THE EXPANSION OF THE MUSLIMS AND MOUNTAIN FOLK OF NORTHERN SYRIA
——The Jarajima in the Umayyad Period——

Keiko OHTA*

1 The Jarajima in History of Thughur

The Amanus-Taurus mountain chains, which span from the southeast part of the Anatolia peninsula to northern Syria, was the border line between the Caliphate and the Byzantine empire—that is, between the Muslims and the Christians—for several centuries after the Muslim Conquest. The Arabs called this borderland "Thughur", the frontier fortresses. The Muslims succeeded in expanding their sphere of influence swiftly throughout most of the Middle East, whereas this mountainous area which was marked by habitual warfare between the Muslims and the Byzantines, remained a region outside the hegemony of the Muslims for a long time, because of the geographical environment and its strategical and political circumstances.

Heraclius, when he decided to withdraw from Syria, ordered the destruction of the cities and strongholds in western Thughur and the migration of its inhabitants from this region.(1) As a buffer zone, this desolated land and mountains had obstructed the Muslims from expanding their rule over the region.(2) Its return to the hands of the Muslims began from the second half of the Umayyad period, and the reconstruction of the cities and immigration of large numbers of Muslims caused a great change of the social circumstances therein. For this reason, it is difficult to know the nature of the indigenous inhabitants living there at the time of the Muslim expansion and their reaction to it. We can find, however, some information on the Jarajima (Μαρῆατατ in Greek), a indigenous group of the Amanus mountains who remained in their native land after the withdrawal of the Byzantine Army and had taken part in the Arabo-Byzantine conflicts. This information shows
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us the movements of the indigenous people in western Thughūr under the anarchical circumstances of the early Islamic period. Their movements are of importance not only in considering the special characters of the history of the border country, but also in studying the changes in indigenous society under the influence of Muslim expansion. Therefore, this article will examine the character of the Jarājima, their activities in the Arabo-Byzantine conflicts and the policies of these Great Powers toward them, in order to reconstruct the social history of Thughūr in the early Islamic period.

The mountain chains of Syria (the Lebanon, the Nuṣayris and the Amanus=Jabal al-Lukkām), stretch south and north and join the Taurus mountains at the southeast corner of Asia Minor. The native land of the Jarājima was the town of Jurjūma situated in the Amanus mountains north of Antioch between Bayyās and Būqā.(3) It was the name of this town that they were called the Jarājima. This word may also connected with Gurgum, the old name of the district of Mar'ash. Therefore, it is supposed that not only the inhabitants of Jurjūma but also all of the people in the vicinity should be known as the Jarājima.(4) On the other hand, there are no definitive opinion on the origin of their Greek name of the Ἴπατος.(5) In general, the Jarājima have been regarded as a marauding or insurgent people in the Amanus mountains.(6) But, another source defines them as mercenaries belonging to the Byzantine Army.(7) During the first phase of the Muslim Conquest, the Jarājima concluded a very advantageous peace treaty with the Muslims, but they did not refrain from their insurgency against the Muslims in the mountainous region and from co-operating with the Byzantine Army. It is no doubt that their activity had great influence on the Arabo-Byzantine peace treaties. In addition, they were known to play an important role in the anti-Muslim movements carried out by the indigenous peoples of Syria. These facts show that the Jarājima did exert a great influence on the history of Syria during the early Islamic period.

The major sources concerning the Jarājima are as follows,(8)

(Arabic)

* al-Jāḥiẓ (d.255/863), al-Bayān wa Tabyīn, Cairo, 1948-50. <abr. al-Jāḥiẓ>
* al-Baladhuri (d.278/892), Futūḥ al-Buldān 3vols., Cairo, 1956. <abr. Futūḥ>
* idem, Ansāb al-Ashrāf, vol. 5, Jerusalem, 1936. <abr. Ansāb>
Generally speaking, there has been very little research done on the Jarajima up to the present day. They have been talked only in a fragmentary manner in histories of the Umayyad, the early Islamic period, and the Byzantine empire. We find only one monograph on the *Μαροδαίτα* written...
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by K. Amantos. P.H. Lammens' article on the Mu‘awiya era and J. Well-hausen's paper on the Arabo-Byzantine conflicts are also useful for studying the Jarajima.

Amantos offers some opinions on the etymological and ethnological origin of the Mardaites, noting that, after their migration into Byzantine territory, they were employed as sailors, whereas they had been known as armed infantrymen in the mountainous region of Syria. In addition, he examines the reason why the Byzantines allowed the withdrawal of the Mardaites from the point of Byzantine history. Concerning the characteristics of the Mardaites, he asserts that they were not a regular army but had actively offered their military services to the Byzantine empire from earlier times, because their forefathers were thought to be the Lebanon Corps mentioned in Procopius' History. Therefore, he argues that they had been tied to the Byzantines and belonged to the Greek Orthodox Church. He also suggests that, even though they were regarded sometimes as leaders of the anti-Muslim movement among the indigenous peoples of Syria, that is the Monophysists and so on, they were in fact under the Byzantine government and were part of the Byzantine Army.

