



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

---

The Azāriqa in Islamic Heresiography

Author(s): Keith Lewinstein

Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 54, No. 2 (1991), pp. 251-268

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of [School of Oriental and African Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/619134>

Accessed: 24/09/2010 16:42

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

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



*School of Oriental and African Studies and Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.*

<http://www.jstor.org>

# THE AZĀRIQA IN ISLAMIC HERESIOGRAPHY<sup>1</sup>

By KEITH LEWINSTEIN

## I. Introduction

Since the publication in the West last century of a major Sunnī work on the Islamic sects,<sup>2</sup> those interested in the early *firaq* have found themselves dependent on the heresiographical tradition. Islamicists have had little choice in the matter; most writing and thinking produced in circles later deemed heterodox has not been preserved, and to a large extent is available only through the mediation of the heresiographers. While material of other sorts has not gone unstudied,<sup>3</sup> it has for the most part been the heresiographers who have shaped the way we look at early Islamic sectarianism.

This marriage of modern scholarship and medieval heresiography is, however, a distinctly uncomfortable one. As indispensable as the *firaq* material may be, questions about its reliability persist. The difficulties which characterize this literature are well known, and hardly need to be rehearsed here: it is late, highly schematic, and frequently hostile to the doctrines and groups which it describes.<sup>4</sup> To these might be added one other problem noted less frequently: most of the books in general academic circulation have passed through Ash'arite and/or Mu'tazilite hands.<sup>5</sup> If, as we shall see, the tradition is not entirely synoptic, there are at least powerful forces at work which militate against a diversity of perspectives.

Given these problems, a systematic effort at source criticism is clearly in order. The criticism produced up to now has been done more in an *ad hoc* than in a deliberate way; it normally consists of the informal observations of those whose primary interests run to the positive historical data to be culled from the material. Thus, serious textual criticism has generally taken a back seat to historical reconstruction, despite the source-related problems which nearly everyone acknowledges.<sup>6</sup> Here, the emphasis will fall strictly on the texts, and on the way in which the material they preserve has been reshaped through the process of transmission.

With the texts themselves at centre stage, scholars might have two different critical strategies to choose from. On the one hand there is the possibility of outflanking the standard Ash'arite–Mu'tazilite tradition by exploiting material from outside of it.<sup>7</sup> Alternatively, one might aim to take apart the standard

<sup>1</sup> I should like to thank Michael Cook, Louise Marlow and Chase Robinson for their useful comments on an earlier draft of this paper; and Michael Chamberlain for his thoughtful criticism of the final.

<sup>2</sup> Shahrastānī, *Kitāb al-Milal wa-l-Nihāl*, ed. Cureton (London, 1846) (hereafter *MN[SH]*).

<sup>3</sup> Most recently, the early theological epistles examined by van Ess in a number of publications and Cook in *Early Muslim dogma* (Cambridge, 1981).

<sup>4</sup> Watt puts these problems clearly, and suggests some sensible rules of thumb, in *The formative period of Islamic thought* (Edinburgh, 1973), 1–6.

<sup>5</sup> Makdisi, 'Ash'arī and the Ash'arites in Islamic religious history' (Part 1), *SI*, 17, 1962, 41; and cf. Bernand, 'Le Kitāb al-Radd 'Alā 'l-Bida' d'Abū Muḥī Makhūl al-Nasafī', *Annales islamologiques*, 16, 1980, 45.

<sup>6</sup> While historical and textual concerns are sometimes combined successfully (e.g. Wadād al-Qādī's *al-Kaisāniyya fī 'l-Ta'rikh wa-'l-Adab* [Beirut, 1974]), it often happens that the critical end of things is given only perfunctory attention. The best example of what can be accomplished by focusing entirely on textual questions is Madelung, 'Bemerkungen zur imāmīschen Firaq-Literatur', *Der Islam*, 42, 1967, 37–52 [= *Religious Schools and Sects in Medieval Islam*, London, 1985, XV].

<sup>7</sup> I have explored some of the possibilities here in connexion with eastern Ḥanafite heresiography in my unpublished thesis, *Studies in Islamic heresiography: the Khawārij in two Firaq traditions* (Princeton, 1989). There and here I use the term 'standard' to designate the Ash'arite and Mu'tazilite works commonly exploited by scholars.

sources and lay bare (or as bare as possible) the raw material from which the tradition was originally constructed. This is the approach taken here. By using a single sect as a test case, I shall attempt to isolate and chart the patterns of transmission within the standard heresiographical tradition. I hope to demonstrate that the tradition as we have it is not an organic whole which can be reconstituted simply by citing several of the extant works as evidence for any particular point. It is instead a collection of fragments removed from their original literary contexts and transmitted along several different lines. If we wish to make good sense and efficient use of the material, we had best try to recover the earlier literary connexions between these fragments.

For this case study I have chosen the infamous Khārijite sect of the Azāriqa. The choice was not a difficult one. The Azāriqa are a group of undeniable importance which engaged the attention not only of the heresiographers but of the Muslim historians as well. The main outline of the sect's history is thus well known. During the confusion of the second *fitna*, the Baṣra-based Khārijite movement broke up into a number of competing groups. While some among the Khāwarij preferred to adopt a stance of political quietism and moderation, remaining physically (if not morally) within the community of ordinary Muslims, others took to separatism and extremism. In the moderate camp we can place the proto-Ibādīs and the proto-Ṣufriyya; the extremists followed either Najda b. 'Āmir or Nāfi' b. al-Azraq, the founder of the Azāriqa.<sup>8</sup> The Azāriqa withdrew from ordinary society and continued to conduct guerrilla warfare against Zubairid and Umayyad armies, as well as against the civilian populations of Iraq and western Iran, until finally meeting a violent end in Ṭabaristān in 79 A.H.<sup>9</sup> Because the group represents an archetypal case of sectarian extremism, no heresiographer could afford to ignore them. As a case study the Azāriqa can serve as a useful entrée into the patterns of source-dependency within the *firaq* literature.

## II. Formation on the main tradition

Much of the discussion here will centre on a critical reading of the *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* of Abū 'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī (d. 324).<sup>10</sup> This reliance on Ash'arī is to a certain extent unavoidable: he is not only a leading source for many later heresiographers, but also provides what is perhaps the best window into earlier (and no longer extant) texts. Ash'arī's usefulness is due at least in part to the modesty of his literary intentions. Unlike many later writers, Ash'arī has no interest in leaving behind a grand testament to his own skill as a heresiographer. He is not nearly as self-conscious an organizer of the material as Baghdādī or Shahrastānī.<sup>11</sup> Instead, his abiding concern is to collect between two covers as much of the earlier material as possible. Ash'arī makes little attempt to harmonize his presentation or to disguise its rough edges. Because the text is so rough-hewn in places, the separate narrative pieces behind Ash'arī can often be detected, and one can glimpse the hands of earlier heresiographers at work.

The problem lies in putting names to those hands. While Ash'arī does refer explicitly to earlier (now lost) works, like most heresiographers he does so only exceptionally. No sources are quoted by name in the Azāriqa account, although three earlier writers are mentioned elsewhere in Ash'arī's Khārijite chapter: the

<sup>8</sup> On the *tafarruq* of the Khawārij see Wilkinson, 'The early development of the Ibādī movement in Baṣra', *Studies in the first century of Islamic society* (Southern Illinois University, 1982), 132; and Pampus, *Über die Rolle der Ḥārīḡiyya im frühen Islam* (Wiesbaden, 1980), 76–7.

<sup>9</sup> *EI* (2nd ed.), s.v. Azāriqa.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. H. Ritter, 2 vols., Istanbul (1929–33).

<sup>11</sup> Ash'arī does not even bother to cite the famous seventy-three sects *ḥadīth*, long the standard frontispiece for heresiographical works.

Mu'tazilite Abū Ya'lā al-Zurqān (d. c. 298),<sup>12</sup> the Khārijite Yamān b. Ribāb (fl. late second century A.H.),<sup>13</sup> and the Shāfi'ite scholar Ḥusain b. 'Alī al-Karābīsī (d. 256), the last of particular importance for Khārijite heresiography.<sup>14</sup> Unfortunately, only a small fraction of the Khārijite material in Ash'arī's Azāriqa chapter may in some sense work as a single, unified text, it is at base a composite of material of distinct types, probably stitched together from a number of different sources.

This variety of sources is partially reflected in the account's thematic diversity. Thematically, the material can be grouped under three rubrics: (1) Secession from larger communities; (2) Leadership within the sect; and (3) Sectarian legal doctrines. The extent to which these three categories of material travelled separately in the earliest tradition is apparent both from the breaks in Ash'arī's presentation and from the distinct rhetorical qualities of each of the groups concerned. The language of the first category is shaped largely by the needs of theological argument; it is concise, and aims deliberately to underscore the unacceptable separatist values of the Azraqite movement. The second category is more historical in its concerns and more expansive, even anecdotal, in its mode of expression. Lastly, the third is superficially neutral and descriptive, a catalogue of the sect's distinctive legal views. As we shall see, the third category was shaped by larger polemical concerns (i.e. anti-scripturalism) which had been obscured by Ash'arī's day. In dividing the material along these lines I am aiming to reconstruct something of the way the tradition looked before Ash'arī's time, as well as to facilitate comparison with other *firaq* manuals.

(A) *Secession*: included here is material relating both to the Azāriqa's secession from the rest of the Khārijite movement and to the general Khārijite secession from the community at large. This material is scattered throughout Ash'arī's account, although, as we shall see, there is sufficient internal evidence to suggest that many of these passages originally belonged together. Ash'arī's Azāriqa chapter begins with a standard *awā'il* passage (designated here as Section 1)<sup>15</sup> in which Nāfi' b. al-Azraq is mentioned as the first to have raised differences among the Khawārij (*awwal man aḥdatha 'l-khilāf bainahum*). His doctrinal contributions are summed up in a neat trinity: dissociation from the quietist Khawārij (*al-barā'a min al-qa'ada*); examination of all prospective members of the group (*al-miḥna li-man qaṣada 'askarahu*); and the ascription of unbelief to those refusing to undertake a *hijra* to the group's camp (*ikfār man lam yuhājir ilaihi*).<sup>16</sup> Each of these positions reflects divisions between extremists and moderates within the Khārijite movement itself; ordinary Muslim opponents of the sect are not an issue here.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Ritter, 'Philologika III: Muhammedanische Häresiographien', *Der Islam*, 18, 1929, 38.

