

Management of Al-Sham and the Role of the Loyalist in It

Dr. Adnan Ahmad Lababneh
History Department - Jadara University

The study showed that the policy of the Umayyads in the administration was based on the tribal factor, establishing a tribal balance as much as possible between Qaysiyyah and Yemenia, and exploiting loyalty to the Umayyad House, although some of the caliphs had violated this by siding with one of the parties.

On the other hand, the study confirmed that the loyalists in the Levant in general and the soldiers of Damascus in particular played some military and administrative roles that supported the Umayyad state through their presence in the army, navy and administration during the Umayyad era.

With regard to the administrative system, the study showed that the selection of the loyalist during the era of Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan and some of his successors were chosen from the residents of the areas where they had strong tribal influence, which helps in strengthening the authority of the governor and then extending the authority of the caliph himself.

As for the Marwanite period of the Umayyad state, the administration was distinguished by the fact that most of the governors of the soldiers were from the same Marwani family, and the most likely reason was due to the caliph's desire to build rule on the strength of Umayyad fanaticism as the symbol of the Umayyad state.

Keywords: lands' administration, Sham administration, loyalists and administration.

Abstract

The Role of AL -shams Soldiers in Land and Marine Conquests Battle

- The Historical studies revealed that the policy of the Umayyad caliphate was strongly based on tribal factors that Targeted establishing the tribal balance between Qaisiah and Yamanite Clans to ensure their loyalty to the Umayyad family. However, some of the caliphs violated or did not abide by this tradition or trend, so they were either biased to this clan or the other.
- The research assured that the local population who converted to Islam called the Mawali have contributed and played certain roles in the administrative and military affairs in the Levant in general and Damascus to support Banu Umayya via their presence in the army and the naval bases in the Umayyad dynasty.
- The research indicates that the governors of provinces or the Wallis during Muawiya ibn Abi Sufyancaliphate and some of his successors were generally nominated or elected by the population of the regions, where those Wallis have strong hordeolum clan dominance, a situation that strengthens the Wallis influence and control on that region.

- However, during the Marweeds period, the Wallis were selected recruited from within the Umayyad family to strengthen the grip, power, and dominance of Umayya as a symbol of the state.

Levant's administration and the role of the loyalist in it:

When talking about the management of the soldiers, it is worth noting the traceability of the administrative system and the tracking of the administrative staff of the soldiers of the Levant in general and the soldiers of Damascus in particular, also, there are no comprehensive lists of all the governors in the soldiers of the Levant, or for all the judges, that is, for all postal workers or bureaucrats and others, and despite that there are historians who care about administrations and employees such as Ibn Habib, Khalifa bin Khayat, al-Tabari, al-Jahshiari, al-Qalqashandi and others. However, these lists that they mentioned about the Levant were incomplete, so we do not find a mention of the names of some of the governors in most of the soldiers, especially the soldiers of Damascus in the time of more than one caliph. This shortage included postal workers, judges, police owners, district and city workers and other administrative institutions. (Lababneh A., 2002, p.47).

It was the custom of the Rightly Guided Caliphs if they sent a leader to conquer a country, they appointed a ruler before they leave, for example, Amr Ibn Al-Aas was appointed in Palestine, Sharhabeel in Jordan, and Yazid Ibn Abi Sufyan in Damascus. And Abu Bakr said to them: 'If you have a fight, then your ruler is the one you are at his work'. And when Khalid ibn al-Walid came to serve the princes of al-Sham, Abu Bakr made him commander-in-chief of the army (Khalifa B.K, 1969, p.122), and each of the princes of the Levant remained on his side (Al-Tabari, 1966, p.427). And when Omar bin Al-Khattab