On the other hand, Lammens considers the Jarajima as a semi-bandit group who had maintained independence in the mountainous region belonged to the non-Orthodox Churches (Monophysite or Monothelite), and had become the vanguard of the resistance carried out by the indigenous peoples against the Muslims. Therefore, he asserts that they were not under any of the Great Powers, though they co-operated with the Byzantine Army temporally. Many scholars also have recognized them as a semi-independent party to the history of the Amanus mountains.

There are difficulties presented in the study of the Jarajima due the fact that the sources referring to them have been written in various languages and dated according to different calendars. Also, in many cases, references to them have been prejudiced and often distorted. For these reasons, most of research has inclined to present rather uncritically the information provided in the sources.

2 History of the Jarajima

1. The first peace treaty with the Muslims
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al-Baladhuri mentions that, when Abū ‘Ubayda, a commander of the Arabs in the conquest of Syria, came to northern Syria and took Antioch and other cities in 15/636, the Jarajima shut themselves up in their city, first intending to join the Byzantine Army, but later deciding to remain in the Amanus mountains. At this time, the Muslims took no note of them. There is no further reference mentioning that they took part in the battles between the Byzantines and the Arabs. But here is no doubt that the policy of Heraclius, which forced all of the inhabitants of the borderlands to withdraw with the Byzantines, did not apply in the case of the Jarajima, thus they remained in their native land of their accord. After that, when Ḥabib b. Maslama al-Fihri retook Antioch, he attacked Jurjuma. The inhabitants of the city made peace with him immediately and opened the city gates without hostilities. According to al-Baladhuri, the terms of the peace treaty were as follows,

* The Jarajima would act as helpers to the Muslims, as spies and frontier garrisons at Mt. al-Lukkām.
* They would be exempted from jizya (poll tax).
* They would have a right to a share of the booty taken from the enemy, whenever they took part in the military operation of the Muslims.
* Besides the Jarajima, all those who lived in Jurjuma, as well as the merchants, employees and dependents of the natives, together with the inhabitants of the surrounding villages (called al-Rawādīf), would be included under these terms.

This agreement proves that the Muslims granted the Jarajima special privileges, thus enabling the latter to have possibly maintain a nearly independent state, as long as they remained friendly to the Muslims. Considering these terms, it may be supposed that they also maintained similar independence under Byzantine rule. Moreover, this peace treaty does not prove without a doubt the Jarajima were subsumed under Muslim control, for even after coming to these terms, they repeated their attacks upon the Muslim Army.

2. The first Arabo-Byzantine peace treaty concerning the Jarajima

Later, we find some mention of the Jarajima at the end of Mu‘āwiya era. Theophanes mentions in the records of A.M.6169 that, in the ninth year of Constantinus IV (58/678), the Mardaites invaded Mt. Lebanon by order of the emperor, and took possession of it from Mt. Galilee to Jerusalem. Many runaway slaves and captives, and the indigenous groups gathered under
them, enlarging their rebellion. Under these conditions, Mu'awiya sought peace from the emperor and came to terms with him, agreeing on an annual tribute of three thousand pieces of gold, and fifty captives and thoroughbred horses. This agreement continued for thirty years.\(^{(16)}\)

Michael the Syrian and Bar Hebraeus testify to this movement by the Jarajima, reporting that the emperor sent brigands and outlaws of the Romans, called Gargümâyê or Maridayê in Syrian, to seize the mountainous region of Lebanon, but at length the Arabs gained the upper hand, some of them killed and some of them blinded.\(^{(17)}\) According to Aghapius al-Manbiji, in the seventeenth year of Mu'awiya (58/678), a Byzantine fleet attacked the coast of Şur and Şaydâ, and joined the Jarajima who had taken possession of the mountainous region from Mt. Galilee to the Amanus range by order of the emperor.\(^{(18)}\) On the other hand, Nicephorus mentions that Mu'awiya had to agree to this peace treaty because of the destruction to his fleet caused by a series of unsuccessful naval battles and by a damaging storm. He does not mention anything about the rebellion of the Jarajima being related to this peace treaty.\(^{(19)}\)

After an examination at these records, it is no doubt that the Jarajima rose in rebellion at the request of the emperor and co-operated closely with the Byzantine troops. Their rebellion did not have, in the first stage, the character of movement of Syrian natives opposed to the Muslim government. They did not attack the fertile plain region at the foot of the Amanus mountains, but rather entered into the mountain range of southern Syria. This fact shows, in addition to their character as mountain folk, that they thought it important to co-operate with the Byzantines. It is also certain that they were at that time under the supervision of the Byzantine government, because Mu'awiya made terms with the emperor in order to put their rebellious movement to an end. Owing to this intimate connection of the Jarajima to the Byzantines, Amantos regards them as a troop belonging to Byzantine Army from earlier times,\(^{(20)}\) however, his opinion comes into question upon examination of the Jarajima's former movements.