<sup>13</sup> Madelung, 'The Shī'ite and Khārijite contribution to pre-Ash'arite Kalām', *Islamic philosophical theology*, ed. P. Morewedge (Albany, N.Y., 1979), 127.

<sup>14</sup> Karābīsī's work was widely known as the primary source for information on the Khawārij and other early sects (*mu'awwal al-mutakallimīn fī ma'rifat madhāhib al-khawārij wa-sā'ir ahl al-ahwā'*) (Subki, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyya* [Beirut n.d.], 1:252.6; Baghdādī, *Uṣūl al-Dīn* [Beirut, 1401], 208.15–16).

<sup>15</sup> This sectioning of the text is entirely subjective, of course, and reflects my own reading of the way the account has been constructed.

<sup>16</sup> Ash'arī, 86.7–9. Cf. the parallel in Balkhī's *Maqālāt*, cited in Nashwān al-Ḥimyarī, *al-Ḥūr al-'In* (Tehran, 1973), 177.20–178.1.

<sup>17</sup> This is clear from the wording elsewhere in the tradition. Cf., for example, Baghdādī, *al-Farq Baina 'l-Firaq* (ed. M. Badr, Cairo, 1323/1905), 63.1–6, where the first Muḥakkima (in contrast to the Azāriqa) are said to have avoided the *takfīr* of quietists who otherwise share their views (*idhā*

This doctrinal trinity reappears (with the same economy of expression) in a slightly later passage, to be designated Section 3.<sup>18</sup> Nāfi' himself is no longer the immediate concern; he has been replaced by the sect's problematic attitude toward the Khārijite *salaf*. The Azāriqa are here accused of affiliating with the earlier Muḥakkima Khawārij despite the latter's willingness to keep company with quietists and to accept followers without subjecting them to examination. In other words, the polemical possibilities behind Section 1 are explicitly worked out in Section 3: Nāfi's trinity represents an unacknowledged departure from the traditional Khārijite line. The Azāriqa respond to the charge of inconsistency by arguing that the proper position to take (i.e. the Azraqite position) was simply not apparent to their forbears (*hādhā tabayyana la-nā wa-khafiya 'alaihim*).<sup>19</sup>

Cook has pointed out the parallels (explicit and implicit) between Ash'arī's polemical strategy and that employed against the Azāriqa by the first-century Ibādī writer Sālim b. Dhakwān; the assumption of an originally moderate Muḥakkima movement from which the Azāriqa deviated is, according to Cook, more consistent with an Ibādī than a Sunnī mindset.<sup>20</sup> Ash'arī's first and third sections, then, would appear to be the residue of polemic used by the moderate Khawārij of Baṣra against the extreme secessionists. This Ibādī (or proto-Ibādī) writing might well represent the earliest strata of material in the *firaq* tradition.

A variation on the secession theme appears in Sections 4 and 8 of Ash'arī's account. Here the emphasis falls on the Azāriqa's withdrawal from the larger community of ordinary Muslims. Five examples of their secession are given by Ash'arī in the first of these passages: the sect considers grave sin as unbelief (*kufr*); it designates the territory of opponents as *dār kufr*; it insists on the eternal punishment of the grave sinner; it ascribes unbelief to 'Alī and the Ṣiffīn arbitrators; and finally, the Azāriqa are said to murder the children of unbelievers.<sup>21</sup> The first, third, and fourth of these charges (sin, punishment, and 'Alī) echo Ash'arī's general Khārijite introduction,<sup>22</sup> and the link is strengthened somewhat by the unique appearance of the verbal form *taqīlu* in both passages. Furthermore, the remaining two points in this section, *dār kufr* and the murder of children, link up very nicely with the end of Ash'arī's Azāriqa presentation, Section 8, where the fate of children in the afterlife as well as the unbeliever status of anyone living in the *dār kufr* are treated.<sup>23</sup> The parallel use of the verbal form *yarawna* (which appears, significantly, only in these two places) strengthens the connexion between the two passages. Moreover, the fact that later *firaq* works present this material together suggests that the intervening

*kāna 'alā ra'yihim*); and Qalhātī, *Kitāb al-Kashf wa-'l-Bayān*, (Arabic MS, Br. Mus. Or. 2606), fol. 197a.7: *tabarra'a [Nāfi'] min al-qā'id wa-law kāna 'arīfan li-amrihi tābi'an li-madhhabihi*. (The published edition of this work is unavailable to me.) And the first-century Ibādī polemicist Sālim b. Dhakwān states that the Azāriqa dissociate even from bedouin who sought affiliation with them (Hinds xerox, 173.4–6).

<sup>18</sup> Ash'arī, 87.2–5.

<sup>19</sup> Ash'arī, 87.5. The justification is less defensive in the *Farq*, 63.17: 'This is something we continue to do despite them' (*hādhā shai' ma zilnā dūnahum*). The tight polemic in 1/3 is broken up by a passage of a very different sort, to be discussed below.

<sup>20</sup> *Dogma*, 98. I would add that the apparent redundancy between two elements of Ash'arī's trinity (*barā'a* from and *takfīr* of those who remain at home) is suggestive of an originally Ibādī polemical concern. It is the Ibādīs, and not the Sunnīs, who like to make such distinctions. See above, note 17, for the distinction between quietist sympathizers and outright opponents implicit in the rhetoric. This would seem to be an Ibādī and not a Sunnī polemical move.

<sup>21</sup> Ash'arī, 87.5–8. Balkhī's parallel includes women as well as children (*Hūr*, 178.1–2).

<sup>22</sup> 86.3–6. For Balkhī as Ash'arī's source here, see below, note 28.

<sup>23</sup> Ash'arī, 89.10–12.

passages in Ash'arī are secondary insertions.<sup>24</sup> The source of the Ash'arī presentation must have kept 4 and 8 together; we can presume sections 5, 6 and 7 (to be discussed below) to have originated in one or more different accounts.

Although we have classified both 1/3 and 4/8 as secession material, there are important differences between the two. The first of these has to do with rhetorical approach. While there is obviously a polemical backdrop to the charges appearing in 4/8, and the short, conclusive statements here are of the sort useful in theological debate, the style of argument is much looser than what we have in 1/3. The passage is noticeably jumbled; the late appearance of 'Alī's *kufr* is strange, and the *dār kufr* point seems to intrude between sin and the sinner's deserts. This, as well as Ash'arī's gloss of the term *dār*,<sup>25</sup> suggests that several of these points have been pulled from a different context, and that what we have here is ultimately composite. There is no tightly constructed polemical strategy comparable to what is behind 1/3. Unlike the earlier passages, moreover, 4/8 do not appear to have been shaped by distinctively Ibādī concerns. The reference to the murder of children aside, nothing here parallels the *Sīrat Sālim*, and much of it might just as easily have the Ibādīs as the Azāriqa as a target. These passages serve Sunnī rather than Ibādī ends, and are to be assigned a different (and probably later) origin than 1/3.

Whatever the material's ultimate origins, it seems likely that the general Khārijite introduction, Section 4, and Section 8 reached Ash'arī in some form through the *Katāf al-Maqālāt* of Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Balkhī (d. 319).<sup>26</sup> Balkhī's hand is apparent both in parallels between Ash'arī and published extracts from Balkhī,<sup>27</sup> and in parallels between Ash'arī's general Khārijite introduction and the general introduction to Balkhī's Mu'tazilite chapter (published by Sayyid).<sup>28</sup> Much of Ash'arī's larger framework, in fact, betrays a stylistic similarity to what we might imagine Balkhī to have written (based on his published Mu'tazilite chapter).<sup>29</sup> But if Balkhī was the source, he is never mentioned as such anywhere in Ash'arī's Khārijite presentation.

<sup>24</sup> Baghdādī, *al-Milal wa-'l-Niḥal* (hereafter *MN[B]*) ed. 'A. Nader, Beirut, 1970), 63.16–64.1, reading *ra'aw* for *za'amū* at 64.1; Ibn al-Dā'ī, *Tabṣīrat al-'Awāmm* (hereafter *TA*) (ed. 'A. Iqbāl, Tehran, 1313 A.S.), 39.7–8.

<sup>25</sup> Ash'arī, 87.6: *wa-inna 'l-dār dār kufr ya'nūna dār mukhālīfihim*.

<sup>26</sup> A manuscript of Balkhī's *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* was discovered by Fu'ād Sayyid nearly 40 years ago in a private Yemeni collection. Sayyid edited and published only the section relating to the Mu'tazila *apud Faḍl al-'Iṭzāl wa-Ṭabaqāt al-Mu'tazila* (Tunis, 1974), 63 ff. The manuscript does not appear to have been microfilmed by the Egyptian research mission of which Sayyid was a member, and Sayyid's own copy presumably remains in private hands. For Balkhī's Khārijite material, we have thus to make do with the extracts preserved in Nashwān al-Himyārī's *Hūr*. While there is some question about Balkhī's precise date of composition, I assume him to be slightly earlier than Ash'arī, based on the comments of Ḥājī Khalīfa (*Kesf el-zunūn* [Istanbul, 1943], 1782.11), and of Balkhī himself (*Faḍl al-'Iṭzāl*, 55).

<sup>27</sup> See above, note 16.

