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Preface

With the advent of the Iranian Revolution in 1978, the Western world became aware to a much greater extent than before of the significance and the emotional and intellectual power of Shi’ite Islam. Serious students and observers of world affairs at that time began to cast about for Western-language studies of Shi’ite history, only to find that there was much less scholarly work available than might have been anticipated. Aside from the studies of Hamid Algar, Alessandro Bausani, Henri Corbin, Michel Mazzaoui, and, somewhat later, Shahrough Akhavi, Michael Fischer, Said Arjomand, and Abdulaziz Sachedina, one could find few substantial examinations of “Twelver” (Imāmī or “moderate”) Shi’ism in Iran for the past four centuries.¹ This was true

in spite of the fact that it has been the state religion of Iran since
the beginning of the sixteenth century. Since the Iranian Rev-
olution, not surprisingly, a number of important works have
appeared, for example, those of Yann Richard, Heinz Halm,
Moojan Momen, and Hossein Modarressi, just to mention a few,
which have given us a much better understanding of Shi‘ism
in Iran and, in some cases, elsewhere.\(^2\) Now, happily, one may
also point to a number of studies of non-Twelver Shi‘ism (e.g.,
Ismā‘īlim), for example, the works of Farhad Daftary, Paul
Walker, Abbas Hamdani, Wilferd Madelung, Heinz Halm, and
Ismail Poonawala.\(^3\)

\(^2\) Yann Richard, *Shi‘ite Islam: Polity, Ideology, and Creed*, trans. Antonia Nevill (Oxford, 1995); Heinz Halm, *Shiism*, trans. Janet Watson (Edinburgh, 1991); Moojan Momen, *An Introduction to Shi‘i Islam: The History and Doctrines of Twelver Shi‘ism* (New Haven and London, 1985); Hossein Modarressi Tabatabai, *An Introduction to Shi‘i Law* (London, 1984). One may multiply the number of such works, especially those of Nikki Keddie (for example, *Iran and the Muslim World: Resistance and Revolution* [New York, 1995]) but, in the interest of space and time, other writings on various aspects of Twelver Shi‘ism will be included in the bibliography, where one will also find more recent studies of Shi‘ism outside Iran, especially in Iraq and Lebanon.

From a casual reading of the aforementioned scholars, it is clear that the history of Shi‘ite Islam is a very long, controversial, and complicated one, and it is certainly not the purpose of this work to present an exhaustive history of Shi‘ism. In spite of all of the emphasis upon Iranian Shi‘ism, it is crucial to understand that Shi‘ite history has its roots in the wider history of the early Muslim community and that it is not specific to one ethnic or linguistic group. The pluralistic nature of early Shi‘ism constitutes the starting point for the present study, devoted to an examination of certain “extremist” Shi‘ite organizations that originated in early Muslim Iraq (i.e., seventh–eighth century A.D.) and that had an impact upon later religious groups, whether Shi‘ite, non-Shi‘ite, or even quasi-Shi‘ite. Whereas a long exposition of the broad patterns of Shi‘ite history is beyond the scope of the present study, certainly that history can be better understood through elucidating the evolution of four early extremist Shi‘ite groups whose ideas and tactics had a substantial impact upon later Shi‘ites (“moderate” and “extremist”)4, non-Shi‘ite groupings, and quasi-Shi‘ite religious movements. Such an investigation is necessary for an understanding of the origins and development of Shi‘ism and other facets of the Islamic faith.

The groups to be examined in this book include the followers of Bayān ibn Sam‘ān, al-Mughīra ibn Sa‘īd, Abū Mansūr al-I‘jī, and ʿAbd Allāh ibn Mu‘āwiya. These sectarian leaders all led uprisings against the Umayyad Caliphs (who ruled from 661 to 750 A.D.) during the first half of the eighth century. In addition to their seditious activities aimed at the ruling elite, these individuals and those who followed them developed religious doctrines and tactics destined to have a lasting influence upon groups all the way to the present. Their doctrines were to affect moderate Shi‘ites, extremist Shi‘ites (the Nusayris or ‘Alawis of present-day Syria), quasi-Shi‘ite sects such as the Druze and the

4 The issue of “extremism” or Ghulāt among the Shi‘ites is examined in note 11.
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Ahl-i Haqq (Kurdish sectarians), and even non-Shi’ites, for example, the Sunni-affiliated Sufis. The organization and techniques employed by at least two of the four groups were later used with telling effect against their religious-political opponents.

