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FOREWORD

In 1939 the prospect of a war which would involve many Asian nations made men in positions of responsibility in Britain suddenly aware of the meagre number of our experts in Asian languages and cultures. The Scarbrough Commission was set up, and its report led to a great expansion of Oriental and African studies in Britain after the war. In the third decade after 1939 events are making clear to ever-widening circles of readers the need for something more than a superficial knowledge of non-European cultures. In particular the blossoming into independence of numerous African states, many of which are largely Muslim or have a Muslim head of state, emphasises the growing political importance of the Islamic world, and, as a result, the desirability of extending and deepening the understanding and appreciation of this great segment of mankind. Since history counts for much among Muslims, and what happened in 632 or 656 may still be a live issue, a journalistic familiarity with present conditions is not enough; there must also be some awareness of how the past has moulded the present.

This series of 'Islamic surveys' is designed to give the educated reader something more than can be found in the usual popular books. Each work undertakes to survey a special part of the field, and to show the present stage of scholarship here. Where there is a clear picture this will be given, but where there are gaps, obscurities and differences of opinion, these will also be indicated. Full and annotated bibliographies will afford guidance to those who want to pursue their studies further. There will also be some account of the nature and extent of the source material.

The present volume differs in some ways from the others so far published, though it may be said to survey the present state of our knowledge of Islamic chronology. The intention, however, is rather that it should prove a useful reference book to many classes of workers in the field of Islamic history.

The transliteration of Arabic words is essentially that of the second edition of The Encyclopaedia of Islam (London, 1960,
FOREWORD
continuing) with three modifications. Two of these are normal
with most British Arabists, namely, q for q, and j for dj. The
third is something of a novelty. It is the replacement of the
ligature used to show when two consonants are to be sounded
together by an apostrophe to show when they are to be sounded
separately. This means that dh, gh, kh, sh, th (and in non-Arabic
words ch and zh) are to be sounded together, where there is an
apostrophe, as in ad'ham, they are to be sounded separately.
The apostrophe in this usage represents no sound, but, since it
only occurs between two consonants (of which the second is
h), it cannot be confused with the apostrophe representing the
glottal stop (hamza), which never occurs between two conso-
nants.

W. Montgomery Watt
GENERAL EDITOR

---
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INTRODUCTION

Every scholar who is concerned with the history of the Islamic
world encounters the need for reliable lists of rulers, dynasties,
governors, and other officials. But whereas the historian of
Britain and Europe has long been well supplied with a varied
selection of these Hilfsmittel,¹ the orientalist has a much
smaller field of choice.

For Islamic scholars, Stanley Lane Poole's The Moham-
madan dynasties: chronological and genealogical tables with
historical introductions (London 1893) was a laudable pioneer
work, arising out of that author's numismatic interests, and in
particular out of his work on the British Museum catalogues of
Islamic and Indian coins. The obvious utility of the book led
speedily to a Russian translation by Wilhelm Barthold, Musul-
manskiya dynastiy (St Petersburg 1899), to which the great
historian of Central Asia appended a valuable list of his own
corrections. Some twenty-five years later, Halil Edhem, Direc-
tor of Museums in Istanbul, produced a Turkish version, his
Döヴel-i İslamiye (Istanbul 1345/1927, printed in Arabic charac-
ters), with a considerable amount of fresh information on the
Turkish dynasties of Anatolia, a region which Lane Poole had

treated only in a cursory fashion. Meanwhile, the German
Iranist Ferdinand Justi had published his Jiransches Namenbuch
(Marburg 1895). The greater part of this work is an alphabeti-
cally-arranged dictionary of Iranian onomastics, but at the end
lie devoted an extensive section (pp. 390-479) to genealogical

tables of Iranian dynasties; here the term 'Iranian' is interpreted
in its widest sense, to cover both pre-Islamic and Islamic times
and to cover dynasties which were ethnically non-Iranian but
which were affected by Iranian culture and used Iranian names
and titles (e.g. Georgian and Armenian families in Trans-
caucasia, various Turkish dynasties of Iraq, Anatolia and
Persia, and the Muslim dynasties of India). Justi's tables are in
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many cases founded upon a more solid and profound examination of the relevant historical and literary texts than are those of Lane Poole, and for coverage of the Iranian world and its associated regions, the *Iranisches Namenbuch* is in many respects superior to *The Mohammedan dynasties*. Also worthy of mention is Eduard Sachau’s ‘Ein Verzeichnis Muhammedanische Dynastien’, Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Kl. (1923), No. 1, pp. 1-39. This contains genealogical lists of various minor lines of rulers and governors not included in Lane Poole’s work. Sachau’s source for these was the *Šahā’if al-akhkār* of the Ottoman scholar Ahmad b. Lutfallāh, called Mūnijjīm-Bashī ‘the Chief Astronomer’ (d. 1113/1700), this being an abridgment in Turkish of his original work in Arabic, the *fāmi‘ ad-duwal*. For this general history, Mūnijjīm Bashī used some sources now otherwise lost, and in the Arabic original at least was careful to give genealogical charts of the dynasties treated.²

Over the last forty years, however, the specialist Islamic historian has had recourse to the *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l’histoire de l’Islam* of the Austrian numismatist, Eduard von Zambaur (Hanover 1927). This remarkable work is founded, as the author explains in his Preface, v-vi, on both numismatic and epigraphic evidence and on historical texts, above all on a systematic examination of the general history of Ibn al-Athīr (d. 639/1243), *al-Kāmil fi t-ta‘rikh*. The *Manuel* gives the fullest available survey of the dynasties of the Islamic world, from Spain and Morocco to India, and also includes lists of the provincial governors, of the caliphs, and of the viziers, of many of the leading dynasties. The compilation of this work was a prodigious achievement for one man, but a work on this scale can never again be undertaken by a single person. Zambaur was both a numismatist and an Arabic scholar, and was further conversant with Persian and Turkish. He was not familiar with the languages of the Islamic fringe regions, such as Hausa, Swahili, Urdu, Bengali, or Malay, and indeed, no one now can claim to encompass, even in the most superficial manner, the primary sources for the whole range of Islamic dynastic chronology. Zambaur freely confessed that the coverage in his book was far from complete, and any Islamic history specialist can point to obvious lacunae. For instance, such dynasties as the Musḥa‘a’s of Ahwāz, and Lihrīstān, the Sultans of Mā‘bar or Madura in South India, and the Khans of Sībir or Timur in Western Siberia, are not mentioned, and whole regions of the Islamic fringes, such as the Arab and Hausa amirates of the southern edges of the Sahara, and Indonesia (with one or two minor exceptions) are omitted. An Arabic translation of the *Manuel* was begun under the auspices of the Cultural Commission of the Arab League by Zaki M. Hasan Bey, Hasan Ahmad Māhīī ed. (Mu‘jam al-ansāb wa-l-usarāt al-hākimī fi t-ta‘rikh al-Islāmī [Cairo 1370/1951]), but no attempt was made here to correct and revise Zambaur’s original work. The only prospect of a revised and expanded version of the *Manuel* would seem to be in a co-operative venture by Islamic historians, each component section being allotted to a specialist in the particular field; possibly such a project could be an adjunct to the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* now in progress.

At the broader level, it has long seemed to me that there is also a need for a compact, up-to-date handbook to the Islamic dynasties and their chronology, a book which would be useful to orientalists not requiring the detail of Zambaur’s book and to students embarking upon the study of Islamic history. Such a reference book should, moreover, be of value for historians who work in non-Islamic fields, but whose spheres of interest nevertheless overlap the Islamic world at times (e.g. historians of the Iberian peninsula, of Byzantium, of Africa, and of India). I myself have certainly found the dynastic and historical sections on the Chinese and Indian worlds in the *Handbook of oriental history*, ed. C. H. Philips (London, Royal Historical Society 1951) – a book which has, incidentally, a good section on the Near and Middle East – extremely useful for handy reference purposes.