became caliph in Jumada Al-Akhirah in the year 13 AH / August 634 AD, the whole matter of Al-sham in war and peace was gathered to Abu Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah (Al-Azdi, 1970, p.102-103). The rule of Abu Ubaidah over the Levant continued until his death in the plague of Emmaus in the year 18 AH / 639 AD (Khalifa B.K, 1969, p.123). And Abu Ubaidah, as successor to the Levant, during his illness appointed Muadh bin Jabal (Khalifa B.K, 1969, p.155). So Muadh died of the plague a few days later, and before his death Muadh appointed Yazid bin Abi Sufyan. It was said that Amr bin Al-Aas became the successor, and Yazid also died in the same year (18AH/639AD) after he appointed his brother Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan as successor and Omar approved him. Al-Baladhari mentions that Omar bin Al-Khattab appointed Yazid to Jordan and Palestine, while it is understood from the caliph that the one who was appointed over Jordan and Palestine is Omar bin Al-Aas (Khalifa B.K, 1968, p.155). However, it appears from the above and from the narration of Al-Waqidi that when Abu Ubaidah and Muadh bin Jabal died, Omar bin Al-Khattab approved Yazid bin Abi Sufyan in Damascus. Abu Ubaidah appointed him on it, and Amr Bin al-Aas was approved on Palestine, and Abu Ubaidah was also appointed him on it. When Sharhabil bin Hasna, the governor of Jordan, died, Omar bin Al-Khattab gathered Jordan and Palestine for Amr bin Al-Aas, and that was the year (18 AH / 639 AD) also his works were added to the work of Yazid bin Abi Sufyan. He died at the end of the year (18 AH / 639 AD) as a result of the

plague of Emmaus After he appointed his brother Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan as successor, the Rashidi Caliph Omar bin Al-Khattab approved him for the work of his brother, then collected all of the Levant for him. (Al-Thahabi, 1982, p.133).

Al-Baladhari mentions that when Umar ibn al-Khattab appointed Muawiyah in al-Sham, appointed with him Abu al-Darda' the district of Damascus and Jordan and their connections. And Ubadah ibn al-Samit was appointed as the governor of the district of Homs and Qansreen and their connections.. The Caliph Omar Ibn Al-Khattab died in the year 23 AH / 643 AD, and the governor of the Levant, Muawiyah Ibn Abi Sufyan

(Khalifa B.K, 1968, p.155).

Al-Tabari mentioned that Omar Ibn Al-Khattab did not gather Sham for Muawiyah Ibn Abi Sufyan and he brought it: And Yazid bin Abi Sufyan died, so Omar replaced Muawiyah, so Jordan and Damascus were gathered to Muawiyah. Omar and Muawiyah died over Damascus and Jordan. And Umair bin Saad over Homs and Qansreen and Alqamah bin Mahrez over Palestine. As it is understood from a second narration by Saif, in which he said: 'When Othman was appointed, he approved Omar's workers over the Levant. When Abd al-Rahman bin Alqamah al-Kinani died - and he was in charge of Palestine - he joined his work with Muawiyah, and Umair bin Saad fell ill in the Emirate of Othman, a long-term illness (And he was on Homs and Qansreen). He asked him to release him from this job and asked for his permission, so he gave him permission and joined his work with Muawiyah, so the Levant gathered to Muawiyah for two years of the Emirate of Othman. It appears in this that the narration of Saif contradicts what was reported by Khalifa and the narration of Al-Waleed bin Muslim. But if we take into account that the mandate was probably public, then the authority of the governor is general

(Al-Tabari, 1966, p.289-290), And in his hand is the guardianship of prayer, war and tax, and perhaps it is special, so the authority of the ruler depends on what is mentioned in the deed of appointment regarding guardianship over prayer, war or tax (Al-mawardi, 1994, p.72).

Also, Omar Ibn Al-Khattab did not follow a specific approach in appointing governors. He may have made the mandate general, as is the case of the state of Abu Ubaidah over the Levant, and perhaps he made it private, as is the case in the state of Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan, and that apparently depended on the personality of the ruler and on the nature of the age (Al-Dinuri, 1960, p.129).

