A partir du XIIIe siècle Sabta fournit à la Cour de Fès les puissants secrétaires de chancellerie, prenant ainsi le relais des cités andalouses, décrétées par les belles-lettres. Pour illustrer ce changement historique et culturel, Ibn Haldün prend l'exemple de la célèbre famille sabtie des Banū 'Abd al-Muhayman. Il observe que "la fonction de plume, comptabilité et correspondance revient à celui qui en a la compétence". Mais il ajoute aussitôt que "tantôt c'est le monopole d'une certaine famille, tantôt elle partage le privilège avec d'autres\(^{52}\). Désormais le talent seul ne suffit plus pour faire carrière dans les lettres et la haute administration. Solidarité clanique et patrimoine familial sont largement pris en considération et le talent perd la première place.

\(^{52}\) Ibn Haldün, *Discours*, 1, 44.

---

**THE QADI AS RULER\(^1\)**
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1. *Qādi*-s who ruled in al-Andalus

In this section, I have collected information on those Andalusian *qādi*-s who acted as rulers during the 5th/11th and the first half of the 6th/12th centuries. I start by the judges who took power at the beginning of the Taifas period; then follow the cases of Ibn Muzayn, who seems to have started his rule in 440/1048, and that of Ibn Jahhāf, whose rebellion took place at the end of the Taifas and the beginning of the Almoravid period. Then the *qādi*-s of the towns which rebelled against the Almoravids are studied.

The main question I am asking is: did the fact that there were *qādi*-s acting as rulers mean that it was thought that they were entitled to rule as *qādi*-s? In other words, in times when the question of the imamate was open and there were contending parties with different answers, was the rule of the *qādi*-s one of the answers? We shall see first how, why and for how long those judges came to rule.

The fifth/eleventh century

There is no monographic study on the Andalusian judges who took power into their hands during the 5th/11th century. In the general histories, the rule of the *qādi*-s is usually stressed as a proof of the importance held by judges in al-Andalus without further analysis. At the same time, in the extant studies where the subject has been dealt with, there is confusing information about who actually were those *qādi*-s. To the best of my knowledge, there were four cases of judges who ruled in al-Andalus: Ya'ish b. Muḥammad of Toledo, Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl b. 'Abbād in Sevilla, 'Īsā b. Abī Bakr Muḥammad b. Sa'īd b. Muzayn of Silves, and Ibn Jahhāf of Valencia. I do not take into

\(^{1}\) I wish to thank all the participants in the Symposium where this paper was read for their comments and suggestions.
consideration the Bakri dynasty of Saltès and Huelva, because I have not found evidence that the first ruler of the dynasty, Abū Zayd Muhammad b. 'Ayyūb (who started his reign in 403/1012) was qāḍī when he took power. His father, 'Ayyūb b. 'Amr al-Bakri (d. 398/1007) had been qāḍī of Niebla. Neither do I consider the Jahwari dynasty of Córdoba for the same reason: contrary to what appears in some studies,3 no source mentions that Jahwari b. Muhammad b. Jahwar (d. 435/1043), who became ruler of Córdoba after the deposition of Hishām al-Mu'tadd bi-llāh and the abolition of the Umayyad caliphate in Dhu'l-Hijja 422/November 1031, had been judge of the town.4

1. Ya'ish b. Muhammad (Toledo).5

1.1. His name was Ya'ish b. Muhammad b. Ya'ish b. Mundhir al-Asadi, Abu Bakr.6

---

2 See on the members of this family Sīla, ed. Cairo, n° 267; Dhakhiwa, [VI], 55; Holta, II, 181; Bayān, III, 204, 240; anonymous text in Bayān, III, 299; al-'Udari, p. 107; 'A'wa'il, p. 210. The famous geographer Abu 'Ubayd al-Bakri is a member of this family: see E.F. E. 1, 159-61 (E. León-Provençal) and Walf, XVII, 241. The only hint that the case of al-Bakri could be similar to the ones studied here is in a sentence in the biography of Ya'ish b. Muhammad b. Ya'ish in Tarib, VIII, 41: qama abduhu bi qiyara al-qāḍi Abu 'Ubayd b. 'Abd al-Karim b. 'Abd al-Majid bi gharb al-andalus. However, the word qāḍī is absent in the reference to al-Bakri.

3 For example, P. Chatelain, "Le poids des intellectuels hispano-arabes dans l'évolution politique d'al-Andalus," Cahiers de la Méditerranée, 37 (1988), pp. 101-129 (Aires du Colloque "Intellectuels et milieux dans le monde islamique"), p. 120. He does not mention the name of Ya'ish b. Muhammad.

4 See on him, his ancestors and his successors, Duroy, Historie, III, passim; Soud, Les Bani Wathur, pp. 77-80; Rouch Vila and Homenbach, Les Bani Wathur. See also Viguera, "Los jueces de Córdoba.

5 The scholars who have paid attention to this figure give incomplete information: see for example Duroy, Historie, III, 4; 239; Dunlop, "The Dhimmis", p. 83; Posto Vives, Los Reyes de Tusas, p. 52; Wasserstein, p. 75, 96, 100-1; Delgado Valero, Toledo islamico, p. 36 (quoting Posto Vives), who mentions the Bani Katturah as "Custodes" and Delgado as "Quedado"; Martin, "Familias de alemán de Toledo," s.v. Katturah and Mundhir. I have not been able to consult the study by H. Sharabi, Toledo under Banu Dhi l-Na'i (1012-1053): a study of the political and cultural relations between the Muslims and the Christians in eleventh century Spain, Ph.D., Univ. of Chicago 1955, quoted by Delgado as referring to the affair of Ya'ish.

6 See on him Taribb, VIII, 41-2; Sīla, ed. B.A.H., n° 1405 and ed. Cairo, n°

---

5120; Dhakhiwa, [VI], 16 (= Holta, II, 37-8); Bayān, III, 196; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, IX, 636; al-Nawawī, p. 85; al-Qasqashani, Suhba, V, 252; Avila, Sociedad, n° 1103.7 See Ibn al-Farraj, ed. B.A.H., n° 1384 and ed. Cairo, n° 1386; Buglosa, n° 324; Avila, Sociedad, n° 830.

---

8 See on him Sīla, ed. B.A.H., n° 477 and ed. Cairo, n° 482; Avila, Sociedad, n° 930 and Martin, "Familias," n° 24.

9 See on them Avila, Sociedad, n° 466 and 773 (appears as Muhammad b. Muqith).

10 See on him Avila, Sociedad, n° 688.


12 Sīla, ed. B.A.H., n° 1313 and ed. Cairo, n° 1427; Martin, "Familias," n° 15.

13 See on him Sīla, ed. B.A.H., n° 69 and ed. Cairo, n° 71; Avila, Sociedad, n° 338 and E. de Santiago Simón, "A propósito de la prodigidad de un alfonsi,"
Ahmad had received the ijaza of the teachers of Córdoba together with his father. He was famous for the lavish treatment he gave to his pupils, especially in terms of food, which confirms the wealth of the family of the Hani Kavian. Ya’ish and Ahmad got along well, although the former surpassed all his contemporaries in ibn. The rā’sūn mentioned by Ibn Hayyān seems to refer to the field of legal ruling, as Ibn Bashkiwi states that Ya’ish and Ibn Kavian were put in charge of the ahkām of Toledo. The actual rule of the town at the beginning of the fitna (around the years 400/0999-403/1012) was in the hands of Ibn Masarra. This Ibn Masarra has not been identified. In my opinion, he must be a member of the family of Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm b. Masarra al-Tujibī (d. 352/963 or 354/965), from Toledo, one of the most important Mālikī fiqhāt of the time, who settled in Córdoba and whose intervention in the trial against the muhājīr Abū I-Khayr was decisive in having him condemned to death, as well as in emphasizing the Mālikī school of law as the “official” legal school of the Umayyads. Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm b. Masarra was also an ascetic, author of a Khulāṣ al-nuṣāṣī, and refuted the followers of the famous Ibn Masarra (Isḥāq was not connected to Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Masarra, d. 319/931). Given the fact that the only known son of Isḥāq died in Córdoba, the “Ibn Masarra” who took power in Toledo must have belonged to the branch of the family which stayed in the latter town. Be that as it may, Ibn Masarra acted as the ruler of Toledo at the time of the fitna. According to Ibn Hayyān, Ibn Masarra indicated a preference towards Ya’ish, so that Ahmad b. Kavian fell out of favour and was sent into exile to Santarem. Contrary to what Ibn Bashkiwi says in the biography of Ahmad b. Kavian, it was Ibn Masarra who had Ahmad killed in Santarem. This took place in the year 403/1012.

When Ibn Masarra died (date unknown), Ya’ish was left as sole ruler of Toledo (gādi lāyi ṣibāḥ al-rā’sūn). He is said to have expelled Ibn Masarra’s son from Toledo, which shows his clear intention to have the field for himself. Ibn Hayyān gives a positive portrayal of him, saying that he protected the region of Toledo and excelled in the administration. Ya’ish quotes another source, al-Sāḥib, who also expressed a favourable opinion of Ya’ish as a virtuous and righteous man, very learned, who helped to perform ḥajj and ḥajj, inured at great expense on behalf of God (إِبْلِ السَّاهِبِ), and who used to recite the Qur’an and pray very often. Al-Sāḥib adds that, although Ya’ish was tempted by the love of this world, God would grant him pardon because of his virtue.

