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Abstract:
This study examines the transgression of the powers of the Imam and its impact on the authority and influence of the Imamate from the establishment of the first Ibadi Imamate until the end of the second Imamate (132-280 AH / 579-893 AD). For the purpose of this study, “transgression of powers” means the individual and collective practices in the various levels of power aimed at transgressing the power of the Imams and opposing their policy. We should take into account the factors behind their transgression of the authority of the Imamate, as these practices were not linked only to the period of political unrest, but were even seen in the eras of power and glory of the Imamate.

The study consists of three main sections. The first topic focuses on the fluctuation of the power of the Imam and its relation to transgressing his power. The second topic discusses the transgression of the powers of the Imam during the first Ibadi Imamate (132-134 AH). The last topic sheds light on examples of transgressing the power of the Imam during the second Ibadi Imamate (177-280 AH).
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Introduction

The circumstances conceding with the emergence of the Ibadism can explain many of the developments and subsequent incidents, including those related to the relationship between the Imamate and its partners and the relationship between the leadership and society, as well as the rights and political duties of those assuming social positions in the administrative structure of the Imamate. This relationship is extremely complex, as it endeavors to strike a balance between the religious and political goals and between the visions and interests of the other partners within the Imamate.

We should pose a set of questions related to the political transgression of the power of the Ibadi Imamate to identify the political behaviors of those transgressing the authority of the Imamate. This analytical method is based on deeply comprehending the texts related to real events and link them together, while not neglecting the nature of the figures who had been part of these events and shaped the history of that era. So, is the transgression of the Imam’s power linked to the ability of the first generation of Hamalat Al Elm (Seekers of Knowledge) (1) to bring up a second, third and fourth generations who were acquainted with the political, social and intellectual updates (2)? Or is it linked to the position of those transgressing the power of the Imamate in the Ibadi community, whether belonging to the opposition or pro-Imamate? Or are there other issues, such as the tribal belonging, that affected the transgression of the political authority of the Imamate other than the opposition or pro-Imamate? What is the position of the People of Power and Influence (3) in this regard? (4)? And how did the Imamate ultimately deal with these attempts of transgressing this power?

Wilkins and Fawzi stated that one of the main factors behind transgressing the authority of the Ibadi Imamate is the role of the tribe. Wilkins explained the first transgression of the authority of the Imamate, saying: “The opposition to Bani al-Julanda is, perhaps, due to rivalries between family members. The Imam al-Julanda is descended from the family of Ja’far ibn al-Julanda, whereas his great opponent was Ja’far bin Said bin Abbad, the head of the lower branch of the family to whom power was transferred in the early days of Islam (Wilkins, 1994, P. 22). Fawzi says the same thing when he explained the reason behind overthrowing the Imam by al-Julanda family. He says: “al-Julanda family was divided regarding the Ibadi da'wa and the Abbasid Caliphate.” The Ibadis chose al-Julanda bin Masoud bin Jaifar, who represented the second branch of al-Julanda family to be the first Imam of the Ibadis, but the first branch of Banu al-Julanda, who had political power before the emergence of the Imamate, and which was led by Jaifar bin Saeed bin Abbad, opposed the Imamate and stood by the Abbasids.” (Fawzi 2019, pp. 32-33).
This study aims to focus on three important issues, firstly: The nature of the transgressions of the power of the Ibadi Imamate during the period studied. Secondly, the motives behind the occurrence of these transgressions, especially as they were not only related to the period of political turmoil of the Ibadi Imamate in Oman but related to eras of power. Thirdly, the political measures taken by the Imamate to address these transgressions.

**Topic I: The Fluctuations of the Ibadi Imam’s Power and its Relationship to the Transgression of his Power**

The power of the Ibadi Imam in Oman had been associated with a group of political and religious forces, but the most prominent of these forces were the authority of scholars and jurists (the authority of the people of power and influence), and the authority of the tribe. Before addressing the impact of these two forces on the authority of the Ibadi Imamate and its relationship to the transgression, it is necessary to address the background of the appointment of the Ibadi Imam according to the theory of governance adopted by the Ibadis. Abu al-Mu’thir says: “Imamate is a creed from Allah to establish the limits, give the oppressed their rights and judge between people. The scholars and people of influence and power gather to choose an Imam among them to obey Allah” (Abu al-Mu’thir, 1986, p.72).

The Imamate, therefore, is an obligation stipulated by the Qur’an and Sunnah to implement the rulings of Allah, take care of the people’s affairs, preserve their rights, prevent discord, disagreement, chaos and corruption, and preserve social relations (Al-Kindi, 1986, vol 68, p. 157; Al-Kindi, 2016, vol.10, pp. 270-275). According to the Ibadi school of thought, there are four types of Imamate as follows: The imām al-zuhūr "Imam of glory” (5), the imām al-difā’ “imam of defense” (6), the imām al-shārī "Imam of exchange” (7), and the imām al-kitmān "Imam of secrecy” (8).

In view of the importance and seriousness of the position of the Imam, the Ibadi jurists, based on the Sharia texts, set conditions for whoever holds this position, which are: He shall be free, adult, rational, healthy and Muslim (Al-Shaqsi, 2011, vol 8, p. 48; Abu Ishaq, 1993, pp. 193-194; Al-Salmi, 1993, p. 146). He shall be also just, honest, pious and strong, as well as taking care of protecting Muslims and punishing those who violate the Sharia. (Abu al-Mu’thir, 1986, p. 44; Al-Kharousi, 1999, p. 12). All of this would not be possible without a full knowledge of the legal rulings (Abu Ishaq, 1993, p. 194; Al-Salmi, 1993, vol. 4, p. 268).

