

THE EMERGENCE OF THE TAIFA KINGDOM OF TOLEDO

David J. WASSERSTEIN

Tel Aviv University/Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin

INTRODUCTION

At the end of the fourth/beginning of the eleventh century, the Umayyad caliphate of Cordoba collapsed. In the period following its break-up, the territory of Islamic Spain came to be divided into a large, though fluctuating, number of petty states, many of which survived until the invasions of the Almoravids at the end of the fifth/eleventh century.¹ States emerged in different areas for varying reasons, and they survived for varying lengths of time.² Toledo became the capital of one of the more important of these states, under the rule of the Dhū l-Nūnid dynasty.³ Parts of the early history of this dynasty, and of the Toledan taifa, have been studied and clarified by D. M. Dunlop, who has drawn attention to the figure of the *qāḍī* Ya‘īsh, who ruled the city for a time between the collapse of central Umayyad-‘āmirid authority and the takeover by the Dhū l-Nūnids.⁴ However, the importance of Toledo, in the geographical centre of the Iberian peninsula, dominating a huge surrounding territory and on the frontier between the area of Muslim rule and those areas of the peninsula under Christian control,

¹ See Lévi-Provençal, E., *Histoire de l’Espagne musulmane*, Paris-Leiden, 1950-67² (henceforward Lévi-Provençal, *HEM*²), II, 291-345, for the period from 399/1009 to 422/1031; Prieto y Vives, A., *Los Reyes de Taifas. Estudio histórico-numismático de los musulmanes españoles en el siglo v de la hégira (xi de J. C.)*, Madrid, 1926; and M. ‘A. ‘Inan, *Duwal al-Ṭawā‘if, mundhu qiyāmiḥā ḥattā al-faṭḥ al-murābiḥī* (Part Two of *Dawlat al-Islām fī al-Andalus*), Cairo, 1960, for general surveys of the period; Wasserstein, D., *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings: Politics and Society in Islamic Spain 1002-1086*, Princeton, 1985, 55-115, for the process of the break-up of the caliph-‘āmirid state and the emergence of the taifas.

² For discussion of these aspects of Andalusí political developments in this period, see my *Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings*.

³ Cfr. Dunlop, D. M., «The Dhunnunids of Toledo», *JRAS* (1942), 77-96; id., «Notes on the Dhunnunids of Toledo», *JRAS* (1943), 17-19; *El*², II, 242-43 (art. «Dhū l-Nūnids», by D. M. Dunlop); Sharabi, H., *Toledo under the Banu Dhū l-Nūn (1032-55), a study of the political and cultural relations between the Muslims and the Christians in eleventh century Spain*, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Chicago, 1954; Wasserstein, D. J., «Toledan Rule in Cordoba», *Israel Oriental Studies*, 13 (1993), 247-70.

⁴ Cfr. the sources cited in the previous note. For the phenomenon of *qāḍīs* as rulers of Muslim cities in the medieval period, and especially in times of stress and transition, see the study by M. Fierro, «The *Qāḍī* as ruler», in *Saber religioso y poder político en el Islam. Actas del Simposio Internacional (Granada, 15-18 octubre 1991)*, Madrid, 1994, 71-116.

raises questions about the nature of the transfer of power there from the caliphal-‘āmirid system to the successor régimes. How did the transfer occur? Who were the successors? Why were they able to engineer their own takeover and survival? And how was it that it was they, rather than others, who were able to do so successfully?

In this article I offer a study of some of these questions, based on a micro-study of developments in Toledo. Such a study can be attempted only thanks to the survival of stray remarks and scattered facts in the sources at our disposal. They make possible a far more detailed study than has so far been attempted for this city and its history at this time. It may be that similar studies can be carried out for other cities, but it appears particularly desirable to pursue these questions in relation to Toledo both because of the significance of this city in the period before the collapse of the caliphal-‘āmirid system, and because of the importance which the city possessed later, under the Dhū l-Nūnids, during the fifth/eleventh century.