It would be strange indeed if the thirty-nine years since the publication of Zambaur’s work, and the seventy-three since the one of Lane Poole, had not brought a vastly increased knowledge of large sectors of Islamic history and its chronology. Whole dynasties, formerly known only sketchily, have now been brought into the clearer light of modern knowledge (e.g. the Qarakhanids of Transoxania, see below pp. 111-14). Wherever possible I have endeavoured to benefit from the
recent work done on the various dynasties, and to incorporate in my own tables the corrections and improvements ascertainable from these researches. Yet in this age, no one can hope to encompass the whole field of Islamic history, and it is almost inevitable that some significant modern works on history or numismatics shall have been passed over. I should, accordingly, be grateful for corrections or fresh information from those with specialist knowledge of particular areas.

The choice of dynasties to be covered in a work of this restricted compass poses obvious problems. Major dynasties like the Umayyad and 'Abbāsid Caliphs, the Fatimids, the Seljuqs, the Mamluks, the Ottomans, the Safavids, and the Delhi Sultans must obviously be included without further ado. But somewhere beyond these, one reaches a point where relative significance or importance is difficult or impossible to ascertain, and where selection must include an element of arbitrary preference. Thus one might well ask why, amongst the dynasties of South Arabia, should the Ṣulayḥids and Rastūlids of the Yemen be included but not the Najāḥids or Zuray’ids? Or why the more recent dynasties of Muslim India, such as the Nawāibs of Bengal, Oudh, and Arcot, the Nīţāms of Hyderabad and the Sultans of Mysore, are not to be found? I can only say that I have tried to give reasonably equal space to all the main geographical regions of the classical Islamic world, from North Africa to India, whilst regretfully renouncing any attempt at coverage of Indonesia or Black Africa.

Lane Poole prefixed to each list of rulers in his book a short account of the dynasty in question, accounts which, he said, ‘do not attempt to relate the internal history of each dynasty; they merely show its place in relation to other dynasties and trace its origins, its principal extensions, and its downfall; they seek to define the boundaries of its dominions, and to describe the chief steps in its aggrandisement and in its decline’ (Preface, vi). These accounts were an eminently useful feature of The Muhammadan dynasties, and I have thought it worth while to add similar accounts to my own dynastic lists. Certainly, if a book on Islamic dynastic chronology is to be of use at all for students and for non-Islamic scholars, such brief introductions seem to be essential. My aim here has been similar to that of Lane Poole: not to give a potted history, for the page or so available in the case of the major dynasties would suffice only for a derisory account, but to place the dynasty in the broad context of Islamic history; to outline some of the major trends of its period; and where relevant, to indicate some of the dynasty’s achievements. It should be noted that the bibliographical references at the foot of each article are to the sources found useful in compiling the list of rulers, cc. in elucidating chronology and titulature. They are not references to works on the general history of the dynasty in question; for such indications, one should consult the bibliographies given in the relevant Encyclopædia of Islam articles, or the works described in Cl. Cahen’s refonte of Jean Sauvaget’s Introduction à l’histoire de l’Orient Musulman: éléments de bibliographie (Paris 1961), English translation (unfortunately, with rather more cursory bibliographical references), Introduction to the history of the Muslim East: a bibliographical guide (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1965).

Following Lane Poole, I have given dates in both the Muslim Ḥijrī and Christian eras. It should be noted by non-Islamic scholars that whilst the pre-Islamic Arabs used a solar calendar, the Prophet Muḥammad introduced a lunar year of 354 days, the twelve months having twenty-eight, twenty-nine or thirty days in them. The Ḥijrī months do not therefore correspond with the four seasons of the year, as do the Christian Gregorian ones or the Jewish ones, but begin slightly earlier each year. For instance, the month of Ramadan 1387 begins on December 3rd, 1967. As we have seen that the Muslim year is eleven days shorter than the Christian Gregorian one, the next Ramadan would begin on November 22nd, 1968. It will thus take about thirty-three Christian years before Ramadan begins again in early December. In this way, the ninety-seven Christian years are approximately equal to a hundred Muslim years.

It is difficult to convert quickly from Christian to Ḥijrī dates and vice-versa, and recourse has usually to be made to conversion tables. In fact, a shifting lunar calendar has obvious disadvantages for the fixing of recurrent agricultural operations or financial transactions, and solar calendars soon came into use in the Islamic world for these practical purposes. Today, most of the Islamic world follows the European Gregorian calendar for purely secular and everyday purposes; Persia and Afghan-
ISTAN, however, use a solar year which runs from the year of
Muhammad’s hijra or migration from Mecca to Medina in 622.
But the primary records for Islamic history up to the nineteenth
century, whether written in manuscripts or in numismatic or
epigraphic form, are almost invariably dated in the Hijri sys-
tem, and the dates of accessions, deaths, etc. are accordingly
given in it.

Since the Christian and Muslim years hardly ever corres-
dpond, it follows that it is impossible to give equivalent dates
with complete accuracy unless the month and day of the Hijri
year are known; but the Islamic sources are by no means always
as exact as this. In this book, I have followed two basic prin-
ciples in converting from Muslim to Christian dates.

Firstly, I have ascertained as far as possible the exact day or
at least month of the year in question, and have taken this into
account when converting; and Zambaur, though not Lane
Poole, was careful to give the day and month wherever this
was known to him. Secondly, where this exact information is
lacking, I have simply taken the Christian year as the one in
which the greater part of the Muslim year fell; and if the
Muslim year began half-way through the Christian year (i.e. at
the end of June or beginning of July), I have taken the Christian
year as the one in which the first half of the Muslim year fell.
The equivalents arrived at in this way are clearly not always
going to be right, but this procedure seems to me in the present
context preferable to the cumbersome citation of two Christian
years. Thus I have written 741/1340 instead of the more exact
741/1340-1.

In putting together a book on Islamic chronology and
genealogy, one encounters certain problems arising from the
particular nature of the Arabic system of nomenclature.4 The
number of Arabic personal names is comparatively restricted,
making confusion easy. Also, the complexity of the Arabic
system of nomenclature poses problems in indexing: whether
to enter a person under his patronymic (kunya), given name
(ism), honorific title or nickname (tasab) or name indicating
origin or profession (niqba)? In the text of the book, I have not
given the known names and titles of each ruler in full; for these
details, recourse must be made to Zambaur. The name or names
given by me are generally those by which the ruler is best

known, together with any further components of his name
necessary to distinguish him from other members of the
dynasty; the procedure is to a certain extent arbitrary and selec-
tive, but necessary on grounds of space. Turkish and Mongol
names, increasingly frequent after the eleventh century, when
dynasties of Turkish military origin spread themselves all over
the Islamic world from Algeria to the Yemen and Bengal, pre-
sent a further difficulty. These names frequently appear in the
Arabic script of the sources in deformed, sometimes barely
recognisable shapes. Wherever ascertainable, I have set down
what seems to be the correct Turkish or Mongol form, but
where there is a considerable divergence between this form and
the arabised one, I have noted the second form of the Arabic
script in brackets, thus: Öljeytü (Uljaytu), Hülegü (Hulagu),
Temür (Timur), Tughril (Tughril). Furthermore, where
Ottoman Turkish pronunciation has produced forms of Arabic
names which look markedly different from the standard trans-
literation of the Arabic originals, these are likewise noted,
thus: ʿUthmān (Osman), Muhammed (Mehmet), Bāyazīd
(Bayezid). In the index of personal names (which in a book of
this nature must be detailed if it is to be any good at all) I have
entered separately all these alternative forms, with cross-
references where necessary; and I have also put in such standard,
Europeanised forms as Saladin and Avicenna.

Various scholars have given me the benefit of their specialist
knowledge and have looked critically over appropriate sections
of the book. They include Professor Aziz Ahmad (section on
India), Dr A. D. H. Bivar (the Saffarids), Prof. C. Cahen
(Egypt, Syria and Iraq), Dr J. F. P. Hopkins (North Africa),
Prof. R. M. Savory (modern Persia), and Mr J. R. Walsh
(Anatolia). Dr George C. Miles, Chief Curator of the Ameri-
can Numismatic Society, was kind enough to send me a copy
of his monograph Coins of the Spanish Mulak al-Tawāṣif, and
Prof. E. Birnbaum made some useful suggestions regarding this
Introduction. To all of these I am grateful, whilst at the
same time assuming full responsibility for the book's short-
comings. Finally, may I record my appreciation of the exten-
sive facilities afforded to the orientalist in the Library of the
University of Toronto (where this book was put together
during a year's stay as Visiting Professor), and my thanks to
the Edinburgh University Press for including the book in their Islamic Surveys series?