More than that, Umar ibn al-Khattab sometimes moved to appoint workers within the region ruled by the governor, whether his mandate was general or his mandate was private. For example, he used Abdullah ibn Qays on the coasts (Al-Tabari, p. 66). Likewise, Khalid bin Al-Walid was isolated from Qansreen in the state of Abu Ubaidah. He was appointed by Muawiyah, Alqamah bin Alana bin Awf, Horan, and Horan was affiliated with the Damascus land. (Al-Balathari, 1932, p.131).

If we take into account these matters, Omar Ibn Al-Khattab gave Muawiyah Ibn Abi Sufyan the decision to war in the Levant and perhaps its war and prayer; because the guardianship of prayer is often one of terms of reference of the ruler of war. However, when Umar ibn al-

Khattab appointed Abu al-Darda' as the governor of the district of Damascus and Jordan and appointed Ubadah ibn al-Samit the district of Homs and Qansrine, he assigned them the mandate of prayer. Perhaps on behalf of Muawiyah in the place this took over his judiciary. So what is meant by the words of the Caliph and from the narration of Al-Walid bin Muslim is that Omar gathered the whole of Levant for Muawiyah (meaning over its war) on the one hand, and the mandate of Umair bin Saad over Homs and Qansrine, and Alqamah bin Mahrez or Abdul Rahman bin Alqamah, later on, over Palestine, as stated in the narration of Seif On the other hand, there will be a guardianship over the tax, or they have been appointed by Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan as his deputies on the other hand.

Perhaps what supports what we have said is the saying of Al-Azdi, who narrates on the authority of Al-Hussein bin Ziyad, that when Omar bin Al-Khattab ended up with "the destruction of Abu Ubaidah and the destruction of Muadh over the coast of Al-Sham, he sent Abdullah bin Qart Al-Thamali to Homs and worked in it a year..." Abu al-Darda' al-Ansari was used over Damascus, and he used Yazid ibn Abi Sufyan on the soldiers who were in the Levant, and he wrote to him to go to Caesarea.

(Al-Azdi, 1970, p.274).

Al-Azdi adds that Umar wrote this to the lords of the lands: "As for I appointed Yazid bin Abi Sufyan, the whole land of Al-Sham and ordered him to go to Caesarea, so do not disobey his command and do not disagree with his opinion and Peace be upon you" (Al-Azdi, 1970, p.276). And if we add to this the narration of Al-Waqidi that when Yazid bin Abi Sufyan died, his brother Muawiyah was appointed as successor, and Omar approved him for his brother's work, meaning that he approved him for the war of Sham

(Al-Balathari, 1932, p.289).

In any case, when Uthman bin Affan assumed the caliphate (24-35 AH / 644-655 AD), he made the state of Muawiyah over the Levant a general authority over prayer, war and taxation. (Al-Balathari, 1932, p.13). And he became endowed with wide powers and had absolute disposition in his jurisdiction and appointed governors and workers over the lands belonging to him. (Al-Tabari, 1966, p.421).

Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan, as it is known, was able to stand up to the Caliph Ali bin Abi Talib (35-40 AH / 655-660 AD) with his people from the Levant, and to become the Caliph of the Muslims (40-60 AH) (660 - 679 AD) (Khalifa BK, 1969, p.180, 190). With the transfer of the caliphate to him and the taking of the city of Damascus as the capital and center of his caliphate, land of al-Sham became under the direct administration of the caliph. (Najdat K., 1408, p.296). And the Umayyad caliphs, in general, took governors to help them in managing the soldiers, and they appointed for each land a governor to represent them in that, on the condition that, as it appears from the narrations that appear in the sources in this regard, they did not gather two lands for one governor. (Khalifa B.K, 1969, p.311). They also did not entrust any public authority to any governor to consider his mandate, meaning that their mandate was private and not public, and in most cases the powers of the governor were to consider all matters related to his mandate except for the judiciary and the army, and perhaps

finance as well (IbnAsaker, p.587). And the rulers of Ajnad al-Sham in the Umayyad period, according to Ibn al-Adim, were like a condition, they did not deal with matters and wars (Ibn al-Adim, 1951, p.41). In other words, the governor's main task was to maintain security and order in his state, in addition to appointing workers to cities and villages and monitoring them so that he rewards their good and replaces the bad ones (Ibn Abdul Hakam, 1967, p.69).

