A Critical Assessment of Heinz Halm's Views on the Fatimid Caliph of Egypt
al-Hākim bi-Amr Allāh

Raziyeh Ansari* & Mohammad Ali Chelongar**

Abstract

Al-Hākim bi-Amr Allāh (reign 996–1021), the sixth Fatimid caliph in North Africa, is one of the most controversial characters in the history of Islam, who has engendered different and sometimes conflicting views of historians. Adopting a descriptive–analytical method, the present study aimed to assess the views of Heinz Halm, the contemporary Ismaili era researcher, on al-Hākim. Although al-Hākim has gone down the history as a brutal, wicked-minded man, Halm in *The Fatimids and Their Traditions of Learning* (1997) refers to al-Hākim as a highly-respected person among Egyptians, as a person who had a stable character with consistency in religious policies. Moreover, Halm depicts al-Hākim as totally opposed to the Druze who emerged, as a religious sect, with a belief in al-Hākim's divinity.[1] The results of the study showed that Halm, drawing eclectically on historical sources, reports, and statements to depict al-Hākim's character as justified and sound, had foregrounded, marginalized, and eliminated historical data about al-Hākim.

Keywords: Al-Hākim bi-Amr Allāh, Heinz Halm, Fatimids, Ismaili, Druze, Egypt, orientalism

Introduction

Abū ʿAlī Manṣūr, known as al-Hākim bi-Amr Allāh (reign 996–1021), was appointed as the six Fatimid caliph in 996 when he was only eleven. During the early years of his reign, al-Hasan ibn Ammār (the leader of the Kutama) and then Barjawān were responsible to manage the affairs. Having ordered Barjawān's death in 1000, al-Hākim himself took absolute power for the rest of his reign. Different historical sources and documents have portrayed al-Hākim's time and character differently.

According to the Sunni historians, al-Hākim's reign was characterised by many crises, and even his bizarre decisions and commands could not help but lead to the escalation of the crisis and the ensuing rebellions against him. Most of these sources depict al-Hākim as possessing negative and unpleasant characteristics, such as bloodthirsty,[2] wicked-minded and disturbed,[3] evil-minded and fickle,[4] low-minded and stupid,[5] devilish and pharaonic,[6] etc. The conflicting accounts of al-Hākim's life and character have also attracted the attention of contemporary scholars. For example, in *Al-Hākim bi-Amr Allāh wa Asrar Al-Da'wah Al-Fatimiyah,* Muhammad Abd Allah Inān fully deals with the events of al-Hākim's time and the formation of the Druze, maintaining that al-Hākim shared the beliefs of the Druze. Muhammad Kamel Hussein in the book *Tāefatah al-Druze: Tārikhohā wa Aqāyedohā* describes al-Hākim's character and his position among the da'īs. The Ismaili-oriented book titled *Al-Hākim bi- Amr Allāh: Khalīfah, Imām, wa Muṣliḥ* written by Ārif Tāmir endorses al-Hākim and his policies, referring to him as a social reformer. *Asl al-Movahhedin al-Druze wa Osulohom* by Amin Muhammad Tali' and

---

* Raziyeh Ansari (PhD), Post-doctoral Researcher, Department of History, Faculty of Literature and Human Scince, University of Isfahan, Iran. Email: ansari_raziye@yahoo.com.

** Mohammad Ali Chelongar (corresponding author) (PhD), Professor, Department of History, Faculty of Literature and Human Scince, University of Isfahan, Iran. Email: m.chelongar@ltr.ui.ac.ir.

[1] A branch of Ismaili sect believing in Al-Hākim's divinity. This branch was established and expanded by (al-Ḥasan b.Ḥaydara al-Akhram, Ḥamza b. ʿAlī b. Aḥmad, Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Darazī), and was named Druze, which announced Al-Hākims divinity openly in public. Farhad Daftary (2007), *The Ismailis Their History and Doctrines*, Cambridge: Cambridge University press, pp.186-187.

[2] Ibn al-Atir (1385/1965), *al-Kāmel fi'l-ta'rīḳ*, Vol. 9, Beirut: Dār Ṣādir-Dār Beirut, p. 316; Aḥmad b. Moḥammad Ibn Ḵhallikān (1364), *Wafayāt al-a'yān va-abnā' al-Zamām*, Vol. 5, Ehsān 'Abbas (ed.), Qom: Al-Sharif al-Razi, p. 292; Ebn Al-ʿEbrĪ (1992), *Tarikh Mukhtasar al-Duwal*, Antun Salihani al-Yasu'I (ed.), Beirut: Dar al-Mashriq, p. 180; Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Dhahabī (1993/1413), *Tārīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-al-a'lām*, Vol. 28, Umar Abd al-Salām Tadammurī (ed.), Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿArabī, p. 283; Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Maqrīzī (1418/1998), *Al-Mawāiz wa al-'i'tibar bi ẕikr al-ḵiṭaṭ wa al-'aṭār*, Vol. 4, ḵalīl al-Manṣūr (ed.), Beirut: Dār al-Kotob al-Īlmīa, p. 77; Ibn al-'Imād al-Ḥanbalī (1986/1406), *Shadharāt al-dhahab fī akhbār man dhahab*, Vol. 5, M. al-Arna ʿūṭ (ed.), Damascus and Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr, p. 61.

[3] Dhahabī (1993/1413), *Tārīkh al-Islām*, Vol. 28, p. 289.

[4] Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Dhahabī (1999), *Dawla Al-Islam*, Vol. 1, Hasan Īsmail Merve (ed.), Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, p. 359; Ibn al-'Imād al-Ḥanbalī (1986/1406), *Shadharāt al-dhahab*, p. 61.

[5] Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Ibn 'Idhari al-Marrakushi (1983), *al-bayān al-mughrib fī ākhbār mulūk al-andalus wa'l-maghrib*, Vol. 1, J. S. Colin and E. Lévi-Provençal (eds.), Bayrūt: Dār al-Thaqāfah, p. 256.

[6] Dhahabī (1999), *Dawla Al-Islam*, Vol. 1, pp. 359-360.

The Druzes: A New Study of Their History, Faith, and Society by Nejla Abu-Izzedin are the works written by the Druze, which not only study al-Hākim but also express approval and justification for the Druze's beliefs. Another significant work on the Fatimid caliph is *The Fatimids and Their Traditions of Learning* by Heinz Halm, whose account on al-Hākim's life and character is different from those of the Sunni historians.