<sup>28</sup> Both centre on what the sect in question *ajma'ū 'alā* (Balkhī, *Faḍl*, 63.1–64.13; Ash'arī, 86.1–6). Note also the appearance in Ash'arī of Balkhī's *wa-hum mukhtalīfīn*. The general introductory passage in Ash'arī is in fact explicitly ascribed to Balkhī in *Farq*, 55.8–56.8; the two Najdite exemptions from the wider Khārijite *ijmā'* noted in Ash'arī's introduction appear, however, to be the author's own insertions. It is also possible that these exemptions are to be attributed to the slightly earlier writer Zurqān: a similar exemption of the Najdiyya from the Khārijite *ijmā'* appears in Nawbakhtī's *Fīraq al-Shī'a* (ed. Ritter, Istanbul, 1931), 10.5–7, and the passage immediately precedes a statement of Zurqān's on a related subject.

<sup>29</sup> In addition to the similarities in their introductory passages, both include toward the end a geographical passage listing the areas where the sect in question is strongest: *al-kuwar allatī ghalaba 'alaihā 'l-'iṭzāl/ 'l-khārijīyya* (Balkhī, *Faḍl*, 108.1–114.5; Ash'arī, 128.5–8). Balkhī includes a similar section in his Khārijite chapter extracted in *Hūr*, 202.15–203.1. The geographical material is accompanied in both Balkhī and Ash'arī by a parallel *tasmīya* passage: *wa-'l-sabab alladhī la-hu summiyat al-mu'tazila bi-'l-'iṭzāl/summū 'l-khawārij* (Balkhī, *Faḍl*, 115.1–15; Ash'arī, 127.12–128.4). For Balkhī's Khārijite *tasmīya* passage, see *Hūr*, 200.14–201.5. The appearance of these passages in both the Mu'tazilite and Khārijite chapters of Balkhī suggests that they were important structural features of Balkhī's presentation which Ash'arī borrowed for his own Khārijite chapter.

There is one other piece of Ash'arī's Azāriqa account to consider in the secession category, although it does not take the same form as the material we have considered up to now. Ash'arī preserves a lengthy anecdote (Section 6) designed to show Nāfi' b. al-Azraq's position on *taqiyya* as having occasioned his split with the moderate Khawārij.<sup>30</sup> We are told of the sect's negative judgement in the case of a Yemenite woman of Azraqite sympathies (*tarā ra'ya 'l-khawārij*) who, despite the wishes of her family, marries a non-Arab co-religionist. Upon the husband's refusal to move to the Azraqite camp, the woman secures a divorce and is then married to her family's original choice. When informed of the woman's plight, Nāfi's followers pronounce negatively on the first marriage, because it was concluded outside the *dār al-hijra*.

The message is clear, if not explicit: there are to be no armchair Azraqites; one must not practise dissimulation while continuing to live as a believer in the *dār al-kufr*. Authentic belief is belief manifested in action.

The anecdotal quality of this passage distinguishes it from the other secession material in Ash'arī. As it adds nothing of great importance (the sect's rejection of *taqiyya* is obvious throughout), it is tempting to read the marriage anecdote as a secondary insertion into the heresiographical tradition. The fact that it disappears after Ash'arī's time suggests that its place in the tradition was never entirely secure. Against such a reading, however, can be set several indications that this passage may have been part of the presentation inherited by Ash'arī: namely, the clear fit between language employed here and the opening passage of Ash'arī's next Khārijite account (the Najdiyya),<sup>31</sup> and its fit with Section 1 of Ash'arī's Azāriqa account.<sup>32</sup> Even if the anecdote acquired Sunni heresiographical credentials before Ash'arī's time, there is evidence that it began life in an Ibādī and not a Sunnī workshop. In the first place, the problem of intermarriage between Khārijites and ordinary Muslims is naturally of much greater import to the Ibādīs than the Sunnīs, and would have carried more polemical weight among the former.<sup>33</sup> It is Ibādī and not Sunnī noses that would have been put out of joint by an Azraqite refusal to recognize the marriage of two Khārijite sympathizers who had not undertaken a *hijra*. The co-existence of *taqiyya* and communal identity is an issue between the moderate and secessionist Khārijites; it is irrelevant to Sunnīs.

In the second place, the use of language here is distinctively Ibādī. This is clear in a variant preserved by the Syrian heresiographer Khushaish (d. 253). Three-quarters of a century before Ash'arī, Khushaish associates the story with an otherwise unknown Khārijite group called the Najrāniyya.<sup>34</sup> He makes much of the distinction between the woman's *aṣḥāb* (i.e. her co-religionists) and her *qawm* (i.e. non-Khārijite members of her tribe). This is a common formulation

<sup>30</sup> Ash'arī, 88.5–89.3.

<sup>31</sup> At 89.15, Najda is met by a *nafar min ahl 'askar Nāfi'*; earlier, at 89.2, Nāfi's disapproval of *taqiyya* was supported by *ahl 'askarihi illā nafaran yasīran*. At 90.1, these splitters tell Najda of their having dissociated from (*bari'ū min*) Nāfi', which echoes the Azāriqa's treatment of the *ahl al-taqiyya* at 89.3.

<sup>32</sup> Section 6 begins (at 88.5) '*wa-kāna sabab al-ikhtilāf alladhī aḥdathahu Nāfi' . . .*' echoing Section 1's '*wa-awwal man aḥdatha 'l-khilāf bainahum Nāfi' b. al-Azraq wa-'lladhī aḥdathahu . . .*' (86.7–8). The phrasing also appears in the opening of the Najdiyya section (90.1), further strengthening the link between the two sections posited in the previous note.

<sup>33</sup> See Ash'arī, 111.6–12, and 112.3–6. The sale of slave girls to opponents (110.1–12) may be a related issue.

<sup>34</sup> The group takes its name from a woman called Umm Najrān (= Ash'arī's Yemenite woman?) who marries 'among her people' in Baṣra, but then secretly takes a husband from among her Khārijite co-religionists. When the first husband appears and compels her return, the Khawārij disagree about her status (in Malaṭī, *Kitāb al-Radd wa-'l-Tanbīh*, ed. S. Dederig [Istanbul, 1936], 137.3–6); cf. the similar division in Nāfi's camp at Ash'arī, 89.2.

in Ibādī literature.<sup>35</sup> It is also worth noting that the identification of the woman in Ash'arī as 'Khārijite' (lit. 'holding Khārijite ideas') is not inconsistent with the probable Ibādī outlook of the narrator.<sup>36</sup>

(B) *Leadership of the Sect*: two blocks of material in the Ash'arī account fall under this heading. The first appears between Ash'arī's opening foundational passages (1 and 3). After Nāfi' is named as the originator of the extremist trinity, possible alternative founders are named. Mentioned here, in Section 2,<sup>37</sup> are 'Abd Rabbih al-Kabīr and an otherwise unknown Ibn al-Waḍīn (= Abū Ismā'īl al-Baṭīhī?).<sup>38</sup> Nāfi's attitude toward Ibn al-Waḍīn is characterized as inconsistent: initial dissociation followed by posthumous affiliation. Moreover, despite his eventual affiliation, Nāfi' neglected to acknowledge the past *kufṛ* of those like himself who had earlier disagreed with Ibn al-Waḍīn's extremism before coming around to it; and this while he was quick to deem an unbeliever anyone who persisted in opposing his own new-found extremism.

Thus, Section 2 looks like an insertion into an otherwise coherent account of Nāfi's three principal innovations (1/3). One might object that the break between 2 and 3 is not beyond dispute; both passages possess an underlying similarity of rhetorical approach in their focus on the problem of affiliation despite obvious doctrinal inconsistency.<sup>39</sup> Still, the second section turns on a moderate Nāfi' having at first rejected the extremist line, a position which clouds somewhat the clear Muḥakkima-Azāriqa dichotomy in 1 and 3. The polemical force of the passage is considerably weaker than what we have in 1 and 3. It seems to have been written not by a polemicist intent on showing the Azāriqa as deviating from a moderate Khārijite line, but by a collector of *akhbār* concerning leading Khārijite figures.<sup>40</sup>

The second block of leadership material, Section 5 in Ash'arī, deals with dissent among the supporters of the well-known Azraqite chief Qaṭarī b. al-Fujā'a.<sup>41</sup> The entire passage is clearly intrusive here; it is of no apparent doctrinal significance, and its concern with secondary historical developments does not fit the rest of Ash'arī's account. In its prosopographical concerns it echoes Section 2. Six Azraqite figures are mentioned here, including 'Abd Rabbih al-Kabīr (also mentioned in 2, although there without the junior 'Abd Rabbih who appears here). The awkward appearance of Section 5 in the account argues against its early inclusion in the *firaq* tradition. We might well assume the material to have travelled in non-heresiographical circles before being inserted into the tradition at some secondary stage. Other than a rather obscure reference in the frequently obscure Abū 'l-Ḥusain al-Malaṭī (d. 377),

<sup>35</sup> See Schwartz, *Die Anfänge der Ibāditen in Nordafrika* (Wiesbaden, 1983), 24, 29.

<sup>36</sup> For the Ibādī use of the term 'Khārijite' to refer to their extremist brethren, see Qalhātī, fol. 198a.3; and *Sīrat Sālim*, 193.5–7.

<sup>37</sup> Ash'arī, 86.9–87.2.

<sup>38</sup> For the former, see Tabarī, *Ta'rikh al-Rusul wa-'l-Mulūk*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, et al. (Leiden, 1879–1901), ser. ii, 1018.3 ff. He figures in inter-Azraqite schisms at a later date, opposing Qaṭarī b. al-Fujā'a's leadership in the year 77. Baghdādī adds an 'Abd Rabbih al-Ṣaghīr to the list (*Farq*, 63.11–12), a name which appears later in Ash'arī's account (at 87.15, in connexion with the movement against Qaṭarī). I have not been able to identify Ibn al-Waḍīn, but he may be a scribal error for Abū Ismā'īl al-Baṭīhī, an Azraqite splitter mentioned by Ibn Ḥazm (see below, note 78).

<sup>39</sup> The similarity is even more striking in the parallel in the *Farq*, where Baghdādī ends the Muḥakkima 'l-Ūlā affiliation passage (Ash'arī's Section 3) with the same phrase he has already used to close the Ibn al-Waḍīn issue (Ash'arī's Section 2): *wa-akfara [Nāfi'] man yukhālīfuhu ba'da dhālika [Farq*, 63.15–17). But Baghdādī may simply be tidying things up.