The governor's task was also to take care of the prisons and prisoners (). The ruler is more free to justify when he is responsible for financial management, because the kharaj worker can greatly limit the authority of the ruler (Ibn Saed, 1968, p.323).

Despite the lack of available information, what came of it indicates that the rightly-guided caliphs used to choose the rulers from the class of the Companions, while we find Muawiyah in his caliphate, as we find his son Yazid after him. They deliberately select the governors from among the tribal leaders according to the stability and abundance available to them. (Al-Balathari, 1932, p. 128). This is apparently a result of the increasing influence of the tribes that supported Muawiyah in his struggle with Ali bin Abi Talib (Najdat K, 1980, p.298).

We also find the caliphs of Banu Umayyah from the Marwani branch who chose the rulers of the lands from the members of their household, and Al-Waleed bin Abdul Malik followed the style of his father, and he appointed his son Omar bin Al-Walid (Khalifa B.K ,1969,p.311). However, Omar bin Abdul Aziz departed from this approach, and it seems that the Umayyad caliphs after Omar bin Abdul Aziz followed the approach before them, and although most of the rulers in the Marwani period were members of the Marwani House, some indications indicate that the nobles of the tribes continued to enjoy strong influence, and it was They have an apparent impact on the course of events, especially in times of strife and internal conflicts.

In addition to the governors, there were the workers of the sub-districts and the workers of collecting the money, and it was customary that the leaders of the Muslims arranged a worker in every city that was opened and included a group of Muslims to him .(Al-Balathari, 1932, p.129-130). And maybe they supplying his city with soldiers if it was one of the main cities and a city threatened by enemies. So Abu Ubaidah appointed a worker in every city, he also joined him with a group of Muslims and supply the city threatened by enemies. (Al-Balathari, 1932, p.130-135). And the appointment of city's workers was by the leaders of the Al-Fateh Army, and in a later period by the governors of Al-Ajnad ,or sometimes by the Caliph .

And if the governors of the lands are directly responsible in front of the caliphs, then the workers of the districts and sub-districts are responsible to the governors (). In general, they were acting on behalf of the governors in maintaining security and order, and perhaps supervising the collection of money if the collection of money was one of the tasks of the governor of the soldiers (Al-Jahshyari, 1983, p.37).

As for the money-collecting workers; usually, the wali is responsible for collecting the kharaj money and the jizyah owed by the dhimmis. The collection of tithes and alms (zakat) money from Muslims. The news of the conquests shows that the financial management in general was the responsibility of the leaders of the tithe of agricultural crops from the Muslims, as it

should not be handled by the tax worker because it is not permissible for the money of alms to be included in the money of the tax, because the purpose of the expenditure of each is different from the other.(Abu Youssef A.K, 1987, p.80).

There are two stories regarding this matter:

The first: It is mentioned by Al-Baladhuri and it is understood from it that the caliph was appointed by him, when the season for collecting alms comes workers who carry them agreements and covenants for the people of the region who want to collect the money of their alms.(Al-Asfahani, 1965, p.20).

The second: Ibn Asakir mentions it, and it indicates that every people had a corporal among them who collected their alms (). NajdatKhamash believes that the first narration relates to the people of the desert, while the second narration relates to the people of cities and villages (Najdat K, 1408, p. 300)).

