Georg Leube

Insult the Caliph, Marry al-Ḥasan, and Redeem Your Kingdom: *Freiheitsgrade* of Kindī Elites During the 7th to 9th Century

Abstract: This contribution aims to bring a tribal and provincial perspective to the study of the early Islamic Empire. It begins with an exploration of the boundaries, functions and possible deployment of interpersonal networks formulated in the terminology of common tribal affiliation during that period, building on the author's prosopographical study of the Arabic tribe (*qabīla*) of Kinda during the first three generations of Islamic history. It then considers the perspective of tribally founded elites, demonstrating and addressing their mainly local areas of authority as compared to administrative structures founded on visions of centralized power. In its last part, this paper moves from a *longue durée* comparison of the trajectories of families of different Kinda-affiliated tribal notables towards an assessment of the sources of authority at the disposal of a tribally-based leader, especially one in conflict with the central powers. On these three levels, this paper aims to determine the amount of independence available to tribal elites negotiating multiple roles. These roles included those of loyal provincial administrators, equal peers of global rulers and rebels contesting the legitimacy of the early Islamic Empire's ruling elites on a potentially apocalyptic scale.

Keywords: Prosopography; Kinda; tribe (*qabīla*); regional sources of authority; early Islamic history

> Among the words of the Prophet of God [...] to the delegation of Kinda are the following: God gave me the kingdom of Kinda, the fortresses of Ḥimyar and the treasures of the Persian King and the Byzantines![1]

---

1 Al-Hamdānī, *al-Iklīl*, 1, 66. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from Arabic are by the author.

Introduction

Two caveats must be stated at the outset of this article. First, it builds on a comprehensive prosopography of the Arabic tribe of Kinda established by reading,[2] or at least perusing the tables of content and indices of,[3] a wide array of Arabic historiographical sources for the first three generations of Islamic history.[4] All were composed by authors who died before or around 350 H/962 CE. As a result, the suggestions put forth here are firmly grounded regarding the tribe of Kinda and the 1st century H/7th century CE, but become more tentative in character as the source materials are supplemented with episodes from later periods.

The second caveat concerns the very concept of tribes and tribal elites. It has fallen into disrepute over the last decades because of colonialist and culturist usage. In this article, the term 'tribe' is used exclusively to designate the interpersonal network described as a *qabīla* in Arabic, connecting persons whose affiliation to this network is designated by means of a *nisba* or marker of tribal affiliation, as part of an individual's names. This includes al-Kindī as well as the *nisba* of subtribes such as al-Sakūnī, al-Saksakī and al-Tujībī. The individuals so connected were in the course of the early Islamic conquests spread out over the whole Islamic *oecumene* and seem to include all the trades and lifestyles early Muslims engaged in. In this context, 'tribe' does not indicate homogenous lifestyles or pejorative connotations. The word is used as a mechanical selecting device, enabling the establishment of a broad prosopography spanning a wide array of historical contexts, iconic episodes and historiographical sources pertaining to the early Islamic world.

---

2 Al-Azdī: *Futūḥ al-Shām*; al-Balādhurī: *Ansāb al-ashrāf*; *Futūḥ al-buldān*; Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam: *Futūḥ Miṣr wa-l-Maghrib*; Ibn Aʿtham: *Kitāb al-Futūḥ*; Ibn Hishām: *Al-Sīra al-nabawiyya*; al-Iṣfahānī: *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn*; Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ: *Taʾrīkh*; al-Kindī the Elder: *Kitāb al-Wulāt wa-l-quḍāt*; al-Kindī the Younger: *Faḍāʾil Miṣr*; Naṣr b. Muzāḥim: *Waqʿat Ṣiffīn*; al-Ṭabarī: *Taʾrīkh*; al-Wāqidī: *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*; *Kitāb al-Ridda*; al-Yaʿqūbī: *Taʾrīkh*.

3 Abū Mikhnaf: *Akhbār al-Mukhtār; Maqtal al-imām al-Ḥusayn*; Abū Yūsuf: *Kitāb al-Kharāj*; Agapius of Manbij / Maḥbūb al-Manbijī: *Kitāb al-ʿUnwān*; al-Azraqī: *Akhbār Makka*; al-Dīnawarī: *Akhbār al-ṭiwāl*; Eutychius of Alexandria / Saʿīd b. al-Biṭrīq: *Naẓm al-jawhar*; al-Hamdānī: *Kitāb al-Iklīl*; *Ṣifat Jazīrat al-ʿArab*; Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī: *Kitāb Taʾrīkh sinī mulūk al-arḍ wa-l-anbiyāʾ*; Ibn Ḥabīb: *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*; Ibn Hishām: *Kitāb al-Tījān*; Ibn Saʿd: *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt*; al-Iṣfahānī: *Kitāb al-Aghānī*; al-Jahshiyārī: *Kitāb al-Wuzarāʾ wa-l-kuttāb*; Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ: *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt*; al-Maqdisī: *Kitāb al-Badʾ wa-l-taʾrīkh*; al-Masʿūdī: *Akhbār al-zamān; Murūj al-dhahab*; *Al-Tanbīh wa-l-ishrāf*; Sayf b. ʿUmar: *Kitāb al-Ridda wa-l-futūḥ wa-kitāb al-jamal wa-masīr ʿĀʾisha wa-ʿAlī*; al-Wāqidī: *Futūḥ Bahnasā; Futūḥ al-Shām*.

4 See Leube 2017.

Boundaries and Functions of Tribally Formulated Networks

In the course of spirited polemical discussion sparked by Donner's employment of the ethnological fieldwork of Emrys Peters and others, with its concept of the "segmentary lineage" supposedly underlying tribal structures in early Islamic history,[5] Lecker takes a skeptical stance regarding the utility of modern fieldwork in reconstructing early Islamic conditions.

> [...] it is possible that a camel can now carry the same load it could carry fourteen centuries ago. But as regards the economic, social, and political aspects of life in ancient Arabia, we have to rely, for the time being, on the evidence of the primary sources.[6]

Before embarking on a discussion of the possible modes in which early Islamic Arab tribal networks could be employed by central and tribal elites, it is therefore a good idea to outline the structure and fixity of tribal affiliation as evinced in the prosopography of Kinda.

