According to Ṭabarī, Ibn al-Athīr and Baghdādī the insurrection led by Ḥamza al-Khārījī broke out in Khorāsān in 179/795³ yet in the chronicle dealing with the history of Sīstān we find a later date, namely 181 A. H. After converting it into 798 A. D. a Soviet historian A. Yakubovskiy recognized it as the date of the outbreak of the insurrection. He linked this fact causally with the then two years' period, during which Khorāsān was administered by 'Alī ibn 'Īsā favoured by Hārūn al-Rashīd against the opinion of several persons⁴. Arithmetic preponderance of the earlier date cannot be treated as an argument settling this dilemma. Besides quotations from the already mentioned Ṭabarī or Ibn al-Athīr will not solve this contradiction as Ṭabarī contained the information on the outbreak of the ḥamziyya insurrection in a single sentence, and the works of Ibn al-Athīr and Baghdādī are later compilations and in this particular case, the secondary sources. Ṭabarī who was as a matter of fact nearly a contemporary of the discussed events, allotted to the insurrection as much space as was necessary for the description of the caliphate history. In proportion it was not much but even then he gave some unprecise and sometimes incorrect data. In this situation we must rely almost entirely on the local chronicles as close as possible to the discussed period and events.

As the *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* informs the first battle between the caliphate forces and the ḥamziyya insurgents was fought on a Friday in shawwāl 181 A. H.⁵ which corresponds to one of the four dates of our era: November 29-th, December 6-th, December 13-th, December 20-th. Even at this stage of our considerations we can ascertain that the date 798 mentioned earlier as the beginning of the disturbances is too late. Let us consider though more carefully the context of this bit of information.

In this part of the chronicle, a short piece of information about the battle of 181/797 is preceded by a few sentences about the birth of Ḥamza, his quarrel with an amīl in Bādghēs, the flight from persecutions, and finally, the return to Sīstān

with group of the survivors of the kharijite insurrection in 'Irāq led by Qaṭarī ibn al-Fuja'a. The chronicler placed the description of Ḥamza's first deeds immediately after the information about a new governor's arrival in Sīstān which occurred early in 180 A. H.⁶ This year began on March 16-th 796 A. D. Such succession of events in the chronicle explicitly shows that at that point the chronological order in its arrangement was broken as not only the birth of Ḥamza which is obvious but also the whole cycle of the two years' period between 180/796 and the year of the first battle in 181/797. First, when starting a quarrel with an amīl, Ḥamza already had to be a leader of some group. Taking flight from the amīl, Ḥamza was a well known person, though in a comparatively narrow circle, exercising certain charisma and possessing a suitable, even if slight organizing experience.

Unless he satisfied these conditions he would not be able to draw the survivors of the Qaṭarī insurrection to his side, bring them to Sīstān, and besides to take over during these two years the leadership of the powerful khārījite movement in Sīstān, comprising at that time 5 thousand men⁷. The supposition that the period from the emergence of Ḥamza as the insurgents' leader till the day of the open battle with the caliphate forces could not be very brief is justified, as what Ḥamza achieved, i.e. gaining ascendancy needs both time and experience, and two years are not enough for it.

As because of the unprecise construction of this fragment from the *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* we cannot determine anything definite through negative hypotheses let us turn to another chronicle, namely the *Zain al-akhbār* by Gardēzī. Gardēzī was well informed about the insurrection though he imparted his knowledge in a rather chaotic way. He mentions Ḥamza for the first time in a chapter dealing with the period during which the eastern territories of the caliphate were administered by Manṣūr ibn Yazīd⁸. Manṣūr was appointed to that post on dh'l-ḥijja 16-th 179⁹ (March 1-st 796) and he arrived in Nēshāpūr, the governor's capital,