Important factors to be emphasized include the understanding of these groups as belonging to a milieu of religious dissent and also, especially, to a fluidly conceived community in the process of defining its parameters and its governing paradigm. In other words, it is vital to understand that our received notions of Islamic thought and institutions were in the process of formation at the time these groups were active. They may be seen as religious dissenters whose vision of reality was violently suppressed and unacceptable to the larger community, but it is particularly important that their ideas were not eradicated and, in fact, came to play an important role in some of the groups mentioned above and to be referred to again by those who incorporated these concepts into an evolving, dissenting body of belief. One must also be cognizant of the fact that, as always, these groups were not solely “religious.” As is always the case, religious groups or sects, however one chooses to label them, exist in the world, that is, they relate in some way or other to social, political, or even economic realities surrounding them. As we shall see, this was most certainly the case with the movements to be examined here.

In the present study, the ideas and activities of the Bayāniyya (followers of Bayān), the Mughirīyya (the followers of al-Mughīra), the Mansūriyya (Abū Mansūr’s partisans), and the Janāhiyya (the sect forming around Ibn Mu‘awīya) will be analyzed in terms of origins, evolution, and the nature of their impact upon later Islamic sects or groups. In particular, an attempt will be made to delineate the original contributions of each of the four groups. The present volume, it should be emphasized, must not be construed as an exercise in comparative religion or the history of religion. The approach adopted here, quite frankly, is to treat religious ideas as a form of ideology that shapes the
behavior of its adherents. Furthermore, it should be noted that the organizational structure of this monograph is conceived in a manner calculated to actually present the subject matter as well as the results of the research, particularly because there is disagreement and a lack of clarity about just who believed what, and how those beliefs originated and were transmitted.

Ultimately, the most significant goal here is to show that these four sects were the first millenarian movements (groups expecting total, imminent, and collective salvation in this world) to appear in the Muslim world. In a sense, the inspiration for this project lies not in any of the synthetic or monographic studies of Shi‘ism, however excellent and provocative, but rather in a book that the present author read many years ago as a young man. When I first encountered Norman Cohn’s brilliant *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages*, I felt that it was one of the most penetrating analyses of religious dissent that I had ever encountered and, quite frankly, one of the most interesting books of history in any field with which I was familiar. It was controversial; the author made dangerous and tenuous connections between Reformation religious groups and modern political movements; but for all of its radical interpretations, it seemed to penetrate to the heart of what religious dissent, involving violence and/or revolutionary politics, was about. The importance of its insights and methodology came to be readily seen in the series of conferences, volumes of collected essays, and journals devoted to comparative millenarism that it stimulated (references to these can be found in the bibliography). It has continued to generate books and articles about millenarism.

When I began to examine the various volumes and essays devoted to this subject, I was struck by the absence of any serious and systematic studies from Islamic history. This situation has not changed over the decades since I first began working with this subject. To be sure, one sees the term “millenarian”
employed in various studies, but, with the exception of Said A. Arjomand, scholars of Islam seem to feel no need to explain exactly what this term involves. At the very least, a millenarian movement is a group or sect expecting total, imminent, and collective salvation in this world. This may or may not involve the intervention of some messianic figure. One may speak of a millenarian paradigm, but the varied nature of the phenomenon has to be kept in mind. The groups to be examined here possess many of the characteristics that are seemingly a part of this type of sociopolitical religious movement, regardless of time or location. Such characteristics as militant elitism, reversal of status, antinomianism (not simply vulgar libertinism), and, frequently, a sense of relative deprivation or perceived injustice are often associated with millenarian movements and are demonstrably present within the groups constituting the subject of this study. In this sense, hopefully, one will gain some understanding of the millenarian impulse in early Shi’ite and Muslim history generally. It is also to be hoped that this analysis will show the similarity of the sects under examination to other groups in other religious traditions, at other times and places, that is to say, that this research will be of potential value for comparative studies, whether by anthropologists, sociologists, or historians of comparative religion. It must be reiterated, however, that this book is not, per se, a study in comparative religion. Furthermore, in the interest of clarity and coherence, I propose to reserve the millenarian analysis for a separate chapter. One might argue that it would be preferable to treat the topic group by group in each of the relevant chapters, but it seems to me that technical problems with sources and analysis of the groups’ ideas would obscure their millenarian features, in addition to which these features are best understood by analyzing them within the context of the groups taken together, instead of in isolation. One of the most obvious reasons for this is that the four groups under consideration evolved over a period
of years in which survivors of one suppressed group went on to join and to take their ideas with them into another.

The book consists of six chapters. Chapter 1 is devoted to an examination of 'Abd Allāh ibn Saba' and his followers, as well as to the rebellion of al-Mukhtār and the Kaisāniyya. Special emphasis is placed upon the impact of Ibn Saba’ and al-Mukhtār upon the four sects constituting the primary focus of this study. Chapters 2 through 5 deal with Bayān, al-Mughīra, Abū Mansūr, 'Abd Allāh ibn Mu‘āwiya, and their respective followers. Chapter 6 focuses upon the millenarian features of the four groups, considers the impact of the four groups on later movements, and also points to parallels with non-Islamic millenarians outside the Middle East. A short conclusion offers final thoughts about the nature of the four sects examined in the body of the text.