It is noteworthy that, in addition to the movement of the Jarajima, this peace treaty was also caused by the disaster of the Arab fleet, thus the rebellion of the Jarajima should be placed clearly in the context of positive counterattacks by the empire against the Muslims. Nevertheless, once having risen up in Lebanon, they appear to have lead their movement by themselves.
in conjunction with the local indigenous peoples.

3. The Jarājima during the second civil war

At the time of the second civil war in Muslim territory, the Jarājima reopened their rebellious hostilities against the Muslims. Theophanes mentions that, in the seventeenth year of Constantinus IV (65/685)—that is the first year of ‘Abd al-Malik—, due to the fact the Jarājima entered into Mt. Lebanon and rose against the Muslims, at the same time as a great famine and epidemic spread in Syria, ‘Abd al-Malik was compelled to negotiate with the emperor and agree to the same terms as Mu‘āwiya; that he gives the Byzantines a thousand nomismata and one thoroughbred horse and slave per day. It is interesting that these terms were not the same as those researched previously in A.M.6169 but rather those agreed upon in A.M.6150 (38-9/659) between Mu‘āwiya and Constans II (641-68).(21)

Theophanes mentions another peace treaty negotiated between ‘Abd al-Malik and Justinianus II and renewed in A.M.6178 (67-8/686-7) under the following conditions:

* The emperor would withdraw the Mardaites tagma from Lebanon and check their incursions into Muslim territory.
* ‘Abd al-Malik would give the Byzantines a thousand nomismata and one thoroughbred horse and slave per day.
* The tax of Cyprus, Armenia and Iberia would be borne commonly and in equal shares by both parties.

As a result, the emperor withdrew twelve thousand of the Mardaites to Byzantine territory. (22) Michael the Syrian and Bar Hebraeus testyfy to this peace treaty without mentioning the date. (23) And Aghapius also mentions that ‘Abd al-Malik was compelled to sign this treaty in order to put an end to the insurrection of “a Roman party” in Lebanon. (24) Among these authors, Bar Hebraeus only mentions the second civil war as another reason of this peace treaty. (25)

On the other hand, the records of the Muslim authors are very different. al-Balādhuri mentions in Futūḥ as follows,(26)

When ‘Abd al-Malik was ready to leave for al-‘Irāq to fight against al-Muṣ‘ab b. al-Zubayr,(27) certain Roman horsemen came forth to Mt. Lukkām under a Roman commander and started for the Lebanon mountains, after having been joined by a large body of the Jarājima, anbāt (the natives) and runaway slaves. Under the circumstances, ‘Abd
al-Malik had to make terms with them, agreeing to pay 1000 dinār per week to them. He also made terms with the emperor, agreeing to pay him a sum of money, because he was too busy to be engaged in the war with the people of al-ʻIrāq and feared that the emperor would come to Syria and conquer it. In this agreement he followed the preceding one of Muʿāwiya, when he was engaged at the battle in al-ʻIrāq. All this jibed with the rebellion of ‘Amr b. Saʿīd(28) in Damascus in A.H. 70. After that, ‘Abd al-Malik sent Suḥaym b. al-Muhājir to the commander of the troops in Lebanon. This Suḥaym deceived him and fell upon him and his troops at advantageous moment. Thereupon Suḥaym announced publicly a promise of security to those who joined the Roman commander. Accordingly, a part of the Jarājima scattered among the villages of Ḫimṣ and Damascus, but many of them returned to their city on al-Lukkām. The natives also returned to their villages and the slaves to their masters. (abridged translation)

In Ansāb, al-Balādhuri mentions these details in different order as follows: (1) Justinianus II sent a commander to Mt. al-Lukkām, aiming to muster an army against the Muslims. (2) The Jarājima and the others gathered to him, and they marched to Lebanon. (3) Under these conditions, ‘Abd al-Malik sent his envoys(29) to the emperor and made terms similar to Muʿāwiya. (4) After that, he also made terms with the party in Lebanon, agreeing to a weekly payment of 1000 dinār to them, thus putting an end to their rebellion. (5) Then, ‘Abd al-Malik dispatched Suḥaym, who deceived the Roman commander and fell upon the rebels in Lebanon. (6) The Romans and some of the Jarājima were killed, and the rest of them scattered as mentioned above in Futūḥ. (7) Then, ‘Abd al-Malik left for al-ʻIrāq to fight against Muṣʿab.(30)