already in the same month¹⁰, that is before two weeks elapsed. We know neither the date of his dismissal nor the date of his successor's appointment. The latter, Ja'far ibn Yaḥyā ibn Khālid¹¹ is not mentioned by all the list of the governors of Khorāsān¹². These shortcomings of chronology decrease the accuracy in establishing the date of Ḥamza's appearance. The third governor was 'Alī ibn 'Ysā ibn Māhān, a popular, if negative character. Hārūn al-Rashīd appointed him to this post on jumādā II 2-nd 180 A. H. (August 13 796)¹³. The comparison of the two dates, of Manṣūr and 'Alī's appointment, shows that the first action of Ḥamza recorded by Gardēzī could occur between March 1-st and August 13-th. We cannot be much mistaken allotting one month for holding the office by Ja'far ibn Yaḥyā. Delimiting thus the period during which Manṣūr governed in Khorāsān, we close the time of Ḥamza's appearance on the political arena of Khorāsān with two dates: March 1-st and July 15-th 796 A. D.

Transferring this date to the pages of the *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* we decide that it can refer solely to Ḥamza's quarrel with the 'amīl. It is confirmed by another source. According to the *Zain al-akhbār*, Ḥamza had to take flight to Kōhistān after an incident there is no precise information about, which happened when Manṣūr was the governor, whereas the *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* informs that in this period roughly Ḥamza had to leave Sīstān and that he returned with the above mentioned partisans of Qaṭarī. As they were active in Sīstān it is possible they were also in the neighbouring Kōhistān¹⁴. Dīnawarī writes about a rebellion in Khorāsān in 180/ 795 including only a single detail. We learn from him that an 'amīl perished then in a successful attempt upon his life¹⁵. Though it is true we have not heard before about the official dying in the quarrel with Ḥamza, there are no reasons to question the validity of the information given by Dīnawarī. The fact of Ḥamza's flight is not only compatible with the 'amīl's assassination, but it is also a highly probable compliment. Such circumstances then as an attempt upon the 'amīl's life (struggle

against the caliphate fiscus was one of the principles of the ḥamziyya ideology), the place (Bādghēs can be considered a part of Khorāsān) and the time enable us to ascertain that these are the events in which Ḥamza participated.

Having decided that the beginning of the ḥamziyya armed movement falls between March 1-st and early July of 796, we cannot refer this to the establishing of the foundations of the sect itself, nor to the forming of the initial propositions of the theory propagated by Ḥamza. The theory was aimed at the reform of the teachings of a larger khārijite group of 'ajārīda. In its full form, such as we know from Shahrastānī ḥamziyya could be moulded in the course of its founder's activity and doubtless so it was. One can prove on the basis of some of its elements, especially those referring to social questions, that the ḥamziyya originated under the influence of political factors and some of its slogans were created in order to comply with the current situation in Sīstān. The very beginning then, the date of the first founders' meeting is impossible to determine at present, though aware of Ḥamza's energy and his indefatigability we can well presume it had not happened long before his first independent appearance. The decay of the sect as a military power and ideological factor has been either neglected or not presented clearly¹⁶. R. Rubinacci alone pronounces himself positively in favour of the year 195/810¹⁷ as the date of the suppression of the insurrection, but so far he remains isolated in his opinion. Rubinacci has not mentioned the date without reasons, yet there are several arguments against his judgment.

The first stage in the ḥamziyya history closed down ten years earlier. After this date the insurrection of Ḥamza does not return anymore to the pages of the chronicles concerned with the affairs of the whole caliphate. We read in these sources that in this year the caliph's troops defeated the khārijite forces but Ḥamza managed to escape at the head of a detachment of forty men, save himself from the slaughter and take refuge in the re-