The loyalist in the Levant:

The Persians were present in the Levant before the Islamic conquest, and this is confirmed by what Al-Balathari mentioned, about the conquest of Baalbek, and the text of the Book of Peace, which confirms the presence of the Persian element in it alongside the Romans, Arabs and Nabataeans (Al-Balathari, 1932, p.136).Muawiyah ibn Abi Sufyan transferred other numbers of Persians from Baalbek and Homs to the coasts of Jordan, Tyre and Acre, in the year 42 AH/662 AD; A year later (43 AH / 663 AD) he transferred other numbers from Basra, Kufa, Faras, Baalbek and Homs to Antioch. During the caliphate of Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan, an eyewitness narrates that they came down on Tyre and the coast, with Arab soldiers and creation from the Romans.(Al-Balathari, 1932, p.124,135-136).The famous companion Salman al-Farsi, who stayed in Beirut and did not leave it died in the year 34 AH / 654 AD, and during the reign of Al-Walid bin Abdul-Malik, some of the loyal Persians were appointed such as Abu Khorasan and his brother Al-Layth bin Tamim Al-Farsi and Sufyan Al-Farsi to Al-Sham sea invasion (Ibn Asaker, 1951, p.169)

(Al-Balathari, 1932, p.124,135-136).

In the days of Hisham, the governor of the city of Tyre was of Persian origin, and he was Khalid ibn Hasfan al-Farsi. As for Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan's transfer of the Persians to the coasts of the Levant, and their handing over the coasts by the Umayyads to guard them, some objected to this narration and considered it unrealistic, with evidence that the Umayyads were following a purely Arab policy in which they depended on the Arabs completely, so how could they bring Persian groups to be strong with them and the Arabs At the height of their glory, their strength and their giving

(Abd el-Aziz S. , 1966, p.36) (Al-Balathari, 1932, p.124,135-136).But some of the historians took it and supported it, as it is possible that the Caliph Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan had followed a similar policy with the intention of reviving the coastal cities, which became devoid of activity and vitality after most of their residents fled.

Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan continued the process of populating the coasts of the Levant and resorting to a policy of granting and feudalizing lands, not to establish a class of farmers earthbound to the land, but to consolidate and strengthen the relationship of warriors stationed in the Islamic frontiers, because of the danger it entails in the face of the Byzantine Romans, so he tempted the Arab population owning land in order to solve the problem of the residents of the Levant coast (Fati O., 1966, p.238). But the Arab population at first did not give this any attention or enthusiasm and did not realize these temptations; Perhaps because they did not know what was going on in the minds of the Umayyad Caliph Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan; Perhaps because they did not need such lands, and in any case, Muawiyah turned to seeking the assistance of non-Arabs to work on the reconstruction of the coastal cities of the Levant, so he brought the Persians from within the Levant and brought them down to the coastal cities (Abdel-Aziz S. 1966, p.36).

As for the loyalist's occupation of high posts and military leadership; The worker of the Caliph Abdul Malik bin Marwan in Tripoli was Suhaim bin Al-Muhajir Al-Rumi, then he became a prince and commander of the fleet in Tripoli during the reign of Al-Waleed bin Abdul Malik (Ibn Asaker, 1951, p.283). The name of Talid, the mawla of Abdul Aziz bin Marwan, appears on the African state after the martyrdom of Zuhair bin Qais al-Balawi.

(Ibn Asaker, 1951, p.283).

In the caliphate of Omar bin Abdul Aziz, Ismail bin Obaid bin Abi Al-Muhajir, who is the grandson of Abu Al-Muhajir, chose Dinar, the freed slave of Salamah bin Makhlad over the mandate of Africa and Morocco, as he was one of the trustworthy people who before that, he was governess for the children of Abdul Malik bin Marwan (Ibn Al-Atheer, 1983, p.39)

Hisham bin Abd al-Malik, appointed Ubayd Allah ibn al-Hijab, the guardian of Banu Salul over the mandate of Egypt and its levy, then appointed him to Africa in the year 116 AH / 734 AD, and they appointed his son as successor to Egypt. And he had a great role in the administration and the state, as the greatest credit goes to him in transferring one of the Arab tribes to Egypt, the Qais tribe, in the year 109 AH / 727 AD, and their court was transferred to Egypt, as al-Maqrizi mentioned. This had a great impact in spreading Islam in Egypt between intermarriage and loyalty between them and the people of Egypt

(Al-Maqrizi, 1326, p.146).