al-Nuwayri and Ibn al-Athir also mention the movement of the Jarājima in reference to Ansāb in the year of 69/688-9. Both also mentions in other items (al-Nuwayri in A. H. 69, and Ibn al-Athir in A. H. 70) that, because the Romans mobilized an army from those who were in Syria, ‘Abd al-Malik sought peace from the emperor, agreeing to a weekly payment of 1000 dinār.(31) In addition, al-Ṭabarī mentions the rebellion of ‘Amr in the records of A. H. 69 and 70, the above-mentioned peace treaty in 70, and the departure of ‘Abd al-Malik against Muṣʿab in 70 and 71. Elias dates the peace treaty at A. S. 999 (A. H. 69) and ‘Amr’s death in A. S. 1000 (A. H. 70).
4. Observations

The peace treaty between Constantinus IV and 'Abd al-Malik is testified in the records of al-Ya'qubi and al-Mas'udi, which noted that 'Abd al-Malik sent money and gifts to the emperor in order to seek peace with him.\(^{33}\) It is noteworthy that in this treatment, he concluded the same terms of Mu'awiya not in A. M. 6169 but in 6150 (38-9/659). The former were reached under the condition of localized troubles such as the rebellion of the Jarajima and the disaster of the Arab Navy, whereas the latter were reached during the first civil war which brought great crisis upon all Muslim territory. Without a doubt, both of Mu'awiya's agreement were made under different conditions. This fact is attested to by the differences in the sums of payment decided upon. The treaty of A. M. 6176 between 'Abd al-Malik and Constantinus IV was no doubt influenced by the second civil war, though Theophanes and others mention that it was caused by the rebellion of the Jarajima. Viewed from another angle, however, the Jarajima exerted great influence on the security of Syria, and the Muslim government was obliged to take note of them in order to continue the fight in Iraq.

The treaty in A. H. 69-70 according to the Muslim sources is recognized as corresponding to the one in A. M. 6178 mentioned by Theophanes, but there are many discrepancies as to the details of both. Concerning the date, Theophanes claims it to be two years earlier than the Muslim authors, however, it seems to proper to think the latter was correct, because it is known that there miscalculations were made in several dates by Theophanes, especially for that particular period.\(^{34}\) In addition to this fact, the date of the Muslims is corroborated by Elias, who writes his chronicle on both the Seleucid and the Hijra eras. Therefore, we can conclude that the series of above-mentioned incidents happened in the summer of A. D. 689, which extended from A. H. 69 to 70.\(^{35}\)

al-Baladhuri mentions that 'Abd al-Malik concluded two different peace treaties, one with the emperor, agreeing to pay an disclosed sum of money, the other with the troops in Lebanon, agreeing to pay 1000 dinar per week. Because he does not mention the sum of the former, it seems that al-Nuwayri and Ibn al-Athir who mentions this sum as 1000 dinar were mistaken, confusing it with the payment of the latter. As al-Baladhuri clearly mentions in this treatment of A. H. 69 that 'Abd al-Malik followed the preceding terms of Mu'awiya just as Theophanes mentioned in A. M. 6176 (65/685). And it
was recorded that the sum of the payments in 6176 and 6178 were equal to the treatment of Mu'āwiya on 6150 (38-9/659). Therefore, it is proper to consider that 'Abd al-Malik agreed to offer 1000 nomismata, a horse and a slave daily in this peace treaty, as well.

In spite of making terms with the troops in Lebanon, soon after the end of the rebellion of 'Amr in Damascus, 'Abd al-Malik designed a counterattack to sent Suhaym against them. This shows that 'Abd al-Malik thought the agreement with them to be only a temporary one. On the other hand, according to Theophanes, the agreement with the emperor was continued about five years until the emperor broke it off himself in A.M. 6183.(36) Comparing these facts, there is no doubt that each treaty had a different character.

It is also possible to think that the Jarājima may have received some reward from the Byzantine government in compensation for their insurrection in Lebanon and their immigration to Byzantine territory, although there is no record of it. The fact that 'Abd al-Malik could reconcile with them through a weekly payment of 1000 dinār may be indicative of such a reward for their military actions. Perhaps this sum was more favorable for them than the reward from the Byzantines. According to al-Balādhuri, the troops in Lebanon, most of which seem to be of the Jarājima, made terms with the Muslims on their own. This fact shows that this indigenous troops maintained independence in their military course of action, though they were mustered under a Byzantine commander. In this point of view, they by no means can be called a regiment in the Byzantine Army. Moreover, the Byzantine government also regarded them only as temporary army, because no counter-action by the empire is recorded when they were scattered by the Muslim forces.

