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PART I

THE HISTORICAL AND LITERARY BACKGROUND
CHAPTER 1

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

One of the most significant aspects of early Muslim rule was, as noted by the north Mesopotamian monk John bar Penkaye in the 680s, that “there was no distinction between pagan and Christian, the believer was not known from a Jew.” This initial indifference of the Muslims to divisions among the peoples whom they conquered, when compounded with the flight and enslavement of an appreciable proportion of the population and with the elimination of internal borders across a huge area extending from northwest Africa to India, meant that there was considerable human interaction across social, ethnic and religious lines. This was especially true for those who sought employment in the bustling cosmopolitan garrison cities of the new rulers, where one was exposed to contact with men of very diverse origin, creed and status. In addition, there were the widespread phenomena of conversion and apostasy, of inter-confessional marriage and festival attendance, of commercial contacts and public debate, all of which promoted the circulation of ideas and information. It is, therefore, particularly important for the study of the seventh and eighth-century Middle East that one’s approach be equally promiscuous, even if one’s interest is in a specific community. By way of example, this chapter will comment briefly upon three issues that are of general import for the history of this time and place.

Late Antiquity to Early Islam: Continuity or Change?

Since the Arab occupation of the Middle East that began ca. 640 proved to be permanent, this date is usually taken to mark a turning point in the history of this region and its peoples. To the degree that domination by a different ethnic group and the emergence of a new religious tradition must have had notable repercussions, this periodisation does have some validity. But it also begs a number of questions. For example, to what extent might these events have consolidated, rather than reversed, processes already under way? Also, did these
events have immediate consequences, and if so were they merely superficial—such as the replacement of elites—or infrastructural—such as institutional innovations? These questions acquire a particular significance in the case of Islam, since in the three or four centuries preceding its appearance, a period now usually referred to as Late Antiquity, the world it was to inherit had already been subject to major upheaval and transformation.\(^5\)

In the first place, the loose territorial empires of the Romans and Parthians had given way to the integrated ecumenical empires of the Byzantines and Sasanians.\(^6\) Their close proximity, the result of Rome’s shift to the east in the second century, and the assertiveness of the Sasanians, compared to their complacent predecessors, led to confrontation. Inevitably, such emulation between states of similar standing engendered large-scale political, social and cultural change. Both moved towards greater administrative centralisation and absolutist government, to the detriment of civic autonomy in the West and of the provincial nobility in the East. Byzantium would seem to have had the upper hand initially, at least in terms of wealth and centralisation, and so the Sasanian emperors embarked upon a vigorous campaign of Byzantinisation, actively setting out to acquire the money, skills and ideas of their rival. This they did by extortion as much as by imitation, using their formidable military capacity or the threat of it to extract material, human and intellectual resources.\(^7\) Further, both empires engaged in a scramble for influence, striving to win peripheral peoples over to their side. Thus the peoples of Ethiopia and southern Arabia and the Arabs of the Syrian steppe and northern Arabia were all actively courted for their allegiance and support.\(^8\)

In the second place, the ruling elites no longer remained indifferent to the beliefs of the masses. Indeed, the emperors of both realms, now sharing their creed with the majority of their subjects, evinced an interest in the promotion of religious uniformity within their lands, achieving this via a hierarchically organised clergy.\(^9\) As religion and politics became ever more closely related, warfare assumed an increasingly religious character and religious difference frequently became equated with political dissidence, the result being persecutions. This drive towards greater integration and conformity provoked those jealous of their own independence to establish a certain distance between themselves and imperial culture. The result was heresy in the Byzantine sphere\(^10\) and self-administering religious communities under the Sasanians. But—and this is perhaps the most distinctive feature of Late Antiquity—religion pervaded not only political life, but almost every aspect of existence. This can be seen most clearly in the redefinition
of the Classical World brought about primarily through the agency of Christianity. Bishops replaced councillors in caring for the welfare of a city’s inhabitants, churches and shrines overtook theatres and temples as the centres of communal life, monks and ascetics became the new heroes of the people, hagiographies and miracle stories dislodged secular writings as the most popular choice of literature, and icons and crosses triumphed as symbols of divine protection.

Seen against this background, it becomes evident that Islam did not, initially at least, “seal the end of Late Antiquity,” but rather continued many of its salient features. The expansionist aims of Justinian, Khusrau II and other Late Antique emperors were pursued with alacrity by the youthful Muslim state. And it was in the latter that Late Antiquity’s twins, religion and politics, achieved full union. The Sasanian solution to religious difference, the formation of independent religious communities, was institutionalised in Islam, such communities being designated “people of the Book” (ahl al-kitāb) and being expected to live by laws deriving from their own scriptures. Moreover, Islam, though distinctive in many ways, fitted well into the Late Antique mould, being all-pervasive, zealously assertive of its God’s omnipotence, concerned with the hereafter and confident that the gap between heaven and earth could be bridged by people with special gifts and at places of special significance.

But if it is in some measure true that Late Antiquity and Early Islam lay on a continuum, there were nevertheless enough new elements in the latter to determine that it would gradually depart from the former, finally assuming the guise of Medieval or Classical Islam. But what were the junctures along this road? Where, if one were compelled to periodise, would one place the signposts to mark the way? The first indications of the distinctiveness of Early Islam were manifested at the turn of the eighth century in the reigns of the caliphs ‘Abd al-Malik (685–705) and Walīd (705–15): aniconic coins, inscriptions condemning Christianity’s Trinitarian stance, mosques laid out to uniform specifications, administrative documents all drafted in Arabic and residential estates poised on the desert fringes. The transfer of the seat of government to Iraq by the Abbasid dynasty in the mid-eighth century was actually accompanied by a certain efflorescence of Late Antique forms of life. The presence there of large numbers of willing bureaucrats in the Sasanian mould led to an expansion and centralisation of the administration and cultivation of court manners and etiquette after the fashion of the Khusraus. No more than a stone’s throw away from the old Sasanian capital, the caliph’s chambers at Baghdad reverberated to discussions
of Greek philosophy and medicine, to “the maxims of Buzurgmihr and the
Testament of Ardashir,”\textsuperscript{18} and to theological debates conducted according to the
rules of Aristotelian logic.\textsuperscript{19} But after only eight or so decades of unitary rule there
occurred a number of events which heralded the second and more significant
watershed, namely the withdrawal of the caliph to the isolation of Samarra, the
first adoption of the institution of slave soldiers and the beginnings of the
fragmentation of the Islamic empire. The Late Antique dream of universal rule
coinciding with a universal faith was shattered and the Medieval idea of
commonwealth, a group of discrete polities united by a shared culture and history,
began to take hold.\textsuperscript{20}

Identity and Allegiance

When the Zoroastrian priests complained to Hormizd IV (–90) about his pro-
Christian tendencies, the emperor is supposed to have replied that just as a
throne is supported by two opposing pairs of legs, so the Zoroastrian religion
required a counterbalance.\textsuperscript{21} Brief episodes of persecution notwithstanding, it is
true that the Sasanian rulers were generally tolerant towards the non-Zoroastrian
communities of their realm, allowing them to conduct their worship unmolested as
long as they paid tribute and obeisance. Emperors ensured compliance by
requiring the heads of the various religions, in whose election they would often
have had a hand, to spend time at court, accompany them on hunting and war
expeditions, undertake diplomatic missions and serve as advisers and physicians;
but religious matters proper they left alone. Under these conditions, and especially
in pluralist Iraq, the various religious groups gradually transformed themselves
into communal organisations with their own schools, law courts, places of
worship, religious hierarchy and so on. They were effectively socio-legal
corporations ordered along religious lines.\textsuperscript{22}

