

SHI'ITE MUSLIMS IN THE LAST DECADES OF THE Umayyad State

<"xml encoding="UTF-8?>

The Shi'ite Muslims Under the Pressure of the Umayyads

As previously mentioned, Umayyads had three obstinate foes, namely Kharidjites who were of great trouble to them during various periods. Shi'ite Muslims who were in opposition to Mu'awiya from 'Ali's term on and thereafter Imam Husayn (a), the penitents, Mukhtar, Zayd Ibn 'Ali and Yahya Ibn Yazid ran wild against them. Moreover, Shi'ites's ideology especially its political aspect based on which the 'Alawites authority was a lawful one operated as an effective trend in the society producing a great threat to the Umayyads. In reality, subsequent to their eradication, Shi'ite Muslims were the Umayyads's successor and ultimately the third group was Iraqi people who regardless of their religion, went on the rampage against them since the treatment of Damascus towards them which probably stemmed from tribal or regional prejudice was a contemptuous one. In spite of the fact that such movements someTimes had leaders or some supporters who had good will, most of the time they covering their objectives as well as reviving the Prophet's Sunna as well as social justice.

Although all of those groups were threatening the Umayyads, the two first groups were more threatening. It is known that the Kharidjites at last could subjugate them in Iraq, then some of those so-called Shi'ite Muslims opportunistically overthrew the and came to power themselves. The Umayyads was striving hard to confine Shi'ite Muslims by any means to prevent them from increasing their influence.

Formerly, we touched upon how the Umayyads bothered the 'Alawites. Now, by bringing some examples, matter is elucidated. During the Umayyads' rule excluding a short time during 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, they insulted Imam 'Ali (a). From among them one can name Khalid Ibn 'Abd Allah Qasri who did the same while being on the pulpit as well as describing him in the most biting way. And as one would expect to justify what he had done, he urged some traditionalists to vilify him. For the very same reason, Hisham Ibn 'Abd al-Malik wrote a letter to A'mash, a so-called Shi'ites in Kufa and called upon him to compile a book about 'Uthman's virtues and Imam 'Ali's wrongdoings but he refrained from doing so while such individuals as Zuhri did never hesitated to do this.

Since he had heard 'Ali (a) was using henna for dying his beard, he quoted from Torah, "Whosoever dyes his beard black is cursed".

The Umayyads' agents used abusive words towards 'Ali's family throughout the Islamic land to taint their reputation and eliminate them from political as well as intellectual scene by rendering the worst accusations against them. That was why harsh treatment in damning 'Ali was quite justified for them. Once Hadjdjadj asked his governor in Fars to make 'Atiyya Ibn Sa'd damn 'Ali (a) and if avoided doing so, he should be whipped four hundred times and be shaved as punishment. They did this as Hadjdjadj had ordered. Some individuals as Ibn Abi

Layla, an Iraqi jurisprudent, was made to curse 'Ali (a) in public.

It was quite common for Mu'awiya, Abu Bakr as well as 'Umar to fabricate Hadith to crush Shi'ite Muslims who were referred Rafidi extremist and now most of those forged traditions compiled by the Sunnites are at hand.

When Hisham in 106 A.H., the second year of his caliphate, entered Hijaz for Hadjdj, Medina's governor, one of 'Uthman's grand children, by alluding to 'Uthman's virtues told caliph, "In this region, it is quite common to curse Abu Turab, now you can follow this custom too".

Hisham in reply said, "Now I am here for Hadjdj and do not intend to curse anyone."

This does not mean that Hisham was not a man of cursing others. In contrast all of his deeds revealed his hostility towards the Prophet's Household and their followers. He himself was the murderer of Zayd Ibn 'Ali and any Shi'ite Muslims and under those circumstances, he probably gave such reply to Sa'id Ibn 'Abd Allah for a specific reason.

When Zayd Ibn 'Ali (a) was in Damascus, Hisham shamelessly inquired him about his brother, In this way, he demonstrated his malice towards مافعل اخوك البقرة, Imam Sadiq (a) and said سماه رسول الله باقراً وتسميّة البقرة! لقد اختلّفتما اذاً, him in his insulting question. In response, Zayd said The Messenger of Allah had called him Baqir and now you are addressing him in "this way."

Then he went on to say Djabir's quotation in which Allah's Messenger had told him, "Give Imam Baqir my best regards."

Shi'ite Muslims such as Kumayt Ibn Zayd Asadi, an outstanding Arab poet, were pressurized in various forms. He was imprisoned for his beliefs and, in particular, having Khalid Ibn 'Abd Allah Qasri satirizing the Umayyads. Hisham Ibn 'Abd al-Malik demanded Khalid to pull his tongue out of his mouth and hang him from the door of his house.

Filled with terror, Kumayt wore his wife's clothes who had gone to see him in prison, then he tried to escape. Having no way to do so, he took refuge in Maslama Ibn 'Abd al-Malik and finally he could satisfy Hisham and save his life. It was quite obvious that he was a Shi'ites since he was with Imam Baqir (a) and other Muhammad's descendants. Also, his Hashimites followers are the best proof in this regard.

Apart from suppressing Yazid Ibn 'Ali's uprising, Yusuf Ibn 'Umar, Iraq's governor from 120-126 A.H. martyred many of Shi'ite Muslims.

Yusuf“ فقتل يوسف بن عمر من شيعة آل محمد خلقاً كثيراً رحمة الله عليهم ”According to Ibn A'tham Ibn 'Umar murdered large numbers of Shi'ite Muslims of Muhammad (s)'s progeny.”

In a letter addressing Hisham, Yusuf divulged the misery of this household arising from ruler's pressure.

Umayyads negative propagation against Shi'ite Muslims, their politico-ideological opponent, forced Sunnis to adopt a bitter stance on them and despite the fact that the Umayyads themselves were affected by Jewish culture, they made Shi'ite Muslims be known like the Jews. Such accusations were in fact reflections of the Umayyads's propagation. His mention of a detailed quotation, Imam Baqir (a) displays Shi'ite Muslims stance plainly.

“Noone knows what sufferings we, Ahl al-Bayt, experienced from Quraysh's oppression and stance-taking, so did the Shi'ite Muslims. When Allah's prophet was about to depart this life told us that we were superior to people while the Quraysh who were collaborating with each other divorced this issue and did take advantage of our superiority to come to power. Then, the post of ruling rotated among them up to the time that once again Ahl al-Bayt restored it, but people who had paid allegiance to us disregarded it and launched an attack against us and 'Ali (a) experienced great hardness prior to his martyrdom. Then it was his son's turn and just the same happened to him. Thereafter, we were constantly irritated, deprived of our rights, threatened, murdered and driven out of our homelands to such an extent that neither us nor were our followers secure any longer. Then the liars and deniers of the truth paved the ground for themselves and approached the originators of injustice as well as their agents throughout the Islamic land. After that, they started forging and spreading traditions. They did quote us as saying things which were neither mentioned nor performed by us. They merely intended to sow the seed of hatred in the hearts of individuals. This was a policy being followed subsequent to Imam Hasan's martyrdom during Mu'awiya's term. Limbs were cut off and those eminent were plundered and their houses were destroyed. This situation worsened during 'Ubayd Allah Ibn Ziyad's term. Hadjdadj Ibn Yusuf came to power in Kufa after him and he did the same to the Shi'ite Muslims. They were so hard pressed that they would rather be called Zindiq or infidels instead of Shi'ite Muslims. In consequence, the so-called pious people fabricated some traditions touching upon the superiority of the previous rulers something which was by no means true in practice. The succeeding traditionalists verified what had been forged by them inasmuch as they were not quoted by a bunch of unfaithful and lying people.”

.This was what Imam Sadiq (a) had stated regarding injustice imposed on Shi'ite Muslims

Internal Events of Shi'ite Muslims

Possibly, there would be no other issue as important as pondering upon the socio-ideological attitude of the Shi'ite Muslims during that time, something which should make clear the stance of some groups surviving under the shadow of "Shi'a". Earlier, discussing about 'Ali's Imamate, it had been stated that Imamate was considered as a "Divine Decree" among the companions and the Commander of the Faithful himself had made great attempt to clarify it. Looking into

Imam Sadjjad's viewpoint regarding Imamate, evidence suggested that he considered Imamate as a divine decree and Imam as a person whose obedience is obligatory on behalf of God. Here, it is worth stating internal problems the Shi'ite Muslims were tackling with.

It was quite obvious that Shi'ite Muslims were misled mainly due to their detachment from their Imams and it was an apparent consequence since neither Imams nor the Shi'ite Muslims could contact each other directly. In spite of great endeavors being exerted by Imams, they did not have enough influence on the Shi'ite Muslims in particular those residing in Iraq far from them, let alone those in Khurasan, to guide them ideologically.

It is requisite to refer to the book entitled "the History of Shi'ism in Iran" overtured by "various forms of Shi'ism" to discern completely what had been mentioned formerly. Here, some points .would be referred to either dropped thoroughly or not discussed in detail

Exaggeration and the Exaggerators

An incident later came to be known as "Exaggeration" in Islamic history, a rooted deviation in Shi'ites internal affairs, did play a major role in distorting their image. This has been discussed in more detail in "History of Shi'ism" but we will touch upon it here too.

This occurrence goes back to 'Ali's time during which there had been two opposite views regarding him, namely the extremist one based on which he was dealt with as if he were an infidel and the opposite one according to which he was exaggerated to such an extent that he was characterized with divine features. In spite of the fact that there are serious discrepancies concerning peculiarities of views which are too complex to be clarified; however, taking historical events into account, one can make certain that these incidents did take place during Imam 'Ali's time. According to some researchers and as said before, 'Abd Allah Ibn Saba', the initiator of "Exaggeration", was an imaginary person singled out to stain the Shi'ite Muslims' reputation. Denying him, however one should not equate it with disregarding such exaggerations among the Shi'ite Muslims at that time.

What does Exaggeration imply? Its origin goes back to what had been attributed to Imam 'Ali (a) as well as his descendants that is blasphemy according to the Shi'ites doctrine and

abundant traditions from Imams.

To elaborate the meaning, it deems appropriate to suggest a piece of poem from Sayyid
,Himyari, a Shi'ite Muslims poet

قوم غلوا في علي لا أباً لهم وأجشموا أنفساً في حبه تعباً
قالوا هو الله جل الله خالقنا من أن يكون له ابن أو يكون أباً

Exaggerating about 'Ali (a), some people whose parents may be damned put great pressure on“
people to adore him saying that he was God and Almighty God was either his father or his
son.”

A group of those people were expelled to Mada'in by Imam. Being informed about 'Ali's
martyrdom, they nullified it. There are diverse quotations concerning Imam's severity on them
in history books manipulated based on various inclinations. From among them, we can have
the false account of burning as well as regarding them as dualists.

.Such ideas were also approved by some so-called Shi'ite Muslims during Imam Hasan's time
قيل للحسن بن علي أن أناساً من الشيعة يزعمون أن علياً دابة الارض... فقال، كذبوا، أولئك ليس بشيعة، أولئك
Hasan Ibn 'Ali was told, “A few Shi'ite Muslims hold the view that 'Ali is a creature on”
اعدائهم
the earth...” He said, “They tell a lie, these people are not Shi'ite Muslims, they are 'Ali's
adversaries.”

Forgers of tradition probably had quoted wrong traditions from Imams repeatedly to subjugate
and defame them.

Subsequent to Karbala event when “the penitents” as well as Mukhtar's uprising took place, the
viewpoints of the Exaggerators were still prevailing in Iraq. One point needs consideration, as
mentioned before Mukhtar was accused of several wrongdoings one of which was
Exaggeration. In the same books, various sects in particular “Kisaniyya”, one of the
Exaggerators from among Shi'ite Muslims, was given emphasis while being characterized by
having so many divisions and principles. Most of them are still widespread among upcoming

Exaggerators and attributed to others to defame Shi'ite Muslims as well as their Imams.
Regardless of veracity of Kisannids's exaggerated principles, what can be inferred from Imam
Sadjdjad's statements is that some statements identical to those of Jews and Christians about
'Aziz and Jesus Christ were expressed about Ahl al-Bayt.

Love us as well as you do Islam” احبونا حب الاسلام ولا ترفعونا فوق حدنا
and keep us as high as we are.”

Somewhere else he told
النصارى في عيسى بن مريم فلا هم منا ولا نحن منهم “Some of our Shi'ite Muslims are so kind-
hearted toward us that ascribe what Jews told about 'Aziz and Christians about Christ to us.

By no means are we from among them nor do they.”

It is worthwhile mentioning that the Exaggerators vocalized Imam Husayn is still alive just the same as Jesus Christ, and As'ad Ibn Han'ala Shami was killed instead of him. Tabari quoted Abi Mikhnaf as saying that there had been some Exaggerators in Kufa. According to what Hasira Ibn 'Abd Allah had told Abu Mikhnaf in this quotation, from among Shi'ites Exaggerators were "Hind Bint al-Mutakallifa al-Na'itiyya whose house was center of all Shi'ites Exaggerators. The other one was "Layla Bint Qumama al-Muzayna who was not loved by his brother Rufa'a, a moderate Shi'ites. Once Ibn Hanifa was informed about their presence in Kufa, he wrote a letter to Shi'ite Muslims in there urging them to go to mosques and praise Allah and not to choose their friends from among those who are not pious. If they actually are worried about themselves, they should be pious, cautious of liars, perform prayers while keeping in mind that it is at Allah's behest for all living beings to be either loser or winner. *نفس بما كسبت رهينة، ولا تزر وازرة وزر أخرى والله قائم علي كل نفس بما كسبت فاعملوا صالحاً وقدّموا لأنفسكم حسناً ولا تكونوا من الغافلين* Everyone falls responsible for his practice and no one bears sin of others, God beholds one's deeds, so practice righteously, proceed onto virtues and avoid being among the negligent.”

As it was touched on before, some historians made every endeavor to define Exaggeration as having some principles much the same as that of the Twelfth Imam Shi'ism to attribute those principles to them but paying just a little attention, one can easily understand that they are forged. In Shi'ites sources as well, some people's stance such as Ibn Hanafiyya and Imam's speeches expressed without caution removes any doubt completely.

Confrontation of Imams with the Exaggerators

Shi'ites Imams openly took a stand against movements of exaggerators, instances of which could be seen during Imam Sadiq and Baqir's time, presenting true beliefs and religious principles. During Imam Baqir, such distortion manifested itself clearly and some corrupted individuals from among them came to be leaders of their movement.

Mughira Ibn Sa'id was one of them whose lifetime was mostly spent during Imam Baqir's time and was burned to death in 119 A.H. by Khalid Ibn 'Abd Allah Qasri, Iraqi governor, calling him a magician, Tabari quoted that he along with seven others ran wild against the administration outside Kufa. Being on mosque pulpit, Khalid was told about this and requested water! It is good to mention that Mughira was one of Khalid Ibn 'Abd Allah's Mawali. Later on, Khalid burned both his companions and him to death for they had not relinquished their beliefs. There are several quotations from Kashshi revealing Imam Baqir's abhorrence towards him. Some

actions of him were manipulating Imam Baqir's traditions and teaching magic as well as juggling.

Regarding the Exaggerators' conduct towards Imam Baqir (a), Abu Hurayra 'Idjli wrote these verses

أبا جعفر أنت الولي أحبه وأرضى بما ترضي به وأتابع
أنتنا رجال يحملون عليكم أحاديث قد ضافت بهن الاضالع
أحاديث افشاها المغيرة فيهم وشر الامور المحدثات البدائع

O, Abu Dja'far, you are master and beloved one to me. I am satisfied with whatsoever you are satisfied with and I do follow you. There are some individuals attributing some traditions to you. This is something which downhearts us. Mughira had forged some traditions which is the worst heresy."

Bayan Ibn Sam'an was another one supporting Mughira. He was also burned to death along with Mughira by Khalid Ibn 'Abd Allah.