<sup>40</sup> A good deal of such material is appended to the end of Ash'arī's Khārijite chapter (128.9–131.6).

<sup>41</sup> Ash'arī, 87.9–88.4. See *EI* (2nd ed.), s.v. Qaṭarī b. al-Fujā'a.

what we have here does not appear to have left any other trace in the *firaq* literature.<sup>42</sup>

(C) *Sectarian legal doctrines*: attached to the end of Ash'arī's account'<sup>43</sup> is a passage (Section 7) containing, among other things, certain legal views ascribed to the Azāriqa. Although the passage in Ash'arī is corrupt, it seems to reflect an older attempt to discredit the Azāriqa by representing them as radical scripturalists. They take the Book and not the *sunna* (however vaguely the latter is to be conceived).<sup>44</sup> If an explicit polemical context ever existed for this material, however, it was apparently lost by Ash'arī's time; what we have in the *Maqālāt* are simply the remains of an older anti-scripturalist polemic.

The details mentioned in Section 7 are of secondary importance in terms of the constitution of the sect (they do not bear directly on the matter of secession), but they will nevertheless come to form a standard unit in the later heresiographical tradition. The items listed in Ash'arī are as follows: (1) The group's refusal to stone adulterers;<sup>45</sup> (2) The sect's insistence that God is pleased with everyone in their camp who manifests his religion; (3) The sect's considering licit the violation of trusts despite God's command (Q. 4:58) to honour them;<sup>46</sup> (4) The group's suspension of the penalty for false accusation (*qadhf*) in certain cases (namely, when the slander is directed at men and not women); and (5) A seemingly obscure reference to violent struggle.<sup>47</sup>

The second and fifth points are clearly intrusive here. They do not fit at all well with the legal tenor of the rest of the passage, and are absent from the parallel sections of later *firaq* works.<sup>48</sup> Their separate origin is perhaps marked by the fact that they alone among the five points are introduced by the verbal form *qālū*. What is more, the fifth point is probably foreign to the Azāriqa account as a whole, as it enjoys a comfortable berth in Baghdādī's Khalafiyya narrative. There, we read (in language parallel to that in Ash'arī's Azāriqa account) that the Khalafiyya sect of the Khawārij refuses to engage in violent struggle in the absence of a suitably qualified *imām*.<sup>49</sup> Baghdādī goes on to report that they agree with the Azāriqa on the question of unbelievers' children. The passage in Ash'arī, then, is actually a Khalafite *imāma* doctrine better preserved in Baghdādī; the (unrelated) reference to the Azāriqa (which Baghdādī preserves) explains how the passage slipped into the Azāriqa section of the Ash'arī text.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>42</sup> *al-Tanbīh wa-l-Radd*, 41.9. The 'Amr b. Fatāt mentioned here as founding the otherwise unknown 'Amriyya sub-sect of the Azāriqa is presumably identical with the 'Amr al-Qanā given in Ash'arī's Section 5.

<sup>43</sup> Ash'arī, 89.3–9. It is separated from the preceding passages by *ahdathū ašyā'*, possibly indicating the use of a new source here.

<sup>44</sup> The scripturalist leanings of some early Khārijites have been noticed before. See Hawting, 'The significance of the slogan *lā ḥukma illā lillāh* and the references to the *ḥudūd* in the traditions about the Fitna and the murder of 'Uthmān', *BSOAS*, xli, 3, 1978, esp. 460–1 and the sources cited at note 37; and Cook, 'Anan and Islam: the origins of Karaite scripturalism', *JSAI*, 9, 1987, 169–72.

<sup>45</sup> Ash'arī, 89.3. See Schacht, *The origins of Muhammadan jurisprudence* (Oxford, 1950), 73–4; and cf. Burton, *The collection of the Qur'ān* (Cambridge, 1977), 68–104, for one possible historical context.

<sup>46</sup> *istahallū khafr al-amāna*. It is in this passage only that the Azāriqa clearly label their opponents *mushrikūn* rather than *kuffār* (and thus depart from what would become the Ibādī position). Sālim (174.6.–7) makes the same charge (*istihlāl akl al-amānāt*). The refusal to abide by the letter of Q. 4:58 (at least in the case of opponents) goes badly with the sect's scripturalist tendencies.

<sup>47</sup> *Mā kaffa aḥad yadahu 'an al-qital mudh anzala 'llāhu 'azza wa-jalla 'l-baṣf*. Cf. Q. 5:11 and 5:28.

<sup>48</sup> There is no mention of them, for example, in Baghdādī (*Farq*, 64.1.–5; and *MN[B]*, 64.1.–6, the latter usually close to Ash'arī) or in Ibn al-Dā'ī (*TA*, 39.8.–11).

<sup>49</sup> *Farq*, 75.15.–18: *wa-qad kaffū aidiyahum 'an al-qital li-faqdihim man yaşluhu li-'l-imāma minhum*.

<sup>50</sup> The *imāma* doctrine here must accordingly be from a source behind both Baghdādī and Ash'arī. It would follow that Madelung is unjustified in holding Baghdādī himself responsible for

The second point (which I shall identify as the *hijra* statement) is also out of place here, and does not connect with anything else in the Ash'arī account. The language is vague and lends itself to quite different interpretations: *qāhū nashhadu bi-'llāh annahu lā yakūnu fī dār al-hijra mimman yuzhiru 'l-islām illā man radiya 'llāhu 'anhu*. Watt takes the passage as evidence of the sect's legal strictness, and translates it as follows: 'We swear by God that in the camp of the faithful there *shall not be* any professors of Islam except those of whom God approves [my emphasis].' In other words, Watt wants to have backsliders expelled from the Azraqite camp; there is no room for sinners in the community of saints.<sup>51</sup> The problem with this reading is that it does not fit with accusations of lax standards we meet with elsewhere in the *firaq* tradition. The Ibādī tradition has the Azariqa willing to tolerate all sorts of misbehaviour among their followers.<sup>52</sup> And a somewhat independent textual tradition attests a similar sort of laxity in the sect's camp.<sup>53</sup> On the whole, it seems that the Azāriqa saw themselves (or were accused of seeing themselves) as protected from accountability before God. As long as they were members in good standing (i.e. *mu-hājirūn*), there was little that they could do to jeopardize their own salvation. A more appropriate translation of Ash'arī's passage would therefore run as follows: 'We testify that those who have manifested their belief by making a *hijra* to our camp are all [therefore] approved of by God.' Ash'arī's language, in short, is less declarative than descriptive. It is not that 'there shall not be' anyone in their midst of whom God disapproves, but rather, that God in a sense automatically approves of everyone in their camp without distinction and regardless of behaviour.

Ash'arī's Section 7 is thus something of a patchwork: the original thrust of the passage is legal, but this has been obscured somewhat by the intrusion of foreign material. Baghdādī's *MN* might well preserve an earlier and sounder version of the passage. The content is entirely legal, with the two suspicious elements of Ash'arī's version (the *hijra* statement and the apparently 'Khalafite' imāma fragment) missing. Also found here is the charge that the Azāriqa reject the *niṣāb*, the minimum amount of stolen property necessary before the

---

this (possibly inaccurate) explanation of Khalafite quietism (*Religious trends in early Islamic Iran* [Albany, N.Y., 1988], p. 66, n. 54).

<sup>51</sup> 'Khārijite thought in the Umayyad period', *Der Islam*, 36, 1971, 221. Watt's pro-strictness reading here accords with his attempt to defend the Khawārij against charges of backsliding and laxity, and seems to have been influenced by a corrupt passage in Shahrastānī's Najdiyya account. Shahrastānī's statement (92.5) that Najda was 'rough on people in imposing the penalty for intoxication' (*ghallaḏa 'alā 'l-nās fī ḥadd al-khamr taghlīḏan shadīdan*), quoted by Watt here, is clearly a corruption of Ash'arī's charge that Najda ignored the penalty in question (Ash'arī, 91.12: *'aṭṭala ḥadd al-khamr*; cf. *Farq*, 68.14, where the sense is unmistakable: *asqaṭa ḥadd al-khamr*). Watt appears to have changed his reading somewhat in a later work, where he clearly understands the Azāriqa as guaranteeing Paradise to everyone in their camp (even sinners): 'We bear witness by God that those professing Islam in the camp (*dār al-hijra*) all are approved by God' (*Formative period*, 24).

<sup>52</sup> Sālim, 174.9, where the sect has God forgiving even the adulterer and thief among them (this passage is presumably what led Cook [*Dogma*, p. 96] to see only laxity in Ash'arī); and cf. Qalhātī, fol. 199b.4–8, where the Azāriqa grant even the habitual sinner membership in the *ahl al-janna* as long as he resides in their camp. This *ahl al-janna* doctrine is in Ash'arī held by an anonymous Khārijite sect (119.8–10), but elsewhere in the heresiographical tradition is associated with the mysterious Bid'iyya sect of the Khawārij (*Hūr*, 178.6–7; Ibn 'Abbād, *K. al-Kashf 'an Manāḥij Aṣnāf al-Khawārij*, ed. M. Dānishpazhuh, *Nashrayi Dānishkada-yi Adabiyāt-i Tabriz*, 2 [1347sh], 157.23; Abū 'l-Ma'ālī, *Bayān al-Adyān*, ed. H. Raḏī [Tehran 1342sh], 48.3–4; Khwārazmī, *Liber Mafātīḥ al-Olūm*, ed. G. van Vloten [Leiden 1895], 25.3). The Bid'iyya, as we shall see, are given a dubious Azraqite pedigree by some heresiographers.