Heinz Halm, a well-known German professor at Tubingen University, is a prolific scholar of Islamic with numerous valuable works especially on Shi'ism.[7] Although Halm's works were reviewed by Arjomand,[8] Hamdani,[9] Bianquis,[10] there is no critical assessment of the German orientalist's views. The present study attempts to provide a critical assessment of Heinz Halm's views on al-Hākim as presented in his book *The Fatimids and Their Traditions of Learning* (1997)**.** The book provides a justified and positive view of al-Hākim, portraying him as a highly-popular person who was stable and consistent in his actions—unlike the claims of the Sunni historians. Concerning al-Hākim's stance towards the Druze,[11] Halm not only rejects al-Hākim's connection to the Druze movement but also depicts him as totally opposed to this religious sect. It is difficult for any historical research to unravel the reality behind a historical event, yet there are a set of criteria known as source criticism that can minimize the error in historical judgment and guide it towards reality. Any methodical and systematic criticism can facilitate the scientific development of society, continually rectify models of human knowledge, and strengthen human thought. In this line, the present study embarks on a critical assessment of Halm's views on al-Hākim.

Criticism of Halm's Views on al-Hākim's Opposition to the Druze

Halm (1997) rejects all Sunni historians' claims about al-Hākim's support of the Druze movement, his tolerance towards the sect, or his contribution to the establishment and propagation of the Druze. The caliph's edicts (*sijillat*) provide no clue to al-Hākim's claiming divinity or to his role in propagating the Druze teachings. Moreover, Hamid al-Din al-Kirmānī, a great *da'ī* (Islamic missionary) in al-Hākim's era, was active in confronting the Druze.[12] Accordingly, Halm depicts al-Hākim as totally opposed to the Druze movement. In *Shi'ism* (1995), however, Halm seems less assertive in his views on al-Hakim's putative opposition to the sect.[13] Due to lack of sources, it is not possible to make a definitive judgment on the relation between al-Hākim and the Druze. Yet, some evidence is provided here that might undermine Halm's views.

The Freedom of the Druze in Propagating Their Beliefs
There are historical evidences that indicate the freedom the Druze enjoyed in propagating their beliefs. For example, Hamza ibn Ali, the founder of the Druze, presented his book *Rasa'il al-Hikmah* (or *the Epistles of Wisdom*) to al-Hākim of the rank of *LaHoot* on Safar A.H. 408, when, according to Hamza ibn Ali, the slave and servant of our Lord first had appeared.[14] Together with such statements, the Sunni historians' accounts on the relation between al-Hākim and the Druze show the relative freedom of the Druze, for instance in inviting Hamid al-Din al-Kirmānī to solve the Druze crisis in Cairo. The evidence shows the success of the Druze in propagating their beliefs, which in turn attests to the congenial atmosphere of the time. Moreover, the open announcement of the Divinity of al-Hākim by the Druze[15] as well as the invitation of the wise and influential people to this sect[16] are evidences proving their overt activities.

[7] For example, *The Empire of the Mahdi: The Rise of the Fatimids (875–973)* (1991); *Shi'ism* (1995); *Shi'a Islam: From Religion to Revolution* (1997)

[8] Saïd Amir Arjomand (1999), "Heinz Halm, Shiʿa Islam: From Religion to Revolution, trans. Allison Brown," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 276-278.

[9] Sumaiya Hamdani (1998), "Shica Islam: From Religion to Revolution; Heinz Halm," *Digest of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 7, pp. 71-73.

[10] Thierry Bianquis (1998), "The Fatimids and Their Traditions of Learning," *Arabic*, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp. 435-437.

[11] A branch of Ismaili sect, the Druze was established and expanded by al-Hasan ibn Haydara al-Farghani al-Akhram, Hamza ibn Ali, and Muhammad bin Ismail Nashtakin ad-Darazi. The Druze would announce al-Hākim's divinity openly in public. Daftary (2007), *The Ismailis Their History and Doctrines*, pp.186-187.

[12] Heinz Halm (1997), *The Fatimids and their Traditions of Learning*, London and New York: I. B. Tauris, p. 39-40.

[13] Heinz Halm (2004), *Shi'ism*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, p. 179.

[14] Ḥamzah ibn ʿAli, Isma'il At-Tamimi and Baḥa Ad-Din Assamuqi (1986), *Rasa'il al-hikmah (Epistles of Wisdom)*, Vol. 1, Lebanon: Dār al-ajal al-Marifa, p. 36.

[15] Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Al- Maqrīzī (1996/ 1416), *Etʿāẓ al-honafā b-aḵbār al-Aema al-Fāṭimiyyin al- ḵolafā*, Vol. 2, Moḥammad Ḥilmī Moḥammad Aḥmad (ed.), Cairo, p. 113.

[16] Yūsefl bn Taḡrī Bardī (1992/ 1413), *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira fi Mulūk Miṣr wa al-Qāhira*, Vol. 4, Moḥammad Hosein Šams al-Dīn (ed.), Beirut: Dār al-Kotob al-ʿIlmīa, p. 185.

The progress made by the Druze forced the Fatimid court into serious thinking[17] and brought the Ismaili community to the verge of collapse, casting a shadow over them like a big cloud of smoke, as al-Kirmānī puts.[18] According to al-Kirmānī's descriptions of Cairo, the enormous influence of those ghulāt (exaggerators) on some Ismailis made it impossible to have the latter revert to their previously-held beliefs, so they could do nothing but try to save those Ismailis who were in doubt.[19] The situation, if not indicating favourable circumstances for the invitation of the ghulāt, surely points to the freedom they had in propagating their beliefs. This might be the reason why al-Kirmānī moved to the capital city and wrote some works in response to the ghulāt (e.g. *Al-Risalat Alva'iza fi Al-Rad 'ala Al-Akhram Al-Farghani*). Another outstanding point in his description of Cairo is the account he gives of a group who have broken the solemn vow, let go of the strong rope of religion, and reverted to their past.[20] The freedom of the Druze in propagating their beliefs without being suppressed or even condemned by the Fatimid caliph could have led some Ismailis to doubt their Imam, hence their confusion and disregard for their Imam. Al-Kirmānī's description actually attests to the freedom the Druze had in advancing and propagating their beliefs and inviting others to the sect.

Absence of Valid Documents on al-Hākim's Condemnation of the Ghulāt

Opposing groups and individuals would accuse Fatimids of exaggerated thoughts, which was considered very repulsive in the Islamic community. Accordingly, the Fatimid caliphs sought to exonerate themselves from the accusation and enlighten the community about their beliefs in a bid to thwart the opponents' attempts at delegitimising the Caliphate. For example, al-Mansur (reign 945–953) voiced his disapproval for such beliefs as follows:

> Yesterday, I paid a visit to the people of the Crown Prince of Muslims, and today some call me the divine; some call me the messenger; some believe that I possess foreknowledge; some believe that I receive divine revelation; they have actually propagated such beliefs as they are our words. You must abandon such beliefs about us and just remember God, as we are just one of His servants and creatures.[21]