Over the first three generations of Islamic history, affiliation to Kinda is often expressed via a tribal *nisba*. The main instances in which individual affiliations to Kinda (as opposed to another tribe) are ambiguous are those of the Egyptian killers of the third caliph ʿUthmān and the fourth caliph ʿAlī. A contested Kindī affiliation is given for Sūdān b. Ḥumrān,[7] Kināna b. Bishr[8] and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān

---

5 Donner 1981, *passim* and especially chapter 1, 11–49.

6 Lecker 1989, xii.

7 Sūdān b. Ḥumrān is designated as al-Sakūnī and therefore belonging to the Kindī subtribe of al-Sakūn by Sayf b. ʿUmar, *Ridda*, 158, and al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 248 and 745, and in the form of Saʿd b. Ḥumrān al-Tujībī as belonging to the subtribe of al-Tujīb by al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, 2, 380. He is affiliated to the Madhḥijī subtribe of Murād by al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 4, 175, 184, 193 and 205; Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 2, 203, 236, 238 and 246; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt* 3, 47–48 and 54, and by al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 761 and 775. An affiliation to the Ḥimyarī subtribe of the Banū dhū Aṣbaḥ is given by al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 17, where his name appears in the form of Sūdān b. Rūmān al-Aṣbaḥī, and also in al-Maqrīzīs Khiṭaṭ according to footnote 5 of al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 17, where he seems to be called Sūdān b. Rayyān al-Aṣbaḥī. I have not been able to check this in the original. In al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 248, a maximum of seven leaders of the rebellion against ʿUthmān are announced, while eight names are given. One of these eight names is a certain Sawād b. Rūmān al-Aṣbaḥī who is not mentioned anywhere else. This *hapax legomenon* may be explained as a duplicate of Sūdān b. Ḥumrān, who would accordingly have been affiliated to Ḥimyar in this narrative as well. A further Aṣbaḥī is in this context mentioned by al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 775, as Nahrān al-Aṣbaḥī. He is also not mentioned elsewhere and can probably be explained as a duplicate of Sūdān b. Ḥumrān.

8 Kināna b. Bishr is identified as al-Kindī by al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 4, 205. He is affiliated to the Kindī subtribe of al-Sakūn by al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1, 49; 2, 219–220, and 4, 173. His affiliation to the Kindī subtribe of al-Tujīb is mentioned by al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1, 49; 2, 220; 4, 173–174, 177,

b. ʿUdays,[9] who were implicated in the murder of the caliph ʿUthmān. It is also given for the killer of ʿAlī commonly known as Ibn Muljam.[10]

As the deaths of these two rulers form iconic and contested moments in the Islamic cultural memory of the first Islamic civil war, it is not altogether surprising to find the affiliation of the assassins contested as well. Statistically, the proposed affiliations are summarized in Table 1, counting multiple affiliations via *nasab*, *ḥilf* and *ʿidād* in the case of Ibn Muljam as separate complete affiliations complete in themselves.

Table 1: Quantitative Distribution of Tribal Affiliations Alternating with Kinda

Name	Kinda	Ḥimyar	Madhḥij	Balī	al-Layth
Sūdān b. Ḥumrān	4 (18,2%)	4 (18,2%)	14 (63,6%)		
Kināna b. Bishr	19 (90,5%)		1 (4,8%)		1 (4,8%)
ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿUdays	1 (6,7%)			14 (93,3%)	
Ibn Muljam	6 (26,1%)	4 (17,4%)	13 (56,5%)		

While the variance in the tribal affiliations of these presumably well-known villains is certainly considerable, all remain within the sphere of Southern Arabic tribes settling in Egypt after the early Islamic conquests. Otherwise, a Kindī af-

193 and 205; Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 2, 203, 211, and 213; al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 17; al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 745 and 775; and 3, 152. Differing affiliations are given for a Madhḥijī subtribe as al-Nakhaʿī by Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 2, 236, and to al-Layth by Sayf b. ʿUmar, *Ridda*, 158.

9 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿUdays is only affiliated to Kinda via the subtribe of al-Tujīb by al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 758, while being affiliated to Balī by al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 4, 174–175 and 205; Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ*, 133–134 and 337–338; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 3, 47; al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 17; al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, 2, 380; Sayf b. ʿUmar, *Ridda*, 158; al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 745, 751, 761, 766–767 and 787, and al-Yaʿqūbī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 122.

10 Ibn Muljam is called al-Murādī according to al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2, 265; al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, 197; Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 2, 255; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 3, 24; al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 193, and al-Yaʿqūbī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 147.

In terms of multiple affiliations by *nasab*, *ḥilf* and *ʿidād*, the following versions are suggested: *min ḥimyar*, while an ancestor fled to Murād according to al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2, 259. *Al-ḥimyarī wa-ʿidāduhū fī murād wa-huwa ḥalīf banī jabala min kinda* according to al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2, 260. *Al-murādī wa-huwa min ḥimyar wa-ʿidāduhū fī murād wa-huwa ḥalīf banī jabala min kinda* according to Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 3, 25. *Min murād, ʿidāduhū fī kinda* by al-Iṣfahānī, *Maqātil*, 32, and al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 176. *Min tujīb, ʿidāduhum fī murād* by al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, 2, 457. *Al-yaḥṣubī* [subtribe of Ḥimyar: Caskel/Strenziok 1966, 2, 589] *wa-ʿidāduhū fī murād* according to al-Masʿūdī, *Tanbīh*, 296. Finally, he is introduced as a *ḥalīf* of the Kindī subtribe of al-Sakūn by al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 448.

filiation is only contested in a handful of dispersed instances during the first three generations of Islamic history.[11] Considering there are about 3,000 entries for Kinda as a tribe and individuals affiliated to Kinda in the author's prosopography of this period, this handful of cases where affiliation is actually contested or conflicted points to an impressive stability of tribal affiliation. Even in the context of supra-tribal contingents of troops mobilized from two or more tribes typically living in the same vicinity, Kindīs continue to be identified as affiliated to Kinda in their *nisba*s, rathern than to a supra-tribal entity combining Kinda and its various partner-tribes in war.

As one nears the timeframe of the composition of the great collections of early Islamic historiography, one would expect the percentage of disputed affiliations to further decrease in proportion to the decreasing formability of events in the course of shorter periods of narrative transmission and embellishment. By contrast, what does shift during the timeframe of the first three generations of Islamic history is the particular level seen as relevant for tribal or subtribal affiliation and reference in the given *nisba*. In the case of Kinda, the most notable instance of this phenomenon is the subtribe of al-Tujīb. This group mainly settled in early Islamic Egypt. In the works of Egyptian historians such as Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, their *nisba* is given as al-Tujībī, replacing the al-Kindī of more global Islamic authors such as al-Ṭabarī. This trend of an increasingly independent Kindī subtribe in Egypt and the Islamic West giving al-Tujīb as its tribal affiliation seems to have increased during subsequent periods, as indicated by the dynasty known as the Banū Tujīb which came to prominence during the later period of Umayyad dominion over Islamic Spain in Catalayud and Zaragoza.