Ya’ish never adopted the name of ra’sūn, restricting himself to the name of faqih and dressing the way the ‘ulamā’ did. Ya’ish appointed his son ‘Abd Allāh as ra’sūn of Toledo, an action which suggests his reluctance to be called so himself, but also shows that he tried to keep the government of Toledo within his own family. As faqih and qādī, Ya’ish became known for his severity (shiddu): he forbade women to leave Toledo following funeral processions and he also forbade the processing of dārnak. The first prohibition is obviously related to the fact that cemeteries were among the few places where women and men could and did mix, being occasion for illicit intercourse among the two genders.

---


14 The expression used is that Ibn Kavian wuḏba ʿabhām Ṭabdālā mara Ya’ish. This could be interpreted in the sense that they were judged together. However, that the figure of al-dhābiḥ al-ʿabhām does not correspond to that of the qādī, as M. Khalfān seems to imply (see his “La organización de la justicia: cádiz y otros municipios,” version of M. I. Vigo, to appear in Los Reinos de Taifas, I. VIII of the Historia de España fundada por R. Jiménez Pidal y dirigida por M. I. Jover, forthcoming). See also note 35. The examples of sharing the qādī’s ship that are mentioned in the Qudrdat Qurtuba by Ibn Ḥarith al-Kusamī are not to be taken seriously in my opinion; see my “M. I. Vigo y al-Ḥanibān al-Himṣi: historia y leyenda,” E.O.B.A., 1 (Madrid 1988), section 12.


16 He is the source used by Ya’ish, the only author who mentions this Ibn Masarra.

17 Ibn Bashkiwi (ed. Calif, n° 448) records in the biography of Suhaym b. ʿUmar b. Muhammad al-Usayn, Abū I-Khayr, known as Ibn Suhayh, from Toledo, that Ibn Ya’ish named him judge of Toledo (I owe this reference to C. Müller). However, it would seem that Ibn Ya’ish did not rename the title of qādī (in-Kifayn Ibn Ya’ish in-Kifāyayn b. Iqbal. Ibn Ya’ish yadda? Ab I-kifāyayn I understand the last sentence as referring to Ibn Ya’ish).
sexes. The second prohibition seems to have been an attempt to protect consumers from fraudulent practices in the market; it attacked the interests not only of the merchants but also of the wealthy sectors of Toledo society, consumers of *darmak.*

These two prohibitions must not have made him very popular among the Toledans. Ibn Hayyān states that they finally tried his government (*mallād dawlatu-ham.*). They killed his son (who was the one who had been given the title of *ra’s*) and deposed *Ya’ish* in the year 417/1026. He went to Calatayud, where he died in the year 418/1027, 419/1029 or 427/1035. His rule had lasted for around fourteen years.

It is not clear what happened after his deposition. It would seem that two brothers (or a father and a son), of whom nothing is known, took power, *‘Abd al-Rahmān* and *‘Abd al-Malik* b. *Matyūh,* who also became unpopular and were deposed. It was then that the Toledans decided to offer the rule of the town to Ismā’il b. *‘Abd al-Rahmān* b. Dhi l-Nūn (d. 435/1043), member of a Berber tribe who had been operating in the area of Sátiyar since the times of the Umayyad *amir* Muḥammad. The caliph *‘Abd al-Rahmān* III managed to have them submit to Córdoba by appointing them to rule in their territories in the first half of the 4th/10th century. During the times of al-Maġzūr they continued to hold governorships on the Frontier. The Bani Dhi l-Nūn became the rulers of Toledo during the rest of the 9th/11th century.

1.2. The reaction of Toledo to the *finns* thus appears to have been to give the rule to local families whose prestige came from wealth and *ilm.* *Ilm,* as represented by *Ya’ish,* had eventually the upper hand on wealth, as represented by Ibn Kāwthār. The little we know of the policies of *Ya’ish* indicate that he tried to dissociate the figures of the *ra’s* and the *qādi/fiqh,* while in fact, and contrary to the norm, the *qādi* named the *ra’s* and was the one who actually ruled. The fact that the ruler was a *qādi* who took his training seriously, manifested itself in the attempt to "moralize society" by the prohibition of certain practices that affected the freedom of movement of women and the market. The sources do not record such policy in any of the other cases of judges who ruled. An explanation for this could be the importance of pietistic tendencies in Toledo and its surrounding region, a ribā' area where the duty of *al-amr bi-l-ma’naf wa-l-nahy ‘an al-munkar* seems to have been taken seriously in practice. The best example is the case of *Abī Allāh* b. *‘Abd al-Rahmān* b. *‘Udhmān* b. *Sa’d* b. Dhunni/Dhunayn al-Sadafi, Abī Muḥammad (d. 424/1032),* author of a book on such duty and a man who tried to live in conformity with it. In a later period, we have the example of Ibn al-Murābih, who acted as a voluntary *muftah* in the case of the *ṣindiq* Ibn Ḥātim al-Talaytīrī. The pietistic movement in Toledo could have supported the coming to power of a figure like *Ya’ish,* a severe *Mālikī fiqāh* who tried to make society conform to his interpretation of proper Islamic behaviour. It may not come as a surprise that the Toledans, once they had tasted *Ya’ish’s* policies, became fed up with the attempt and eventually offered the rule to an outside military man, supported by an important local family, the Bani l-Hadīdī. This was a wealthy family of scholars, active from the second half of the 4th/10th century, who do not seem to have had "pietistic" leanings, but who

---

18 On the revived practices associated with women attending cemeteries see Ibn ‘Abdīn, pp. 26-70-94-6, pass. 52.
19 See Wixon, "The *darmak* decree."
20 They are mentioned in *A’māl,* p. 177.
were on the contrary supporters of those scholars of Toledo who showed interest in the non-Islamic sciences.²⁹

2. Muhammad b. Ismā'il b. 'Abbād, Abū l-Qāsim (Sevilla).³⁰

2.1. During the fina, Sevilla passed to the hands of the Hammādids (descendants of the Hasanid ʿIdris). The caliph ʿAli b. Hammād named his brother al-Qāsim governor of Sevilla (408/1017-409/1018). When ʿAli was killed, al-Qāsim became the new caliph in Córdoba. When he was deposed by his nephew Yahyā b. ʿAli in 412/1021, al-Qāsim took refuge in Sevilla, where he continued to proclaim himself caliph and where he availed himself of the services of the qaḍī of the town, Abū l-Qāsim Muhammad (d. 433/1041), son of the previous qaḍī of Sevilla Ismā'il (b. Muhammad b. Ismā'il b. Quraysh). ʿAbbād b. ʿAmr b. Aṣik b. ʿAmr b. ʿAnfūs b. ʿAlī b. ʿAlī b. ʿAttāf b. Nuʿaym al-Lahmi, Abū l-Walid (d. 410/1021).³¹

As regards Ismā'il, in the times of Hishām II, he had been in charge of al-shurta al-wusṭā and the direction of the Friday prayer. Al-Manṣūr named him judge of Sevilla, a post that had been previously held by al-Manṣūr himself.³² It is said that the family of the Banū ʿAbbād owned one third of the lands of Sevilla. Ismā'il appears to have played an important role in the administration of Sevilla during the

³⁰ See on the members of the family Murīb, "Familia," n° 11; on their policies in ʿAbbād dynasty, especially to two of its members, al-Muʿtaṣid and al-Muʿtamin, starting by Douty, Loc. de Ababdi, and Historia, III, 7-17, 234-5; E.I., e.v. Abbādīds (E. Levi-Provençal); Bosch Vila and Hoevenhuis, "Los Banu ʿAbbād," Wassermeyer, pp. 75-7 and 137-9, as well as the monographs on Sevilla by Kloppe, Bonaboud and Bosch Vila. See also Stern, "Islamic city," p. 33, note 16.

³¹ See on him, apart from the notices mentioned in note 26, Dhimara III, 12-23; Hadda, II, 24-9; al-Dhahabi, Sīrah, XVII, 527-30, n° 354; Aṭāl, pp. 152-3; al-Udhūr, p. 106.

³² See on him, ed. B.A.H., n° 271 and ed. Caim, n° 235; Toorib, VIII, 31; Manfuh, p. 94; Avila, Sociedad, n° 543.

³³ See on this point Ibn Hashim, Nagh. transl., p. 133.

³⁴ A report states that he shared the rule with the ʿAbd Allah ʿAbd Allah al-Zubaydi and the vizier Abū Muhammad ʿAbd Allah b. Maryam, as well as with ʿAīb b. Ḥajjāj al-Hadrami and ʿAbd Allah b. ʿAlī al-Harawi, all of them members of important Sevilla families.


³⁶ See Bosch Vila, Sevilla, pp. 96-7.
the former Umayyad caliph Hishām II al-Mu'ayyad. The false Hishām was proclaimed caliph in Sevilla and the khulfa' made in his name, as a way to counteract the Hammūdīs' pretensions to caliphal rule. The resultant situation in Sevilla is comparable to that which had prevailed in Córdoba with al-Manṣūr and (the real) Hishām II; Ibn 'Abbād became the ḥājjī like Almanzor, and Ibn 'Abbād's son, İsmā'il, became like al-Mużaffar, al-Manṣūr's son. Ibn 'Abbād tried, with some success, to get the other Taifa kingdoms to recognize the false Hishām.

Abū I-Qāsim b. 'Abbād was succeeded by his son Abū 'Amr 'Abbād (433/1042-461/1068), who used the titles of al-ḥājjī and later that of al-Muťaṣīd, both appearing on the coins he minted. The false Hishām died during his reign at an unknown date. 'Abbād kept his death secret until 452/1060, when he had consolidated his position, and then ordered his name to be pronounced in the khulfa' and adopted the title of al-Muťaṣīd. It seems that it was he who inaugurated the fashion of adopting caliphal titles. His expansionist policy was continued by Abū 'Amr 'Abbād's son, Abū I-Qāsim Muhammad (461/1068-484/1091), who took the title of al-Mu'tamūd. He conquered Córdoba in 467/1075. Although for a time he kept the name of the false Hishām on the coins, eventually he substituted it by the ambiguous call to al-'umām 'abd Allāh amīr al-mu'minin. He named qāḍī of Sevilla his son 'Ubayd Allāh al-Rashīd.