This trend continued and was extended under the Muslims, who made little
distinction between any of the conquered peoples, designating most as “people of
the Book” and offering them freedom of action in return for taxes and loyalty. This
was accepted with some relief by many groups formerly under the rule of
Byzantine emperors, who had generally pursued a less liberal policy than their
Sasanian counterparts with regard to religious difference. Jews had been
tolerated, but had been placed under a number of strictures and had encountered
increasing hostility in the sixth and early seventh centuries. The Monophysite
communities of Egypt and Syria, too, had faced mounting pressure to conform,
culminating in the persecution of Heraclius’ reign, and indeed, had already begun
to take steps towards separate organisation.\textsuperscript{23} Gradually the Muslim authorities
became more involved in the internal affairs of the various communities, largely because of the bribes offered to them and the denunciations made before them by non-Muslims wishing to advance their cause. And in Abbasid times it was once more common practice for the heads of the religions to appear at court and to escort the caliph on expeditions.

The boundaries between communities were patrolled by religious specialists whose task was to reinforce allegiance to the community. This they did by urging exclusive attendance of the institutions of that community, by issuing laws prohibiting interaction and intermarriage with non-members, by promoting distinctive insignia and symbols, and by disseminating propaganda against the adherents and beliefs of all other groups. Much of this polemic would have been for internal consumption only, as is clear from the somewhat stale and one-sided Christian anti-Jewish literature of pre-Islamic times, but in our period a considerable proportion of the apologetic writing seems to derive from real debate. This was particularly true in the early Abbasid era, when there were a number of propitious factors: the cosmopolitan nature of Baghdad and its province, the caliphs’ patronage of scholarship, the emergence of Arabic as a lingua franca, the universal deployment of dialectical reasoning based upon categorical definitions, and the proliferation of converts and apostates, which meant that there were many with a genuine knowledge of two religions and with a real will to champion one over the other. But also, quite simply, there were matters that needed debating. Islam prompted questions that had not arisen before, such as what were the attributes of a true prophet, and challenged long-cherished assumptions, such as that imperial ascendancy confirmed possession of truth. The latter point did put the non-Muslims on the defensive, especially the Christians and Zoroastrians, but for the Muslims too it was to be no easy contest. They were new at the game and entered the arena with only a weakly articulated confessional identity and an underdeveloped battery of doctrine, and it was thus particularly in the sectarian milieu of eighth and ninth-century Iraq that communal boundaries were staked out and dogmatic territories delineated.

Nevertheless, though religious allegiance came to be the prime form of identity, other forms of affiliation—political, linguistic, geographical, ethnic, historical, cultural and sectarian—still bore weight. Thus Maximus the Confessor (d. 662) could aver: “I love the Romans because we are of the same faith and the Greeks because we have the same language;” Arab and Armenian Monophysite Christians could fight in the armies of Heraclius all the while that Monophysite ecclesiastics were railing against imperial policies; and East Arabian Christians
could secede from the religious suzerainty of Iraq though all professed the same Nestorian creed. It is, however, very difficult in the period of Late Antiquity and Early Islam to assess the extent and significance of these other claims upon a person’s loyalty and to estimate the degree to which they might have coalesced. Should we, for example, characterise the ninth-century monks of Mar Saba monastery in Muslim-ruled Palestine, who were assiduously translating Greek hagiographies into Arabic, as Byzantine? Could those Muslim Arabs among the frontier troops of Khurasan, who spoke Persian, celebrated Persian festivals, wore trousers and had Iranian wives, be considered Persian? To what degree was the use of a particular language or script a sign of partiality?

A diligent perusal of the sources with these questions in mind would probably produce interesting results, for even a cursory inspection shows much local pride and old prejudice still to exist. “The Egyptians are an obstinate people,” observes Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem (ca. 634–39); “when they have once decided upon something, whether good or bad, they are not easily diverted from it, and they are all like that.” The famous logician and astronomer Severus Sebokht (d. 667) expresses his pride in being a Syrian and often polemicises against Greek cultural chauvinism. Having noted the dependence of Ptolemy on Babylonian science, he adds: “That the Babylonians were Syrians I think no one will deny, so those who say that it is in no way possible for Syrians to know about these matters (astronomy) are much mistaken.” And he concludes another work by sarcastically remarking: “Being an unlearned Syrian, I am putting these small queries to you to convey to those who assert that the whole of knowledge exists only in the Greek tongue.” When Simeon, Jacobite bishop of Harran (700–34), asked George, Chalcedonian governor of Tur ‘Abdin, to provide him with workmen for the building of a church, the latter “delayed a little, for he did not have much faith in the holy men of our region, of us Syrians. This was because he had been brought up in the west with the Greeks and had become accustomed [to their ways].” Conversely, Syrian ascetics are accused of emitting an evil odour by one Chalcedonian monk; and another, the chronicler Theophanes (d. 818), calls Athanasius, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch (603–31), a wicked man, “filled with the cunning that is native to the Syrians,” on account of his part in the religious controversies of the early seventh century. A Jewish taverner named Samuel speaks disparagingly of his Arabic agnomen (kunya): “No Arab kunya can honour me, nor fill me with pride and lend me high rank. Though light and made up of few letters, unlike others, yet it was created as a burden [for me].” And if we turn to ninth-century Iraq we find a vigorous debate under way concerning the merits and
demerits of various cultural traditions, most notably Arab versus Persian.\textsuperscript{37}

This complex tissue of identities and allegiances forms the background to the emergence of Islam and helps explain the very different reactions of the various confessional communities. The hostility of Greek writers to the Muslims (mis)led one scholar into inferring that “the early Islamic conquests were accompanied by persecution, intolerance, massacres, havoc and enslavement.”\textsuperscript{38} Another scholar, concentrating on the comments of eastern authors, is able to speak of “an eirenic response to Islam.”\textsuperscript{39} The Muslims themselves appear to have made no discrimination in their attacks nor in their government; complaints about both are heard from all quarters. One is forced to conclude that the differing reactions of Christians reflects not a difference in their treatment at the hands of the Arabs, but rather a difference in their perceptions and intentions, which in turn depended upon and mirrored their differing allegiances.