What are the functions pertaining to common tribal affiliation in the context of Kinda as mentioned in the sources? It has already been argued that the supra-tribal confederation of al-Yamaniyya, based on supposedly common South Ara-

---

11 Mālik b. Hubayra is usually affiliated to the Kindī subtribe of al-Sakūn, but described as al-Fazārī by Khalīfa, *Taʾrīkh*, 127–128 and 143. His *nisba* of al-Yashkurī in al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, 3, 104, is possibly a simple scribal error. Abū l-ʿAmarraṭa ʿUmayr b. Yazīd, a companion of the Kindī ʿAlīd martyr Ḥujr b. ʿAdī, is usually described as al-Kindī (e.g. al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3, 427–428 and 441; and al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 242–244), but affiliated to the tribe of Kalb as al-Kalbī by al-Iṣfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17, 141. Al-Ḍaḥḥāk b. Qays is in a single instance described as al-Kindī by al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3, 447, while elsewhere he is consistently called al-Fihrī. Zufar b. al-Ḥārith is unanimously affiliated to the Banū Kilāb, but his supposed Kindī descent is mocked in verses reported by al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 4, 382. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 7, 298, confesses that he is not quite sure whether the Syrian transmitter of *ḥadīth*, Salama b. Nufayl, was affiliated to Kinda or to Ḥaḍramawt. The possible Kindī descent of some of the pre-Islamic ancestors of a group of clients of Quraysh in Mecca predates the timeframe of this paper and is therefore excluded from the present discussion.

bic ancestry and usually including Kinda, was not as stable as later theories would have us believe.[12] Additionally, this supra-tribal body does not seem to have had a noticeable impact on events, as opposed to its near omnipresence in rhetorical arguments reported by some historiographical sources.[13] Other examples of supra-tribal cooperation between Kinda and other tribes are mainly reported in the context of the mobilization of troops from Kufa during the first three generations of Islamic history. These also appear unstable, as evinced by the bewildering array of quarters, fifths and sixths enumerated in the sources, which are frequently contradicted by the actual composition of Kufan troops. I will accordingly now focus on the functions attached to common affiliation to Kinda, rather than to some supra-tribal entity encompassing Kinda as well as other tribes.

In his discussion of the role of Arab tribes in Egypt during the first three centuries of Islamic history, al-Barrī describes the following fields in which tribal affiliation served as the main category of administration: the army,[14] the organization of the city quarters of al-Fusṭāṭ,[15] the tribal list of the military administration or *dīwān*,[16] the organization of the spring pastures (*murtabaʿ*),[17] the mosques[18] and councils (*majālis*)[19] of the tribes, the designation of a member of the tribe responsible to the governor (*ʿarīf*)[20] and the appointment of a guardian inside the tribal quarter.[21] It is quite clear that these administrative functions were part of interpersonal networks formulated in the terminology of common genealogical descent. They were also interdependent. Tribal contingents of the army drew their pay as a group, were settled in common quarters and were mobilized together. While the historical relevance of these networks during the period of Muḥammad's early successors is not as clear as their narrative importance in the context of later Islamic cultural memory suggests, such tribal neighborhood-networks are palpable from the time of the emerging Umayyads and even seem to have outlasted the ascent of other networks that took away some of their administrative importance.

---

12 Caskel/Strenziok 1966, I, 33.
13 Orthmann 2002, 287–292.
14 Al-Barrī 1992, 282.
15 Al-Barrī 1992, 283.
16 Al-Barrī 1992, 283–285.
17 Al-Barrī 1992, 285–286, based mainly on Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam.
18 Al-Barrī 1992, 286.
19 Al-Barrī 1992, 286–287.
20 Al-Barrī 1992, 287–288.
21 Al-Barrī 1992, 288.

Sketching the impact of common tribal affiliation in interactions beyond this level of tribally organized neighborhood committees is not an easy task. Drawing once again on the prosopography of Kinda, I will therefore discuss the circumstances of trans-regional cooperation between individuals affiliated to Kinda as reported in the sources. The first type of cooperation between Kindīs from different regions that is presented as based on common tribal affiliation is the intercession of Kindīs for members of their own tribe. Instances of such intercessions along Kindī tribal networks include the restitution of property[22] and the pardon of a captive[23] after the Battle of the Ḥarra. The latter case is especially interesting since it is explicitly stated by al-Masʿūdī that the captive ʿAlī b. ʿAbdallāh b. al-ʿAbbās, the ancestor of the future ʿAbbāsid Caliphs, was pardoned thanks to the intercession of his maternal uncles of the tribe of Kinda (*akhwāluhū min Kinda*)[24] and not due to the pleas of his Qurashī relatives. Probably the clearest instance of such an intercession based solely on common tribal affiliation is reported in the following story:

> ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAzīz al-Kindī rebelled [against the Umayyad governor in Iraq] and took his little son Muḥammad with him… [When it became clear that the battle had been lost] he called out: You people of Syria, is there anyone of Kinda among you? A number of men went forward and answered: Yes, that's us. He asked them: Take this your brother and send him to your people in Kufa (*ilā qawmikum bi-l-kūfa*), for I am ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAzīz al-Kindī! [After rejecting an offer to be personally spared, he fights alongside his comrades until he dies.][25]

ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAzīz is obviously otherwise unrelated to his Syrian fellow Kindīs and asks men who are strangers to him personally to return his son safely to Kufa. This represents a clear instance of the employment of common tribal affiliation for trans-regional cooperation and cannot be explained by any other connections between the personages involved.

An example of another way in which common tribal affiliations were acted upon by Kindīs from different regions concerns the shelter given to the Egyptian Ibn Muljam (as shown above, widely held to be affiliated to Kinda) by the leader of Kinda in Kufa, al-Ashʿath b. Qays.[26] However, as al-Ashʿath and Ibn Muljam

---

22 Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, 244.

23 Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 4, 10; Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 5, 299; al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, 3, 86, and al-Masʿūdī, *Tanbīh*, 264.

24 Al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, 3, 86.

25 Al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 459.

26 Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2, 262; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 3, 26; al-Iṣfahānī, *Maqātil*, 33; al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, 2, 458–459, and al-Yaʿqūbī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 147–148.

are among the most popular 'villains' of the first civil war, this sheltering of a fellow tribesman abroad may also be explained from a narrative perspective as a 'logical addition' ordering the otherwise quite complicated relationships between early Islamic 'villains' of the first civil war. As other trans-regional instances of interactions between Kindīs based on common tribal affiliation do not survive, this mode of trans-regional cooperation along tribal networks seems to have been secondary in importance to the major role played by tribally formulated networks in the organization of local society, especially in garrison towns.