Citing al-Mansur's words, Qāzi No'mān states that the caliph began crying in fear of God and renounced the exaggerators' beliefs about himself.[22] This clearly indicates that al-Mansur tried to exonerate himself and his Caliphate from those beliefs so that he could protect his position and reputation in the Islamic society because those beliefs would have led to further accusations as well as the enemy's propaganda. Consequently, the Fatimid invitation could have reached a deadlock, especially outside the territory. Aware of such consequences, the Fatimid caliphs expressed their disapproval for such beliefs. For instance, having heard about the da'ī's exaggerating about himself and his ancestors, al-Qā'im bi-Amr Allāh (reign 934–946) referred to them as preventers of the Fatimid invitation, the ones who would lead people astray, make them deny, and get them to move away from the Fatimids. He reasons that when the da'īs attribute a quality to us that lacks in reality, that people do not find it in us, they will not accept us as Imams; therefore, al-Qā'im openly curses the da'īs.[23] He considers these exaggerators as hypocrites, who not only make such lies and accusations to get people to reject the Ismaili invitation but also guide people towards the fire while keeping themselves exempt.[24] Al-Mu'izz li-Din Allāh (reign 953–975), in his speech on confronting the ghulāt movement of his time, states:

> …we have been informed that some do exaggerate about us; they attribute some exaggerated sayings to us, which is said neither by us nor others about us; we take refuge only in God from their lies; we are His servants and creatures; we do not claim to be a prophet; we only protect the Imamat status.[25]

[17] Wladimir Ivanow (1946), *The Alleged Founder of Ismailism*, Bombay, p. 286.
[18] Ḥamīd al-Dīn Al-Kirmānī (1987/ 1407), *Majmu'at rasā'il al-kirmānī*, M. Ghalib (ed.), Beirut: al-Mou'sa al-Arabiya lldratsat va Al-Nashr, pp. 113- 114.
[19] Al-Kirmānī (1987/ 1407), *Majmu'at rasā'il al-kirmānī*, pp. 113-114.
[20] Al-Kirmānī (1987/ 1407), *Majmu'at rasā'il al-kirmānī*, pp. 113-114.
[21] Al- Qāzī No'mān (1963/ 1383), *Da'ā'em al-Eslām*, Vol. 1, Asaf Ali Asghar Fyzee (ed.), Cairo: Dar al-Ma'arif, p. 55.
[22] No'mān (1963/ 1383), *Da'ā'em al-Eslām*, p. 55.
[23] Al- Qāzī No'mān (1996), *Al-Majālis va al-Masāyerāt*, al-Ḥabīb al-Faqī, Ebrāhīm Šbūḥ and Moḥammad al-Ya'āvī (eds.), Beirut: Dār al-Montaẓir, p. 84.
[24] No'mān (1996), *Al-Majālis va al-Masāyerāt*, p. 420.
[25] No'mān (1996), *Al-Majālis va al-Masāyerāt*, p. 523.

Al-Mu'izz li-Din Allāh also refers to the ghulāt as the ones who raise doubts about his Caliphate and Imamat.[26] Therefore, the harm coming from the ghulāt was said to be more dangerous than that of the visible enemies of the caliph. To exonerate the Fatimid Caliphate from accusations, Al-Mu'izz li-Din Allah stresses that they are liars who have disobeyed the Fatimids.[27]

The reign of al-Hākim provided the appropriate grounds for spreading oppositional propaganda against the caliph by both Sunni and Shi'i communities. For example, Al-Mu'ayyad bi-Llāh (944–1020), a Zaydī Imam, wrote an epistle remonstrating al-Hākim and the Ismailis, which was later responded by al-Kirmānī in *al-Risāla al-Kafiya fil-radd 'ala l-Haruni al-Husayni*.[28] During the period, the ghulāt movement, which had been opposed strongly by former caliphs, became remarkably widespread and reached its pinnacle in the capital of the Fatimid Caliphate.

Concerning al-Hākim's stance towards the Druze, Halm states that there exists no decree or edict implying al-Hākim's calling himself God or something close to God or expressing the Druze's beliefs.[29] It is equally essential to note that there is historical document or statement indicating al-Hākim's opposition to this course of event—despite the fact that the ghulāt movement put the Fatimid court in a critical situation, and that they provided opposition forces and external enemies with a pretext to denounce the Caliphate. For example, al-Qādir bi-Llāh (reign 991–1031), the Abbasid caliph, organized a gathering of Shia leaders in 1011 to reject the Fatimid descent, where they talked about the Fatimid caliph's divinity as well. The document related to this event states that the newly appeared person (i.e., al-Hākim) in Egypt and his ancestors have crossed the lines and claimed divinity.[30] This event attests to the fact that the ghulāt were active before the official announcement of the Druze. Yet, there is no document, speech, script, or edict by al-Hākim indicative of the caliph's disapproval of the ghulāt movement and his exoneration from their beliefs. Nevertheless, the historical sources provide some accounts about his reaction to the Abbasid gathering. According to these accounts, the Fatimid caliph would give a speech against the gathering every Friday, saying: we are better than Abbasid caliphs because we are the offspring of Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet (PBUH).[31] Yet there exists no document, speech, script, or edict indicative of al-Hākim's opposition to the Druze.

In contrast, his successor, al-Zāhir (1021–1036), expressed his disgust at all ghulāt sects—especially the Druze—by releasing an official letter in 1024, in which he exonerated himself from their beliefs:

> Among these disbelievers (the ghulāt), a group of low wisdom appeared whose ignorance and foolishness led them astray. They exaggerated about us, spoke dishonestly about our ancestors, and attributed their unfavourable exaggerations and complete foolishness to us, mentioning of which here is by no means appropriate to our dignity.[32]

Having humiliated them by characterizing them unwise, ignorant, foolish, and dishonest, the Fatimid caliph distanced himself from them and adopted a stance towards them by take refuging in God from such ignorant, misled people.[33] Besides the exoneration, the caliph went on to annihilate the Druze as he says: we eradicated these corrupt-sinner disbelievers, dispersed them on this land, and they escaped, frightened and ostracized.[34] The measures taken by al-Zāhir against the Druze led the sect to have an abhorrence of him,[35] which indicates that the atmosphere was congenial for them during the reign of al-Hākim. Though the crisis had reached its peak during al-Hākim's reign, the reaction against the Druze was delayed as it occurred after al-Hākim's death.