It has often been claimed that the Monophysites of the Byzantine provinces welcomed the Arabs in some measure, based on assumed reaction to the persecutions of Heraclius and on hindsight comments of later writers.\textsuperscript{40} Yet the only surviving seventh-century Coptic texts are all hostile to the Arabs.\textsuperscript{41} And later observations, such as that by the Jacobite patriarch Dionysius of Tellmaḥre (d. 845): “If, as is true, we have suffered some harm... nonetheless it was no slight advantage for us to be delivered from the cruelty of the Romans,”\textsuperscript{42} contrast strongly with the anguish in earlier accounts like the following:

When the Arabs heard of the festival which took place at the monastery of S. Simeon the Stylite in the region of Antioch, they appeared there and took captive a large number of men and women and innumerable boys and girls. The Christians who were left no longer knew what to believe. Some of them said: “Why does God allow this to happen?”\textsuperscript{43} And behind the casual notices in Arabic sources that such and such a city surrendered without a struggle is not necessarily a welcome of the Arabs, but often a sad recognition that no help was coming:

The people of Ḥimṣ were exhorting one another: “Hold out, they are only bare-footed ones. ..” An old man stood up and urged them to make peace with the Muslims, but they said: “How can we do that when the emperor is still in authority and power?”\textsuperscript{44}

Certainly, the heavy-handed approach of the Chalcedonian patriarch Cyrus must have alienated many Copts, and this is important for explaining why they so quickly came to an acceptance of Muslim rule. For this is where the difference in
Christian reactions is most marked. Christians writing in Syriac and Arabic, though wishing to disprove the Muslims’ assertions, do so with rational argument and fair characterisation of their beliefs. The Nestorian catholicos Timothy I (780–823) even goes so far as to say that the Arabs “are today held in great honour and esteem by God and men, because they forsook idolatry and polytheism, and worshipped and honoured one God. For this they deserve the love and praise of all.” 45 But in Greek writings the Muslims were never anything but enemies of God. They were never to replace the Persians as a topic of learned digressions and diplomatic analyses, but rather to join the ranks of pagans and Jews as an object of attack and ridicule.

There are a number of reasons for this. In the first place, the image that an average Byzantine had of the Arabs was conditioned by more than a millennium of prejudice.46 Their non-urban style of life rendered them culturally inferior; the observation that “the Saracen tribe is known to be most unreliable and fickle, their mind is not steadfast” betrays all the disdain of a city-dweller for the non-urban barbarian.47 And their Biblical ancestry, as descendants of the slave-woman Hagar, tarnished them as religiously inferior, as “the most despised and insignificant of the peoples of the earth.”48 Secondly, though Zoroastrianism had made pretensions of being a universal truth, it was too different to be a serious challenge to Christianity. Islam, however, drew on the same religious heritage as Christianity. It recognised Moses and Jesus, the Torah and the Gospels, but demoted them in favour of Muhammad and the Qur’an. When backed with dazzling military success, the Muslims’ claim to have the latest version of God’s revelation was hard to refute. “It is a sign of God’s love for us and pleasure at our faith,” they said, “that God has given us dominion over all lands and all peoples.”49

This brings us to the crucial point: that whereas the Persians had been evicted from the provinces, the Arabs had stayed and made them their own.

But this is still insufficient explanation. Christians in Sasanian lands had also been overrun by the Arabs, and they would appear to have harboured similar opinions towards pre-Islamic Arabs as their Byzantine co-religionists. “There were many people between the Tigris and the Euprates,” comments one late sixth-century writer, “who lived in tents and were barbarians and murderers; they had many superstitions and were the most ignorant of all the people on the earth;” “furious are the wild asses, children of Hagar, and they have laid waste both good and bad,” says a late fifth-century poet about the Persian bedouin.50 The crucial difference was that the Christians of Iraq had no lost or diminished sovereignty to lament. As regards their faith, they had no reason to rue the Sasanians’ passing
nor to expect deliverance from them. Thus it was both easier and more necessary for them to accept the change of rulers than for their Byzantine counterparts. “Give to Caesar what is Caesar’s and to God what is God’s,” advised the catholics Isbo’yahb III (649–59). So when the Muslims replaced the Persians, the Christians simply set about establishing the same pattern of relations and agreements as had obtained in Sasanian times, seeking freedom to pursue their worship unmolested in return for political loyalty and payment of taxes.\footnote{51}

It is, then, because the Arabs were to them political as well as religious enemies that Byzantines were so hostile. This affected Greek writings in particular, since by the seventh century the Greek language had become intimately linked with Greek identity and with allegiance to Chalcedon and the empire. Its outpourings were, therefore, dominated by imperial concerns, with an eye suspicious of outsiders and dissenters.\footnote{52} But it is also true for Byzantines of other extractions in varying degrees. Thus the Coptic writer John of Nikiu (fl. 690s) has only abuse for the Muslims, and Jacob of Edessa (d. 708) speaks of “the harsh yoke of the Arabs,” though he is able to give us some objective descriptions of their beliefs and practices. Armenians were bellicosely proud of their identity, both political and religious, and had little love for Arab, Byzantine or Persian rule. Their writings on Islam tend, therefore, to be vitriolic, though Sebeos (wr. 660s) is able to give a dispassionate account of its emergence, perhaps because he lived before the Muslim occupation of Armenia.\footnote{53}

Apocalypticism

Already in the late sixth century there were many convinced “that the end of the present world is already near and that the never-ending kingdom of the saints is about to come.”\footnote{54} In the ensuing two centuries such speculation intensified and was rife among all the communities of the Middle East. This mood of apocalypticism, of concern for the end of history and what lay beyond it, expressed itself in a variety of different ways for a number of different purposes. But in each case the chief benefit of apocalypticism was that it could fit contemporary political and social events into a transcendent scheme of meaning, thus giving them religious validation, into a broader explanatory context, thus making them understandable.\footnote{55}

For Christians and Zoroastrians it was of crucial importance to account for the successes of the Muslims, who had done so much damage to their respective empires and their self-esteem, and to divine what would be their outcome. In answer to the first question both communities pointed to the laxity of their
members, and in response to the second they reinterpret and recast earlier apocalyptic scenarios. Christians viewed Arab rule as the time of testing before the “final peace” when “the churches will be renewed, the cities rebuilt and the priests set free from tax.” To the Zoroastrians it was the age of adversity which closed the millennium of Zoroaster and preceded the millennium of Ushedar in which the Good Religion would flourish. In both cases the ousting of the Muslims and regeneration of the religion was to be achieved by a saviour figure, whether an idealised Christian emperor in the image of Alexander the Great, Constantine and Jovian, or the warrior-king Wahram Warjawand coming from India with an army and one thousand elephants to destroy Iran’s enemies. Apocalypses thus offered an interpretation for historical change, thereby rendering it more meaningful, and hope for redemption in the near future, thereby encouraging steadfastness.56

As regards the Muslims, their greatest worry was whether they would manage to hold on to their acquisitions. And at certain key times—such as during their various civil wars, when it looked as if they might lose all, and during their siege of Constantinople in 717, when it looked as if they might gain all—these fears and hopes found their voice in a veritable explosion of apocalyptic sentiment. The battles with their enemies, chiefly the Byzantines, were identified with the malāḥim, the final wars at the end of the world which would eventually, after many setbacks, conclude with the Muslim capture of Constantinople and the appearance of the Antichrist. This construction aided the Muslim warriors to weather any reverses, for they could see that they would ultimately triumph, and gave added meaning to their efforts, since it was no ordinary war they were fighting, but Armageddon itself.57

The changes in the life of the Jewish communities brought about by the rise of Islam provoked much messianic speculation among Jews of our period and even led to a number of uprisings. The first occurred in the wake of the Arab conquests and was initiated by a Jew from Beth Aramaye, who “said that the messiah had come. He assembled weavers, barbers and fullers, some 400 men in all, who set fire to three churches and killed the local governor.”58 In the aftermath of the 717 siege of Constantinople and Leo III’s forced baptism of Jews in 721, a Christian convert to Judaism from the district of Mardin proclaimed to Jews that he was Moses, “sent again for the salvation of Israel and to lead you into the desert in order to introduce you then to the inheritance of the Promised Land, which you will possess as before.”59 And around the time of the Abbasid revolution “an illiterate tailor” named Obadiah, also known as Abū Īsā al-İşfahānī, claimed to be the
“prophet and apostle of the awaited messiah” and “led a rebellion against the government.”