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION


2. The availability in Istanbul libraries of MSS of the Arabic original (on which see A. Dietrich, "Textkritische Bemerkungen zu V. Minorsky’s Studien zur kaukasischen Geschichte", *Orientalia*, N.S. XXVII (1958), 262-8) was not apparently known to Sachau.


The Orthodoxy or Rightly Guided Caliphs
(Al-Khulafa' ar-Rashidun)
11-40/632-61

11/632 Abū-Bakr
13/634 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb
23/644 'Uthmān b. 'Affān
35-40/656-61 'Alī b. Abī-Ṭālib
Umeyyad caliphs

On the Prophet's death in Medina in 11/632, four of his Companions, all of them close to him either through blood or through marriage, succeeded him as leaders of the Muslim umma or community. They assumed the title of Khalīfa or Caliph (literally, 'he who follows behind, successor'). Abū-Bakr was the father of Muḥammad's favourite wife 'Ā'ishah, and one of his oldest and most trusted supporters; it was he who restored the authority of Medina over the outlying parts of the Arabian peninsula after the Bedouin tribes had renounced their personal allegiance to Muḥammad (the Ridda Wars). 'Umar also had a daughter who had been married to the Prophet, and it was under 'Umar's vigorous direction that the martial energies of the desert Arabs were turned against the Byzantine territories of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt and the Sāsānian ones of Persia and Iraq. 'Umar was also a great organiser, and both the introduction of a rudimentary civil administration into the conquered provinces and the invention of the Diwān system for paying pensions to the Arab warriors are ascribed to him. It was also he who adopted the title Anār al-Muʾminīn 'Com-
mander of the Faithful', implying a spiritual as well as purely political element in his leadership.

‘Uthmân was the Prophet’s son-in-law, and was elected caliph after ‘Umar’s murder by a small council of the leading Muslims, but his reign ended in a rebellion by discontented elements and his own death in 35/656. This assassination led to strife and counterstrife in the ensuing years, and for this reason it was later referred to as al-Bâb al-maṣūm ‘the door opened to civil warfare’. The last of the orthodox caliphs, ‘Ali, was triply related to Muhammad as his cousin, foster-brother, and son-in-law, and thus in the eyes of certain pious circles regarded as particularly well-fitted to succeed to the Prophet’s heritage. But he was never able to enforce his authority in the territories of Muʿawiyah, governor of Syria (see below, p. 3). He moved his capital to Kufa, attempted to rally the Arabs of Iraq to his side, and confronted Muʿawiyah in battle at Siffin on the upper Euphrates, but had no decisive success. After ‘Ali was murdered in 40/661, his son al-Ḥasan half-heartedly tried to succeed him in Iraq, but was soon persuaded by Muʿawiyah to renounce all rights to the caliphate.

In later centuries, the period of the first four caliphs was regarded as a Golden Age in which the pristine Islamic virtues flourished, hence the title ‘rightly guided’ was applied to them, distinguishing them from the allegedly impious and worldly Umayyad caliphs who succeeded them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 3-5, 9; Zambaur, 3.
tions, and plunder did not come in as easily as at the outset of Arab expansion. All North Africa west of Egypt was occupied, and in 91/710 Muslim troops passed across the Straits of Gibraltar into Spain, later crossing the Pyrenees and raiding Carolingian France. Beyond the Caucasus, contact was made with the Turkish Khazars, and the Greek frontiers in eastern Anatolia were harried. In eastern Iran, Khwarazm was invaded and Transoxania slowly conquered for Islam against the strenuous opposition of the native Iranian rulers and their Turkish allies. Finally, an Arab governor penetrated through Makrān into Sind, implanting Islam for the first time on Indian soil. All these conquests had an important aspect in that they brought into the Islamic world large numbers of slaves; the use of this labour enabled the Arabs to live on the conquered lands as a rentier class and to exploit some of the economic potential of the rich Fertile Crescent.

Yet this administrative and economic progress did not prevent the fall of the Umayyad caliphate. The caliphs faced the sullen, insensate opposition of the Arab tribesmen of Iraq, and that of the pious elements centred on Medina, many of whom favoured the claims of ‘Ali’s descendants, the Imāms of the Shi‘a (properly Shi‘a ‘Ali, ‘party of ‘Ali’). Moreover, the masses of non-Arab peoples in the conquered territories, the Mawāli, were beginning to stir and to resent their position as second-class citizens. Hence the Umayyads were in 132/750 overthrown by a revolution which began in Khurasan or eastern Persia and which was led by an agitator of genius, Abū Mus‘īm. He exploited a wide variety of discontents to gain the caliphate for the ‘Abbāsid. In a general massacre of the Umayyads, one of the few members of the family to survive was Hishām’s grandson ‘Abd-er-Rahmān; he escaped to North Africa and eventually founded in Spain a fresh line of Umayyads (see below, pp. 11-12).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 4-6, 9; Zambaur, 3 and Table F. E11 ‘Umayyads’ (G. Levi della Vida).
THE CALIPHS

623/126 al-Mustansir
640-6/1242-58 al-Musta’sim
Mongol sack of Baghdad

1. In Cairo 659-923/1261-1517

659/1261 al-Mustansir
660/1261 al-Hākim I
701/1302 al-Mustakfī I
740/1340 al-Wāthiq I
741/1341 al-Hākim II
753/1352 al-Mu’tadid I
763/1362 al-Mutawakkil I, first time
779/1377 al-Mu’ta’īsm, first time
779/1377 al-Mutawakkil I, second time
785/1383 al-Wāthiq II
788/1386 al-Mu’ta’īsm, second time
791/1389 al-Mutawakkil I, third time
808/1406 al-Musta’in
816/1414 al-Mu’tadid II
845/1445 al-Mustakfī II
855/1451 al-Qā‘īm
859/1455 al-Mustanjid
884/1479 al-Mutawakkil II
903/1497 al-Mustamsik, first time
914/1508 al-Mutawakkil II, first time
922/1516 al-Mustansik, second time
923/1517 al-Mutawakkil III, second time
Ottoman conquest of Egypt

The ‘Abbāsid came from the family of the Prophet’s uncle al-‘Abbās, of the Meccan clan of Hāshim, and because of this descent they were able to claim a legitimacy in the eyes of the pious which the Umayyads had lacked. Even so, the early ‘Abbāsid had to contend with frequent revolts of the Alids, descendants of Muḥammad’s son-in-law ‘Alī, whom their partisans the Shi‘a considered had an even better title to the caliphate, one based on a specific act of designation by the Prophet. In self-defence, the ‘Abbāsid soon adopted a system of honorific titles (al-qābī sing. laqab) on succession to the caliphate, a practice unknown to their Umayyad predecessors; these titles proclaimed dependence on God and claimed divine support for ‘Abbāsid rule. The theocratic nature of the ‘Abbāsid’s authority was emphasised in other ways, and the orthodox religious institution enlisted as far as possible on the side of the dynasty. It is possible that these trends owed something to older, Persian religio-political ideas, for the revolution of Abū-Muslim, which brought the ‘Abbāsid to power, was essentially in origin a Persian movement; the transfer of the caliphal capital from Damascus to Baghdad symbolises the new eastwards orientation.