Beyond this, a study of this kind also represents an attempt, from a methodological point of view, to see how far we can push the sources on issues which, while they possess great importance, cover very small ground chronologically and appear often to be scarcely covered by the material preserved in the source material which has survived. The Arabic texts of the middle ages which we have generally appear concerned with individuals and with events, rather than with groups and with processes. The specific texts on which this study is based are concerned primarily with religious scholars and scholarship on one hand, and with literary anecdotage on the other. Their overall nature is such as to suggest that they can be of little help with larger questions, and, by extension, that such larger questions may not be capable of the profounder study which they, and we, demand. It emerges from this study that, within certain limits, we can indeed pursue micro-studies of individual developments even in places which are far from the centres of interest of those who composed the texts which are at our disposal today. In the light of the material and the interpretations derived from it which are offered here, this is a very comforting conclusion to be able to draw.

SOME TEXTS AND SOME PROBLEMS

We begin with chronicles. Two important sources for the fifth/eleventh century contain some previously unexploited material which enables us to begin the task of sketching in some further detail of the political history of the taifa of Toledo in this intermediate period. The first is the section of Ibn ‘Idhārī’s *al-*

Bayān al-Mughrib dealing with the taifas.⁵ And the second is the *A‘māl al-A‘lām* of Ibn al-Khaṭīb.⁶

In the *A‘māl*, Ibn al-Khaṭīb says the following:

[The B. Dhī l-Nūn] were not possessed of leadership or of nobility until the reign of al-Manṣūr Muḥammad Ibn Abī ‘Āmir; at that time they advanced, and became famous, and led armies, and settled in the *kūra* (province) of Shantabariyya [= Santaver]. Now when ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Matyūh seized power in Toledo, and then after him ‘Abd al-Malik b. Matyūh, and treated its people badly (*asā‘a al-sīra fī ahlihā*), they deposed him, and agreed to send to Ibn Dannūn (*sic*). And he sent his son Ismā‘īl b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Dannūn to them from Santaver.⁷

Ibn ‘Idhārī has the same story, but in rather more detail, and it is worth giving it in full:

They [*scil.* the B. Dhī l-Nūn] advanced in [al-Manṣūr’s] reign, and became famous; some of them led armies and governed provinces (*a‘māl*) and cities; and one of them, at the end of the time of the caliphate (*jamā‘a*), was governing the *kūra* of Shantabariyya. And when the *fitna* broke out in al-Andalus the governor in the city of Toledo and its environs was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Manyūh, but his fate came to him during this [period], and ‘Abd al-Malik b. Manyūh inherited his post (*nazar*), and treated the subjects (*ra‘iyya*) badly. Now the people of Toledo were from of old people of dissension (*fitna*) and rebellion against the kings, and they did not like the conduct (*sīra*) of this *fatā* («young man», «slave») so they deposed him and appointed someone [else] over themselves to manage their affairs. Then they became hostile to him for some reason and deposed him [as well]. Then they decided to write to Ibn Dhī l-Nūn in Shantabariyya, and he sent his son Ismā‘īl b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Dhī l-Nūn to them, and this *fatā* («young man», i. e., Ismā‘īl

⁵ The section of Ibn ‘Idhārī’s *Kitāb al-Bayān al-Mughrib fī akhbār mulūk al-Andalus wal-Maghrib* dealing with Islamic Spain in the fifth/eleventh century was published by E. Lévi-Provençal, Ibn ‘Idārī al-Marrakūṣī, *Al-Bayān al-Mughrib, tome troisième. Histoire de l’Espagne musulmane au XI^e siècle*, Paris (Textes arabes relatifs à l’histoire de l’occident musulman, 2), 1930 (repr. Beirut, n. d.).

⁶ The section of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s *Kitāb A‘māl al-A‘lām fī man būyi‘a qabla al-iḥtilām* dealing with Islamic Spain was published by E. Lévi-Provençal, Lisān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *Histoire de l’Espagne musulmane extraite du Kitāb A‘māl al-A‘lām*, Rabat (Collection de textes arabes publiée par l’Institut des Hautes Etudes marocaines, 3), 1934 (repr. Beirut, 1956; references are to this edition). There is a German translation by Wilhelm Hoenerbach, *Islamische Geschichte Spaniens, Übersetzung der A‘māl al-A‘lām und ergänzender Texte*, Zürich and Stuttgart, 1970. The Banu Matyūh, discussed here along with others, are mentioned in passing by ‘Inān, *Duwal al-Ṭawā‘if*, 96, but he seems as confused by the reports in the sources as the sources themselves.