Like contemporary apocalyptic writers, the leaders of these insurrections evidently interpreted the momentous events taking place around them as heralding the world’s end, but they sought not merely to speculate on, but also to participate in, and even to accelerate, this great drama and to enjoy the fruits of the messianic age.

On the fringes of the Muslim empire, in eastern Iran and Azerbaijan, there occurred a number of millenarian revolts in the course of the eighth and ninth centuries. Their participants sought salvation, but of a very terrestrial kind; they hoped not for the end of the world *per se*, but the end of the present evil world with all its inequities, and they wished it to be replaced with an infinitely better one, effectively heaven on earth.

So the leaders of these revolts did not merely herald the last days, but announced that “the rule of the Arabs was at an end,” or proclaimed that from the progeny of their hero Abū Muslim there would arise “a man who would take possession of the whole world and wrest the rule from the Abbasids,” or even that Abū Muslim himself would reappear to “fill the world with justice.” Their goad was the intrusiveness of Abbasid rule which, particularly through extension of fiscal controls, was beginning to make its presence felt and to disrupt traditional patterns of life even at a village level. That it was chiefly villagers who were involved is indicated by the large numbers participating in the revolts, by the ease with which these were put down and by the fact that their instigators were themselves of lowly extraction and village origin. Apocalyptic rhetoric served here an integratory function, welding together an otherwise disparate people unaccustomed to political organisation, and provided them with a goal, an era of justice and equity for all, the institution of which was imminent.

On contemplating the great number of apocalyptic movements and writings of the seventh and eighth centuries, one is led to wonder whether this is also the case for other periods or whether ours is in any way unusual. Of course, an interest in the structure and goal of history was central to each of the four principal religions of the Middle East and consequently all produced their fair share of visionaries to interpret the significance of events and to depict the end of times. One must, however, make a distinction here between eschatology and apocalypticism, “between a general consciousness of living in the last age of history and a conviction that the last age itself is about to end, between a belief in the reality of the Antichrist and the certainty of his proximity, between viewing the events of one’s own time in the light of the end of history and seeing them as the last events themselves.” Certainly, eschatological speculation can become
apocalyptic, and this is likely if some significant date draws near or some disaster befalls. Thus when it was the 500th anniversary of the Incarnation, supposedly marking the 6000th year since Creation, “the end of the world was awaited as never before;” and when in 557 Constantinople was shaken by a series of tremors, “immediately fantastic and fallacious pronouncements began to circulate, to the effect that the whole world was on the point of perishing. For certain deceivers, behaving like self-inspired oracles, prophesied whatever came into their heads and terrified all the more the populace who were already thoroughly disposed to be terrified.”

Such calendrical or physical crises could, however, be accounted for by traditional theories of time and meaning, and so they occasioned no innovations in apocalyptic writing. The same is true of the outbreaks of bubonic plague in the 540s and 1340s, which must have entailed greater loss of life than the Arab conquests and the Crusades. Yet the latter two events spawned numerous apocalyptic tracts, whereas the former two left little trace in the apocalyptic record. Evidently, it was not the degree of destruction or number of fatalities caused by a catastrophe that counted, but the challenge that it posed to the established understanding of history. Indeed, great challenges might come from a non-life-threatening event, such as the conversion of Constantine to Christianity and the Arabs’ active assertion of Islam. Apocalypses served to interpret such epoch-making changes, to make sense of and facilitate adaptation to new developments, and it is in this light that we should see the plethora of such writings in our period.

1 There is no multi-faceted introduction to the history of the seventh and eighth-century Middle East. One must simply consult the relevant works for each community (useful are Whittow, Making of Orthodox Byzantium; Sharf, Byzantine Jewry; Spuler, Iran in frühislamischer Zeit; Hawting, First Dynasty of Islam, and Noth, “Früher Islam,” together with Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate). A chronological outline of events may be found in Excursus C below. Note that non-Muslim sources will be quoted in this and the next chapter without explanation of their nature or background, for which see the relevant entry in Part II below.

2 John bar Penkaye, 151/179.

3 Compare again ibid., 147/175: “Their robber bands went annually to distant parts and to the islands, bringing back captives from all the peoples under the heavens.” Anastasius of Sinai, Narrat., C5, gives us an example of Jewish and Christian prisoners-of-war performing forced labour together at Clysma in Sinai. The removal of borders also permitted the free flow of natural and manufactured artefacts (see Watson, Agricultural Innovation in the Early Islamic World, and its assessment by Crone, “Review”).

4 On conversion and apostasy see the introduction to Chapter 9 below. The fact of inter-confessional fraternisation may be deduced from the frequent condemnation of its various forms by religious leaders (see the entries on “Athanasius of Balad,” “Jacob of Edessa” and “George I” in Chapters 4–5 below for some examples). On public debates see the comment in the introduction to Chapter 2 below. Two likely places of exchange were the public baths (Sharf, Byzantine Jewry, 56, notes that the Quinisext Council of 692 forbade Christians to bathe with Jews; Emed i Ashwahishtan, Rivāyat, no. 19, bans Zoroastrians from frequenting...
Muslim baths) and the tavern (see Synodicon orientale, 225: canon against Christians who go after mass to Jewish taverns; Kennedy, “Abū Nuwās, Samuel and Levi:” discussion of the famous poet’s conversation with two Jewish taverners; Manushchihr, Dādistān ī dēnīg, no. 49, permits Zoroastrians to sell wine to non-believers).

5 On the Byzantine side see especially Brown, The World of Late Antiquity, and Cameron, The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity. For Sasanid Iran the standard work is still Christensen, L’Iran sous les Sassanides. For an overview of both sides see Crone and Cook, Hagarism, 41–70; Garsoïan, “Byzantium and the Sasanians;” Howard-Johnston, “The Two Great Powers in Late Antiquity.”

6 On “the Roman territorial empire” and “the Christian ecumene” and the advantages of the latter over the former see Mann, Sources of Social Power, 250–340 (esp. 306–307). For simplicity I shall in this book use the term Byzantine to designate that empire which had its capital at Constantinople (330–1453), though the reader should bear in mind that some scholars prefer the term Late Roman for at least the fourth and fifth centuries and that the citizens of this empire always styled themselves as Romans.

7 Cf. Hall, Powers and Liberties, 139, 141 (“The invasion of Italy by the French in the late fifteenth century spread the styles of the Italian Renaissance around Europe, and thereafter rivalry and status-seeking ensured that what was fashionable elsewhere had to be copied at home. This emulation was not confined to artistic matters….War in European history served as a source of progress”). Likewise, Iran took over from Byzantium mosaics and building techniques, baths, medicine, philosophy and astronomy, as well as tribute and captives.