Moreover, Al-Kirmānī's attempts to confront the Druze cannot be ignored. His words and works provide a true reflection of al-Hākim's time and character. In his works, al-Kirmānī seeks to present al-Hākim as opposed to the ghulāt, characterizing him as only a servant of God who obeys Him, performs

---

[26] No'mān (1996), *Al-Majālis va al-Masāyerāt*, p. 420.
[27] No'mān (1996), *Al-Majālis va al-Masāyerāt*, p. 420.
[28] Al-Kirmānī (1987/ 1407), *Majmu'at rasā'il*, pp. 148- 182.
[29] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, pp. 39-40.
[30] Ibn Taḡrī Bardī (1992/ 1413), *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira*, Vol. 4, p. 230.
[31] Muhammad Ibn Iyās (1402), *Badā'i' al-zuhūr fi waqā'i' al-duhūr*, Vol. 1, Muḥammad Muṣṭafā (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-Amma lil-Kitab, p. 208.
[32] Ibn Taḡrī Bardī (1992/ 1413), *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira*, Vol. 4, pp. 249-250.
[33] Ibn Taḡrī Bardī (1992/ 1413), *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira*, pp. 249-250.
[34] Ibn Taḡrī Bardī (1992/ 1413), *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira*, pp. 249-250.
[35] Nejla M Abu Izzeddin (1993), *The Druzes: A New Study of Their History, Faith and Society*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, p. 106.

prostration before Him, puts trust in Him, and leaves his affairs to Him.[36] However, al-Kirmānī does not cite a single statement from the caliph himself in order to exonerate him from the accusations. If al-Hākim had announced any statement in opposing the movement, it would surely have been cited by the dāwa organization to combat the ghulāt and dismiss the accusations brought by the opposition. Even though no reliable account proving al-Hākim's support for the Druze exists, his silence on the issue is an interesting case given the fact that other Fatimid caliphs tried a lot to exonerate themselves from the ghulāt movements—not only purging the Ismaili society from deviant people and exaggerated thoughts but also strongly opposing and suppressing other ghulāt movements in their territory. For instance, the ghulāt movement in Dār al-ʿIlm during al-Āmir's reign, which had begun by Qassār (a person who claimed to be God), was strongly opposed, and he and his followers were crucified and hacked to death with arrows.[37] The bones of the dead were later mixed and buried in different places in order to make Qassār's grave undetectable and avoid gatherings of his followers around his grave.[38] Considering the strong opposition to the ghulāt during the reigns of the Fatimid caliphs, it becomes clearer how passive was al-Hākim in combat against the movement which reached its climax during his reign, requiring the most serious response on the part of the caliph.

Even there is no statement or evidence in historical sources proving that the caliph himself invited al-Kirmānī to confront the Druze crisis; instead, the invitation is said to have been issued by the Dāʿī al-Duʿāt of Khuttakīn dāwa organization, and it was Khuttakīn who supposedly titled al-Kirmānī as *Sadiq al-Ma'mun* in a bid to resolve the crisis.[39] If the caliph had invited al-Kirmānī to Egypt, entitled him as *Sadiq al-Ma'mun*, or spoken in praise and appreciation of his efforts, al-Kirmānī would have referred to this as a mark of honour.

Criticism of Halm's View on al-Hākim's Great Popularity with Cairenes

According to Halm, "Among the people of Cairo the caliph al-Ḥākim was extremely popular"[40] and "for a long time the people hoped, and indeed expected, that the popular caliph and his successful reign might return some day."[41] However, some statements and pieces of evidence indicate that such sentiment was not so common. For instance, Halm himself points to al-Hākim's mistrust of the court authorities and the idea of killing them all, the feeling which "must have been the result of his unpleasant childhood experiences."[42] Yet Halm relates it to their "encroachments and enrichments, their venality and deceit."[43] Relating the killings to childhood experiences reveals that Halm's claim is far from rationally justified, especially given the fact that most of those in the position of *Wazīr* and *Wāsita* would be killed after a short time—after Barjawān was killed, whoever replaced him was killed as well.[44] Moreover, al-Hākim killed a number of other state authorities, including judges, deputies, scribes, etc.[45] More importantly, al-Hākim had created an oppressive atmosphere against the violators, and some of the officials had a short tenure—this actually shows the anti-caliph sentiment among the court officials. In such an atmosphere, even if the court officials had betrayed and become corrupt, serial killings could have caused horror and terror among people and feelings of hatred for the caliph among survivors, followers, and tribes of the putative dead.

Concerning al-Hākim's religious policy, Halm states that the caliph "sought to enforce the *sharīʿa* upon his subjects and to urge it under the threat of severe punishment."[46] Obviously, this method could not win popularity for al-Hākim. It is also possible to mention the destruction of churches by al-Hakim. Although, in the Fatimid age in Egypt, there was an official support to build the churches and Monasteries, [47] al-Hakim ordered the destruction of churches. In addition, al-Kirmānī, in *Al-Maṣābīḥ fī*

---

[36] Al-Kirmānī (1987/ 1407), *Majmu'at rasā'il*, p. 145.
[37] Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 2, p. 381.
[38] Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 2, p. 382.
[39] Idrīs ʿImād al-Dīn b. al-Ḥasan al-Qurashī (1420), *ʿUyūn al-akhbār wa-funūn al-āthār fī faḍā'il al-A'immah al-aṭhār*, Vol. 6, Muṣṭafā Ghālib (ed.), Bayrūt : Dār al-Andalus, p. 283.
[40] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, p. 36.
[41] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, p. 40.
[42] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, p. 35.
[43] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, p. 35.
[44] Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 4, pp. 74-77.
[45] Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 4, pp. 74-77.
[46] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, p. 36.
[47] Abdel Wahab and M. Abdel Wadood (2012), "The History of the Sponsorship and Financial of the Christian Monasteries and Churches in the Fatimid Era in Egypt (969-1171 AD/358-567H)," *Egyptian Journal of Archaeological and Restoration Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 2, p. 138.

Eṯbāt Al-Aemma,[48] reasons out that al-Hākim's destruction of few churches was indicative of his merit and virtue. Referring to the destruction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, Halm states that these measures "left bitter memories" among the Christians, and they "were an attempt to contain the rise of anti-Christian sentiment among Muslims."[49] Halm believes that "there was no general persecution of Christians, as has been falsely maintained time and again."[50] However, the destruction of the holy churches—esp. the Church of the Holy Sepulchre that was a major pilgrimage destination for the Christians, comparable to Mecca for Muslims—[51] must have caused emotional distress among the Christians, which aroused outrage across the west,[52] as the destruction was used as a pretext for the Crusades.[53] Ḥakim's destruction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was deeply effective which causes Western historians have focused on its impact on the Christian West.[54] However, the reasons of such destruction are debated.[55] Even though the destruction of the churches can be persuasively justified as occasional and transient—leave aside the historical reports on imposing strict regulations on *dhimmis*—[56] the very destruction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre could have led to a decline in the caliph's popularity among the Christians (both the Melkites and Copts) forever, notwithstanding the order later issued to reconstruct the churches.