The Ibadi jurists stated that the Imam shall be accepted by all scholars and jurists (the People of Power and Influence), (Al-Kindi, 2016, vol. 9, pp. 252-253; Al-Saadi, 1989, vol.8, p.109). We can clearly see the power of the scholars who had been, along with the tribe, the main driver of the political
system of the Ibadi Imamate. As their task was not confined to accepting the Imam, but rather appointing and removing the Imams. Al Basyawi said: “The people of justice meet and pledge allegiance to the Imam to obey Allah and His Messenger, and to enjoin good and forbid the evil” (Al Basyawi, 1986, p. 187). The Imams were also required to listen to the advice of scholars and not to make a decision without consulting them (Abu al-Mu’thir, 1986, p. 73; Al-Saadi, 1989, vol. 8, p. 109; Atfayesh, 1972, vol. 14, p. 306; Al-Shaqqi, 2011, vol. 8, p. 45). The two Kindis said: “Consultation is an obligation that shall be fulfilled by the Imam. Non-commitment to it is an act of disbelief and a sign of weakness. Others said that it is a mandatory; if the Muslims require it, then it becomes an obligation. Non-commitment to it is an act of disbelief and leads to his removal from the Imamate.” (Al-Kindi, 1986, vol 68, p. 193; Al-Kindi, 2011, vol.10, p. 333).

There are a number of examples that reflect the power of the scholars who had the final say in the appointment and removal of Imams in the first and second Ibadi Imamates, such as: Sheikh Judge Musa bin Abi Jaber Al-Azkawi, who was leading the appointment of three Imams, namely: Al-Julanda bin Masoud, Muhammad bin Abi Affan, and Al-Warith bin Kaab Al-Kharousi. He had the final say during the negotiations to remove Ibn Abi Affan. According to Al Salmi, the two Sheikhs Judges Suleiman bin Abi Uthman and Masada bin Tamim appointed Imam Ghassan bin Abdullah after the death of Imam Al Warith bin Kaab to avoid any possible chaos. (Al-Salmi, 2000, vol 1, p. 120). Sheikh Judge Musa bin Ali was also leading the efforts of appointing two Imams, Abdul Malik bin Hamid and Al Muhanna bin Jaifar. Sheikh Judge Muhammad bin Mahboub was the head of the People of Power and Influence who had appointed the Imam Al Salt bin Malik, whereas Sheikh Judge Musa bin Musa Al Azkawi was leading the efforts of removing Imam Al Salt bin Malik and appoint Rashid bin Al Nazir instead of him. The former was also removed by the People of Power and Influence who appointed Azzan bin Tamim as the new Imam of the Ibadis in Oman. (Al Azkawi, 2006, vol 2, pp. 856,862, 865-866; Al-Salmi, 2000, vol. 1, pp. 85, 109, 112, 120, 132, 148, 160, 213, 241).

As for the tribe, it had been behind many of the transgressions as it was the second force influencing the authority of the Ibadi Imamate. I wouldn’t be exaggerating to say that all the transgressions during the studied period were linked to the authority of the tribe in one way or another, whether they were individual or tribal transgressions or those transgressions that were led by ambitious Ibadis such as Musa ibn Musa Al Azkawi, or those transgressions that were associated with foreign powers such as the Abbasid invasion led by Muhammad ibn Nur, who came with the approval and support of the Nizari tribes, as we will see later. What was driving those tribes to transgress the highest political authority in the Ibadi Imamate system? What were the motives that stood behind their
transgression of the political authority of the Imam, and who was supporting and assisting them? How did the Ibadi Imamate deal with these transgressions?

**Second topic: Transgressing the powers of the imam during the first Ibadi Imamate (132-134 AH / 749-751 AD)**

It is known that the first Ibadi Imamate in Oman, which coincided with the emergence of the Abbasid state, lasted only about two years. The latter defeated it in a military confrontation in the second battle of Julphar (9), which marked the collapse of the first Imamate after the killing of its first Imam in (134 AH / 751 AD) (Al-Azawi, 2006, vol 2, pp. 853-855).

At the beginning of the establishment of the first Imamate, there was a transgression of the power of Imam al-Julanda bin Masoud (10), despite the agreement of the religious and political powers to choose him as an Imam, according to the Omani sources (Al-Basyawi, 1986, vol. 1, p. 87; Al-Kindi, 2016, vol. 1, p. 325; al-Azawi, 2006, vol. 2, p. 853; Ibn Ruzaiq, 2008, vol. 2, p. 416; al-Salmi, 2000, vol. 1, p. 85). The religious authority represented by the founder of the Ibadism, Abu Ubaidah Muslim bin Abi Karima, supported the Ibadi Imam from Bani al-Julanda (11), who ruled Oman for more than a century and three decades, but this did not stop the transgression of the Imam’s political authority. Rather, the situation becomes more complicated than it seems when we know that the source of this transgression is the family of the Imam himself.

We do not know much about when Bani al-Julanda started to transgress the power of the first imam of the Ibadis. The modern Omani sources (al-Azawi, 2006, vol. 2, pp. 853-855; Ibn Ruzaiq, 2008, vol. 3, pp. 416-419; al-Harthi, p. 253) except Al-Salmi and Al-Maawali (Al-Salmi, 2000, vol.1, pp. 90-91; Al-Maawali, 2014, p. 96) do not mention any of these transgressions at all despite the seriousness of these incidents. So, did the Omani sources, as usual, summarize the historical events and ignore such a transgression? Or is there something else behind this we can discover? However, all of this does not mean that this transgression appeared in a political vacuum, but rather it could constitute, in this context, an early model for the problematic relationship between the Imamate and the tribe on the one hand, and the relationship of both the tribe and the Imamate with the jurists, negatively and positively on the other hand. This could also reflect the effect of all of this on the nature of the development of the Ibadism and its political and intellectual paths and the transgressions of the authority of the Imamate.

The story we know about this transgression is that the Imam al-Julanda bin Masoud killed Ja`far bin Saeed bin Abbad and his two sons, Al Nizar and Za’ida (12) (Al-Kindi, 2016, vol.11, p. 325). The Imam al-Julanda was affected after this incident because of the relationship between them. The People
of Power and Influence ordered him to step aside, so he stepped aside after throwing his sword and his hood (13) in the imamate house. However, the People of Power and Influence brought him back to the Imamate again after a while (Al-Kindi, 1986, vol.68, p. -345).