In Shi'ite Muslims sources, Bayan Ibn Sam'an was bitterly reproached since he was said to have quoted false traditions. Hamza Ibn 'Amara al-Barbari just the same as Abu l-Khattab Ghali, Bazi' and Mughira Ibn Sa'id were all cursed by Imams.

There are detailed descriptions of the Exaggerators and their beliefs in Sa'd Ibn 'Abd Allah and Nuwbakhti books. Despite the fact that both the Exaggerators and their leaders were corrupted, one should be heedful enough while dealing with what had been written concerning them in sectarian and religious books in particular those which had been compiled by Sunnis with great pessimism.

It deems appropriate to take Imam Sadiq's reactions towards the Exaggerators during his life throughout the Umayyads's time when both in this time and during the 'Abbasids they were very active.

It should be noted that the Exaggerator's deviation was to such an extent that the religious principles were at risk. What they had in minds was not to leave a single principle of religion, either fundamental or practical one untainted. Anyhow, it appears that they had mystical inclinations according to which some people were deceived after being fascinated by their attractions. The Exaggerators were more active in Hidjaz than anywhere else since Iraq was a place where various cultures such as Iranian, Russian, Syriac and Jewish and so forth met and it had the capacity to put an impression on Muslims' attitudes. These interactions confused most religious beliefs.

The notion of Exaggeration threatened Shi'ism since it not only had falsified their principles from within and secluded them but also distorted public images towards them in such a way

that it seemed they were indifferent to the practical laws of Islam.

Taking a glance at sectarian books, it can be perceived in spite of the fact that, considering sectarian divisions, Exaggeration is said to be a distinct one, not only the leaders of various sects but Sunnites scholars as well do not differentiate between various divisions of Shi'ism and prevent from endorsing their traditions. One of the reasons of such pessimism is influence of the ideas of Exaggerators on Shi'ite Muslims. Despite all efforts being made firstly by Imams and secondly their scholars, the effects are still more and less obvious. To bring an example, one can refer to some quotations from the Exaggerators regarding Qur'an's distortion in some of the Shi'ites hadith books.

Imam Sadiq (a) and subsequent Imams opposed strongly that falsification. Previously, endeavors being made in an interval from 'Ali (a) to Imam Baqir had brought about Ahl al-Bayt's popularity as well as expansion of Shi'ism. Accordingly, the Exaggerators were trying hard to penetrate deep into Shi'ite Muslims with the intention of damaging it both internally and externally. From among crucial undertakings of Imam Sadiq (a) to preserve noble Islamic culture bestowed to Shi'ite Muslims were purification of Shi'ism, struggle to negate the Exaggerators as well as remove them from approaching Shi'ite Muslims' instances of which are to be divulged here.

One of the central activities of Imam was preventing Shi'ite Muslims from having relationship with the Exaggerators since it could magnetize some of the Shi'ite Muslims to them with all their possible attractions. Besides, they claimed that they were tied to Imams and upon denying them, they expressed what they had done was simply out of dissimulation. Mufaddal quoted Imam Sadiq (a) as referred to Abu I-Khattab as well as other Exaggerators, O, Mufaddal, do avoid the " يا مفضل! لا تقاعدوهم ولا تؤاكلوهم ولا تشاربوهم ولا تصافحوهم " as saying Exaggerators, neither eat or drink with them and do not shake hands with them."

In another quotation once again Imam (a) accentuated the statement زينب الأجدع ملعون وأصحابه ملعونون، فلا تجالس اهل مقاتلتهم فاني منهم برئ وآبائي عليهم السلام منهم بـراء Both Abu I-Khattab and his followers are cursed. Do not have association with their supporters. My forefathers had abhorred him, so do I."

Imam (a) was in particular heedful to the Shi'ites youth stating احذروا على شبابكم الغلاة لا يفسدوهم، الغلاة شر خلق الله، يصغرون عظمة الله ويدعون الربوبية لعباد الله " Remain watchful not to let the Exaggerators deviate your young men. They are the Allah's archfoes. Reducing His Majesty, they profess to His servants that they are God."

Imam Sadiq (a) had warned individuals against having association with not only the Exaggerators, but all the innovators as well stating واخذر مجالسة اهل البدع فأنها تنبت في القلب

Do not keep company with innovators inasmuch as it sows the seeds of “كفرًا وضلالاً مبيناً” blasphemy in your heart as well as misleading you overtly.”

To exclude them from membership of a Shi'ites society, Imam Sadiq (a) found fault with their beliefs and urged people not to accept them by referring to Allah's Book for his evaluation. Shahrastani quoted that Sudayr Sayrafi had gone to Imam and said, “May I be your sacrifice! Your followers have diverse opinions; some are of the belief that some one whispers in your ears; some say that Allah reveals secret to you; some think that you are inspired; some others assume that you see in your dreams or give decree based on your forefathers' command.

Which one is true?

In response, Imam said “لا تأخذ بشيء مما يقولون نحن حجة الله وأمناءه على خلقه، حلالنا من كتاب الله وحرماننا منه” DO not accept whatsoever they tell you. We are Allah's witness and faithful ones” for His servants and we do consider something either lawful or unlawful while having reference to His Book.”

Quotations of this kind indicate that due to the wrong beliefs of the Exaggerators some were doubtful whether Imams introduced new religions or there would be new revelations. Underlining the fact that whatsoever they say comes from Allah's Book, Imam Sadiq (a) demanded people not to endorse those wrong beliefs.

In another quotation, Shahrastani stated that Fayd Ibn Mukhtar went to Imam Sadiq (a) and said, “May I be your sacrifice! What is this divergence among our Shi'ite Muslims? At times, I attend their meeting and I feel apprehensive about what they say. Then I refer to Mufaddal and find out what makes me calm there.”

In response Imam (a) said “اجل! انّ الناس اغروا بالكذب علينا حتى كأنّ الله فرضه عليهم لا يريد منهم غيره، واني لأحدّث أحدهم الحديث، فلا يخرج مني حتى تتأوله على غير تأويله” See individuals are fond of laying the blame on us as if Allah made them do so and not anything else. When I say something to someone, he alters it soon before leaving me.”

Sahmi quoted 'Isa al-Hudjrani as saying, “I went to Dja'far Ibn Muhammad al-Sadiq and said,”Shall I retell what I heard from this tribe?”

Imam replied, “Say it.”

I said “فانّ طائفة منهم عبدوك واتّخذوك الهاً من دون الله وطائفة أخرى والوا لك النبوة و...” Some of these people do worship you and consider you a God quite different from Allah and another group do regard you as a prophet.”

Imam wept bitter tears, then said “ان أمكنني الله من هؤلاء فلم اسفك دمائهم سفك الله دم ولدي علي يدي” If I dominate them at Allah's behest, I will surely shed their blood; otherwise, Allah will do the same to my son.”

Occasionally, the narrators of quotations manipulate what Imams had said according to their tests with the intention of nullifying basic principles of Shi'ite Muslims. Thereafter, some of them will be mentioned.

Mahdavitism was the central belief of the Exaggerators which was rejected by Imam Sadiq (a).

They also believe in prophecy of some Imams.

Imam Sadiq (a) told them "من قال انا انبياء فعليه لعنة الله ومن شك في ذلك فعليه لعنة الله" God may curse whosoever regards us as His Prophet and whosoever remains skeptical of it."

From among the Exaggerators, some had equated God with Imam saying "هو الذي في السماء اله وفي الارض اله قالوا هو الامام" He is the one who exists in the heavens and earth, they said, "He is امام." Imam."

That was why Imam Sadiq (a) told that they were even worse than Magians, Jews, Christians and the unbelievers.

Imam was at odds with the Exaggerators in particular with those beliefs based on which they attributed Godliness to Imams.

The he went on to say "لعن الله من قال فينا ما لا نقوله في انفسنا ولعن الله من ازالنا عن العبودية لله والذي خلقنا واليه ما بنا ومعادنا وبيده نواصينا" May Allah curse those who quote us as saying what not told by us. May Allah curse those refraining us from worshipping Him, He who has created us and we all will to Him while He determines our fate."

As maintained by Islamic jurisprudence, it deems right to excommunicate individuals denying basic principles of Islam. This is done to prevent violations provided that it do develop through its normal course. Imam Sadiq (a) endeavored to excommunicate the Exaggerators from Islamic society to frustrate them from distorting the Shi'ites fundamental principles.

One of the undertakings of the Exaggerators was symbolizing religious notions in such a way that they lose their basic significations. Imam Sadiq (a) in a letter addressing Abu I-Khattab, one of the Exaggerator's leaders, stated "بلغني انك تزعم ان الزنا رجل وأن الخمر رجل وأن الصلاة رجل وأن الصيام رجل وأن الفواحش رجل وليس هو كما تقول، انا اصل الحق، وفروع الحق طاعة الله، وعدونا أصل الشر وفروعهم الفواحش" You are said to be of the opinion that adultery, intoxication, prayer, fasting and mischief are all men with these names. What you said is not true. I am the supreme truth and in comparison worshipping Allah is subordinate one. Our enemies are the major evil while their mischief is a minor thing in comparison."

In another quotation, Imam stated "على أبي الخطاب لعنة الله والملائكة والناس اجمعين فاشهد أنه كافر فاسق مشرك" May Allah, His angels as well as His servants put a curse on Abu I-Khattab. I do confess that he is infidel, lewd and polytheist."

Somewhere else, by referring to the Exaggerators, Imam (a) stated "توبوا الى الله فانكم فساق كفار"

مشركون "Do repent your sins. You are undoubtedly lewd, infidel and polytheist." Imam Sadiq excommunicated them so openly that, on one hand, they themselves perceived there was no longer any dissimulation and, on the other hand, Shi'ite Muslims stopped having communication with the Exaggerators completely. The Exaggerators could publicize their beliefs primarily due to the fact that they called on their followers not to observe either jurisprudic legals or inhibitions. They quoted Imam Sadiq (a) as saying, "Whomsoever knows Imam, he shall be permitted to do whatsoever he wants to."

To remove all doubts Imam said ,أَمَّا قُلْتُ: ان عرفت، فاعمل ماشئت من قليل الخير وكثيره، فإنه يقبل منك "I said if you knew your Imam, you would surely do good either less or more. Such cognition is the key to the acceptance of your practices."

Imam alluded to the fact that ordinances are subordinate to sainthood (Wilayat) or without which observing such rules is worthless. The Exaggerators did not take the primary meaning of that statement into account based on their non-observance of the jurisprudic rules. They were quite distinguishable from those who were adherent to them.

One influential factor in the emergence of the Exaggerators was public stupidity. At the same time, ambition as well as yearning to attract individuals, especially with regard to those who claimed succession of Imams and upgraded them to Godliness with the intention of introducing themselves as prophets were other leading factors.

Imam Sadiq (a) asserted ,إِنَّ النَّاسَ أُولَعُوا بِالْكَذِبِ عَلَيْنَا... وَإِنِّي أُحَدِّثُ أَحَدَهُمْ بِحَدِيثٍ فَلَا يَخْرُجُ مِنْ عِنْدِي حَتَّى يَتَأَوَّلَهُ عَلَى غَيْرِ تَأْوِيلِهِ وَذَلِكَ أَتَّهَمُ لَا يَطْلُبُونَ بِحَدِيثِنَا وَبِحَبْنَا مَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ وَإِنَّمَا يَطْلُبُونَ الدُّنْيَا "Individuals are eager to falsify our accounts. Even before we end our speech, they reiterate it to others regardless of its exact meaning. Neither in learning traditions nor seeking our friendship do they desire what Allah wants rather they are after mammonism."

To discriminate the forged traditions of the Exaggerators from the authentic ones motioned by Ahl al-Bayt, Imam Sadiq (a) referred to Qur'an as a criterion.

Regarding this he stated ,لا تقبلوا علينا حديثاً الا ما وافق القرآن والسنة او تجدون معه شاهداً من احاديثنا المتقدمه فان المغيرة بن سعيد لعنه الله دس في كتب ابي احاديث لم يحدث بها ابي، فاتقوا الله ولا تقبلوا علينا ما خالف قول ربنا تعالى وسنة نبينا صلى الله علي واله، فإننا إذا حدثنا قلنا قال الله عز وجل وقال رسول الله "Do not accept whatsoever they quote from us on condition that they are in accordance with either Qur'an or Sunna or our previous traditions. May Allah curse Mughira Ibn Sa'id, the one who quoted traditions from my father not told by him. Be pious and do not endorse whatsoever is at odds with Qur'an and Sunna since whatsoever we quote is based on these two sources."

There are some other quotations indicating the same action of the Exaggerators.

For instance, Imam Sadiq (a) said, "Mughira took home the books being written by Imam Baqir's companions then he returned those to their owners." He quoted "ويدش فيها الكفر والزندقة ويسندها الى ابي ثم يدفعها الى اصحابه" and attributed them to my father after that, he returned those to their owners."

Imam also stated "فكلما كان في كتب اصحاب ابي من الغلو، فذاك ما دسه مغيرة بن سعيد في كتبهم" Whatsoever can be found in the books of my father's companions regarding the Exaggerators" are nothing but what Mughira registered there."

Such action of Imam Sadiq (a), on one hand, could differentiate the Shi'ite Muslims from the Exaggerators but, on the other hand, it had a negative effect on Shi'ite Muslims' expansion. Just because of the Exaggerators, Abu Hanifa told his followers not to reiterate Ghadir hadith. Notwithstanding the fact that it was quite unacceptable, it could divulge the impact of the Exaggerators' action on quoting the most accurate accounts of 'Ali's virtues.

This was discussed in detail since it was supposed to reveal not only the Exaggerators' deviation in the History of Shi'ism but also the reaction of Imams in protecting Shi'ism from threat of the Exaggerators inasmuch as they roused public hatred towards Ahl al-Bayt. And .they had to defend themselves

Shi'ism when Giving Superiority to 'Ali (a)

Speaking about the internal affairs of Shi'ism, there still is another form of Shi'ism which merely appreciates the 'Alawites and considers them as the true ones for caliphate while according to its principle neither Imamate is a divine leadership nor Imam is someone whose obedience is mandatory. In the realm of policy and leadership, taking the distinct features of them in comparison with other influential tribes into account, one can observe that 'Ali (a) was superior than 'Uthman as well as other caliphs. In view of such definition of Shi'ism, not only majority of the Sunnis traditionalists but Iraqi ones as well are Shi'ites. Reviewing Mizan al-'itidal from Dhahabi, one can see that a great number of religious scholars later come to be known as Sunnites were believed to be Shi'ites at that time. From among them, there were some people as Muhammad Ibn Djarir Tabari and Hukaym Niyshaburi, the greatest Sunnites scholars in the 3rd and 4th centuries, who severely criticized Mu'awiya. These people were not few in Iraq in 1A.H. most of whom were irritated by Hadjdadj and other Umayyads's rulers just due to their devotion to Imam 'Ali (a) as well as to the Prophet's progeny.

What should not be left out of consideration regarding this group is that they were by no means Shi'ites based on its principles. The expansion of Shi'ism in Kufa due to the presence of both Imam 'Ali (a) and his son there for over five years was the basic cause of the formation of that

group there. Embracing Shi'ism, some individuals at that time spread it in that region. On the other hand, there were also some traditionalists of Kufa affected by this morale. They refrained from quoting Imam 'Ali's virtues just the same as others since they were influenced by 'Uthman. He as well as his supporters criticized Kufiyan hadith-narrators since they did not observe the limitations being imposed by them on not only quoting Ahl al-Bayt's virtues but the evils of companions for the very reason, such individuals as A'mash the so-called Shi'ites

Muslim, was accused of forging hadiths narrated by the residents of Kufa.

Once Iraqis were said to be Shi'ites but by taking all limitations into account, one can understand what kind of Shi'ism it is, despite the fact that there were many Shi'ite Muslims who considered Ahl al-Bayt merely as their Imams and leaders.

