

Zaydi Shiism and the Hasanid Sharifs of Mecca

Author(s): Richard T. Mortel

Source: *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (Nov., 1987), pp. 455-472

Published by: Cambridge University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/163211>

Accessed: 10-07-2015 17:04 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Journal of Middle East Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Richard T. Mortel

ZAYDI SHI'ISM AND THE ḤASANID SHARIFS OF MECCA

I

The sharifs of Ḥasanid descent, commonly referred to as the Banū Ḥasan, who ruled Mecca and its dependencies from the middle of the fourth century A.H./tenth century A.D. until the early twentieth century, can be divided into three major dynastic branches, each of which bears the name of the first of its members to attain the office of emir of Mecca.¹ Thus, the first dynasty of the Ḥasanid sharifs of Mecca, known as the Ja'farids,² was founded by Ja'far b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Amīr, a descendant in the ninth generation of al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, in about the year 357/968, shortly before the conquest of Egypt for the Fatimids of North Africa by their general, Jawhar, in 358/969. Control of Mecca remained in the hands of the Ja'farids until the last representative of the line, Shukr b. Abī'l-Futūḥ, died without leaving a male heir in 453/1061.

Following a brief period of anarchy, during which several factions of the Banū Ḥasan contested control of the holy city, in 454/1062, the Sharif Muḥammad b. Ja'far, a descendant in the twelfth generation of al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, successfully united the warring parties under his leadership and restored order in Mecca. The dynasty he founded became known as the Hawāshim, after his *kunya*, or patronymic, Abū Hāshim, and it remained in power until 597/1200–1201, when the Sharif Mukthir (or, perhaps, Mukaththir) b. 'Īsā was deposed by the scion of yet another branch of the Banū Ḥasan, Qatāda b. Idrīs. His descendants, known to historians of Mecca as the Banū Qatāda, held sway in the Hijaz until 1925, when the territories under their control were absorbed into the domain of King 'Abd al-'Azīz "Ibn Saud."

This paper will review the material concerning the sectarian allegiance of the Banū Ḥasan from the fourth/tenth until the ninth/fifteenth century, which can be gleaned from the writings of medieval Arab historians, geographers, travelers, and encyclopedists. Analysis of this information within the appropriate historical framework demonstrates with considerable clarity that, until nearly the end of the period under consideration, the sharifs of Mecca espoused Zaydi Shi'ism. Elucidation of this important point sheds new light on the complex network of relationships between the emirate of Mecca and the various dynasties that ruled Egypt, Yemen, and Iraq throughout much of the medieval period.

In recent years, the Arabian Peninsula in general, and the Hijaz in particular, have come under the increasing scrutiny of both Western and Arab historical scholarship. However, contemporary students of the political and social history of Mecca have confined themselves to a passing reference to the Shi'ism of the sharifs, or otherwise ignored the problem of the precise nature of their religious beliefs altogether, thereby ignoring a significant factor in the dynamics of Mecca's foreign relations.³ Other historians have even maintained that the sharifs of Mecca were Sunnis during the period under consideration here.⁴ A thorough review of the source material bearing on this question is, therefore, long overdue.

II

During the second century A.H./eighth century A.D., the Hijaz became the stage for a number of unsuccessful 'Alawid uprisings, directed against the 'Abbasid caliphs in Baghdad, who were perceived as having failed to fulfill the promises made to the 'Alawids by the leaders of the 'Abbasid *da'wa* prior to the 'Abbasid revolution of 132/750. It soon became abundantly clear that the 'Abbasid ruling faction had no intention of granting their erstwhile 'Alawid allies any effective share in the process of government. The most prominent leaders of the 'Alawid opposition belonged to the Banū Ḥasan, such as 'Abd Allāh al-Maḥḍ (d. 145/762), his son Muḥammad (d. 145/762), known as "the Pure Soul" (*al-naḥs al-zakiyya*), and his great-grandson, Ismā'īl b. Yūsuf al-Ukhayḍir (d. 252/866), as well as al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, known as "*ṣāhib* Fakhkh," after the valley on the outskirts of Mecca where he was killed by 'Abbasid agents in 169/786.

'Alawid opposition to 'Abbasid rule appears to have entered into a phase of quiescence during the greater part of the third/ninth century, only to become active once again at the dawn of the fourth/tenth century in the guise of a Ḥasanid sharif by the name of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān. According to Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808/1406), who remains our sole source of information regarding this development, Muḥammad b. Sulaymān was descended from an earlier Ḥasanid insurgent named Muḥammad al-Nāhiḍ b. Sulaymān b. Dā'ūd b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, who took control of Mecca in 301/914 and refused to give allegiance to the 'Abbasid Caliph al-Muqtadir. It is not known how long Muḥammad b. Sulaymān retained control of Mecca, nor do we have any information concerning the extent of his influence in the Hijaz or the composition of his following. However, it is clear from Ibn Khaldūn's laconic remarks that Muḥammad b. Sulaymān was a Zaydi Shi'i;⁵ he thus becomes the earliest Ḥasanid sharif of Mecca to have been identified with this sect.

Neither the Sharif Ja'far b. Muḥammad, who founded the sharifate of Mecca ca. 357/968, nor any of his successors, the Ja'farids, are unequivocally identified as Zaydi Shi'is in any of the sources known to this writer. However, the probability is strong that they espoused the Zaydi creed, as had their elusive predecessor, Muḥammad b. Sulaymān. Source material for all aspects of the political, economic, and social history of the primitive sharifate is at best meager, and this situation is not remedied until the time of the later Hawāshim, in the

mid-sixth/twelfth century, concerning whose activities there exists a body of more comprehensive information, and whose Zaydism can be established beyond doubt. Identification of the Ja'farids and the early Hawāshim as Zaydi Shi'is, however, serves to explain a number of important aspects of the political history of Mecca from the middle of the fourth/tenth century until that time.

Since the commencement of their rule in Mecca, the Ja'farids gave their allegiance, not to the Sunni 'Abbasid caliph in Baghdad, but rather to the Isma'ili Shi'i Fatimid caliph in Cairo. The Sharif Ja'far b. Muḥammad is reported to have mentioned the name of the Fatimid Caliph al-Mu'izz li-Dīn Allāh in the ritual sermon (*khuṭba*) during the Friday prayers in the Great Mosque at Mecca as early as 358/969, after having been informed of the Fatimid conquest of Egypt. The same source also claims that Ja'far sent news of this formal expression of his allegiance to al-Mu'izz himself, who was as yet in Qayrawān, in present-day Tunisia. Al-Mu'izz, in turn, responded by dispatching a formal letter of investiture to the Sharif Ja'far b. Muḥammad as Emir of Mecca.⁶

On the other hand, two earlier historians, Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200) and Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1232), both maintain that the name of the 'Abbasid Caliph al-Muṭi' continued to be mentioned in the *khuṭba* in Mecca until the month of Dhū'l-Ḥijja 363/August–September 974, during the pilgrimage season, when it was replaced by that of the Fatimid Caliph al-Mu'izz,⁷ whereas al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442), relying on contemporary Fatimid sources since lost, claims that the *khuṭba* was not recited in the name of al-Mu'izz li-Dīn Allāh until the following year, 364/975.⁸

The Fatimids were quick to consolidate their position in Mecca, and thereby gain prestige throughout the Muslim world, by sending generous gifts to the Hasanid sharifs so as to ensure the continuation of their loyalty, in addition to regular shipments of grain to the Hijaz.⁹ The Fatimid policy with regard to Mecca proved to be so successful that, with only one minor interruption,¹⁰ the name of the 'Abbasid caliph was destined not to be mentioned again in the Friday *khuṭba* at Mecca, nor during the rites associated with the annual pilgrimage to Mecca, until 454/1062 or 455/1063, during the reign of the Sharif Muḥammad b. Ja'far, the first of the emirs of Mecca known as the Hawāshim.¹¹ Although the eagerness of the sharifs of Mecca to proclaim their allegiance to the Fatimid caliphs can be attributed at least in part to Mecca's pressing need to import grain from Egypt, on which it had been traditionally dependent, it is very probable that another reason for such an alliance was the Shi'i creed of the Ja'farids themselves. They would presumably be more inclined to support a fellow Shi'i, although Isma'ili, caliph in Cairo than a Sunni 'Abbasid caliph in Baghdad whose ancestors had a history of suppression of 'Alawid legitimist aspirations throughout the lands under their control.