gions of Kābul. Such authors as Tabarī, Ibn al-Athīr or Ya'qūbī (in Geography), do not mention ḥamziyya anymore, so one could judge that the insurrection fell. Besides it is certain that there were rumours of Ḥamza's death. It was reported that he was killed near Kābul reached by a chase set in pursuit of him. It is an example of confusing the details and linking them in wrong relationships, since the news of Ḥamza's death was premature. The leader was alive and the insurrection went on, though limited to the area of one province, i.e. Sīstān and becoming a local problem to be dealt with by the governors. Before, the ḥamziyya were active on a larger territory engaging greater forces of the enemy. After 185/801 the ḥamziyya organized only occasional raids and they could not remain for longer periods anywhere else besides Sīstān¹⁸. That is the main reason why the general histories of the caliphate ceased to deal with the problem. Local chronicles, on the other hand, such as the Zain al-akhbār or the Tārīkh-i Sīstān which naturally discussed historical details of Sīstān in a more precise way, are a good source of information, well depicting the decade 185-195/801-810. They demonstrate convincingly that in this period the ḥamziyya receded into the background of the political life in the eastern borderland of the caliphate. In the result of the defeat in 194/809 the ḥamziyya had to turn to the defensive¹⁹ and though it rose relatively quickly from the deepest depression under the leadership of a temporary successor of Ḥamza, Bū 'Aqīl²⁰, it never regained the same strength as before 194/809. The second severe blow then, breaking the movement down, though not destroying it completely was identified with bringing the case of Ḥamza to the end.

In the Wārīkh-i Sīstān the battle of 194/809 is not mentioned and this circumstance needs explaining as the chronicle is the main source of our knowledge of the insurrection. A closer analysis of the text justifies the supposition that a suitable piece of information, of an unknown length dealing with the battle lost by

the Khawārīj has been removed from the chronicle. The revising attempts have left a slight but discernible trace. Namely between the sentence informing about the death of Hārūn al-Rashīd wa kafa allāh al-mu'minina al-qitāl 'God protected the caliph against the battle', and the next one telling about planned reorganization of the ḥamziyya troops there in no coherence²¹. In Ḥamza's address quoted by the chronicle he announces the changes and refers to certain events that are not mentioned by the Tārīkh-i Sīstān at all. The events had to be of great importance, as they induced or even forced Ḥamza to divide his army into small units and to carry on the war by guerilla methods beyond the earlier fields of action. Thus we can interpret it as the announcement of a temporary retreat into distant desert regions. For the same unknown reasons the insurrection leader and the main ideologist announces his departure for the distant countries to flight the heathens and to rally the partisans²².

Such a basic reorganization, change in the methods of struggle, and the departure or rather the flight of Ḥamza could be caused only by a crushing defeat. If, as the Tārīkh-Sīstān maintains, the campaign under the leadership of the caliph was stopped because of his death, what would be the use of the above mentioned changes within the sect? The editor's endeavours aimed at hushing up the ḥamziyya failure are suggested by the figures given in the chronicle. They refer to the number of the insurgents troops before the war, at the moment of marching out and during the reorganization. Thirty thousand of desperadoes went to the war, yet only five thousand²³ were divided in units of five hundred each as a result of the reconstruction of the movement. What was the fate of the rest? It is obvious they perished.

The chronicler's rather elaborate suggestion what Hārūn al-Rashīd marched with the army to defeat and destroy Ḥamza is in my opinion a later forgery aimed at increasing the importance of the insurrection of Ḥamza in the eyes of posterity.

He is presented there as a paragon of virtue and we learn how intensely subjective the attitude is comparing it to the contrary hostile one maintained by Ibn Funduq towards Ḥamza and his subordinates. Similarly to the story about the relationship between the caliph and the rebel, the information (ibid., 169, V. 7) about Arab state machine ceased to function after the death of al-Rashīd in the Persian city of Tūs is no exact. It was just the other way round. In spite of the changes on the throne and the civil war the state administration was very efficient; it is proved for example by al-Ma'mūn's manouvre concerning the insurrection of Rāfi ibn Laith in Transoxania²⁴.