A real Shi'ites follower is someone who only believes in the Imamate of 'Ali's descendants and regards them as the successor of the successors whose obedience is obligatory regardless of his political power. Belief in this principle was a criterion to distinguish ideological Shi'ism from others and those who were skeptical in this regard were not from Shi'ite Muslims. Aban Ibn Taghlib in this regard mentioned الشيعية، الذين اذا اختلف الناس عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه واله، اخذوا بقول علي عليه السلام، واذا اختلف الناس عن علي اخذوا بقول جعفر بن محمد عليه السلام "A Shi'ite Muslim is someone who endorses whatsoever Imam 'Ali (a) said, once people were at variance concerning what Allah's Messenger has said and when soever the same happened concerning 'Ali's utterances, he should accept whatever Dja'far Ibn Muhammad mentioned."

This meaning of Imamate was based on "Ghadir hadith" and those who did not believe in this were called the Disavowers. Imams probably turned their back on them merely to keep face. Ahl al-Bayt's quotations, on the other hand, presented a clear definition of sainthood which was the cornerstone of Shi'ites beliefs. There are numerous quotations which equate sainthood with prayer, fasting, Hajdj and tax alms and at times, it is even more emphasized. In practice, the Imams who were Shi'ites leadership asked people for paying their financial dues to them. They not only considered the rulers as oppressors and manifestation of tyranny but also said they are legitimate and divine Imams. Accordingly, they did carry out financial as well as political responsibilities upon them.

Once Imam Baqir (a) was asked about his father's inheritance, he said "ما كان لأبي بسبب الإمامة فهو لي وما كان غير ذلك فهو ميراث على كتاب الله وسنة نبيه" I am heir to my father's position and other things, except this, which are my father's personal features are to be divided in accordance with Qur'an as well as Prophet's Sunna."

There are some quotations regarding booties, in which the Imams made it quite clear that they have been the right owners of them. Unfortunately, some of the ignorant writers of Sunnis as

well as the orientalist, regardless of so many quotations in various aspects of our Islamic jurisprudence, presented our Imams in such a way as if they did claim they were Imams and were attributed by others; however, there are numerous quotations from Shi'ite Muslims, as said before, which remove all historical doubts.

There were a great number of people in Iraq who were of the opinion that the Ahl al-Bayt were selected by Allah's Prophet and obeying from them was mandatory. However, they might be misled regarding some facts. Hisham Ibn 'Abd al-Malik who was apprehensive of the 'Alawites' rebellion wrote a letter to Yusuf Ibn 'Umar expressing the opinion of Kufiyans

فقد عرفت حال اهل الكوفة في حبهم اهل البيت ووضعهم ايّاهم في غير مواضعهم لافتراضهم علي انفسهم طاعتهم (و وظّفوا عليهم شرائع دينهم) ونحلتهم ايّاهم عظيم ما هو كائن مما استأثر الله بعلمه دونهم "You know quite well how Kufiyans adore Ahl al-Bayt. They exaggerate about them. They believe that they should obey them in their religious activities because they believe they have some kind of wisdom granted to no one but them."

The content of this letter indicates that there has been a kind of ideological Shi'ism whose milestone was Imam, someone who defined the Islamic law for them and his obedience was incumbent. As referred before, this issue was subject to debate. Since Iraqi Shi'ite Muslims, on one hand, were for from Medina, the main residence of Imams as well as other 'Alawites, and, on the other hand, they were pressurized by the Umayyads and later on, by the 'Abbasids rulers they, could not understand who the veritable Imam was; nevertheless, from the very beginning, it was believed that only 'Ali's descendants were given the right to rule. To verify this, refer to what had been mentioned regarding political views of the Penitents. A matter of prime importance was Shi'ism in Qum originated from Kufa. The strong belief of the people of this city in Shi'ism indicated that the Ash'arites in this city had learnt the basic principles of Shi'ism in Kufa.

As it was previously mentioned, since Shi'ites Imams were far away from Medina, deviations in Shi'ism came about, one of which was the Imamate of Muhammad Ibn Hanafiyya who was supposed to be veritable Imam subsequent to 'Ali (a), Imam Hasan and Imam Husayn (a).

Despite the fact that this belief was not widespread, it did undoubtedly exist.

"Kuthayyir 'Azza" died in 105 A.H. was among poets who had Shi'ites beliefs. He was actually from the Kissanids who believed that Muhammad Ibn Hanafiyya was an Imam.

He wrote these verses

ولا الحق اربعة سواء	ألا إن الائمة من قريش
هم الاسباط ليس بهم خفاء	علي والثلاثة من بنيه
وسبط غيبته كربلاء	فسبط سبط ايمان وبرّ

وسبط لاتراه العين حتي يقود الخيل يقدمها اللواء
تغيب لايري عنهم زمانا برضوي عنده غسل وماء

Take it into account that our Imams are four people from the Quraysh tribe. 'Ali and three" children of him, one of them, Hasan Ibn 'Ali is the epitome of piety and kindness. The other one is the one being embraced by Karbala and the third is the one who can not be seen by eyes until an army appears with a flag in its forefront. For a while he would be on Radawi mountain, out of sight with honey and water at hand."

Radawi is one of the sacred mountains around Medina.

,Other poems from the very same author hint at his belief in Mahdavitism of Ibn Hanafiyya

فهديت يا مهدينا ابن المتهدي انت الذي نرقي به ونرتجي
انت ابن خيرالناس من بعد النبي انت إمام الحق لنسا نمتری
يابن علي سر ومن مثل علي

O our leader! May He raise thy blessings, thou art the one whose light of guidance we seek to" our sublimity and we stay fully hopeful of him. Thou art descendant of the best man after the Prophet (s), no doubt our truthful Imam. O son of 'Ali! Thou art like 'Ali among us."

Regardless of his misinterpretation of the true Shi'ism, Kuthayyir 'Azza basically believed in the cornerstone of Shi'ism, that is divine sainthood. Accordingly, he did not accept caliphate subsequent to prophet.

,In a poem, he wrote

برئت إلي الإله من ابن اروى ومن دين الخوارج اجمعينا
و من عمر برئت ومن عتيق غداة دعي امير المؤمنين

I invoke by God to resent 'Uthman and the Kharidjites as well as 'Umar and Abu Bakr, once" called Amir al-Mu'minin."

One of the principles of ideological Shi'ism in rejecting the legitimacy of the first caliphs since based on it Imamate is at Allah's behest. Khandaq al-Asadi was a friend of Kuthayyir who once was in Hadjdj along with him. Suddenly he shouted, "You had relinquished both the truth and your Prophet's Household consisting of four people and they are right".

Revolting against him, people beat him to death. Isfahani has a quotation in Aghani revealing that Imam Baqir (a) had taken part in Kuthayyir's funeral ceremony and asked others to let him go under his coffin. It was probable that Kuthayyir just the same as Sayyid Himyari in the course of time either had given up he Kissanids or due to his friendship with Ahl al-Bayt supported them.

Sayyid Himyari, one of the Shi'ites poets, was a member of the Kissanids too. Addressing Muhammad Ibn Hanafiyya who was believed to be alive on Radawi mount, he wrote these

,verses

ألا قل للوصي فدتك نفسي اطلت بذلك الجبل المقاما

Tell the successor, May my life be sacrificed to you, you overstayed in that mountain.”

There are many poems about his religion. At the same time, there are some quotations indicating his change of religion, which are all declared untrue by Isfahani based on his reference to some narrators. Based on some poems attributed to him, it was said that he believed in Imamate of Dja'far Ibn Muhammad Ibn Sadiq (a). It is not obvious why much effort was made to declare these verses untrue. Anyhow, it can have several reasons. For example, it had been proposed to say that he obeyed the Exaggerators not Imam Sadiq. In a poem In the name of “تجفرت باسم الله والله اكبر ,regarding his conversion, he was quoted as saying

Lord, the Exalted, I am turned to Dja'fari religion.”

This verse is called in question, lthough not so strongly, since Sayyid because of his enough ,In another poem, he went on to say تجفرت باسم الله eloquence in speech could not have said

أيا راكباً نحو المدينة جسرة عذا فرة تهوي بها كل سبب
إذا ما هداك الله لاقيت جعفرأ فقل, يا امين الله وابن المهذب

O thou who art on sturdy camelback trotting through deserts”

O noble! Once thou meet Dja'far, tell him he is trustee of God and the pure one.”

Kashshi also has a quotation indicating his conversion to Twelve-Imam Shi'ism. He had done so probably due to his argument with Mu'min al-Taqa, one of the companions of Imam Sadiq (a) and a man of debate, in which he was defeated. Since he died in Mansur's time, it was impossible for him to be still a Kissanids. On the other hand, the number of followers of this sect is not obvious or it is better to say that apart from some quotations mentioned previously, there is no other proof affirming the existence of other followers of this sect. Additionally, a number of followers were decreased since they came to obey either 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya or the 'Abbasids.

There also are some verses from Sayyid Himyari indicating his hatred towards the early caliphs. When Mahdi 'Abbasi was heir apparent, he asked him to cut off gifts been given to Banu Taym and Banu 'Adi inasmuch as they had deprived Ahl al-Bayt of their rights after

Prophet's departure. Aghani quoted that Imam Sadiq invoked God's blessing for him.

The role of poets such as Kuthayyir 'Azza Sayyid Himyari, Kumayt Ibn Zayd Asadi was of a prime significance in depicting the characteristics of Ahl al-Bayt particularly 'Ali (a). They used the most delicate expressions in this regard. It was said that he never wrote a poem without

,mentioning this very verse

أجد بآل فاطمة البكور فدمع العين منهمر غزير

Family of Fatima hath a hard time, that is why tears roll down stormily

, or in another poem he said

أقسم بالله وآلائه والمرء عما قال مسئول
أن علي بن أبي طالب على التقي والبر مجبول

I do swear by Allah and his blessings, individuals shall be asked about what they say, Surely"

'Ali is created a pure one."

Whosoever tells me "من أتاني بفضيلة لعلي بن أبي طالب ما قلت فيها شعراً فله ألف دينار", He vocalized even one of the 'Ali's virtues about which I had not written a poem, I will give him one thousand Dinars."

Demonstrating the role of the Shi'ites poet is a matter of great significance but can not be discussed here.

True belief in Shi'ism, something which prevailed among all the Shi'ite Muslims had emanated from instructions being disseminated by Imams. During the above-mentioned time, Imam Baqir and Sadiq (a) played the same role. There were a great number of hadith narrators among the followers of Imam Baqir (a) with their names mentioned in the Shi'ites scholastic books such as Ridjal by Tusi. Verifying merely those traditions being narrated by the Imams regarding either the Islamic Jurisprudence or Shari'a was one of the basic requirements in accepting the divine leadership of Imams. In other words, Imams made every effort to introduce Ahl al-Bayt as the politico-religious pillar. Here, the issue of full-scale obedience is a central principle which requires all to refer to Ahl al-Bayt on different things, something reiterated in the speeches of the Infallible Imams from 'Ali's time onwards. Previously, we touched upon 'Ali's remarks concerning Ahl al-Bayt and their stances. During the late 1st and 2nd centuries when Imam Baqir and Imam Sadiq (a), led the Shi'ite Muslims, various sects appeared each of which claimed the leadership of Muslims. Accepting the political leadership of caliphs, the majority of them struggled to have the religious leadership in their own hands. On the other hand, the Shi'ites Imams, as it was mentioned in "Thaqalayn hadith", underlined that the sole reliable sources are Qur'an and Ahl al-Bayt.

Imam Baqir (a) in his speeches most of the time called on people to take advantage of the knowledge of Ahl al-Bayt and just accept what they say as true traditions. In his speed, Imam Said to Salama Ibn Kuhayl and Hakam Ibn 'Uyayna Traverse both the East and the West of the world, then you will know no science is "من عندنا" the accurate one save that of us."

In another quotation referring to Hasan Basri, one of the renowned scholars of that time, he said, فليذهب الحسن - يعني البصري - يميناً وشمالاً فوالله ما يوجد العلم الا ههنا "Hasan Basri can go"

wherever he wants, but I swear by Allah he can acquire knowledge nowhere but from us.”
In another quotation, Imam said
فليذهب الناس حيث شاءوا، فوالله ليس الأمر إلا من ههنا- وأشار إلى
Individuals can go wherever they want, but I swear by Allah they can find it nowhere but “
بيته here, then he referred to his house.”

Such utterances invite people to refer to Ahl al-Bayt to receive Islamic instructions. The
acceptance was equal to embracing Shi'ism.

Somewhere else, Imam Baqir (a) said
آل محمد ابواب الله والدعاة إلى الجنة والقادة إليها
Muhammad's descendants are the gates of divine knowledge through which people can “
attract Allah's satisfaction. They call people to the Heaven and drive them towards it.”

Imam also said
كلّ شيء لم يخرج من هذا البيت فهو وبال
Whatsoever comes out of any house “
other than this would be harmful.”

Our insistence in mentioning these statements be due to their notable effect on the formatain
of Shi'ism.

Imam Baqir (a) also said
أيها الناس! أين تذهبون وأين يراد بكم؟ بنا هدي الله أولكم وبنا ختم آخركم “
people! Where are you going? And where have you been gone? From the very beginning, you
have been guided by Ahl al-Bayt and at last, all of you will return to them.”

When Hisham came to Medina, Imam said
الحمد لله الذي بعث محمد بالحق نبياً وأكرمنا به، فنحن
صفوة الله على خلقه وخيرته على عباده وخلفائه، فالسعيد من أتبعنا والشقي من عادانا وخالفنا “
Praise be to Allah, He who selected Muhammad as our prophet. We were respected just because of him.
Accordingly, we are selected caliphs from among his creatures. Only those who follow us are
fortunate not those who consider us as their enemy and disobey us.”

Because of such utterances, Imam Baqir(a) was summoned to Damascus by Hisham. In Imam
Sadiq's statements, it has been stressed that all other ways lead to their deviation. Imam (a)
said
إيتها العصابة! عليكم بآثار رسول الله (ص) وسنته وآثار الائمة الهداة من اهل بيت رسول الله “
O Shi'ite Muslims! It is upon you to take Prophet's Sunna as well as the traditions of Imam from Ahl al-
Bayt.”

Somewhere else, he told Yunus Ibn @ubyan
يا يونس! إن أردت العلم الصحيح فعندنا اهل البيت فانا
ورثنا واوتينا شرع الحكمة وفصل الخطاب “
O Yunus! We have the true knowledge inasmuch as we “
have inherited the paths of wisdom and ways of distinguishing the credal error from the gospel
truth from Allah's Prophet.”

Imam Sadiq (a) said
ان عندنا ما لا نحتاج معه إلي الناس، وإنّ الناس ليجتاجون إلينا وإنّ عندنا كتاباً باملاء
رسول الله وخطّ علي، صحيفة فيها كل حلال وحرام “
We have something with which we are not in need of anyone while all are in need of us. We have a book which was dictated to 'Ali (a) by Allah's
Prophet. This book contains all ordinances of the lawful or unlawful.”

This utterance was actually the repetition of what Imam 'Ali (a) had said to the residents of Kufa several times "أهل الكوفة! سلونا عما قال الله ورسوله، فإنا أهل البيت أعلم بما قال الله ورسوله" O the residents of Kufa! Ask us of what Allah and his prophet has said. Ask us since Ahl al-Bayt are the most informed source of what they have said."

The evidence indicates that there has been a unanimous cultural movement on the part of Ahl al-Bayt and the Shi'ites Imams to introduce Ahl al-Bayt as the center of religion of the Muslims.