In 401/1011, the Emir of Mecca, the Sharif Abū'l-Futūḥ al-Ḥasan b. Ja'far withdrew his allegiance to the Fatimid Caliph al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh. He did not, however, pledge his loyalty to the 'Abbasid Caliph al-Qādir, but, encouraged by the support of Abū'l-Qāsim al-Maghribī, a former vizier of al-Ḥākim who had fled to the Hijaz after incurring the latter's wrath, proclaimed himself caliph

instead, and assumed the title “al-Rāshid bi-Allāh,” i.e., the one whom Allah has rightly guided. Initially, Abū'l-Futūḥ enjoyed the support of the Ḥasanid sharifs of Mecca, as well as the Banū Jarrāḥ, a branch of the powerful Arab tribe of Tayy³, which had settled in southern Palestine in the vicinity of Ramla. But Abū'l-Futūḥ's success proved to be ephemeral, as Mecca's relative economic poverty could not provide him with the substantial financial resources needed to carry on such an ambitious revolt, while al-Ḥākim succeeded in wooing the Banū Jarrāḥ to his own side and in stirring up dissension and dissatisfaction with Abū'l-Futūḥ within the ranks of the Banū Ḥasan in Mecca itself. Faced with the possibility of the loss of his power base, Abū'l-Futūḥ was compelled to return to Mecca in order to salvage the situation there, and by 403/1012, he had renounced all claims to the caliphate and once again pledged allegiance to al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh.¹²

Several explanations have been advanced for Abū'l-Futūḥ's motives in his revolt against Fatimid suzerainty in the Hijaz. Medieval sources for the history of Mecca's relations with the Fatimid dynasty of Egypt, which are as a rule quite detailed concerning such matters, fail to mention the dispatch of any monetary stipends or shipments of grain from Egypt to the Hijaz during the three-year period immediately preceding Abū'l-Futūḥ's revolt, and there is no doubt that the ruling sharifian clan, as well as the population of Mecca at large, suffered a noticeable decline in their standard of living as a consequence. Abū'l-Futūḥ is known to have mentioned this point as being one of the reasons for his displeasure with al-Ḥākim to Abū'l-Qāsim al-Maghribī, when the latter was attempting to convince him to break with the Fatimids.¹³

Neither Mecca's economic woes nor Abū'l-Qāsim al-Maghribī's proddings are by themselves convincing explanations for Abū'l-Futūḥ's decision to throw off the Fatimid yoke so completely and decisively by proclaiming his own rival caliphate. The answer may lie in a decree (*sijill*) sent by al-Ḥākim to Abū'l-Futūḥ in 395/1005, which contained an order to the governors of all the regions acknowledging Fatimid sovereignty to ritually denounce Abū Bakr and ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, the first two of the Rāshidī caliphs. This decree not only aroused the ire of the Sharif Abū'l-Futūḥ, who refused to comply with it, but it caused a rift in the hitherto ideal relations between Mecca and Cairo.¹⁴

Al-Ḥākim's *sijill* requiring the ritual cursing of two of the most illustrious Companions of the Prophet Muḥammad would have been sufficient cause to prompt Abū'l-Futūḥ to seriously consider discontinuing the weekly mention of the name and titles of the Fatimid caliph in Mecca, thereby withdrawing his allegiance. Al-Ḥākim, himself an earnest partisan of Ismaʿīlī Shiʿism, regarded Abū Bakr and ʿUmar as usurpers of ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib's legitimate rights to the caliphate, which, according to Shiʿi doctrine, had been confirmed by the Prophet Muḥammad himself. On the other hand, the moderate Zaydī sect of the Shiʿa, while continuing to acknowledge the absolute priority of ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib over all other Companions, either accepted the legitimacy of the caliphates of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar or else adopted a position of neutrality with regard to them. Furthermore, the majority of Zaydis refrained from the public vilification of them or of any other of the Prophet's Companions.¹⁵ Nor did Abū'l-Futūḥ wish

to transfer his allegiance to the ʿAbbasid caliph of Baghdad, and therefore the sole course of action remaining to him was to break off Mecca's ties with the Fatimids and announce his own caliphate.

III

In 454/1062, the Hawāshim succeeded the Jaʿfarids as emirs of Mecca, and from the early years of their reign, a varied body of textual evidence clearly demonstrates that the new rulers of the holy city were Zaydi Shi'is. Sectarian considerations, however, do not appear to have played a predominant role in determining the nature of the political loyalty of the Hawāshim; for the most part, the names and titles of the Fatimid caliphs were replaced by those of their ʿAbbasid counterparts in the Friday *khutba* in the Great Mosque at Mecca, until the eventual collapse of the Fatimid dynasty itself in 567/1171.¹⁶ This transformation in the character of Mecca's relations with the two great powers that were contending for the loyalty of the greater part of the Islamic world can be attributed to the decline in Fatimid power and the gradual breakdown of state institutions that set in during the lengthy reign of the Caliph al-Mustaʿşir (427/1035–487/1094). During the middle years of al-Mustaʿşir's reign, a famine of unprecedented severity held Egypt in its grip for seven years and, as a consequence, the periodic shipments of grain and the financial largesse on which the sharifs of Mecca had come to depend for much of their livelihood were sharply curtailed. Consequently, it became a matter of the utmost importance for the sharifs to find new patrons, and the Saljuq protectors of the ʿAbbasid caliphate in Iraq were eager to fill that role and thereby assert a nominal Sunni sovereignty over the Muslim holy places of western Arabia. In spite of several attempts by the Fatimids to persuade the Hawāshim to resume allegiance to them, they were largely unsuccessful.

Once the Hawāshim had broken the ties that bound them to the Fatimids, and had transferred their political loyalties to the ʿAbbasids, the latter attempted to induce them to forsake the Shi'i religious observances that had become current in Mecca, and conform to Sunni practices. Thus, in 464/1071–1072, the ʿAbbasid Caliph al-Qā'im sent the Sharif Abū Ṭālib al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad to Mecca with a large sum of money and several robes of honor for the Sharif Abū Ḥāshim Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar, the founder of the second dynasty of the sharifs of Mecca, along with a request that he order the traditional Shi'i formula "Come to the best of works!" (*ḥayy ʿalā khayr al-ʿamal!*) to be deleted from the call to prayer (*adhān*) in the Great Mosque. Although Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar initially defended the addition of the refrain, arguing that such had been the practice of ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib himself, he eventually complied with al-Qā'im's request.¹⁷

This incident is of great importance for the historian of the medieval Hijaz; it is the earliest date since the foundation of the sharifate of Mecca ca. 357/968 for which there exists textual evidence for the observance of practices peculiar to Shi'ism in Mecca. Furthermore, it demonstrates that Shi'ism enjoyed the support of the grand sharif of Mecca himself.

After Saladin's conquest of Egypt and subsequent deposition of the last of the Fatimid caliphs, al-^ʿĀḍid, in 567/1171, he sent his brother Tūrānshāh b. Ayyūb to obtain control of the Yemen in 569/1173. On his way there, Tūrānshāh paused for a short time in Mecca, where he confirmed the reigning Sharif, ^ʿĪsā b. Fulayta, in the office of emir,¹⁸ signaling that Mecca had come under the protection of the fledgling Ayyubid dynasty. Ten years later, in Ramaḍān 579/December 1183–January 1184, another of Saladin's brothers, al-Malik al-^ʿAzīz Tughtagīn b. Ayyūb, arrived in Mecca on his way to assume the governorship of the Ayyubid province of the Yemen, during the reign of the Sharif Mukthir b. ^ʿĪsā. Tughtagīn, representing the enthusiastic Sunnism of the new masters of Egypt, ordered that the Shi^ʿi formula "Come to the best of works!," which had been reintroduced into the call to prayer in the Great Mosque, once again be deleted.¹⁹