As for the eastern front, Muqatil bin Hayyan was a leader, as was Uthman bin Hayyan al-Marri, the governor of Medina, the mawla of Umm al-Darda', and it is said the mawla of Utbah bin Abi Sufyan. , p.200). Al-Walid bin Abdul-Malik was used it over Medina and was the ruler of the conquest in the days of Yazid bin Abdul-Malik

In the military field:

It is known that the Islamic conquests with all their military activities and roles were in the hands of the Arabs, and the historical role of the Arabs in this field was mentioned by many history books, and the Mawali had a share in that, as history books and translations are rich in mentioning the participation of Al-Mawla in the Islamic armies from an early age, for

example Al-Masoudi mentioned) 404 Al-Masoudi, 1966, p.)In the Battle of Siffin, the number of the people of Al-Sham was one hundred and fifty thousand fighters, excluding servants and followers, meaning the loyal followers of their masters, and this means that the total forces of the Muslims of Al-Sham were between Arabs and loyalists of three hundred thousand fighters or more, if we assume that with each fighter there is one servant, Some have more than one, and some have five or more servants and followers. Moreover, the number of loyalists in each party was equal to the number of Arab fighters (Al-Miqdad, 1988, p.178).Among those who realized the importance of the loyalist Ziyad bin Abih, the governor of Muawiyah over Iraq, when he recommended Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan to use the loyalists because they support, forgive and thank more than others .(Al-Tabari, 1966, p.387) .The best of what appeared in the fighting units of the loyalists in the Islamic army in the caliphate of Marwan ibn al-Hakam in Marj Rahat in the year 64 AH / 683 AD, where they played a major military role in stabilizing the pillars of the Marwanite state and in mobilizing fighters. In the narration of Abu Makhanf, that Marwan bin Al-Hakam responded to one of the nobles loyal to him, Abd Al-Rahman bin Umm Al-Hakam, when he said to him: “Gather the loyalists of the Umayyads to you, and I will arm them for you all.” There were also two thousand or more of the loyalists of Abbad bin Ziyad, who came from Howarainto support the Umayyads (Al-Balathari, 1966, p.41).

It was common for the loyalists to enter the army as volunteers throughout the Umayyad state, and in the Levant their numbers were large in the Maslameh'sarmy that attacked Constantinople, and their numbers were unlimited in the army of Musa bin Nasir in the conquest of Andalusia (Al-Dhahabi, p.497). We must also distinguish between these and the loyalists who enter the army as servants to the soldiers from their masters, for Hisham bin Abd al-Malik had a slave called Yaqoub, so he would take Hisham’s bid of two hundred dinars and Yaqoub would take it and invade and they would become themselves in the servants of the court (Al-Tabari, 1966, p.202).

Among the important roles of al-Mawli, a clear role emerged for them in the conquest of the sea during the caliphate of the Umayyad caliph al-Walid ibn Abd al-Malik, where Suhaim ibn al-Muhajir al-Rumi was a prince of the sea and commander of the fleet in Tripoli (Al-Balathari, 1966, p.300). The conquest of the sea from the coast of the Levant in the caliphate of al-Walid also took over two princes of the loyal Persians from the inhabitants of the coast of Mount Lebanon, Abu Khorasan and the second Sufyan al-Farsi .(Ibn Asaker, 1954, p. 169).Among the loyalists, Ibn Abi Kathir al-Jazami al-Khorasani, who was appointed by Suleiman ibn Abd al-Malik, was appointed as the governor of the Battle of the Sea. Among those who took over the sea was Khalid bin Al-Hasfan Al-Farsi, who fought the Byzantine fleet when it attacked the Beirut frontier in the year 107 AH / 726 AD and forced them to flee and flee (IbnAsaker, 1954, p. 169). The Caliph Hisham bin Abd al-Malik was interested in the coasts and the sea, and in his caliphate the House of Shipbuilding moved from Acre to Tyre (Qudamah B.J., 1981, p.290).