In conclusion, the tribal network of Kinda is surprisingly unambiguous in its definition of Kindīness. The few cases where affiliation to Kinda is contested belong to early episodes of civil strife and may possibly be explained as the result of a narrative shifting of blame over the course of transmission. The Kindīness so defined serves mainly to facilitate mutually interdependent purposes of regional administration and mobilization.

In contrast, instances of trans-regional utilization of tribal ties are few. Accordingly, the confrontation of the Kindīs of al-Shām and the Kindīs of Iraq during the decisive phase of the Battle of Ṣiffīn can be seen less as an acute schism in a closely-spun, interregional Kindī network relevant to the daily life of all of its members, but rather as a traumatic manifestation of the regionalization of Arab tribal networks some twenty years after the early Islamic conquests.[27]

Foundations of Authority of Tribally Based Regional Elites

I will now examine the perspective of the families of Kindī elites and investigate the origins of their authority. Following the research of Paul[28] and Franz[29], I propose to conceptualize locally based elites as negotiators between central authorities and local groups. Drawing once again on examples from the tribe of Kinda but transcending the narrower focus of the first three generations of Islamic history contained in the systematic prosopography of Kinda, I will attempt to show how claims to authority were maintained by the families of tribally based provincial elites over several early Islamic generations.

The first case study of the foundation of the authority of provincial elites and their integration in tribal networks is situated in early Islamic Egypt. Here, the two most eminent Kindī families during the time of the Marwānid caliphs

---

27 Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 3, 141, and Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, *Ṣiffīn*, 227.

28 Paul 1996, *passim*.

29 Franz 2007, *passim*.

both claimed descent from heroes of the early Islamic conquests, namely Shuraḥbīl b. Ḥasana and Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj. Interestingly, these two founding figures of the families of Kindī aristocrats in Egypt came from diametrically opposed backgrounds. Shuraḥbīl grew up in Mecca as the son of a Kindī client of Quraysh and appears to have been a close companion of Muḥammad, as shown by his early. During the conquest of southern al-Shām he is depicted as leading troops from tribes other than Kinda or, for that matter, Quraysh. Accordingly, his authority must have been based not on tribal backing but almost solely on his ties to Muḥammad and his successors, the embodiment of central Islamic authority. Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj, on the other hand, does not appear in the vicinity of Muḥammad or his immediate successors and apparently owed his authority solely to the backing of the Kindī troops he commanded during the early Islamic conquests.

In the aftermath of the conquests, both Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj and the descendants of Shuraḥbīl b. Ḥasana appear to have settled in Egypt. Several sons of Shuraḥbīl are portrayed as owners of houses in al-Fusṭāṭ and leading figures among Egyptian *ashrāf*.[30] A house of Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj, also in al-Fusṭāṭ, is mentioned by the historian al-Kindī as pulled down by political opponents during the first civil war.[31]

Outside the context of their settlement in al-Fusṭāṭ, the sons of Shuraḥbīl remained relatively obscure.[32] Muʿāwiya, on the other hand, took an active role in leading the Egyptian opposition to the returning killers of the third caliph ʿUthmān during the first civil war.[33] After moving out (*kharaja*) from the Egyptian garrison town of al-Fusṭāṭ and calling for vengeance for the slain caliph, he and his followers are described as 'al-Khawārij'. This is the first chronological instance of this designation in the source material evaluated for the prosopography of Kinda.[34] Subsequently Muʿāwiya played a crucial role in the Sufyānid conquest of Egypt.[35] Some years after the Sufyānid conquest of Egypt, he is reported to have been appointed as its governor on the authority of al-Wāqidī and al-

---

30 Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ*, 135–136, 138.

31 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 27.

32 Only Rabīʿa b. Shuraḥbīl is mentioned in an *isnād* as reporting to his son Jaʿfar that his own father Shuraḥbīl b. Ḥasana had bequeathed half his possessions to the caliph ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. See Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ*, 175.

33 E. g. al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 18.

34 Al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 145. Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 27 and 29, and al-Yaʿqūbī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 134, call the supporters of Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj *al-khārija*.

35 Al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 145. His deposition is reported by al-Ṭabarī *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 230.

Madāʾinī,[36] however, this appointment is not confirmed in the accounts of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam or al-Kindī who focus on Egypt and Egyptian affairs. He is also held to have led several *ghazawāt* to Ifrīqiya and the Maghrib and is thereby included in the lists of conquerors of North Africa.[37] A client (*mawlā*) of his (or rather the descendant of a client of Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj) was deposed as governor of Tilimsān around 143 H/760–761 CE.[38]

Despite the contrasting background of their founding fathers, the trajectories of the families of Muʿāwiya and Shuraḥbīl converged in the time of their sons and grandsons during the Marwānid restoration. In 86 H/705–706 CE, after the long-time Marwānid governor of Egypt ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Marwān appointed him *ṣāḥib al-shuraṭ* [39] and then *qāḍī*,[40] ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj was deposed and succeeded by ʿImrān b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Shuraḥbīl, who was also appointed *qāḍī* by the new governor.[41] He was in turn deposed in 89 H/707–708 CE and succeeded as *qāḍī* of Egypt by the son of his predecessor, ʿAbd al-Wāḥid b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muʿāwiya.[42] The responsibilities of these provincial notables appointed by centrally legitimized governors appear to have included deputy control of the *shuraṭ* when the governor was absent from al-Fusṭāṭ[43] and the supervision of the tribal *ʿurafāʾ* caring for the affairs of orphans.[44]

The intermediary position of such Kindī notables, constantly negotiating between local support and external governors, becomes evident when a new governor sent to Egypt wished to appoint followers of his own to positions of authority.

When [the new governor] ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbd al-Malik came to Egypt, he wished to replace the agents (*ʿummāl*) of [his predecessor] ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. Accordingly, he wanted to depose

---

36 Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 8, 143–144, and al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 224.

37 Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ*, 351, and Khalīfa, *Taʾrīkh*, 126–127 and 295–296.

38 Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ*, 246.

39 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 53.

40 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 324. See also Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ*, 264. For a general discussion of later *qāḍī*s in Egypt, see the work of Mathieu Tillier, most notably Tillier 2011. For the general context of *qāḍī*s under the Umayyads see most recently Judd 2015.

41 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 58.

42 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 60.

43 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 64. This is probably the *khilāfat al-Fusṭāṭ* mentioned in the biography of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muʿāwiya; al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 324. Another instance of deputyship is mentioned by Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ*, 264, according to whom ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muʿāwiya informed the governor daily about "the dead and other things" when the latter took refuge from a plague raging in al-Fusṭāṭ.