Moreover, al-Kirmānī's account of Cairo during al-Hākim's reign challenges Halm's claim about the caliph's popularity. Al-Kirmānī writes that people have moved away from *Auliyâ' al-Din* due to their conduct.[57] In his account, al-Kirmānī uses the term *people* (الناس) indicating not just Ismailis but the general population regardless of their religion and sect. This account undermines Halm's claim about al-Hākim's popularity. In *Al-Maṣābīḥ fī Eṯbāt Al-Aemma,* al-Kirmānī also reports on the attempted murders on al-Hākim, heavy expenditure by opponents on killing him, the radical ant-caliph movements, and the hatred for al-Hākim.[58]

Introducing al-Hākim, Halm considers all Sunni historians, without exception, as being against the caliph and as the historians who have provided distorted accounts of al-Hākim's characteristics. He then picks up the belligerent account from the Sunni sources accusing al-Hākim of worshiping Mars and Saturn or not taking a bath for seven years. Obviously, these accounts are not without feelings of animosity and grudge, so they cannot be trusted. However, it is noteworthy that Halm ignores those historians who have adopted a fairer and sometimes sympathetic stance towards the Fatimids. Halm mostly uses the book of the Sunni historian al-Maqrīzī who is considered by Halm as a historian who not only described the Fatimids with respect and praise but also believed in their legitimate power.[59] However, the German author does not consider al-Maqrīzī's accounts of al-Hākim's bloodthirsty and merciless character or his serial killings that could not have won popularity for the caliph.[60] To depict a justified and sound image of al-Hākim, Halm eclectically borrows al-Maqrīzī's accounts. For example, he refers to the edict issued by al-Hākim regarding religious freedom—dated by al-Maqrīzī to 1009—[61] but shows a total disregard for al-Maqrīzī's accounts of other edicts such as the one issued by al-Hākim in 1005 about cursing the Sheikhs and imposing strict regulations on dhimmis and Sunnis, or the edict issued in response to people's supplications for mercy from the caliph's violence. That the copies of edicts were given to Muslims, Christians, and the Jews[62] indicates the general violence on the part of al-Hākim and people's panic and horror of the caliph. The public fear of caliph is evident where

---

[48] Ḥamīd al-Dīn Al-Kirmānī (1969), *Al-Maṣābīḥ fī Eṯbāt al-Aemma*, M. Ghalib (ed.), Beirut: Manshörät Hamad, p. 150.
[49] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, p. 37.
[50] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, p. 37.
[51] Ibn al-Atir (1385/1965), *al-Kāmel*, p. 209; Rašīd al-Dīn Fażl allāh (1378 sh), *Jāmi' al-Tāvārīḵ (Tārīḵ-e Esmāīlīān)*, Moḥammad Rošan (ed.) Tehran: Markaz-e Pejūhešī-e Mīrāṯ-e Maktūb, p. 54; Abu'l-Qasim 'Abd-Allah b. 'Ali Kashani (1987), *Zubdat al-tawarikh: bakhsh-e Fatimian wa Nizarian*, Muhammad-Taqi Danishpazhuh (ed.), Tehran: Moaseseye Motaleat va Tahghighat-e Farhangi, p. 90; Dhahabī (1993/ 1413), *Tārīkh al-Islām*, Vol. 27, p. 238.
[52] Christopher Tyerman (2006), *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, p. 55.
[53] Muhammad Jamāl al-Dīn Sūrūr (1994), *Ta'rīkh al-dawla al-fāṭimiyya*, Cairo, p. 88.
[54] Steven Gertz (2020), "Fatimids Fighting over Jerusalem: An Interreligious or Intrareligious Matter?," *The Journal of the Middle East and Africa*, Vol. 11, No. 2, p. 7.
[55] Jennifer Pruitt (2017), "The Fatimid Holy City: Rebuilding Jerusalem in the Eleventh Century," *The Medieval Globe*, Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 42.
[56] Al- Maqrīzī (1996/ 1416), *Et'āẓ al-honafā*, Vol. 2, p. 53; Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 4, p. 163.
[57] Al-Kirmānī (1987/ 1407), *Majmu'at rasā'il*, p. 113.
[58] Al-Kirmānī (1969), *Al-Maṣābīḥ*, p. 152.
[59] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, p. xiii.
[60] Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 4, pp. 74- 77.
[61] Al- Maqrīzī (1996/ 1416), *Et'āẓ al-honafā*, Vol. 2, p. 78.
[62] Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 3, pp. 40- 41.

al-Maqrīzī cites al-Musabbihi, the respected historian of the Fatimid period, saying that the people were terrified of al-Ḥākim the amīr al-muʾminīn (the Leader of the believers).[63]

There are also notable accounts of prohibiting the eating of some popular Egyptian foods, such as Mulukhiyah, Jarjeer, and Mutawakkiliye.[64] Some Sunni writers argued that the prohibition was due to the personal penchants of Āʾishah, Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyān, and al- Mutawakkil.[65] Considering the prohibition eccentric and unfounded,[66] the Ismaili researchers believe that the reasons provided by the Sunni historians are irrelevant; instead, they argue that the prohibition might have been due to medical circumstances. For example, ʿĀrif Tāmir, introducing al-Ḥākim as a botanist and a medicine man, believes that the harmful effects of those foods (e.g., blood concentration) led the informed caliph to prohibit their consumption,[67] despite the fact that traditional medicine has clearly enumerated various health benefits for those foods. Obviously enough, imposing strict regulations, whether scientifically justified or not today, could not by any means help the caliph gain popularity since restrictions concerning the very living of people, such as their eating habits and everyday needs, would cause dissatisfaction. The rules and regulations cornering women are considered by Ismaili scholars as an attempt to combat immorality and corruption,[68] although such restrictions must have led to widespread dissatisfaction among women. Halm ignores all these historical accounts, but the Ismaili community accepts them and goes on to explain them through scientific reasoning.[69]

There are also noteworthy historical accounts regarding the scientists during al-Ḥākim's reign. For instance, having been honourably invited by al-Ḥākim to regulate the Nile river water,[70] Ibn al-Haytham (947–1039) pretended to be insane after the failure in his mission so that he could keep himself safe from al-Ḥākim; Ibn al-Haytham ended pretensions after al-Ḥākim's death and went on with his scientific line of work.[71] The horror experienced by the scientist, who was neither a religious nor a political dissident, due to his possible failure clearly depicts the public fear of al-Ḥākim.

Moreover, al-Ḥākim invited several Sunni theologians to teach at the Dār al-ʿIlm, was one of the most important foundations during the Fatimid age which protects science,[72] including Abdul Ghani bin Saied, Osama Jannada bin Mohammad, and Abu-'l-Ḥasan Ali ibn Sulayman Magari Antaki.[73] However, in 1009, Osama Jannada bin Mohammad and Abu-'l-Ḥasan Antaki were killed by al-Ḥākim's order, but Abdul Ghani bin Saied escaped.[74] These scholars might have abused the freedom prevailing in the educational centres and propagated their own religion against the ruling sect (i.e., the Ismaili sect). Even in this scenario, murdering them could have led to anger and worry among people, especially among Sunnis.