However, this transgression of the power of the Imamate, although it soon disappeared completely after the killing of those who committed it, left deep effects on the Ibadi school of thought and the al-Julanda family. At the political level, the Banu al-Julanda did not forget what happened to their family during the days of the first Imamate of the Ibadis. After a year from this incident, the descendants of Jaifar bin Said, Muhammad bin Za’ida and Rashid bin al-Nizar, opposed again the Ibadism, but this time in cooperation with the Abbasids who ruled on behalf of them for four decades, during the transitional period between the two Imamates (134-177 AH/ 752-793 AD). Their grandson exceeded the powers of Imam Ghassan bin Abdullah al Yahmadi, under the leadership of al-Saqir bin Muhammad bin Za’ida. The al-Julanda family became a symbol of opposition to the Imamate when al-Mughira bin Roshan al-Jalandani transgressed the Imamate of al-Mu’anna bin Jaifar al Yahmadi (14) despite the latter's strength. This was the last in a series of transgressions of the Banu al-Julanda to the authority of the Ibadim Imamate (al-Kindi, 1986, vol.68, p. 306; al-Kindi, 2016, vol. 12, pp. 419-420; al-Salmi, 2000, vol. 1, pp. 90, 121-122, 152-153).

I think that the opposition of the al-Julanda family to the Ibadim Imamate can be linked to broader context related to the nature of power among the Bani al-Julanda who ruled Oman since the dawn of Islam until a time near to this period under research, and their belief of their cultural role as they consider themselves as the ones who had preserved the unity of Omani society and had the honor of embracing Islam when Abd and Jaifar, sons of al-Julanda, received the letter of the Messenger of God, PBUH, and voluntarily embraced Islam. This was the first step of embracing Islam by the Omani people. So, this event marked a historic turning point for al-Julanda in particular, and the people of Oman in general (Ibn Saad, 1990, vol. 1, p. 201; Al-Baghdadi, vol. 1, p. 77; Al-Baladhari, 1996, vol. 10, p. 278; al-Tabari, 1967, vol. 3, pp. 29,95; Al-Masoudi, d., vol. 1, p. 240; Al-Awtabi, 2015, vol. 2, p. 722; Al-Azkiawi, 2006, vol. 2, p. 846). The Banu al-Julanda had also maintained a kind of political independence for Oman from the embracement of Islam to the Righteous Caliphs era, the Umayyad era and the reign of Caliph Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan (15). More importantly, they had been honored to participate in the Islamic conquests, the wars of apostasy and the fights against the Kharijites, Najdat and Sufriyya (16), as well as their confrontation with the Umayyads (Ibn Khayat 1967, pp. 278, 297, 380; al-Tabari, 1967, vol. 3, p. 314 / vol.7, pp. 462-463; Ibn Al-Jawzi, 1992, vol.4, pp. 85-86 / vol.7, p. 324; Al-Waqidi, 1990, pp. 54-59).
This political and religious role of al-Julanda family made them thinking that they are the best to assume the power, refusing to give up power after these decades, despite the fact that the Ibadis apparently appreciated all of that by choosing the first Imam from their family. However, I think that this appreciation was not fully true as the Ibadis wanted to court the ruling family in Oman so that they can announce the second imāmat al-zuhūr “Imamate of glory” after their failure in Yemen. They wanted to rearrange themselves internally, especially since they are expecting an external enemy, the Abbasids, which really happened shortly after its establishment, as we mentioned before. We do not find among the Bani al-Julanda someone assuming a special position in the history of the Ibadism except al-Julanda bin Masoud. So, was the matter of introducing him to the Ibadism in Basra and his participation in the establishment of the state of Imam Abdullah bin Yahya al-Kindi (17) in Hadramout planned or a coincidence? (Al-Ruqishi, p. 58; Al-Siyabi, 1981, vol.2, p. 565).

In this context, al-Julanda family are criticized because it had clung to power decades before the imamate was established and after the Imam, Al-Julanda bin Masoud, was chosen by the People of Power and Influence from their family in 132 AH/749 AD. Instead of being an important step to unite the two branches of al-Julanda family, it caused them disputing as the first branch that held political power before the establishment of the Imamate, headed by Ja’far bin Saeed bin Abbād, opposed the second branch that assumed the power of Imamate; this made the People of Power and Influence disappointed. On the other hand, the al-Julanda family did not include the other tribes and didn’t try to make them as allies, which led to a number of tribal revolutions against them, despite the fact that they were sharing political power with the Banu al-Abbas, such as Banu Hana’a revolution (18), Banu al-Harith revolution(19), Banu Nafi` revolution (20), Banu Hamim revolution (21), and Banu Baker revolution (22) during the transitional period between the two Imamate of Oman (134-177 AH). During this period, the descendants of Ja’far bin Said ruled on behalf of the Abbasids; All of these events helped the Ibadis to announce the establishment of the second Ibadi Imamate and the end of both al-Julanda family and the Abbasids alike (Al-Awtabi, 2015, vol. 2, pp. 719-723; Al-Salmi, 2000, vol. 1, pp. 105-109).

Third topic: Transgressing the powers of the imam during the first Ibadi Imamate (177-280 AH/794-893AD)

The Ibadis in Oman were able, after nearly forty-three years, to revive the Imamate in 177-794 AD, which was known as the second Imamate. It lasted for more than a century with eight Imams, all of them from the Auzdi tribe of Al-Yahmadi (23). Omanis believe that the second Ibadi Imamate was the ideal model for the Ibadi state. The Omani sources describe the epochs of the early Imams,
including the sixth Imam Al Salt bin Malik al-Kharousi, (24) with almost identical narratives. Those eras were known for their prosperity and domestic unity. However, the Imamate faced a number of political transgressions which were confronted physically sometimes and diplomatically other times.

The rise of the second Ibadi Imamate coincided with a transgression of its political authority. This happened with the violation of the instructions of the Ibadi Imam Muhammad bin Abi Affan al-Yahmadi and the head of the People of Power and Influence, Sheikh Judge Musa bin Abi Jaber al-Azkawi, to send Saeed bin Ziyad al-Bakri (25) to the east (26) of Oman to quell the unrests. (Al-Kindi, 2016, vol. 12, pp. 551-552; Al-Salmi, 2000, vol. 1, pp. 110-111).