After the defeat in Lebanon, the Jarājima were divided into the four groups. First, twelve thousand men immigrated into Byzantine territory, according to the terms of the Arabo-Byzantine peace treaty. It was not known whether they departed from Syria at the same time or not, but Theophanes mentions in the chronicle of A.M. 6179 that the Jarājima joined the troops of Justinianus II in Armenia.(37) Secondly, there was a part who returned to their native country. They may have maintained their autonomous community as before, because al-Balādhuri mentions that they used to make razzias either against the villages of Antioch, or against the rear part of
the Muslim Army during the summer expedition in the reign of 'Abd al-Malik. Therefore, he ordered the muster of some Antiochians and the other indigenous peoples as garrisons against them. Thirdly, some settled in the villages in the vicinity of Ḫimṣ and Damascus. Finally, some joined to the Muslim Army, like Maymūn al-Jurjumānī, who is known to have been put a charge of a garrison at Antioch by ‘Abd al-Malik and to have taken part in the expedition against al-Ṭuwānā (Tyana). No doubt, the military power of the Jarājima was diffused and decreased after the defeat in Lebanon and the emigration to Byzantine territory. The Jarājima remaining in the Amanus mountains clearly decreased in population, and so the influence of the Byzantines over them would also have decreased, since a pro-Byzantine portion of them accepted to depart from their native country under their own will. As a result of the decline of the power of the Jarājima in the Amanus region, the Muslims were able to enter Asia Minor up to the central region without any trouble. What this meant was rapid expansion of the Muslim power in the Thughūr.

5. The expedition against al-Ṭuwānā and the conquest of Jurjūma

After the second civil war, the Muslims again became devoted to their expeditions against Byzantine territory. Among them, the expedition of al-Ṭuwānā by Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik is well known as a great siege. In the records of this expedition, the Jarājima are mentioned two different times.

The first attack of Maslama against al-Ṭuwānā fell in 86/706. According to Theophanes, the Muslims besieged it in order to avenge the death of the same Maymūn al-Jurjumānī, the Jarājima who joined the Muslim army after the defeat in Lebanon. al-Balādhuri also mentions that this Maymūn took part in the expedition of Maslama against al-Ṭuwānā at the head of an army of 1000 men from Antioch and fell a martyr. Grieving his death deeply, ‘Abd al-Malik sent a large army against the Byzantines to avenge him. On the other hand, al-Ṭabarī mentions that Maymūn had joined the troops of Maslama, who was in command of an army of 1000 men from Antioch. If al-Balādhuri's version is correct, an army of Antioch under the command of Maymūn may have been made up of the Jarājima who joined the Muslim Army with him after the defeat in Lebanon.

On the other hand, some of chroniclers mention in the same time that Jurjūmā, the native town of the Jarājima, was also conquered by the Muslims.
under the command of Maslama. The expeditions against al-Ṭuwānā seem to have lasted about for two years and were concluded in Jumādā II, 89/ March, 708. Moreover, according to al-Baladhuri, Jurjūma was also conquered by Maslama in A. H. 89. Comparing these sources, Maslama reduced this city not long after the conquest of al-Ṭuwānā. al-Baladhuri mentions during this year (89/708) the Jarājima gathered themselves into their city Jurjūma and were joined by a host of the Byzantines from Alexandretta and Rūsīs. Hearing this news, al-Walid (705-15) sent against them Maslama, who fell upon them with a host of Muslims, reduced their city, and gave them the following concessions before destroying the city.

* They could settle wherever they wanted in Syria, and would be provided eight dinār per person, two muddā of wheat and two qisṭ of oil per family.
* They would be allowed to keep their Christianity, but would take to wear Muslim dress. However they would be exempt from jizya (poll tax).
* They would have to take part in the Muslim campaigns, but would be allowed to keep for themselves the booty from those who they killed hand to hand combat.

* From the property of the wealthy among them, there would be levied (as tax) the same amount as from the wealthy of the Muslim.

After Jurjūma was destroyed by the hand of Maslama, some of the Jarājima settled in Mt. Ḥuwwār, Sunḥ al-Lūlūn and ‘Amq Tizin, some of them left for Ḥims, and the patrician (būṭriq) of Jurjūma moved with his entourage out to Antioch, then fled to the Byzantine empire.

These terms were generous than the preceding agreement, in return the Jarājima had to give up their native country in the Amanus mountains. ‘Abd al-Malik had already adopted a policy to make them emigrate into Byzantine territory in his peace treaty with Justinianus II. It would therefore be correct to say that the Muslim government at that time intended to take over that policy. As a result, many of the Jarājima scattered in either Byzantine or Muslim territory thus their influence was declined in northern Syria. Considering this fact, it seems that the Muslims had no interest in subjecting them to Muslim rule, were rather more intent on eliminating their influence of them in the Amanus region.