44 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 326.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muʿāwiya from his positions as *qāḍī* and *ṣāḥib al-shuraṭ*. As he was unable to find anybody to field a complaint against him, however, he appointed him general of the frontier guards of al-Iskandariyya, raised his salary and sent him away.[45]

While it is explicitly stated in another version of this story that the new governor wanted to "replace agents with agents and companions with companions",[46] even the son of the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik was unable to depose ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muʿāwiya without a pretext and accordingly instead promoted him out of his office. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān's son ʿAbd al-Wāḥid was in turn dismissed when Qurra b. Sharīk came to Egypt as the new governor.[47]

While the family of Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj was not in any position to claim superiority over the Marwānid central administration, the descendants of Shuraḥbīl b. Ḥasana were arguably able to advance claims of preeminence based on the prestige of their ancestor as one of Muḥammad's closest companions. In this context, ʿImrān b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Shuraḥbīl apparently overestimated the strength of his position in dealing with the newly arrived Marwānid governor:

> [There is widespread unrest in Egypt during the administration of ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbd al-Malik.] ʿAbdallāh was told that ʿImrān [b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Shuraḥbīl] had helped [a fugitive poet who had derided the governor] and had also taunted him himself with the following verses:
>
> I, the son of my father of Badr, the *hijra* to Yathrib
>   and the *hijra* to the Negus, am most splendid.
> I am exalted due to my largesse, have you forgotten the merit
>   of my fathers? While this one is called the offspring of Marwān.
>
> When this was reported to ʿAbdallāh, he deposed him from his rank as *qāḍī* and *ṣāḥib al-shuraṭ*.[48]

A lampoon such as this would have been unthinkable from descendants of Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj. The claim to preeminence ʿImrān voiced is voided by the governor, who according to another rendering of the story even has ʿImrān jailed.[49] However, the conflict between ʿImrān and the governor is in another account motivated by the judge's intent to punish a secretary of ʿAbdallāh for drunkenness.[50] One is thus led to doubt the factual relevance of ʿImrān's claim to preemi-

---

45 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 326. See also Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ*, 266.
46 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 58.
47 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 330.
48 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 327–328.
49 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 60. See also Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ*, 266.
50 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 328.

nence in a story that could be told without reference to poetry. In this case, the verses could be explained as rhetorical embellishments, which were taken up by traditionalists happy to see a Marwānid governor of Egypt lampooned by a pious *qāḍī*.

It is tempting to speculate on ʿAbdallāh's reason for appointing the son of the predecessor of ʿImrān, ʿAbd al-Wāḥid b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, to be ʿImrān's successor as *qāḍī* in the light of ʿAbd al-Wāḥid's patent unfitness for office. He is described as a youngster (*ghulām ḥadath*)[51] of 25 years[52] and "not a *faqīh*"[53] by al-Kindī. As the personal characteristics of the young man are clearly considered negligible, his appointment may have been motivated by a desire to use ʿAbd al-Wāḥid to mobilize the support of his tribal and other networks in al-Fusṭāṭ, not least the support of his father, the former *qāḍī* and *ṣāḥib al-shuraṭ*.

In searching for foundations of transgenerational local authority among the leading provincial families of Kinda, it is tempting to turn to the houses ascribed to the descendants of Shuraḥbīl b. Ḥasana and Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj. These apparently still formed familiar landmarks in the urban topography of al-Fusṭāṭ during the time of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam. The account of the tearing down of Muʿāwiya's house in the course of his involvement in the first civil war is paralleled inside the prosopography of Kinda by accounts of how al-Mukhtār caused the house of Muḥammad b. al-Ashʿath, the leader of Kinda in Kufa, to be pulled down after his attempt to take Muḥammad b. al-Ashʿath captive had failed. In the course of this conflict between the locally based leader of Kinda and the newly arrived ʿAlīd agitator, the holdings of Muḥammad b. al-Ashʿath are described as follows:

> Muḥammad b. al-Ashʿath b. Qays was in the village of al-Ashʿath near al-Qādisiyya. Al-Mukhtār sent Ḥawshab, the guardian of the *kursī*, with a hundred men against him, saying: Fly towards him, for you will find him playing and hunting, or standing confounded, mindless with fear or lying in ambush![54] But if you catch him, bring me his head. [Ḥawshab] accordingly went out to his *qaṣr* and sieged it, but Muḥammad b. al-Ashʿath escaped and went to Muṣʿab [b. al-Zubayr]. So they sieged the *qaṣr*, thinking he was still inside, until they entered, saw that he had escaped and returned to al-Mukhtār. He [al-Mukhtār] sent word for [al-Ashʿath's] house to be pulled down and for the house of [the former Kindī Kufan leader of an abortive ʿAlīd revolt] Ḥujr b. ʿAdī al-Kindī to be rebuilt with the bricks and stones of his house.[55]

---

51 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 328.

52 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 330.

53 Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 328.

54 This part of al-Mukhtār's speech is composed in the *sajʿ* or rhymed prose characteristic of al-Mukhtār's near-prophetical rank in the historiographical accounts.

55 Al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 510.

The settlement of Kufa is described as consisting of tribal quarters, with the quarter of Kinda surrounding the house of Muḥammad's father al-Ashʿath b. Qays as the most eminent leader of Kinda in Iraq during the early Islamic conquests. It is tempting to see the houses of the leading families in the early Islamic garrison towns as representing the tribally grounded urban capital at the disposal of the leading families of Kinda. Accordingly, the rebuilding of the house of Ḥujr b. ʿAdī, another Kindī aspiring to tribal leadership in early Islamic Kufa who was eventually decapitated near Damascus following an abortive revolt, takes on a strong symbolic significance as the vindication of Ḥujr's family of "good Kindīs" in the re-founded Kufa after al-Mukhtār's revolt.[56]

Another material element of the prestige of the family of al-Ashʿath b. Qays in Kufa that was transmitted over several generations is mentioned in the above report as "the village of al-Ashʿath b. Qays." This village, otherwise called Ṭīzanābād, is said to have been given to al-Ashʿath as an iqṭāʿ[57] or sold to him in exchange for some possessions of al-Ashʿath in Ḥaḍramawt by the third caliph ʿUthmān.[58] It appears to have remained in al-Ashʿath's family at least until the time of his son Muḥammad, as evinced in the above account, and was a favorite drinking venue among Kufans:

> I never went past the vineyards of Ṭīzanābād
> Without wondering who would want to drink water![59]

Another garden, called Shumārā and lying in the vicinity of al-Ḥīra, seems to have remained in the possession of descendants of al-Ashʿath (baʿḍ al-ashāʿitha) at least until the time of al-Rashīd.[60] It is tempting to speculate that similar estates on a smaller scale underpinned the authority of Kinda's leading families in other regions as well.