It is worth noting Abū Rakwa's revolt that broke out during al-Ḥākim's reign and lasted for two years. Halm laconically refers to it as a shameful failure. Abū Rakwa claimed to be a son of Hishām ibn Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān.[75] Banu al-Qara, al-Lawatia, Mazzate, and Zanāta tribes joined the revolt. According to Ibn Khaldūn, they were always involved in bloody conflicts, but the tribes decided to unite behind Abū Rakwa in opposition against al-Ḥākim. In addition, the Kutāma and influential leaders like al-Husayn b. Jawhar joined Abū Rakwa, which really challenged al-Ḥākim's popularity. According to Walker,[76] Abū Rakwa's revolt that took place near Cairo indicates that the support for al-Ḥākim

[63] Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 3, pp. 40- 41.

[64] Al- Maqrīzī (1996/ 1416), *Etʿāẓ al-honafā*, Vol. 2, p. 53; Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 4, p. 163.

[65] Al- Maqrīzī (1996/ 1416), *Etʿāẓ al-honafā*, Vol. 2, p. 53; Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 4, p. 163.

[66] Abu Izzeddin (1993), *The Druzes*, p. 77.

[67] Ārif Tāmir (1982/ 1402), *al-Ḥākim bi-amr Allāh: khalifa, wa imam, wa muṣliḥ*, Beirut, pp. 81- 82.

[68] Al- Maqrīzī (1996/ 1416), *Etʿāẓ al-honafā*, Vol. 2, pp. 102- 103; Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 4, p. 76.

[69] Tāmir (1982/ 1402), *al-Ḥākim bi-amr Allāh*, pp. 81- 82.

[70] Jamāl al-Dīn ʿAli b. Yūsuf Ibn al-Qiftī (1371), *Taʾrīkh al-hukamā'*, Behin Daraei (ed.), Tehran: University of Tehran, p. 228.

[71] Ahmad ibn al-Qasim Ibn Abi Usaibi'ah (2001), *Uyun al-Anba' fi Tabaqat al-Atibba*, Vol. 3, ʿĀmir al-Najjār (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-Amma lil-Kitab, pp. 374- 375.

[72] Al Husaini M. Daud (2022), "The Effect of Fatimid Dynasty Authority toward the Development of Islamic Education in Egypt," *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*, Vol. 10, No. 1, p. 22.

[73] Aḥmad b. Moḥammad Ibn Khallikān (1364), *Wafayāt al-aʿyān va-abnā' al-Zamām*, Vol. 1, Ehsān ʿAbbas (ed.), Qom: Al-Sharif al-Razi, p. 372.

[74] Al- Maqrīzī (1996/ 1416), *Etʿāẓ al-honafā*, Vol. 2, p. 80.

[75] Ibn al-Atir (1385/1965), *al-Kāmel*, Vol. 9, p. 197; Dhahabī (1993/ 1413), *Tārīkh al-Islām*, Vol. 27, p. 235; Abd al-Rahman Ibn Khaldūn (1988/ 1408), *Kitāb al-ʿIbar wa dīwān al-mubtadāʾ wa 'l-khabar fi ayyām al- ʿarab wa 'l- ʿajam wa 'l-barbar wa man ʿāṣarahum min dhawi'l-sulṭān al-akbar*, Vol. 4, Beirut, p. 73; Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 4, p. 73; Al-Qurashī (1420), *ʿUyūn al-akhbār*, Vol. 6, p. 259.

[76] Paul Ernest Walker (2002), *Exploring an Islamic Empire: Fatimid History and Its Sources*, London and New York: I. B. Tauris, p. 57.

among rural tribes and the urban population was generally weak and unreliable. Both early historians and contemporary researchers acknowledge the change in al-Ḥākim's violent and anti-Sunni methods after the revolt.[77] The strict policies adopted against the Sunni community, which was a majority in Egypt, cannot be ignored. Such measures could not have won popularity for al-Ḥākim.

Criticism of Halm's Views on al-Hākim's Stability and Consistency

Rejecting the Sunni historians' account on al-Ḥākim's erratic and unpredictable mood and his contradictory commands, Halm depicts a rather stable and consistent image of the caliph's character by referring to the annals of Cairo coeval with al-Ḥākim's reign and his edicts (*sijillāt*).[78] There have remained only a few incomplete accounts coeval with the reign of al-Ḥākim. One is a semi-official history of the Coptic Church written by many authors throughout the centuries, which is titled as *Siyar al-bīʿa al-muqaddasa* also known as *Tàʾrīkh baṭāriqa al-kanīsa al-miṣriyya*.[79] This source offers no evidence supporting Halm's claims. The histories by Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-Anṭākī and al-Mukhtār ʿIzz al-Mullk Muḥammad al-Musabbihī are also important sources.[80]

Because al-Anṭākī was hostile to al-Ḥākim, Halm considers him as an antagonist chronicler, who wrote about al-Ḥākim without visiting him in person.[81] Al-Anṭākī was a Melkite Christian who lived in Egypt until 1014 and then migrated to Syria due to harassment of Christians. Therefore, he can be considered an eyewitness of the events during his sojourn in Egypt; he was also al-Ḥākim's physician for a short period.[82] Feeling animosity towards al-Ḥākim, al-Anṭākī offers a negative and distorted image of the caliph suffering from melancholy.[83] However, al-Anṭākī must have been closely familiar with the events in Egypt as well as al-Ḥākim's orders, thus his account of the caliph can somehow qualify as relevant.

Only some parts of al-Musabbihī's book remained. Actually, al-Musabbihī's ideas can be found in works of some historians like Ebn Zafer, Ibn Khallikān, and Al- Maqrīzī[84] who have used al-Musabbihī's book. These works present some accounts that refute Halm's claim concerning al-Hakim's stability and consistency. Citing al-Musabbihī, al-Maqrīzī states: "In 16th Rabi al-Akhir 402, al-Ḥākim issued a decree to destroy a district known as lo'lo' next to Maghas facing the gulf and save the debris and building material. After the destruction, any person in possession of any looted material was arrested and jailed."[85]

This report indicates al-Ḥākim's inconsistency in issuing insignificant orders about the freedom to possess the material of the destroyed building which was later revoked leading to arresting the people in possession of the material. It contradicts Halm's views about al-Ḥākim's stable and consistent character. Giving historical data about the reign of al-Ḥākim, Halm himself points out such contradictions where he first refers to the destruction of the churches ordered by al-Ḥākim and then to the caliph's order to reconstruct the churches in the last years of his reign.[86] Yet Halm does not consider other decrees issued and later revoked by al-Ḥākim.