Because of the existence of strong local support for Shi^ʿism in the holy city, Tughtagīn's efforts met with no more success than had those of the ^ʿAbbasid Caliph al-Qā^ʿim more than a century before. The Andalusian traveler Ibn Jubayr, who was present in Mecca during Tughtagīn's visit, remarks that the Sharif Mukthir was a Shi^ʿi of the Zaydi persuasion,²⁰ as were the rest of the Ḥasanid sharifs.²¹ However, Ibn Jubayr also observed that, on certain occasions, Mukthir would perform the evening ritual prayer (*ṣalāt al-^ʿishā^ʿ*) along with the Sunni imam of the Shafi^ʿi rite,²² contrary to the practice of the Banū Ḥasan, who customarily performed all the prescribed ritual prayers along with their own Zaydi imam. In addition, Ibn Jubayr recorded that the Banū Ḥasan did not observe the Friday congregational prayer (*ṣalāt al-jum^ʿa*), but performed the four *rak^ʿas* of the noon (*ẓuhr*) prayer instead, in conformity with Shi^ʿi practice. As for the fourth ritual prayer of the day, performed shortly after sunset (*ṣalāt al-maghrib*), Ibn Jubayr remarked that the Shi^ʿa of Mecca performed it as one body only after the four Sunni imams of the Great Mosque had led their own followers in the performance of their devotions.²³

IV

Toward the close of the sixth/twelfth century, Qatāda b. Idrīs, a sharif of Ḥasanid extraction who was originally from the region known as Wādī Yanbu^ʿ, roughly midway between Medina and the Red Sea coast, wrested control of Mecca from the last of the Hawāshim, Mukthir b. ^ʿĪsā,²⁴ and founded the third dynasty of the sharifs of Mecca, known as the Banū Qatāda, which ruled the emirate of Mecca and its dependencies until the twentieth century. During his twenty-year reign as Emir of Mecca (ca. 597/1200–1201–617/1220), Qatāda succeeded in restoring a large measure of order and stability to the internal politics of the holy city, after the state of near anarchy that had prevailed there during the last few decades of the rule of the Hawāshim.²⁵ Qatāda then embarked on an expansionist policy in the Hijaz, which culminated in the extension of Meccan hegemony to Yanbu^ʿ and Medina in the north and to the Sarāt mountains of Yemen, south of Ṭā^ʿif.²⁶

Zaydi Shi^ʿism continued to be the dominant sect among the Banū Ḥasan throughout the Hijaz during this period. Although Qatāda b. Idrīs was a native

of Wādī Yanbu^c, far to the north of Mecca, the epicenter of Shi'ī activity in the Hijaz, he too adhered to Zaydism²⁷ and energetically supported the Zaydi beliefs and practices that had been current in Mecca during the time of his predecessors, the Hawāshim. During Qatāda's reign, the Shi'ī version of the call to prayer was the only one used in the Great Mosque at Mecca.²⁸ The Ayyubids were as unsuccessful in their attempts to suppress it and to eradicate Zaydism from the holy cities of the Hijaz as had been the 'Abbasids. Ibn al-Mujāwir, the celebrated traveler and geographer who visited Mecca not long after Qatāda's death, noted that the majority of its inhabitants adhered to "the *madhhab* of the Imam Zayd b. 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn."²⁹

The violent death of the Sharif Qatāda b. Idrīs at the hands of his son al-Ḥasan in 617/1220 ushered in a period of intense strife in the political history of Mecca, which culminated in the military occupation of the city in 620/1223 by the Ayyubid ruler of the Yemen, al-Malik al-Mas'ūd Yūsuf, acting in the name of his father, al-Malik al-Kāmil Muḥammad, the Ayyubid sultan of Egypt and Syria. Six years later, after al-Mas'ūd's death, one of his lieutenants, Nūr al-Dīn 'Umar b. 'Alī b. Rasūl, assumed control of the Ayyubid territories in Yemen for himself and founded the Rasulid dynasty. During the following two decades, suzerainty over Mecca was vigorously contested by the Rasulids and the Ayyubids of Egypt and Syria. Actual control of the holy city changed hands several times, until 652/1254, when Muḥammad Abū Numayy, a great-grandson of Qatāda b. Idrīs, succeeded to the emirate and managed to restore the actual control of affairs to the Ḥasanid sharifs.³⁰

The lengthy reign of Abū Numayy (652/1254–701/1301) represents the apogee of Ḥasanid political independence in Mecca during the age of the Mamluks (648/1250–923/1517), who had succeeded the Ayyubids as rulers of Egypt and Syria. An important eyewitness account of political, social, and religious life in Mecca during the closing years of Abū Numayy's reign is afforded by the narrative of the Moroccan pilgrim al-Qāsim b. Yūsuf al-Sibtī al-Tujībī (d. 730/1329), who arrived in Mecca in 696/1297. Al-Tujībī's observations confirm that the Banū Ḥasan continued to adhere to Zaydi Shi'ism; he remarks that the protector and most fervent supporter of Zaydism in the holy city was the Grand Sharif Abū Numayy himself.³¹ The Shi'ī formula of the call to prayer was in official use in the Great Mosque,³² and a Zaydi imam led his followers in the performance of the prescribed ritual prayers.³³ On Fridays in the Great Mosque, the Zaydi Shi'a performed the four *rak'as* of the noon (zuhr) prayer rather than attend the Friday prayer observed by the Sunnis, just as Ibn Jubayr had witnessed more than a century earlier. Al-Tujībī adds that although many of the Sunni ulama in Mecca were opposed to such Zaydi observances, they were powerless to take any measures designed to eliminate them, because of the Sharif Abū Numayy's patronage of Zaydism.³⁴

Several later Arab historians were favorably impressed by the record of Abū Numayy's achievements, not the least significant of which was his preserving Mecca's independence despite the increasing efforts of both the Rasulids and the Mamluks to bring the Hijaz in general and Mecca in particular into their own spheres of influence. The ninth/fifteenth-century historian of Mecca, Taqī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Fāsī, was so enthusiastic as to proclaim that, "Were it

not for his madhhab, he would have been [a] suitable [choice] for the caliphate; he was a Zaydi, as were his relatives.”³⁵ Al-Fāṣī’s encomium was echoed by two Egyptian historians of the Mamluk kingdom, al-Maqrīzī and Ibn Taghrī Bardī.³⁶

After the death of the Sharif Muḥammad Abū Numayy in 701/1301, the Mamluk Sultan al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalāʾūn proceeded to implement a policy based on more active intervention in the internal politics of Mecca, designed to bring it under at least nominal Mamluk control. Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad was aided in the realization of this goal by the intense rivalry of four of the sons of the late grand sharif—Abūʾl-Ghayth, ʿUṭayfa, Ḥumayḍa, and Rumaytha—over the succession to the emirate.³⁷ The Mamluks soon discovered that the most effective instrument for the execution of their new dynamic policy toward the Hijaz was the commander of the annual Egyptian pilgrimage caravan, the *amīr al-ḥājj*.³⁸ Thus, in Dhūʾl-Ḥijja 701/July–August 1302, the Egyptian *amīr al-ḥājj*, Baybars al-Jashnakīr, deposed Ḥumayḍa and Rumaytha, who had managed to assume joint control of Mecca after Abū Numayy’s death, and appointed Abūʾl-Ghayth and ʿUṭayfa in their stead, after making them swear an oath of loyalty to al-Nāṣir Muḥammad.³⁹

On his return to Cairo, Baybars al-Jashnakīr informed the sultan of the Shiʿi observances he had witnessed in the Great Mosque at Mecca, whereupon al-Nāṣir Muḥammad undertook to write to Abūʾl-Ghayth and ʿUṭayfa to demand the elimination of the Shiʿi formula “Come to the best of works!” from the call to prayer, and the removal of the Zaydi imam from the Great Mosque. Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s message was relayed to Mecca by Burulghī al-Ashrafī, commander of the Egyptian pilgrimage caravan in 702/1303.⁴⁰ Although Abūʾl-Ghayth and ʿUṭayfa are reported to have complied with the sultan’s wishes, the need for official reiteration of the same demand by the Mamluk administration in subsequent years eloquently demonstrates that Zaydi practices must have been resumed in Mecca soon thereafter. The sharifs of Mecca, while accepting the inevitability of Mamluk intervention in their own political quarrels, were as yet unwilling to permit Mamluk interference in purely doctrinal matters.

