

groups in a strongly segmented society which recognized one another by a certain political principle, mostly by their view of history, and in times of upheaval could be won over to cooperate with one another – similarly as in present-day Beirut? Did the “head of the sects” have a following at all or is this simply an invention of the heresiographers who out of every Nu‘aym immediately made a Nu‘aymiyya, even if he had never existed. By means of a last example we wish to document how complex this can become.

2.1.3.2.3.1 The Kāmiliyya

The heresiographers frequently mention a so-called Kāmiliyya.¹ They were difficult to classify; because allegedly they had not only dissociated themselves from Abū Bakr and ‘Umar but also from ‘Alī. For this reason, they seemed neither to belong to the Sunnīs nor to the Shī‘ites; they had considered, so one could say, all the Muslims, with the exception of the Prophet, to be “unbelievers”. This rather exaggerated formulation went back to Jāhiz; but later it turns up everywhere. In reality, the situation was not so uniformly bad: the Kāmiliyya viewed Abū Bakr and ‘Umar as usurpers; on the other hand, what displeased them about ‘Alī is that he had put up with the affront. By not venturing to do something against the agreement in the *saqifa* of the Banū Sā‘ida, he had committed an error (*akhta‘a*); later he had made up for this when he took up arms against Mu‘āwiya. Obviously, the caliphate was legitimately allotted to him.

This doctrine still circulated within the Zaydiyya. An Imam must show he is active; ‘Alī had been lacking in this respect. But the extreme and polemical formulation of this view won such authority through Jāhiz and occurred so early on that the heresiographers no longer understood the true context. Just as with the previously mentioned groups, the name no longer signified anything for them. Many still knew that the Kāmiliyya went back to a certain Abū Kāmil; but that with this *kunya* a certain Mu‘ādh b. al-Ḥuṣayn al-Nabhānī from Kūfa was meant, is only found once in an obscure place² and nowhere did it find its way into the heresiographical tradition.³ Mu‘ādh b. al-Ḥuṣayn has not left any trace behind either in the Shī‘ite or in the Sunnī biographical

1 Ash‘arī *Maq.* 17, ll. 4 ff.; Ibn Ḥazm, *Fīṣal* iv, 96, ll. 2 ff. from bot. > Saksakī, *Burhān* 42, ll. 5 ff.; Baghdādī, *Farq* 39, ll. 3 ff./54, ll. 1 ff. and *Uṣūl al-dīn* 279, ll. 1 f.; 286, ll. 6 f.; 332, ll. 3 f.; Shahrastānī 133, ll. 8 ff./368, ll. 1 ff.; Šafadī, *Nakt al-himyan* 127, ll. 4 ff.; Nashwān, *Hūr* 155, ll. 5 ff. In what follows I base myself on what I have said in: WI 28/1988/141 ff.; all the additional evidence is found there.

2 In Qādī ‘Abd al-Jabbār, *Tathbīt* 201, ll. 1 f.

3 Not even in the case of the Qādī himself who in a heresiographical excursus in the *Mughnī* once again simply presents the form *Abū Kāmil* (xx, 176, ll. 10 ff.).