The Islamic empire virtually reached its full extent under the Umayyads, and under the early ‘Abbāsid, the borders were almost static. Only a few of the caliphs distinguished themselves as practical soldiers—al-Ma‘mūn and al-Mu’ta’īsm led successful expeditions into Anatolia against the Byzantines—and in the tenth and early eleventh centuries it was the Muslims who were forced on to the defensive by the vigorous Macedonian emperors. Already in the ninth century the political unity of the caliphate began to dissolve. A branch of the Umayyads ruled in Spain with complete independence, and North Africa was in general too distant to be controlled properly. In Egypt, the Ta‘ifīs enjoyed an autonomous status, whilst in Persia the Tāhirids governed were followed by local Iranian dynasties like the Sāmānids and Saffārids, who paid some tribute to Baghdad but were otherwise left alone. The effective political power of the ‘Abbāsid became reduced to Iraq, above all in the tenth century, when political Shi‘ism triumphed over a large part of the Islamic world. The Fā‘īmids seized first North Africa and then Egypt and Syria, proclaiming themselves rival caliphs in Cairo. In Iraq and Persia, the Daylam Sīyids rose to power, entering Baghdad in 434/945 and reducing the caliphs to the status of puppets, with almost nothing left but their moral and spiritual influence. The appearance of the Turkish Seldjuqs in 447/1055 relieved the caliphs of this sectarian religious pressure, but the Seldjuqs, despite their own strongly Sunni views, did not intend to let the political power of the caliphs revive. It was only in the twelfth century, when the Great Seljuqs lost their solidarity and their power became enfeebled, that the fortunes of the ‘Abbāsid began to rise under such competent caliphs as al-Muqtasī and an-Nāṣir. Unfortunately, this re-
covery was cut short by the Mongol cataclysm, and in 656/1258 Hüllegü murdered the last caliph of Baghdad.

The first three centuries of ‘Abbāsid rule (eighth–eleventh centuries) saw the full flowering of medieval Islamic civilization. Literature, theology, philosophy, and the natural sciences all flourished, with fertilizing influences coming in from Persia and the Hellenistic world. Economic and commercial progress was widespread, above all in the older, long-settled lands of Persia, Iraq, and Egypt, and trade links were established with outside regions like the Eurasian steppes, the Far East, India, and black Africa. Despite the political breakdown and insecurity of the tenth century, this progress in the material and cultural fields continued, and it was in this regard quite apt for the Swiss orientalist Adam Mez to designate this period ‘the Renaissance of Islam’. The incoming Turkish dynasties of the eleventh century and after were largely absorbed into the cultural fabric of Islam; it was the Mongols, for several decades fierce enemies of Islam and all that it stood for, who dealt really serious blows at this fabric.

The Baghdad caliphate was thus extinguished by the Mongols, but soon afterwards the Mamlūk sultan of Egypt, Baybars, decided himself to install a caliph, and invited an uncle of the last ‘Abbāsid of Baghdad, one of the few members of the family to escape massacre, to Cairo (659/1261). This caliph led an army and unsuccessfully tried to reconquer Baghdad, dying in the attempt, and a further ‘Abbāsid was installed the next year. This establishment of a caliph in Cairo served to legitimise Mamlūk rule, and was a moral weapon in the warfare against the crusaders and the Mongols; furthermore, the caliphs continued, as they had done in Baghdad, to act as heads of the Futuwwa or chivalric orders. But they had no practical power in the Mamlūk state, and there was certainly no idea of a division of power with the sultans. The last caliph, al-Mutawakkil III, was carried off to Istanbul in 923/1517 by Selim the Grim, but the story that he then transferred his rights in the caliphate to the Ottoman sultans is a piece of fiction originating in the nineteenth century.
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Arab and Berber troops crossed over the Straits of Gibraltar from Morocco to Spain in 923/711 and speedily overthrew the Visigoths, the Germanic military aristocracy who ruled Spain. During the next decades, they drove the remnants of the Visigoths into the Cantabrian Mts of the extreme north of the Iberian peninsula, and even penetrated across the Pyrenees into Frankish Gaul, until Charles Martel defeated them at Poitiers (or Tours) in 114/732. During these early years, Spain was ruled by a succession of Arab governors sent out from the east, but in 138/756 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān 1, later called ad-Dākkāh 'the Incomer', and one of the few Umayyads to have escaped slaughter in the 'Abbāsid revolution, appeared in Spain and founded the Umayyad Amīrate there.

In a peninsula where the facts of geography militate against central control and firm rule, the establishment of the Umayyads was an achievement indeed. The Amīrate was based on Seville and Cordova, but the Amīrs' hold on the provinces was less secure. Although a good proportion of the Hispano-Roman population became Muslim (the Muwaliḍ), a substantial number remained Christians (the Mozarabs), and looked to the independent Christian north for moral and religious support. In particular, Toledo, the ancient capital of the Visigoths and the ecclesiastical centre of Spain, was a centre of rebelliousness. Amongst the Muslims, there were many local princes whose military strength as marcher lords enabled them to live virtually independently of the capital Cordova; these flourished above all in the Ebro valley of the north-east, the later Aragon and Catalonia (e.g. the Tujibids of Saragossa and the Banū-Qaḍ of Tudela). In the later ninth century, there were two centres of prolonged rebellion against the central government, one around Badajoz under Ibn-Marwān the Galian, and the other in the mountains of Granada under Ibn-Ḥaḍūn.

Despite these weaknesses, and despite the continued independence of the petty Christian kingdoms of the north, the Spanish Umayyads made Cordova a remarkable centre of trade and industrial production; and as a home of Arabic culture and learning, it was only inferior to Cairo and Baghdad. The tenth century is dominated by the greatest ruler of the dynasty, 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān 111, called an-Nāṣir 'the Victorious', who

reigned for fifty years (300-50/912-61). He raised the power of the monarchy to a new pitch; court ceremonial was made more elaborate, possibly with Byzantine practice in mind, and 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān countered the pretensions of his enemies the Fāṭimids by himself adopting the titles of Caliph and Commander of the Faithful. The doctrine of orthodox legal theory, that the caliphate was one and indivisible, was thus clearly set aside. The army's strength was built up with fresh Berber recruits from Africa and with slave troops brought from all parts of Christian Europe (the Ṣuqālība). The Christians of the north were humbled and an anti-Fāṭimid policy launched in North Africa. In the last years of the tenth century, real power in the state passed to the Hājib or chief minister, Ibn-Abi-ʿAmir, called al-Muṣṭár 'the Victorious' (the Almanzor of Christian sources); it was he who captured Barcelona and who sacked the shrine of St James of Compostella in Galicia.

Yet early in the eleventh century, for reasons which still remain rather mysterious, the Umayyad caliphate fell apart. A series of short-lived caliphaties alternated with rule by members of the Ḥanānid family, local rulers of Malaga and later of Algeciras. The Umayyads finally disappeared in 422/1031, and Muslim Spain fell into a period of political fragmentation, in the course of which various local princes and ethnic groups held power (the age of the Mulk ʿat-tawāʿif or Reyes de Taifa, see p. 14).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 19-22; Zambaur, 3-4 and Table A.

The Muluk at-Tawâ'if in Spain
Eleventh century

The half-century or so between the final collapse of the Umayyad caliphate and the coming of the Almoravids was one of political fragmentation accompanied, however, by great cultural brilliance. A number of local dynasties, enumerated at twenty-three by A. R. Nykl, seized power in the various parts of al-Andalus, some of these being mere city-states, others, like the Aftasids in the south-west, ruling great tracts of territory. These dynasties were of varying race, reflecting the heterogeneity of the military classes under the Umayyads and the ethnic tensions and rivalries amongst these groups. Some were pure Arab, like the 'Abdâdis of Seville and the Hûdids of Saragossa. Others were Berber like the Mknasa Aftasids of Badajoz, the Hawwâra Dhû-n-Nûnids of Toledo (whose original name was the Berber one of Zennûn), and probably the Hammûdids of Malaga, even though the latter had become somewhat Arabised by the eleventh century and were tracing their descent through the Moroccan Idrisids to the caliph 'Ali. Some of the Taifas sprang out of the great influx of troops from Africa which had taken place under al-Manṣûr at the end of the tenth century, such as the Sanhaja Berber Zirids of Elvira; and a group of 'Amirid clients and descendants of al-Manṣûr flourished in Valencia. In certain places of the south-east, e.g. in Tortosa, Denia, and initially at Valencia, military commanders of Saqalibah origin seized power for a time.

The larger Taifas pursued aggressive policies at the expense of their neighbours. The 'Abdâdis expanded almost to Toledo, and to further their designs at one stage resuscitated a man who claimed to be the last Umayyad caliph, Hishâm. Several of the Taifas were quite content to intrigue with or even call in the Christians against their fellow-Muslims; the last Aftasid, 'Umar al-Mutawakkil, was ready to cede most of the territory he held in Portugal to Alfonso VI of Leon and Castile in return for help against the Almoravids.