The inability of Abūʾl-Ghayth and ʿUṭayfa to maintain a minimum of stability in Mecca prompted further Mamluk military intervention. In Dhūʾl-Ḥijja 704/July 1305, there were replaced as joint Emirs by their brothers Ḥumayḍa and Rumaytha, by order of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad.⁴¹ Nevertheless, the state of affairs in Mecca continued to worsen during the following years, as the emirs, along with their followers and slaves, took to the systematic pillage of the annual pilgrimage caravans of Egypt, Syria, and Yemen. Once again, al-Nāṣir Muḥammad opted for direct intervention, and so in Dhūʾl-Ḥijja 713/March–April 1314, Ṭuḡsubā al-Zāhirī, the Egyptian *amīr al-ḥājj*, deposed Ḥumayḍa and Rumaytha and designated Abūʾl-Ghayth as sole Emir of Mecca.⁴² However, soon after Ṭuḡsubā’s return to Cairo early in 714/1314, Ḥumayḍa drove his brother Abūʾl-Ghayth from Mecca and resumed the office of emir, although without the participation of Rumaytha.⁴³ Later in the same year, Ḥumayḍa inflicted a crushing defeat on Abūʾl-Ghayth and his allies from the Ḥusaynid sharifs of Medina in a battle fought on the outskirts of Mecca, and then personally ordered his brother’s execution. No doubt anticipating renewed Mamluk intervention in the Hijaz, Ḥumayḍa decided to throw in his lot with their rivals for

the control of the Muslim holy cities, the Rasulids of Yemen, and so the name and titles of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad were replaced in the Friday khutba in the Great Mosque by those of the Rasulid Sultan al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad Dā'ūd.⁴⁴ When a contingent of Mamluk horsemen actually arrived in Mecca in 715/1315, Ḥumayda did not seek the protection of his new Rasulid patrons as might have been expected, but fled instead to the court of the Ilkhanid Sultan of Iraq, Uljaytū, a great-grandson of Hūlāgū Khān.⁴⁵

Relations between the Rasulids and the Mamluks had greatly improved since 712/1312, and it is probable that the Sharif Ḥumayda realized that al-Mu'ayyad Dā'ūd would not be anxious to risk jeopardizing his rapprochement with al-Nāṣir Muḥammad by harboring a rebel against Mamluk authority. On the other hand, the Ilkhanid Sultan Uljaytū had converted to Twelver Shi'ism in 710/1310, and, since 712/1312 had attempted, although without appreciable success, to wrest the Syrian provinces from Mamluk control.⁴⁶ The unexpected appearance at the court of Uljaytū of the Sharif Ḥumayda, the former Emir of Mecca and a Zaydi Shi'i whose enmity toward al-Nāṣir Muḥammad was widely known, was an opportunity whose importance was not lost on the Ilkhan.

In Rajab 716/September–October 1316, Uljaytū delegated to the Sharif Ḥumayda the command of a well-equipped army consisting of several thousand Mongol horsemen and a large contingent of Arab tribesmen from Iraq, and sent him to the Hijaz with orders to bring it under Ilkhanid control. Soon after Ḥumayda's expedition passed the southern Iraqi port city of Baṣra, news reached them of the untimely death of Uljaytū, whereupon the army quickly fragmented and a large part of it deserted. Those who remained with Ḥumayda were set on by the chieftain of the Āl Faḍl beduin and severely defeated. Ḥumayda managed to survive the debacle, and made his way to Mecca accompanied by twenty-three horsemen, arriving there early in 717/1317.⁴⁷

The death of the Sultan Uljaytū effectively thwarted Ilkhanid designs on the Hijaz, which went beyond mere annexation of the holy cities of Islam to include the active propagation of Shi'i doctrines in western Arabia.⁴⁸ Several Arab historians also mention that one of the objectives of the ill-fated expedition led by the Sharif Ḥumayda was to have been the removal of the remains of Abū Bakr and 'Umar from their places of burial next to the grave of the Prophet Muḥammad in the Prophet's Mosque at Medina.⁴⁹ Ḥumayda could have been expected to lend his support to Ilkhanid attempts to spread Shi'ism in the Hijaz, but it is questionable whether he, a moderate Zaydi Shi'i, would have actively cooperated with the Ilkhanids in the execution of the more extremist aspects of their policy vis-à-vis the Hijaz.

Despite the failure of the Ilkhanid expedition of 716/1316, Ḥumayda did not despair of eventually establishing some form of Ilkhanid hegemony over Mecca. Toward the end of the month of Dhū'l-Hijja 717/May 1318, Ḥumayda removed his brother Rumaytha from the office of Emir of Mecca and assumed it himself. One of his first official actions was to replace the name and titles of the Mamluk Sultan al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad in the Friday khutba by those of Uljaytū's son and successor, Abū Sa'id.⁵⁰ But the Ilkhanid khutba proved to be of short duration, for Ḥumayda fled Mecca early in the following year, 718/1318, shortly before the arrival of a company of Mamluk soldiers dispatched to the Hijaz by

al-Nāṣir Muḥammad to reestablish Mamluk influence in the holy city. Mecca was then placed under direct Mamluk military occupation, which lasted until al-Nāṣir Muḥammad appointed the Sharif ʿUṭayfa b. Abī Numayy Emir of Mecca in 719/1319.⁵¹

The most ardent partisan of Zaydism in Mecca during the third decade of the eighth/fourteenth century was Rumaytha b. Abī Numayy. Although he had played only a passive role in the tortuous internal politics of the emirate during the previous two decades, leaving the direction of affairs largely in the hands of his brother Ḥumayḍa, it is clear that Rumaytha gave at least tacit support to the latter's overture to the Mongol Ilkhans. During the pilgrimage season of 718/1318, Badr al-Dīn b. al-Turkumānī, the commander of the company of Mamluks responsible for maintaining order in Mecca, seized Rumaytha and carried him to Cairo in chains, where he was placed under house arrest. In his account of this incident, the contemporary Egyptian historian Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī (d. 732/1332) reports that Rumaytha had been providing covert support for his brother Ḥumayḍa ever since the latter had replaced al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's name in the khuṭba with that of the Ilkhanid Sultan Abū Saʿīd, earlier in the same year.⁵² After news of the murder of the Sharif Ḥumayḍa, who had been living in the vicinity of Mecca, reached the sultan in Cairo toward the end of 720/1320, al-Nāṣir Muḥammad released Rumaytha, restored him to favor, and designated him joint Emir of Mecca alongside his brother ʿUṭayfa, who had held the office independently for one year.⁵³ Shortly after his return to power in Mecca, Rumaytha publicly proclaimed his support for Zaydi Shiʿism.⁵⁴

According to the Meccan historian al-Fāsī (d. 832/1429), a Zaydi imam of sharifian ancestry used to lead the Shiʿa in the performance of the prescribed ritual prayers in front of the Kaʿba in the Great Mosque during this period. After the completion of the dawn (*fajr*) and sunset (*maghrib*) prayers, he would raise his voice, loudly intoning the following supplications:

O Allah! Grant Your blessings to Muḥammad and to his family [*ahl baytihi*], the chosen and the purified ones, those who have been selected, the elect, those from whom Allah has driven away uncleanness and whom He has made pure. O Allah! Grant victory to the truth and to those who are in the right, and vanquish error and those who propagate it, by [virtue of] the survival of the shadow of the Commander of the Faithful, the explicator of the clear message [i.e., the Qurʾān] and the unveiler of the mysteries of the Qurʾān, the Imam, son of the Imam, son of the Imam, Muḥammad b. al-Muṭahhar b. Yaḥyā,⁵⁵ the scion of the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace!, he who was raised up for the cause of religion, the Imam of the pious and the protector of those who fast. O Allah! Grant him victory and diffuse his illuminations; kill those who envy him and overthrow those who oppose him!⁵⁶

The undisguised Shiʿi sentiments expressed in these prayers and the public invocation of the name of the Zaydi Imam of Yemen provide a dramatic illustration of the sectarian sentiments of Rumaytha b. Abī Numayy and his fellow Ḥasanid sharifs in Mecca, and shed important light on the reality of their political loyalties as well.