Despite the success of Al-Bakri's pacification mission in the eastern part of Oman, he took an act of revenge in favor of Bani Al-Harith who were tricked by Banu Hana’a during the rule of Muhammad Bin Za’ida and Rashid bin Al Nazar Al-Julandani during the transitional period between the two Imamates; Al-Bakri took revenge on Banu Najo by cutting their palm trees, destroying their crops, shedding their blood, and burning their homes and belongings, despite Judge Musa bin Abi Jaber al-Azkawi's warning to avoid such actions (Al-Azkawi, 2006, vol. 2, pp. 855-856).

The new thing about this transgression is that Imam Muhammad ibn Abi Affan did not lift a finger to stop such transgressions committed by al-Bakri against the teachings of the Ibadis (27). This paved the way for the emergence of the role of jurists and scholars in drawing Ibadi politics. Sheikh Musa bin Abi Jaber al-Azkawi met with the People of Power and Influence to remove Imam Muhammad bin Abi Affan from his position because of this transgression that undermined the confidence of the Sheikhs in him, in addition to other transgressions by the Imam Muhammad himself against the Ibadis and their scholars as narrated by Sheikh Judge Musa bin Abi Jaber in his biography (Al-Azkawi, p. 192).

As for the second transgression during the second Ibadi Imamate, it happened during the Imamate of Al Warith Bin Kaab Al Kharousi (28) (179-192 AH / 795-807 AD) when a group of Shurat (29) from Nizwa (30) came to Sohar (31) to kill the leader of the Abbasid campaign against Oman, Isa bin Ja’far, who was captured by the Omani armies in the battle of Hatta (32). The Wali of Sohar put him in prison and didn’t kill him. The Wali informed the Imam about what he did with the Abbasid prisoner. Then, the Imam went to the people to consult them on the matter of Ibn Ja’far. The head of the People of Power and Influence, Sheikh Judge Ali Ibn Azra, said to the Imam: “You can kill him, or leave him.” The Imam didn’t kill him despite his intention to do so (Abu al-Hawari, 1985, vol. 2, pp. 134-135; al-Kindi, 2016, vol.12, pp. 418-419).
This group who came from Nizwa to Sohar challenged two powers, the authority of the Imamate and the authority of the Wali of Sohar, Maqarsh bin Muhammad al-Yahmadi, who was supposed to protect the prisoners. The Imam did not take any significant action against those who had attacked the prisoner. When closely examining the move of this group from Nizwa and the reaction of Imam Al Warith towards the transgression, we can say two things:

Firstly, This group of people took their step according to the jurisprudential principle that says: “No one is protected except the Imam, and there is no protection without the Imam” (Abu Al-Hawari, 1985, vol. 2, p. 310; Al-Kindi, 2016, vol.11, p. 310). This means that the Imam Al Warith did not grant Ibn Ja’far protection, and thus it was permissible to kill him with or without the Imam’s approval, as Al-Kind states in his book: “The Imam is the one responsible to kill the prisoners of war or to authorize others to kill them, and if he doesn't authorize them, and doesn't prevent them, then they can be killed,” (Al-Kindi, 2016, vol. 11, p. 298).

The use of this rule was not the first nor was it the last in the history of Oman. As the Omani sources mentioned that the Wali of Ibra (33) had brought a group of people under his security to Imam al-Julanda bin Masoud saying that the Muslims said that killing them is permissible. Imam al-Julanda said: "They have no security with me”. The same thing was repeated more clearly during the Imamate of Ghassan bin Abdullah Al-Yahmadi (34) (192-207 AH / 807-822 AD) when he sent a company to the Wali of Samael (35), ordering him to send Al-Saqr bin Muhammad bin Zaida Al-Julandani to him. He sent another company under the leadership of Judge Musa bin Ali, to secure his safe arrival to Nizwa. However, all this did not prevent the Ibadis from killing him before he reached the Imam. Neither the Wali nor the head of the People of Power and Influence were able to protect Al-Saqr bin Muhammad, just as the Imam did not lift a finger to respond to what they did with Muhammad al-Julandani (Abu al-Hawari, 1985, vol. 2, pp. 134-135; Al-Salmi, 2000, vol.1, pp. 90-91, 116-117, 122-123).

Secondly, the Ibadis based their killing of Ibn Ja’far on the consent of both the Imam and the head of People of Power and Influence. The head of the People of Power and Influence had given the Imam two options, one of which was killing, which was chosen by the Ibadis, just as this option was chosen by the Imam before consulting the scholars and jurists of his time (Abu al-Hawari, 1985, vol. 2, pp. 134-135; Al-Salmi, 2000, vol.1, pp. 90-91, 116 -117, 122-123).

One of the most prominent transgressions, during the Imamate of Ghassan bin Abdullah al-Kharusi (192-207 AH / 807-820 AD), was the transgression of Bani Hana’a, headed by Rashid bin Shazan bin Ghassan al-Hina’i. This transgression came in the context of the support of Banu al-Julanda
to the rebel tribes against the Imamate, hoping to regain their power. An evidence of that is the relation between them, Al-Saqr bin Muhammad bin Za’ida, and Bani Hana’a. They hid his brother’s participation in this revolution against the Imamate, which led to his accusation of being against the Imamate and being killed by the Ibadis. The Banu Hana’a attacked Dima (36) and killed its Wali appointed by the Imam after they plundered its people. The Imam sent an army to fight them, but their leader managed to flee with a group of his followers to Al Rustaq (37), seeking the protection of Al-Yahmad tribe from the Imam (Al-Kindi, 1986, vol. 33, pp. 88 / col. 69, p. 34; Al-Kindi, 2016, vol. 32, pp. 352-353; Al-Salmi, 2000, vol. 1, pp. 121-123).

Although the Imam had put an end to the transgression of Bani Hanaa and of Bani al-Julanda, he remained in Dima to secure the Omani coasts from any expected attack, as the Imamate, during his era, witnessed a violation of its authority by the Indian pirates who attacked the northern coasts of Dibba (38) and Julphar and was confronted by the Imam, using, for the first time in the history of the Imamate, ships known as Shaza and al-Ghurf (39). He went personally to Sohar to participate in the efforts of facing the attacks on the Coasts of Oman (Al-Salmi, 2000, vol.1, p. 121).