Towards the end of the eleventh century, the tide was clearly beginning to flow against the Muslims in Spain. The religious classes reacted against the hedonism and irresponsibility of so many of the local rulers, and were ready to accept the rule of the puritanical Berber Almoravids; as it happened, the Christians' capture of Toledo in 418/1025 made an appeal to the Almoravids by the 'Abdâdid poet-king al-Mu'tamid inescapable.

The most important dynasties amongst the Muluk at-Tawâ'if were as follows (for complete details, see Zambaur, 53-7 and Map 1):

- Hammûdids in Malaga and Algeciras (400-49/1010-57)
- 'Abdâdis in Seville (414-84/1023-91)
- Zirids in Granada (403-83/1012-90)
- Banû-Yahlîya in Niebla (414-45/1023-51)
- Banû-Muzayn in Silves, Algarve (419-45/1028-53)
- Banû-Razîn in Albarracín, La Sábila (402-c. 500/1011-c. 1107)
- Banû-Qâsim in Alpuente (c. 430-85/c. 1029-92)
- Jahwarids in Cordova (422-61/1031-69)
- Aftasids or Banû-Haslama in Badajoz (413-87/1022-94)
- Dhû-n-Nûnids in Toledo (before 419-78/before 1028-85)
- 'Amirids in Valencia (412-89/1021-96)
- Banû-Sanûmî in Almeria (c. 430-80/c. 1039-87)
- Tujibids and then Hûdids in Saragossa, Lerida, Tudela, Calatayud, Denia, Tortosa (410-536/1029-1142)
- Banû-Mujâhid and Banû-Ghâniyâ in Majorca (413-601/1022-1205)

Almoravid conquest of Muslim Spain 483/1090

1. Hammûdids of Malaga
   400/1010 'Ali an-Nâsîr
   407/1016 al-Qâsim I al-Ma'mûn, first reign
   412/1021 Yahyâ I al-Mu'tâli, first reign
   413/1023 al-Qâsim I, second reign
   414/1023 Yahyâ I, second reign
   427/1036 Idrîs I al-Muta'âyîd
   430/1039 Yahyâ II
   430/1039 al-Jasân al-Mustârah
   434/1043 Idrîs II al-'Âli, first reign
   438/1046 Muhammad II al-Mahdi
   440/1048 Muhammad II al-Mu'tâshîm
   440/1048 al-Qâsim II al-Wâhidî
446/1054 Idrīs III al-Muwaṣṣaṣīn
446/1054 Idrīs it, second reign
447-9/1055-7 Muḥammad II al-Muṣṭaʿlī
Conquest of the main branch in Malaga by the Zirids of Granada, and of the cadet branch in Algeciras by the 'Abdādīs in 430/1048

[Note: The above table is based on that in Prieto y Vives (see bibliography), which differs considerably from that in Zambar, 53-4]

2. 'Abdādīs of Seville
414/1023 Muḥammad I b. 'Abbād
433/1042 'Abbād al-Mu'tādīd
461-8/1069-91 Muḥammad II al-Mu'tamīd
Almoravid conquest

3. Juhwarids of Cordova
423/1031 Jahwar
435/1043 Muḥammad ar-Rashīd
450-61/1059-69 'Abd-al-Malik
'Abdādīd conquest

4. Afsāsids of Badajoz
413/1022 'Abdallāh al-Muṣṭārīf
437/1045 Muḥammad al-Muẓaffar
460-87/1068-94 'Umar al-Muṭawakkil
Almoravid conquest

5. Dhīn-Nūnids of Toledo
? ' Abd-ar-Raḥmān b. Dhīn-Nūn
419/1028 Ismā'īl ibn-Zāhir
435/1043 Yahyā al-Ma'mūn
467-78/1075-85 Yahyā al-Qādir
Conquest by Alfonso VI of Leon and Castile

6. 'Āmirīds of Valencia
412/1021 'Abd-al-'Azīz al-Muṣṭārīf
453/1061 'Abd-al-Malik al-Muẓaffar
457-68/1065-76 Dhīn-Nūnīd occupation

7. Tujibids and Hīdīds in Saragossa, etc.

Tujibids
410/1019 Mundhir I al-Muṣṭārīf
414/1023 Yahyā al-Muẓaffar
420/1029 Mu'tiṣ-ad-Dawla Mundhir II
Hīdīds
430/1039 Sulaymān al-Muṣṭaʿlīn
438/1046 Ahmad I al-Muqṭṭadīr
474/1081 Yūsuf al-Muṭāmīn
478/1085 Ahmad II al-Muṣṭaʿlīn
503/1100 'Imād-ad-Dawla
'Abd-al-Malik
under Almoravid suzerainty
513-36/1119-42 Ahmad II al-Muṣṭaṣṣīr
Conquest by Alfonso I el Batallador and Ramiro II of Aragon

Bibliography. Zambar, 53-7; Lane Poole, 23-6.
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After the Almohads abandoned Spain, most of the Muslim cities fell speedily into the Christians’ hands: Cordova fell in 635/1236 and Seville in 646/1248. One Muslim chief of Arab descent, Muhammad al-Ghālib, managed to gain control of the mountainous and easily-defensible province of Granada, and made the citadel of the town of Granada, known as the Alhambra (al-Ḥamrā’ ‘the red [fortress]’), his centre, agreeing to pay tribute first to Ferdinand I of Castile and then to his successor Alfonso X. The Nasrid sultans tried to pursue a policy of balance between the Christians and the Marinids of Fez, whose ambition it was to regain Spain for Islam; but Muslim hopes of successful Marinid intervention were dashed by Sultan Abū-Ḥasan ‘Ali’s defeat by Alfonso XI of Castile at the Río Salado in 741/1340.

Despite its precarious position, Granada remained for two and a half centuries a centre of Muslim civilisation, attracting scholars and literary men from all over the Muslim West. The historian Ibn-Khaldūn served as a diplomatist for Muhammad v; and in Vizier Liṣān-ad-Dīn Ibn-al-Khatīb, whose history of Granada is a source of major importance, Nasrīd Granada produced a major literary figure. But the marriage of Ferdinand v of Aragon to Isabella of Castile in 1469 brought about the unification of Christian Spain under one crown, and the prospects for Granada’s survival darkened. The Muslims in fact hastened their own end by refusing the customary tribute and by becoming embroiled in internal succession disputes, and in 897/1492 Granada fell to the Christians, the last Nasrids fleeing to Morocco.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 28-9; Zambaur, 58-9.
The Idrisids were the first dynasty who attempted to introduce the doctrines of Shi'ism, albeit in a very attenuated form, to the Maghrib; until their time, the region had been dominated by the radical equitarianism of the Khurïjids. Idris I was a great-grandson of Caliph 'Ali's son al-Hasan, and thus connected with the line of Shi'ī Imams. He took part in an Alid rising in the Hijāz against the 'Abbāsids in 169/786, and was compelled to flee to Egypt and then to North Africa, where the prestige of Alid descent led several Zenāta Berber chiefs of northern Morocco to recognise him as their leader. It seems to have been Idris I, and not his son Idris II, who began the building of Fez on the site of the old Roman town of Volubilis. It soon became populous, attracting emigrants from Muslim Spain and Ithnā'ishīyya, and it became the Idrisids' capital; its role as a holy city, home of the Shufē or privileged descendants of the Prophet's grandsons al-Hasan and al-Ḥusayn, also begins now, and henceforth, the Shufē are an important factor in Moroccan history (see below, pp. 38-41). The Idrisid period is also important for the diffusion of Islamic culture over the recently-converted Berber peoples of the interior.