Since the death of the Sharif Muḥammad Abū Numayy in 701/1301, the Mamluks, during the lengthy reign of Sultan al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalā'ūn, made several attempts to impose their version of Sunni orthodoxy on the population of Mecca, as an adjunct to their more general policy, which sought to permanently establish Mamluk sovereignty in the Hijaz. Rumaytha's enthusiastic support of Zaydism, which went so far as to permit public prayer for the Zaydi imam of Yemen in the Great Mosque, represented a serious challenge to this policy, and the Mamluks soon found it necessary to redouble their efforts aimed at the suppression of Zaydism in the holy city. Thus, in 725/1325, the Zaydi imam of the Great Mosque is reported to have fled to Wādī Marr, on the outskirts of Mecca, during the passage through Mecca of the army of Mamluks dispatched to the Yemen by al-Nāṣir Muḥammad at the request of the new Rasulid Sultan al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad Dā'ūd, to assist him in maintaining order in his realm. After the departure of the Mamluks, the imam returned to Mecca and resumed his duties in time to participate in the rites of the pilgrimage season.⁵⁷

Although the Mamluk army did not interfere with the activities of the Zaydis in 725/1325, the flight of the Zaydi imam illustrates the state of tension that existed between the Sunni Mamluks and the Shi'ī Ḥasanid sharifs. In the following year, the Sharif Rumaytha journeyed to Cairo in response to a formal summons from al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. Shortly after Rumaytha's arrival, the sultan sent an official decree to Rumaytha's brother and joint Emir of Mecca, 'Uṭayfa b. Abī Numayy, ordering him to forbid the imam of the Zaydi Shi'a from leading his followers in the performance of the ritual prayers in the Great Mosque. Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Majd al-Dīn al-Jazarī (d. 739/1338), the contemporary Damascene historian who narrates this incident, claims that 'Uṭayfa acceded to the sultan's wishes and forcibly expelled the Zaydi imam from the Great Mosque in Sha'ban 726/July–August 1326.⁵⁸ But the imam soon returned to his duties: The Moroccan traveler Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who was in Mecca in the month of Dhū'l-Ḥijja/October–November of the same year, mentions that the imam led his fellow Shi'is in prayer in the Great Mosque at that time.⁵⁹ It is worthy of note that the Sharif Rumaytha had by that time returned to Mecca, where he continued to exercise the functions of the office of Emir in conjunction with his brother 'Uṭayfa.⁶⁰

In spite of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's repeated attempts to proscribe Shi'ī observances in Mecca, sharifian support of Zaydism remained largely unaffected. The contemporary encyclopedist Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Faḍl Allāh al-'Umarī (d. 749/1348) confirms the deeply rooted attachment of the sharifs of Mecca to the Zaydi creed, and records an illuminating conversation that he had with Mubārak, the son of the Sharif 'Uṭayfa, which touched on the political overtones of the Shi'ism of the sharifs. The sharifs, Mubārak said, "reserve their obedience for that Imam [i.e., the Zaydi Imam of the Yemen], and consider themselves to be his deputies. They deal cautiously with the ruler of Egypt for fear of him and for the *iqṭā'*, and they flatter the ruler of Yemen in order to avoid conflict, to ensure that the Kārim continue [to come to Mecca] and [to obtain] the stipends."⁶¹

Rumaytha b. Abī Numayy died while Emir of Mecca on the eighth of Dhu'l-Qa' da 746/3 March 1346, and with his death a new era in the history of the holy city began, as power was transferred to a new generation, the grandchildren of the Sharif Muḥammad Abū Numayy. The various contenders for power during the next half-century were all descendants of Rumaytha, the most successful of Abū Numayy's numerous progeny. This new phase of Meccan history, which lasted until the accession of Ḥasan b. 'Ajlān in 797/1395, witnessed a gradual decline in sharifian support for Zaydi Shi'ism, from the earlier enthusiasm of personalities such as Ḥumayda and Rumaytha. During the second half of the eighth/fourteenth century, contemporary writers began to express doubts concerning the Shi'ism of some prominent Ḥasanids in Mecca, while others were known to have actually professed Sunni Islam.

The first intimation of the coming transformation in the future of Zaydi Shi'ism in Mecca can be traced back to the very day of the death and burial of the Sharif Rumaytha. After the sharif's body had been prepared for burial, a Zaydi imam by the name of Abū'l-Qāsim b. al-Shughayf al-Zaydī stepped forward to officiate at the obsequies, but was prevented from doing so by the chief qadi of Mecca, Shihāb al-Dīn al-Ṭabarī, a Shafi'i jurist. Although Rumaytha's son and successor 'Ajlān was present, he did not interfere.⁶²

Al-Fāsī has preserved an anecdote that provides further evidence of the beginnings of a trend away from Zaydism in Mecca. According to his account, Ibn al-Shughayf, the acknowledged leader of the Zaydi Shi'a in Mecca, was formally requested to abjure his Zaydi beliefs by the renowned Shafi'i jurist of Egypt 'Izz al-Dīn b. Jamā'a, during one of the latter's visits to the Hijaz. Ibn al-Shughayf, who was apparently not under any form of duress, is said to have done so in writing and to have accepted Sunnism.⁶³

From the death of Rumaytha b. Abī Numayy in 746/1346 until 762/1361, control of the emirate of Mecca was contested by several of his sons; the office of emir was held for the most part by 'Ajlān and Thaqaba, either independently or jointly, although their brother Sanad and their cousin Muḥammad b. 'Uṭayfa b. Abī Numayy also governed the emirate for short intervals. Changes in power were of frequent occurrence, and no single sharif or coalition of sharifs was able to retain control of Mecca for more than one or two years at a time. On several occasions, the transfer of executive authority was effected through direct Mamluk intervention.

In 754/1353, when Thaqaba b. Rumaytha was Emir of Mecca, the imam of the Zaydi Shi'a in the Great Mosque was severely beaten and then imprisoned after refusing to renounce Zaydism. He was later able to escape from his place of confinement, and fled to Wādī Nakhla, on the outskirts of Mecca. The precise circumstances surrounding this incident are unclear, although it is known that the imam in question used to lead the Zaydi Shi'a in the performance of the prescribed ritual prayers in the Great Mosque, and that a pulpit (*minbar*) had been erected for him there, from which he customarily addressed his fellow Shi'is on certain occasions, such as the Feast of Breaking the Ramadan Fast (*'īd*

al-fiṭr) and the Feast of Immolation (ʿīd al-aḍḥā).⁶⁴ It is worthy of consideration that the assault on the Zaydi imam took place during the reign of the Sharif Thaqaḇa, who was known to be a fervent Zaydi who showed great respect for the beliefs and observances of his sect.⁶⁵

In Dhū'l-Ḥijja 754/December 1353–January 1354, ʿUmar Shāh, the commander of the Egyptian pilgrimage caravan, implementing the orders given him by the Mamluk Sultan al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ṣāliḥ, deposed Thaqaḇa and designated his brother ʿAjlān as Emir of Mecca in his stead. Soon thereafter, ʿUmar Shāh had the Zaydi muezzin of the Great Mosque beaten to death.⁶⁶ This incident, along with the earlier assault on the Zaydi imam of the Great Mosque, are evidence of a more resolute Mamluk attempt to extirpate Shi'ism from Mecca. It is possible that the Mamluks found a willing ally in the execution of their policy in the Sharif ʿAjlān b. Rumaytha, who ruled Mecca at intervals from 746/1345 until 762/1361, and thereafter continuously until his death in 777/1375. ʿAjlān had earned particular renown because of his profound respect for Sunni beliefs, to the extent that some historians even acclaimed him as the protector of Sunnism in the holy city, at a time when his fellow Ḥasanid sharifs continued to publicly profess Zaydism. According to al-Fāsī, certain of ʿAjlān's contemporaries claimed that he had actually converted to Sunnism and followed the Shafi'i school of Islamic law, which was then predominant in Mecca.⁶⁷

ʿAjlān's support of Sunnism, however, was still an anomaly in Mecca in the late eighth/fourteenth century, and it is uncertain whether he had any imitators among the Banū Ḥasan. His brother Sanad, who ruled Mecca for several short intervals between 748/1347–1348 and 762/1361, was a powerful advocate of Zaydism who appointed a Zaydi *khaṭīb* to preach to his fellow Shi'is in the Great Mosque on festival days.⁶⁸ And despite ʿAjlān's own pro-Sunni reputation, Ibn Taghrī Bardī (d. 874/1469) was unable to ascertain whether his son Aḥmad, who held the office of Emir of Mecca jointly and at times independently, from 762/1361 until 788/1386, shared his father's beliefs, or continued to adhere to the Zaydism of his fellow sharifs.⁶⁹

As late as the first quarter of the ninth/fifteenth century, the sharifs of Mecca were still regarded as Zaydi Shi'is by their contemporaries. The Egyptian encyclopedist Shihāb al-Dīn Abū'l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Qalqashandī (d. 821/1418) wrote that “these Ḥasanids of Mecca and Yanbuʿ . . . follow the Zaydi madhhab.”⁷⁰ Elsewhere, he affirms the connection between the sharifs of Mecca and the Zaydi imams of the Yemen that was alluded to earlier by Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī.⁷¹