⁷ Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *A‘māl*, 177; trans. Hoenerbach, *Islamische Geschichte Spaniens*, 352 and 585, n.° 6.

b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Dhī l-Nūn) took over the kingdom of Toledo and its towns.⁸

Although the account in Ibn 'Idhārī is longer and more detailed than that in Ibn al-Khaṭīb, the similarities in wording and phraseology, as well as of content, suggest a common source; this, in the context of Islamic Spanish historiography in general and in the context of these two writers in particular, is not very surprising.⁹ What that source may be we cannot, as yet, know, but it may perhaps be Ibn Ḥayyān, who is an important source for many writers of later periods who deal with the end of the caliphate and the taifa period in al-Andalus.¹⁰ However that may be, the longer account, that in Ibn 'Idhārī, offers us more information and, if we cannot be sure that it is more accurate, it at least offers us what its original author appears to have thought was more accurate an account of what had happened. It is worth noting that Ibn al-Khaṭīb tends to offer shorter versions of fifth/eleventh century history than does Ibn 'Idhārī, though often depending on the same sources, partly because of the scale and nature of his work as compared with that of Ibn 'Idhārī; as a result, the relative terseness of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, and his omission of some of the information contained in Ibn 'Idhārī's account, need not cause concern, or throw doubt upon the general accuracy of Ibn 'Idhārī's version of events.

Some of the information given in these accounts can be confirmed from other sources: thus we know, from the *Crónica anónima*, that one of the B. Dhī al-Nūn, Yaḥyā b. Abī al-Faṭḥ Ibn Dhī al-Nūn, was named governor of Santaver in 317/929, by 'Abd al-Raḥmān III al-Nāṣir, and that his family had a long connection with that town.¹¹ That both of our writers suggest that the family

⁸ Ibn 'Idhārī, *Bayān*, III, 276-77.

⁹ Cfr. Chalmeta, P., «Historiografía medieval hispana: árabe», *Al-Andalus*, 37 (1972), 353-404. See more broadly also Molina Martínez, L., «Historiografía», in *Historia de España Menéndez Pidal* (ed. J. M. Jover Zamora), tomo VIII/i, *Los Reinos de Taifas. Al-Andalus en el siglo XI*, ed. M. J. Viguera Molíns, Madrid, 1994, 3-27; Viguera Molíns, M. J., «Historiografía», in *Historia de España Menéndez Pidal* (ed. J. M. Jover Zamora), tomo VIII/ii, *El retroceso territorial de al-Andalus. Almorávides y Almohades siglos XI al XIII*, Madrid, 1997, 3-37; and see also the article «Ta'rikh (al-Andalus)», in *EP²* by Manuela Marín (in the press; I thank Dr. Marín for permitting me to see this in advance of publication).

¹⁰ As against this, however, it is to be noted that Ibn Bassām, *Dhakhira*, IV part i, ed. I. 'Abbās, Beirut, 1399/1979, 142-43, offers a quotation from Ibn Ḥayyān on the early history of the Dhū l-Nūnids which could not be the source of the passages under discussion here; this does not, of course, rule out the possibility that other parts of Ibn Ḥayyān's works may be the source.

¹¹ Lévi-Provençal, E. and García Gómez, E. (eds.), *Una crónica anónima de 'Abd al-Raḥmān III al-Nāṣir*, Madrid-Granada, 1950, 84 (Arabic text), 158 (Spanish translation). On this text see Chalmeta, P., «Deux précisions d'historiographie hispano-arabe», *Arabica*, 29 (1983), 330-35, at 333-35, «L'auteur de la Chronique d'al-Nāṣir»; Lévi-Provençal, *HEM²*, II, 23-24; see also, for the connection of this family with Toledo and Santaver during the fourth/tenth century, *id.*, *ibid.*, I, 386-88, II, 30-32.

acquired prominence only under al-Manṣūr (i. e., in the last third of the fourth/tenth century) need indicate no more than that such prominence as they possessed before that time was very local in its effects (Santaver is only some one hundred and fifty kilometres from Toledo, to the north-east). Toledo itself is well characterised by Ibn 'Idhārī as a place whose inhabitants were «of old people of dissension and rebellion against the kings», as its history under the Umayyads amply demonstrates.¹² And the account given by both writers of the process by which the Dhū l-Nūnids came finally to rule the city tallies well with the facts as deduced by Dunlop.¹³