Regarding the troubled history of the descendants of al-Ashʿath b. Qays during the time of the unsuccessful revolt of his grandson ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ashʿath (usually known as Ibn al-Ashʿath), it is at first glance slightly surprising to find baʿḍ al-Ashāʿitha in continued possession of valuable estates even after the suppression of the revolt. It may be possible to explain this continued possession by re-interpreting the chronic infighting among the rela-

---

56 Relatives of Ḥujr b. ʿAdī appear as supporters of al-Mukhtār in al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 4, 353, and al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 506.

57 Al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ*, 317–318.

58 Al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 704.

59 Al-Iṣfahānī, *Aghānī*, 25, 147.

60 Al-Iṣfahānī, *Aghānī*, 5, 189–190.

tives of Ibn al-Ashʿath during his revolt. From the long-term perspective of regional leading families who wished to preserve their status, it would have been a wise decision not to back any provincial revolt unambiguously (not even the revolt of one of their own), but rather to hedge by maintaining their involvement with both sides.

As the regional families perpetuated their prestige by means of the establishment of landed estates, their backing in tribal networks became less tangible. While reports of al-Ashʿath conquering Ādharbayjān are underpinned by the settlement of Kindīs at Sarā in Ādharbayjān until the time of al-Balādhurī,[61] and al-Ashʿath himself settled amongst his network of supporters from Kinda and other backgrounds in Kufa, there is no indication of Kinda being particularly involved in the revolt of al-Ashʿath's grandson against the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik. It is therefore crucial to distinguish between the generation of the early Islamic conquests, when Kindī contingents were mobilized along tribal networks led by Kindī leaders, and the time of the second civil war, when the leading families of the tribes in Kufa to all appearances cooperated with Muṣʿab b. al-Zubayr against al-Mukhtār as a collective body. I hesitate to discount the relevance of the formulation of networks of support in a tribal terminology even in this context. Care must be taken not to rigidly conceptualize local aristocrats active after the generation of the conquests as tribally founded. One should rather start by examining the different fields of authority available to local elites at the time and then aim to ascertain the relative relevance of tribal and other support during the event in question.

From the perspective of the various families among Kinda aspiring to local eminence, it appears that notwithstanding the diverse backgrounds of their respective founders, a fairly homogenous provincial aristocracy had emerged by the time of the Marwānid restoration. Based on support from local Kindī networks and other provincial supporters, such families of *ashrāf* appear to have owned important houses in the early Islamic garrison towns, and in some instances also landed estates. They transmitted these over several generations. While members of these families were forthcoming as judges or administrators for the centrally appointed provincial governors, they were in general unable to successfully challenge a governor designated by the global Islamic authorities once he had taken charge of his designated province.[62]

---

61 Al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ*, 376.

62 Even in the pre-Marwānid anecdote where Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj succesfully rejects a governor of Egypt, he is depicted as meeting the caliph's candidate two journeys from Egypt and returning together with him to the caliph Muʿāwiya. See al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 274–275.

Sources of Authority at the Disposal of Kindī Elites in Conflict with Central Authority

During the early Islamic conquests, Kindī leaders were frequently depicted as equals of the Islamic elite of Medina. This holds especially true for al-Ashʿath and his family. While a marriage planned between his sister and Muḥammad seemingly did not take place,[63] al-Ashʿath himself married a sister of Abū Bakr.[64] He later married daughters of his to sons of the caliphs ʿUthmān and ʿAlī.[65] The daughter of al-Ashʿath married to al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī is said to have poisoned her husband, according to Ibn Aʿtham on the instigation of the arch-villain Marwān.[66] However, this intermarriage of the family of al-Ashʿath with the highest echelons of early Islamic elites ceased during the next generation. The strategically most advantageous marriage his son Muḥammad b. al-Ashʿath could realize was that of a daughter to the longtime Umayyad governor of Iraq ʿUbaydallāh b. Ziyād.[67]

This shift in marriage patterns after the generation of the conquests corresponds to a general descent of Kindī elites from global Islamic power to mere provincial relevance in a number of other fields. On the level of court ceremony, al-Ashʿath is portrayed as boasting of his eminence even as he is led captive in front of the caliph Abū Bakr after the *ridda* of Kinda.[68] During the time of Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān, the caliph is shown as treating the Kindī leaders Shuraḥbīl b. al-Simṭ and Muʿāwiya b. Ḥudayj rather humbly when they visit his court in Damascus.[69] The latter is even reported to have beaten Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān when the caliph considered cancelling military stipends.[70]

In contrast, such claims to acceptance as peers by the central Islamic authorities were routinely brushed off in the next generation. Muḥammad b. al-Ashʿath was severely scolded and sent away when he attempted to seat himself next to the caliph Muʿāwiya on his *sarīr* during an audience conducted between Muʿāwiya and al-Aḥnaf.[71] In other accounts, he was ordered around by the pro-

---

63 Ibn Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, 95, and al-Ṭabarī *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 256.
64 Al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ*, 138 and 140; Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 1, 86 – 87, corresponding to al-Wāqidī, *Ridda*, 319 – 320; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 6, 99; al-Maqdisī, *Kitāb al-Badʾ*, 5, 156; al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 357 – 357, and al-Yaʿqūbī, *Taʾrīkh*, 2, 90.
65 Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, *Ṣiffīn*, 20, and Caskel/Strenziok 1966, II, 286 and 466.
66 Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 4, 206 – 207.
67 Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 4, 47.
68 See Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 1, 84, corresponding to al-Wāqidī, *Ridda*, 314.
69 See Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, *Ṣiffīn*, 46 – 47.
70 Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ*, 126 – 127.
71 Al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 287.

vincial governor of Iraq.[72] We have already seen how ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muʿā-wiya owed his honorable discharge merely to his positions as *qāḍī* and *ṣāḥib al-shuraṭ* in al-Fusṭāṭ. Such a marginalization of Kindī elites, who appear to have been reduced to a merely provincial relevance by the generation after the conquests, is also apparent in the personal mobility of Kindī elites based on pro-vincial tribal networks; they rarely if ever left their provinces.

In contrast to this decline in importance of the landed aristocrats founded by Kindī leaders of tribal troops during the conquests, a new type of Kindī leaders emerges in this period, commanding troops composed of different tribes based on their appointment by central Umayyad authorities. This type continued to act on a global Islamic scale in the early Islamic realms and includes figures such as Mālik b. Hubayra, described as a frequent leader of expeditions *fī arḍ al-Rūm* and a notable at the court of the Sufyānid caliphs, and Ḥuṣayn b. Nu-mayr, who played a crucial role in the period of the second civil war and led troops in the Arabian Peninsula, Iraq and Syria. Both are depicted as jointly de-manding the region of al-Balqāʾ in today's Jordan as an exclusively Kindī fief in return for their support of Marwān b. al-Ḥakam.[73] This type of Kindī leaders ap-pears to have been much less dependent on the support of their fellow Kindīs. They led troops composed of a number of Arab tribes and may be better under-stood as renegade generals in search of a central authority that would guarantee their continued prestige than as tribally founded Kindī leaders.