As for the Imamate of Abd al-Malik bin Hamid (207-226 AH / 822-840 AD), the Mahra tribe overruled the Ibadi authority when they refused to pay the Zakat (alms) and killed its collectors, as well as avenging those who killed their people in their wars with Rashid Bin Al Nadhar in the Mjaza battle, (40) according to Al-Siyabi (Al-Sayabi, 1994, vol. 2, p. 74). Imam Abd al-Malik bin Hamid dealt with these people firmly and severely until he forced them to seek protection from him many times, but the Imam continued to chase them because of the Muslim blood they had shed, until the head of the People of Power and Influence, Sheikh Musa bin Ali al-Azkawi, interceded for them, so the Imam granted them the protection and pardoned them ( Al-Ruhily, p. 25; Al-Salmi, 2000, vol.1, pp. 132-133).

As for the Imamate of Al-Muhanna bin Jaifar (41) (226-237 AH / 840-851 AD), his Imamate was very strong to an extent that his forces in Nizwa reached seven hundred camels and six hundred horses. The same sources describe this period of Imamate as strong and firm when it comes to dealing with violators (Al-Azkawi, 2006, vol.2, p. 862; Al-Salmi, 2000, vol.1, p. 148). However, this did not prevent the occurrence of transgressions of the Imam’s political authority. The first of these transgressions was the refusal of the Mahra tribes to pay the alms, headed by Wassim bin Ja’far al-Mahri, to the Imam’s alms collector, Abdullah bin Suleiman. Ja’far al-Mahri was asked to pay two groups of alms but he refused and said: “Take one, and if you don’t want to take it, look at the graves of your companions (42).” As for the second of these transgressions, it was the killing of the Imam’s
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Imam Al-Muhanna bin Ja’far dealt with the previous transgressions strictly when he forced the Mahri tribes to submit to him after imprisoning Waseem Al-Mahri. Nobody from his tribe could release him. However, after a year, a group ofMahris went to Al-Yahmadi tribes to intercede for Waseem with the Imam. He was released upon one of the three conditions, which are: leaving Oman, being in war, or paying their alms annually. They agreed to choose the last condition. As for the Bani al-Julanda transgressions, they remained calm and silent after this defeat (Al-Azkawi, 2006, vol 2, p. 862; Al-Salmi, 2000, vol.1, p. 148).

I think that the most dangerous transgression during the time of Imam Al-Muhanna is what happened in the southern parts of Oman, when Imam Al-Muhanna assigned the judiciary to the Walis of those regions such as the Adam (44), Senaw (45) and Ja’alan (46). It is more likely that these Walis had been unjust and cruel. Al-Saadi said that Sheikh Judge Muhammad bin Mahboub, who was at that time the head of the People of Power and Influence, had written a letter to the Imam describing the transgressions of these rulers and their injustice to the subjects, calling on the Imam to dismiss them, saying to him: “Some of our people have complained about a number of Walis because of their oppression, threats, beating, imprisonment and restrictions. If they knew that if they did something wrong with their people, you would replace them by others better than them, they wouldn’t do that. You didn’t believe what had been said about them, but you believed them and had been pleased to collect money from them. There are members of your family who oppressed the people, but they are afraid of reporting these oppressions. Those are the Walis of Al Sar and Manah. Other Walis are the Walis of Adam, Ja’lan and Hijar (49). You have burned the letters of the people sent to their families. You can burn those which include violations, but you can’t burn those written to their families. They have written the letters using papers they bought and you have no right to burn something they have bought with their money. You are a polite Imam and a model. You have to be careful of anything against the Quran, the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah, PBUH, and the teachings of the righteous. Remember the rights you are responsible for. Al Ahwash asked you to give him his rights taken by his brother. He asked for your justice” (Al-Kindi, 1986, vol. 28, pp. 83-86; Al-Saadi, 1989, vol. 36, pp. 133-135).

It appears, from the letter of Judge Muhammad bin Mahboub to the Imam Al-Muhanna, that the injustice of the Walis was not evident in southern parts of Oman, but also in Al Sir, Hijar and Manah. Why did the transgressions of his Walis reach to that level of injustice? And why didn’t the Imam deal
with them in the same firmness as he did with Wassim Al Mahri? Isn’t it clear from the letter of Ibn Mahboob that the Imam was aware of the transgressions of these Walis, especially when we see the oppressions committed by his relatives?

In my opinion, and in spite of what has been mentioned, these unfair practices by the Walis of al-Muhanna are only examples of irregular and rare transgressions during the period of the Imamate of al-Muhanna bin Jaifar. This also reflects the prompt responses of the Omani scholars and jurists who combated such practices and reported them to the Imams, warning them from the consequences of such acts.

The period between (273-280 AH / 886-893 AD) of the Ibadi Imamate witnessed tremendous transgressions, affecting the Imams and the people together. The political power of the Imams had been explicitly violated during this time because of the political influence which was transferred to the tribal leaders and influential people in the Imamate. Judge Musa bin Musa al-Azkawi (50) led a reform process, as described by the sources it, to remove Imam al-Salt bin Malik and appoint Rashid bin al-Nazar (273-277 AH / 886-890 AD) (51) as Imam of Oman without the consensus of the People of Power and Influence. Then, he removed that Imam in less than four years, and appointed Azzan bin Tamim (52) as Imam of Oman (277-280 AH / 890-893 AD) (Al-Azkawi, 2006, vol.2, 865-878).

What Judge Musa bin Musa al-Azkawi did with regard to the appointment of Imam Rashid bin al-Nazar and the removal of Imam al-Salt bin Malik is not a transgression of the power of the Imam himself as it was a serious violation of the principles on which the Ibadi Imamate was based, which stipulates that the approval of the People of Power and Influence shall be taken before appointing the Imam, which was not done according to Abu al-Mu’thir: “They pledged allegiance to Rashid wrongfully” (Abu Al-Mu’thir, 1986, p. 32). A group of scholars refused the pledge of allegiance to Rashid bin al-Nazar, headed by Judge Omar bin Muhammad al-Dhabi, Musa bin Muhammad bin Ali, Azzan bin al-Hazbar, Azzan bin Tamim, Shazhan bin al-Salt, Ghadana bin Muhammad, and Abu al-Mu’thir al-Salt bin Khamis (Al-Salmi, 2000, vol. 1, P. 193).