2.2. During the Umayyad period, Sevilla had been a center of opposition to the central Umayyad rule in Córdoba, opposition led mainly by the powerful Arab families (of Yemeni affiliation) of the town, like Banū 'I-Hajjāj and the Banū Khalūdīn. The former even managed to create an independent kingdom in the times of the Umayyad amīr 'Abd Allāh. When 'Abd al-Rahmān III restored the obedience to

the Umayyads in 301/913, Sevilla was ruled by governors usually of mandāl origin. Although the Banū Ḥajjāj and the Banū Khalūdīn lost their former political power, they must have preserved their wealth and estates. In fact, there was a member of the Banū Ḥajjāj among the notables with whom the qāḍī Abū I-Qāsim b. 'Abbād shared power at the beginning. It would seem, however, that the "old" families were not prepared any more for rule, either because they had been weakened during the previous century, or because the "new" families who had received the support of al-Manṣūr were those who were better situated to retain power in their hands.

Whereas İsmā'il had had a proper intellectual training as fiqhī, his son Abū I-Qāsim b. 'Abbād held the qāḍīship more for political reasons than because of his intellectual background. In his case, and in contrast to the case of Ya'shī, wealth was superior to 'ilm. Unlike Ya'shī, he is not alleged to have tried to "moralize" society. Maybe this explains the fact that, unlike Ya'shī as well, he successfully managed to establish a dynasty. When his formal dependency on and obedience to the Hammūdī caliphs was broken, the qāḍī Abū I-Qāsim b. 'Abbād produced a peculiar solution to the question of the imamate (the false Hishām) and from then onwards the actual ruler presented himself as a ḥājjī. Whether or not he continued being the qāḍī is unresolved. There is no study on the qāḍīship in Sevilla after that moment, but it would seem that there was a tendency to retain it within the family. After the conquest of Córdoba in 461/1069, the qāḍīship of Sevilla seems to have been dependent upon that of Córdoba. In this sense, it is worth noting that later, when the Taifa rulers sent ambassadors to the Almoravīd

57 The Banū 'Abbād bear the nīḥa al-Lakhmī. According to Ibn Hayyīn, their ancestors entered al-Audālīn at the time of the conquest or with Bağh b. Bağh. Having settled in Sevilla, they prospered and gained respect and prestige in the times of al-Halīm II, his son Ḥishām and al-Manṣūr b. Alī 'Amīr, when we hear of the first important member of this family, İsmā'il b. 'Abbād. This shows that even if it is true that they belonged to the old Arab aristocracy of the town, their power had begun with al-Manṣūr. See on this M. Trin., "Consideraciones," pp. 312-3 and 315.

58 The comparison between Abū I-Qāsim Muhammad and Ya'shī as both qāḍīs who ruled is made in Hulla, II, 37-8.
3. 'Isā b. Abī Bakr Muhammad b. Muzayn (Silves).

3.1. The history of Silves (in the Gharb al-Andalus, now Portugal) during the first half of the 13th century is far from clear. It would seem that it was first ruled by 'Isā b. Muhammad, called al-Hājib, from 404/1013 until 432/1040. He was succeeded by his son Muhammad, who ruled from 432/1040 to 440/1048, and who took the title of 'Amīd al-dawla.

Around the year 434/1042, Silves would have been in the hands of a man called Ahmad b. Jarāh. He took the name of al-Hājib Mu'ayyad al-dawla, and behaved as a tyrant until eventually the people of the town rebelled. It would have been then that the qāḍī Abū l-Askāf 'Isā b. Muhammad of the Banū Muzayn took power. His full name was 'Isā b. Abī Bakr Muhammad b. Sa'id b. Jamil b. Sa'id b. Ibrahim 16 b. Abī Naṣr Muhammad b. Ibrahim 16 b. Abī l-Jawd Muzayn 16 b. Muṣā al-Awādī, Abī l-Askāf. Of a family originally from Ukhūmāba, descendants of a mawdūd of Rumlū bint 'Uthman b. 'Affān, he was qāḍī of Silves. His father, Abū Bakr Muhammad, had also been the judge of Silves and the castles (huṣūn) of the West. 'Isā commenced his rule in 440/1048 and took the title of al-Muzaffar. He was defeated by al-Mu'taḍid, the king of Sevilla, in 445/1054. 'Isā's son, Muhammad, took the title of al-Nāhir and ruled from 445/1053 until 449/1057. Muhammad's son 'Isā, who also took the name of al-Muzaffar, ruled from 450/1058 to 455/1063, when Silves was conquered by Sevilla.

3.2. The similarity of names between the first two rulers and the first two members of the Banū Muzayn is rather surprising and makes wonder about the reliability of our information. If the sequence of events that I have drawn is correct, then the qāḍī of Silves would have taken power after the rule of a man who had earned the reputation of a tyrant and against whom the population of the town rebelled; they must have then offered the qāḍī to become the ruler, probably because of his membership in a powerful and prestigious family. Having accepted to rule, the qāḍī 'Isā b. Muzayn adopted a caliphal title and most probably stopped being the judge of the town. 'Isā, of whose training as a fasih nothing is known, managed to establish a dynasty, albeit a short one, as they were subject to the expansionist policies of the powerful kingdom of Sevilla. The scanty information we possess of this case does not mention any special policy implemented by the qāḍī.


4.1. His name was Jaṯar b. 'Abd Allāh b. Jaṯar b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Jaḥāf b. Yunnūn Yazzān b. Sa'id al-Maṣāri, Abū Ahmad. He belonged to a family whose members had held important
charges in Valencia for the Umayyads. The ancestor who gives the name to the family, Jaḥḥāf b. Yumm (d. 327/939), was judge or governor of Valencia for ʿAbd al-Rahmān III.44 His son ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Jaḥḥāf was judge of Valencia in the time of al-Ḥakam II. The grandson of this ʿAbd al-Rahmān, Abū l-Muṭṭarrīf Abū al-Rahmān b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Jaḥḥāf (d. 472/1079)6 was judge of Valencia under the rule of the ʿAmirids.52 Belonging to such a family meant having considerable opportunity of becoming judge of Valencia.

The Ibn Jaḥḥāf who interests us, Jaʿfar, after studying fiqh in Játiva with Abū ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Barr and Abū l-ʿAbībīr al-ʿUdhri, became judge of Valencia, succeeding the son of his father’s paternal uncle, Abū l-Muṭṭarrīf Abū al-Rahmān b. ʿAbd Allāh,57 in the year 472/1079. He was still the judge when the Denumerid al-Qādir, having left Toledo in the hands of the Christians, became the lord of Valencia. Al-Qādir was not a popular figure, especially because, as he was on friendly terms with Alfonso VI, he was suspected of contemplating the surrender of the town to the Christian king, just as he had done with Toledo. In shabīb 483/September 1092, the Cid, to whom Valencia was paying the famous “parias” (tributes), left for Zaragoza. Taking advantage of his absence, the Valencians contacted the Almoravids. Their leaders were the judge Ibn Jaḥḥāf and the magistrate (ṣāḥib al-ʿakhkām) Ibn Wājib.58 It was decided to kill al-Qādir. According to one version, Ibn Jaḥḥāf himself killed him on the 24th Ramadān 485/28 October 1092; according to other sources, it was a member of the Banū ʿAbd al-Qādir of Toledo, who in this way avenged his family for their persecution by al-Qādir. Be that as it may, Ibn Jaḥḥāf was proclaimed the next day and moved into the palace. He became the raʾis of Valencia, ruling the town for three years. It would seem that he abandoned the ʿqāṭī-ship, naming as his successor his relative Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Jaḥḥāf, son of Abū l-Muṭṭarrīf Abū al-Rahmān.59 He is said to have soon behaved as a king, imitating the example set by Abū l-Qāsim b. ʿAbd Allāh of Sevilla. As Guichard points out, Ibn Jaḥḥāf in fact acted as muqāt, naming the magistrates, recruiting the army, collecting the taxes and controlling the intellectual life. Nevertheless, he did not adopt any honorific laqab, nor minted coins. Guichard also stresses how frequently Ibn Jaḥḥāf consulted the inhabitants of Valencia and how, when he came to power the second time, insisted in having his nīʿūzī written down in a document signed by all the notables of the town.53

The events that led to the execution of Ibn Jaḥḥāf can be summarized as follows. Ibn Jaḥḥāf tried to muster an army able to end the threat of the Cid. Part of the army was constituted of Almoravids. However, the alliance with the Almoravids had also its inconveniences, and Ibn Jaḥḥāf had to shift between the Cid and the Almoravids in order to get the maximum benefit for him and his town. In September 487/1094, the appearance of the Almoravid army at a moment when he was on friendly terms with the Cid, made Ibn Jaḥḥāf renounce the government of Valencia, which then fell into the hands of the Banū Wājib, another important local family associated with the ʿqāṭī-ship, who were pro-Almoravids.60 One member of the family, Abū l-Ḥasan...
Muhammad b. 'Umar b. Wājib (d. 519/1125), is the one who probably succeeded Ibn Jahlīf as ra’īs.