8 Smith, “Events in Arabia in the 6th Century A.D.”

9 Zoroastrianism was closer to Judaism than Christianity in that it was chiefly the religion of a nation and had little sensitivity to the problem of the clash between orthodoxy and heresy that so affected Christianity. It was, therefore, more tolerant than the latter in the face of religious difference. The Sasanian emperors did, however, urge some conformity (enacting calendrical and liturgical reforms, outlawing images in favour of sacred fires), suppressed overt dissent (e.g. Mazdakism), were usually hostile to missionary efforts by Christians and occasionally struck a more universalist note (e.g. Shapur II asks a Christian martyr: “What god is better than Ahuramazda? Which one is stronger than Ahreman? What sensible human being does not worship the sun?”—cited by Shaked, Dualism in Transformation, 91).

10 For Eastern Christians the question of orthodoxy/heresy mostly turned on the problem of Christ’s nature. The Monophysites (Copts in Egypt, Jacobites in Syria) wished not to dilute the divinity of Christ and so insisted on one divine nature, the human and divine elements having fused at the incarnation. The Nestorians, found chiefly in Iraq and Persia, wanted to hold on to the very comforting fact that Christ had become a man like us and to avoid saying that God had suffered and died, and so stressed two distinct natures, a human and a divine. Trying desperately to eschew the two extremes of denial of Christ’s humanity and dualism, the Chalcedonians or Melkites, who represented the imperial position, postulated two natures, united but distinct. Though important in their own right, these confessional divisions were also bound up with regional, ethnic and linguistic affiliations. General introductions are given by Atiya, Eastern Christianity, and Meyendorff, Christ in Eastern Christian Thought.

11 Two recent and very readable studies illustrating some aspects of this transformation are Brown, Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity, esp. 118–58, and Cameron, Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire.

12 The spread of Manichaeism and Zurvanism, reforms in Zoroastrian worship and the proliferation of visions of the hereafter all suggest that religion may have played an enhanced role in the Sasanian realm, but this still requires documentation. See Boyce, Zoroastrians, 101–44, and esp. Shaked, Dualism in Transformation.

13 Herrin, Formation of Christendom, 134, invoking Pirenne. The continuation of Late Antique ideas into Islam was pointed out long ago by Becker, Islamstudien, 1.201 (“Der Islam…ist die Weiterbildung und
konservierung des christlich–antiken Hellenismus….Es wird eine Zeit kommen, in der man rückwärtschauend aus der islamischen Tradition heraus den späten Hellenismus wird verstehen lernen”). It is so far non-Islamicists who have begun to recognise this; e.g. Bowersock, *Hellenism in Late Antiquity*, 71–82 (Hellenism and Islam); Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth*, esp. 138–68 (boldly argues that Islam is the consummation of Late Antiquity by virtue of its achievement of politico-cultural universalism).

14 The phrase “people of the Book” is found scattered throughout the Qur’an, meaning those possessing a scripture (though seeming primarily to intend Jews and Christians). For hints that the Muslims did from an early date expect their subjects to live according to their Books, see the entries on “Isho’bokht of Fars” and “Patriarch John I” in Chapters 5 and 11 below respectively.

15 Note, for example, the hostility of Islam, Judaism, Christianity and Zoroastrianism to magic, an alternative source of supernatural power, though of course each had to put up with its persistence.

16 Some may be surprised to see Zoroastrianism placed on a par with Judaism, Christianity and Islam as a Late Antique religion, especially given its traditional presentation as aristocratic, dry and ritual-bound. The glimpse of a more syncretic Zoroastrianism that we get from the early Abbasid prophetic movements in Iran (see n. 63 below) and the recent study of Shaked, *Dualism in Transformation*, should go some way to dispelling this notion.

17 On these developments see Excursus F, nos. i–iv, below; Grabar, *The Formation of Islamic Art*, 45–187.

18 Jāḥiẓ, *Dhamm akhlāq al-kuttāb*, 191. Buzurgmihr was minister for Khusrau I.

19 Examples and literature given in the introduction to Chapter 11 below.

20 Thus it is with these events in mind that Crone speaks of the “emergence of the Medieval polity” (*Slaves on Horses*, 82–91); see also Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth*, 100–68, and Kennedy, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphas*, 200–11 (“The structure of politics in the Muslim commonwealth”). The two periodisations proposed here are confirmed by material culture (e.g. Walmsley, “The Social and Economic Regime at Fihl,” 256, on ceramics at Fihl: “Two periods of accelerated change, which involved the loss of some wares and the appearance of new types, occurred between AD 600 and 900. The first can be dated to the end of the 7th and early 8th century, the second to the first half of the 9th century”), and are suggested by the progress of the Arabic language, which began to be used as an official language at the turn of the eighth century and as a *lingua franca* in the early ninth century, and of conversion to Islam, which first appears as an issue in non-Muslim sources at the end of the seventh century and starts to gain momentum in the late eighth and early ninth century. The reason for this agreement is that these two times mark the acme of the Umayyad and Abbasid dynasties respectively, when they would have been able to affect the greatest change and make the greatest impression.


22 See Morony, “Religious Comunities in Late Sasanian and Early Muslim Iraq.” For some general comments, based on Palestine, see Stroumsa, “Religious Contacts in Byzantine Palestine.”


24 On the admonition not to seek judgements from the law courts of non-believers, see the entry on “George I” in Chapter 5 below. For examples on the Muslim side against interaction with outsiders, see kister, “‘Do not assimilate yourselves’.”

25 Note, for example, “the attention paid to the cross as a religious and political symbol, which for specific reasons intensified during the seventh century….What we see at this time is the development of a religious discourse focused on a symbol which could be universally accepted” (Cameron, “Byzantium and the Past in the Seventh Century,” 261–65).
From the Muslims’ point of view, of course, they had corroborated that assumption, but for the non-Muslims it was essential to refute it. See the entries on “Anti-Jewish Polemicists,” “ps.-Methodius” and the “Monk of Beth Hale” in Chapters 3, 8 and 11 below respectively.

See further the introduction to Chapter 11 below, and Wansbrough, Sectarian Milieu, 98–129. Note how the first Muslim creeds state what we do not believe or what we avoid rather than what we hold to, indicating that they were the product of debates with others (see Ibn AbīYa’lā, Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila, 2.40, on the attempt of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak [d. 797] to determine the orthodox sect by a disavowal of the erring sects; cf. Abū Hanīfa’s Al-fiqh al-akbar, discussed in Wensinck, Muslim Creed, 102–24).

Maximus, Relatio Motionis §13, PG 90, 128C.

Even in the Muslim Arab case, where there was a fair degree of coincidence (compare the words attributed to one general by Lewond, XXIV [tr. Arzoumanian, 116]: “We all belong to the same race, speak the same language and are subject to one and the same rule and, above all, we are brethren”), there were still tribal, factional and sectarian divisions. See Crone, “The Qays and Yemen of the Umayyad Period;” Khalidi, “Aspects of Communal Identity in Umayyad Poetry.”

Compare the discussion by Grabar, The Formation of Islamic Art, 1–18, on what constitutes Islamic art.