Between the removal of the Imam and the appointment of a new one, Oman witnessed a severe tribal crisis that led the country to a devastating civil war ended with the demise of the second Ibadi Imamate (53) and the return of the Abbasid control over Oman as a result of the transgression committed by the Nizari tribes in retaliation for the defeat by the Yemeni tribes in the Battle of al-Qaa (54). They joined forces with the Abbasid Caliph al-Mu’tadid against them. (279-289 AH / 792-902 AD, al-Mu’tadid sent his famous campaign under the leadership of Muhammad ibn Noor (55), who took severe measures against the Ibadis, burned their books and destroyed their aflajs and farms. Al-
Azkawi commented on this incident saying: “When Muhammad ibn Noor came to Oman, chaos broke out, conflicts provoked and people separated; some of them lift Oman and other gave up because of their weaknesses” (Al-Azkawi, 2006, vol. 2, p. 871). As for Al-Salmi, he described this incident clearly saying: “The people of Sohar and its surroundings in Al-Batinah were afraid, so they escaped with their money and families to Seraph, Basra, Hormuz and other countries ...” (Al-Salmi, 2000, vol. 1, 258).

Abu al-Mu’thir referred in his biography to the prevalence of injustice and the oppressed in Nizwa prison without being guilty (Abu al-Mu’thir, 1986, vol. 1, pp. 50, 52, 54). The employees of the Rashid bin Al Nazar Imamate infringed on the rights of the weak and the needy. The punishments became severe and far away from the Islamic Sharia controls. Some prisoners were tied to an extent they lost their ability to walk, while others were punished until they died (Abu al-Mu’thir, 1986, vol. 1, p. 54).

The litigations were presented before those who did not understand anything in the judiciary. They listened to testimony of untruthful people. They executed judgements without any witnesses. An example of this is what Judge Musa bin Musa did when he approved a dowry for a woman with the clerk of Al Salt. He also sought the help of Saeed bin Muhammad in the retaliation of Qassis Jarrah, who was previously considered as untruthful by Imam Salt bin Malik and ordered to dismiss him. This incident led to the removal of that judge. (Abu Al-Mu’thir, 1986, vol.1, p. 45).

Women had also suffered from the oppression and confiscation of their rights in the cities of Oman such as Nakhl and Rustaq. Merchants also had suffered from the same oppression where their money was seized as looting and theft increased (Abu Al-Mu’thir, 1986, pp. 28-70).

**Conclusion (results)**

This study comes up with a number of conclusions as follows:

1) The Omani sources confirmed that tribe was the main driver of most of the transgressions of the authority of the Ibadi Imam during the studied period, most importantly the Banu al-Julanda tribes who had been able to violated the power of the Imamate three times. The first of which was during the time of Imam al-Julanda bin Masoud, then during the Imamate of Ghassan bin Abdullah al-Yahmadi and the last of them at the time of Imam Al-Muhanna bin Jaifar. Banu al-Julanda were the main supporter of the transgression committed by Banu Hana’a at the time of Imam Ghassan bin Abdullah. The second tribe is Al-Mahra tribe, which violated two Ibadi powers, namely the authority of Imam Abdul-Malik bin Hamid and Al-Muhanna bin Jaifar. The Auzdi Yamani tribes were the main supporter for the transgression of Shazan bin Al Salt of the authority of Imam Rashid bin Nazar. The Mudhari Nizari tribes were also the main supporter of the Abbasid attack on Oman in 280 AH / 893 AD).
2) The main goal of the tribes’ transgressions was to take power, but the different thing happened during the political turmoil in Oman (273-280 AH / 886-893 AD) was the foreign intervention, when the Nizari tribes sought help from the Abbasids.

3) The People of Power and Influence have been able to draw a formula for political accommodation for many armed and unarmed transgressions carried out by tribes or individuals with the aim of preserving the cohesion of the Imamate internally. An example of this is what Sheikh Judge Musa bin Abi Jaber Al-Azkawi did with the transgression of Saeed bin Ziyad Al-Bakri And what Sheikh Al-Qadi Musa bin Ali Al-Azkawi did with the transgression of the Mahrah tribes at the time of Imam Abd al-Malik bin Hamid. The founding generation of the People of Power and Influence was able to achieve a kind of balance between the Imamate and the tribe. However, this role disappeared after the removal of Al Salt bin Malik, due to the emergence of another generation of young people completely different from the founding generation, such as Musa ibn Musa did, who pretended to be a reformer in the Imamate, and therefore could not stop the Nizari tribes from transgressing the authority of the Imamate.

4) The ruling families in Oman (the Banu al-Julanda / Al-Yahmadi) combined between the use of armed forces and the political solution to face the transgressions. There had been individual transgressions which did not require any force. However, there had been collective armed transgressions that were faced by political measures and armed solutions, just as the Al-Yahmadi family did with the Al-Mahrah tribes in its first transgression, and then it soon used political mediation in its second transgression.

5) The individual and group transgressions negatively affected the authority of the Ibadi Imamate internally and dispersed its efforts that could have been used in its development or used against external aggressions.

Margins:

(1) Hamalat Al Elm (Seekers of Knowledge). The students who graduated from the Imam Abu Ubaidah Muslim Ibn Abi Karima School in Basra during the first half of the second century AH / 10th century AD and moved to their countries as scholars and advocates of truth. They are the first building block of the Ibadi school of thought and its political actions in their regions in the East and the Islamic Maghreb (Researchers Group, 2008, vol.1, p. 307).

People of Power and Influence: They are the primary commanders whom the ummah trusts, including scholars and chiefs in the army. If they agree on an order or ruling, they must be obeyed, provided that it does not contradict the Qur’an and the Sunnah (Al-Razi, 1999, vol.10, pp. 108-113).