In 194/809 the insurgents were undoubtedly hit hard, yet to suppose this caused the fall of the insurrection would be a mistake. The compulsory emmigration of Ḥamza the reasons of which are unknown and the aims still unexplained lasted approximately six years. In 200/815 Ḥamza returns to Sīstān and takes over the leadership of the ḥamziyya. During the early years following Ḥamza's return the sect undergoes a short period of awakening, experiences the influx of fresh forces, but does not regain its former states among the Khawārij of Sīstān. Serious modifications occurred within the sect itself, caused partly by the changes in political relations in eastern Persia, mainly in Khorāsān and Transoxania. They consisted in the increasing drive towards political independence. The Khawārij are joined by a new local element. Those people were less ideologically involved in the khārijism than the Arab immigrants. The latter who were the backbone of the ḥamziyya up to 194/809 tended to treat the participation in the flights more as a religious dictate²⁵. Therefore in the period 195-205/810-820 two groups, a conservative and an innovatory one emerged within the ḥamziyya. Both fractions recognized the power of Ḥamza, who was able to keep both by himself accepting the social radicalism of the acts which was the concession to the conservatives, as well as plunders advertised by the newcomers²⁶. The change

in conduct limited the ḥamziyya influence making the sect many enemies. Yet this process reaching back to 194/809 did not develop immediately, and certainly it did not work quickly enough to cause either the sect's dissolution or its deterioration already in the next year.

On jumādā II 12-th 231 A.H. (August 28-th 828) dies Ḥamza ibn 'Abd Allāh holding the position of the leader of the sect till the end of his life. It is the sole unquestionable detail concerning his death. The Tārīkh-i Sīstān mentions the name of the place where Ḥamza perished, but the text of the chronicle is illegible in this fragment the name is distorted and therefore it cannot be identified²⁷. The Zain al-akhbār informs that Ḥamza was killed near Kābul, Balkhī on the other hand maintains that Ḥamza perished drowned in one of the wadī in Kermān which would prove that the tide of the deceased's luck turned completely, as it is extremely difficult to get drowned in Kermān, especially in August. According to Baghdādī though, Ḥamza was killed in the battle of Nēshāpūr as he wanted to regain Khorāsān some time after he had been driven away by Ṭāhir ibn Ḥusain²⁸. In this particular case the details are of secondary importance to us, whereas the fact of choosing a new leader of the sect on the day of Ḥamza's death is essential. He was Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn 'Umair al-Jāshānī²⁹. The immediate election explicitly shows that the ḥamziyya was not dissolved on the death of its founder, but on the contrary displayed at that very moment remarkable vitality. Soon Abū Ishāq left the ḥamziyya ranks³⁰. His renouncement faces us with a nother problem, i. e. how can we isolate the ḥamziyya from other khārijite groups mentioned in the Tārīkh-i Sīstān unless we assume that the whole khārijite movement in this province was united? Untill Ḥamza lived it was considerably simple. Though the chronicle does not employ the appellation "ḥamziyya" it introduces other terms, as "the Khawārij from the group of Ḥamza's partisans"³¹ which is sufficient to recognize that the ḥamziyya group is concerned. The case sets

complicated after the death of Ḥamza as the chronicler does not use this name anymore, we do not hear either about the men of Ḥamza or the khārījite group of Ḥamza, and no other name is introduced that would prove that we encounter the continuation of the ḥamziyya. If the affiliation of Abū Ishāq to the ḥamziyya is certain, there are certain doubt concerning his successor. We learn from the *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* that after Abū Ishāq's recoucement the Khawārij elected Abū 'Awf³² as a leader. But we do not know which sect is concerned. The context suggests the same group which Abū Ishāq had left, but context in chronicles such as the quoted one is not a certain proof.

A note sent in 247/861 by Ya'qūb ibn Laith to 'Ammār-i Khārījī, one of the leaders of the Sīstān Khawārij can be of some help here: Your previous activity consisted in this that Ḥamza ibn 'Abd Allāh never raided this country, nor did he any harm to the inhabitants of Sīstān. He struggled against the representatives of the caliphate power proclaiming: You do injustice! The ra'āyā of Sīstān were under his protection. Though the country was then ruled by the foreigners the inhabitants of Sīstān lived in peace thanks to his leadership. Later, under Abū Ishāq and Abū 'Awf countries of the heathen were raided. Now the situation is different. If you wish (Sīstān) prosperity relinquish the power of caliph, rise with your army and join us as we have rebelled in a good cause not to let anyone do harm to Sīstān. If God Most High helps us we shall increase the territory of Sīstān as much as we possible can. And if you do not like it, at least do not harm anyone in Sīstān but follow the path of the old Khawārij³³.