Millar, “Empire, Community and Culture in the Roman Near East,” 162, argues that “the combined effects of Hellenisation and Roman rule served in the median term to suppress local identities.” This is to some degree true, but unfortunately Millar takes Jewish identity as his yardstick, whereas a more subtle gauge is needed. There is no sense of territorial nationalism among non-Jews of our period (Jones, “Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?”), but there is much ethnic chauvinism and this could blend with religious loyalties. For example, it is said that the Coptic monastery of Metras remained firm against the Chalcedonian patriarch Cyrus, since “the inmates of it were exceedingly powerful, being Egyptians by race and all of them natives without a stranger among them; and therefore he could not incline their hearts toward him” (Hist. Patriarchs XIV, PO 1, 498).

Sophronius, Miracles no. 39, PG 87, 3573B (= Marcos, 332).


Simeon of the Olives, Life, 135–36. Compare the use of the expression “the land of the Greeks” by Jacob of Edessa, Canons to John, B23 (in Vööbus, Synodicon, 244).

John Moschus, Pratum spirituale, CVI; Theophanes, 329. See Harvey, Asceticism and Society in Crisis, 135–45, on the differences between Chalcedonians and Monophysites as reflected in their hagiography.

Kennedy, “Abū Nuwās, Samuel and Levi,” 112–13, citing a wine-poem of Abū Nuwās (d. ca. 813). A variant has ju’ilat instead of khuliqat, which suggests that the kunya was imposed on the taverner, though it is possible that he adopted it in the hope of some social benefit.

This is the so-called Shu'ubiyya controversy, which was largely concerned with the cultural orientation of Islamic civilisation. For some examples of this debate see Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien, 1.101–76.

Constantelos, “The Moslem Conquests of the Near East as Revealed by the Greek Sources,” 356.


Moorhead, “The Monophysite Response to the Arab Invasions,” argues against this, but the view is still commonly voiced; e.g. Suermann, “Orientalische Christen und der Islam,” 122, 133–34, and Sahas, “The Seventh Century in Byzantine–Muslim Relations,” 5.

See the entries on the Homily on the Child Saints of Babylon and “John of Nikiu” in Chapter 4, and on
“ps.-Shenute” in Chapter 8 below (the latter two survive only in translation); cf. also the two Coptic papyri discussed in the “Dubia” section of Chapters 3 and 4 below. Furthermore, whether in Coptic or Arabic, writings by Copts mostly remained hostile to Islam (see the entry on “Copto-Arabic Texts” in Chapter 8 below, and note that after Isaac of Rakoti the entries in the History of the Patriarchs are largely hostile).

42 Preserved by Michael the Syrian II.III, 410/413, and Chron. 1234, 1.237. What is common to these two sources for the period 582–842 comes from Dionysius; see the entry on him in Chapter 10 below.

43 Also by Dionysius (Michael the Syrian II.VI, 417/422; Chron. 1234, 2.260), here citing an earlier source rather than giving his own opinion.

44 Tabaři, 1.2390–91; Azḏi, Futūḥ, 145–46.

45 Timothy I, Syriac Apology, 131/59.

46 Most recently see Jeffreys, “The Image of the Arabs in Byzantine Literature.”

47 Theophylact Simocatta, History, 3.XVII.7 (tr. Whitby, 100).

48 Chron. 1234, 1.237.

49 Monk of Beth Hale, Disputation, fol. 2a; cf. Leo-‘Umar, Letter (Armenian), 330: “You attribute to your religion the success with which heaven favours you.”

50 Nau, “Histoire de Mar Ahoudemmeh,” 21–26; Segal, “Arabs in Syriac Literature,” 106 (citing Isaac of Antioch’s account of the sack of Beth Hur). Arabs could, however, redeem themselves by becoming Christian, and there was much competition between Monophysite and Nestorian missionaries for Arab souls.

51 See the entries on “Isho’yahb III” and “Ḫnanisho’” in Chapter 5 below. However, though the official line was “the Arabs are good to us,” there are hints that there was regret among some at the passing of Sasanian rule. Isho’yahb had sharply to rebuke one bishop who had been mourning for the “dead kingdom:”, “If you were at this time upholding reverence for God,” he chides, “you would not joyfully and lightly show such reverence for what is dead, what has no power and no life” (Isho’yahb III, Ep. C7, 237).

52 See Cameron, “The Eastern Provinces in the Seventh Century.” Note that the numerous anti-Jewish tracts that we have from the seventh century, discussed in Chapter 3 below, are all written in Greek. Hayman, Disputation of Sergius against a Jew, v, states that “no Syriac anti-Jewish literature has survived from the period between the sixth and the twelfth century A.D. except for Sergius’ Disputation,” though this could be in part due to misfortune (e.g. Assemani, BO 3.1, 194, assigns a “disputation against the Jews” to the mid-eighth-century author Abraham bar Dashandad).

53 See Thomson, Muhammad and Islam in Armenian Literary Tradition,” and the entries on “Sebeos” and “Armenian Texts” in Chapters 4 and 10 below.

54 McGinn, Visions of the End, 64, citing Pope Gregory I’s letter of 601 to the English king Ethelbert. See also Hillgarth, “Eschatological and Political Concepts in the Seventh Century.”

55 I use apocalypticism in its broadest sense, as argued for by McGinn, Visions of the End, esp. 28–36.

56 For the information in this paragraph see the entries on “ps.-Methodius” and the Bahman yasht in Chapter 8, and on the “Tool of God’s Wrath” and the “Age of Adversity” in Chapter 12 below.

57 For the information in this paragraph see the entry on “Muslim Arabic Apocalypses” in Chapter 8 below.


59 Chron. Zuqnin, 173. On this pretender, named Severus, see Starr, “Le mouvement messianique au début du VIIIe siècle.” Note that he is the subject of an enquiry put to Natronai ben Nehemiah, gaon of Pumbedita (719–30), as to whether and on what conditions those Jews who had followed him might be received back into the orthodox fold (Gaonic Responsa [Moda’i], 3.V.10).
Nemoy, “Al-Qirqisānī’s Account of the Jewish Sects,” 328. There is some confusion as to whether this pretender appeared during the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik or Marwān II (744–50). For discussion and bibliography see Wasserstrom, “The Īsāwiyya Revisited;” Elr, s.v. “Abū Īsā Eṣṭahānī” Erder, “The Doctrine of Abū Īsā al-Iṣfahānī.”

For Jewish apocalyptic writings of this time see the entry thereon in Chapter 8 below. More generally see Baron, SRHJ, 5.XXV; Wasserstrom, Between Muslim and Jew, 47–89 (“The Jewish Messiahs of Early Islam”).

On millenarianism see in particular Cohn, Pursuit of the Millennium; Worsley, The Trumpet shall Sound, esp. 221–56.

Thus sunbadh, who is a typical example of what must have been a common phenomenon. In the later stages of the revolution the Abbasids had recruited Zoroastrian villagers in their armies, probably with promises of social advancement, and superficially converted and trained them, only to disband them once they had achieved power. These peasant soldiers, resentful and to some degree experienced in arms, would have been disposed to rebellion. The governor of Rayy had attempted to arrest Sunbadh who, after the death of Abū Muslim, was returning to his home in Khurasan. “Sunbadh killed him, took control of Rayy and returned to Zoroastrianism. Whenever a Zoroastrian came to him making a claim against a Muslim, he (Sunbadh) would judge in favour of him in that….He would kill the Arabs with the wooden club and he wrote to the king of Daylam that the rule of the Arabs was at an end” (Balādhurī, Ansāb, 3.246–47); “he called himself Fayruz Isbahbadh” (Tabarī, 3.119). Medieval writers tended to view all these Iranian prophetic movements as inspired by Mazdakism or extreme Shi‘ism, but from this and other accounts (esp. see Maqdisī, Bad‘, s.v. “Khurrami”) it is clear that their basis was Zoroastrianism, here revealing its syncretic potential (there are certainly some elements of gnosticism and Mazdakism).