However, during the reign of Muḥammad al-Muntaṣir the Idrisid dominions became politically fragmented. Their various towns—the Idrisids' hold in Morocco was essentially on the
The Rustamids
160-296/777-909
Western Algeria

160/777 'Abd-ar-Rahmān b. Rustam
168/784 'Abd-al-Walīhāb (or 'Abd-al-Wārith)
   b. 'Abd-ar-Rahmān
208/823 Abū-Sa‘īd Aflah
218/872 Abū-Bakr b. Aflah
   2  Abū-l-Yaqzān Muḥammad
281/894 Abū-Ḥātīm Yūsuf, first reign
284/897 Ya‘qūb b. Aflah
288/901 Abū-Ḥātīm Yūsuf, second reign
294-6/907-9 Yaqzān b. Muḥammad

Capture of Tāhart by the Fāṭimid Dā‘ī
Abū-‘Abdallāh

The Rustamids have an importance for the history of North African Islam quite disproportionate to the duration and extent of their political power. In the eighth century, the majority of the Berbers of North Africa adopted the radical, egalitarian religio-political sect of Khrājiyya as a protest against domination by their orthodox Arab masters. Whereas in the east, Khrājiyya was an extremist, savagely violent minority sect, in the west it was a mass movement and therefore more moderate. The Khrājī sub-sector of the Ibadīyya, the followers of one ‘Abdallāh b. Ibādī, had their original North African centre amongst the Zenāta Berbers of the Jebel Neǔissa in modern Tripolitania. After a temporary occupation of Qayrawān, the centre of orthodoxy and Arab power in the Maghrib, a group of Ibadīyya fled to western Algeria under the leadership of ‘Abdallāh b. Rustam, whose name would indicate Persian descent, and founded a Khrājiyya principality centred on Tāhart or Tihart (modern Tiaret) (144/761). In 160/777 he became Imām of all the Ibadīyya in North Africa. This nucleus around Tāhart was linked with the Ibadī communities of the Aurès, southern Tunisia and Tripolitania, and groups as far south as the Fezān oasis acknowledged the spiritual leadership of the Rustamid Imāms. Surrounded as they were by enemies, the
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the Norman conquest of the later eleventh century, forming an important centre for the diffusion of Islamic culture to Christian Europe. The Aghlabids were also enthusiastic builders; Ziyādat-Allāh I rebuilt the Great Mosque of Qayrawān, and ʿAḥmad that of Tunis, and useful agricultural and irrigation works were constructed, especially in the less fertile south of Ifriqiyya.

However, the Aghlabids’ position in Ifriqiyya deteriorated towards the end of the ninth century. The Shiʿi propaganda of Abū-ʿAbdallāh, the precursor of the Fāṭimid Mahdi ʿUbaydallāh, had a powerful effect amongst the Kutama Berbers; this burst out into a military rising, and the last Aghlabid Ziyādat-Allāh IIII was driven out to Egypt in 296/909, after fruitless attempts to secure help from the ʿAbbasids.
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The Zirids were Sahbiya Berbers inhabiting the central part of the Maghrib, who early identified themselves with the Fatimid cause, bringing military relief to the Fatimid capital al-Mahdiyya when in 334/945 it was besieged by the Kharijite rebel Abū-Yazīd. Accordingly, when the Fatimid caliph, al-Mu’izz, left for Egypt, he appointed Buluggīn b. Zirī governor of Ifriqiyya. The latter kept up the traditional enmity of his people with the nomadic Zenārās, and overran all the Maghrib as far as Ceuta. These possessions proved too unwieldy for one man to govern, and under Buluggīn’s grandson Bādıṣ a divīsio imperii was made: the western regions went to the Ḥammādīd branch of the family, and these made their capital at Qalʿat Bani-Ḥammād, whilst the Zirid main branch retained Ifriqiyya with its capital Qayrawān.

The rich resources and wealth of Ifriqiyya tempted the Zirid al-Mu’izz to rebel against his Fāṭimid overlords, and in 433/1041 he transferred his allegiance to the ‘Abbāsids (the Ḥammādīds, however, remained faithful to the Fāṭimids at this time). Hence shortly afterwards, the Fāṭimids released against the Zirids bands of unassimilated, barbarian Bedouins of the Hīlāl and Sulaym tribes, who migrated from Lower Egypt to the Maghrib. These Arabs gradually worked their way across the countryside, terrorising the towns, and forcing the Zirids to evacuate Qayrawān for al-Mahdiyya on the coast and the Ḥammādīds to withdraw to the less accessible port of Bougie. Having lost control of the land, they now turned to the sea and built up a fleet; it is, indeed, this period which inaugurates the age of the Barbary corsairs. But they were unable to prevent Muslim Sicily falling to the Normans, even though peaceful commercial relations were later established with the Norman kings. However, in the twelfth century, the Zirids were hard pressed; Roger II of Sicily captured al-Mahdiyya and the Tunisian coast, forcing al-Ḥasan to pay tribute, and soon afterwards the Zirid and Ḥammādīd territories passed to the Almohads.
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THE ALMORAVIDS

Reconquista was beginning, it became clear that only the rising power of the Almoravids could save the divided and squabbling principalities there. Yusuf b. Tashufin crossed over from Africa in 479/1086 and won a great victory over Alfonso VI of Leon and Castile at Zallâqa near Badajoz, which, however, he regrettably failed to follow up, and Toledo remained in Christian hands. Over the next few years, Yusuf suppressed almost all the Taifas, only the Hûdids being allowed to remain in Saragossa. But in the early years of the twelfth century, the Almoravid position in the Maghrib was threatened by the rise there of a fresh power, that of the Almohads (see pp. 30-1); it was because of this pressure in the rear that the Almoravids were unable to save Saragossa from the Christians in 512/1118. In 541/1147 the last Almoravid ruler in Marrakesh, Isâ'âq, was killed, and the Almohads began crossing to Spain. When the last Almavid governor in Spain, Yahyâ b. Ghânîya, whose family was related by marriage to the Almoravids, died in 543/1148, their power was ended, but the post-Almoravid line of the Banî-Ghânîya continued in Majorca from its conquest in 509/1115 till the Aragonese occupation of 625/1228, and in Minorca as vassals of Aragon till 685/1286.
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The Almohads (from *al-Muwaḥḥidīn* 'those who affirm God’s unity') represented, intellectually, a protest against the rigidly conservative and legalistic Mālikīsm prevalent in North Africa and against the social laxity of life under the later Almoravids. Their founder, the Berber Ibn-Tūmart, had studied in the east and had acquired ascetic, reforming views. After receiving the homage of the Maṣmūda Berber chiefs of Morocco, he put himself at the head of a mass movement, proclaiming himself the Mahdi or Promised Charismatic Leader. His lieutenant, ‘Abd-al-Mu’īn, later styled himself Ibn-Tūmart’s caliph or representative. The Almohads gradually took over Morocco, extinguishing the Almoravids there and making Marrakesh their own capital. In Spain, there was a vacuum of power after the decline of the Almoravids, in which some local groups like the Taifikasi of the previous century reappeared (e.g. in Valencia, Cordova and Murcia); then in 540/1145 ‘Abd-al-Mu’īn dispatched an army to Spain and soon occupied all the Muslim territory there. A powerful Almohad kingdom, now with its capital at Seville, was constituted; ‘Abd-al-Mu’īn conquered as far as Tunis and Tripoli, and the Ayyūbīd Saladin sought his alliance and naval assistance against the Franks. The structure of the Almohad state reflected the Messianic, authoritarian nature of Ibn-Tūmart’s original teaching, and was built round a close-knit hierarchy of the caliph’s advisers and intimates. The court was a splendid centre of art and learning, above all for the last flowering of Islamic philosophy associated with such scholars as Ibn-Ṭufayl and Ibn-Rushd (Averroës), both of whom acted as court physicians to the Almohad sultans.

Yet the Almohads could not hold up the Christian advance permanently. A victory at Alarcos in 591/1195 had no lasting effect, and the catastrophic defeat of Las Navas de Tolosa in 609/1212 at the hands of a coalition of the Christian kings of the peninsula, resulted in the withdrawal of the Almohads from Spain altogether. The last sultans reigned only in North Africa, but there too their grip began to loosen. The rising of Yaghmārān b. Zayyān at Tlemcen in 633/1236 led to the foundation there of the independent ‘Abd-al-Wādīd dynasty; and in the next year, Abū-Zakariyyā’ Yahyā, the governor of Ifriqiyya, proclaimed his independence in Tunis and founded the dynasty of the Ḥaṣfids. Finally, the Almohad capital Marrakesh itself fell to the Marinids in 667/1269.
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1. ‘Almohads’ (A. Bel).