<sup>53</sup> Mubarrad, *al-Kāmil fī 'l-Adab*, ed. M. A. Ibrāhīm (Cairo, n.d.), 3:285.1, 306.2–4; Abū Ḥatim al-Rāzī, *Kitāb al-Zīna*, vol. 3, published *apud* Sāmarrā'ī, *al-Ghuluww wa-'l-Firaq al-Ghāliya fī 'l-Ḥādāra 'l-Islāmiyya* (Baghdad, 1392/1972), 284.4–12; *TA*, 38.19; 'Abbās b. Manṣūr al-Saksakī, *al-Burhān fī Ma'rīfat 'Aqā'id Ahl al-Adyān* (Ar. MS Cairo, Dār, Kalām 578), fol. 3a.6. The relationship between these texts will be discussed below.

penalty for theft can be imposed.<sup>54</sup> The *niṣāb* doctrine is very much at home in this passage, and we can assume it not only to have been in Baghdādī's source, but to have been a part of the pre-Ash'arī history of the passage. It fits well with the larger implications of the sect's stoning and false accusation doctrines: all three are grounded in a scripturalist approach to law. God says nothing in the Qur'an about stoning adulterers, and the condemnation of slander in Q. 24:4 is apparently directed only at those who would unfairly charge women with sexual misconduct (men are not mentioned).<sup>55</sup> The *niṣāb* requirement of the *fiqh* would also have offended scripturalist sensibilities, as Q. 5:38 contains no such restriction on the penalty for theft.<sup>56</sup>

These three charges may have been part of a larger effort to discredit the Azāriqa by emphasizing their departure from common practice. This line of attack began early; Sālim b. Dhakwān himself reproaches the Azāriqa for rejecting the stoning penalty, despite the Prophet's own custom.<sup>57</sup> Before Ash'arī appeared on the scene further examples would be produced. These passages might actually document authentic Azraqite practices; alternatively, they may simply reflect a growing inclination among writers to milk the polemical potential offered by the group's scripturalist tendencies. The *firaq* tradition, in other words, may for polemical reasons have expanded on the Azāriqa's rejection of *sunna* by enlarging the repertoire of charges even after the sect's demise. This would explain the absence of these legal questions from doxographical material not transmitted by the heresiographers.<sup>58</sup> It would also explain the existence of a body of writing which dwells more on the legal issues of Ash'arī's third category than on the secession problem central to most of the extant heresiography. It is to this body of writing that we now turn.

### III. *Legal practice and the tradition*

The content of two published accounts suggests that legal issues may early on have had an importance which is not readily apparent in the fragments transmitted by Ash'arī and his successors. These accounts are preserved in the *firaq* treatises of pseudo-Nāshī' al-Akbar (comp. early third century) and Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456). In pseudo-Nāshī'<sup>59</sup> we have a source at least somewhat independent of the material in Ash'arī and his successors. The author has little to say about *hijra*, *takfīr*, *barā'a*, and *taqiyya* (the issues which so exercise the other writers),<sup>60</sup> and what he does say is not of a piece with the usual account in the standard tradition. Pseudo-Nāshī' tends to employ distinctive language: he is almost alone in labelling the Azraqite practice of indiscriminate murder *isti' rād bi-'l-saif*,<sup>61</sup> and he is the only *firaq* writer explicitly to contrast *taqiyya* with

<sup>54</sup> *MN(B)*, 64.1–5. Cf. also *TA*, 39.11.

<sup>55</sup> Shahrastānī is the only heresiographer to underline the scripturalist context here (*MN[SH]*, 90.14–16).

<sup>56</sup> The Prophet's *sunna* is invoked against those who would follow only the *zāhir al-Qur'an* in Shāfi'i, *al-Umm* (Cairo, n.d.), 6:130.1–131.11; and cf. Schacht, *Origins*, 107.

<sup>57</sup> 173.3–4. Sālim's use of the term *sunna* here, presupposing as it seems to a *sunna* documented with prophetic *ḥadīth*, might be an interpolation (cf. *Dogma*, 100). But the charge itself (i.e. rejection of the common practice of the community) could still be early.

<sup>58</sup> There is no mention of these questions in either the *Kāmil* of Mubarrad or Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī's *Kitāb al-Zīna*. We shall see below that both of these (as well as texts dependent on them) are to be kept apart from Ash'arī and his successors.

<sup>59</sup> Published by van Ess in *Frühe mu'tazilitische Häresiographie: Zwei Werke des Nāshī' al-Akbar* (gest. 293H) (Beirut, 1971). For a revised dating and attribution of the text, see Madelung, 'Frühe mu'tazilitische Häresiographie: das *Kitāb al-Uṣūl* des Ġa'far b. Ḥarb?' *Der Islam*, 57, 1980, 220–36 [= *Religious schools and sects*, vi].

<sup>60</sup> The term *mihna* is used in the account (69.1), but with reference to the troubles caused by Ibn al-Zubair rather than to the Azraqite practice of examination.

<sup>61</sup> Pseudo-Nāshī', 69.4–5. The phrase appears also in Nawbakhtī, *Firaq al-Shī'a*, 64.3–4; and Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal fī 'l-Milal wa-'l-Ahwā' wa-'l-Nihal* (5 vols., Cairo, n.d.), 144.28. It appears in Ash'arī (129.2), but not in a narrowly Azraqite context.

the familiar slogan *al-amr bi-l-ma'rūf wa-l-nahy 'an al-munkar*.<sup>62</sup> But most significant for us is the attention he devotes to the sect's legal doctrines. He associates these doctrines not with the Azāriqa as such, but with what he tells us are two of the group's sub-sects, the Khāzimiyya and the Bid'iyya.<sup>63</sup> The name of the latter is, of course, suspicious; the group may very well be nothing more than a polemical construct useful in establishing the departure of certain Khārijites from the *sunna*.<sup>64</sup>

Pseudo-Nāshi' mentions five separate points in connexion with these two 'Azraqite' groups: (1) People should cooperate in goodness and piety and not conceal the clear guidance that God has revealed; (2) Rejection of stoning; (3) Permission to marry the niece of one's wife (*abāhū nikāḥ al-mar'a 'alā 'ammātihā wa-'alā khālatihā*); (4) Refusal in general to require anything of the believer which is not specified in the Qur'ān or the subject of unanimous agreement among Muslims; (5) Requiring only two daily prayers (as specified in Q. 11:114); (6) Prohibiting the eating of fish not ritually slaughtered (*ḥaramū akl al-samak ḥayyan ḥattā yudhkā bi-dhabḥ*).<sup>65</sup>

Although the author never makes the point explicitly, all six of these doctrines have in common a concern to act in accordance with scripture rather than take as normative the common practice of the community. This legal concern is most apparent in the first and fourth points (neither the stoning of adulterers nor the five daily prayers are mentioned in the Qur'ān), and the third point is a statement of the larger principle in operation.<sup>66</sup> Both the second and fifth points are given a certain amount of play elsewhere in the *firaq* tradition. The rejection of stoning, as we have seen, is commonly associated with the Azāriqa, and the two-prayers doctrine is ascribed either to the Bid'iyya<sup>67</sup> or to a little known group called the Baṭiḥiyya, apparently another sub-sect of the Azāriqa.<sup>68</sup> The third doctrine also appears to have a scripturalist background, as it pointedly follows the letter of the marriage prohibitions in Q. 4:23 despite the traditional view that wives' aunts are also within the forbidden degrees.<sup>69</sup> The fish restriction in point six is presumably the remains of a distinctive position taken on the question of whether fish found dead in the water might legally be eaten, or whether they instead come under the Qur'ānic prohibition of carrion.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>62</sup> Pseudo-Nāshi', 69.3-4.

<sup>63</sup> The former is normally part of the 'Ajārida-Tha'āliba network, and is not considered an Azraqite group elsewhere. The latter is frequently an orphan group, although some relationship with the Azāriqa is implied by Ash'arī; see below, note 67.

<sup>64</sup> The earliest reference to such a group is in the *Sīrat Sālim*, and there entirely in a polemical context; the author says nothing of the sect's beliefs, but simply calls on them to act in accordance with the *sunna* of the Prophet (193.15). Cook identifies pseudo-Nāshi's Bid'iyya (69.15-70.6) with Sālim's sect, based on the former's rejection of the *sunna*'s five daily prayers (*Dogma*, 92). A two-prayers doctrine need not be behind Sālim's criticism of the Bid'iyya, though. As we shall see, there are any number of scripturalist positions ascribed to the Azāriqa (and its sub-sects) that might have done just as well.

<sup>65</sup> Pseudo-Nāshi', 69.11-70.6.

<sup>66</sup> Presumably the five daily prayers are not a requirement even given the unanimous agreement of Muslims, since in this case the *ijmā'* goes beyond the Qur'ānic language. A parallel to the first point is listed for the Najdiyya in Ash'arī, 125.11-12, *MN(SH)*, 92.16-18, and Nawbakhtī, *Firaq al-Shī'a*, 10.8-9. In all three places the scripturalist implications are less prominent than in pseudo-Nāshi', and the doctrine looks to be as much a rejection of *imāma* as *sunna*.

<sup>67</sup> Ash'arī's single reference to them (at 126.14) is apart from his main Khārijite account. This probably argues for a different source. (Note also that Ash'arī, contrary to his custom, actually cites a source here, although an anonymous one [*ḥakā ḥākin*].) The significance of this will become apparent below.

<sup>68</sup> See below, note 78.

<sup>69</sup> See, for example, *Umm*, 5:5.5-6.10, where the issue is put explicitly as one between those who accept and those who reject tradition as a source of law. Cf. also Ricks, 'Kinship bars to marriage in Jewish and Islamic law', *Studies in Islamic and Judaic Traditions* (Atlanta, 1986), 131.

<sup>70</sup> On the status of the 'floating fish', see Cook, 'Early Islamic dietary law', *JSAI*, 7, 1986, 246-7.

While this is not quite a scripturalist position, it might well reflect a similar sort of mentality.