Maqdisī, Bad‘, 6.95; Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, 6.186. It was Abū Muslim who had recruited Iranian villagers, and his execution by the caliph Maṃsūr made him a martyr in their eyes and confirmed to them the iniquity of Muslim rule.

Cf. Michael the Syrian ll.XXXV, 475/522–23 (increased taxes reported in conjunction with an uprising in Iran). Probably also important were such factors as increased Muslim land ownership and acceleration of conversion to Islam. Note that in this same period peasant revolts were frequent in Egypt and rural banditry endemic in Sistan (Crone, Slaves on Horses, 71 and notes thereto).

Many also claimed prophethood, unnecessary for those already endowed with authority by virtue of office or birth. Note especially Ustādhsīs (Ya‘qūbī, Ta‘rikh, 2.457–58) and Muqanna‘, who was originally a bleacher (Narshakhī, History of Bukhara, 65–67).

Most of these revolts are described by Sadighi, Les mouvements religieux iraniens. Some comment on them is made by Omar, “The Nature of the Iranian Revolts;” Daniel, khurasan under Abbasid Rule, 125–56; Kennedy, Early Abbasid Caliphate, 183–86; Amoretti, “Sects and Heresies.” Scholars tend, however, to reduce the role of religion, inflate the social status of the leaders and explain the syncretic nature of their teachings as an attempt to appeal to both Muslims and non-Muslims. Patricia Crone seems to be the only one who has perceived their true significance, namely a nativist reaction to intrusive alien rule, and it is to her that I owe most of my ideas an this subject.

McGinn, Visions of the End, 4.
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As regards Muslim works, which are not the main concern of this book, there is no attempt made to list translations or alternative editions.

ALJAMIADO

ARABIC (Muslim)
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______. Al-‘ibar wa l-i’tibār = Ms. BL Or. 3886 (the attribution to Jāḥiẓ is unsure); an edition is being prepared by Wim Raven.


______. Kitāb al-tanbīḥ wa-l-ishrāf. ed. M.J. de Goeje (Bibliotheca geographorum arabicorum 8; Leiden, 1894).
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______. Kitāb al-masā’il wa-l-ajwiba = Michel Hayek, ed. ‘Ammār al-Baṣrī: apologie et controverses (Beirut, 1977), 93–266.
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Anthony Rawli. Passion = Dick, ed./tr. “La Passion arabe de S. Antoine,” 119–27/127–33. For the Ethiopie and Georgian versions (derived from the Arabic), as well as a late Arabic abridgement, see Peeters, “S. Antoine le néo-martyr,”
and *idem*, “L’autobiographie de S. Antoine.”


Bar Hebraeus. *Taʾrikh mukhtaṣar al-duwal.* ed. A. Salihani (Beirut, 1890); ed./tr. Edward Pocock as *Historia compendiosa dynastiarum* (Oxford, 1663). This is an Arabie recension of Bar Hebraeus’ Syriac chronography (see the section on Syriac sources below), which he undertook at the request of a Muslim acquaintance.


Eutychius. *Annales* = Louis Cheikho, ed. *Eutychii patriarchae Alexandrini Annales*, 2 parts in 1 vol. (CSCO 50–51 scr. arabici 6–7; Beirut, 1906–1909); Edward Pocock, tr. *Contextio gemmarum sive Eutychii patriarchae Alexandrini Annales* (Oxford, 1658), which is reprinted in *PG* 111, 889–1156, and is still worth consulting for its detailed indices; Bartolomeo Pirone, tr. *Eutichio patriarca di Alessandria* (877–940), *Gli Annali* (Franciscan Centre of Christian Oriental Studies; Cairo, 1987). This is the so-called Antiochene recension, found in numerous manuscripts; the original Alexandrian recension is
preserved only in Ms. Sinai arab 582, partially edited and translated by Breydy, Das Annalenwerk des Eutychios. For the quotations in this book Breydy’s edition hardly differs at all, so I cite only Cheikho’s edition.


\textit{Hist. Patriarchs (Hamburg)} = C.F. Seybold, ed. Severus ibn al-Muqaffa‘. Alexandrinische Patriarchengeschichte von S. Marcus bis Michael I (61–767), nach der ältesten 1266 geschriebenen Hamburger Handschrift im arabischen Urtext herausgegeben (Hamburg, 1912). I cite this early recension only where it differs appreciably from the above.


General Index

In the arrangement adopted here, the Arabic definite article (al-) at the beginning of an entry, the transliteration symbols for the Arabic letters hamza (‘) and ‘ayn (‘), and distinctions between different letters transliterated by the same Latin character (e.g. d and q’al) are ignored for purposes of alphabetization.

Aba I, catholicos
  pronouncement on monogamy, 173 n. 212;
  proponent of Nestorianism, 174

Abālish, disputation with Zoroastrian leader, 511
‘Abbās ibn Muḥammad, governor of the
  Jazira, trial of Cyrus of Ḥarran before, 378 and n. 129
‘Abbās ibn al-Walīd
  ambitions, 659 n. 182; builder of ‘Ayn al-Jarr, 652 n. 128; campaigns, 652 and n. 128, 655

Abbasids
  cosmopolitan nature of regime, 19; employment of Aramean Christians as secretaries, 241 n. 19; identified as sons of Hāshim, 252–53, 274–75; location of capital, 668 and n. 229; millenarian revolts against, 29–30 and nn. 63–64; possible references to: in Apocalypse of Peter, 293 and n. 107; in Bahīra apocalypse, 273, 274; in Persian apocalypses, 322: referred to, as wearers of black: in Chinese sources, 253; in Syriac sources, 397, 411 n. 77: religious policies, 18–19; representation by black beast, 274; transfer of seat of government to Iraq, 16; see also individual caliphs and governors

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abd al-A‘lā, emissary from
  ‘Umar II to Leo III, 496–97

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, governor of
  Egypt, census of youths, 284

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Adāt, exchange between Ibn
al-Zubayr and, 536 n. 45

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Alī, uncle of Saffāh

governor of Syria, Palestine, Phoenicia, 669; role in third civil war, 405–406, 666–69, 670

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Adī, governor of Sistan, 552 n. 33

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir, governor of Baṣra

role in conquest of Fars, 551 and n. 29; sons pro-Zubayrid, 551–52

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Awn, early ḥadīth codification, 4 n. 12

‘Abd Allāh al-Baṭṭāl, campaigns, death in battle, 656 n. 156, 659

‘Abd Allāh ibn Darrāj, fiscal governor for Mu‘āwiya, in accounts of demons of Qenneshre, 144–45

‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith, governor of Armenia for Mukhtār, 371–72 n. 109

‘Abd Allāh ibn Ḥātim al-Bāhilī, governor of Mesopotamia, Azerbaijan, 373 and nn. 115–16