In the first five chapters the organization is essentially the same. Each chapter consists of four basic divisions. The first part contains information about the leader of the particular group. Next, the membership of each sect is examined. This is followed in each instance by an enumeration and discussion of the religious ideas. In the final paragraphs of the individual chapters, an attempt is made to assess the contributions and the significance of each sect.

There is little in the way of secondary literature devoted specifically to these groups, the best study undoubtedly being that by Heinz Halm, entitled Die Islamische Gnosis: Die Extreme Schī‘a und die ’Alawiten. Halm’s study traces the nature of gnostic thought from the early extremist Shi‘ites through the Nusayris (still extant, of course, in Syria). He provides the reader with invaluable historiographical materials gleaned from heresiographers and, of greater import, examines and translates into German

5 Heinz Halm, Die Islamische Gnosis: Die Extreme Schī‘a und die ’Alawiten (Zurich and Munich, 1982).
the major texts of the various groups themselves. In spite of its signal importance, Halm's book does not address certain major historical, sociological, or political issues surrounding these sects. One of the most useful book-length treatments of the sects is still the Ph.D. dissertation of the late W. W. Rajkowski, which unfortunately has remained unpublished and which suffers from a lack of systematic comparison of the source materials, as well as a failure to adequately explore the intellectual relationships among the groups. In addition, it is dated in some respects with regard to the sources the author utilized. In spite of all of this, it remains one of the clearest, most detailed, and most coherently organized examinations of not only the four sects relevant to the present volume, but, indeed, of early Shi‘ism in Iraq generally. S. H. M. Jafri’s Origins and Early Development of Shi‘ite Islam contains mention of the groups but only as they related to the ‘Alids and only in a fashion calculated to minimize their importance and to distance them from moderate Shi‘ism.

Another brief but well-formulated treatment of at least two of the four sects can be found in Wadad al-Qadi’s definitive study of the rebellion of al-Mukhtār and the rise of the Kaisāniyya Shi‘a. Al-Qadi conceives of the sects she examines as branches or offshoots of the Kaisāniyya, and, even though valid in at least one case, this approach does not take into account the original ideas of the four groups and the ways in which they differed from the partisans of Mukhtār.

Among the books mentioning the four sects, Henri Laoust’s study of what he refers to as “schisms” in Islam does little more than summarize their ideas in passing and so is of little use to the serious investigator of their historical role.

---

8 Wadad al-Qadi, al-Kaisaniyya fi Tai‘rkh wa al-Adab (Beirut, 1974).
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Watt’s *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought* has a section on the groups, but it is short and seems to add little to his earlier treatment of Umayyad Shi‘ism in an article mentioned later in this chapter.\(^\text{10}\) Moojan Momen offers some interesting and useful remarks in his large synthesis, *An Introduction to Shi‘i Islam*, cited previously, but his treatment is brief, centers upon Islamic conceptual categories, such as *Ghulāt* (“extremists”), and thereby fails to address the sociopolitical aspects of the sects. As the important article of Wadād al-Qādī demonstrates, the term “*Ghulāt,*” indicating extremism or exaggeration, was a fluid one for Islamic authors and could mean different things in different accounts.\(^\text{11}\) For this reason, the term “*Ghulāt*” in this study will be used to indicate sects possessing at least one of the following characteristics: deification or supernatural status of *ʿAlī and other Shi‘ite Imāms*, belief in transmigration of souls, the concept of God becoming incarnate in any given person, and the expectation that a person will experience reincarnation.

In an important study of the spiritual and esoteric nature of the early Shi‘ite Imāms, Mohammad ʿAlī Amīr-Moezzi refers marginally to some of these groups but, interestingly enough, seems to use primarily research that I had published some years ago. The same secondary treatment is true of an outstanding study of the relationship between Jewish and Shi‘ite sectarian movements, published by Steven Wasserstrom in 1995. Wasserstrom’s book, incidentally, is an intriguing examination of comparative religious techniques and the influence religions can have on one another. The crucial concept of the *Mahdī* (saviour figure), which plays a central role in Shi‘ism generally, is treated with great insight and depth by Abdulaziz Sachedina, in his work


\(^{11}\) Wadād al-Qādī, “The Development of the Term *Ghulāt* in Muslim Literature with Special Reference to the Kaysānīyya,” in *Akten des VII. Kongresses für Arabistik und Islamwissenschaft* (Göttingen, 1974), 295–319.
cited previously, but he addresses the issue for later, Twelver, thought using classical Shi‘ite texts, and therefore sheds no real light upon how the four sects and other early groups understood the concept. Other brief remarks about these groups are to be found in the work of Hossein Modarressi, *Crisis and Consolidation in the Formative Period of Shi‘ite Islam: Abu Ja‘far ibn Quba al-Rāzī and His Contribution to Imamite Shi‘ite Thought*. Finally, among books and monographs, I would like to take special note of the as-yet-unpublished dissertation of L. N. Takim, which, though devoted to an investigation of the early Shi‘ite Rijal, refers in a few places to individuals associated with extremist Shi‘ite sects. It is to be hoped that this important study will soon appear in print.\(^{12}\)