The closest account to pseudo-Nāshī's is that of Ibn Ḥazm; both authors clearly get us behind the presentation we have in Ash'arī. Ibn Ḥazm divides his legal material between the Azāriqa and the Baṭīḥiyya. Under the former he mentions the stoning and slander doctrines in language not attested elsewhere,<sup>71</sup> and gives a unique twist to the sect's rejection of the *niṣāb*: here, the issue is not the size of the theft required to amputate, but rather, the amount of limb which the thief will lose (Ibn Ḥazm has the group taking the entire arm, a position not at all inconsistent with a scripturalist mind-set).<sup>72</sup> But even more suggestive of an independent source here is Ibn Ḥazm's unique reference to an inter-Azraqite dispute over the religious duties incumbent upon a menstruant. It seems that certain Azraqites held prayer and fasting obligatory even for the impure *ḥā'id* (in contrast to the general Sunnī position); meanwhile, others considered the menstruant's prayer and fasting void, but departed from the community in requiring the woman later to make up lost prayers just as Muslims ordinarily make up for lost fast days.<sup>73</sup>

Both of these practices are consistent with a scripturalist approach to law. Behind the first is presumably a refusal to follow the lawyers in expanding the Qur'ānic limitation of physical contact with the *ḥā'id* (Q. 2:222) in such a way that it restricts the discharge of her religious obligations.<sup>74</sup> Such a view is attested nowhere else in the *firaq* tradition, although in his discussion of the legal consequences of menstruation Ibn Ḥazm refers to a sub-sect (*qawm*) of the Azāriqa which here departs from the community's consensus.<sup>75</sup> The second of these practices appears to have given rise to a number of *ḥadīth* directed explicitly against the Khawārij; 'Ā'isha is made to call someone a Ḥarūrīte for implying that *qaḍā' al-ṣalāt* is obligatory for women, despite the more flexible practice in the Prophet's day.<sup>76</sup> This *ḥadīth* did not escape the notice of all the heresiographers; the Ḥanafite-Māturīdite author 'Uthmān b. 'Abdallāh al-'Irāqī (whose sources were not limited to the standard works) thought the tradition important enough to cite in explanation of the term Ḥarūrīyya.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>71</sup> His phrasing conflates the normally distinct issues of *rajm* and *qaḍhf*: *ibtal rajm man zanā wa-huwa muḥṣan* (*Fiṣal*, 5:144.23–24). The heresiographers everywhere else use *muḥṣan* only in the context of slander (and not stoning).

<sup>72</sup> *Fiṣal*, 4:144.24. The Khārijite position is also given in Sarakhsī, *Kitāb al-Mabsūṭ* (Cairo, 1324), 9:133.17–134.3; and Ibn Ḥazm, *Kitāb al-Muḥallā* (Cairo, 1347), 11:357.10–20. The Khawārij take the *aidiyahumā* of Q. 5:38 quite naturally as referring to the entire arm, while the jurists are forced to establish that the cutting be done only at the wrist.

<sup>73</sup> *wa-awjabū 'alā 'l-ḥā'id al-ṣalāt wa-'l-ṣiyām fī ḥaidihā wa-qāla ba'ḍuhum lā wa-lākin taqḍī 'l-ṣalāt idhā ṭahurat kamā taqḍī 'l-ṣiyām* (*Fiṣal*, 4:144.23–24). For the general Sunnī position on *qaḍā' al-ṣiyām*, see Khiraqī, *Mukhtaṣar* (Damascus, 1384), 60.6–8; *Muḥallā*, 2:175.10–12 (reading *wa-lā* for *wa-qaḍ*); *Umm*, 2:104.9–13, and 1:60.1–2.

<sup>74</sup> See the discussion in *Umm*, 1:59.17–60.1. The tradition quoted here (in which 'Ā'isha is prohibited from making the *ṭawāf*) is one of the standard proof-texts demonstrating the unfitnes of the *ḥā'id*. It is worth noting that the Ahmadiyya today reject many of the traditional restrictions placed on the *ḥā'id*, and justify their views on scripturalist lines (M. Mohammed Ali, *The Religion of Islam*, 392 f.; cited in Bousquet, 'La pureté rituelle en Islam', *RHR*, 138, 1950, p. 62, n. 5).

<sup>75</sup> *Muḥallā*, 2:162.11. The group permits prayer, fasting, circumambulation of the Ka'ba, and sexual intercourse. Even the last does not explicitly come under the prohibition of Q. 2:222, although it is hard to imagine an interpretation that would permit it. The departure from *ijmā'* mentioned here is elsewhere associated with the Baṭīḥiyya sub-sect of the Azāriqa (see below, note 78).

<sup>76</sup> For example, Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan* (4 vols., Beirut, n.d.), 1:68.16–69.3; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, *Musnad* (6 vols., Beirut, n.d.), 6:231.25–232.2, and 6:94.19–21; Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ* (*al-ḥaid*, Bab 20). 'Ā'isha insists that while the Prophet was alive '*fa-nu'maru bi-qaḍā' al-ṣawm wa-lā nu'maru bi-qaḍā' al-ṣalāt*'.

<sup>77</sup> The people of Ḥarūrā' (here, said to be a place in Bahrain) are notorious for asking nettlesome questions (*kāna ahluhu . . . muta'annitin fī 'l-su'āl*); in this case, they inquire about the Sunnī inconsistency in requiring *qaḍā' al-ṣawm* but not *qaḍā' al-ṣalāt* (*al-Firaq al-Muftariqa Baina Ahl al-Zaigh wa-'l-Zandaqa*, ed. Y. Kutluay [Ankara, 1961], 10.14–19).

With Ibn Ḥazm's Baṭīhiyya sect of the Azāriqa we get a number of other *fiqh* problems, at least some of which have a scripturalist dimension.<sup>78</sup> The two-prayers doctrine and the prohibition of fish not ritually slaughtered are familiar from pseudo-Nāshī' (the latter only from pseudo-Nāshī'). And three other legal questions attested nowhere else are also mentioned here: the *hajj* can be performed in any month; Zoroastrians do not qualify as *jizya* payers; and the sect takes as an unbeliever anyone making the *khuṭba* on the two festival days (*yukaffirūna man khaṭaba fī 'l-ḥajr wa-'l-adhā*).<sup>79</sup>

The second of these doctrines may well have a scripturalist basis, as the protected status of the Majūs in the *fiqh* is not at all clear from the language of Q. 22:17.<sup>80</sup> The legal issues alluded to in the third and first points are more problematic. The Sunnī law books do not suggest (even indirectly) that there was ever serious opposition in principle to the festival *khuṭba*, although it is conceivable that Khārijite scripturalists might have disapproved of any such extra-Qur'ānic institution.<sup>81</sup> Finally, the permission to undertake the *hajj* in any month (point one), while seemingly inconsistent with Q. 2:197 (*al-ḥajj ashhur ma'lūmāt*, etc.), might actually be directed against the traditional understanding of the 'well-known months' as Shawwāl, Dhū 'l-Qa'da, and Dhū 'l-Ḥijja.<sup>82</sup>

In Ibn Ḥazm, then, we have a way around Ash'arī into the earlier material; the fact that the *Fīṣal* fits so well in places with the pseudo-Nāshī' text makes it likely that Ibn Ḥazm is drawing from a pool of genuinely early material. Much of this appears to be of the legal sort imperfectly represented in Ash'arī's Section 7. One might well conclude from this that the legal material (with its emphasis on scripturalism) had an importance early on which it had lost by Ash'arī's day. Much of the earliest anti-scripturalist polemic found its target in the Bid'iyya and Baṭīhiyya, sub-sects possibly created for just this purpose. It is significant that neither group survives in Ash'arī's main framework, where the anti-

<sup>78</sup> *Fīṣal*, 4:144.18–21; cf. Saksakī, *Burhān*, fol. 5a.11–14 (corrupted to Maṭīkhiyya), and Yāfī'i, *Marham al-'Ital al-Mu'dila* (anon. abridgement), Arabic MS Berlin, We. 1819, Ahlwardt 2806, fol. 63b.11–14 (corrupted to Maṭbakhīyya). Ibn Ḥazm names as founder of the group a certain Abū Ismā'īl al-Baṭīhī, who, he tells us, was originally an Azraqite before outdoing them in extremism (*ghalā 'an sā'ir al-Azāriqa wa-zāda 'alaihim*). He considers the sect outside the *ijmā' al-umma* (*Fīṣal*, 2:89.9–10). This charge goes nicely with the label Bid'iyya (applied to the other Azraqite sub-sect), and with pseudo-Nāshī's third point, mentioned above. It is also brought against an anonymous sub-sect of the Azāriqa elsewhere by Ibn Ḥazm (see above, note 75). This suggests that the distinction between the Bid'iyya and Baṭīhiyya was never very sharp; the two may well have been little more than convenient labels created to organize the legal material gathered on the Azāriqa.

<sup>79</sup> *Fīṣal*, 4:144.17–20.

<sup>80</sup> The acceptance of *jizya* from them is based entirely on the Prophet's practice and the *sīra* of the first two Caliphs; cf. the traditions cited in Abū Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-Kharāj* (Cairo, 1397), 139–42; and *EI* (2nd ed.), s.v. Madjūs. The ambiguity of the Qur'ānic passage at the same time allows the community to place the Majūs in the category of idolators (rather than *ahl al-kitāb*) as far as *munākaha* and *dhaba'ih* go. The whole question may have been an object of dispute within the Azāriqa. Ibn Ḥazm points out that the sect murders Muslims while leaving Christians, Jews, and Majūs in safety (4:144.28–29). There is some support for this in the *Sīrat Sālim* (175.2), where another Khārijite sect, the Najdiyya, are said to honour the covenants of 'their people' (i.e. ordinary Muslims) towards the *dhimmīs*, even while considering 'their people' to be polytheists. Cf. Pampus, *Über die Rolle*, 86.

<sup>81</sup> Possibly, we have here an allusion to a specific feature of the *khuṭba* rejected by the sect. The most polemical feature of the legal discussion concerning the festival sermon is the insistence that it be performed *after* the prayer (in contrast to the usual practice on Fridays); the sermon is not among the stipulations (*sharā'iṭ*) of the *ṣalāt al-'īd*, and can in fact be omitted without invalidating the prayer. (See, for example, Sarakhṣī, *Mabsūt*, 2:37.10–38.4; *Umm*, 1:239.14–15; Ibn Rushd, *Bidāyat al-Mujtahid* [Cairo, 1386], 221.12–14). The lawyers generally hold an Umayyad responsible for altering the Prophet's practice and placing the *khuṭba* before the *ṣalāt* in an effort to expand their own influence. Whatever the original practice, might a Khārijite opposition to the festival *khuṭba* have arisen in an anti-Umayyad context?