The regional tribal networks of the families founded by the conquerors sketched in the first part of this contribution appear to have played a significant role in later times only during times of general upheaval, such as after the ʿAb-bāsid conquest of al-Shām. The descendants of the conqueror of Ḥimṣ, al-Simṭ b. al-Aswad al-Kindī, seem to have played a particularly significant role in repre-senting local unrest by mobilizing support along tribal and regional networks, as evinced by the surprising number of members of this family whose crucifixion after abortive revolts is reported by Ibn Ḥabīb's *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*.[74]

Otherwise, it appears that tribal networks of merely regional importance were not sufficient to successfully challenge the central Islamic authorities. The great revolts led by Kindī notables after the establishment of a stable post-conquest order do not appear to have depended on the mobilizing potential of common tribal affiliation. Kindīs are underrepresented among the followers of the Kindī Ibn al-Ashʿath in his revolt against ʿAbd al-Malik. Instead, his revolt is

---

72 E. g. al-Iṣfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17, 146 – 147.

73 Al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 421.

74 Ibn Ḥabīb, *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*, 485 – 488.

presented as backed by the Iraqi milieu of pious readers of the Qurʾān, or *qurrāʾ*, who were opposed to the splendor of the centralized Islamic administration. Interestingly, a certain accordance of interests between the pious urban opposition of the *qurrāʾ* (or for that matter, Khawārij) and the ambitions of the leading family of Kinda in Kufa can be traced across three generations, from al-Ashʿath's leadership in the call for arbitration at Ṣiffīn via the singular inefficacy of his offspring sent out from Kufa against Khawārij in the surrounding countryside,[75] to the backing given to Ibn al-Ashʿath's revolt by the *qurrāʾ*.[76] Unfortunately the extent, internal composition and external functioning of such cross-tribal networks of provincial opposition joining persons of different social background is difficult to ascertain due to the lack of a stable common identifier such as a tribal *nisba* like the one underlying this study.

In renderings of the revolt of Ibn al-Ashʿath, one is also confronted with the mobilizing potential of a challenge to existing Islamic order based on apocalyptic claims. This use of apocalyptic iconography is frequently mentioned in historiographical accounts of Ibn al-Ashʿath's revolt,[77] and has even left material remains in the form of Arabo-Sasanian *dirham*s minted during this revolt with apocalyptic slogans and titles.[78] A similar use of a globally Islamic iconography of apocalyptic renewal used in challenges to Qurashī central authority also appears in the revolts of the Kindī Ibāḍī leader ʿAbdallāh b. Yaḥyā, commonly known as Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq, or 'searcher of justice', in 8th-century Southern Arabia,[79] as well as in the well-known revolt the later courtly poet al-Mutanabbī, literally 'the one aspiring to be a prophet', owed his nickname to.[80] I suggest interpreting the use of such titles of globally Islamic relevance as an attempt to transcend the limited regional potential of inherited tribally formulated networks. Kindī elites could voice effective challenges to the Qurashī caliphs of early Islamic empires only by leaving behind their uniquely Kindī tribal affiliations and presenting themselves as redeemers of globally Islamic relevance, as exemplified in Ibn al-Ashʿath's speech to his troops before the decisive battle against the Umayyad governor of Iraq.

---

75 This is also remarked by Crone 1980, 110 – 111.

76 See Sayed 1977, *passim*.

77 E. g. al-Maqdisī, *Kitāb al-Badʾ*, 6, 35.

78 Gaube 1973, 32, 36 and 52.

79 See the long account in al-Iṣfahānī, *Aghānī*, 23, 233 – 270, and al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 6, 172 – 186.

80 See Franz 2007, 95 – 103.

> Then Ibn al-Ashʿath ascended a *minbar* in his camp, which he used to carry with him, praised God and proclaimed: You people! War is a contest in which the souls of men wither.[81] Even the prophet of God, peace be upon him, never was victorious if victory was not given to him and his companions. If this thing [*hādhā l-amr, scilicet* rule over Islam] is among Quraysh, there is nothing to be done.[82] If, however, it can rest on any other among the Arab, then I am ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ashʿath b. Qays b. Maʿdī-karib! [...] Afterwards, the soldiers began to fight, but Ibn al-Ashʿath continued to stand on his *minbar* while the misssiles were flying about him: He however did not in any way attempt to shield himself from them or was in any way afraid.[83]

Notwithstanding Ibn al-Ashʿath's bravado, the subsequent battle was lost. In conjunction with the frequent parallels drawn between his revolt and the later ʿAbbāsid revolution,[84] it is tempting to consider the revolt of Ibn al-Ashʿath as some sort of a high-water mark of upheaval focused on a non-Qurashī pretender against central Qurashī authority. Personally qualified for rulership due to his education and his descent from the pre-Islamic kings of Kinda,[85] Ibn al-Ashʿath transcended the networks of his tribe to voice a universally relevant claim to opposition. As the failure of his revolt became quite clear soon after his proud challenge of ʿAbd al-Malik, global Islamic authority remained invested in a Qurashī-led central administration. Tribal networks of provincial elites remained important only on a regional scale.

Conclusion

In the first part of this paper it has been shown that affiliation to the tribally formulated network of Kinda as represented in the sources is remarkably stable. The relevance of this network seems to be limited mainly to provincial or even urban matters. While there is ample enough evidence of the administration of city quarters being directed via tribal networks, cooperation along tribal ties is very rare on a trans-regional scale.

Accordingly, the leaders of locally relevant tribal networks furnished suitable personnel for provincial administration under a centrally appointed governor. They are best described as intermediaries between the official power of a

---

81 This first passage of the speech is composed in rhymed prose or *sajʿ*.

82 This passage is quite unclear. I translate *ad sensum*.

83 Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 7, 139–140; a shorter version of his speech is given by al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 688.

84 E. g. Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 7, 127–128, and al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 3, 681.

85 Al-Jāḥiẓ, *al-Ḥayawān*, 5, 194–195.

global Islamic administration and the support given to them and frequently also their ancestors and offspring by local networks formulated along tribal and other lines.