After the conquest of Jurjūma, the Jarājima divided up into five groups as follows: A portion settled in Cibyrraioton thema, especially in Attaleia in Byzantine territory, and became sailors. Some settled in Cilicia,
and others in Antioch or the neighboring region of the Amanus mountains. Some settled around the district of Ḥimṣ, and another portion joined the Muslim Army. The military groups did unite under the name of the Jarājima or the Mardaites, but they never regained their former power. Those who remained in northern Syria became subject to Muslim rule, probably experienced gradual Islamization.

3 An analysis of the Jarājima

1. Characters of the Jarājima

What were the characteristic features of those who were known as the Jarājima? Consulting the sources, we can not affirm the Christian sect to which they belonged, but Amantos asserts that they might have belonged to the Greek Orthodox Church, while others like Lammens regard them as the Monophysite or the Monothelite and so on, without any referable authority. Their origin and the ethnic group also can not be affirmed from the sources. But, it is no doubt that they were neither Arabs, because the Muslims understood them to be a regional group named from their city Jurjūma, nor Greeks, because the Byzantines called them by a somewhat ethnological name, Ṣabʾaiwat. I can be affirmed, however, that they were an armed party, having their base in the Amanus mountains. On this point, they were very different from the people who settled in the towns and villages under the protection of the Byzantine Army, in that they remained in their native country at the time of the Muslim Conquest without following the Byzantines. It should be confirmed from the sources that they were an armed portion of the indigenous people of the Amanus region, militarily controlled the passes there, and lived on compensation for maintaining garrisons, or by trade and plunder. They seem to have generally settled in Jurjūma and its neighboring villages. It can therefore be supposed that they might have been cultivators as well. The scope of their activity expanded from southern and central Syria to the southeast portion of Asia Minor, but mostly limited to the mountainous regions. This fact attests to their character as mountain folk, in addition to their strategy of co-operation with the Byzantines.

Concerning their military character, it is only mentioned that they were armed infantrymen in the record of Nicephorus. The reason why they were employed as sailors after their emigration to Byzantine territory is
not known, but they had not been cavalrymen. As to their community, they seem to have maintained autonomy under their own chieftains from the Byzantine period under the protectorate of the patriarchate of Antioch. It is possible that they were under a joint chieftainship system, regarding the record in Futūk which says that “a number of the Jarājima” came out to the Muslim camp to seek peace upon the latter’s first attack on Jurjūma. The chieftain among them was called biṭriq (patrician). But, it is supposed that his individual influence was not strong, and that the Jarājima may have been have been composed of sub-organizations of some kind. But it is noteworthy that they lived together under a leader called Κατεπάνω even after their emigration to Byzantine territory. This fact seems to show that they kept a common group consciousness long after the diffusion of their regional power.

2. Independence and the ethnic identity of the Jarājima

The records that the Jarājima were dependents of the patriarchate of Antioch and garrisons in the Amanus mountains, prove that they had established friendly relations with the Byzantine empire under some kind of patronage of the latter. But they had not always submitted to the Byzantine authority. Though their rebellious movements were certainly carried out under the request of the Byzantine empire, we can also observe a voluntary character to their military action. Besides, considering to the terms they came to with the Muslims, it cannot be said that they stood by the Byzantines in the religious and economic oppression by the Muslims. Therefore, it would be proper to suppose that they rose up against the Muslims, taking some reward from the Byzantine government, but there remains no record of it.

Concerning their rebellion in 69/689, Justinianus II sent a military commander to the Amanus mountains in order to muster the Jarājima and the other natives. He intended to organize a temporary irregular army to engage in the warfare against the Muslims. Considering this incident from the side of the Jarājima, they used the authority of the Byzantine empire to justify their rebellious movement. The independent feature of their activities is evidenced by the record of their reconciliation with the Muslims of their own accord. Therefore, it can be said that they co-operated with the Byzantine Army voluntarily, keeping their independent character as a regional power.

This character seems to be related to the psychological motive for their
rebellious move against the Muslims. Of course, they had felt more intimate with the Byzantines than with the Muslims. This is shown by the fact that many of them chose to immigrate to Byzantine territory, under the direction of Justinianus II. It is also probably true that they were anxious about the expansion of Muslim power. The independence they were allowed by the Muslims was an exceptional case owing to their military power. If Muslim rule had been established in western Thughur, they probably would have been compelled either to disarm and become protected non-Muslim subjects or to participate in the Muslim Army as the Islamic converts. It is therefore possible that they stood by the greatest anti-Muslim force, the Byzantine empire, out of fear of losing their military independence. Nevertheless, they neither identified themselves with the Byzantines nor rose against the Muslims in the cause of reviving Byzantine rule in Syria.