<sup>82</sup> For the jurists' discussion of the *ashhur ma'lūmāt*, see, for example, *Muḥallā*, 7:65.10–68.16 and 69.17–25; and Ibn Rushd, *Bidāya*, 1:334. Note that pseudo-Nāshī' (69.8–11) associates a *hajj* doctrine with his Khazimiyya sub-sect of the Azāriqa: they prohibit pilgrimage as long as *taqiyya* is operative.

scripturalist polemic has lost pride of place to the secession material. If the two sects had indeed enjoyed impeccable Azraqite credentials, it would be hard to see why the latter is not mentioned at all in Ash'arī's presentation and the former is banished to the final third of the Khārijite chapter (where the author collects supplementary material from outside of his principle source).<sup>83</sup> As it stands, the two sects' awkward connexion to the Azāriqa leads one to suspect that they are secondary heresiographical creations, and that at least some of the legal material itself reflects later polemical concerns.

#### IV. Later Ash'arite transmission

The presentation we have in Ash'arī is at the base of a good many later heresiographical accounts. The most important of these are the accounts of Baghdādī (d. 429) and Shahrastānī (d. 548). The former is perhaps the least interesting for our purposes, as he stays quite within the boundaries of the presentation behind Ash'arī. Baghdādī's two *firaq* works, the *Milal wa-'l-Niḥal* and *Farq Baina 'l-Firaq*, are somewhat different in character, with the former keeping much closer in shape to the account flowing through Ash'arī and the latter betraying a certain amount of reformulation. We have seen already that in two key places the *MN(B)* can take us behind corruptions and interpolations in Ash'arī.<sup>84</sup> In the *Farq*, by contrast, there has been an attempt to re-cast the material in line with Baghdādī's own style, even if no independent sources have been brought to bear. Yet in a number of places it is clear that despite Baghdādī's re-casting of the text, some of the Ash'arī framework continues to show through. Baghdādī must have had in front of him the Ash'arī account (or the account directly behind it), even if he was not afraid to violate its structure when necessary.<sup>85</sup>

Both in form and content Shahrastānī is considerably less bound by what the earlier writers in the tradition had produced. The structure of Ash'arī's account has here been entirely discarded in favour of an idiosyncratic arrangement into eight separate *bida'*.<sup>86</sup> Although no sources are explicitly cited, there are suggestive parallels between Shahrastānī and two earlier works: pseudo-Nāshī' and the *Kashf wa-'l-Bayān* of the Ibādī writer Qalhātī. The first of these parallels comes in Shahrastānī's reference to an Azraqite belief that God is able to send a prophet whom He knows either was or will become an unbeliever. The doctrine is attested only in Shahrastānī,<sup>87</sup> but it might link up with a belief which pseudo-Nāshī' ascribes to the Bid'iyya: even prophets are liable to become idolators if they commit minor or major sins.<sup>88</sup>

The second of these parallels is concerned with the sect's prohibition of *taqiyya*. In this case, Shahrastānī employs language which elsewhere he attributes to Balkhī.<sup>89</sup> It is significant that the same language is found (in another context) in the *Kash wa-'l-Bayān* of the Ibādī heresiographer Qalhātī.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>83</sup> Ash'arī, 126.14–15.

<sup>84</sup> See above, note 54.

<sup>85</sup> Lewinstein, *Studies*, 70–4. With very minor changes in wording, Baghdādī's presentation is reproduced by Isfarā'īni, *al-Tabṣīr fī 'l-Dīn wa-Tamyīz al-Firqa 'l-Nājiya 'an al-Firaq al-Hālikīn* (Cairo, 1359/1940), 29.11–30.14.

<sup>86</sup> *MN(SH)*, 89.8–91.4.

<sup>87</sup> *MN(SH)*, 90.18–20. The other writers who refer to the doctrine are all clearly dependent on Shahrastānī; namely, Ibn al-Murtaḍā, *al-Baḥr al-Zakḥkhār (Muqaddimat Kitāb al-Baḥr al-Zakḥkhār* [Beirut, n.d.]), 48.11; Ijī, *Mawāqif* (Cairo, n.d.), 324.15; Kirmāni, *Dhail Kitāb Sharḥ al-Mawāqif* (= *al-Firaq al-Islāmiyya*) (Baghdad, 1973), 66.4–5.

<sup>88</sup> Pseudo-Nāshī', 70.1–2.

<sup>89</sup> *MN(SH)*, 90.17–18: *inna 'l-taqiyya ghair jā'iza fī qawl wa-lā fī 'amal*; cf. Shahrastānī's description of the Najadāt's *taqiyya* doctrine (cited from Balkhī) at 92.15–16.

<sup>90</sup> Qalhātī, fol. 202b.16–203a.1 (reading *taqiyya* for *baqiyya*, and with reference to the Ṣufriyya).

This text is yet to be securely dated,<sup>91</sup> but there is internal evidence to suggest that it must have been an important source for Shahrastānī's Khārījite chapter.<sup>92</sup> Both of these parallels suggest that Shahrastānī was willing to range outside of the standard *firaq* circles in search of data, and this makes him a more valuable heresiographical witness than his late date and highly-refined presentation would lead us to expect.

#### V. *A separate tradition*

In the absence of second- and third-century texts it is difficult to tell how much of the earliest material was lost to Ash'arī and his successors. The legal data in pseudo-Nāshī' and Ibn Ḥazm suggest that at least some elements have fallen out; that other elements also escaped Ash'arī's net is clear from what a number of works outside of the Ash'arite-Mu'tazilite nexus have preserved.<sup>93</sup> In the *Kāmil* of Mubarrad (d. 285) and the *Kitāb al-Zīna* of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 322) we have a body of material not available elsewhere. Some of this is attested in the *Sīrat Sālim*, which suggests that it was at one time part of the common stock of *firaq* material circulating in Iraq. Although the *Kāmil-Zīna* presentation never made it into the commonly consulted heresiographies, it did find at least some acceptance among the later writers; it appears (among other places) in the *TA* of Ibn al-Dā'ī (fl. first half of the sixth century) and the *Burhān* of Abū 'l-Faḍl al-Saksakī (d. 683).

Aside from the poetry, the content of Abū Ḥātim's account (based probably on the *Kāmil*) can be divided into three sections, the first and third of which do not directly concern doctrine. The first consists of a brief characterization of Nāfi' as chief of the Khawārij in Baṣra and Ahwāz, and one of the first among their religious thinkers, warriors, and heroes. Also mentioned are his reputed discussions with Ibn 'Abbās.<sup>94</sup> The third section, historical in nature as well, describes the sect's retreat from Baṣra to Ahwāz and then to Kirmān.<sup>95</sup> Between the two is a doctrinal section which deals entirely with the status of opponents in Azraqite eyes:

- (1) The *dār kufr* exists except where belief is manifested (*al-dār dār kufr illā man azhara īmānahu*).<sup>96</sup> We have seen that a piece of this language (the *hijra* statement) makes an awkward appearance in Ash'arī, but does not seem to have been picked up by any of his literary descendants. It is outside of the main body of material preserved in Ash'arī. The problem of laxity which it suggests is, as we have seen, also found in the *Sīrat Sālim*. It appears elsewhere in the *Zīna* text as well, where the Azāriqa are said not to ascribe unbelief to anyone in their camp except the murderer of a co-religionist.<sup>97</sup>
- (2) Restrictions on social intercourse with opponents: beasts slaughtered by the latter are not licit, and there are to be no ties of marriage or inheritance

<sup>91</sup> Qalhātī's own dates are unknown. For reasons which are unclear to me, Wilkinson calls the *Kashf* a seventh-century [hijrī] work based on early sources ('The early development of the Ibādī movement in Baṣra', *Studies in the first century of Islamic society* [Southern Illinois University, 1982], p. 242, n. 8), while Cook (working from the chain of transmission given at the end of the British Museum MS) tentatively places the author in the fifth century (*Dogma*, 234).

<sup>92</sup> Lewinstein, *Studies*, pp. 116, 150, n. 82. Ironically, Rieu thought that Shahrastānī might have been behind Qalhātī (*Supplement to the Catalogue of the Arabic manuscripts in the British Museum* [London, 1894], 122). The nature of the parallels, however, points to Shahrastānī as the dependent writer: as I argue in my thesis, the language is usually more at home in the Ibādī text.

<sup>93</sup> I am leaving aside here the eastern Ḥanafite material studied in Part 2 of my thesis.

<sup>94</sup> *Zīna*, 284.8–10. The wording matches *Kāmil*, 3:184.15–16.

<sup>95</sup> *Zīna*, 284.13–15.

<sup>96</sup> *Zīna*, 284.11; *Kāmil*, 3:285.1.

<sup>97</sup> *Zīna*, 284.4–6 (reading *tukaffiru* for *taqbalu*, and *min ahl maqālātihim* for *min ghair*, etc.), where it has fallen into the Baihasiyya section. Cf. also *Kāmil*, 3:306.2–4.