2. Line of Waṭṭāṣids

831/1428 Abū-Zakariyyā‘
852/1448 ‘Ali Yalīyā
865/1459 Muhammad I

Regents for the
Marīnid ‘Abd-al-
Haqq II
Ash-Šaykh

875/1470 Muhammad II al-Burtuqālī
931/1525 Almād, first reign
952/1545 Muhammad III al-Qasrī
954-6/1547-9 Almād, second reign
Sa‘dī Sharifs

The Marīnids succeeded to the heritage of the Almohads in Morocco and the central Maghrib, dividing up their territories with the Ḥafsids of Tunisia. The Banū-Marīn were a tribe of the nomadic Zenātā Berbers; their cultural level was probably low, and they were uninspired in their bid for power by any of the religious enthusiasm which had given driving power to the conquests of the Almoravids and Almohads. These facts, together with what seem to have been comparatively small numbers, doubtless account for the protracted nature of their struggles with the last Almohads. They first invaded Morocco from the Sahara in 615/1216, but were halted by the Almohad Abū-Sa‘īd and did not secure Marrakesh till 669/1270 and Sijilmāsa till four years later.

Established with their capital at Fez, the Marīnids acquired a strong sense of being heirs to the Almohads, and attempted to rebuild their empire in the Maghrib. They were also inspired with the spirit of ḥabd and dreamed of the reconquest of Spain; the Marīnid period does, indeed, see a great growth of maraboutism and popular religious fervour. Several Marīnid sultans fought personally in Spain. Abū-Yusuf Ya‘qūb crossed over in answer to an appeal from the Nasrids of Granada and won the battle of Eljas in 674/1275. After the Spanish capture of Gibraltar in 709/1309, Marīnid troops again appeared in Spain, but Abū-l-Ḥasan ‘Alī was routed at the Rio Salado in 741/1340 by the forces of Alfonso X of Castile and Alfonso IV of Portugal, and the Marīnids never again tried to interfere in Spain. In North Africa, the Marīnids wore down their neighbours the ‘Abd-al-Wādi of Tlemcen, occupying their capital
in 737/1337 and at later dates, but they were unable to dislodge the Ḥafṣids from Tunisia.

Towards the end of the fourteenth century, the decline of the Marinids began to be apparent. In 803/1401 Henry III of Castile attacked Tetuan and in 818/1415 the Portuguese took Ceuta, and this Christian aggressiveness caused a great wave of religious sentiment in the Maghrib and calls for jihad against the infidels. This reaction facilitated the assumption of de facto power by the Banū-Waṭṭāṣ, a collateral branch of the Marinids who had already attained high office under the sultans. Abū-Zakariyyā Yalīyā at first ruled as regent for the young Marinid 'Abd-al-Haqq II, and set to work combatting the Portuguese. 'Abd-al-Haqq tried in 862/1458 to rule directly, but was assassinated seven years later. The Waṭṭāṣid Muḥammad I ash-Shaykh was proclaimed sultan in Fez in 877/1472, seizing the city from the Idrīsid Shorfa'. But the later Waṭṭāṣids were unable to withstand the growing power of the Sa’dī Shāfs, who finally occupied Fez in 936/1530; an attempted Waṭṭāsid revanche with Ottoman Turkish help failed, and the dynasty was permanently extinguished.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** Lane Poole, 57-9; Zambaur, 79.


---

**THE ḤAFṢIDS**

| 625/1228 | Abū-Zakariyyā Yalīyā I |
| 647/1249 | Abū-‘Abdallāh Muḥammad I al-Muntasir |
| 675/1277 | Abū-Zakariyyā Yalīyā II al-Wāthiq |
| 678/1279 | Abū-Isḥāq Ibrāhīm I |
| 681/1282 | usurpation of Ahmad b. Abī-‘Umāra |
| 683/1284 | Abū-Ḥafs ‘Umar I (in Tunis) |
| 684/1285 | Abū-Zakariyyā Yalīyā II al-Muntasir (in Bougie and Constantine till 689/1290) |
| 694/1295 | Abū-‘Abdallāh (or Abū-‘Aṣida) Muḥammad II al-Muntasir |
| 709/1309 | Abū-Yalīyā Abū-Bakr I ash-Shahīd |
| 709/1309 | Abū-Isḥāq Khālid ibn-‘Nāṣir |
| 711/1311 | Abū-Yalīyā Zakariyyā I al-Līhyānī (in Tunis) |
| 718/1318 | Abū-Yalīyā Abū-Bakr II al-Mutawakkil |
| 747/1346 | Abū-Ḥafs ‘Umar II |
| 748/1348 | first Marinid occupation of Tunis |
| 750/1349 | Abū-l-‘Abbās Ahmad I al-Faḍl al-Mutawakkil (in Tunis) |
| 750/1350 | Abū-Isḥāq Ibrāhīm II al-Muntasir, first reign |
| 758/1357 | second Marinid occupation of Tunis |
| 758/1357 | Abū-Isḥāq Ibrāhīm II, second reign |
| 770/1369 | (in Tunis till 770/1369; other Ḥafṣid princes in Bougie and Constantine) |
| 770/1369 | Abū-l-Baqʿa Khālid II (in Tunis) |
| 772/1370 | Abū-l-‘Abbās Ahmad II al-Muntasir (previously in Bougie and Constantine) |
| 796/1394 | Abū-‘Alī ‘Abd-al-‘Azīz al-Mutawakkil |
| 837/1434 | Abū-‘Abdallāh Muḥammad IV al-Muntasir |
with violent fluctuations in Ḥafsīd power and stability, with the towns of the central Maghrib and of southern Ifriqiyya and the Jarid region there tending to throw off Ḥafsīd control during periods of weak rule. At times there were several contestants for the Ḥafsīd throne, with claimants ruling in various towns. In the sixteenth century, the dynasty was in clear decline, their authority often being limited to the region of Tunis itself. The establishment of the Turks in Algiers and other ports, and the Ḥafsīds’ inability to control these corsair depredations, invited attacks and reprisals by the Christians. The Emperor Charles V planted a Spanish garrison at Tunis in 941/1535. The last Ḥafsīds retained a precarious authority with Spanish help against the Turks, but in 981/1574 Sinān Pasha finally took Tunis, and the last Ḥafsīd was carried off captive to Istanbul.

Tunis under the Ḥafsīds enjoyed a great resurgence in prosperity. Before the disruptive activity of the Barbary corsairs caused a deterioration in relations, the Ḥafsīds had extensive commercial treaties with the Italian and southern French towns and with Aragon. The land benefited also from the influx of Spanish Muslim refugees (amongst whom were the historian Ibn-Khalīlīn’s forebears). Tunis became a great artistic and intellectual centre, and it was the Ḥafsīds who in the thirteenth century introduced the madrasa system of education previously known in the lands to the east.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 49-50, 52-3; Zambaur, 74-6. El Ḥafsīds (H. R. Idris).
### SPAIN AND NORTH AFRICA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1207/1793</td>
<td>Sulaymān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208/1822</td>
<td>'Abd-ar-Rahmān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276/1859</td>
<td>Muhammad IV b. 'Abd-ar-Rahmān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290/1873</td>
<td>al-Ḥasan I b. Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312/1895</td>
<td>'Abd-al-‘Azīz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325/1907</td>
<td>al-Ḥāfiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330/1912</td>
<td>Yūsuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345/1927</td>
<td>Muhammad V b. Yūsuf, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372/1953</td>
<td>Muhammad b. ‘Arāfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371/1955</td>
<td>Muhammad V, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381- /1962-</td>
<td>al-Ḥasan II b. Muhammad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From mediaeval times onwards, the Shārifī of Morocco (classical form Shurafāʾ, sing. Shārif) have played an outstanding part in the country’s history. The Maghrib has often been receptive to the leadership of messianic or charismatic figures, and some of the most characteristic forms of popular Islam there have been the cult of holy men, saints and marabouts (<em>murābiṭīn</em>, see above, p. 28), and the formation of religious fraternities organised round the religio-military centres of the qāwīyas. The strength of maraboutism and the rise to social pre-eminence of the Shārifī have been especially characteristic of Moroccan Islam, for Morocco, with its Atlantic seaboard and its proximity to Spain and Portugal, has borne the brunt of Christian attacks, and the Muslim reaction has been commensurately intense. The Shārifī are the descendants in general of the Prophet, but in Morocco, most of the lines of Shārifī have traced descent from the Prophet's grandson al-Ḥasan b. ‘Ali, and the Sa’dī and Fillīs specifically traced their descent through al-Ḥasan's grandson Muhammad an-Nāṣir as-Zakkiya (d. 1457/762). The Idrīsids (see above, pp. 20-1) were the first line of Shārifī to achieve power in Morocco, but in ensuing centuries various Berber dynasties were dominant there. However, the chance of the Shārifī came in the sixteenth century when the Waṭārīds' power in Fez was clearly waning. From a base in the Sūs region of southern Morocco, the Sa’dī line of Shārifī—who had come from Arabia in the later fourteenth century—gradually extended their power northwards, expelling the Waṭārīds from Fez in 950/1549. The full name and titles of the founder of the line's fortunes, Muhammad al-Mahdī al-Qā'im bi-amr-Allāh, show
how messianic expectations and feelings of religious exaltation and jihād against the Christians, were utilised by the early Sa’dīs. Their authority was now imposed over almost the whole of Morocco, and the Bilād al-Makhtūn, the area where the government’s writ ran and where taxation and troops were raised, reached its maximum extent. The Turks of Algiers and the Portuguese in the coastlands were repulsed; and Ahmad al-Mansūr occupied Timbuctu and destroyed the African kingdom of Gao (on the Niger, in the modern republic of Mali), so that his authority extended for a time from Senegal to Bornu. The social and fiscal privileges of the Shorfa’ were now further consolidated and confirmed by each new sultan on his accession.