There was also very little chance of them fighting against the Muslim governing class in the resistance of the indigenous peoples of Syria. Therefore, we can only say the Jarajima disliked to the possibility of control by a great foreign power and fought to maintain their independence as before. They seem to have had no sense of their garrisons belonging to the Byzantine empire nor to the leaders of the Syrian resistance. This character may represent the general character of all the inhabitants of the Thughur region at that time.

Up until the Jarajima diaspora throughout Byzantine and Muslim territory, they had been autonomous of any governing organization. This is a situation peculiar not only to the Jarajima, but also the other communities in the Thughur region.

3. Policies of the Muslim and the Byzantine governments concerning the Jarajima

In the terms agreed upon by the Muslims and the Jarajima, in which the former were compelled to make some concessions to the latter, there can be seen that the Muslims had no intention to putting the Jarajima under their political control. They wished only to pacify the rebellious movement of the Jarajima. This rather tenuous policy is thought to be caused by the fact that the Muslims could neither disarm the Jarajima by force, nor utilize their military power because of Muslim juristic principles. Therefore, a policy to force the Jarajima to emigrate from Muslim territory was probably taken by the Muslim government. Consulting the sources, we can
find two underlying principals to such a policy: conciliation with some concessions and removal from the Amanus region and Muslim territory. Even after the destruction of Jurjuma, these principals stood. Concerning their removal from the region, we can suppose that the purpose of the policy was to establish security in the mountainous region of western Thughūr, which was of political and strategical importance to the Muslims as the Gate of Asia Minor and the flanks of Syria proper.

Meanwhile, the Byzantine empire intended to make use of the military power of the Jarājima. At the time of the first Muslim conquest of Syria, Heraclius planned to make northern Syria into a buffer zone by destroying its towns and villages and driving the inhabitants out. He thus succeeded in preventing the Muslims from driving past there, but the Byzantines lost a strategic position for striking back into Syria. This can be shown from the fact that there was no organized counterattack by the Byzantines in either of the civil wars that broke out in Muslim territory. Under such circumstances, the Byzantines may have intended to make use of the Jarājima as a native army fighting against the Muslims. But, there is no doubt that the Byzantine government recognized them only as irregular and temporary soldiers on the periphery outside the borders of the empire.

As mentioned above, we do not know the reason why the Byzantine government agreed to the request by the Muslims to force the Jarājima to emigrate, and thus give up the policy to use their military power, in spite of the obtained good results from it. Other than being a blunder on the part of the emperor, it may well be supposed that the move had financial reasons. Payment to the Jarājima for their garrisons may have become impossible to continue. On second thought, however, considering the sum paid by the Muslims to the empire on the signing of their peace treaty, it is probably not correct to assume financial reasons. Amantos asserts that this policy was carried out because of internal problems similar to those of the Slavs. In any case from the point of view of foreign policy concerning the Muslims, this move no doubt caused great damage to the Byzantines.

Therefore, it is necessary to consider the general circumstances of the Thughūr region at that time. In spite of temporary interruptions caused by the Muslim civil wars, the Muslim Army had already succeeded in penetrating to center of Asia Minor, and their military superiority had already been establishing in western Thughūr. Given this situation, it was probably
very difficult for the Byzantines to continue their support of the Jarājima in Syria. In addition, as Muslim power increased, the importance of the Amanus mountains as a buffer zone line of defense decreased, together with that of garrisons therein. In this view, it may be possible that, because of their having receded inside the Byzantine border line from the Amanus region, the request of the Muslims to make the Jarājima drive out was easier to accept for the Byzantine government, and so there was no change in Byzantine policy to make use of the Jarājima as garrisons in the border country. But this is no more than a guess.

There was great contrast between the policy of the Muslims and that of the Byzantines, but both of the Great Powers seem to have considered them as a people outside their political and strategical organizations proper. This may be related with the ethnic character of the Jarājima.

4. The Thughūr region under the expansion of Muslim power

There remain many problems to be solved in the historical study of the Jarājima as well as that of the Thughūr region as a whole. It is certain that the expansion and establishment of Muslim hegemony advanced swiftly into the towns of Syria. But, the countryside and the mountain range remained outside Muslim rule or at most only under nominal control for a long time, allowing the inhabitants to live their lives as before. Especially in western Thughūr we find a strong independent character opposed to the advance of Muslim hegemony. This region had been sandwiched between the great foreign powers even before the Muslim Conquest, and had established its autonomy in order to survive in unending conflicts. Concerning this special regional character, the expansion of Muslim power caused the dissolution of the indigenous society and the emigration of its members. This change may have been similar to the advance of the Islamization there. The movement of the indigenous peoples and the changes that occurred in their societies seem to have exerted a great influence on the establishment of Muslim rule in the Thughūr region. The history of the Jarājima shows the special character of that social change in that region of the era and is therefore important as an excellent example of the general changes brought about by the expansion of the Muslims.
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Notes


(2) *Futūḥ*, 1/194–203.