Al-Qalqashandī's remarks are the latest textual evidence for the existence of Zaydism in Mecca. None of the available sources for the history of the Mamluk Kingdom known to this writer, whether published or manuscript, mention any attempt by the sultans of the ninth/fifteenth century to suppress Zaydism in Mecca, such as had frequently occurred during the preceding century. More importantly, the three native-born historians of Mecca—Taqī al-Dīn al-Fāsī (d. 832/1429), Najm al-Dīn ʿUmar b. Fahd (d. 885/1480), and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿUmar b. Fahd (d. 922/1516)—whose chronicles and biographical dictionaries provide a vivid and detailed picture of all aspects of life in Mecca from the close

of the eighth/fourteenth century until the Ottoman annexation of the Hijaz in 923/1517, make no mention of the existence of Zaydism in the holy city after the death of the Sharif ʿAjlān b. Rumaytha in 777/1375. Consequently, it appears highly probable that there occurred a marked decline in sharifian support for Zaydism beginning in the latter part of the eighth/fourteenth century, which eventually led to its complete disappearance, most likely during the first half of the ninth/fifteenth century. The favorable attitude toward Sunnism that was first adopted by ʿAjlān b. Rumaytha should therefore be interpreted as a forerunner of the profound changes that were to transform the sectarian affiliation of the Banū Ḥasan in the following century, as a result of the constantly increasing military and economic pressure of the Mamluks, who eventually occupied Mecca in 827/1424.

The results of this transformation are reflected in the biographical notices concerning the grand sharifs of the ninth/fifteenth century; by means of a careful screening of the data provided therein, the Sunnism of these sharifs can be established beyond reasonable doubt. Thus, the Sharif Ḥasan b. ʿAjlān (reigned 798/1395–818/1415; 819/1416–829/1426) is reported to have studied prophetic *ḥadīth* under the aegis of a number of (Sunni) scholars in Egypt and Syria, some of whom granted him licenses (singular, *ijāza*) to narrate *ḥadīth*.⁷² Ḥasan b. ʿAjlān also built a *madrasa* next to the Great Mosque in which, presumably, both *ḥadīth* and Sunni jurisprudence were among the subjects in which instruction was offered.⁷³

Ḥasan b. ʿAjlān passed on his interest in the study of *ḥadīth* to his sons, Abū'l-Qāsim, Ibrāhīm, and ʿAlī, all of whom obtained *ijāzas* permitting them to narrate *ḥadīth* from a number of prominent traditionists in 836/1432–1433.⁷⁴ Of these three individuals, ʿAlī was perhaps the most serious *ḥadīth* scholar; in addition to his having studied several sections of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim, the complete *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī was read aloud in his presence several times.⁷⁵ Both compendia are, of course, the backbone of Sunni scholarship in the field of prophetic traditions.

Barakāt b. Ḥasan b. ʿAjlān, who reigned for thirty years as Emir of Mecca (829/1426–859/1455) obtained several *ijāzas* to transmit *ḥadīth*. Furthermore, he is reported to have actually taught prophetic traditions in Cairo and Mecca,⁷⁶ where one of his students, Najm al-Din ʿUmar b. Fahd, was the future historian of the holy city.⁷⁷ Barakāt's son and successor, Muḥammad (reigned 859/1455–903/1497), undertook the study of *ḥadīth* in Egypt and Syria as well as the Hijaz, and also obtained a number of *ijāzas* from leading traditionists,⁷⁸ as did his own son Barakāt b. Muḥammad (reigned 903/1497–931/1525).⁷⁹

Thus, beginning with Ḥasan b. ʿAjlān, the sharifs of Mecca took great pains to disassociate themselves from the Zaydi Shiʿism of their forebears. To achieve this end, they undertook the scholarly study of prophetic *ḥadīth*, as related by the Sunni authorities of the early centuries of Islam, until several of their number became recognized as *ḥadīth* scholars in the Sunni tradition in their own right.

NOTES

¹For detailed information concerning the political and economic history of Mecca from the foundation of the sharifate until the end of the Mamluk era, see Richard Mortel, *al-Aḥwāl al-siyāsiyya wa'l-iqtisādīyya bi-Makka fi'l-ʿaṣr al-Mamlūkī* (Riyadh, 1985).

²A thorough discussion of the problems involved in establishing the genealogy of the founder of this dynasty and the reasons for its being called “Jaʿfarid” can be found in Richard T. Mortel, “The Genealogy of the Ḥasanid Sharifs of Mecca,” *Journal of the College of Arts, King Saud University*, 12, 2 (1985), 221–50.

³See, for example, A. J. Wensinck, “Mecca,” in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st ed.; Donald P. Little, “The History of Arabia During the Baḥrī Mamlūk Period According to Three Mamlūk Historians,” in Abdulgadir M. Abdalla, Sami al-Sakkar, and Richard T. Mortel, eds., *Studies in the History of Arabia*, Vol. 1, Part 2: *Sources for the History of Arabia* (Riyad, 1979), p. 216; ʿAlī b. Ḥusayn al-Sulaymān, *al-ʿAlāqāt al-Ḥijāziyya al-Miṣriyya zamān salāṭīn al-Mamālīk* (Cairo, 1973), pp. 28–29; Muḥammad Jamāl al-Dīn Surūr, *Siyāsat al-Fāṭimiyyīn al-khārījīyya* (Cairo, 1976), p. 34. ʿAḥmad ʿUmar al-Zaylāʿī, *Makka wa ʿalāqātuḥā al-khārījīyya (301–487 A.H.)* (Riyad, 1981), makes no mention of this problem.

⁴See, for example, ʿĀʾisha bint ʿAbd Allāh Bā Qāsī, *Bilād al-Ḥijāz fi'l-ʿaṣr al-Ayyūbī* (Mecca, 1980), p. 20; ʿAṭīyya al-Qūṣī, *Tijārāt Miṣr fi'l-Baḥr al-Aḥmar mundhu fajr al-Islām ḥattā suqūt al-khilāfa al-Abbāsiyya* (Cairo, 1976), p. 109.

⁵ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Khaldūn, *Kitāb al-ʿibar wa dīwān al-mubtadaʾ wa'l-khabar* (Cairo, 1284 A.H.), vol. 4, p. 99. The text reads, “al-Zabīdī,” i.e., a native of Zabīd in Yemen, instead of “al-Zaydī,” but it is clearly in error given the contextual meaning.

⁶Najm al-Dīn ʿUmar b. Muḥammad b. Fahd, “Ithāf al-warā bi-akhbār Umm al-Qurā,” manuscript at King Saud University Library, Riyadh, no. f113/2, events of the year 358; ʿAbd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad al-Jazīrī al-Anṣārī, *Durar al-fawāʿid al-muʿazzama fī akhbār al-hajj wa ʿarīq Makka al-mukarrama* (Cairo, 1384 A.H.), pp. 244–45.

⁷Abū'l-Faraj ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam fī tārikh al-mulūk wa'l-umam* (Hyderabad, 1358 A.H.), vol. 7, p. 75; ʿIzz al-Dīn ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī'l-tārikh* (Beirut, 1965–1966), vol. 8, p. 648.

⁸Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāz al-ḥunafā bi-akhbār al-ʿāʾima al-Fāṭimiyyīn al-khulafā* (Cairo, 1967–1973), vol. 1, pp. 225, 230.

⁹Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Muyassar, *Akhbār Miṣr* (Cairo, 1919), pp. 47, 49; Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam*, vol. 7, pp. 80–81; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, vol. 8, p. 667; al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāz al-ḥunafā*, vol. 1, pp. 252, 267, 272; see also my article, “Maṣādir al-tamwīn al-ghidhāʾī li-imārat Makka,” in *Journal of the College of Arts, King Saud University*, 12, 1 (1985), 193–219.

¹⁰According to a late (ninth/fifteenth-century) source, the commander of the Iraqi pilgrimage caravan proclaimed the khuṭba in Mecca in the name of the Buwayhid Sultan ʿAḍūd al-Dawla and the ʿAbbasid Caliph al-Ṭāʾiʿ during the pilgrimage season of 368/979; see ʿUmar b. Fahd, “Ithāf al-warā,” events of the year 368. The Buwayhids were, of course, Shiʿis.