Ya'qūb appeals in his letter for unity and following the examples of the past. The general tone of the message implies that Ḥamza, Abū Ishāq and Abū 'Awf were well known and respected in Sīstān, at least in the khārījite circles to which Ya'qūb appeals. The first two certainly belonged to the ḥamziyya. The affiliation of the third is indicated both by the context of

the information about his being chosen as leader and his classification in the quoted letter.

Abū 'Awf, the new leader of the sect suffered numerous and painful defeats. After the battle of dhu'l-ḥijja 7-th 216 (January 15-th 832) the Khawārij had to retire to the city of Awq. There Abū 'Awf formed a new group, soon defeated by the Arab commander. Abū 'Awf was probably killed then, as the *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* does not mention him again. It was the end of 216 A. H.³⁴ After Abū 'Awf quits the scene some khārījite groups are still active³⁵ and after several years there appears 'Ammār-i Khārījī, the addressee of Ya'qūb's letter³⁶. The question whether 'Ammār-i Khārījī belonged to the ḥamziyya arises. The earliest news of him dates from 238/852, twenty years after the disappearance or death of Abū 'Awf. Considering that in 238/852 'Ammār-i Khārījī was a well known personage we can well suppose that his career had begun several years earlier though without obvious reasons we cannot prolong his activity by over two decades to link him in time with Abū 'Awf. In the quoted letter of Ya'qūb neither the affiliation of 'Ammār to any of the khārījite sect nor his union with the three leaders of the ḥamziyya are mentioned. If we assumed though that 'Ammār was one of the successor's of Ḥamza we would admit over twenty years' break in the written records of the ḥamziyya. It could be caused by diminished activity of the group mean either the latent life of the sect or its complete dissolution followed by its restoration.

The latter possibility should be rejected, as reviving the movement, in the natural course of this they would return to its primary pure form of the early radicalism, the betrayal of which was attributed to 'Ammār by Ya'qūb. Assuming though the latent existence of the sect, we should take for granted its ideological stability combined with military weakness, i.e. agree to something contrary to our knowledge of the sect. It displayed lesser ideological stability than military values. The sect doc-

trinally weak for years, additionally harassed by military defeats, the death of its founder and internal disintegration was not able to remain as a separate group in the khārījī environment. These members which saved themselves from the slaughter of 216/832 devoid of moral support probably joined the other branches of the khārījism which differed from the hamziyya slightly only in their teachings. It seems rather improbable for a small group to live latently in an ideologically similar environment for several years without losing its identity. As there are no particulars concerning the affiliation of 'Ammār-i Khārījī we must leave him out of the hamziyya, considering Bū 'Awf its last leader, after the death of whose in 216/832 the hamziyya ceased to exist. We possess no evidence that it became later a leading force, even going by different name.