AlsoMukhareq bin Maysara bin Hujair al-Ta'I took over the conquestof the sea. And from what was narrated or said on the authority of Malik bin Adham bin Mukhrez that he delegated to Hisham bin Abdul Malik, when a delegation came from the sea, and the orator of

the sea was one of the loyalists, so he advised him if he had a need by sea, let him add to the Arab loyalists, as it is better for our interests and more generous to ourselves and send fear in the hearts of us our enemy, Hisham said: I have spoken the truth, so he cut off the sea expedition for the loyalists and the Arabs (Al-Masoudi, 1966, p.392). This means that the operations of the sea were at the beginning of the matter in the hands of the loyalists, and the commanders of the sea continued in their hands until the end of the days of the Umayyad state. Al-Mughirah bin Ubaid Al-Azdi Al-Khorasani took over the conquest of the sea during the days of the Umayyad Caliph Yazid bin Abdul Malik until the caliphate of Yazid bin Al-Walid (Ibn Asaker, 1954, p.190).

The role of the guardian in intellectual life:

Just as the loyalists had their contributions to the administrative and military life, they also had contributions to the intellectual life. Where their intellectual role was governed and linked to the values of Islam, its Arabic language and its just principles, many of the loyalists were taught by Muslim scholars, and many of them excelled as well. Al-Zuhri (d. 104/723 AD) narrated: "We hated writing this knowledge until these princes forced us to do so." (Al-Dahabi, 1982, p. 326). These princes' (Al-Dahabi, 1982, p.326). The jurists had many loyalists who studied with them, and these jurists from the loyalists had a high position among the caliphs and princes of the people of Levant at the time of the Umayyad Caliphate. Yazid ibn Abi Maryam was the mawla of Sahl al-Ansari, the imam of the mosque in Damascus during the days of al-Walid ibn Abd al-Malik (Ibn Asaker, 1954, p.384), Makhoul al-Dimashqi (d. 113 AH / 731 AD) was the scholar of the people of the Levant in the second layer of the followers (Ibn Saed, 1968, p.170). Al-Qasim bin Abd al-Rahman al-Dimashqi (d. 112 AH / 730 AD) was the muhaddith of Damascus, a trusted loyalist who had seen forty immigrants and supporters (Al-Dahabi, 1982, p.194). Suleiman bin Musa (d. 119 AH / 737 AD), the Mufti of Damascus, was a loyalist in the third layer (Al-Dahabi, 1982, p.433). Malik Yen Dinar was the most knowledgeable of the scholars from among the trustworthy followers and among the prominent scribes of the Holy Qur'an, and his father was Dinar (d. 127 AH / 744 AD) from the captivity of Sijistan (Al-Maqrizi, 1326, p.152). And there is Salih bin Kisan, the imam, the hafiz, the trustworthy. He was a scholar of hadith and jurisprudence. Omar bin Abdul Aziz joined him, and he was the governor of Medina, and he used to take from him, and he was governess to his children (Al-Balathari, 1966, p.454). It is impossible to collect or enumerate the jurists and scholars from among the famous loyalists and others with knowledge or jurisprudence, whether it is in the Jazira or the Levant, such as Maymoon bin Mahran and Ata bin Rabah in Mecca and Tawus bin Kisan in Yemen. (Abu Youssef, 1987, p.115).