The Almoravids, however, proved unable to maintain their position and eliminate the Christian danger. When they left, Ibn Jahlīf came back to power at a moment when Valencia was under siege by the Cid. Conditions inside the town were so wretched that the inhabitants decided to surrender to the Christians. Among the stipulations of surrender was that Ibn Jahlīf would keep his position of qaḍī and that he would hand over to the Cid the treasures of al-Qādir. The Cid took possession of Valencia in 488/1095 and shortly after Ibn Jahlīf was put to death: tortured, he is alleged to have been burnt alive. According to the sources, the Cid would have taken this decision because he suspected Ibn Jahlīf to have hidden part of al-Qādir treasure. Valencia remained in Christian hands until the conquest of the town by the Almoravids in 495/1101. During the rule of the Cid, 'Abd Allāh b. Jahlīf, who had been named qaḍī by his relative Ja'far, acted as qāḍī al-maqālim wa-t-ta'dīl. A son of Ja'far, Ahmad (d. 547/1152), did not seem to have suffered because of the alleged crime of his father.

4.2. The opposition of the inhabitants of Valencia to the rule of al-Qādir that led to his regicide, seems to have been headed by two local families, the Basān Jahlīf and the Banū Wājib, whose members are known to have been scholars and magistrates, but who probably also possessed wealth and estates. As in the case of Muhammad b. Ismā‘īl b. 'Abdīdīdī, Ibn Jahlīf seems to have managed to be left alone as ra’īs of the town, while renouncing the qaḍī-ship. His subsequent behaviour can be interpreted as that of a man who, once he held power, decided to keep it in his hands and, aiming at that, he shifted his alliance back and forth from the Christians to the Almoravids. But, notwithstanding his supposed personal ambitions, he could also represent the party of those who sought a local rule and were thus opposed to both those who leaned towards the Christians and the Almoravids, like the Banū Wājib. If this interpretation is correct, he prefigurated the qaḍīs who took power at the end of the Almoravid period.

Almoravid period

Ibn al-Abbār defines the period between the fall of the Almoravids and the Almohad conquest as the time when the judges came to power in al-Andalus, east and west (ta‘ammurat al-qaḍā‘ī fī bilādi-hā sharqan wa-gharb). However, the figure of the qaḍīs/ra’īs is peculiar of the central-eastern zone of al-Andalus, where towns were more important. In fact, the judges mentioned by the sources are those of Córdoba, Jaén, Málaga, Murcia and Valencia. I do not include the case of Ibn Aḍāh, who became the ra’īs of Granada following the appeal for rebellion made by Ibn Hamdin. He had been judge of Almería, but he was not qaḍī of Granada when the rebellion took place and there is no evidence that he became the qaḍī of Granada after the rebellion. Ibn Aḍāh supported Ibn Hamdin, until Ibn Hūd managed to enter the town and secure the support of the populace. An army came from Murcia commanded by its judge, Ibn Abī Ja‘far, in order to help Granada against the Almoravids, but they defeated the 3 Rabi‘ I 540/24 August 1145. Before that, Ibn Aḍāh had died and was

---

57 After the conquest, the Almoravids named a judge of Maghribi origin, who died around the year 510/1116; his successor was a member of the Banū Wājib: Gachard, Les mausolées de Valence, p. 102.

58 Descendants of him are recorded in the biographical dictionaries: his son 'Abd al-Rahmān (Tabqaṭ, ed. B.A.H., n° 1574) and his grandson 'Abd Allāh (d. 555/1156) (Tabqaṭ, ed. B.A.H., n° 1365 and Wājib, XVII, 269, n° 233).

59 See on him Ma‘ṣūm, pp. 36-7.

60 Tamašt, ed. B.A.H., n° 85. A chronology of the events can be found in Codex, Decadencia, pp. 405-16; Mu‘ānīs, “Nūsīs,” pp. 123-5.

61 Seville remained all this period under the control of the Almoravids, until it was conquered by the Almohads. The case of Orthoñal is not clear: Ibn al-Khatib mentions it qaḍī among those who rebelled at the end of the Almoravid rule, but without giving dates: see Amal, pp. 258-9.

62 See Tamašt, ed. B.A.H., n° 1849; Hulle, II, 211-7; Codex, Decadencia, pp. 80-3; Gaspar Romero, Historia de Murcia musulmana, pp. 177-23; Dandash, p. 79. He belonged to a distinguished Arab family who had rebelled against the Umayyads.

succeeded by his son. Both he and Ibn Hūd eventually left the town to the Almoravids.

There are several studies of the fall of Almoravid rule in al-Andalus, either general like those of Codera (excellent for its time) and Dandach, or specific for each town, as well as the study by Lagardère on the Andalusian judges during the Almoravid period. Guichard, in his Les Musulmans de Valence (appeared in 1991), studies the figure of the qādi-in-ty and the reasons for its appearance, with results close to mine. I was able to consult his study when mine has already been completed, the references to Guichard's study having been incorporated at a second stage.

Among the reasons given for the weakening of the Almoravids power in al-Andalus, the most important seem to have been their inability to check the Christians' expeditions and the rebellion in the Algarve of the Sīf Mūrib, led by Ibn Qasī in Safar 539/August 1144. By the same time, Abū Ja'far Ahmad b. Hūd Sāyf al-dawla, the son of the last Hūdī king of Zaragoza, had started an appeal to the Andalusians to proclaim him amīr. A "man of the sword," he was in the best position to face the Almoravids in the military field, especially because he seems to have had the support of the Christians, if he were not acting on behalf of the king of Castilla.

5. Ibn Hamdūn (Córdoba).


who had held at various moments the qādi-ship in Córdoba under the Almoravids.

His grandfather, 'Ali b. Hamdūn, Abū l-Hasan, was from Granada. He had an important tie of kinship that has not been noticed until now: he was the son of the daughter of Abū Zakariyya' Yahyā b. Muhammad b. Husayn al-Ghasṣānī al-Quwayfī, a famous scholar who belonged to a prominent family of Granada. The Banū I-Quwayfī were of great help to the Almoravids: Abū Ja'far Ahmad b. Khalīfī b. Abī al-Malik b. Gālī b. al-Ghasṣānī al-Quwayfī (d. 498/1105) is called "al-faqīh zo'um Harūmān bī dawla al-murūbīn wa-ahd ḍālūn-him . . . wa-dakhala fi 'anāl al-sulṭān." Ahmad's son, Abū Bakr Muhammad (d. 510/1116), was named judge of Granada by the agreement of the population of the town (wa'ilīya qādī 'alai bi-hi 'an iyya min abīhi 'alai dhilīka); he has already been mentioned as one of the ambassadors sent by the kings of Taifas to the Almoravids to get their help against the Christians. It is my belief that the importance of the Banū Hamdūn under the Almoravids stemmed from this family connection.

Muhammad b. Abī b. Hamdūn, Abū Abī Allāh (439/1060-508/1114), father of our protagonist, was qādi under the Almoravids from 503/1111 to 508/1114. He supported Abū b. Yūsuf b. Tāshfin against the Almoravid rebel Muhammad b. al-Hājī Dāwūd b. Umar al-Sīnājī al-Lamānī, whose rebellion took place in Córdoba in 505/1110. Ibn Hamdūn's brother, Abū l-Qāsim Ahmad (472/1079-521/1127), succeeded his father as judge from 508/1114 until 511/1117 and from 513/1119 (or 515/1121) to 521/1127. In the meantime, Ibn

pp. 143-5; Dandach, pp. 76-82.
64 See Les musulmans de Valence, I, 107-8 and 114.
65 See the study by Dreher mentioned in the bibliography.
66 See on him Codera, Decadencia, pp. 71-100; Dandach, passim; to add to the known references al-Dhasabi, Suyur, XX, 41-4, n° 19 and XX, 37-41, n° 18 (his father).
67 See Bagyof, n° 685; Ibn al-Abbār, Ma'jme, pp. 64, 70, 89, 95, 114, 126, 147, 234-5; Hulla, II, 26; Yannina, ed. Cairo, n° 77; Mokhrī, I, 37, 61, 100, 162, 16; Nafal, pp. 253-4; Marqasib, p. 103-4; Suyur, XX, 243-4, n° 159; Wajfi, XIII, 12; Nafal, II, 537; Codera, Decadencia, pp. 43, 53-88; Mowla, "Nafal," p. 108; Buchs Vils, Almoravidès, pp. 248, 249, 288-9; Lagardère, "Haut judicature, "

68 See on him Codera, Decadencia, p. 54.
69 I take this data from the biography of al-Quwayfī in Tarih, VIII, 160-1.
70 Tarih, VIII, 161, I, 147-30. He was opposed to the Zirids, as can be seen in Tībyān, pp. 119-21, 124-7, 134 and especially page 387.
71 Tāsmita, ed. B.A.H., n° 515; Lagardère, "Haut judicature," p. 177.
73 See Ma'jme, pp. 133, 146, 193.
Rushd al-Jadd (d. 520/1126) was judge. One of the Banū Hamdīn was responsible for the (alleged) burning of the works of al-Ghazālī.

The qāḍī-ship of Córdoba seems to have been in the hands of three families: the Banū Hamdīn, the Banū Rushd and the Banū Ašghāh al-Āzādī. It could have been a dangerous post to hold: the qāḍī Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Khalaf b. Ibrāhīm al-Tujibī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh (458/1065-529/1135), known as Ibn al-Hājj, was assassinated while praying, probably as result of internal tensions in Córdoba.