However, the unity of the sultanate weakened in the seventeenth century, when independence movements appeared in various parts of Morocco, and the last Sa’dīs disappeared, despite English and Dutch help, by 1669/1659. The total disintegration of Morocco was prevented by the Filāli Shorfa’ of Tāfilalt in eastern Morocco, whose leaders Maulāy ar-Rashīd and Maulāy Ismā‘īl (Maulāy = ‘My lord’) restored Sharifī authority all through the land and built up a large standing army, which included a force of black slaves, ‘Abīd al-Bukhārī or al-Bawākhrī. In the eighteenth century, the last foothold of the Portuguese was eliminated, and trade treaties were made with the northern European powers; but in the nineteenth century, any foreign penetration of Morocco was discouraged. Nevertheless, internal disorder grew in this period, and Morocco fought two disastrous wars against the French (1860/1844) and the Spanish (1859/1860). The French protectorate proclaimed in 1830/1912 saved Morocco from anarchy and from possible dismemberment by the European powers, although the conquest of the country by the French on the sultan’s behalf took some twenty years. Finally, in 1911/1912 Morocco threw off the protected status and became once more independent, with the Filāli dynasty remaining as monarchs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 60-1; Zambaur, 81 and Table c. 191 ‘Morocco. II History’ (G. Yver), ‘Sa’dians’ (A. Cour), ‘Shorfa’ (E. Lévi-Provençal). H. Terrasse, Histoire du Maroc, II.
bautism and saint-worship of those regions, but the firm organisation of the order gave these enthusiasms lasting effect and purpose. Expectations of a coming Mahdi, who would restore the supremacy of pristine Islam, were also rife, as events in Dongola were to show in the Mahdiyya movement there of the eighteen-eighties and nineties. The Sanussis hoped for a reunion and regeneration of all Islamic peoples, and the Ottoman sultan "Abd-al-‘Hamid II hoped to recruit their support as part of a Pan-Islamic crusade. The Sanussis were, indeed, enthusiastic propagators of their ideas, and qawwāls were founded in the Hijaz, Egypt, the Fezzan, and as far south as Wadai and Lake Chad, the faith following in this case the trans-Saharan caravan routes.

The Sanussis were in the forefront of Muslim opposition to the French advance into the central Sudan, and for some thirty years they were to provide the spiritual and military driving-power for resistance to the invading Italians in Libya, especially in Cyrenaica. Italy’s entry into the First World War in 1915 on the Allied side inevitably inclined the Sanussis towards the Turkish cause, and the head of the order, Sayyid Ahmad, held on in Cyrenaica till 1918, departing then for Istanbul; the military direction of the Muslim cause in Cyrenaica was thereafter left largely to local Sanussi leaders. During the Second World War, the British government recognised Muḥammad Idris, who had been an exile in Egypt for twenty years, not merely as a spiritual chief but also as Amir political and military leader of the Sanussis of Cyrenaica. In 1371/1951 he became king of the federated kingdom of Libya, comprising Cyrenaica, Tripoli-tania and the Fezzan; in 1382/1963 it became a unitary state. Thus the process of the Sanussi family’s development from being heads of a religious movement to the headship of a modern Arab state is somewhat reminiscent of the Wahhābiyya and the Al Ša‘ūdī in Saudi Arabia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Zambait, 89; EI ‘al-Sanussi’.

THREE

THE FERTILE CRESCENT: EGYPT
SYRIA AND IRAQ

254-92/868-905

Egypt and Syria

254/868 Āḥmad b. Ţūlīn
270/884 Khumārāwayh
282/896 Ḥayš
283/896 Ḥārūn
292/905 Shaybān

Conquest by the caliphal general
Muḥammad b. Šalāymi"
return for a tribute of 300,000 dinars. The treaty was later revised in a form less favourable to the Tüllünids, but it was not until Khumārāwiyān’s death in 383/996 that the fabric of their empire, weakened by Khumārāwiyān’s reckless extravagances, began to crack. The inability of the last Tüllünids to keep the Qarmāṭi religious sectaries of the Syrian desert in check led the caliph to despatch an army which conquered Syria and then seized the Tüllünid capital of Fustāţ or Old Cairo, carrying off the remaining members of the family to Baghdad.

For the Egyptian historians, the age of the Tüllünids was a golden one. Ahmad held power by means of a large slave army, in which Turks, Greeks and black Nubians predominated, but the ensuing financial burden was alleviated for the people of Egypt by the ending of governmental malpractices; only under Khumārāwiyān did administrative chaos and insubordination in the army appear. Since Syria can best be held from Egypt by sea, Ahmad also built a strong fleet. He was a great builder in his capital Fustāţ, laying out there the military quarter of al-Qatā‘i and constructing his famous mosque to accommodate all those troops who could not find room in the mosque of ‘Amr b. ‘Abd-Allāh.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** Lane Poole, 68; Zambaur, 93.

1. Tüllünids (H. A. R. Gibb).


323/935 Muhammad b. Tughj al-Ikhshid
334/946 ‘Umayr b. ‘Uyyah]
349/961 ‘Ali
355/966 Kāfūr, originally regent for ‘Ali
357-8/968-9 Almad

Conquest of Egypt by the Fāṭimid general Jawhar

Muhammad b. Tughj came of a Turkish military family which had already been in the ‘Abbasīd’s service for two generations. He was appointed governor of Egypt in 323/935, and secured from the caliph al-Rāḍī the title of Ikhshid. The Arab sources are unclear about the meaning of this title, but it is obvious that Muhammad b. Tughj knew that it was a designation of honour in the Central Asian homeland of his forebears (it is in fact an Iranian title meaning ‘prince, ruler’, and had been borne by the local Iranian rulers of Soghdia and Farahān). Muhammad b. Tughj defended himself against the caliph’s Amīr al-Umarā’ or Commander-in-Chief, Muhammad b. Rā‘īq, and against the Hamdānids in Syria, holding on to Damascus. His two sons were, however, mere puppets, and real power passed to his Nubian slave Kāfūr (Kāfūr = ‘camphor’, a reference by antiphrasis to his black colour), whom he appointed regent for his sons just before he died. On ‘Ali’s death in 355/966, Kāfūr became unrestricted ruler. To Kāfūr belongs the credit of holding up the threatened Fāṭimid advance along the North African coast and of containing the Hamdānids in northern Syria; it was only after his death in 357/968 that a weak and ephemeral grandson of Muhammad b. Tughj was installed in Fustāţ, to go down almost immediately before the Fāṭimid invasion. Kāfūr was famed as a liberal patron of literature and the arts, and it was at his court that the poet al-Mutanabbi spent some time.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** Lane Poole, 69; Zambaur, 93.