¹¹Taqī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Fāsī, *Shifāʾ al-gharām bi-akhbār al-balad al-ḥarām* (Cairo, 1956), vol. 2, p. 197; Surūr, *Siyāsat al-Fāṭimiyyīn*, p. 28; Mortel, *Aḥwāl*, pp. 17–25; Ḥusayn al-Hamdānī, *al-Sulayḥiyyūn wa'l-ḥaraka al-Fāṭimiyya bi'l-Yaman* (Cairo, 1955), p. 95. Evidence for the mention of the names of the Fatimid caliphs in the khuṭba in Mecca and the annual Fatimid presentation of the *kiswa*, or ceremonial covering, to the Kaʿba during the pilgrimage season—both indications of Fatimid sovereignty over Mecca—during the period of the Jaʿfarids, can be found in the following sources: Ibn Muyassar, *Akhbār Miṣr*, p. 49; Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam*, vol. 8, p. 105; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, vol. 8, p. 667; al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāz*, vol. 1, pp. 225, 246, 252–53, 267, 272, 281, 282, 284, 289; vol. 2, pp. 7, 8, 15, 20, 24, 41, 51, 59, 68, 95; al-Jazīrī, *Durar*, p. 254.

¹²For accounts of Abū'l-Futūḥ's revolt, see Abū Shujāʿ Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Rudhārawrī, *Dhawl tajārīb al-umam* (Cairo, 1916), vol. 3, pp. 236, 238; Jamāl al-Dīn ʿAlī b. Zāfir al-Azdī, *Akhbār al-duwal al-munqaṭiʿa* (Cairo, 1972), pp. 48, 49, 50; Abū'l-Abbās Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-aʿyān wa anbaʾ abnāʾ al-zamān* (Beirut, 1968–1972), vol. 2, pp. 174–75; Ibn Khaldūn, *Ibar*, vol. 4, p. 102; Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAlī b. ʿInaba al-Ḥasanī, “ʿUmdat al-ṭālib fī ansāb āl Abī Ṭālib,” in *Majmūʿat al-rasāʾil al-Kamāliyya (8) fi'l-ansāb* (al-Ṭāʾif,

1980), p. 233; al-Fāsī, *al-ʿIqd al-thamīn fī tārikh al-balad al-amīn* (Cairo, 1959–1969), vol. 4, pp. 70–72, 74, 75; idem, *Shifāʾ al-gharām*, vol. 2, p. 195; al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʾāz al-ḥunafā*, vol. 2, pp. 87, 95; ʿUmar b. Fahd, “Ithāf al-warā,” events of 401.

¹³ Abu Shujāʿ, *Dhayl*, vol. 3, p. 236; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-aʿyān*, vol. 2, pp. 174–75; al-Fāsī, *ʿIqd*, vol. 4, p. 71.

¹⁴ Ibn Khaldūn, *ʿIbar*, vol. 4, p. 101; ʿUmar b. Fahd, “Ithāf al-warā,” events of 395.

¹⁵ See Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Shahrastānī, *Kitāb al-milal waʾl-niḥal* (Cairo, 1967), vol. 1, pp. 154–57; ʿAbd al-Qāhir b. Tāhir al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayn al-firaq* (Beirut, n.d.), pp. 22–23, 30–37, for a discussion of the fundamental tenets of Zaydi Shiʿism. It deserves to be mentioned that a minority of Zaydi scholars are known to have adopted a radical pro-Imami Shiʿi position vis-à-vis the Companions, and permitted their public vilification. The mainstream of Zaydi thought, however, seems clearly opposed to such practices. See E. Kohlberg, “Some Zaydi Views on the Companions of the Prophet,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 39 (1976), 94–97.

¹⁶ For further information regarding Mecca’s relations with the Fatimids and the Abbasids during this period, see Mortel, *Aḥwāl*, pp. 23–31; Surūr, *Siyāsāt al-Fāṭimiyyīn*, pp. 28–33.

¹⁷ Jamāl al-Dīn Abūʾl-Maḥāsīn Yūsuf b. Taghrī Bardī, *al-Nujūm al-zāhira fī mulūk Miṣr waʾl-Qāhira* (Cairo, ?–1972), vol. 5, p. 89.

¹⁸ Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Yūsuf b. Quzaoghlū, *Mirʾāt al-zamān fī tārikh al-aʿyān* (Hyderabad, 1952), vol. 8, pp. 300–301.

¹⁹ Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Mirʾāt al-zamān*, vol. 8, p. 388; Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Ismāʿīl, Abū Shāma al-Maqdisī, *Kitāb al-rawḍatayn fī akhbār al-dawlatayn* (Cairo, 1287–1288 A.H.), vol. 2, p. 74; al-Fāsī, *ʿIqd*, vol. 5, p. 62; Ibn Taghrī Bardī, *Nujūm*, vol. 6, p. 103; ʿUmar b. Fahd, “Ithāf al-warā,” events of 581.

²⁰ Abūʾl-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Jubayr, *Tadhkira biʾl-akhbār ʿan ittifāqāt al-asfār* (Cairo, 1968), p. 11.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 106.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 84–85.

²⁴ Ibn Khaldūn, *ʿIbar*, vol. 4, p. 105; al-Fāsī, *ʿIqd*, vol. 4, p. 70.

²⁵ Ibn Taghrī Bardī, *Nujūm*, vol. 6, pp. 249–50.

²⁶ Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, vol. 12, p. 401; Ibn Khaldūn, *ʿIbar*, vol. 4, p. 105; al-Fāsī, *ʿIqd*, vol. 7, p. 39.

²⁷ Imād al-Dīn Ismāʿīl b. Kathīr, *al-Bidāya waʾl-nihāya fīʾl-tārikh* (Cairo, 1351–1358 A.H.), vol. 13, p. 92.

²⁸ Al-Fāsī, *ʿIqd*, vol. 7, p. 57; Ibn Taghrī Bardī, *Nujūm*, vol. 6, p. 250.

²⁹ Jamāl al-Dīn Abūʾl-Faṭḥ Yūsuf b. Yaʿqūb b. al-Mujāwir, *Tārikh al-mustabṣir* (Leiden, 1951), vol. 1, p. 5.

³⁰ Further details concerning the complex political history of this period can be found in Mortel, *Aḥwāl*, pp. 42–52.

³¹ Al-Qāsim b. Yūsuf al-Sibtī al-Tujībī, *Mustafād al-riḥla waʾl-ighdirāb* (Tunis, 1975), p. 297.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 298.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 297.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 298–99, 300.

³⁵ Al-Fāsī, *ʿIqd*, vol. 1, p. 467.

³⁶ Al-Maqrīzī, *Kitāb al-sulūk li-maʿrifat duwal al-mulūk* (Cairo, 1956–1973), vol. 1, p. 927; Ibn Taghrī Bardī, *Nujūm*, vol. 8, pp. 199–200.

³⁷ For the events of the half-century (701/1301–746/1345) during which the office of Emir of Mecca was held by the sons of Abū Numayy, see Mortel, *Aḥwāl*, pp. 65–92; al-Sibāʿī, *Tārikh Makka*, pp. 262–72.

³⁸ The importance of the Egyptian amīr al-ḥājj in the history of Mecca during the Mamlūk period has been dealt with by ʿAbdullāh ʿAnkawī in “The Pilgrimage to Mecca in Mamlūk Times,” in *Arabian Studies*, 1 (1974), 146–70.

³⁹ Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī, “Nihāyat al-arib fī funūn al-adab,” manuscript, Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, no. 549 maʿārif ʿamma, vol. 30, f. 7; al-Fāsī, *ʿIqd*, vol. 4, p. 234; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *al-Durar al-kāmina fī aʿyān al-miʾa al-thāmina* (Cairo, 1966), vol. 2, p. 167; Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad al-ʿAynī, “ʿIqd al-jumʿān fī tārikh ahl al-zamān,” manuscript, Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, no. 1584 tārikh, vol. 21, ff. 267–68.

⁴⁰Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, vol. 1, pp. 940–41; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, vol. 2, pp. 9–10; Ibn Fahd, “Ithāf al-warā,” events of 702; al-Jazīrī, *Durar*, p. 291.