According to the local scale of such tribal networks, a global or Islamic challenge to central authority could only be voiced in a terminology other than tribal affiliation. A central role in such challenges voiced by Kindīs seems to have been played by the personal character of the respective Kindī leader, frequently drawing on apocalyptic or prophetic iconographies. When such a globally relevant claims to counter-authority were voiced by Kindīs, however, Kinda was underrepresented among the supporters of the challenge. It almost seems as if a rebel such as Ibn al-Ashʿath had to leave behind the Kindī networks and regional prestige underpinning his family's status in early Islamic Kufa in order to claim the universal Islamic authority of al-Manṣūr or al-Qaḥṭānī, disavowing his status as the scion of one of the leading families of Iraq in order to transform himself into a redeemer capable of challenging ʿAbd al-Malik himself.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

al-Balādhurī, Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā (2011), *Ansāb al-ashrāf*, edited by Muḥammad Muḥammad Tāmir, Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya.

al-Balādhurī, Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā (no year given), *Futūḥ al-buldān*, edited by Ayman Muḥammad ʿArafa, Cairo: al-Maktaba al-tawfīqiyya.

al-Dīnawarī, Abū Ḥanīfa Aḥmad b. Dāwūd (1995), *Kitāb al-Akhbār al-ṭiwāl*, edited by ʿUmar Fārūq al-Ṭabbāʿ, Beirut: Dār al-Arqam b. Abī l-Arqam.

al-Hamdānī, Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad (1986), *Kitāb al-Iklīl*, vol. 1, edited by Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Akwaʿ b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥawālī, Beirut: Shirkat dār al-tanwīr li-l-ṭibāʿa wa-l-nashr.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Abū l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd al-Ḥakam (2004), *Futūḥ Miṣr wa-l-Maghrib*, edited by ʿAlī Muḥammad ʿUmar, Cairo: Maktaba al-thaqāfa al-dīniyya.

Ibn Aʿtham al-Kūfī, Abū Muḥammad Aḥmad b. ʿAlī (1968–1975), *Kitāb al-Futūḥ*, edited by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Muʿīd Khān, Hyderabad: Dār al-nadwa al-jadīda (partially reprinted in Beirut?).

Ibn Ḥabīb, Muḥammad (n.d.), *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar*, edited by Ilse Lichtenstädter, Beirut: al-Maktab al-tijārī li-l-ṭibāʿa wa-l-nashr wa-l-tawzīʿ.

Ibn Saʿd, Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad (2012), *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*, edited by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAṭā, Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya.

al-Iṣfahānī, Abū l-Faraj ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn (2008), *Kitāb al-Aghānī*, edited by Samīr Yūsuf Jābir, ʿAbd al-Amīr ʿAlī Muhannā and Yūsuf ʿAlī Ṭawīl (the last is only mentioned on the title in Latin script), Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya.

al-Iṣfahānī, Abū l-Faraj ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn (no year given), *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn*, edited by al-Sayyid Aḥmad Ṣaqar, Cairo: ʿĪsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa-shurakāhu.

al-Jāḥiẓ, Abū ʿUthmān ʿAmr b. Baḥr (1965–1969), *Kitāb al-Ḥayawān*, edited by ʿAbd a-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa-awlāduhū.

Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ, Abū ʿAmr al-ʿUsfurī (1995), *Taʾrīkh*, edited by Ḥikmat Kashlī Fawwāz and Muṣṭafā Najīb Fawwāz, Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya.

al-Kindī, Abū ʿUmar Muḥammad b. Yūsuf (1912), *Kitāb al-Wulāt wa-kitāb al-quḍāt*, edited by Rhuvon Guest, Cairo: Dār al-kutub al-islāmī (modern reprint?).

al-Maqdisī, Abū Naṣr Muṭahhar b. Ṭāhir (no year given), *Kitāb al-Badʾ wa-l-taʾrīkh*, no editor given, Cairo: Maktaba al-thaqāfa al-dīniyya.

al-Masʿūdī, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn (1985), *Murūj al-dhahab*, edited by Mufīd Muḥammad Qamīḥa, Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya.

al-Masʿūdi, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn (1967), *Kitāb al-Tanbīh wa-l-ishrāf*, edited by M. J. de Goeje, Reprint Leiden: Brill.

Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, Abū l-Faḍl al-Minqarī (1998), *Waqʿat Ṣiffīn*, edited by ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, Najaf: Maktabat Āyatullāh al-ʿAẓmī al-Marʿashī al-Najafī.

Sayf b. ʿUmar (1995), *Kitāb al-Ridda wa-l-futūḥ wa-kitāb al-jamal wa-masīr ʿĀʾisha wa-ʿĀlī*, edited by Qāsim al-Sāmarrāʾī, Leiden: Smitskamp Oriental Antiquarium.

al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad b. Jarīr (no year given), *Taʾrīkh al-Ṭabarī*, edited by Muṣṭafā al-Sayyid and Ṭāriq Sālim, Cairo: Al-Maktaba al-tawfīqiyya.

al-Wāqidī, Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad b. ʿUmar (1991), *Kitāb al-Ridda*, edited by Maḥmūd ʿAbdallāh Abū l-Khayr, ʿAmmān: Dār al-Furqān.

al-Yaʿqūbī, Aḥmad b. Abī Yaʿqūb b. Jaʿfar (2002), *Taʾrīkh*, edited by Muḥammad ʿAlī Bayḍūn, Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya.

Studies

al-Barrī, ʿAbdallāh Khurshīd (1992), *al-Qabāʾil al-ʿarabiyya fī Miṣr fī l-qurūn al-thalāthati l-ūlā li-l-hijra*, Cairo: Dār al-kātib al-ʿarabī li-l-ṭibāʿa wa-l-nashr.

Caskel, Werner / Strenziok, Gert (1966), *Ǧamharat an-Nasab: Das genealogische Werk des Hišām Ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī*, 2 vols., Leiden: Brill.

Crone, Patricia (1980), *Slaves on Horses*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Donner, Fred McGraw (1981), *The Early Islamic Conquests*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Franz, Kurt (2007), *Vom Beutezug zur Territorialherrschaft*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Gaube, Heinz (1973), *Arabosasanidische Numismatik*, Braunschweig: Klinckhardt & Biermann.

Judd, Steven (2015), "The Jurisdictional Limits of Qāḍī Courts during the Umayyad Period", *Bulletin d'études orientales* 63: 43–56.

Lecker, Michael (1989), *The Banū Sulaym*, Jerusalem: Hebrew University.

Leube, Georg (2017), *Kinda in der frühislamischen Geschichte*, Würzburg: Ergon.

Orthmann, Eva (2002), *Stamm und Macht*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Paul, Jürgen (1996), *Herrscher, Gemeinwesen, Vermittler*, Stuttgart: Ergon.

Sayed, Riḍwān (1977), *Die Revolte des Ibn al-Ašʿaṯ und die Koranleser*, Freiburg: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.

Tillier, Mathieu (2011), "Les 'premiers' cadis de Fusṭāṭ et les dynamiques régionales de l'innovation judiciaire (750 – 833)", *Annales Islamologiques* 45: 214 – 242.