Sheikh Judge Musa bin Abi Jaber, the head of the People of Power and Influence and one of the scholars graduating from Basra, was able, by virtue of his political acumen, to save the Imamate three times from complex circumstances during the studied period. First of them: When the Ibad organization and its members in Izki maintained intense vigilance and activity during the transitional period between the two Imamates (134-177 AH). Secondly, when he was able to absorb the tribal movement during the Nizwa meeting and made it an Ibadi gain by appointing Muhammad bin Abi Affan as Imam of Oman. Thirdly, the appointment of the Al Warith bin Ka'b al-Kharousi as Imam of Oman after his decision to remove Imam Muhammad bin Abi Affan. On the other hand, Judge Musa bin Musa al-Azkawi was a reason that led the second Imamate into a destructive war that led to its end by the Abbasids (Al-Riyami, 2015; Al-Khataria, 2020, Judge Musa bin Abi Jaber al-Izkawi).

Imāmat al-zuhūr “Imamat of glory”: The top of the four "states of the religion" (masālik ad-dīn) in Ibadism, as it represents the full application of the theory of governance for the followers of the Ibadism starting from the choice of the Imam, the establishment of governance, the implementation of the duties and the organization of the state and society. An example is the Imamate of Al-Julanda bin Masoud (132-134 AH) (Al-Kindi, 2016, vol.10, pp. 298-341; Atfayesh, 1983, pp. 76-77; Al-Thamini, 1986, vol. 2, p. 107).

Imāmate al-difā’ “Imamate of defense”: This type is applied when the followers of Ibadism are facing an external enemy or when an Imam abuses his power. In both cases, the scholars meet to choose an Imam to defend the sect and its ideology. They decide whether to remove the Imam or make him as Imam of glory, as happened with Imam Muhammad bin Abi Affan (ibid).

Imāmate al-shārī “Imamate of exchange”: It means bartering the life of this world for the hereafter, self-sacrificing, and fighting the oppressive authority. This type of Imamate is followed when tyranny cannot be tolerated. A group of Ibadis arise to combat that tyranny, as Abu Bilal Mirdas bin Hudayr did in 61 AH. (ibid) (ibid)

Imāmate al-kitmān “Imamate of secrecy” It is unlike the Imamate of glory, where Ibadis distance themselves from political life and engage in the religious activities for fear of being oppressed by the authority until moving to another state. An example of this is what happened to the Ibadism in
Basra during the days of Imam Jabir bin Zaid and the transitional period between the first and second Imamates in Oman. (ibid)

(9) Julphar: One of the most important ancient Omani cities; it is known today as Ras al-Khaimah. (Al-Hamwi, vol. 2, 1995, p. 154).

(10) Al-Julanda bin Masoud: One of the sons of al-Julanda bin Al-Mustakbar, he was appointed as the Imam in 132 AH, and was killed by the Abbasids in 134 AH. For more details, see: (Al-Batashi, 2016, vol.1, p. 297).


(12) Descendants of Saeed bin Abbad, ruler of Oman during the Umayyad period.

(13) The Kumah (Omani traditional cap), the hood and the ring were among the most important emblems in the appointment and removal of Imams. (Ibn Baraka, 1986, vol.2, p. 391; Al-Salmi, vol.1, pp. 90, 197).

(14) Al-Muhanna bin Jaifar: Descended from the Auzdi Al-Yahmad tribe. He was appointed as the Imam following the death of Imam Abd al-Malik bin Hamid. The pledging of allegiance process was done by Judge Musa bin Ali. His imamate lasted eleven years. See: Al-Saadi, 2007, vol.3, pp. 221-223).

(15) For more details on the status of Oman during the Rashidun Caliphate until the reign of Caliph Abdul Malik bin Marwan, see: Anonymous, 2005 AD, pp. 37-51; Khleifat, 1994, pp. 5-54).

(16) al-Najdat and al-Sufriah: Two groups of the Kharijites (Dissenters). al-Najdat was called after Najdah bin Amer Al-Hanafi, and al-Sufriah was called after Abdullah bin Al-Saffar, but others said after Ziad Al-Saffar (Al-Qalhati, 1984, vol 2, pp. 428-429, 433).

(17) Abdullah bin Yahya Al-Kindi: He led the Ibadism in Yemen and was appointed as Imam, after fomenting the revolution against the Umayyad Caliph Marwan bin Muhammad. He captured Hadramawt, Sanaa, Makkah, Taif and Medina. The Imamate in Yemen was defeated by the Umayyad leader Abdul Malik bin Muhammad bin Attiyah al-Saadi. (Al-Nadabi, 2019, pp. 47-111).

(18) Banu Hana’a: They descended from Hana’a bin Malik bin Faham Al-Auzdi. They live in the villages surrounding Jabal Al-Kour such as Al-Ghafat, Blad Seet, Samail and Al Rustaq. It is one of the Yemeni tribes. (Al-Siyabi, 1965, p.91).
(19) Banu Al-Harith: A Yemeni Qahtani tribe Al-Qahtaniyah, descended from Al Auzd. This tribe includes a number of branches such as Browani, Daghashi, Khanajari, Tuqi, Sinnawiy, Ghaithi and others. (Al-Siyabi, 1965, p. 114).

(20) Banu Naf’: A Nizari Adnani tribe, descended from Sama bin Lua’i bin Ghalib al-Qurashi. They were the leaders of Al Aqr. (Al-Siyabi, 1965, p. 23).

(21) Banu Hamim: A Nizari Adnani tribe, descended from Humim Anza bin Asad bin Rabia’a bin Nizar bin Maad bin Adnan. They live in the villages of Al Rustaq. (Al-Siyabi, 1965, pp. 73-74).


(23) Al-Yahmad: A branch of Al-Auzd, which is a Qahtani tribe migrated from Yemen with the Arab tribes and landed in Oman. They are descended from Al-Yahmad bin Hama bin Othman bin Nasr bin Zahrin bin Kaab bin Al-Harith bin Kaab bin Abdullah bin Malik bin Nasr bin Al-Auzd. The Al-Yahmad tribe includes a group of tribes, including Al-Kharousi and Al Harith. (Al-Samani 1999, vol.4, p.526. Al-Siyabi, 1965, pp. 111, 114).


(25) His father, Ziyad bin Saeed, was the leader of the Al-Harith tribe and killed Ghassan bin Saeed Al-Hinai, the leader of Banu Hana’a.

(26) Al Sharq region: It refers to Al Sharqia Governorates at the present time, starting from the eastern villages of the Al Awamir to the borders of Bidyiah. For more details, see: Al-Abri, 2009, p.2).