One point should be taken into account is that the Shi'ite Muslims confronted some problems ideologically, as said before in discussing about the Exaggerators, due to dissimulation during the life of Imam Baqir and Sadiq (a) regarding both the corrupt administrations and public uproar. In addition, Imams themselves also faced some political problems not dealt with here. Regarding Ahl al-Bayt, as the authority was a justification for some linked to them as well as the Hashimites to be claimant and raise some difficulties for them. The 'Alawites internal divisions had paved the ground for such deviations, and on one hand, led to the formation of fragmentation in Shi'ism and deprived Imams of their rights of divine Imamate, on the other hand. Some of these divisions are to be discussed here

Zayd Ibn 'Ali's Uprising and the Zaydids in Shi'ism

Zaydism is one of the sects of Shi'ism and an internal inclination. The practical and principle laws are similar to those of Sunnis. It is also somehow based on the Mu'tazilites and Hanafites principles. But regarding political factors, it is mostly based on Shi'ism and all nations believe that this sect is actually a branch of Shi'ism.

It is generally believed that this has emanated from Zayd Ibn 'Ali's approach and its basic principles have been effected by his rebellion and all other movements are subordinate to it.

Now this is discussed historically.

Zayd, the son of 'Ali Ibn Husayn (a), was born from an Umm Walad (a slave who had been freed) mother. It is supposed that Mukhtar had bestowed him to Imam Sadjjad. He is one of the 'Alawites who organized the first uprising of them subsequent to Karbala's event. His action actually was the beginning of other rebellions of this kind initiated by the Zaydids thereafter throughout the Islamic land. They, most of the time, withstood the Umayyads and 'Abbasids' army while they were few.

According to Dinwari, the date of his rebellion goes back to 118 A.H. which is unreal. On the other hand, Muhammad Ibn Ishaq said it was in the year 120 A.H.. While, based on other sources, it was most likely to be in 121 or 122 A.H. and it was surely in Safar. While Ibn Kathir

mentioned that it was in 122 A.H. other people such as Ibn Abi l-Hadid, Zubayr Ibn Bakkar, Mas'udi , as well as some others were of the opinion that it was in 121 A.H. A researcher referring to some evidence tried to say it occurred in 122 A.H.. Based on the evidence, in all probability, it happened in Safar, 122 A.H.. It is said that since Safar was the second month of the year and some of the preparatory steps of the rebellion have been taken in the previous year so it happened in 122 A.H.. Based on another evidence, Khalid was deposed in Djamadi al-Awwal, 120 and by referring to the events taking place thereafter during the specific period mentioned by the historians in which Zayd was in Kufa, it is improbable to say that it took place at the beginning of the year 121 A.H..

The first happening of this rebellion is about the time when Khalid Ibn 'Abd Allah Qasri or, as mentioned in some quotations, Tariq, Khalid's male slave or his son Yazid confessed under torture when Yusuf Ibn 'Umar came to Iraq, individuals such as Zayd Ibn 'Ali, Dawud Ibn 'Ali and some others all owed them. Yusuf Ibn 'Umar informed Hisham about it. Then, he called upon Yazid and others to go to Damascus. They all said that such confession was not true. Accordingly, Hisham Ibn 'Abd al-Malik sent them to Kufa to solve that problem before Khalid and Yusuf Ibn 'Umar. Zayd and others who were afraid of Yusuf Ibn 'Umar wrote a guarantee of clemency and even took someone to Kufa along with themselves to judge Hisham's treatment towards them. Later on, it came to be known that Khalid or his son or Tariq had done it since he was under torture and wanted to be released for a while. This happening might have occurred either after 120 A.H. or when Khalid was deposed. Again, at that time, Zayd was either in Medina, then was sent to Damascus at Hisham's behest once he was informed about what Khalid had done. Or he himself was in Damascus or in its outskirts, based on some evidence, to solve his problems with the Hasanites concerning 'Ali's charity in there.

What some other quotations reveal is that Zayd had already travelled to Damascus. Based on them, Zayd who was at odd with 'Abd Allah Ibn Hasan Ibn Hasan(a) over 'Ali's charity headed for Damascus so that Hisham personally might find the solution to this problem since it could not be settled in Medina but he refrained from visiting him and whenever Zayd wrote a letter to caliph, he wanted him to return to his home. Eventually, at Zayd's insistence, Hisham accepted to call upon him but he said that he could not admit what he has said and, after a short while, made him to leave Damascus. Setting out for Medina at first, Zayd then shifted his way to Iraq. Apparently what this narration is to convey is different from why Zayd disapproved the Umayyads. It seems that Zayd went there before the time Khalid said. He was also troublesome to Zayd. Regarding Zayd's meeting with Hisham, the historians hinted at what made Zayd be angry with the Umayyads. Later on, Zayd himself told Djabir Dju'fi that he could

not keep silent before Hisham while he was a tyrant and he was against Qur'an. Zayd said, "I saw myself how a Christian insulted the Holy Prophet in his presence. I said to him, "If I could, I would kill you".

But Hisham said, "Leave alone our friend."

In another encounter, Hisham addressed Zayd and told him, "You are told to be entitled for caliphate while you are no one but the son of a slave woman not being competent for this task".

In response Zayd said, "Isma'il was also the same as me, on the other hand, Ishaq like you was not born from a slave woman but before Allah he was superior to Ishaq and his descendants were the best among people". Such an encounter implies that Zayd already thought of caliphate. It is said that he set forth his rebellion with his brother Imam Baqir (a), but it is known that Imam Baqir (a) had departed his life at least six years prior to that.

What is your "أخوك البقرة", Somewhere else, Hisham to insult Imam Baqir(a) asked Zayd brother, Baqara (the cow) doing?"

Our holy prophet called "سماه رسول الله باقراً وتسميه البقرة لقد اختلفتما اذاً", In response Zayd said him Baqir, why are you calling him Baqara? You are at variance with him in this regard."

Anyhow, Hisham sent Zayd to Iraq to call on Yusuf, but since he was apprehensive of him, he wrote a letter to Khalid saying that to let him not stay there even for an hour owing to the fact that he had a great power to attract the residents thereof to himself.

It is worth saying that once Zayd departed Damascus, Hisham said, "I swear by Allah that he will run wild". Resolving the problems arising from Khalid's confession, Zayd remained in Kufa and others who were wrongfully arrested went back to Medina.

Zayd Ibn 'Ali in Kufa

Kufa, the city center of Iraq, was once also the center of caliphate in which many tribes resided. Among the Islamic cities, it was Kufa that was of great threat to the Umayyads accordingly. It was under tightened security and military measures.

O Zayd! go "يا زيد اخرج حيث شئت ولا تدخل الكوفة", When Zayd left Hisham, he said to him anywhere you want but do not enter Kufa."

He also had said the same to Yusuf. As said before, Zayd stayed in Kufa for a while after he put an end to his dispute with Khalid Ibn 'Abd Allah. Every day Yusuf Ibn 'Umar encouraged him to leave Kufa as soon as possible but each time he refrained from doing so under various pretexts. Once he said he was about to leave or he wanted to buy something but finally he was forced to leave there. According to Ya'qubi, Zayd who was expelled from Kufa came there once

again for he was not under strict control. In a quotation from Ibn A'tham, it is read that the soldiers of Ibn 'Umar accompanied him up to "Mantiqa al-Ghudayb" and went back to Kufa.

Following them, Zayd stayed there for four months.

Another quotation indicates that the Shi'ite Muslims were in touch with him. His friends who were irritated by the Kufiyans' unfaithfulness wanted to leave Medina so the rebellion has not been taken seriously. According to Zayd who was, on one hand, pressurized by Yusuf Ibn 'Umar and, on the other hand, not so deeply concerned about the rebellion set out for Medina. Feeling that they lost golden opportunities, the Shi'ite Muslims of Kufa chased him and intercepted him in Qadisiyya. They asked him to return to Kufa to overthrow the Umayyads with their collaboration.

They said, "O Zayd, the son of Allah's Prophet, why are you leaving Kufa while you will have hundreds of thousand of swordsmen prepared to fight with the Umayyads?"

They went on to say, "The number of the soldiers of Damascus in Kufa would not suffice and it was only Hamdan or Midhhadj tribe that could conquer them." Then Zayd accepted to return to Kufa once the Shi'ite Muslims gave an undertaking to support him.

Zayd entered Kufa secretly in such a way that Yusuf Ibn 'Umar was not informed about it for a long period. Thereafter, he came to know about it since Hisham who was told about his arrival told him about it too.

Zayd stayed in Kufa for over ten months and spent two months out in Basra. During this period, Zayd who hid in different houses asked many to join him and he could not be found by the Umayyads for either they were not able to find his hiding place or they were totally unaware of his arrival there. It is said that Yusuf Ibn 'Umar could not believe at first that he had returned to Kufa in spite of all warnings on the part of Hisham about Zayd's riot. He said, "Zayd is a man of wisdom who will never get himself into hot water". Being informed both about Kufiyans' readiness for uprising and the support of Iraqi Ahl Sawad, the farmers of the cultivated lands surrounding Kufa and Iraq, Yusuf Ibn 'Umar commanded to check the way saying that all individuals should be frisked lest any letter of Zayd might be sent somewhere else.

Nasr Ibn Khuzayma was one of the pre-eminent supporters of Zayd. He lived in his house for a while during which the Shi'ite Muslims from different places came there to visit him. Another hiding place of him was the house of a woman from Azd tribe who, later on, married him. Other happenings subsequent to his death divulge the fact that he had another wife as well as three children in that city.

Those points over which people had paid allegiance to Zayd, later on, turned to be the basis of the subsequent riots of this kind such as that of the penitents and Mukhtar's

إنا ندعوكم إلى كتاب الله وسنة نبيه (ص) وجهاد الظالمين والدفع عن المستضعفين وإعطاء المحرومين وقسم هذا الفياء بين اهله بالسواء وردّ الظالمين وإقفال المجمر ونصرنا اهل البيت علي من نصب لنا وجهل حقنا

We enjoin you to follow both Qur'an and the Sunna of the Prophet, fight against the oppressor," defend the oppressed, divide booties among its real owners equally, and finally support Ahl al-Bayt against their foes."

The same statements were quoted by Ibn A'tham. He also referred to one of the letters found in a way by the soldiers of Yusuf Ibn 'Umar in which he had addressed individuals saying, "You are not aware of what had happened to you. There surely is a sedition in your religion and volatility in your livelihood. Bloodshed and plunder your share from the state treasury. I enjoin you to follow Qur'an and Sunna, defend the oppressed, fight against the oppressed who had usurped the rights of Ahl al-Bayt."

In his bidding, Zayd underlined points some of which were religious and financial ones. He also accentuated cruelties that Ahl al-Bayt had endured. Since the residents of Kufa were still dubious about what they had undertaken, Zayd paid allegiance to them not so easily.

During this period of his life, Zayd wrote letters to those fascinated to Ahl al-Bayt expressing the cruelties they endured to stimulate them to fight. In one of those letters he wrote, "Do not rather say you ran wild" rather say we rebelled "غضباً لكم" rather say you ran wild "غضباً لله ولرسوله"

To secure allegiance from individuals, Zayd dispatched his agents to other cities. For instance, he sent Yazid Ibn Abi Ziyad to Raqqa , Mada'in as well as Wasit. Some of the residents of those cities joined him and that was why Yusuf Ibn 'Umar had the gates as well as the roads thereof checked strictly. Zayd also sent Ubdat Ibn Kuthayyir and Hasan Ibn Sa'd to Khurasan. From among scholars and jurisprudents taking part in Zayd's riot either directly or indirectly, one can name Abu Hanifa, one of the eminent jurisprudents and experts in religion in Iraq. Politically speaking, during 'Abbasids and Umayyads's, he opposed them. During the former time, he assisted Nafs Zakiyya and in the latter time, he aided Zayd. He was from among the Murdji'ites and could not stop supporting riots of this kind. Although this sect was somehow against Shi'ism, it basically was a revolutionary movement. It has been proven in many sources that he was from among the Murdji'ites. Due to the same participation, in anti-government clashes, he has also been charged with Djahmites. Murdji'ites are said to have been unwilling to equal anybody to Zayd. As previously mentioned, the Djahmites originated from Djahm Ibn Safwan who himself is one of the major companions of Harith Ibn Suraydj, a revolutionary figure of Khurasan. Of couse, Abu Hanifa was once forced by Mansur to take care of some business. Muhammad Ibn Dja'far Ibn Muhammad (a) indirectly acknowledged the report about his role in Zayd's uprising.

Zamakhshari is quoted as saying that Abu Hanifa incited people to take part in Zayd's uprising. Baladhuri has written, "When Zayd sent for Abu Hanifa, he was shocked and said that who among jurists had accepted his call. He was told, Salama Ibn Kuhayl, Yazid Ibn Abi Ziyad, Hisham Barid, Abu Hashim Rammani and a number of others." Abu Hanifa said, "I have no authority of rebellion."; however, he sent some money for Zayd to be spent for strengthening his troops.

Isfahani also quoted in the same way from Abu Hanifa saying that, "I have some money, you can use it for yourself and your companions for buying armour and weapons." He then gave some money to one of Zayd's slaves to be taken to him.

Mansur Ibn al-Mu'tamir is among the jurists who provoked the people to help Zayd.

He holds in himself a bit of Shi'ism." "فيه تشيع قليل", It is said about him. Some have introduced him among the Khashabids, a title given to Mukhtar's companions. Interestingly, Zayd was even attached to Zuhri who was a learned man affiliated with the Umayyads and asked him to rebel with Zayd.

Zuhri said that he would not do so as long as Hisham was alive, but adding that once Walid was in power, he would be ready to do so.

Zuhri was one of the closest people to Hisham, still somewhere it is narrated that when Zayd's head was sent to Hisham, Zuhri said, "This family had been engulfed due to their haste."

Then the narrator says, "I questioned him whether they could come to power or not." Then the narrator says, "I questioned him whether they could come to power or not." Zuhri replied, "Yes, I heard 'Ali Ibn Husayn(a) quoting Fatima from the Prophet who said من ولدك Mahdi is from my descendants." "

Another one paying allegiance to Zayd was Hilal Ibn Habab, Mada'in's judge. It is uncertain whether Salama Ibn Kuhayl participated in Zayd's riot or not.

A'mash was one of the Iraqi jurists who had Shi'istic inclinations.

'Uthman Ibn 'Umayr said, "Zayd sent me to A'mash to ask him for help." In response, he said, "I am cognizant of Zayd's virtues better than you. Give him my best regards and say that I am not sure whether people will help you or not, but I would join you if I had three hundred people accompanying me."

Apart from those paying allegiance to Zayd in Mada'in, Basra, Wasit, Riy, Musil, Khurasan, Djurdjan and Djazira, fifteen thousand others have been mentioned too.

There were many prominent figures among those paying allegiance to Zayd. Mas'udi said, "Zayd ran riot in Kufa while the noblemen and Qur'an readers allied with him although it is not obvious how many joined him once the war was launched. There were also some of the Kharidjites from among those paying allegiance. Accordingly, it is

necessary to explain that Zayd in essence intended to absorb different groups by acting openly. Afterwards, this will be discussed in detail. Evidence of some kind indicates that the Kharidjites, too, like other groups wanted to take advantage of Zayd's position and of course how many groups there were is not clear.

Baladhuri says, "When Zayd came to Kufa, the Shi'ite Muslims surrounded him and the Kharidjites came up to him as well insofar as the whole people from Mada'in, Basra and ... who paid allegiance to him numbered 15000. Ibn 'Inba, originally a Zaydids, quoted the same thing. Himyari, one of the Zaydids historians, in his book "Al-Di'ama", quoted Sayyid Abu Talib as saying that different groups of people joined together in paying allegiance to Zayd in spite of their ideological differences in such a way that all, no matter whether they were from among the Zaydids, the Mu'tazilites or the Murdji'ites, were equally interested in doing so. The very same author had touched upon the presence of various sects in that riot. This implies that the residents of Kufa left him while if the Kharidjites were there they would surely support him

أبا حسين لو شراة عصابة علقته كان لوردهم اصدار

O 'Ali! The Kharidjites who challenge you are not those who can survive when facing you."