(5) Amantos has offered some opinions about the etymological origin of them in detail, but there was no definitive explanation. K. Amantos, 'Μαρδαίτες', 'Ελληνικά 5, 1932, pp. 132–3.

(6) See Bar Hebraeus, 1/101, 2/38’e, Michael the Syrian, 2/455, 4/437. In addition, most of Arabic dictionaries defined the word al-Jarajima as "bandit".

(7) Nicephorus, pp. 92–3.

(8) The most important sources in Arabic are al-Baladhuri (*Futūḥ* and *Ansūb*), al-Ṭabarī, Ibn al-Athir, al-Nuwayri, Ibn al-‘Adim and a Christian Arabic author Aghapius. In Greek, Theophanes is the most important. Syriac sources are noteworthy to compensate for the Arabics and the Greeks.


(13) Later a governor of Syria. See *EI*, 3/12.

(14) He is known by his expedition to Syria and Armenia. *EI*, 3/12.

(15) *Futūḥ*, 1/189, Yāqūt, 1/123, *Bughya*, 1/250, Kāmil, 2/496. al-Rawādīf means those who followed after them at that time.


(17) Bar Hebraeus, 1/101, 2/38’e, Michael the Syrian, 2/455, 4/437.

(18) Aghapius, p. 352.

(19) Nicephorus, p. 86.

(20) Amantos, op. cit., p. 130.


(23) Bar Hebraeus, 1/103, 2/39’e, Michael the Syrian, 2/460, 4/446. Michael adds Armenia, Gourzan, Arzōn and Adherbayjān would become part of Byzantine territory.


(25) Theophanes mentions the second civil war (1/363–4), but does not be relate
it to this treaty.

(26) Futūḥ, 1/189-90, Bughya, 1/250-1.

(27) Brother of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr who rose against the Umayyad Caliph to begin the second civil war. He died in 72/691. See Ibn Sa'd, al-Tabaqāt al-Kubrā, Beirut, ?, 5/182-3, al-Ṭabarī, II/797-813, EI1, 6/742.

(28) A member of the Umayyad family known as al-Asḥad. He asserted his right to the caliphate, rose against 'Abd al-Malik, and was killed by him. See Ibn Sa'd, 5/237-8, al-Ṭabarī, II/783-96, EI1, 1/453-4.


(30) Ansāb, 5/299-300, 355.


(34) For that time, the difference between Theophanes' date and Christian Era is about 5180 years. It has been pointed out that his miscalculations from A. M. 6102 to 6265 necessitate an addition of about one year. See Ostrogorsky, op. cit., p. 88, Wellhausen, Die Kämpfe, pp. 416-7. Also, every record of the second civil war in Theophanes is off by two years compared to the Muslim accounts. Therefore, we should go with the latter's date.


(36) Theophanes, 1/365.

(37) Theophanes, 1/364, Cons. Porph., pp. 94-5.

(38) Futūḥ, 1/190-1, Ansāb, 5/300, Bughya, 1/251-3.

(39) Futūḥ, 1/190, al-Ṭabarī, II/1185, Bughya, 1/251-2. Tyana is in the southeast of Cappadocia and was of the metropolitanate.


(41) Theophanes, 1/367-8.

(42) Futūḥ, 1/190, Bughya, 1/251-2.

(43) al-Ṭabarī, II/1185.


(46) Futūḥ, 1/190-1, Bughya, 1/252. These cities are on the Syrian coast near Antioch.

(47) Mt. Ḥuwwār is in the west of the Jayhān river in Cilicia. Sunḥ al-Lūlūn seems to mean the vicinity of Lu'l'u'a (Lulon) behind the Taurus mountains. 'Amq Tizin seems to be the lowland of Tizin between Antioch and Aleppo.

(48) Their party was mentioned in the reign of Leon VI (886-912) in Cons. Porph., pp. 240-3. Cibyrraioton was a navy thema situated on the south coast of Asia Minor. Amantos, op. cit., p. 133, Honigmann, op. cit, p. 40, Ostrogorsky op. cit., p. 131.

(49) In addition to the Mt. Ḥuwwar and Lulon as mentioned above, they were found in fort of Mūra between al-Maṣṣīṣa and the Amanus mountains. See Futūḥ, 1/197.
(50) See Futūh, 1/191.
(51) In 101/720, a party of them joined the troops of Maslama in Iraq, fighting against the rebellion of Yazid b. al-Muhallab.
(52) Nicephorus, pp. 92-3.
(53) Futūh, 1/189, 190.