

01 Kasım 2019

attributed to him has recently been published by R. al-Sayyid (in: *Maj. Kull al-Ādāb Şan'ā'* 11/1990/105 ff.). Later, other 'Alid pretenders also occasionally bore the name (cf. Ibn 'Inaba, *Umdat al-ṭālib* 179, ll. 8 f., and the Yemeni inscription in: JA 273/1985/98). On the question in general now see Muh. Qasim Zaman in: *Hamdard Islamicus* 13/1990, No. 1/59 ff.

2.1.3.3.8.1 Rāfiẓīte Theology and Its Milieu. Stoic and Jewish Influences

The spreading interest in jurisprudence and theology is also probably a sign of embourgeoisement. Leadership of the community comes into firm hands; uncontrolled wild growth is trimmed back. To a great extent charismatic personalities lose ground. "Prophets" scarcely come forth any longer; the theologians are wary of still using this word in the old broad sense.¹ The miracles with which "the prophets" often gave themselves legitimacy are now denounced as magic and charlatanism.² The image of the Imam is transformed; since the time of Ja'far al-Şādiq, he is more a teacher than a charismatic leader. Charisma had been used up by the Abbasids; they had at first attracted adherents from the Kūfan Shī'a and now through their military power were able to hold the latter in check.

Along with the charismatics, women had apparently also forfeited their influence. Women appear in the environment of Mukhtār;³ later, gnostics like Mughīra b. Sa'īd or Abū Manşūr al-'Ijlī surrounded themselves with them. By contrast, women had no place among the jurists and theologians; the female ascetics who had lived within the circle of Mughīra and Abū Manşūr were primarily remembered as terrorists.⁴ The concept of extremism (*ghulūw*) was developed by this generation of theologians.

1 On this cf. Hodgson in: JAOS 75/1955/6. But Dirār b. 'Amr still wrote against the followers of Mughīra b. Sa'īd and Abū Manşūr al-'Ijlī who believed that the earth never could be without a prophet (Werkliste xv, no. 25).

2 Cf. the reports in Halm, *Gnosis* 59 (Bayān b. Sam'ān), 91 (Mughīra b. Sa'īd), 217 (Yūnus b. Zabyān), 237 f. (Muḥammad b. Bashīr; on him also below Chpt. C 1.4.1). Quite typically Qummī, *Maq.* 34, ll. 15 ff. This does not exclude that the Gnostics, via the Aramaic milieu that they perhaps actually came from, had contact with magic; recently in a study on Mughīra b. Sa'īd Wasserstrom very strongly – and rather uncritically – emphasized this aspect (*History of Religions* 25/1985/6 ff.).

3 Cf. W. Qāḍī in: *Akten VII. Kongreß UEAI Göttingen* 296.

4 They were sometimes linked with the so-called *khannāqūn*, "the stranglers" (cf. Jāhiz, *Bayān* 1, 365, l. 3 with Text XII 2, verses 31 f., and *Ḥayawān* vi, 389, ll. 2 ff. from bot.; also *Ḥayawān* II, 266, l. 7, and 268, ll. 3 f. On this van Vloten in: *Feestbundel Veth* 57 ff., where the passage from the *K. al-Ḥayawān* is translated; Pellat, *Milieu Basrien* 199 ff. and in: *Oriens* 16/1963/105 f.; Gimaret, *Livre* 519, fn. 83).

01 Kasım 2019

Bashshār b. Burd because of his earlier contacts with the Kāmiliyya.¹⁶ This last document is the most instructive with regard to our context. Here for the first time is found the assertion that the Kāmiliyya (whose name is not mentioned) both “disparaged Abū Bakr” as well as “dissociated themselves from ‘Alī”; there the gnostic idea is alluded to with the keyword “metempsychosis”, and there with the mention of Maylā’, the wet-nurse of Abū Manşūr al-‘Ijlī, the connection is directly made with the latter’s circle. Bashshār b. Burd, however, presumably had very little to do with all this; the only sure fact is that his father, a simple brickmaker, sympathized with the Kāmiliyya/Manşūriyya.¹⁷ This then probably also means that Abū Kāmil, the founder of the Kāmiliyya, lived during the first decades of the 2nd century. Jāhiz scarcely still had any interest in him; for him it is only a matter of Bashshār b. Burd in this passage. But since Jāhiz, as a Mu‘tazilite, was on the side of Şafwān, he further exaggerated the latter’s statement about the Kāmiliyya. He did this in a brief prose sentence which could easily be utilized; in this way he determined the later tradition.

2.1.3.3 The Rawāfiḍ

We do not know how the Kāmiliyya really stood *vis-à-vis* the first two caliphs, whether they in fact “declared them to be unbelievers”, as Jāhiz maintains, or simply “spoke disparagingly” about them, as is said in Şafwān al-Anşārī (and then only with regard to Abū Bakr).¹ But ultimately it was not so important. If they found no place within the Shi‘a, it was because they did not give any encouragement to the cult of ‘Alī. Founded on a “fundamentalist” basis as the latter was, it chiefly flourished after the catastrophe of 145/763. After this event the hour of the activists was over for a long time; there was not another ‘Alid revolt in Iraq for almost two generations. The cautious drifted off into the camp of the *aşhāb al-ḥadīth* or into the verbal extremism of the Rawāfiḍ; as much as both these groups differed in their views, nonetheless they strongly resembled one another in restricting themselves to unpolitical erudition. How greatly Rāfiḍite thought won in attractiveness for a normal Shi‘ite intellectual – who for the most part also had to think of his property and wished to be left in peace – follows paradigmatically from the generation gap which came about in Butrite families. In this respect, the most striking example is the son of Thābit b. Hurmuz,²

16 Text XII 2, there verses 23 ff.

17 See below Chpt. B 2.2.1.

1 Text XII 2, verse 28.

2 On him see above p. 28z.