So it implicitly indicates that the Kharidjites did not participate in that rebellion; nevertheless, they emotionally supported it

Zayd Ibn 'Ali's Clash with the Umayyads' Forces

In an extensive search to locate the hiding place of Zayd, Yusuf paid one of his servants some money to go within the Shi'ite Muslims and introduce himself as one of the Ahl al-Bayt's devotees coming from Khurasan. He had decided to find Zayd's whereabouts in this way. He also at Hisham's command gathered all people together in the mosque and made them one by one to take an oath to disclose Zayd's hiding place if they knew it.

Measures of this kind made Zayd revolt at least one week sooner than the expected time. At a Tuesday evening, once the riot was started at Yusuf's command all those suspected of backing Zayd as well as the nobles and renowned figures of the city were summoned to a mosque then his agents said that they would kill whosoever stayed out of mosque no matter whether they were Arabs or not. Accordingly, all were forced to go there. Such an action prevented people from joining Zayd. Then at Wednesday night that was very cold, Zayd along with seventeen others left the house of Mu'awiya Ibn Ishaq Ibn Zayd Ibn Haritha and lit a huge fire. The door of the mosque was still locked and the government agents let no one out, they were all crying",

"Allah Akbar (God is Great) and those able to join Zayd did so.

The number of those who joined him that night and the day after is not distinct. Based on

some sources, they were 400 or 220 people and based on some others, they were 300. According to 'Awana, they were 250 people. What another quotation reveals is that there were 400 accompanying Zayd but the number of them reduced to 300 or less. Sa'id Ibn Khaytham who was on the side of Zayd said that they had been 500. Since Abu l-Faradj Isfahani et al had a lengthy discussion regarding events of a two-day clash, it is not necessary to mention them once again, so just those of prime importance are to be touched upon.

"Ya Mansur, Amit, Amit" was a slogan being chosen by Zayd in his riot which was the same slogan in the war of Badr being chosen by the Holy Prophet. It was Zayd himself who said this was the very same slogan being chanted by the Holy Prophet there. By the very same reason, he selected the same in his riot and it, later on, came to be used in other riots. Observing that the Kufiyans again repeated what they had done to Husayn (a); seizing to support him, Zayd

They treated me just in the same way they had treated Husayn (a)" **فعلوها حسينيّه**, said As referred before, the Kufiyans were hasty; on one hand, they made a decision very soon and, on the other hand, they regretted what they had done even sooner. This time in contrast it was not the matter of treachery since they were all besieged in mosque not being able to join him. Being severely in need of help in that predicament, Zayd could not justify their absence and

This is not a justification for those paying allegiance to us." **ما هذا لمن بايعنا بعذر**, said From the very beginning steps of their riot, Zayd had repeatedly reminded Nasr Ibn Khuzayma, But **فعلوها حسينيّه**, one of his devotees, of what had happened to Husayn in Karbala by stating

Nasr said, "People are surrounded in the mosque and are not able to leave there." Then, they resolved to launch an attack on the mosque to set the people free. The Umayyads troops on the roof of the mosque did not let them open the door of the mosque by throwing stones on both the people inside and Zayd's forces outside. Striving to reach the door of the mosque, Zayd's forces shouted **يا أهل المسجد اخرجوا من الذل إلى العز ومن الضلالة إلى الهدى** "O people of mosque! Turn to exaltation guidance from humiliation and deviation."

At that time, it was probable that even individuals being able to help, refrained to doing so. As said before, those who were surrounded in the mosque at least could have an excuse but the rest who had concealed themselves in their housees due to a fear of the government's agents were to blame for such treachery. In Kunasa where Zayd was extremely in need of help other than two or so no one else helped him.

Accepting the majority of the people being surrounded in the mosque, Zayd said **أين الباقون لا يخرجون إلينا** "Where art survivors to rush to us."

Ibn A'tham referred in his speeche to those staying in their houses while they heard his cry of

help.

In contrast to Karbala's event, the main opponents of Zayd in this riot were the forces of Damascus sent to Kufa in such critical situations. Zayd managed to kill most of them in his two-day clash but it did not suffice him since the Damascus army was composed of 12000 soldiers. It was such a great army that the soldiers standing in lines could not move easily. Being informed about what Zayd had done, Hisham dispatched 8000 soldiers to Iraq to fight along with Yusuf Ibn 'Umar.

It is said that the women in Kufa asked Zayd to let them go to war. In reply, he said that he was disappointed of the men much less the women. Once someone, who was from Damascus, said *أما أحد يغضب لفاطمة بنت رسول الله*, abusive words to Fatima (a). Weeping bitter tears, Zayd said

Is there not anyone who may share wrath of Fatima's, daughter of the Messenger (s)!"

Zayd's problems were doubled when Yusuf Ibn 'Umar 1300 of his skilled archers, known as "Al-Qiqaniyya" who were apparently from Sind. They killed the remainders of Zayd's army.

Yusuf Ibn 'Umar had paid someone 1000 Dinars to behead Zayd Ibn 'Ali.

Ibn A'tham said, "Zayd fought bravely just the same as his grandfather, Husayn (a) when all of a sudden an arrow pierced his forehead. Then he was sent to the house of someone from Hamdan tribe, one of the Shi'ites tribes in Iraq. Pulling the arrow out of his forehead, he passed away. When Zayd was martyred, he was 42 years old and it was only after his martyrdom when the doors of the mosque were opened to public.

After Zayd's martyrdom, Yusuf Ibn 'Umar searched for his body to send his head for Hisham. Based on some different evidence, Zayd's servant who was from Sind or another servant or Hadjdjam was brought to him and he was someone who pulled the arrow out of his head, making known Zayd's burial place, to Yusuf. When they found his body, they sent his head for Hisham, then hung him in Kunasa. Nasr Ibn Khuzayma, Mu'awiya Ibn Ishaq Ibn Zayd Ibn Haritha and Ziyad Ibn 'Abd Allah Fihri, Zayd's devotee, were all hanged too.

Being furious at the Kufiyans, Yusuf Ibn 'Umar threatened them when they were in the mosque and hurled abusive words at Ahl al-Bayt. He also ordered all the houses to be searched. After that, they either killed or burnt to death all the captives and the injured.

They also apprehended Zayd's wife, and after making her naked, they whipped her to death. 'Abd Allah Ibn Ya'qub whose daughter had married Yahya Ibn Zayd was also killed. Yusuf Ibn 'Umar also whipped a woman 500 lashes that had told her mother to harbor Zayd's daughter. He also ruined many houses. He ordered to cut the limbs of another woman who had helped Zayd and her husband was also killed. Yusuf Ibn 'Umar had ordered four hundreds of his soldiers to watch Zayd's dead body and at night 100 soldiers did so. Upon hearing about

Zayd's martyrdom after four years, Walid Ibn Zayd ordered to burn his body then either to spatter its ashes around or throw to the Euphrates. He had a handmaid and three children of hers in Kufa. They were all given to Fadl Ibn 'Abd al-Rahman who was one of the sons of 'Abd al-Muttalib.

Although Hisham was angry because of Zayd's riot, he ordered not to cut Kufiyans' grants while regarding the Medinans and Meecans he forbiddened it for one year. He also ordered his governor in Basra, Qasim Ibn Muhammad Thaqafi to send those who were from among the Hashimites in Iraq back to Medina. He ordered the governor of Medina not to let some specific individuals go out of the city. These individuals who were released on bail were asked to report once a week they were inside the city.

,In this regard Fadl Ibn 'Abd al-Rahman wrote these verses

كَلَّمَا حَدَثُوا بِأَرْضِ نَعِيقًا ضَمْنُونًا السَّجُونَ أَوْ سَيْرُونًا
أَشْخَصُونَا إِلَى الْمَدِينَةِ أُسْرَى لَا كِفَاهُمْ رَبِّي الَّذِينَ يَحْذَرُونَا

Whensoever a cry is heard on Earth, we are either in prison or about to move. We were" captured and sent to Medina. May Allah not satisfy the demands of those scare us."

Ibn Abi I-Zanad, someone affiliated with the Umayyads, who was known as "Faqih al-Madina" stated that in comparison to the Umayyads' caliphs no one hated bloodshed like Hisham, but Zayd's uprising caused him heavy losses, so he could not keep calm until Zayd was decapitated. Under no circumstances, as it was said, were people completely at ease but during Hisham's time in which only Zayd's uprising in some parts of Kufa had turned there in a state of chaos until he was killed. Quite obvious, it was untrue since during that period, the Kharidjites revolted several times. At the same time, the people of Khurasan who were furious at the Umayyads ran wild under the leadership of Harith Ibn Suraydj, so how is it possible to say that it was a peaceful age?

Zayd's action, as it was told by Ya'qubi, made the Shi'ite Muslims in Khurasan openly disagree the Umayyads by stating their hideous cruelties and revile to all what they had done to Ahl al-Bayt. Accordingly, they could attract lots of supporters

Zaydism, Shi'ism and Zayd Ibn 'Ali (a)

Previously, it was said that Zaydism, a deviation in Shi'ism, initiated a gap between the Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims and the Zaydids to such an extent that during the last years of Imam Sadiq's time, they both accused each other of hideous things.

Accepting not that Zayd was the real founder of Zaydism, one can say that he played a significant role in its formation and this is the most important thing to be discussed. One of the

basic principles Zaydism depending on and was expressed in various ways, was that despite the superiority of Ahl al-Bayt over others and only 'Ali (a) and Hasanayn, Imam Hasan and Imam Husayn (a) have been selected by Allah for Imamate, they were of the opinion that whosoever from among Ahl al-Bayt rises up against the cruel, he shall deserve to be Imam. Such attitude indicates that Zaydism did not consider Imamate the same as the Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims an important matter and even they were lenient with Shiykhs that is Abu Bakr and 'Umar. They were of the opinion that it was true that they never let 'Ali (a) become a caliph and this was just a problem.

Such leniency that had its own theological and juridical impacts led to the expansion of ties between the Zaydids and the Sunnites scholars having Shi'ism inclinations. For instance, the Zaydids were completely affected by Mu'tazilites theologically. They also came to endorse Abu Hanifa's school of thought which was influential in Iraq. Since they were indifferent towards Imamate, they could have a good relationship with the Sunnis. As a result, there remained not more than a handful of juridical decrees intact. It would be a simplistic attitude to assume that the Zaydids followed the Sunnis completely, they instead struggled hard for centuries to maintain their Shi'ites identities.

Whether such attitude regarding Imamate has emanated from Zayd's ideas as well as his conducts or not, discussion goes far in detail. The latest books concerning Zayd's life, the main of which are "Zayd al-Shahid" from 'Allama Muqarram and "Sirah wa Qiyam Zayd Ibn 'Ali" from Mr. Kariman, all are written in such a way to show that Zayd did believe in the Imamate of 'Ali (a) and his sons. In the above-mentioned books, there is no trace of criticism regarding Zayd, instead there are abundant quotations all praising him and reflecting his strong belief in twelve Imams. Although this was true based on some evidence, more attention should be paid if it were supposed to say that it was quite true since some other evidence, on the other hand, contradict the previous ones and this should not be overlooked so simply, rather it is intended Recollect a good memory of thy dead "اذكرو موتاكم بالخير", to overlook them as a precaution or ones."

Something written in many sources was an argument between Zayd and the Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims during the very beginning steps of his riot about his attitude towards the Shiykhs. The Sunnites sources had tried hard to quote it in line with their religious tendencies, but this should not make us disregard it completely.

When a group of eminent figures from among those paying allegiance to him asked of his opinion towards the Shiykhs, he said, "May Allah bless them, never have I heard Ahl al-Bayt disgust them. Accordingly, I would not do this either".

“So why do you want to take Ahl al-Bayt’s revenge of them who had violated your rights?”, they asked.

Zayd said, “The only thing I can say is that they did violate our right, but this could not make me be an unbeliever. Although they usurped the throne and did not follow either Qur’an or Sunna, they were fair to people”.

They asked, “Why they are not cruel to you like the previous rulers. Why do you intend to wage a war against them?”

In reply he said, “Those rulers were not the same as them. They were cruel not only to me and you but to themselves as well. I enjoin you to adhere to Qur’an and the prophet’s Sunna as well as eliminate the heresies. If you accept me, you would be prosperous. If not, you should await the consequence”.

This reply made them not pay allegiance to Zayd. Taking into account the fact that at that time Imam Muhammad Ibn ‘Ali al-Baqir (a) was not alive, the narrator quoted them as saying, “Now Dja’far (a) should take the place of his father and we do not follow Zayd”.

It is said that Zayd called them “Rafida” (the Disavowers) but they themselves are of the opinion that it was Mughira Ibn Sa’id who had done this rather than Zayd.

The same event was quoted by Himyari as well but because of his extremist Zaydids’s stance he stated that the Prophet himself had called them the Disavowers. This would be discussed later.

Himyari went on to say that the Disavowers addressed Zayd saying, “The Umayyads, in restoring your rights, were just the same as the Shiykhs. In al-Futuh, also there is the same statement from them adding that the Disavowers thereafter went to Dja’far Ibn Muhammad and told him what had happened to them but he asked them to go back to Zayd.

Baladhuri stated the same point of what the opponents had said, “Subsequent to Muhammad Ibn ‘Ali (a) our Imam is Baqir, his son.”

Zayd send someone to Imam Baqir (a) to ask him whether he wanted to run a riot or not.

They said, “He might practice dissimulation and as a result, they would not join him.”

It is worth stating that it was a false quotation since Imam Baqir (a) at that time was not alive. It is probable that in the very same utterance, the word Dja’far had been used instead of Abu Dja’far.

One may not doubt about such an argument, on the other hand, it is quite obvious that the historians attempted to demonstrate Zayd as having non-Shi’ites inclinations to overcome the Disavowers who were from among the Twelve-Imam Shi’ite Muslims.

They altered the very same happening to such an extent that another writer went on to say,

"The Disavowers shot his forehead, then they hung him and compelled him to cut the hands of his wife. They did the same to 'Ali, to Hasan, to Husayn and his children.

البراءة من خلفاء الثلاثة البراءة من علي وعكسه ايضاً
Dissociation from three caliphs equals that from 'Ali and vice versa."

Despite the fact that Zayd did not accept caliph III, anyhow, there are some quotations in other sources that all indicate that Zayd called the opponents the Disavowers.

Two further points in this regard should be taken into account. At first, it should be known whether Zayd did make that statement only for attracting others and because of dissimulation or it was really his own attitude. The second point is that whether the Shi'ite Muslims were called the Disavowers merely because of the above-mentioned reasons or there might be some other reasons as well.

At first, Zayd's dissimulation should be discussed. Even if we suppose that Zayd did not believe in the Imamate of other Imams after Husayn (a), it seems impossible that Zayd had been praising the first or second caliph in spite of the efforts on the part of the Sunnites narrators, in this respect, made to show Zayd did praise them. There are many statements that indicate the Shi'ite Muslims disapproved of them. Another point is that, as it was mentioned by Zayd's opponents too, the illegality of those two caliphs was the basis of Shi'ism. They were of the opinion that their caliphate was a pure injustice. This opinion, later on, became the source of other political mistakes such as the formation of the Umayyads. As mentioned before, by Zayd's opponents, Zayd could not have said so. If he did not really accept their legitimacy, so there might be a specific reason for him to approve them. Just for a while, Zayd who had ran wild in Kufa thought whether it was true or not about mobilizing all to oppose the Umayyads. In that situation, he attempted not to disperse a large number of people who are able to help him by taking position against 'Umar and 'Uthman. He even expected the Kharidjites's support and it was quite obvious that if he had really divulged his stance, he would have dispersed all the opponents of the Umayyads who were not the Shi'ite Muslims. On the other hand, he might have mistaken counting on those forces for coming to power, but he surely could not rise up without their help.

In spite of what had been mentioned above, it can not be said for sure that Zayd did not believe in what he had said but it is probable that the Shi'ite Muslims who left him could not perceive that dissimulation. On the other hand, there are some evidence in this regard one of which is the cautious measures taken by the 'Abbasids who just the same as the 'Alawites were Shi'ite Muslims. After coming to power, they still had the same position towards the caliphs and it was reflected in the utterances of Saffah from the very beginning of their caliphates.