The Confession of Ismaili Sources about al-Hākim's Strange Conduct and Their Justifications
Halms discredits all sources written by the Sunni historians in which al-Ḥākim is characterised as idiosyncratic. Nevertheless, even some Ismaili sources attest to al-Ḥākim's idiosyncrasies. Here, a reference is made to al-Kirmānī's *Risālat Mabāsim al-bishārāt bi-al-Imām al-Fāṭimī al-Ḥakim bi-Amr Allāh*, where he refers to al-Ḥākim's statements (e.g., I saw a heavy cloud covering all the sky, and people have faced an enormous disaster) to depict the gloomy situation prevailing in Cairo; then he speaks about people moving away from Auliyâ' al-Din because of their conduct.[87] So al-Kirmānī maintains that people's moving away from Auliyâ' al-Din (i.e., the Fatimid caliph) is due to the caliph's

---

[77] Ibn Khaldūn (1988/ 1408), *Kitāb al-ʿIbar*, Vol. 4, p. 74; Farhad Daftary (2007), *The Ismailis Their History and Doctrines*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 182.
[78] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, p. 35.
[79] Walker (2002), *Exploring an Islamic Empire*, p. 141.
[80] Walker (2002), *Exploring an Islamic Empire*, p. 141.
[81] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, p. 35.
[82] Walker (2002), *Exploring an Islamic Empire*, p. 141.
[83] Yaḥya ibn Saʿīd al-Anṭākī (1990), *Tārīkh al-Anṭākī, al-maʿrūf bi-Ṣilat tārīkh Ūtīkhā*, ʿUmar Tadmurī (ed.), Tripoli, Lebanon: Jarrūs Press, p. 332.
[84] Walker (2002), *Exploring an Islamic Empire*, p.142.
[85] Al- Maqrīzī (1418/ 1998), *Al-Mawāiz*, Vol. 2, p. 396.
[86] Halm (1997), *The Fatimids*, p. 37.
[87] Al-Kirmānī (1987/ 1407), *Majmu'at rasā'il*, pp. 113- 114.

manners and behaviours. Al-Kirmānī actually seeks to provide justifications for al-Hākim's behaviours by referring to then current circumstances as a divine test. However, al-Kirmānī cannot rationally justify all his statements and conduct, so he writes:

> It is obvious that the Imams (PBUH) are common human beings and children of nature, but they are of superior status with respect to their soul. And if their Imamat is justified and proved, neither their words nor their behaviours—if their underlying *hikmah* remains unclear—would harm their Imamat because knowledge and wisdom is not justified by their conduct so to be nullified by rejecting their conduct. Therefore, whether the *hikmah* underlying their conduct becomes clear or not, their Imamat is already established and will remain as such; they will not lose their status and will stay close to the circle they are already clung to, just like the prophets' prophethood which is stable and proved forever.[88]

It is clear that al-Kirmānī attempts to support al-Hākim's Imamat, which was already tarnished by his behaviours. Al-Kirmānī clearly refers to the caliph's words and conduct that were not comprehensible not only for the public but also for the Imam's followers. Undoubtedly, al-Kirmānī cannot rationally justify al-Hākim' behaviours, so he refers to the divine status of the Fatimid Imam, associating it with the Prophet in a bid to frame the caliph's words and conduct as *hikmah* incomprehensible to the ordinary person.

In many of his works, al-Kirmānī first seeks to prove al-Hākim's Imamat, and then he tries to justify his words and conduct and anything strange and incomprehensible therein as something that would not refute the caliph's Imamat. Instead, al-Kirmānī puts a divine wreath around al-Hākim's head in order to justify the caliph's words and conduct and dissuade the reader from understanding them by depicting them as supernatural phenomena incomprehensible for the lay public.

In addition, al-Kirmānī's account mentions two groups that are worthy of attention: 1) a group who resorted to exaggeration and pushed it to the end; and 2) another group who broke the solemn vow, let go of the strong rope of religion, and reverted to their past. These two groups actually stand in contrast to each other in following al-Hākim. This difference can be found in their stance towards al-Hākim. That two groups belonging to the same Ismaili sect adopt such different stances towards one caliph indicates inconsistencies in al-Hākim's character. Actually, the caliph's conduct might have led one group to consider him as possessing a divine status and another group to reject him as their Imam. Therefore, al-Kirmānī hopes to save the third group positioning between the two and resolve their doubts.[89]

Idrīs ʿImād al-Dīn, another Ismaili daʿī, states that in Amīr al-muʾminīn al-Hākim, there appeared virtues, something not heard of before, as well as miracles about which only the deviated and sceptic would have doubts.[90] That Ismaili daʿīs themselves acknowledge al-Hākim's idiosyncratic behaviours—despite their efforts to justify them and label the sceptical minds as deviated—somehow verifies the historical accounts on the caliph's unstable and inconsistent manners.

Conclusion

Assessing Halm's views on al-Hākim alongside relying on historical accounts, the present study showed that Halm had eclectically selected some materials and arranged a series of historical reports and statements in line with his own views and presuppositions about al-Hākim. Therefore, he tried to foreground the elements of his preferred discourse and eliminate or marginalize the competing discourses. In introducing al-Hākim, Halm has viewed all the Sunni sources with lack of trust, labelling them antagonist in nature, although he used some Sunni sources, especially al-Maqrīzī's book. Moreover, Halm's historical discussions challenge his own views on al-Hākim. For example, Halm's comments on killing the court officials, sparking off rebellions, and imposing strict regulations all contradict his claim about al-Hākim's popularity. In fact, foregrounding, marginalization, and elimination evident in Halm's historical account is tantamount to his failure to minimize the error in historical judgment and offer a precise account about al-Hākim.

---

[88] Al-Kirmānī (1987/ 1407), *Majmuʿat rasāʾil*, p. 130.
[89] Al-Kirmānī (1987/ 1407), *Majmuʿat rasāʾil*, pp. 113- 114.
[90] Al-Qurashī (1420), *ʿUyūn al-akhbār*, Vol. 6, p. 281.

References

Abu Izzeddin, Nejla M. (1993), *The Druzes: A New Study of Their History, Faith and Society*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Al- Maqrīzī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī (1998/ 1418), *Al-Mawāiz wa al-ʾiʾtibar bi ẕikr al-ḵiṭaṭ wa al-ʾaṯār*, Kalīl al-Manṣūr (ed.), Beirut: Dār al-Kotob al-Īlmīa.

Al- Maqrīzī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī (1996/ 1416), *Etʿāẕ al-honafā b-aḵbār al-Aema al-Fāṭimiyyin al- ḵolafā*, Moḥammad Ḥilmī Moḥammad Aḥmad (ed.), Cairo.

Al- Qāẓī Noʿmān, Abu Ḥanīfa Moḥammad (1996), *Al-Majālis va al-Masāyerāt*, al-Ḥabīb al-Faqī, Ebrāhīm Šbūḥ and Moḥammad al-Yaʿāvī (eds.), Beirut: Dār al-Montaẕir.

Al- Qāẓī Noʿmān, Abu Ḥanīfa Moḥammad (1963/ 1383), *Daʿāʾem al-Eslām*, Asaf Ali Asghar Fyzee (ed.), Cairo: Dar al-Maʾarif.

Al-Anṭākī, Yaḥya ibn Saʿīd (1990), *Tārīkh al-Anṭākī, al-maʿrūf bi-Ṣilat tārīkh Ūtīkhā*, ʿUmar Tadmurī (ed.), Tripoli, Lebanon: Jarrūs Press.