Ibn Hamdīn is said to have become qāḍī after the death of his brother Abū l-Qāsim in the year 522/1126. He was deposed in 527/1132; named again in 529/1134 after the judge Ibn al-Hājj was killed and lasted until 532/1137, when he was succeeded by Abū J. Qāsim Ahmad b. Rushd. Ibn Rushd is said not to have been energetic enough. In 535/1140, the people of Córdoba (al-‘umma) stirred up riots, the judge eventually fled, and Córdoba was left without a judge. This lasted for a year and then Abī b. Yūnūf b. Tāshufin permitted the abī Qurṭuba to choose a judge. They chose Ibn Hamdīn in the year 536/1141 and was its judge when the rebellion of Córdoba against the Almoravids took place in 539/1144. He is depicted as being energetic and bold.

In 539/1144, the Almoravids amīr Yāhū b. Gāniyāa left Córdoba aiming at Sevilla to protect it from the attack of the Murīdīn. The populace (al-‘umma) rebelled then against the deputy left behind by Ibn Gāniyāa, Abū ‘Umar al-Masūfī, and proclaimed Ibn Hamdīn. According to the reconstruction made by Codera, the first rule of Ibn Hamdīn would have been in rajab-sha’bān 539/December 1144-January 1145. Although the sources are not clear on this point, it would seem

that on this occasion he was proclaimed as representative of Ibn Hūd. If that were not so, the fact that Ibn Hūd, who counted with followers in Córdoba, decided to take advantage of the rebellion and arrived twelve or fourteen days later, occupying Córdoba. Ibn Hamdīn would not have left Córdoba this time, but he would have stayed in the town plotting against Ibn Hūd. After twelve days, he was able to put an end to the rule of Ibn Hūd, who escaped to Jaén.

In ramaḍān 539/February-March 1145, Ibn Hamdīn became the ruler of Córdoba, whose ‘imāma and khāṭīb pledged allegiance to him. He took the titles of al-Maṣūfī ‘l-lāhā and amīr al-muṣīlīmīn; according to Ibn al-Khatīb, his title was al-Nāṣir l-dīn Allāh, the same chosen by the first Umayyad Andalusian caliph ‘Abd al-Rahmān III. He went to live in the emiral palace (qasr al-khitāba). It would have been at this moment that he wrote to the other rebels of al-Andalus, asking them to pledge him their allegiance. Those who replied were the ruler of Badajoz, Sūrāy b. Wawzir, who minted coins in the name of Ibn Hamdīn; Ibn al-Hājj al-Lurqī and Ibn Abī Ja’far of Murcia, who made the prayer in his name in the months of ramaḍān-shawwāl 539/February-May 1145; Ibn Aḥbā in Granada; Ibn Hādīn in Málaga, and Abū l-Qaṣim b. al-Sājīb b. ‘Azzīn in Jerez and Arcos. Ibn Hamdīn seems to have been able to produce an army, although he was never strong in the military field. Ibn Hamdīn minted coins in his name, maintaining the Almoravids formula “al-imām ‘abī Allāh amīr al-muṣīlīmīn,” eliminating the Qur`ānic verse quoted by the Almoravids (II, 85/79), substituting it by “lā lāha illa Allāh” with or without

39 In Córdoba there were also followers of Ibn Qasi’s Murpīdīn, their leader being Abī ‘Husayn b. ‘Abī Qaṣim b. Mu‘āṭin.

40 In Jaén, Ibn Hūd put an end to the rule of the qāḍī Ibn Juzayy, and then went to Granada, where Ibn Aḥbā was acting as ruler on behalf of Ibn Hamdīn, and made him pledge obedience to his rule. Unable to defeat the Almoravids, Ibn Hūd eventually left Granada and went to Murcia.

41 There are sources which put the beginning of the second rule of Ibn Hamdīn the 10th dhu’l-Hijāh 539/June 1145.

The rule of Ibn Hamdîn lasted eleven months. The party of Cordovans in favour of the Almoravids managed to persuade Ibn Ghâniya to enter Córdoba in sha'bân 540/January 1146. Ibn Hamdîn took refuge in Badajoz, and later in Andaljû. He contacted the king of Castilla, Alfonso VII, and secured his help to reconquer Córdoba in Dhu l-hijja 540/May 1146. Ibn Ghâniya took refuge in the qaṭba, while the Christians caused ravage. Shortly after, the king of Castilla was informed that the Almohads had crossed the Straits, so that an agreement was reached with the Almoravids, by which the Christians left and Ibn Ghâniya remained as ruler in Córdoba. Ibn Hamdîn abandoned Córdoba with the Christians and went either to the castle of Hornachuelos or to Badajoz. He kept trying to regain Córdoba. He even crossed to the Maghrib and had a meeting with the Almohad 'Abd al-Ma'un. Nothing seems to have come from it. Ibn Hamdîn returned to al-Andalus and settled in Málaga, under the protection of his former ally the judge Abî l-Hakam b. Hassûn. There he died in 546/1151. When the Almohads conquered Málaga, they exhumed his grave and crucified his body. Ibn Ghâniya surrendered the town of Córdoba to the Almohads in 543/1148.

5.2. We have seen that the importance of the Banî Hamdîn in Córdoba could have arisen from their kinship with the family of the Banî l-Qulayî, staunch partisans of the Almoravids. They managed to acquire great prestige and power, and they had the support of the population of the town. Ibn Hamdîn, like his relative Muhammad b. Khalaf b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Qulayî' in Granada, was named judge at a certain moment not by the Almoravid amir, but by the ahl of the town, that is, by its notables and without the opposition of the 'âmma. This gave Ibn Hamdîn a basis of support that would explain the fact that, when the 'âmma of Córdoba rebelled, he was chosen as the leader of the town.


6.1. During the Almoravid period, Jaén, a frontier territory of great strategic importance, seems to have been under the rule of the governor of Granada, represented by a qâ'id. The fuqaha' played a role of some importance in the politics of the town. This at least could be deduced from the fact that, in the year 522/1128, the Almoravid governor of Granada put into prison the fuqaha' of Jaén, who were subsequently freed by the amir Abî Hafs 'Umar b. 'Ali b. Yusuf. The information about the "qâ'id Ibn Juzay" who took power in Jaén is not clear. Ibn al-Khatib mentions a 'Yusuf b. 'Abd al-Rahmân b. Juzay," but al-Afsînî in Jaén, called al-Ra's Abî l-Hakam, a wealthy man who died in 589/1193. He adds that he thinks that the qâ'id

81 A.wâ'id, p. 251.
82 See on Ibn Tuyuq, Organisation judiciaire, pp. 101 and ss.
83 See on him Hellâ, IL, 212-251; A.wâ'id, p. 259; Codera, Decadencia, pp. 79-
84 See on him Hellâ, II, 212-251; A.wâ'id, p. 259; Codera, Decadencia, pp. 79-
85 86 See on him Hellâ, II, 212-251; A.wâ'id, p. 259; Codera, Decadencia, pp. 79-
87 See Aguirre Sánchez and Jiménez Mata, Jaén islámico, pp. 202-211.
88 See Bayón, IV, 75; A. Huici Miranda, "'Ali b. Yusuf y sus empresas en el
Andalus," Zarnazda, 7 (1959), pp. 77-122, pp. 102, 112.
89 See Vives, n° 1903-1908.
90 Other sources date his death in 543 or 548.
who acted as amīr (al-mussa‘ummi) in Jaén was another person.\textsuperscript{89} In fact, the latter's name was Yahya b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Yūsuf b. Sa‘īd al-Kalbi, Abū Bakr, member of a distinguished Kalbi family of Granada.\textsuperscript{90} I deduce this name from the nāsib of his descendant, the famous Ma‘likī jurist Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Abū Allāh b. Yahya b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Yūsuf b. Sa‘īd al-Kalbi Ibn Juzayy (d. 741/1340),\textsuperscript{91} author of the Qawānīn al-‘alākām aš-šarḥyya wa-masā‘il al-farā‘ al-fathyya, and himself a qādī. In the short history that Ibn Juzayy appended to his Qawānīn al-‘alākām, he includes a brief note pointing out his kinship with the lord of Jaén at the end of the Almoravid period, Abū Bakr b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Juzayy, saying that he was the great-great grandfather of his father. The rule of the qādī of Jaén did not last long: when Ibn Hūd left Córdoba in Ramadān 539/February-March 1145 and went to Jaén, he defeated the judge and put an end to his government.

6.2. The information about Jaén is very scarce. We do not know whether there was a rebellion of the ṣamna as in Córdoba or whether the qādī took power imitating Ibn Hamdīn and taking advantage of the vacuum of power created by the fact that the Almoravid troops were busy fighting against the Murādīn. In any case, the qādī Ibn Juzayy does not seem to have been for Ibn Ḥūd, who got rid of him when entered Jaén. Ibn Juzayy, who seems to have been a wealthy local man, was probably for ruling himself under the recognition, more or less symbolic, of Ibn Hamdīn, qādī of the former Umayyad capital of al-Andalus.

\textsuperscript{89} See A‘wālī, p. 259.

\textsuperscript{90} During the Almoravid period we know of the existence of an Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Sa‘īd b. Juzayy al-Kalbi al-Ghamdī, who was the teacher of 'Abd Allāh b. ‘Ali b. Samḥān (d. 524/1132). See Lucinti, "Los Bani Sanṣajīn," n° 8.


7. Ibn Ḥusayn (Mālaga).

7.1. Al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥusayn b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥusayn al-Kalbi, Abū I-Ḥamām,\textsuperscript{92} a pupil of Abū ‘Ali al-Ghassāni, was named qādī of Mālaga in 538/1143. His father (d. 521/1127)\textsuperscript{93} had been a pupil of Abū 'Abd Allāh b. Hamdīn (the father of Ibn Hamdīn)\textsuperscript{94} and had been in charge of the qādī-ship in Mālaga.