Attempting to hold the Banu 'Adi and Banu Taym (the Shiykhs' tribes) in high esteem in spite of what the 'Alawites had desired, Mansur sowed the seed of hatred between the 'Alawites and the 'Abbasids. But once Sayyid Himyari asked him to cut the grants of those tribes, when Mahdi 'Abbasi was heir apparent, he did so. This alone is an indication of heresy among the 'Abbasids let alone Zayd and the 'Alawites.

Another evidence regarding Zayd's dissimulation is an utterance of someone saying, "Being Thou ask me of Abu Bakr" *أين سألني عن أبي بكر وعمر، هما أقاماني هذا المقام*, injured, Zayd said and 'Umar, beware that they let me hold this position."

If this statement is true, it will verify Zayd's dissimulation political outcome of which was quite obvious for him. For the very same reason, the Kharidjites, the Murdji'ites and the Zaydids all participated in his uprising. Taking the above mentioned points into account, it can be said that Zayd's dissimulation, later on, turned to be the corner-stone of the Zaydids.

One further point worthy of stating is that Zayd was said to call the Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims, the Disavowers since they left him as soon as they became aware of what he had said about the Shiykhs.

It should also be mentioned that Rafd means "relinquishing the limitations". It also refers to an army that has left their leader. Each division of this army is then called "Rafida", the Disavowers. It also refers to someone who has set his cattle free to go wherever they want to.

"Ibl al-Rafida" is also referred to the camels that go to pasture without shepherd. This term is referred to the Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims who did not accept the first and second caliphs, but were approved by those who had accepted their caliphate. Ash'ari, in this regard, had said, "The Shi'ite Muslims are called the Disavowers since they rejected the caliphate of both 'Umar and Abu Bakr."

Relinquishing themselves from all restrictions, in contrast to them, the literalists, followed different rulers. In history, the distinctive feature of the Disavowers is that they did not accept the caliphate of the Shiykhs and criticized them repeatedly since they had violated the rights of Imams.

The writer of Tabsara al-'Awam in this regard had stated, "Once the enemy was asked about Rafd and Rafidi, he should answer, "It means giving up, throwing and in common usage, the Disavower is someone who believes in the Imamate of 'Ali not Abu Bakr. Since this word means giving up, so they can be called the Disavowers. They relinquished the credal error and followed what was gospel truth. And if you want "Rafd" as an expression, it implies that they never tilted towards Imamate of Abu Bakr and this is just praise rather than reproach. Sayyid Himyari in front of Qadi Bawar who had rejected his witness and called him a Disavower

In spite of what you want, I am a Disavower," *و نحن على رغمك رافض لاهل الضلالة والمنكر*, said someone who rejects aberration as well as unlawful."

Some points should be taken into account regarding why Zayd called the Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims Disavowers.

The first point is that in contrast to what was mentioned before, in *al-Maqalat wa al-Firaq* from Ash'ari, one of the first scripts about various sects in Shi'ism, this term denotes something else. This is the story, Once Mughira Ibn Sa'id who was from exaggerators said that he opposed Nafs Zakiyya in front of the Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims and they excommunicated him. He thought that they were the Disavowers and *فرعم أنهم رافضة وأنه هو الذي سماهم بهذا الاسم* "it was him who called them the Disavowers."

In a quotation from Tabari mentioned previously, the Shi'ite Muslims themselves had accepted this.

The second point is that in an argument between Farazdaq and Hisham Ibn 'Abd al-Malik about Imma Sadjjad (a), Farazdaq wrote his popular poem regarding Imam, the caliph asked him *أورافضي أنت؟* "Are you a Disavower?" If loving Ahl al-Bayt is equal to being a Disavower," *إن كان حب أهل البيت رفضاً فنعم*, He replied "so yes, I am a Disavower too."

Thereafter, he was sent to prison. Since this had taken place during the life of Imam Sadjjad (a) who passed away in 95 A.H., it can be understood that this meaning of Disavower had nothing to do with what was mentioned earlier in Zayd's time. It is probable that this term was used about the Shi'ite Muslims because of its literal usage at first and then to reject the legitimacy of the two caliphs.

The third point is that this term had been used in various manners being quoted by Sha'bi regarding the Shi'ite Muslims. Since he had died years before Zayd's uprising, it can be inferred that at that time, too, the Shi'ite Muslims were called the Disavowers.

There are several quotations in this regard one of which is what Sha'bi had said *ولا تكن رافضياً* "Adore Ahl al-Bayt, but do not be a Disavower."

The fourth point is that as it was stated by the same scholars, individuals such as Isfahani in *Maqatil al-Talibin* and Ibn Sa'd in *Tabaqat* had not this quotation. So it is an indication that shows they, especially Isfahani failed to accept it.

The fifth point is that Fadl Ibn Shadhan quoted the Sunnites narrators as saying, "Hasan Ibn Ibn Hasan Ibn Hasan had *مرقت علينا الرافضة كما مرقت الخوارج على علي*, Hasan Ibn 'Ali (a) had said died before Zayd.

It is probable that Hasan Ibn Hasan Ibn Hasan Ibn 'Ali was the brother of Nafs Zakiyya who

had died after him. Anyhow he, as a Zaydids, had told this. An important point is that Fadl in his reply had considered the literal meaning of this term, in the least referring not to Zayd. They are those who "هم الذين لا يرون قتال احد الا مع امام عدل بما يأتي ويذر" He also said, "Rafid deem permissible fighting anyone joining no one but 'Ali who is well informed about all affairs." It is anyhow certain that probably from the late 1st century onwards, this term based on its literal meaning was used to refer to the Shi'ite Muslims. There also is a forged tradition in which the Holy Prophet had said, "At the end of time, there will appear a tribe that is called the Disavowers. They are disbelievers and you have to kill them."

This statement was surely an insult. Later on, when the Zaydids cut their relationship with the Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims, they used this statement when they spoke ironically about the Shi'ite Muslims. Zayd himself most likely, due to the terrible condition of that time, had used this term. For any reason this term was used and basically its literal meaning had been taken into account. The above-mentioned tradition was prevalent during Imam Sadiq's time as a justification for the rulers to sacrifice the Shi'ite Muslims. Accordingly, this might show that the emergence of this word dates back to the time before Zayd's uprising. It was also said that some of the Shi'ite Muslims asked Imam Sadiq why their enemies called them the Disavowers. In reply, Imam said, "They did not name you so but based on what was in the Torah and Gospel, you are called the Disavowers since seventy people of Pharaoh's servants left him and embraced the religion of Moses and they were called the Disavowers by Allah ... just the same as them, you had joined Ahl al-Bayt and obeyed Allah's command too."

By referring to the previous quotations, it can be understood that Imam had stressed the literal meaning of this word while calling those who had not accepted the ruling of the criminals. 'Ammar Duhni quoted one of the companions of Imam Sadiq as saying the same statements before the judge of Kufa that had called him a Disavower. Criticizing the aforesaid tradition, Fadl Ibn Shadhan proved that it was a forged one. Since it is nonsensical to say that someone who believes in both Allah and His Prophet to be called an unbeliever and deserves to be killed.

He went on to say that in our view the Shi'ite Muslims- whom you call the Disavowers - disapprove Abu Bakr and 'Umar about 'Ali's excellences but they never said that both were .vice-incarnated. They said 'Ali was superior to them in different ways

The Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims and Zayd

The Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims, being of the opinion that Imams have been selected by

Allah and their obedience is requisite and had various stances regarding Zayd and his uprising. As the title implies, two points are to be discussed. Namely, the outlook of both Imams and their companions are to be mentioned.

There are many narrations about Zayd which are difficult to be enumerated. Zayd has been approved in some. Some others had a skeptical view about him, but if we look positively at them, it can be seen that the Shi'ites Imams were optimist towards him. Justifying his uprising, the Shi'ite Imams were of the opinion that he could restore the rights of the oppressed if he would have been obeyed. It could not be understood from these quotations that either Zayd was triumphant in his uprising or he did so at Imam Sadiq's behest at all. Knowing that the uprisings of that kind were not likely to be victorious and even they were so at first, it was not clear what would happen at the end the Shi'ites Imams did not approve those uprisings. On the other hand, martyrdom of he who adores it in an attempt to fight with the oppressor is desirable.

Shiykh Saduq in this regard by narrating about Imam Rida (a) to praise Zayd had stated, "I will bring more traditions from other Imams about Zayd to make the ideas of the Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims regarding Zayd perceptible to all. It is worth saying that none of his quotations implies that Zayd rose up at Imam's behest to bring them to power. One of those quotations which brightens Zayd's intention is to be mentioned here.

، Imam Rida (a) quoted his father and he had quoted Imam Sadiq (a) as saying "انه دعا الي الرضا من آل محمد ولو ظفر لوفي بما دعا اليه" "May Allah forgive my uncle, he who called on others to obey "Al-Rida Men Al Muhammad". If he had been victorious, he would surely have not broken his promise."

This phrase "Al-Rida Men Al Muhammad" implies that he did not ask people to obey him. There are other quotations some of which are about Zayd's martyrdom in Kunasa and about Imam Sadiq's sorrow accordingly and some others are on his approval. An important point mentioned previously was Zayd's martyrdom or his defeat. Zayd's mother was said to have accused Imam of feeling envious upon hearing the news of Zayd's martyrdom from Imam some time before it.

implies that Zayd had not been determined first to transfer the (لوفي به) Most likely the term power to the Imams, on the other hand, to trust Zayd very much, Imam Sadiq (a) was of the opinion that he would surely let Imam Rida come to power if only he could be victorious.

Some of Imam Baqir's hadiths regarding Zayd's virtues in available sources have been compiled by Abu l-Djarud Mundhir, one of the leaders of the Zaydids. Accordingly, they could not be trusted completely. For example, he had quoted Imam Baqir as saying أما زيد فلساني الذي

انطلق به "But Zayd is as my tongue by which I speak."

'Amr Ibn Khalid who was also one of the leaders of the Zaydids said that Imam Baqir (a) by pointing to Zayd had said "هذا سيد اهل بيتي والطالب بأوتارهم" He is the master of Ahl al-Bayt and someone who will take their revenge."

Since the narrators of such quotations were people from the Zaydids, obviously, they might not be relied.

He also had quoted "وكان من كبار الزيدية", Kashshi also had quoted Abu Ya'qub Muqri as saying "وكان من كبار الزيدية", 'Amr Ibn Khalid as saying "وكان من كبار الزيدية" Thereafter, Imam Baqir's utterance previously mentioned was once again reiterated.

What these narrations are to depict is that Zayd was the most important figure of Ahl al-Bayt.

For instance, Imam Baqir as said regarded Zayd's superiority to others among Ahl al-Bayt. Himyari, one of the Zaydids scholars also in his book had quoted Imam as saying, "There is no one among us comparable to Zayd." And "فانصروه" He is the master of the Hashimites, you are to obey him once he calls on you and "help him when he asks for help."

In spite of the fact that these statements are not inconsistent with Imam Sadiq's view about Zayd, since Imam did not consider him as an opportunist but a purified man just the same as his honorable forefathers, so he was sorrowful about his martyrdom, they could barely be valid. Ibn A'tham said that upon hearing the news of his martyrdom, Imam had recited this verse of "من المومنين رجال صدقوا ما عاهدوا الله عليه" Qur'an, "Among the faithful, there are men who abide by their pledge to God" and equated him with individuals such as 'Ali (a) and Imam Husayn (a) "ويل لقاتلهم من جبّار الارض والسماء" Woe unto their murderers" and ended his speech by saying "from revenge of Almighty God."

Abu I-Djarud also in the Sunnites books had said that he was a confederate of Qur'an. In the scholastic books, he was said to be not reliable. Fudayl al-Rassan had a narration on Zayd's virtues. He was also one of the followers of Abu I-Djarud and Ibn Nadim considered him among the Jarudites.

There also is another narration in the Sunnites references indicating that some of the Disavowers had asked Imam Sadiq (a) about paying allegiance to Zayd. Imam said "افضلنا وسيدنا وخيرنا" Disavowers had asked Imam Sadiq (a) about paying allegiance to Zayd. Imam said

It was also said that the Disavowers did not let others know what Imam had said. What was said in the narration shows clearly that it was not more than a fabricated one said only to beat the Shi'ite Muslims. It is a question whether the narrator was informed about it while the Disavowers had concealed it.

Similar to this, 'Amr Ibn Qasim had said, "I went to Dja'far Ibn Muhammad and saw a group of the Disavowers."

Then I said, "They hate your uncle."

Imam said, "My uncle, Zayd?"

I said, "yes."

What was said ...والله اقرؤنا لكتاب الله وأفقهنا في دين الله... He said, "Their action is disliking Allah above was much the same as the narration being mentioned previously. Knowing that Zayd was a pious man seeking Allah's satisfaction, Imam Sadiq by no means abhorred him. Mas'udi, on the other hand, said that Imam Baqir (a) had asked his brother, Zayd, not to trust the Kufiyans since they were well known for being treacherous, so how it is possible that Imam had asked the Shi'ite Muslims to pay allegiance to him. Imam also added out there, "Your grandfather, 'Ali (a), your uncle, Hasan Ibn 'Ali, and your father, Husayn, have been martyred and the Kufiyans hurled abusive words at Ahl al-Bayt."

Then Imam informed him about what he knew regarding the Marwanids as well as the news of the 'Abbasids ruling. But Zayd still insisted on what he wanted to do, Imam said to him إني أخاف عليك يا أخ أن تكون غدا المصلوب بكناسة الكوفة، وودعه ابو جعفر I am afraid of finding you hung in Kunasa of Kufa, so Imam said farewell to him."

As it was mentioned in the aforesaid statement, Imam did not order him not to go there but advised him. Even if we do not doubt about its validity, we can understand that Imam was not optimistic about it. In quotations about Imam Baqir's view regarding Zayd, something which should be taken into account is that Zayd had wanted to rise up before. The number of these narrations on the other hand, may reveal that the narrator had wrongly written the name of Imam Sadiq instead of Baqir or Dja'far instead of Abu Dja'far.

It was also said, just the same as what Mas'udi had said, "Upon showing the letters that the Kufiyans had sent to Zayd asking him to rise up, Imam said, "Lest they might humiliate you, so do not hasten."

Zayd who got angry said, "Imam is not someone who stays at home, but he is someone who defends his territory and"

These narrations that accuse Zayd of bringing people around himself are not compatible with In case he wins, he keeps his" لو ظفر لوفي به, what was repeatedly said by Imam Sadiq about word" and all other approvals, an example of which is quotation from Husayn Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab, who lived in time of Shiykh Tusi, in "Uyun al-Mu'djizat" which Afandi stated in his book too.

Imam Baqir by referring to Zayd said ترون أخي هذا والله يدعي ما ليس له ويدعو الناس الي نفسه

You will see my brother claiming“ فيجتمع عليه خلق فيؤخذ ويقتل ويُصَلب في كناسة الكوفة something which does not belong to him. He will call on people to gather around him. Some will do so, but after a while, he would be killed and hung in Kanasa of Kufa.”

As a conclusion, what should be noted is that Imams had praised Zayd while they had also informed him about the consequences of his action. So it can be understood that in this regard he was not after them or at least he had not asked them for a permission to rise up. Accordingly, Imams had praised him because he was a prominent figure who wanted to overthrow the Umayyads and called on others to obey Abd al-Rahman Ibn' محمد من آل محمد, Sayyaba was quoted as saying, “Dja'far Ibn Muhammad gave me 1000 Dinars to give to the families of those being killed in his uprising. Each of them was given 4 Dinars. (it was also said that the family of 'Abd Allah Ibn Zubayr Rasan was given 4 Dinars).

Regarding Zayd, Imam Rida was quoted as saying, فإنه كان من علماء آل محمد وغضب لله عز وجل فجاهد أعداءه حتى قتل في سبيله He was one of the scholars of Ahi al-Bayt. Getting angry for“ Allah's sake, he was martyred in his fight against His enemies.”