‘Abd Allāh ibn Khālid, governor of Fars for Ziyād ibn Abī Sufyān, 551 and n. 29

‘Abd Allāh ibn Marwān, role in third civil war, 618, 620–21, 622–23, 630, 664–67, 668

‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’d, tax policies in Egypt, 281 n. 72

‘Abd Allāh ibn Salām, Jewish convert to Islam, 505

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar, governor of Iraq, 661 n. 191

‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr

apocalypse in support of claims to caliphate, 332–33; conflict with Mukhtār, 648; confrontation with Marwanids, 199, 620–22, 647–49; death, 199, 622, 649 and nn. 107, 109; espousal of Islam as basis of Arab state, 551–54; exchange between ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Adāt and, 536 n. 45; in conflict over sanctuary at Mecca, 536 and n. 45; religious implications of revolt, 552–53 and n. 36; rebellion against Yazīd I, 197 and n. 82, 647

‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir

governor of Sistan, 551–52 and n. 33, 694;
governor of Mecca, 551 n. 30
'Abd al-‘Azīz ibn al-Ḥajjāj, role in third civil war, 660, 661–62 and nn. 194, 196

‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Ḥātim ibn Nu‘man al-Bāhilī, evidence on, in Lewond, 439

‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Marwān

governor of Egypt: policies relative to Christians, 150–51; possible reference to, in Rabbi Eliezer’s Chapters, 316: inscription of, 694–95; lands bequeathed to by Marwān I, 621

‘Abd al-Jabbār, governor of Khurasan, revolt by, 400 n. 45

‘Abd al-Malik, caliph

accession, reign, 621–22, 647–51; adoption of Arabic as language of administration, 481 and n. 89; and brother ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, possible references to, in Rabbi Eliezer’s Chapters, 316; coinage of, 649 and nn. 109–10, 694, 699–700; collection of the Qur’an, 501 n. 166; concurrence of policies on coinage of Justinian and, 104 n. 172; dealings with Ḥnanisho’, 203; dealings with John of Dasen, 201–202 and n. 104; death, 651; emergence of distinctive characteristics of Islam under, 16; encounter with Michael the Sabaite, 380–81; espousal of Islam as basis of Arab state, 48–49, 553–54 and n. 39; lands bequeathed to by Marwān I, 621; miraculous curing of daughter, 204 and n. 113; monetary reforms, 263, 284 and n. 78, 316, 413 and n. 86; mosques built by, 567–68, 569, 649; oral traditions about, 42; order for construction of Dome of the Rock, 222, 316; order for slaughter of pigs, 596 and n. 11, 650; overthrow of Ibn al-Zubayr, 551–52, 622, 648–49; peace sought with Byzantium, 647 and n. 102; policies a spur to apocalyptic feelings, 267 n. 25, 317; road building programme, 263, 316; siege of Nisibis, 198 n. 86; success of, and dating of work of John bar Penkaye, 200 and n. 97

‘Abd al-Malik ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir

governor of Fars for Ibn al-Zubayr, 551–52; Islamic profession of faith inscribed on coins of, 551–52, 694

‘Abd al-Masīḥ al-Kindī

association of Sergius and Bahira, 472 and nn. 60–61; on compilation of Qur’an, 501 and n. 162

‘Abd al-Masīḥ al-Najrānī al-Ghassānī (Rablī’ ibn Qays)

association with Diospolis/Ramla, 385; martyrdom, 381–83 and nn. 135–38

‘Abd al-Quddūs ibn al-Hajjāj, transmitter of Correspondence of Leo III and ‘Umar
II, 494

‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Khālid, campaigns in Asia Minor, 136, 139, 644

‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Mu‘āwiya ibn Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān, first Umayyad king in Spain, 426 n. 125

‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ash’ath, rebellion, defeat, 650, 671 n. 241

‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Muljam, association with murder of ‘All, 644 n. 74

‘Abda, Nestorian monk

consulted by sick Arab governor, 189; conversion of pagans of ‘Ayn al-Namir, 189

‘Abdisho’ of Nisibis

evidence on: Isho’bokht of Fars, 205–206 and n. 120; Isho’dnaḥ of Basra’s Book of Chastity, 211 n. 136; Simeon of Barqa, 390 n. 11

Abjuration, contents, authorship, dating, 517–18

Abo of Tiflis, martyrdom, 346, 685

Abraham

descent from: essential to status as Arab, 336, 549; of Arabs, via Hagar, 261; Etan the Ezrahite identified with, 310 n. 161; holy places associated with, 187–89 and nn. 46, 49; in Christian-Muslim disputations, 470 and n. 51; monotheism associated with, noted as core of Muslim faith, 535–38

Abraham II, catholicos, association with Thomas of Marga, 213 and n.144, 215

Abraham ibn Daud, Book of Tradition (Sefer ha-qabbālā), contents, 449

Abraham of Tiberias, on compilation of Qur’an, 501 and n. 162

Abū 1-‘Abbās al-Saffāḥ see Saffāḥ

Abū ‘Alī Bal’amī, vizier, translator into Persian, 242

Abū 1-A’war

commander of naval expedition against Constantinople, 643; governor, census of Christian labourers/soldiers ordered by, 418–19 n. 104

Abū ‘Awn, Abbasid general, role in third civil war, 666

Abū Bakr, caliph

accession, reign, 617, 636; initiation of conquests, 617, 636; recommendations
on treatment of conquered peoples, 196 n. 79; policy on conquest of Egypt, 579, 580–81, 636; reference to, in writing on abjuration, 518 n. 225


Abū Ḥanīfa

expression of first Muslim creed, 20 n. 27, 545–46 and n. 4; ruling on sacrifices of apostates, 149 n. 115; writing on jurisprudence, 4 n. 12

Abū Hudhayl, rebel leader in Africa, 661 n. 191

Abū ʿĪsā al-Isfahānī (Obadiah), messianic pretender, 28, 293–94 n. 111

Abū ʿĪsā al-Warrāq, Muslim polemicist, 502

Abū Jaʿfar al-Manṣūr see Manṣūr

Abū 1-Khaṭṭāb al-Ibādī, rebel leader, defeat in Egypt, 671 n. 241

Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī

failure to give apostate a chance to repent, 344 n. 28; founder of Baṣra, 186–87

Abū Muslim

rebel hero, and apocalypticism, 29–30 and n. 64; overthrow of Marwān II, 252–53, 665 and n. 215; pilgrimage to Mecca, 670; rival for caliphate, 670

Abū Nūḥ al-Anbārī, *Life of John of Daylam*, 205 and n. 115

Abū Qārib Yazīd ibn Abī Ṣakhr, besieged in Nisibis, 198 n. 86

Abū Rāʾītā al-Takrītī

Jacobite polemicist, 502; on unworthy motives for adoption of religion, 543 and n. 67

Abū Salama, role in third civil war, 666

Abū 1-Sarāyā, Alid rebel, 275

Abū Shaykh ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Ghanawī, reportedly governor of Armenia, 372 n. 113

Abū Turāb see ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib

Abū I-Ward, rebel in Syria, 669

Abyssinia see Ethiopia, Negus

Academies (*yeshīvōt*), Jewish, in Palestine and Iraq, scholarly activity of, 237–40
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