Ibn Ḥusayn rebelled the 13 Ramadān 539/9 March 1145 as ra‘ī Mālaga, besieging the Almoravid governor, al-Manṣūr b. Muhammad b. al-Ḥājī. When he achieved possession of the citadel after seven months, he proclaimed himself a‘wālī, while continuing as judge. He named his brother commander of his troops and wāzī of "Qurtuba." This last information is rather surprising, because at the time Ibn Hamdīn was ruling Córdoba and he and Ibn Ḥusayn seem to have been on good terms. Codex\textsuperscript{95} comments: "aunque este sea como aspiración o puro título, pues no hay indicio de que llegase a obtener tal mando efectivo." I would suggest that Ibn al-Khaṣīf, the source of this information, made a mistake between Qurtuba and Qurtroma, the latter being a town in the kārah of Rayya (Málaga).\textsuperscript{96} Another possibility is that "Qurtuba" is correct and the information refers to the period when Ibn Hamdīn settled in Málaga (where he died in 546/1151) and, by such appointment, Ibn Ḥusayn made it known that he had in mind the recovery of Córdoba.

\textsuperscript{92} Tabulins, ed. B. A. H., n° 85; Helle, II, 242; Marqūbā, p. 104; A‘wālī, pp. 254-5; al-Ḥunaynī, Rasul, p. 162; Codex, Decadencia, pp. 68-70; Guilleau, Málaga musulmana, p. 379; Bochsler, "Los Bani Sanṣajīn," pp. 31-2; Daudsh, pp. 82-3; Lagardère, "Histoire judiciaire," pp. 176, 178-9.

\textsuperscript{93} Tabulins, ed. Cairo, n° 733. Another member of the family (branch of Granada) in Baghāya, no 184; Takusilà, ed. Cairo, n° 1196; Ibn al-Qāsim, Anfās, 1, 193.

\textsuperscript{94} The loyalty and friendship that Ibn Ḥusayn showed to Ibn Hamdīn must have been born out of the relationship between his father and Ibn Hamdīn's father.

\textsuperscript{95} Decadencia, p. 69.

\textsuperscript{96} See J. Villiv, La división territorial de la España musulmana (Madrid 1986), pp. 328-31.
The pressure of the Almoravids (from Antequera and other castles) forced Ibn Hassín (as was the case with Ibn Hamdín) to seek help from the Christians, while at the same time taxing the population with extraordinary taxes and repressing the dissidents. An internal rebellion took place, headed by a "man of the sword" (the rebels contacted a man who was the commander of Ibn Hassín's escort, known as al-Lawshî). Ibn Hassín was defeated and tried to commit suicide, dying the 11 Rabi' 1 547/6 June 1152. He had been in power for almost ten years. His corpse was crucified and his head sent to Marракش. The Almohads entered Málaga after his death.

7.2. The family of Ibn Hassín had produced before him judges in Málaga and Granada. Ibn Hassín is said to have rebelled when the judges of al-Andalus contacted each other by correspondence in order to decide upon the conduct to follow with regard to the Almoravids. This seems to refer to the second rule of Ibn Hamdín, when he contacted other towns asking them to pledge allegiance to him. Ibn Hassín rebelled on that occasion, first calling himself raṣūls, which could indicate that he pledged obedience to Ibn Hamdín. Once he defeated the Almoravids, he adopted the title of amīr, which seems to imply his independence from Ibn Hamdín. The relationship between the two, however, did not break and when Ibn Hamdín could not find any more allies in order to recover Córdoba, he took refuge with Ibn Hassín. Ibn Hassín managed to rule independently for almost ten years, although conditions were not favourable, compelling him to adopt unpopular measures (alliance with the Christians, increase of taxation). What the Almohads did with his corpse and with that of Ibn Hamdín will indicate that they were seen as the symbols of Andalusian resistance to foreign rule.

8. Ibn Abū Ja'far (Murcia).

8.0. The inhabitants of Murcia seem to have rebelled at the time of the first rebellion in Córdoba. The fact that the major part of the Almoravid army had left the Sharg of al-Andalus in order to fight the Murdûn explains that the rejection of Almoravid rule, in both Valencia and Murcia, was made without opposition. In Murcia, Abū Muhammad 'Abdu al-Rahmān b. Ja'far b. Ibrāhīm b. Ahmad al-Ma'allī, Ibn al-Hājj al-Lūṭī, who had the title of Dhū l-wāzāratayn, was proclaimed amīr. He had been serving the Almoravids in Marrākash as kāthīr, but then he started to dislike the service of the rulers and returned to Murcia, where he devoted himself to an ascetic life, approaching the mystics (fīqhār), following the right path and looking forward to the other life. Although proclaimed amīr, Ibn al-Hājj acknowledged (dā'ī fi) Ibn Hamdín for some days during the two months of Ramadan-Shawwal 539/March-April 1145. Then he got tired of the post and renounced it. Ibn al-Hājj died around 550/1155.

8.1. Ibn al-Hājj was succeeded by Muhammad b. Abū Muhammad 'Abd Allāh b. Abū Ja'far Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Ahmad b. Mūsā al-Khushāni, Abū Ja'far, to whom I will refer as

97 One of them, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Ahmad b. Simāl al-Amādī, took refuge in Granada and afterwards in Marракш, shortly after the Almohads conquered it (541/1147). When the Almohads occupied Málaga, Ibn Simāl was named judge of the town, and when Granada was conquered in 551/1156, he was named judge of that town.

98 Codex gives the date of 548/1153.
Ibn Abī Jaʿfar’s first move was to attack the Almoravid forces of Orihuela with an army formed by the “ammah of Murcia. The enemy forces surrendered and were then killed, a victory that permitted Ibn Abī Jaʿfar to seize hold of the treasure of the Almoravids. Following that victory, Ibn Abī Jaʿfar left Ibn Hamdīn (khala’u ... dawaa’u Ibn Hamdīn) and imprisoned his qa’dāʾ al-Thaghib. At this point, he took rule into his hands (da’ā ʾu ʾl-nafsah), calling himself al-Nāṣir li-dīn Allāh and abandoning his former title “al-qā ’l- ’l-amir al-muslimīn.” He also left the qa’dī-ship, naming judge Ibn ʾAbī Allāh b. al-Ḥāfīz. 108 His second move was towards Játiva, where the Almoravid army was besieged in the château, but Marwân b. ʾAbī ʾAbṣār, the qa’dī who had rebelled in Valencia, had already arrived there. Ibn Abī Jaʿfar then returned to Murcia, where in the meantime he had been deposed. The followers of al-Thaghib had released him from prison, but Ibn Abī Jaʿfar managed by cunning to be reinstated. Al-Thaghib was expelled and went to Cuenca. It was then that Ibn Abī Jaʿfar moved at the head of an army to help Ibn Hūd and Ibn Adhāʾ against the Almoravids in Granada, but was defeated and killed in 540/1145. This last move could indicate that he had pledged allegiance to Ibn Hūd, but also simply that he tried for his own interest to help in weakening the military power of the Almoravids.

When Ibn Abī Jaʿfar died, he was not yet 35 years old and in such a short period, as Ibn al-申博r says, he tuṣṣāḥa wa-faqīha wa- darassa wa-darrassa wa-wulaqqya l-qādī wa-taʾammara wa-taraʾ “aṭā’ 109 He is alleged to have stated that he was not interested in power but would only rule until someone more adequate would appear. 110 However, those words fit better the ascetic Ibn al-Hājī. After his death, Ibn Abī Jaʿfar was succeeded by the raʾʾs Muhammad b. ʾAbī al-Rahmān b. Ahmad b. ʾAbī al-Rahmān b. Tāḥir al-Qaysī, Abī ʾAbī al-Rahmān, 111 member of a family that had

\[\text{Reference:}\] 108 See ʾSunūr, X, 602-3; ʾSīla, ed. Cairo, n° 646; ʾBughṭa, n° 893.
110 See ʾMaʾṣūm, n° 281, pp. 298-9 and Dandān, p. 99, note 309 and p. 98, note 235. On the other hand, it is said of Muhammad b. ʾYūnūs b. Ṣaʿdād (d. 565 or 566/1169-70) that he was judge of Murcia after the impiation of the Almoravid ʾadwād, then went to Játiva where he was qa’dī: ʾMaʾṣūm, pp. 176-8, n° 158.
111 On the different versions of whom sent al-Thaghib to Murcia (Ibn Hamdīn or Ibn Hūd), see Codex, Decuralia, pp. 95-3; Guzmán Remiro, Historia de Murcia musulmana, p. 170.

\[\text{References:}\] 108 See Guichard, Les musulmans de Valencia, I, 120.
109 ʾMaʾṣūm, p. 225.
ruled in Murcia in the time of the Taifas. He was named at the end of rabi' I 540/20 September 1145 and was deposed some fifty days later by Abū Muhammad b. 'Iyād. At the beginning, Ibn Tāhir recognized Ibn Hūd, but then declared himself independent and gave the command of the army to his brother Abū Bakr. Ibn Hamdīn attempted to recover his authority in Murcia sending two expeditions there, but to no avail.