An examination of the periodical literature also offers a number of worthwhile, albeit limited, studies, but in at least some cases one encounters problems of narrow scope and peripheral treatment. Probably the best short study of these extremist sects is the second part of a two-article series by Heinz Halm, which appeared in *Der Islam* in 1981. In essence, however, it is a summary minus translations of his already-cited volume on Islamic gnosia, which appeared the following year. In 1984, Mohamed Rekaya examined the groups briefly in an important article devoted to the so-called "Khurramite" movements active in early 'Abbāsid Iran. His remarks, however, were taken largely from my own published studies. In the next year, Steven Wasserstrom contributed a stimulating, award-winning essay to the journal *History of Religions*, which treated the gnostic features of al-Mughīra ibn Sa‘īd’s

teachings and showed how they were rejected by the community. This remains one of the best studies of any Ghulāt group down to the present.\(^{13}\)

In addition to these more recent essays, there are several older periodical treatments that continue, in my opinion, to be of great merit and usefulness. Probably one of the best of these is the study published by Israel Friedlaender more than seventy years ago in the commentary to his translation of Ibn Hazm’s treatise on the Shi’ites. This commentary is cited elsewhere and referred to on a number of occasions in the following pages. It is seen to be of particular value in suggesting possible origins of important concepts associated with the four sects and other early Shi’ite circles.

One of the most stimulating analyses of the nature and classification of the groups is to be found in Sabatino Moscati’s “Per una Storia dell’ Antica Sī’a,” which was published in 1955. The article begins with an excellent discussion of the sources. The author points out the problems involved in the use of those works treating Islamic heresies. The main difficulties, he suggests, are the obvious prejudices of the Muslim authors against “heretical” groups, their resort to stereotypes or clichés in presenting the doctrines of the heretics, and the chronological confusion arising from the arrangement of the heresies by grade rather than time period or stages of development.\(^{14}\) He leaves little doubt, however, as to the necessity of using such sources carefully and systematically.

---


\(^{14}\) Sabatino Moscati, “Per una Storia dell’ Antica Sī’a,” Rivista degli Studi Orientali, XXX (1955), 253.
Moscati classifies the groups as being either primarily “religious” or “political.” He suggests that movements emphasizing religious dogma included predominantly non-Arabs. Other groups that he considers to have been motivated mainly by political goals were, according to his line of reasoning, essentially Arab movements. The latter type, he argues, more often included ’Alids in its positions of leadership or its ranks. The “religious-oriented” group, by contrast, was promoted by non-’Alids, who began by championing ’Alid claims and ended by advancing their own claims to leadership.\(^\text{15}\) Whereas there is some merit in this classification scheme, the research for this study demonstrates that the movements dealt with here were both “political” and “religious” and included both Arabs and non-Arabs. Moscati’s twofold classification will not, therefore, be utilized in this book.

Professor W. Montgomery Watt’s study of Umayyad Shi‘ism has proved to be of greater use in matters of detail and interpretation.\(^\text{16}\) Generally, though, his treatment of the groups with which we are concerned is too brief to be overly helpful. His remarks about the Aramaean Mawāli are of interest, although the presence and role of the Aramaeans in Iraq has now been more rigorously examined by Michael Morony in his *Iraq After the Muslim Conquest*.\(^\text{17}\) Watt’s remarks about the South Arabian complexion of early Shi‘ism are also in need of qualification, as this study indicates the presence of other elements in these movements.

The late Marshall G. S. Hodgon’s investigation of the sectarian beginnings of Shi‘ism has been valuable because of his statements concerning a possible relationship between the speculation of the early Ghulāt (“extremist” or “exaggerating”) Shi‘ites and that

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 263–264.


of the later Sūfis. These suggestions have proved to be useful in tracing the impact of the groups studied here and will be referred to again.

The books and articles just mentioned are the only noteworthy treatments of the early Shiʿite extremists that have appeared to date. Other works have mentioned them briefly or given a synopsis of their beliefs without, however, examining them closely. Furthermore, and more importantly, no one has investigated the four groups upon which this study is concentrated within the framework of millenarian sectarianism. Hopefully, the present treatment will provide the detailed examination heretofore lacking.

The transliteration system is that employed by most English-language journals of Islamic studies at present, especially the International Journal of Middle East Studies. Technical names and personal names are rendered within the strictures of this system, whereas place names such as Mecca or Medina are instead spelled in accordance with current common English usage.

Mahdis and Millenarians