Somewhere else, Imam Sadiq was said to be angry upon hearing that his companions backbited Zayd. He also had considered those reproaching him as being equal to those having hand in his martyrdom.

The conversation between Zayd and the companions of both Imam Baqir and Sadiq (a) shows another dimension of the Twelve-Imam Shi'ites view regarding him. In this regard, there are many narrations pursuit of which are documented. Prior to mentioning them, it should be noted that some of the companions of Imam Sadiq in Kufa when Zayd rose up gave up supporting him once they talked to him about his uprising. This action unfolds the stance of the Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims, if it could not show that of Imams.

An interesting point is that the only one participating in Zayd's uprising from among the companions of Imam Baqir was Sulayman Ibn Khalid. Nadjashi had said about him فقيهاً وجهاً روي عن أبي عبد الله وأبي جعفر عليهما السلام، خرج مع زيد ولم يخرج معه في اصحاب ابي جعفر Being a Qur'an reader,“ عليه السلام غيره، فقطعت يده وكان الذي قطعها يوسف بن عمر بنفسه” jurisprudent and an eminent figure among Imam Baqir and Sadiq's companions, he narrated what they had been saying. He joined Zayd while there was no one from Imam Baqir's companions to do so but him. His hands were cut by Yusuf Ibn 'Umar.”

Shiykh Tusi also had stressed that no one from the companions of Imam Baqir (a) had participated in Zayd's uprising but him. By referring to Imam Baqir's companions, he had meant those prominent figures, not all of them. The emphasis of Nadjashi and Tusi, the most important scholars of the Shi'ite Muslims, is a strong evidence indicating that Imam Baqir's

companions were not present in Zayd's uprising. They did not do this since they had no reason for doing so. Otherwise, it should be said that either they were afraid of doing so or they did it independently without consulting Imam. Anyhow, none of these reasons are acceptable. Another narration regarding absence of Imam Baqir's companions in Zayd's uprising is worth mentioning. At that time, Husayn Ibn Ziyad entered Medina and went to Imam Sadiq (a) to speak about his beliefs. Imam said that his beliefs were the true ones. He spoke about his anxiety. Imam asked him the reason. He replied "إن ظفر بني امية، فنحن عندهم بتلك المنزلة، قال: فقال لي: ليس عليك بأس من أولي ومن أولي "Our condition would be worst of all no matter whether Zayd overcomes the Umayyads or otherwise. Imam said, "Do not worry, neither of them can harm you." This conversation reveals the fact that the Twelve-Imam Shi'ite Muslims, on one hand, were appeasing the Zaydids and, on the other hand, the Umayyads.

There had been considerable discussion between Zayd and some of the companions of Imam Sadiq narrated by Kashshi. Some of the main points are to be discussed. A matter of great importance was that whether there was Imam whose obedience had been necessary or not and if so who was him?

Zurara Ibn A'yun is substantially quoted as saying, "Zayd, being before Imam Sadiq (a), said to me, ما تقول يا فتى في رجل من آل محمد استنصرك "What do you say to someone from Ahl al-Bayt" who asks your help."

Zurara said "إن كان مفروض الطاعة نصرته وإن كان غير مفروض الطاعة فلي أن لا أفعل "If he were supposed to be obeyed, I would help him. If not, I can avoid helping him."

"When Zayd went out, Imam was satisfied with my answer since he was not able to say anything else", Zurara said.

The very last part of this narration indicates that Imam disliked Zayd's uprising. The answer of Zurara also shows his respect toward Zayd not anything else.

The late Kulayni had also quoted a discussion between Mu'min al-Taq and Zayd from some of the companions of Imam, Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn 'Isa, 'Ali Ibn Hakam, Aban Ibn Taghlib and Mu'min al-Taq himself.

He said, "Hiding himself from the public, Zayd asked me whether I could see him. When I went to see him, he said, "O Abu Dja'far it seems that your way is different from ours. Don't you like to join us?"

"If your brother or your father were instead of you, I would do so", I replied.

Zayd said, "I want to rise up and fight with these people. I also want you to join me".

"May I be sacrificed to you! I can not do this," I said.

“Are you withholding your life from me”, Zayd said.

I said, “I will die only once. If there is another proof for Allah on earth other than you, whosoever joins you instead of him, shall be subjugated and if there is no proof for him, it will make no difference to him whether he joins you or not.”

Zayd said, “O, Abu Dja’far, When my father and I were eating food with each other, my father made it cool for me to eat. While I was treated so kindly, you tell me now that the hellfire will not have mercy on me. How is it possible for my father to tell you about (the proof) while I am not aware of it at all?”

I said to him, “He did not tell you anything about it since he was afraid that you might not approve of it and meet the hell fire. But your father told me that if I accepted him, I would behave him well. May I be sacrificed to you, are you superior to the prophets?”

“The prophets”, he said.

,I said, “Jacob told Josef

قَالَ يَا بُنَيَّ لَا تَقْصُصْ رُؤْيَاكَ عَلَى إِخْوَتِكَ فَيَكِيدُوا لَكَ كَيْدًا إِنَّ الشَّيْطَانَ لِلْإِنْسَانِ عَدُوٌّ مُبِينٌ.

Alas! O son, he said, reveal not your dream to brothers for they fall in envy of you.”

Your father also hid the truth from you since he was afraid of you”.

Zayd said, “Your master, he referred to Imam Sadiq (a), had told me that I would be killed in Medina and hung in Kunasa. He has a book in which there is the news of my martyrdom”.

Mu’min al-Taq said, “Thereafter, I went to Medina and informed Imam about what had happened between us, praising me for what I had done, Imam said that I had closed all ways of reasoning to him.

This narration is evidentially true and quite logical. These points mentioned by Mu’min al-Taq were also taken into account by the Twelve-Imam Shi’ite Muslims. It is not intended, based on this narration, to conclude that Zayd claimed Imam rather it is stated to show that Zayd did not believe that Imam Sadiq (a) was to be obeyed obligatorily. The very same story was also said somewhere else. Based on this, Mu’min al-Taq had reiterated his conversation with Zayd to Imam Sadiq (a).

Quoting Zayd, Sawra Ibn Kulayb of Sadiqayn said, “How did you figure out that your master of the thing you say (i.e. his obedience is obligatory from God).

Sawra said, “I told him, you asked a learned person.”

He said, “Tell me.”

And I said, “We came to Muhammad Ibn ‘Ali, your brother, and questioned him and he gave us

The prophet and God in His Book” قال رسول الله وقال الله عز وجل في كتابه ,the answer through said”

When he passed away, we came to you of the Muhammad’s progeny. Some of our questioned were answered while some others remained unanswered, until we came to Dja’far, your brother’s offspring, and he told us the same thing as your father

Zayd smiled and said, “Its reason is availability of ‘Ali’s books to him.”

The same discussion happened between Abu Bakr Hadrami, ‘Alqama of Imam Baqir’s companions and Zayd.

Imam among us isn’t” ليس الامام منا من ارخى ستره انما من شهر سيفه ,They heard Zayd as saying the one who covers himself, but he is the one who pulls his sword.”

Abu Bakr Hadrami, a not-tempted person, said to Zayd, “O father of Husayn! Tell me weather ‘Ali Ibn Abi Talib was Imam in the time of his isolation or his pulling sword?”

Being reticent, Zayd didn’t give any answers.

Abu Bakr went on, “In the case of him to be Imam; therefore, for everyone after him it’s What” فانت ماجاء بك ما هيئنا ,permissible to be Imam not having any sword in his hand. If not caused thee to come here.”

Fadl Ibn Shadhan of Imam’s companions and Shi’ites scholars exists in the way of the afore said quotation. This narration has additionally been narrated in two different ways. As quoted in other narrations, Zayd confirmed that just three Imams exist and the forth is Qa’im , the one who pulls sword. This content, in essence, confirmed the idea about Imamate narrated by Zayd. Apparently there shouldn’t be any rooms for doubt three Imams whose obedience is obligatory from God and the forth on condition of being Qa’im were considered by Zayd and this Qa’im can only be of Fatima’s dynasty.

Zayd, in Furat Kufi’s interpretation, was asked about an Imam who necessarily should be obeyed, and he said, “The Messenger was the prophetic Messenger and nobody can challenge him ... and after him ‘Ali in legal and illegal considered the Muslim’s Imam ... and everyone rejecting him is unbeliever ... and after him Hasan and Husayn are Muslim’s Imams ... and then we, the Messenger’s descendants, are of Hasan and Husayn. None of us possessed their dignity to the Messenger and claimed the Prophet’s remarks concerning Hasanayn for ourselves but our cordiality, friendship and help, as the Prophet’s descendants, is every Muslim’s duty ... But among us, the offspring of Hasan and Husayn, no one neither my father nor my brother claimed to be Imam whose obedience is mandatory..., O father of Hashim! Among us, Imam whose obedience is the one revolting with sword invites to Qur’an and practice of the prophet ... we, among ourselves, don’t know any Imam who necessarily should

be obeyed, busy on his own, pinning hopes for his being truthful, his being locked up and waiting for the tyrants' rules to be executed."

The mentioned interpretations whose content existed in the aforesaid narrations are very clear. Quoting Zayd in other narrations of the same book, it's said that the Immaculates among us are five, the Messenger, 'Ali, Hasan, Husayn and Fatima and the rest like ordinary people do sins. Then Zayd refers to the high status of the household and their role in keeping Qur'an and tradition. Zayd's interpretation concerning Imamate is available in Kafi Kulayni's book. Quoting

Zayd, Himyari in al-Hur al-'Ayn mentioned such a remark.

On the contrary to all these narrations, quoting Zayd, Sulayman Ibn Khalid - Imam Baqir's only Dja'far is our" جعفر امامنا في الحلال والحرام, companion who took part in Zayd's uprising - said Imam in legal and illegal."

Zayd, in this remark, confesses to Imam Baqir's scientific Imamate. From this, it isn't inferred that Zayd considered his brother as Imam whose obedience is obligatory. Zayd, in the content of another quotation, confined that Imam 'Ali's books are available to him. Also Zayd in the Whosoever wants to Djihad," من اراد الجهاد فالي ومن اراد العلم فجعفر بن محمد, other narration said he shall come to me and one who is after knowledge, he shall meet Dja'far Ibn Muhammad."

This indicates scientific Imamate and doesn't basically accept Imam Sadiq's political Imamate. The transfer of these narrations, especially what happened between Zurara and Zayd or Mu'min al-Taq and Zayd on precautionary dissimulation isn't right and lacks evidence.

However these narrations indicate Zayd's lack of belief in Imam who should be necessarily obeyed, some quotations in Kifayat al-Athar conformed Zayd's belief in Twelve Imam's Imamate and through a brief study, it was cleared up that the majority of these narrations were baseless and the authorities mentioned in their predication were mostly unknown. Narration of these hadith, four or five, by Wasiti and Fudayl al-Rassan who were of Abu I-Djarud's companions of Zaydids's directors is the interesting point. In this case, how is it possible for two of Zaydids's directors to narrate hadiths in which their Imam i.e. Zayd believed in Twelve Imams? Abu I-Djarud is of founders of Zaydids ideology, the one who doesn't basically accept any Imam whose obedience is obligatory after Imam Husayn (a).

With all these, it should be cleared up that Imams praised Zayd's personality for having good attributes and pure intentions, in these cases, this matter shouldn't be continued anymore. But different aspects of the issue should be considered.

The owner of Riad al-'Ulama inferring the point that his uprising happened without Imam Baqir's permission according to the narrations that there existed no banned prohibition of the uprising and Zayd was free to choose either self-sacrifice or worldly life. It is obvious that he

not only couldn't completely reject the slanderous narrations but also made it clear that his uprising was done without permission.

The late Madjlisi quoting interfering narrations said, "It's better both to have a favorable opinion about Zayd and for him not to be reproached and not to object Imam's descendants like him unless the rule based on the aversion to people like Dja'far Ibn Kadhdhab shall be proved. It's clear that such an interpretation was said through precaution not reasoning. Although it should be accepted that of old, Shi'ites scholars were optimistic about Zayd, the slanderous narrations about him are all written. We formerly observed that Shiykh Saduq made Shi'ite Muslims' opinion clear concerning favorable opinion about Zayd, as Ibn Kharraz Qumi, of forth A.H. concerning scholars, expressing the same opinion wrote that Zayd rebelled to enjoin the good and forbid the evil not to oppose Dja'far Ibn Muhammad, his brother's son. Of course the case was raised in a way that duality was basically denied and the emergence of this problem was merely resulted from Imam Sadiq's lack of uprising. Not relying on the discrepancy, we can insist on the lack of allegiance. Ya'qubi, as a Shi'ites historian just had a brief reference to Zayd's uprising. Such a stand was considered due to that of the Shi'ite Muslims in being heedless of Zayd's uprising.

Based on what mentioned in "Irshad" and "I'lam al-Wara", the view points of Shiykh Mufid and Satisfaction of "الرضا من آل محمد", Tabarsi is that Zayd was very honorable and called to Prophet's family."

People erroneously thought that he called people to himself while he was aware of his brother's merit, Imam Baqir as well as his will for Imam Sadiq. According to what was said, accepting such an opinion to this extent is difficult. Having a favorable opinion about Zayd, al-'Amri, the Shi'ites genealogist of the 5th century, considers the Zaydids as liars in their laying claim to Zayd. This action, at the same time, includes both defense of Zayd and denial of Zaydids. The late Muhaddith Nuri confirming Zayd rejected the slanderous narrations about him. As it has been stated, among the recent thinkers exist some like Husayn Kariman and Ayat Allah Munta'iri who tenaciously support Zayd.

This issue was briefly brought to an end; however, other quotations whose significance is lesser than aforesaid ones exist, they demand a detailed and investigative study to get a more realistic viewpoint and its fulfillment is impossible in this brief general history

Yahya Ibn Zayd's Uprising

Yahya, son of Zayd was among those who participated in his father's uprising. He after father's martyrdom and his burial accompanied by father's Shi'ite Muslims, went to Niynawa and

Mada'in. He stayed there with a farmer for some time and then went to Riy and Khurasan. Thinking Yahya was in Kufa, Yusuf Ibn 'Umar on top of pulpit reproached people that Yahya hid himself in the women's bridal chamber. He left Riy for Qumis and stayed there with Ziyad Ibn Abi-Ziyad Qushayri for fairly a long time, then he went to Niyshabur. It was there where he was asked to stay but he rejected and said, "'Ali's flag will not be raised over this city.'" Maybe in that time, the situation in Niyshabur wasn't ready for a Shi'ites uprising.

Yahya left Niyshabur for Sarakhs. He stayed there with a person named Yazid Ibn 'Umar Tamimi for six months. "Kharidjites" went to him in Sarakhs and wanted to swear allegiance to him on the base of the war against the Umayyads. Yahya was pleased with their request but *كيف تقاتل بقوم يتبرؤون من علي واهل بيته*, Yazid Ibn 'Umar prohibited him from doing that and said "How did he want to help those expressed disgust for 'Ali and his household.'"

Afterwards, rejecting their request, Yahya through good remarks kept them at the distance. Staying in Sarakhs for six months, Yahya left there for Balkh and lived there with a person called Harish. He probably stayed there longer than others up to the end of Hisham time and about the time of his death.

Being in pursuance of Yahya, Yusuf Ibn 'Umar heard of his going to Khurasan so he asked Nasr Ibn Sayyar to find him, with Yahya's entrance to Balkh or fairly a long time after that Khurasan government found out about his settlement there and based on Ibn A'tham's letter gathered all the people in A'am mosque and investigated their houses one by one. Everyone famous for his affection of the Household was brought and whipped to betray Yahya's place.