Ibn Tāhir was succeeded by Ibn 'Iyād in jumādā I 540/October 1145. This Ibn 'Iyād was a qādī, who had been named by the judge of Valencia, Marwān, to help him to fight the Almoravid troops in Játiva. Ibn 'Iyād did not only seize power in Murcia but also in Valencia. He eventually pledged allegiance to Ibn Hūd, who died soon afterward (sha'bān 540/February 1146) in a battle against the Christians. Ibn 'Iyād remained in this way the only ruler of Murcia and Valencia, although in Murcia, al-Thaghrī acted independently from dhu l-hijāja 540/May 1146 until rājūl 541/December 1146, minting coins with the name "al-raʾis 'Abd Allāh b. Faraj." After the death of al-Thaghrī, Ibn 'Iyād recovered Murcia, but died shortly after (rabi' I 542/August 1147), leaving the rule in the hands of Muhammad b. Mardanīsh, who was going to rule independently for some time in the Sharq of al-Andalus.

8.2. Some sources say that Ibn Abī Ja'far had been named qādī by Ibn Hamdīn himself, while naming al-Thaghrī as qādī of the town. When this happened is not clear. My interpretation is that there was a party in Murcia in favour of the Almoravids to which the judge then incumbent belonged. Thus when Ibn Hamdīn was acknowledged by Ibn al-Hāj, the incumbent judge must have been replaced by Ibn Abī Ja'far. When Ibn al-Hāj retired, Ibn Abī Ja'far succeeded him as amīr of the town and eventually named his own judge.

All those who held power in Murcia minted coins in their own names: so did Ibn Hūd (calling himself amīr with the title of al-

---

113 Ibn Tāhir survived the loss of power and died in Marrakesh in 574/1178.
114 See Syrur, XX, 237-9; Codex, Decadenza, p. 18, 84-7, 99-100.
116 See Gaspar Remiro, Historia de Murcia musulmana, pp. 170-1.
118 A letter has been preserved sent by Tāhirīn b. 'Aṣī to Ibn Ja'barī and dated jumādā I 538/November 1143 in which the judge (called al-fāqīh al-qādī) is asked to control the influence of dangerous books like the Ṣīra of Ghażālī; see Mu'nis, "Nusin," pp. 106, 110-4; Cabanas, "Algazel," pp. 223-32.
119 Les musulmans de Valencia, I, 102. However, it appears to me that the family was not so important. It does not seem to have had a nisba.
Allāh, was judge in Valencia in the year 519/1125, remaining in charge until 529/1134, when Abū Muhammad b. Jahhāf was named. When the rebellion of the Murīdīdids started, the Almoravid governor in Valencia was Yahyā b. 'Ali b. Ghaniyya. He was then made governor general of al-Andalus and called to Córdoba. Ibn Ghaniyya left as his successor in Valencia his nephew 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammad b. 'Ali. 'Abd Allāh did not last long in his post. Discontent among the population was evident, and it seems that the judge and the governor tried to calm them, reminding them of the help that the Almoravids had given Valencia against the Christians. However, in 539/1145, the Valencians rebelled and named as their raʾis the judge Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. Ibn 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammad b. 'Ali escaped to Jātiva. At the beginning, Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz did not take command of the army, which was given to an Almoravid, but when the latter started acting on his own, the qāḍī took the command in his hands. Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz besieged Ibn 'Ali in Jātiva and was able to conquer it with the help of the qāḍī Ibn 'Iyād, who arrived with troops from the frontier. When Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz entered Jātiva, the bay'a was made to him. The judge of Onda, for his part, remained loyal to the Almoravids. Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz returned to Valencia in 540/July-August 1145. The troops became disaffected with their pay and helped Ibn 'Iyād to gain power. So Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz was deposed by the army the 25 Jamādā I 540/13 November 1145. Made prisoner, he stayed in jail in Mallorca for almost twelve years. When he was released, went to Marrakush, where he died in 578/1182.

9.2 Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz is the only case up until now in whose nasab an Arab nisba is lacking. He does not seem to have pledged obedience to Ibn Handān at any moment. Circumstances forced him to become the commander of the army and it was the army that provoked his fall when its members thought they were not being paid enough. This could mean that Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz tried to avoid imposing heavy taxes on the population.

11. Before coming to the conclusions to be drawn from the previous material, it has to be pointed out that al-Andalus was not the only region in the Islamic world where qāḍī-s took power. Just on the other side of the Straits, there was the case of Ḣiyād b. Muḥāfiz al-Yahṣūbī, the famous Qāḍī Ḣiyād, who had been judge of Granada. He then became judge of Saha and was its qāḍī and leader during the collapse of the Almoravid empire. He was kept as judge by the Almohads when they conquered the town in 540/1145. In 542/1147, however, the rumour spread that the Almohads were plotting to kill Qāḍī Ḣiyād. The inhabitants of Ceuta attacked the residence of the Almohad walī and put him to death. The Almoravid rule was restored, but the rebellion was short-lived. The Almoravid governor and Ḣiyād sued for peace before the battle. They asked for and received pardon. The walls of Ceuta were pulled down and Ḣiyād was transferred to a desert location where he continued his judicial functions. In 544/1149, he died in Marrakush while attempting a reconciliation with the Almohads. In the East, we have the case of the Banū 'Ammār, a family of qāḍī-s who governed Tyre and Tripoli of Syria in the forty years that preceded the conquest of Tripoli by the Crusaders in 502/1109, managing to be independent of both Fāṭimid and Saljūqīs. These cases belong, however, to an exceptional pattern (the pattern of...

---

128 He substituted the judge Abū l-Hayyān Muḥammad b. Ṭīḥān, who belonged to the family of notables that we have already mentioned: see Bayhaqi, n° 296.
129 He then named as qāḍī a cousin of him, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ahmad: see Oechelet, Les mauvais de Valence, 1, 102.
130 In the letter written to him by Ibn Ṭūḥā fī Ḥiyād of Murcia, he seems to be called "umar al-mu'llim wa-Nāṣir al-dīn": Muḥāfiz, "Nasab," p. 120.
131 His name was fāṭīḥ b. Ḥusayn b. Abū l-Ḥašāb b. l-Āmmār: see Zāhīdī, ed. Cairo, n° 636; Marqāba, p. 16; Dāmmāl, p. 98, note 235.
132 There are several studies on Ḣiyād, mentioned in Farhat's bibliography. On the rebellion of Saha see Kassas' article. Kassas deals with the dinar minted in Ceuta during the restoration of the Almoravid rule where the statement "al-mu'ādū ali'llāh yu'burīka l-nabi" appears. Whereas he interprets it as an accusation of shirk against the Almohad Abū al-Muʾāwī, in my opinion it cannot be a negative statement, but I can not produce for the moment an alternative explanation.
133 See E.II, s.v. 'Ammār (G. Wutt).
II. The qāḍī as ruler

1. The crisis of the imamate during the 5th/11th-6th/12th
   centuries is the background of the rule of the judges. The
   Umayyad caliphate was proclaimed by 'Abd al-Rahmān
   III in the year 316/929,
   mainly in order to counteract the Fatimid caliphate. It seemed to be
   fairly strong during the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmān III's successor,
   successor, Hishām II, increased the power of the hājjīb
   al-Manṣūr b.
   Abū 'Amr (d. 392/1002). Al-Manṣūr's son al-Mu'azzam was able to
   follow in his father's footsteps, but after al-Mu'azzam's death, his
   brother 'Abd al-Rahmān San'ululu forced the caliph Hishām II to
   name him as heir to the caliphate. This move did not find general
   approval and can be seen as the starting point for the crisis of the
   imamate in al-Andalus. During a period that ended in 422/1031,
   several Umayyad pretenders contended for the caliphate. At the same time, a
   new dynasty was imported from North Africa, the Hammūdids, a
   branch of the Idrīsid family, who could claim al-Hakam II to name him as heir to the caliphate. This move did not find general approval and can be seen as the starting point for the crisis of the imamate in al-Andalus. During a period that ended in 422/1031, several Umayyad pretenders contended for the caliphate. At the same time, a new dynasty was imported from North Africa, the Hammūdids, a branch of the Idrīsid family, who could claim

   126 See on this Shosharian's study, which describes two other patterns (the pattern of symbolic and the pattern of conflict), within the broader discussion of urban autonomy and of the absence in Islam of indigenous peoples in charge of their own governments and staffing their own armies. Shosharian's study provides an interesting context for the Andalusi data. I wish to thank Prof. M. Cook for drawing my attention to this article.


   128 The answer which gained the upper hand was the pledge of obedience to the useful "al-hājjīb al-Mu'tah" or "al-hājjīb al-Mu'tam." The assumption of caliphal titles by the Taifa kings was another way of solving the problem by simply disguising it. In the Taifa period, some of the rulers, like the Berber Zirids of Granada, were not of Andalusian origin. Foreign rule became general with the Almoravids. The Almoravids 'amīrs were rulers because, like the mulāk al-sālih fī, they had seized power. They legitimized their rule by acknowledging the 'Abbāsids and by calling themselves 'amīr al-

   129 It was the case of the Māṣriṣ imām beni'il al-Ru'a'im and also the doctrine of al-Ṭabarānī: see Ferrero, "Religion," 23. and 24. Both cases spring more out of Sufism than of Kharijism.

   129 Of course, they could not care less what the 'Abbāsids caliph might say or do; he was only a way to make it known that they were just pleading their loyalty to the principle of the Sunni caliphate.

   130 See Bu 'Abd al-Barr, Jama' bayan al-lim (2 vols. in 1, Beirut 1598/1980), 1, 30-67.

weakened in the Maghrib by the Almohads, the possibility of autonomous rule by the Andalusian themselves was opened.

2. The judges who took advantage of the moments of crisis and vacuum of power to rule in the towns where they were in charge of the qādī’ship, belonged to important local families. The importance of those families came from wealth or ‘ilm, in most cases from a combination of both, together with expertise in the administration of the town through the exercise of the qādī’ship. In addition to the importance of the family, the personal qualities of the member who managed to seize power were decisive. That seems especially to have been the case of Abū l-Qāsim b. ‘Abbād. In Sevilla, at the beginning, the judge was one amongst a collegial rule of city notables, but the result was the same as in Córdoba: one of the notables in the Cordovan case, the judge in the case of Sevilla, assumed the leading role and transformed collective government into personal rule.