⁴¹Alī b. al-Ḥasan al-Khazrajī, *al-‘Uqūd al-hu²lu²‘iyya fī tārikh al-dawla al-Rasūliyya* (Cairo, 1911–1914), vol. 1, p. 362; al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 4, pp. 234, 405–6; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, vol. 2, p. 11.

⁴²Al-Malik al-Mu²ayyad Ismā‘īl, Abū’l-Fidā, *al-Mukhtaṣar fī tārikh al-bashar* (Cairo, 1323 A.H.), vol. 4, p. 76.

⁴³Al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 4, p. 233; vol. 7, p. 80.

⁴⁴Abū’l-Fidā, *Mukhtaṣar*, vol. 4, p. 76; al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 4, pp. 237–38; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, vol. 2, p. 145; see also Jacques Jomier, *Le Mahmal*, Bulletin de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, Recherches d’Archéologie, de Philologie et d’Histoire (Cairo, 1953), vol. 20, p. 45.

⁴⁵Al-Nuwayrī, “Nihāyat al-arib,” vol. 30, f. 315; al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 4, pp. 238, 407–8; al-‘Aynī, “‘Iqd al-jumān,” vol. 23, f. 54.

⁴⁶Uljaytū’s conversion to Shi’ism is discussed in Sir Henry Howorth, *History of the Mongols* (London, 1876–1888), vol. 3, p. 559; “The Saljuq and Mongol Periods,” in *The Cambridge History of Islam* (Cambridge, 1968), vol. 5, pp. 402, 543–44; Bertold Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran* (Berlin, 1968), pp. 190–91. Ilkhanid designs on Syria are reviewed in Howorth, *History*, vol. 3, pp. 565–67, 577–79; Spuler, *Mongolen*, pp. 111f.; Fāyid Hammād ‘Āshūr, *al-‘Ālāqāt al-siyāsiyya bayn al-Mamālīk wa’l-Mughūl fī’l-dawla al-Mamlūkiyya al-ūlā* (Cairo, 1976), pp. 174–76, 182–85.

⁴⁷Al-Nuwayrī, “Nihāyat al-arib,” vol. 30, ff. 345, 355–56; Abū’l-Fidā, *Mukhtaṣar*, vol. 4, pp. 83–84; Ibn ‘Inaba, *Umdat al-tālib*, p. 242; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, vol. 2, pp. 147–48; Howorth, *History*, vol. 3, p. 572.

⁴⁸Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya*, vol. 19, pp. 77–78.

⁴⁹Al-Nuwayrī, “Nihāyat al-arab,” vol. 30, f. 356; al-Mufaḍḍal b. Abī’l-Faḍā’il, *al-Nahj al-sadīd wa’l-durr al-farīd fī mā ba’d ta’rīkh Ibn al-‘Amīd*, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, vol. 20 (Paris, 1928), pp. 262f.; al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 4, p. 240; al-‘Aynī, “‘Iqd al-jumān,” vol. 23, f. 70; Ibn Fahd, “Ithāf al-warā,” events of 716; Spuler, *Mongolen*, p. 191.

⁵⁰Al-Nuwayrī, “Nihāyat al-arib,” vol. 30, f. 405; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, vol. 2, pp. 167–68; al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 4, pp. 242, 409; al-‘Aynī, “‘Iqd al-jumān,” vol. 23, f. 149.

⁵¹Al-Nuwayrī, “Nihāyat al-arib,” vol. 30, f. 406; Abū’l-Fidā, *Mukhtaṣar*, vol. 4, p. 87; al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 4, pp. 87, 410; vol. 6, p. 96; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, vol. 2, pp. 185, 190; al-‘Aynī, “‘Iqd al-jumān,” vol. 23, ff. 168–69.

⁵²Al-Nuwayrī, “Nihāyat al-arib,” vol. 30, ff. 406, 420–21; see also al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 4, p. 410; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, vol. 2, p. 185.

⁵³Al-Nuwayrī, “Nihāyat al-arib,” vol. 30, f. 421; Abū’l-Fidā, *Mukhtaṣar*, vol. 4, p. 92.

⁵⁴Al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 4, p. 412; vol. 6, p. 97.

⁵⁵Al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 6, pp. 98–99.

⁵⁶Muḥammad b. al-Muṭahhar b. Yaḥyā was the nineteenth Zaydī imam of the Yemen, whose reign extended from 701/1301 to 728/1327; see Ayman Fu’ād Sayyid, *Maṣādir tārikh al-Yaman fī’l-‘aṣr al-Islāmī* (Cairo, 1974), p. 407.

⁵⁷Al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 6, p. 99.

⁵⁸Shams al-Dīn Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Majd al-Dīn al-Jazarī, “Tārikh al-Jazarī,” manuscript, Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, no. 995 tārikh, vol. 3, f. 12; see also al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 6, p. 98, after al-Jazarī.

⁵⁹Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Baṭṭūṭa, *Tuḥfat al-nuḡār fī gharā’ib al-amṣār wa’ajā’ib al-asfār* (Beirut, 1964), p. 161.

⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 148, 161.

⁶¹Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Faḍl Allāh al-‘Umarī, *al-Ta’rīf bi’l-muṣṭalah al-sharīf* (Cairo, 1312 A.H.), p. 160.

⁶²Al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 4, p. 417.

⁶³Ibid., vol. 8, pp. 89–90.

⁶⁴Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, vol. 2, p. 904; Ibn Fahd, “Ithāf al-warā,” events of 754.

⁶⁵Al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 3, p. 399; Ibn Taghrī Bardī, “al-Manhal al-ṣāfi wa’l-mustawfi ba’d al-wāfi,” manuscript, Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya no. 1113 tārikh, vol. 1, f. 451a.

⁶⁶Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, vol. 2, p. 904; Ibn Fahd, “Ithāf al-warā,” events of 754.

⁶⁷Al-Fāsī, *Iqd*, vol. 6, p. 70; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Inbā’ al-ghumr bi-anbā’ al-‘umr* (Cairo, 1969–1972), vol. 1, p. 115; Ibn Taghrī Bardī, “Manhal,” vol. 2, f. 377b; idem, *Nujūm*, vol. 11, p. 139.

⁶⁸Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Qāḍī Shuhba, "Dhayl Tārīkh al-Islām," manuscript, Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, no. 392 tārīkh, vol. 3, f. 161b.

⁶⁹Ibn Taghrī Bardī, *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi* (Cairo, 1956), p. 371.

⁷⁰Shihāb al-Dīn Abū'l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Qalqashandī, *Qalāʿid al-jumān fī'l-taʿrīf bi-qabāʾil ʿArab al-zamān* (Cairo, 1963), p. 162; idem, *Ṣubḥ al-aʿshā fī ṣināʿat al-inshā* (Cairo, 1910–1920), vol. 8, p. 227.

⁷¹Al-Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ al-aʿshā*, vol. 5, p. 52.

⁷²Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sakhāwī, *al-Ḍawʿ al-lāmiʿ li-ahl al-qarn al-tāsiʿ* (Beirut, n.d.), vol. 3, p. 104.

⁷³Al-Fāsī, *ʿIqd*, vol. 6, p. 71.

⁷⁴Najm al-Dīn ʿUmar b. Muḥammad b. Fahd, "al-Durr al-kamīn bi-dhayl al-ʿiqd al-thamīn fī tārīkh al-balad al-amīn," manuscript, King Saud University Library, Riyadh, no. f19, ff. 90b, 150a, 184a.

⁷⁵Ibid., f. 150a.

⁷⁶Ibid., f. 98a; al-Sakhāwī, *Ḍawʿ*, vol. 3, p. 13; Jalāl al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr Muḥammad al-Suyūṭī, *Naẓm al-ʿaqqyān fī aʿyān al-aʿyān* (New York, 1927), p. 100.

⁷⁷Najm al-Dīn ʿUmar b. Muḥammad b. Fahd, *Muʿjam al-shuyūkh* (Riyadh, n.d.), pp. 352–53.

⁷⁸Al-Sakhāwī, *Ḍawʿ*, vol. 7, pp. 151–52; Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Shawkānī, *al-Badr al-ṭālī bi-mahāsīn man baʿd al-qarn al-sābiʿ* (Cairo, 1348 A.H.), vol. 2, p. 140.

⁷⁹ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥusayn al-ʿIṣāmī, *Simṭ al-nujūm al-ʿawālī fī anbaʿ al-awāʾil waʾl-tawālī* (Cairo, n.d.), vol. 4, pp. 280–81.