These investigations resulted in Harish's detention. Although he under torture didn't betray Yahya's place, his son did so. 'Aqil Ibn Ma'qal, the ruler of Balkh, sent someone to bring Yahya who was considered, according to Ibn A'tham's letter, to be in Yunus Ibn Salim's house. Then he was chained and sent to Nasr Ibn Sayyar who inspired him. During this time, Khurasan heard about Hisham's death and Walid Ibn Yazid in response to Nasr's letter in which he asked about Yahya wrote to set him free and let him go wherever he wished.

When Yahya was set free, a group of people of Khurasan went to the blacksmith who made Yahya get rid of the chains and wanted to buy the chains. Some raised the price to twenty thousands dhms. The blacksmith being afraid of news disclosure said to them to put some money together. Then he cut the chain into piece and gave everyone a piece for making rings or for Tabarruk that is a gift considered as bringing good luck.

Yahya went to Sarakhs, writing a letter to its ruler, Nasr wanted him to send Yahya to Tus. He also wrote to the ruler of Tus to send Yahya to Abarshahr and leave him to 'Amr Ibn Zurara and

Yahya was brought to Biyhaq. In there, Yahya asserted that he was afraid of going to Iraq for Yusuf Ibn 'Umar was still in power and will probably kill him. It was there where Yahya and his companions clashed with 'Amr Ibn Zurara. Although it's said that the number of Yahya's companions touched one hundred, that of 'Amr reached ten thousands or even more, the winner was Yahya

الم تر اهل نيشابور لما لقوا الابطال لم يغنوا قليلا
لقوا مئة وهم عشرون ألفاً فما صبروا ولا منعوا قليلا

Didn't you see the people of Niyshabur who confronted the champions when they were a few" but when their number and that of Niyshabur was a hundred and twenty thousands respectively, they lacked resistance and were defeated."

Some more details concerning the time before and about the battle were written in some narrations. Leaving there, Yahya went to Djuzdjan and there, he was joined by a group of regional people as well as inhabitants of Taliqan and Fariyab. Number of these people, according to the narrations, differed from one hundred and twenty, one hundred and fifty or five hundred. And there arrived Nasr Ibn Sayyar's army led by Muslim Ibn Ahwaz. Yahya after three days of battle was hit on the forehead with an arrow. He martyred and so did all his companions. This probably happened at the beginning of the year 126 A.H. in a place called "Arghuna or Arghuni".

Although being beheaded and buried, he was exhumed and hung up the vault of one of the Djuzdjan's corridors due to Nasr Ibn Sayyar's order. Being hung to the Abu Muslim's time, his corpse was brought down, prayed on and buried. Yahya's uprising caused Walid Ibn Yazid to write to the ruler of Iraq. He wanted him to bring Zayd's corpse down, set it on fire and expose his ashes to the wind.

Yahya's uprising, at any rate, made Khurasan more and more ready for a public uprising against the Umayyads. Every child born in that year, according to what Mas'udi said was named Yahya or Zayd.

As some mentioned, Yahya was the first for whom people clad in black and eulogized. After the victory, anyone of the Yahya's combatants whose names were mentioned in the registry book was found and killed by Abu Muslim. The emotion flared up by martyrdom of Zayd and his son, Yahya, along with the public emotions to the benefit of the Household were considered the main reasons for 'Abd Allah's victory who at the price of the Household benefited from these emotions

'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya Ibn 'Abd Allah Ibn Dja'far's movement from 127 to 131 can be considered as a Shi'ites movement due to the presence of some Hashimites and the 'Alawites. No one but his father named Mu'awiya at whose insistence, this infant was named Mu'awiya as well. Searching for poetry and literature, 'Abd Allah, Mu'awiya's offspring, before his military and political movement had companionship with people whose concern was poetry and literature as well. In the last years of the Umayyads rule, when there existed a battle between Marwan Ibn Muhammad who claimed caliphate and Ibrahim Ibn Walid Ibn Yazid, the Umayyads were strongly wanted especially the disputes created by tribal battles between northern and southern Arabs in Kufa made 'Abd Allah Ibn 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz some difficulties. In a narration, Tabari mentioned, observing the incapability of Iraq's ruler, Shi'ite Muslims called 'Abd Allah to swear allegiance whose responsibility was taken by a person called Hilal Ibn Abi I-Ward. 'Abd Allah Ibn 'Umar's presence in Hira gave 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya the opportunity to occupy Kufa and even made of Damascus in there swear allegiance to him. Some from Mada'in and Fam al-Nil swore allegiance to him. Having an inventive hostility with the Umayyads and considering their successors of the Hashimites, people of Kufa paid allegiance to him at once. Rabi'a tribe having a Shi'ites precedence backed 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya up. In the battle between 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya and 'Abd Allah Ibn 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, companions of 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya didn't seriously resist and left him alone with the head of Rabi'a tribe, 'Umar Ibn Ghadban. After that Rabi'a sought quarter for himself, 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya as well as his companions and sent him to Medina from Kufa. He, in Medina, reinforced and went to Djibal while accompanied by people of Kufa and its representative and for fairly a long time, ruled over around Isfahan, Qumis, Hulwan, Istakhr and Riy. The battle against him was postponed due to the Umayyads' difficulties in their combats against Kharidjites and other rebels. Having started his rebel in 127, now he in 128 weakly ruled over Isfahan and Istakhr. His brothers were sent to Fars, Djibal as well as Abu Dja'far Mansur ruled over Ahwaz (Idhadj) for some time then facing some difficulties, he could do nothing. After some time, at least in 129, he combated in Istakhr 'Amir Ibn 'Abbara who was dispatched to him by the Umayyads in Iraq. Being defeated in the aforesaid battle, 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya went to Harat and there he was arrested by Abu Muslim's agent and sent to him. Abu Muslim of 'Abbasids' agents felt at risk on his side, so imprisoned him and ordered to treat hard on him. Baladhuri stated that while in prison, 'Abd Allah called people of Khurasan fools for their obedience to Abu Muslim. Hearing of this news, Abu Muslim put more pressure on him. The 'Alawites and the Talibites would be suppressed by Abu Muslim, for he was of the

'Abbasids' agents. According to a fully explained letter, written by 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya, he was put in chains. Baladhuri through a narration stated that he, being in Abu Muslim's prison, passed away but in another quotation by Hisham Kalbi, it is mentioned that he was murdered by Abu Muslim.

An abstraction of all reports about him from different sources is prepared by Abu I-Faradj in just a few pages. Some contradictions exist among them.

Satisfaction of the "الرضا من آل محمد", According to one quotation, he called people to Household" but in another one he invited them to his own allegiance.

Also in news, it's mentioned that he dressed like "Sufis" and the majority of people of Kufa swore allegiance to him some others did not so and said, "No one is left for us and most of us were killed with the people of this house!"

He also mentioned in details that although 'Abd Allah sent his brothers named Hasan, Yazid, 'Ali and Salih to Istakhr, Shiraz, Kirman and Qum, he went to Khurasan due to being unable to resist against the Umayyads.

On his way, he was seen and asked, "Are you of the Messenger(s)'s progeny? Are you Ibrahim, the Imam?" But these questions were given a negative answer.

The questioner asked, "So I'm free from your help."

Abu I-Faradj also stated, "Being greedy for Abu Muslim's help, 'Abd Allah went to him and was imprisoned. There, 'Abd Allah wrote his famous treatise to him but Abu Muslim being afraid of corruptions of the people's opinion murdered him."

His murder is narrated by others as well. This happened in 131 A.H. Abu I-Faradj in "Maqatil al-Talibin" mentioned the brief of this news. For 'Abd Allah was killed by the 'Abbasids' agent, there existed some forged news against him. An example of it was raised by 'Amir Ibn @abbara who accused 'Abd Allah and his companions of assaulting against women. Here two points are of great significance his personality before the uprising and his stand after that.

The news about him is reported by Abu I-Faradj Isfahani Daraghani. In the portrait given by him, 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya was considered as a poet and a learned person with all the needed possibilities of that time. In addition, he was accompanied by some poets and some accused of dualism - although its purpose isn't clear but can't be mere irreligiosity - and Isfahani named three dualists. In other narrations, he was explicitly accused of dualism. Its correctness isn't exactly specified; however, on the whole it can't be judged. Undeniably in the tumult of Kufa, he was accepted by people of there as a meritorious person for the battle against the Umayyads. In the case of his accusation of dualism, how such a thing is conceivable? The writer of al-Mudjdi, the fifth A.H. century Shi'a genealogist praised him as

كان سيذا كرلما was a generous master and sad that his father made him as his successor for يعرف فيه من كرم الاخلاق He found in him nobility of characters and his call to the satisfaction of the Household is doubted.

At first, this motto basically indicates this faith that caliphate belongs to Muhammad's progeny especially who is "Al-Rida". Secondly, it, for fairly a long time, was utilized by the 'Abbasids' summoners to evade and gradually recognize its applicability in the 'Abbasids. Thirdly, it was regularly used by Zaydids. In fact, popularity belonged to one who called to the satisfaction of the Household not to himself. It isn't cleared up whether such an issue was posed in the time of 'Abd Allah's uprising or later on. In a narration by Tabari, what is worthy of attention is Zaydids's presence about 'Abd Allah's uprising.

Zaydids were attacked by وحمل اهل القلب من اهل الشام علي الزيديه, In one quotation, he stated the middle faction of enemy troops from Damascus.

Sometimes else referring to the clash between Zaydiyya and people of Damascus, he said, "Rabi'a sought quarter for himself, 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya and Zaydids."

This aspect of the issue has not been indicated in other sources. It demands reminding that to Zaydids, Imam should be from the 'Alawites; however, 'Abd Allah was a Talibites and naturally these beliefs were constantly formed later on. Perhaps Zaydids for defeating the Umayyads in that time helped him not for their belief in him. And every 'Alawites uprising, to historians, was probably considered as Zaydi in one way or another. In a narration, Tabari indicates that 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya was surrounded by Kharidjites. And this can be considered as a good device to defame others.

'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya has got a portrait in Firaq books. A party called Djinahiyya and led by 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya was considered of Shi'ites extremists. In the above-mentioned portrait, naturally there is no relation between 'Abd Allah's issue and that of Zaydids. Sa'd Ibn 'Abd Allah Ash'ari mentioned a party linked to him of the Kissanids who believed in Muhammad Ibn Hanafiyya's Imamate and considered his son, Abu Hashim, as his successor. In continuation, they believed that he left will for 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya. Shahrastani mentioned a party named Harithiyya who believed that 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya as Ishaq Ibn Zayd incarnated. We learned that Mada'in - where Ibn Ishaq was from - possessed a lot of Shi'ites extremists. It is likely to say that all these problems, after the murder of 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya, were probably raised by others while he didn't have anything to do with them. The same issue is true about Shi'ites Imams (a) whose spirits were claimed to incarnate in some people.

Anyway, this point is to be reminded that the Umayyads, the 'Abbasids and the majority of

historians couldn't be pleased by a person like 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya for having rebelled against them as well as being of 'Alawites' swords holders. Therefore, he is at all sides surrounded. Naturally, he doesn't have anything to do with what happened after him and of course, such judgment doesn't mean the confirmation of all his behaviors and companionship with various people.

Most of the Hashimites attended the 'Abd Allah's movement and Abu Dja'far Mansur is a typical of that. We know that in that time, 'Abbasids worked independently and why presence of Abu Dja'far alongside 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya is of great importance. Maybe the reason is that victory attainment wasn't seriously taken into account by the 'Abbasids. In that time, the concern of their efforts was to come to terms with 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya and 'Abd Allah Ibn .Hasan known as Nafs Zakiyya at times to get their share in the future

The Shi'ite Muslims and the 'Alawites' Last Position in the Umayyads's time

A great deal of evidence is available showing that to Iraq only 'Alawites were considered as Umayyads's successors and when 'Abbasids through the force of Abu Muslim Khurasani and Abu Salama Khallal ruled, in that time the imagination of 'Abbasids' coming to power was raised. The whole situational climate was naturally to the benefit of 'Alawites and their political status was thoroughly clear.

Satisfaction to the Household الرضا من آل محمد The ambiguous but meaningful interpretation of were applicable to 'Alawites. The imagination of those familiar with this term was the same but the disagreements among 'Alawites were problematic. This disagreement was mostly like that of Hasanids and Husaynids.

On one side, Husaynids whose outstanding figures were Imam Baqir and Imam Sadiq distinguished among Shi'ite Muslims and other religious scholars due to the scientific and ethical position in Iraq community. Husaynids, having a great deal of Shi'ite Muslims believed in their Imamate and considered them as persons whose obedience is necessary. On the other side, Hasanids among whom 'Abd Allah Ibn Hasan Ibn Hasan make effort to introduce his son, Muhammad, as the only 'Alawites candidate for the Umayyads's rule and succession had their own heritage of 'Alawites. It cannot exactly be cleared up whose influence was more than the other but 'Abd Allah Ibn Hasan possessing a better status among 'Alawites and Hashimites could to some extent strengthen his son's position; however, in Iraq a letter based on the acceptance of government was written to Imam Sadiq by Abu Salama, the 'Abbasids' great summoner and regardless of its being serious or not, it indicates Imam's political status. Imam Sadiq's Shi'ite Muslims and the kind of their beliefs were discussed in advance and now here is

a brief look at efforts made by Nafs Zakiyya his father for attainment of leadership. Baladhuri, through a narration, indicated that one day, Hasan Muthanna, son of Imam Mudjtaba, who were superior to his brothers went to 'Abd al-Malik who asked him about the reason for a premature aging.

Yahya Ibn Hakam being present there said, "Iraqis wished who every year invite him for caliphate has done such a thing to him".

Such a remark indicates that 'Alawites were gladly received by Iraqis; however, it lacked a clear direction. Even 'Abd Allah Ibn Dja'far's descendants had the same background. Some issues concerning 'Abd Allah Ibn Mu'awiya Ibn 'Abd Allah Ibn Dja'far were set forth in advance. Even before that, when Hadjdjadj decided to marry 'Abd Allah Ibn Dja'far's daughter, 'Abd Allah Ibn Marwan who was warned due the fact that this marriage along with the situation in Iraq to the benefit of this family may lead to the Umayyads' overthrow interfered in it and Hadjdjadj divorced her.

In any case, 'Abd Allah doing a great deal of measures for his son, Muhammad known as Nafs Zakiyya and calling him "Mahdi", made him an important status among the Umayyads and others. As indicated in some historical news, some meetings were held in this regard and the Hashimites were called to swear some the 'Abbasids among them Mansur and Saffah swore allegiance to him.

Through a narration by Abu l-Faradj, it is obvious that Hashimites going together in Abwa' made up their minds to select and pay allegiance to someone among themselves. 'Abd Allah stating that his son, Muhammad, is Mahdi wanted them to swear allegiance to him. Mansur being present there confirmed his allegiance to him. 'Abd Allah Ibn Hasan stated not to let Dja'far Ibn Muhammad (s) know since he will spoil everything.

Hearing of this, Imam denied Mahdawism of Muhammad Ibn 'Abd Allah and said, "I'm willing to give him a hand if his uprising is to enjoin good and forbid evil", but 'Abd Allah Ibn Hasan accused him of jealousy.

According to Baladhuri, after allegiance, Nafs Zakiyya went to Badiya and stayed there for some time and attended in public at times up to the time of allegiance to Abu l-'Abbas Saffah. When Nafs Zakiyya was in Ghatfan region alongside Al Artat Ibn Shabiha, he was sent to Badiya and called Mahdi. When the 'Abbasids came to power, he hid himself until his revolution in 145 in Medina and he was killed. Mansur having paid allegiance to him was terribly afraid of him and just after his murder and his brother, Ibrahim Ibn 'Abd Allah found comfort.

What is worthy of attention here is that the Abassids were independently doing some activities and Ibrahim, the Imam, sent some representatives to different regions. They took advantage of

. 'Ali's and his descendants' names to draw people's attention and ruled one after the other

Note

If u wan to stydy directly from the book of Jafarian, please click here:

<http://alhassanain.org/english/?com=book&id=399>