NOTES

¹ Goes by different names: Hamza al-Khārījī, Hamza ash-Shārī, Hamza ibn 'Abd Allāh ash-Shārī, Hamza ibn Adrak al-Khārījī or Sijistānī, Hamza ibn Adrak, Atrak or Adharāk, Hamza-i Khārījī, Hamza-i Adharāk, Abū Hamza Abādī 'Abd Allāh. Cf. Tārīkh-i Sīstān, ed. Malek osh-Shoarā Bāhār, Tehrān 1317, according to the index; Tabarī, Ta'rikh, ed. de Goeje, III, 638, 650; Ibn al-Kathīr, Al-bidāya wa'l-nihāya fī ta'rikh, Cairo 1932-1931, X, 173, 177, 186; Balkhī, Le livre de la création, ed. Cl. Huart, Paris 1899-1919, IV, 102, 103; Malekshāh Hosein-e Sīstānī, Ihyā' el-molūk, Tehran 1344, 18; Gardēzi, Zain al-akhbār, ed. A. Habībī, Tehrān 1347, 131, 132; Ibn Funduq, Tārīkh-i Baghaq, ed. A. Bahmanyār, Tehran 1317, 44; Ibn al-Athīr, Al-kāmil fī'l-ta'rikh, ed. C. J. Thornberg, Leiden 1851-1875, VI, 103, 177; al-Ya'qūbī (Ibn Wāḍih), Kitāb al-buldan, ed. de Goeje, Leiden 1891, 304; Ibn Wāḍih, Ta'rikh, ed. M. T. Houtsma, Leiden 1883, II, 554; al-Baghdādī, Al-farq bain al-firāq, ed. M. Badr, Cairo 1328, 78-80; al-Iṣfahānī, Kitāb al-aghānī, ed. Bulāq 1285, XX, 97-111; al-Maqrizi, Khifāṭ, ed. Bulāq 1270, II, 353; W. Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion, London 1928; ibid. in Russian, Moskva 1963, 261; H. Laoust, Le schisme dans l'Islam, Paris 1964, 78; B. Spuler, Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit, Wiesbaden 1952, 53, 169; B. Skladanek,

Powstanie charydzyskie Hamzy al-Hārījī w Sistanie, Przegląd Orientalistyczny 1960, No 1, 25-37; G. Scarzia, Lo scambio di lettere tra Hārūn al-Rashīd e Hamza al-Hārījī secondo il Ta'rikh-i Sīstān, AIUON XIV, 1964, 623-645; C. E. Bosworth, Sīstān under the Arabs, from the Islamic Conquest to the Rise of the Saffārides, Rome 1968, 91-104; B. Skladanek, Est-ce que la caliphe Hārūn ar-Rashīd a écrit a Hamza al-Khārījī de Sīstān, [in:] Yādnāme-ye Irānī-ye Minorsky, Tehrān 1969, 196.

² Z. Safā, Tārīkh-e adabijāt dar Irān 1342, I, 34-35; O. G. Meredith, Hamza, EI², III, 53.

³ Tab. III, 638; Ibn al-Athīr, VI, 101; al-Baghdādī, 79; Ibn al-Kathīr, X, 173.

⁴ Istoriya Irana, Leningrad 1958, 110-111; Tab. III, 702.

⁵ Tārīkh-i Sīstān, 156, 9.

⁶ Ibid., 155, v. 13 ff.

⁷ Ibid., 156.

⁸ Zain al-akhbār, 131.

⁹ Hamza al-Iṣfahānī, Tārīkh sinī mulūk al-ard wa'l-anbiyā', ed. Gottwald, Beyrouth 1961, 165.

¹⁰ Zain al-akhbār, 131.

¹¹ cf. Hamza al-Iṣfahānī, 165.

¹² E. Zambaur, Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam, Hannover 1927, 48.

¹³ Tab., III, 702.

¹⁴ Tārīkh-i Sīstān, 109, 156.

¹⁵ ad-Dīnawarī, Akhbār at-tiwāl, ed. Guirgass, Leiden 1888, 386.

¹⁶ B. Spuler, Iran, 53; Istoriya Irana, 110-111; A. Zarin-kūb, Do gham-e sogūt, Tehrān 1314, 466-467; Dairat ol-moaref-e fārsī, ed. Gh. Moṣaḥeb, Tehrān 1348, I, 866-867; M. Mo'in, Farhang-e fārsī, Tehrān 1345, V, 466-467; Bosworth, Sīstān, 105.

¹⁷ Ajarida, EI², I, 213. According to Baghdādī, 79, the insurrection started in 179/795 and continued till the beginning of al-Ma'mun's reign, i.e. till 198/813.