Thus, we find that the guardians in the Umayyad era had contributed a large share in building the scientific renaissance, and the books of categories and translations confirm the preponderance of the guardian. Historians have wondered about the secret that prompted these loyalists to engage in science and excel in it, and made them lead the intellectual movement. There was an idea saying that the loyalists excelled in science because the Arabs despised them or underestimated them and deprived them of participating in wars, politics and public life from administration and society, which prompted them to follow the path of science and culture. In addition to this, there was another argument based on a false idea

about Ibn Khaldun, which is that the Arab-Islamic society in the first centuries was still a Bedouin society, Therefore, science was the share of the pro-Ajam. Ibn Khaldun clarifies it by saying: "The Arabs were still in the nomadic phase before Islam, so they did not have the faculty of scientific research, and that is because the religion in its beginning had no knowledge or craftsmanship, and the men transferred it in their chests, and the order was in place at the time of the Companions and the Followers. Then the readers who read the book transmitted it, then these sciences and the population became in need of learning, so they were included in the group of trades, and they are from the beginning of the urban, so the sciences became urban and far from the Arabs (Ibn Khaldun, 1981, p.635). Georgi Zaidan (Zidan, 2012, p.88) believes that the Persians used to see the Arabs as the status of sovereignty and the prestige of conquest, so they made the loyalists draw closer by serving the science. Al-Dori, 1949, p.88) replies to those who said that the Arabs were Bedouin and the Arab-Islamic society in the Umayyad era and those who said that culture was promoted by the loyalist, he says, "This saying is due to its frequent repetition and not to a historical basis, for the Umayyad era was An era of active cultural movement in which foreign sciences began to infiltrate the Arabs, while religious sciences in terms of jurisprudence, interpretation, etc... And what is related to it is like history, it was promoted by the Arabs and most of those who carried it out were among them, and the loyalist did not start to contribute clearly until after the bureaus were Arabized after they had been Arabized in language and culture since the era of the Umayyad Caliph Abd al-Malik bin Marwan.

Ahmad Amin (Ahmad A., 1933, p. 155) says about the distinction of the loyalist and their prominence in the Umayyad society. It is clear from his saying: "The Companions had a lot of loyalists, using them in their homes and businesses. If the companion was a merchant, then his guardians and aides in his trade are from the loyalist and if he is a scholar his students and assistants were loyalist in knowledge. And those who had a good readiness excelled in it by virtue of their mixing in secret and in public and their adherence to residence and travel, and it can be said that the nature of knowledge at that time was that it was knowledge of narration in most of it and the Companions, peace be upon them, preserved it, and it is natural for it to pass from the Companions to those close to them and they are the loyalists, and these were only Those who serve them are slaves or slaves.

As for Muhammad Al-Taib Al-Najjar (Al-Taib MN, 1988, p.94), he analyzes his research on the loyalist from a psychological point of view, attributing it to a state of deficiency in the loyalist. Therefore, the loyalist tried to reach the path of glory through science, and he emphasized that Arab nervousness against the loyalist was a double-edged sword, as this fanaticism had an effective effect in serving the sciences of Muslims, and this fanaticism pushed the loyalist to brilliance in science so that their position among the Arabs would rise.

On the other hand, the position of the loyalist in science had its negative effects due to the presence of previous religious effects that affected the understanding of Islam, and made it mixed with their ancient religious beliefs. As for someone who was intolerant of his people and his religion and entered Islam to earn, he may have entered deliberately with the aim of distorting or highlighting the role of his people, or perhaps his previous religious belief. The preceding mentions that the tendency of hostility that appeared from the Arabs towards

foreign elements was not prevalent among religious and practical circles. The man who was known from the loyalists for chastity, righteousness, piety, science or literature, received all respect and appreciation from the Arabs, peoples and rulers.

Thus, the Mawwali became arabized under the Umayyad Caliphate, so they spoke the Arabic language and mastered it in speaking, writing and reading, and they were called by Arabic names. The concept of loyalty became clear to them, and the loyalty system contributed to ensuring the establishment of an organized social relationship between the Arabs and the loyalists based on their various origins, and this mixing had cultural, social and cultural consequences. Knowledge, concepts, and values were mixed with the civilization of Islam, which was the main character and distinguishing feature.