Al-KirmanīK, Ḥamīd al-Dīn (1969), *Al-Maṣābīḥ fi Eṯbāt al-Aemma*, M. Ghalib (ed.), Beirut: Manshörät Hamad.

Al-Kirmanī, Ḥamīd al-Dīn (1987/ 1407), *Majmuʾat rasāʾil al-kirmānī*, M. Ghalib (ed.), Beirut: al-Mouʾsa al-Arabiya lldratsat va Al-Nashr.

Al-Qurashī, Idrīs ʿImād al-Dīn b. al-Ḥasan (1420), *ʿUyūn al-akhbār wa-funūn al-āthār fī faḍāʾil al-Aʾimmah al-aṭhār*, Muṣṭafá Ghālib (ed.), Bayrūt : Dār al-Andalus.

Arjomand, Saïd Amir (1999), "Heinz Halm, Shiʿa Islam: From Religion to Revolution, trans. Allison Brown," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 2, 276-278.

Bianquis, Thierry (1998), "The Fatimids and Their Traditions of Learning," *Arabic*, Vol. 45, No. 3, 435-437.

Daftary, Farhad (2007), *The Ismailis Their History and Doctrines*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dhahabī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad (1999), *Dawla Al-Islam,* Hasan İsmail Merve (ed.), Beirut: Dār Ṣādir.

Dhahabī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad (1993/ 1413), *Tārīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-al-aʿlām*, Umar Abd al-Salām Tadammurī (ed.), Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿArabī.

Ebn Al-ʿEbrĪ. (Bar Hebraeus), Abu'l-Faraj (1992), *Tarikh Mukhtasar al-Duwal*, Antun Salihani al-Yasu'I (ed.), Beirut: Dar al-Mashriq.

Gertz, Steven (2020), "Fatimids Fighting over Jerusalem: An Interreligious or Intrareligious Matter?," *The Journal of the Middle East and Africa*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 115-137.

Halm, Heinz (2004), *Shi'ism*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Halm, Heinz (1997), *The Fatimids and their Traditions of Learning*, London and New York: I. B. Tauris.

Hamdani, Sumaiya (1998), "Shica Islam: From Religion to Revolution; Heinz Halm," *Digest of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 7, 71-73.

Ḥamzah ibn 'Ali, Isma'il At-Tamimi, Baḥa Ad-Din Assamuqi (1986), *Rasa'il al-hikmah (Epistles of Wisdom)*, Lebanon: Dār al-ajal al-Marifa.

Kamel Hussein, Muhammad (1968). *Tāefatah al-Druze: Tārikhohā wa Aqāyedohā*, Cairo.

Ibn Abi Usaibi'ah, Ahmad ibn al-Qasim (2001), *Uyun al-Anba' fi Tabaqat al-Atibba*, ʿĀmir al-Najjār (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-Amma lil-Kitab.

Ibn al-Atir (1385/1965), *al-Kāmel fi'l-ta'riḵ*, Beirut: Dār Ṣādir-Dār Beirut.

Ibn al-'Imād al-Ḥanbalī, Abd al-Hayy ibn Ahmad (1986/ 1406), *Shadharāt al-dhahab fī akhbār man dhahab*, M. al-Arnaʾūṭ (ed.), Damascus and Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr.

Ibn al-Qiftī, Jamāl al-Dīn 'Ali b. Yūsuf (1371), *Ta'rīkh al-hukamā'*, Behin Daraei (ed.), Tehran: University of Tehran.

Ibn 'Idhari al-Marrakushi, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad (1983), *al-bayān al-mughrib fī ākhbār mulūk al-andalus wa'l-maghrib*, J. S. Colin and E. Lévi-Provençal (eds.), Bayrūt: Dār al-Thaqāfah.

Ibn Iyās, Muhammad (1402), *Badā'i' al-zuhūr fi waqā'i' al-duhūr*, Muḥammad Muṣṭafā (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-Amma lil-Kitab.

Ibn Khaldūn, Abd al-Rahman ibn Muhammad (1988/ 1408), *Kitāb al-ʿIbar wa dīwān al-mubtadāʾ wa'l-khabar fi ayyām al-ʿarab wa 'l-ʿajam wa 'l-barbar wa man ʿāṣarahum min dhawi'l-sulṭān al-akbar*, Beirut.

Ibn Ḵhallikān, Aḥmad b. Moḥammad (1364 sh), *Wafayāt al-aʿyān va-abnā' al-Zamām*, Ehsān 'Abbas (ed.), Qom: Al-Sharif al-Razi.

Ibn Taḡrī Bardī, Yūsef (1992/ 1413), *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira fi Mulūk Miṣr wa al-Qāhira*, Moḥammad Hosein Šams al-Dīn (ed.), Beirut: Dār al-Kotob al-'Ilmīa.

Inān, Muhammad Abd Allah (1905). *Al-Hākim bi-Amr Allāh wa Asrar Al-Da'wah Al-Fatimiyah*, Cairo.

Ivanow, Wladimir (1946), *The Alleged Founder of Ismailism*, Bombay.

Kashani, Abu'l-Qasim 'Abd-Allah b. 'Ali (1987), *Zubdat al-tawarikh: bakhsh-e Fatimian wa Nizarian*, Muhammad-Taqi Danishpazhuh (ed.), Tehran: Moaseseye Motaleat va Tahghighat-e Farhangi.

M. Daud, Al Husaini (2022), "The Effect of Fatimid Dynasty Authority toward the Development of Islamic Education in Egypt," *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 13-32.

Pruitt, Jennifer (2017), "The Fatimid Holy City: Rebuilding Jerusalem in the Eleventh Century," *The Medieval Globe*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 35-56.

Rašīd al-Dīn Fażl allāh (1378 sh), *Jāmiʿ al-Tāvārīḵ (Tārīḵ-e Esmāīlīān)*, Moḥammad Rošan (ed.), Tehran: Markaz-e Pejūhešī-e Mīrāt̲-e Maktūb.

Sūrūr, Muhammad Jamāl al-Dīn (1994), *Ta'rīkh al-dawla al-fātimiyya*, Cairo.

Tali', Amin Muhammad (1961). *Asl al-Movahhedin al-Druze wa Osulohom*, Beirut.

Tāmir, ʿĀrif (1982/ 1402), *al-Hākim bi-amr Allāh: khalifa, wa imam, wa muṣliḥ*, Beirut.

Tyerman, Christopher (2006), *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wahab, Abdel and M. Abdel Wadood (2012), "The History of the Sponsorship and Financial of the Christian Monasteries and Churches in the Fatimid Era in Egypt (969-1171 Ad/358-567h)," *Egyptian Journal of Archaeological and Restoration Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 131-140.

Walker, Paul Ernest (2002), *Exploring an Islamic Empire: Fatimid History and its Sources*, London and New York: I. B. Tauris.