¹⁸ Tab., III, 650; Ibn al-Kathīr, X, 186; Ibn al-Athīr, VI, 103; Ya'qūbī, Buldan, 305. In History (Ibn Wāḍih, Ta'rikh, II, 554) he did not repeat the news of Hamza's death. Ya'qūbī (ibid.) writes that Hamza took refuge in Kabul and Zābulistān. Tabarī gives Qandahar as the place of refuge. It would agree with the previous version as Qandahar is situated on the way to Kabul. According to Ibn al-Athīr Hamza

fled to Kōhistān, that is in the opposite direction. If one assumed that the mountainous region was meant there, not the province then the version of Ibn al-Athīr would confirm the previous ones.

¹⁹ It is true Tārīkh-i Baihaq, loc. cit., Baghdādī, 79, writes that after 195/810 Ḥamza conquered Sīstān, Khorāsān, Kirmān and Kōhistān. If the information were precise it would mean that the whole east Iran was seized by the ḥamziyya insurrection. Next though Baghdādī informs that till the end of Hārūn's reign and the beginning of al-Ma'mūn's rule all the troops in the eastern provinces were assembled to fight against Rāfi' b. Laith. It diminishes correctness of the first information as concentration of the army in Transoxania seems improbable in the period when the insurrection spread over half of Iran.

²⁰ Tārīkh-i Sīstān, 174, w. 3-5.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 169, v. 7.

²² The journey undoubtedly a product of imagination remains a very complex problem still unexplained to the end. Cf. p. 2, also Malek osh-Shoarā Bāhār, Sabkshenāsī, Tehrān, I, 284.

²³ Tārīkh-i Sīstān, 168, v. 11, 169, v. 10. According to Gardēzi Ḥamza had six thousand soldiers, whereas Nēshāpūrī, his enemy had twenty thousand. Baghdādī, 80, describes the number of troops belonging to the latter as twenty thousand, but at the same time he mentions Nēshāpūrī in another campaign several years later.

²⁴ Zain al-akhbār, 133.

²⁵ Tārīkh-i Sīstān, 168, v. 10.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 178, v. 5; Tārīkh-i Baihaq, 267.

²⁷ Tārīkh-i Sīstān, 180, vv. 1-2.

²⁸ Zain al-akhbār, 133; Balkhī, 103; Baghdādī, 80. Baghdādī (*ibid.*) writes that Mas'ūd b. Qais, the leader of the khārījite sect of khalafiyya, the enemies of the ḥamziyya got drowned in a small tributary of some river in Kermān. We encounter a case of contamination here as it is hardly probable that khārījite leaders got drowned in Kermān one after another.

²⁹ Tārīkh-i Sīstān, 180, v. 3; in the Zain al-akhbār, 133, he is called Abū Ishāq-i Qāzī.

³⁰ Tārīkh-i Sīstān, 180. After escape from the khawārij Abū Ishāq was hiding on one of the islands called kawāl on the lake of Hāmūn (Zara) (*ibid.*). About Abū Ishāq: Ibn Ru'stah, Kitāb al-a'lāq an-nafīsa, ed. de Goeje, Leyden 1892, v. 174. About the sect of shurat cf. also Iṣṭakhārī, Masālik al-mamālik, ed. I. Afshār, Tehrān 1340, 211. A Sīstānī scholar, Yāsir b. 'Ammār b. Shujā left the ranks of the ḥamziyya in 213/828 and two years later a group of ulema left the Khawārij (Tārīkh-i Sīstān, 181, 184, 185).

³¹ *Ibid.*, 178, 179.

³² *Ibid.*, 180.

³³ *Ibid.*, 202-203.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 173. It had to happen between dhu'l-ḥijja 7-th and dhu'l-ḥijja 30-th 216 A. H. (between January 15-th and February 6-th 832 a. D.).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 187.

³⁶ Ya'qūbī, Buldān, 223, - 'Ammār b. Yasir. Probably he confused him with Prophet's companion. The same mistake was repeated when the index for BGA was being made.

³⁷ The khārījite movement was not united to the very end. If in the times of 'Ammār other groups were active (Tārīkh-i Sīstān 205, 207) it is hardly probable that earlier, after the death of Abū 'Awf the Khawārij would unexpectedly unite, and then desintegrate again after several years without any apparent reason.