(27) Banu Najo: They are from Al Sharqia region and were assisting Bani al-Julanda. They took part, along with Rashid bin Al Nazar, in the battle of Al-Majaza. (Al-Salmi, 2000, vol.1, p. 110).


(30) Nizwa: A mountain in Oman which contains many villages; all of them are called Nizwa. It is famous for making silk dresses. (Al-Hamwi, 1995, vol.5, p. 281).
(31) Sohar: Sohar is the lung of Oman across the coasts and mountains. Sohar is a city with clean air, good people and delicious fruits. It is built with bricks and teak. It is not so big like other similar cities. (Al-Hamwi, 1965, vol.3, pp. 393-394).


(33) Ibra: A town in Oman that includes a group of tribes such as, Al Harith and Al-Masakri. (Al-Siyabi, 1995, pp. 101-102).

(34) Ghassan bin Abdullah: He is from the Auzdi Al-Yahmad tribe. He assumed the Imamate after the death of Imam Al-Warith bin Kaab Al Kharousi. Sheikh Masada bin Tamim and Judge Suleiman bin Othman were among those who pledged allegiance to him. (Ibn Medad, 1984, p. 27; Al-Saadi, 2007, vol. 3, pp. 4-6).


(37) Al Rustaq: This name is derived from the Persian word Rizdak, which has the same meaning. It is currently located within the Wilayats of South Al Batinah Governorate. (Al-Zubair, vol. 1, p. 263).


(41) Al-Muhanna bin Jaifar: he is descended from the Auzdi Al-Yahmad tribe. He was appointed as the Imam following the death of Imam Abd al-Malik bin Hamid. The pledging of allegiance process was done by Judge Musa bin Ali. His imamate lasted eleven years. Al-Saadi, 2007, vol.3, pp. 221-223).

(42) When Wasim said “the graves of your companions”, he means the incident of killing the Muslims by the Mahra tribes during the Imamate of Abd al-Malik bin Marwan (207-226 AH / 822-840 AD). (Al-Kindi, 2016, vol.11, p. 299).


(44) Adam: A town in Oman, south of Manah. Al-Mahariq and Al-Janaba are among the oldest tribes which have lived in this town. (Al-Siyabi, 1995, pp. 125-126).
(45) Sinow: It is located in the southern part of eastern Oman. Al Rashed family is the most famous tribe living in this town. (Al-Siyabi, 1995, pp. 127-128).

(46) Ja'al Alan: It is located on the eastern part of Oman, surrounded by the tribes of Bu Ali, Al Rasib, Al-Hashem, Al-Janaba and other tribes. It covers the areas from Al-Ruwais to Ras Al-Hadd on the southeastern coast and to the borders of Bidiyah, Wadi Bani Khalid and Sur. (Al-Siyabi, 1995, p.13)

(47) Al Sir: An area in Al Dhabhira region that includes the towns of the Al Einin, Al Araqi and Al Ghubbai. (Al-Siyabi, 1995, p. 76).


(50) Musa ibn Musa al-Azkawi: He is from the Nizari tribe of Banu Sama. He is originally from a village in Izki and was the Sheikh of Muslims in his time. He had witnessed the appointment of three Imams, namely: Al Salt bin Malik al-Kharousi, Rashid bin al-Nadr and Azzan bin Tamim. He opposed Imam Al Salt bin Malik and called for his removal, leading the country plunged into a devastating civil war. He died in the battle of Izki aby Imam Azzan bin Tamim in 278 AH / 891 AD. (Al-Saadi, 2007, vol.1, pp. 237-238).


(52) Azzan bin Tamim: He is from the Auzdi tribe of Al-Yahmad. He assumed the Imamate after Imam Rashid bin Al-Nadar. He was killed by the Abbasid commander Muhammad bin Bour. (Al-Saadi, 2007, vol. 2, pp. 344-345).

(53) After the removal of Imam al-Salt bin Malik, Oman was divided into three viewpoints, namely: The viewpoint of the people of Al Rustaq, known as the Rustaqic school, which supported Imam Salt and opposed his removal. And the point of view of Judge Musa bin Musa, Rashid bin Al Nadar, and the tribes that rebelled against Imam Al Salt bin Malik. As for the third group, its point of view was to reconcile between the two previous viewpoints, which the Nizwa school could not achieve because of the bad relationship between the Ibadi Imam and the People of Power and Influence. The Imam was not able to build friendships with the tribes in a tribally complex society as the Omani society. (Al-Izkawi, 2006 AD, vol.2, pp. 866-898).

المستخلص

التجاوز على صلاحيات الإمام وأثرها على سلطة الإمامة ونفوذها حتى سنة (280 هـ/893 م)

خلود بنت حمدان بن سعيد الخاطرية

تتناول هذه الدراسة التجاوز على صلاحيات الإمامة وأثرها على سلطة الإمامة ونفوذها منذ قيام الإمامة الإباضية الأولى وحتى نهاية الإمامة الثانية (132-280 هـ/579-893 م). وتتضمن الدراسة تجاوزات هذه الدراسة تلك الممارسات الفردية والجماعية التي اتخذها من هم في مختلف أنساق السلطة بهدف تخطي سلطة الأئمة والاعتراف على احترامهم في الاعتبار العوامل التي تتفو نفوذهم سلطة الإمامة خصوصا وأن تلك التجاوزات لم ترتبط فقط بفترة الاضطرابات السياسية بل وجدت حتى على أيام قوة الإمامة وعزتها.

وتتكون الدراسة من ثلاثة مباحث رئيسية، يركز المبحث الأول على تباين سلطة الإمامة الإباضي بين القوة والضعف وعلاقة ذلك بالتجاوز عليه، في حين يعالج المبحث الثاني التجاوز على صلاحيات الإمامة خلال الإمامة الإباضية الأولى (132-143 هـ)، أما المبحث الأخير فيتضمن الضوء على نماذج من تجاوزات سلطة الإمامة خلال الإمامة الإباضية الثانية (77-170 هـ).

الكلمات الدالة: تجاوز سلطة الإمامة، الإمامة الإباضية، عمان.
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