The looseness of the structure of the Islamic city can lead to think that the fact that the qādī “should occupy the leading position (at the time of the decline of government authority) in a city, conforms to the general pattern of Islamic city life,” as the judge was the actual local authority in the Islamic towns, which were devoid of institutional forms of autonomous government. Indeed, in theory, the judge was selected by the ruler, but the choice was usually from amongst the notables of the town and, at times, the notables themselves had a say in making the choice. This does not imply that the role of the qādī, in times of decline of government authority, is to be taken for granted: the cases in which that happen are not many; there were towns with powerful local families in which the post of qādī was practically hereditary, like the Banū Fūrīsh of Zaragoza, and they did not seize power during the fatimids; the qādīs could choose to remain loyal to the former authority or to pledge obedience to a new one. Briefly, the seizure of power by the qādī was only one possibility among others. If

---

133 See on this Stern, “Islamic City,” p. 34.
135 See Molina and Avila, “Sociedad y cultura.”

3. This variety of options is what characterized the period of the fatimids which was a prelude to the Taifa kingdoms. The judges who took power during the fatimids of the 9th/10th century are not considered rebels by the sources, as there was no authority universally acknowledged. Each of the three cases studied is different, although the background and circumstances are similar (vacuum of power). In the case of Silves, the scarcity of material does not allow us to draw any special significance from the fact that the member of the Banū Marzûn who took power was a judge. In the case of Sevilla, it is safe to conclude that it was relevant, if only because Abū l-Qāsim b. ‘Abbād was interested in being named as the Hammūdī caliph. The reasons could be that in a town, which had a long tradition of autonomous local rule, there were several families with “qādī-quality” members, so that to acquire the qādī’ship gave the winning family a superior status. Once Abū l-Qāsim b. ‘Abbād got rid of his possible rivals, he successfully strengthened his power by different means (expansionist policy, producing a “caliph”) and created a dynasty, behaving exactly in the same way as any other power holder. The scarce information about judges in Sevilla under the Banū ‘Abbād rule may indicate that they never forgot their origins and the possibilities attached to being a judge in turbulent times if one had the required personality.

Although a judge, Abū l-Qāsim b. ‘Abbād would have behaved as he did in any other capacity; for his part, Ya’ish was above all a faqīh. His serious attempt at making the society he was ruling conform to his standards of moral rectitude was probably the main factor in his eventual failure.

4. The case of Ibn Ḥabīb is a prelude to the flourishing of judges who became the headmen of their towns at the end of the Almoravid period, in the sense that their power was given to them by the town, he it the notables with or without the support of the ‘amru. Their role as spokesmen of the town may had begun before the rebellion against the Almoravids took place. We have seen how Ibn
Hamdín was chosen as qādī by the ahl of Córdoba. It is difficult to establish to what extent that happened in other towns, but the impression is that the Almoravids had little say in the selection of judges and, when they tried to impose foreign elements like the Bābi Samajjin in the qādī-ship, these judges never lasted long and were "itinerant" judges contrary to those of Andalusian origin who were usually in charge of their towns of origin. When Almoravid rule started to be seen as having more disadvantages than advantages and their military power was weak enough to make it possible to face them with some hopes of success, the inhabitants of the Andalusian towns tried to get rid of their control. The choice of the qādī as leader of the rebellion was not the only option: in Granada and in Murcia (at the beginning) members of the notables of the town were the men chosen. But, contrary to what had happened during the 5th/11th century, there were not many other choices, as the governors and the military commanders were also mainly Almoravids, with a few exceptions such as Ibn Hadi. So, notables and judges were the elements available within the towns. Once they were given power, they had to improvise armies and commanders of those armies. In the cases in which they availed themselves of the services of Andalusian military men, they found it difficult to control them as they (al-Thaihir, Ibn Iyāḍ, Ibn Mardanish) soon realized that the field was open also for them. The military problem seems to have been the most important for the judges. In order to solve it, they or members of their families had to become soldiers and in most cases create an army. At the same time, they were forced, like Ibn Hadi, to impose heavy taxes on the population, which led to the loss of popularity and to internal opposition. In the case of Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, it was probably his unwillingness to impose more taxes on the population that led to his deposition by the army.

---

136 The statement by Ibn Juzayy in his report of Andalusian history (see note 91) that "in al-Andalus the judges rebelled, having agreed among them, looking after the (well being of the Muslims) (or-qa'im bi-hillal al-Andalus qua'idan la 'ahd infilq minhum nazar) fi-Insamalima fi-qana bi-Qur'āna Ibn Hamdín wa-bi Ghanawīz Ibn Afifā wa-bi Juyūn ... Ibn Juzayy ... wa-bi Málaga Ibn Hasiin wa-ahdihka anna 540 in a posteriori interpretation.

5. Those who had seized power being judges, once they became rulers adopted titles like ra's, amir, Nāṣir al-dīn, al-Manṣūr bi-l-lāh ... Nevertheless, in the case of the Almoravid period, I think that there is some evidence pointing to the fact that, in spite of the overall result, the qādī's thought they were entitled to rule because of their position.

In theory, the qādī was the delegate of the caliph and when there was no caliph, of the sultan. However, as a member of the 'ulamā', he was also referred to as the deputy or ra'ī of the prophet. In Almoravid times, special attention was paid to this idea. The Risāla fi l-qādī wa-l-ahbā by Ibn 'Abdun shows that there were attempts to give the qādī more power. Lévi-Provençal already pointed out this characteristic: Ibn 'Abdun ... confiere ... a este magistrado religioso, en todas las manifestaciones de la vida social, unos poderes notablemente extensos, but these powers were "muy superiores desde luego a los que entonces ejercía en la realidad." Ibn 'Abdun, apart from stating that the judges and other magistrates must be Andalusians because they know better the affairs of the population and its different social classes, states that the judge should be the controller over other authorities: he should control the collectors of taxes and the viziers of the government (waṣṣ al-dawla), and attend to the sāhir al-sulṭān wa-bi-'umārīd ("los negocios del gobierno y de los agentes del Estado"). Moreover, on
the judge depends the good government of the ruler (al-sultān); for the prince (ra’s) should consult the judge and the fuqahā'. For Ibn ‘Abdūn, who makes no reference to the caliph or the imām, the judge is a “custos” who, at the same time, “custodies custodes.” Ibn ‘Abdūn sees his own times as a period of corruption (fīsūd) and disorder (hārij), to such an extent that only a prophet would be able to put everything in order again with the help of God; however, if the times are not those of a prophet, then the one responsible for putting things in order is the judge (wa-lā yuḥṣīb hākimī il-‘amār illa näbi l-ballāh). If we take into account that al-Andalus, in the first half of the 6th/12th century, was a place where the cycle “prophecy - caliphate - mu’tal” seemed to have exhausted its possibilities, the field was open for the proposal of a new cycle which could begin with a muḥāfīdī like Ibn Tamart, a Ṣufi wolf like Ibn Qassī or a qāḍī.


IBN AL-FARAJI, Taʾrikh ʿulamāʾ al-Andalus, ed. Cairo 1966.


Maghrīb: see IBN SAʿĪD.

Maʿjam: see IBN AL-BAḤIR.

Naṣīr: see AL-MAQĀRĪ.
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AL-QALQASHANDI, Šabbt al-aḥšāʾ, 14 vols., Cairo 1340/1922.


"AL-QĀDIʿ AS RULER

Ṣīlah: see IBN BĀSHKUWĀL.
Siyāṣa: see AL-DHĀHABĪ.
Takhrīms: see IBN AL-ALBĀR.
Tārīkh: see YĀD.
Wafī: see AL-SAFĀʾĪ.
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LA REPUTATION D'UNE NOTE DIPLOMATIQUE DU CALIFE 'ABDARRAHMÂN III PAR LA COUR DU CALIFE FATIMIDE AL-MU`IZZ

En 910, lors de son apparition à Kairouan, le premier Fatimide al-Mahdi avait adopté les titres de calife (hâfîf), d'înâm et d'anîr al-mu'mînîn. Dix-neuf ans plus tard, en 929, l'émir de Cordoue, 'Abdarrahmân III, adopta également les titres califiques de hâfîf et d'anîr al-mu'mînîn ainsi que le nom honorifique d'an-Nâîfir li-dîn Alîh.

Dès le début, les relations entre les deux califats ne pouvaient être qu'hostiles; les prétentions des deux califés s'excluèrent réciproquement. Déjà avant son avènement au trône, dans les années 905-909, le Fatimide al-Mahdi, qui à cette époque vivait encore à Sîjlînma (Sâylînma), sous le masque d'un riche commerçant, avait envoyé à al-Andalus un de ses frères, Abû Ča'far al-Bûgâdî, qui à la cour de Cordoue jouissait d'une bonne renommée en tant qu'honneur de lettres; ce Bûgâdî était selon toute probabilité un espion du futur calife fatimide; après l'avènement de celui-ci il retourna en Afrique du Nord et devint le secrétaire d'al-Mahdi.

Après l'adoption des titres califiques par 'Abdarrahmân III, les tensions entre l'État unayyad et l'État fatimide s'aggravèrent encore; la revendication du titre de calife ainsi que l'incompatibilité des deux trônes -surnommés d'un côté et d'un autre- rendirent le fossé idéologique entre les deux États infranchissable. En Afrique du Nord les