(*lā yaḥillu dhabā'ihuhum wa-munākaḥatuhum wa-mawāriḥuhum*). The language here echoes Sālim (and is picked up later in the Ibādī tradition by Qalhātī), but does not find its way into the standard Ash'arite-Mu'tazilite sources (which do not speak of these matters at all).<sup>98</sup>

(3) Opponents have the same status as the pagan Arabs in the Prophet's lifetime, and are thus to be given a choice only between conversion and the sword.<sup>99</sup>

(4) Quietism is unacceptable, and the quietists are unbelievers (*lā yaḥillu 'l-qu'ūd 'an al-jihād wa-'l-qa'ada kuffār*).<sup>100</sup>

Abū Ḥatim's account finds its way into Ibn al-Dā'ī's *TA*, where it breaks up material from Ash'arī or a related text. Although Abū Ḥatim is not cited as a source, he is at least mentioned elsewhere in the *TA*, and there are extensive parallels between the two texts.<sup>101</sup> The Abū Ḥatim account can be seen in the *Burhān* of Saksakī as well, where it is combined with material clearly from Ibn Ḥazm; neither the *Zīna* nor the *Fīṣal*, however, is mentioned explicitly as a source.<sup>102</sup> The opening section of Saksakī is clearly from the *Zīna*: Nāfi' is said to be the chief of the Khawārij in Baṣra and Ahwāz and one of their leading figures; his discussions with Ibn 'Abbās are mentioned; the *dār kufr* exists where belief is not manifested; and reference is made to the prohibition of marriage, inheritance, and slaughtered beasts.<sup>103</sup> This is followed by a passage which details Azraqite atrocities not mentioned elsewhere, possibly of the author's own invention.<sup>104</sup> Material from Ibn Ḥazm is then reproduced with very few changes: rejection of stoning; the thief loses not just the hand but the entire limb; the problem of the *ḥā'id*; and an abbreviated version of Ibn Ḥazm's unique description of *isti'rad*.<sup>105</sup> Saksakī's use of the *Zīna* and the *Fīṣal* suggests that he has recognized the Ash'arite and Mu'tazilite control of the tradition, and has tried to get around it.

In the *Kāmil* and *Zīna* (as well as their dependent texts) we thus have a kind of sub-tradition providing a way into the earlier material not offered by Ash'arī and his successors. The later Ibādī tradition as we have it in Qalhātī lines up at least partially alongside these texts. For example, the prohibition of marriage and inheritance between Azraqites and ordinary Muslims, and the prohibition of the latter's slaughtered beasts, are unique to Qalhātī and the *Kāmil-Zīna* passages.<sup>106</sup> Since Qalhātī also preserves secession material in line with Ash'arī and his successors,<sup>107</sup> the question arises as to whether Qalhātī is combining

<sup>98</sup> *Zīna*, 284.11–12; *Kāmil*, 3:285.2 (the *mihna* point which follows in the *Kāmil* has fallen out of the *Zīna* version). Cf. Sālim, 172.3, for the coupling of inheritance and marriage. Qalhātī (fol. 197a.8) has all three prohibitions together. See Pampus, *Über die Rolle*, 78. Cook's heresiographical parallel to Sālim on these points is the *Kāmil* (*Dogma*, p. 198, n. 58), but Mubarrad is atypical.

<sup>99</sup> *Zīna*, 284.12–13; *Kāmil*, 3:285.3–4.

<sup>100</sup> *Zīna*, 284.12–13; *Kāmil*, 3:285.3–4 has *wa-'l-qa'ada bi-manzilatihim* (= *manzilat kuffār al-'arab*). The parallel in Sālim runs *anzalahum bi-manāzil 'abadat al-awḥān* (172.2–3).

<sup>101</sup> Abū Ḥatim is mentioned at 146.17, and 152.2. The material from the *Zīna* is inserted at *TA* 38.18–39.2. (The *Kāmil* is clearly not Ibn al-Dā'ī's source, as the minor modifications made by Abū Ḥatim appear also in the *TA*.)

<sup>102</sup> The only source actually mentioned is a lost *Kitāb al-Firaq* of a certain Abū Muḥammad, composed during the Caliphate of al-Muqtafi (530–55). See Ritter, 'Häresiographien', 47.

<sup>103</sup> *Burhān*, fol. 1 3a.3–7. This matches *Zīna*, 284.8–12, both in language and content.

<sup>104</sup> *Burhān*, fol. 3a.7–9. They not only murder children, but they kill the blind, the crippled, and the old. They also throw children into pots of boiling curd. This and the material in the previous note find their way into the *mukhtaṣar* of Yāfi's *Marham* cited above, note 78.

<sup>105</sup> *Burhān*, fol. 3a.9–3a.14; cf. *Fīṣal*, 5:30.10–16.

<sup>106</sup> Qalhātī, fol. 197a.8.

<sup>107</sup> Nāfi' was the first to break with the 'people of rectitude' (as Qalhātī terms the proto-Ibādī moderates); the sect held *hijra* to be the primary religious duty of the true Muslim; the sect dissociated from those refusing to undertake a *hijra*; and the sect took ordinary Muslims to be polytheists (Qalhātī, fol. 197a.4–7).

material from both the Ash'arī and the Mubarrad-Abū Ḥātim sides of the tradition or whether he is dependent on a source (or sources) behind both. One particular piece of Qalhātī's presentation argues for the latter; namely, the statement that the Azāriqa enslave ordinary Muslims and their children. Although this is not a charge commonly found in the heresiographical tradition, it closely resembles a passage in the *Sīrat Sālim*.<sup>108</sup> Qalhātī's parallel to Sālim in a doctrine only narrowly attested in the standard literature suggests that the Ibādī *firaq* tradition may provide a way into the earliest heresiographical tradition.<sup>109</sup>

## VI. Conclusion

In analysing the standard heresiographers' treatment of a single Khārijite sect it is clear that we have not one tradition at work, but several. What the *firaq* literature preserves is a number of distinct presentations of data (or at least the fragmented remains of those presentations) formulated before the composition of the earliest extant treatises. These separate presentations have to be recognized, and their relationship to one another sorted out, before scholars can get at the sect which lies behind them. It is no good simply to cite material on the Azāriqa from the variety of *firaq* books at one's disposal; as I have sought to show, if we are to make sense of it we have to try and place each piece of data in its appropriate literary context.

I have attempted here to isolate these older sub-texts within the surviving accounts. The three categories of material which intersect in Ash'arī all seem to have originated in different accounts of the Azāriqa, and are only awkwardly made to sit together in the *Maqālāt*. The *akhbār* comprising the second category is probably foreign to the heresiographical tradition as a whole. The passages under the first rubric (anti-secession polemic) are tied most directly to Ash'arī's *Vorlage* (probably Balkhī), but are certainly much older. They preserve material both of Sunnī and Ibādī provenance, and serve as the basis for many later accounts of the sect.

Ash'arī's third category is perhaps the most interesting. It is quite separate from the main body of the account behind the *Maqālāt*, and the nature of its data (legal, with a significant core of scripturalism) suggests a polemical strategy very different from that of the anti-secession material. Its original independence from the latter is underscored by the way similar (but distinct) legal issues dominate the accounts of pseudo-Nāshī' and Ibn Ḥazm, almost to the exclusion of anti-secession polemic. The legal material may well have had a life of its own, with the Bid'iyya and Baṭīhiyya sub-sects the creation of writers seeking to integrate this line of attack into their presentation of the Azāriqa. In short, the legal data surviving in Ash'arī might once have been part of a broader attempt

<sup>108</sup> The wording of the entire passage is in fact parallel. Qalhātī, fol. 197a.6: *wa-sabā ahl al-qibla wa-ghanima amwālahum* [for *amālahum*] *wa-sabā dharāriyahum*; Sālim, 172.6-7: *wa-'stahallū sabya qawmihim wa-'stinkāha nisā'ihim wa-khumusa amwālihim wa-qatla dharārīhim*. Cf. also Nawbakhtī, *Firaq al-Shī'a*, 64.7, where we have the phrase *ra'aw sabya 'l-nisā' wa-qatl al-aifāl*; just above this passage, we have *qatl ahl al-qibla wa-akhdh amwālihim*. Interestingly, Malaṭī (*Tanbīh*, 41.9-10) preserves what appears to be a mirror image of Qalhātī's wording, which suggests that the enslavement charge in Sālim and Qalhātī might have enjoyed more heresiographical circulation than is apparent from the extant material: they *do not* spill Muslim blood, take Muslim property as booty, or enslave Muslim children (*lā yarawna ihrāq dimā', al-muslimin wa-lā ghanma amwālihim wa-lā sabya qawmihim*).

<sup>109</sup> Unfortunately, the (unpublished?) *Risāla fī Bayān al-Firaq al-Ibādīyya al-Sitta wa-Ghairihā* by the early sixth-century Ibādī scholar Aḥbū 'Amr 'Uthmān b. Khalifa al-Ṣūfī is unavailable to me. The manuscript is cited by Schwartz (*Anfänge*, 311), and Ennami refers both to a manuscript and to a printed version of the text lacking place and date of publication (*Studies in Ibādism* [University of Libya, 1392], p. 186, note 189).

to discredit the sect with tales of divergent legal usages within the Azraqite camp. There seems little reason to doubt the sect's general scripturalist mentality, even if it is possible that some of the specific issues mentioned by the heresiographers are trumped up.

These internal legal issues are to be distinguished from polemic meant to highlight the legal status which the sect accords opponents. Here, the *Kāmil-Zīna* tradition (transmitted by at least some later writers) seems to preserve material not in general circulation among the earliest heresiographers. We hear in these texts of the specific implications of the group's cutting off all social intercourse with ordinary Muslims. These data must have been produced quite early (they are known to Sālim and to the later Ibādī tradition), but they make no appearance in Ash'arī or in the texts dependent on him. What Ash'arī does have from the pool behind *Kāmil-Zīna* is the obscure (and structurally intrusive) *hijra* statement. The passage in Ash'arī makes little sense on its own; its significance is apparent only when read alongside the accusations of lax behaviour preserved in these two sources (*Kāmil-Zīna*) and in the Ibādī tradition. Its own literary context is lost in Ash'arī, and without it a case could even be made (following Watt's original assumption) for the strictness rather than laxity of the sect.

It is thus possible to uncover several different polemical strategies within the standard *firaq* tradition, and within any one text participating in it. The tradition is far from an organic whole, but is instead a composite of distinct representations of the Azāriqa. Each of these representations presumably once possessed an internal coherence and unified polemical agenda. They were, however, broken to pieces before Ash'arī's time, and consequently appear only as fragments in the extant literature. The fragmentary nature of the material renders problematic any study which takes for granted the literary integrity of the extant presentations.