Nevertheless, there are difficulties with the two passages: neither makes any mention of Ya'īsh, the *qāḍī* who apparently ruled Toledo before the Dhū l-Nūnids, unless we should see a reference to him in one of the two un-named rulers who are mentioned by Ibn 'Idhārī. The two B. Matyūh (or Manyūh), in their turn, do not appear to be known to history as rulers of Toledo through references in other sources (although, as will be seen, one of them at least is not totally unknown), and the same is true of at least one of the two un-named rulers just mentioned (the other, of course, may be Ya'īsh). These are not, however, great difficulties: Ya'īsh, as we have seen, may be one of those two un-named rulers; the two B. Matyūh (or Manyūh) seem both to have been in power for a very short time, and probably thus had little lasting effect on the city and its fate; silence about them in the sources may reflect an ignorance of their existence born of the general confusion of the period; the same is even more true of the un-named rulers. Ya'īsh himself comes through the sources as a very shadowy figure, who withdrew after his deposition to a quiet and apparently undisturbed retirement in Calatayud.¹⁴

There seems to be no good argument against accepting the evidence of these two sources (or of their single common source) for events at Toledo in this period, so far as it goes. However, in doing so, as will be seen, we come up against some difficulties. In *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings* I gave the beginning of the list of rulers of the taifa of Toledo as follows:¹⁵

¹² See now Manzano Moreno, E., «Oriental "topoi" in Andalusian historical sources», *Arabica*, 39 (1992), 42-58, at 49 ff. And see also the later text *Una descripción anónima de al-Andalus*, editada y traducida con introducción, notas e índices, por Luis Molina, 2 vols., Madrid, 1983, Arabic text p. 50, Spanish trans p. 56, for a similar view of the Toledans (Molina suggests, I, p. XIX, a date in the second half of the fourteenth or even in the fifteenth century for the redaction of this work; of course it may well be the case that material contained in the work is of far earlier date).

¹³ *Cfr.* n.º 3, *supra*.

¹⁴ See below.

¹⁵ Cited in n.º 1 *supra*; see p. 96, table of dynasties, n.º 33, and n. 33 there.

ca. 403/1012-13 Abū Bakr Ya‘īsh b. Muḥammad b. Ya‘īsh, *al-qāḍī*.

409/1018-19 Abū Muḥammad Ismā‘īl b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Dhī l-Nūn,
Dhū l-Riyāsatayn, al-Zāfir.

This list has now to be modified, by the addition, or the insertion, of at least three, and possibly four, other rulers before Ya‘īsh. Who were these rulers, and what dates are to be assigned as the beginnings and ends of their periods of rule?

UMAYYAD TWILIGHT IN TOLEDO: AL-MAHDĪ, WĀḌIḤ AND ‘UBAYD
ALLĀH B. AL-MAHDĪ

Direct Umayyad rule in Toledo, defined as rule by the governors appointed by and responsible to the caliphal-‘amirid régime in Cordoba, may be said to have come to an end with the revolution which brought Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Jabbār, al-Mahdī, to power, in 399/1009. At that time al-Nāṣir ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (Sanchuelo) b. al-Manṣūr Muḥammad Ibn Abī ‘Āmir, the *ḥājib*, was killed, and the caliph, Hishām II al Mu‘ayyad, was either killed or deposed. The state fell apart, with individual local governors «seizing what lay in their hands».¹⁶

By about 403/1012-13 Ya‘īsh may have been in control in Toledo, and he remained in power there possibly until no later than 409/1018-19. There are difficulties with both of these dates, which are discussed below, but for the moment they offer a convenient working framework, and if they do in fact stand in need of correction, such correction probably affects the overall chronology, not the inner detail of my conclusions here.¹⁷ Between 399/1009 and 409/1018-19 Toledo, or those who ruled there, played an important rôle in the conflicts around the caliphal title and the power that was still thought to accompany it. (The quietude of Ya‘īsh and of the other rulers of Toledo in respect of these conflicts was as important, in its way, as the participation in this struggle of this strong and potentially significant city would have been.) Two of the major characters in this process, for a short time, were the caliph al-Mahdī and the Slav Wāḍiḥ, both of whom were active in Toledo.

The first of these, al-Mahdī, fled to Toledo, where Wāḍiḥ held the marcher territories loyal to him, in Jumādā I 400/December 1009-January 1010, when he

¹⁶ Ibn Bassām, *Dakhira*, II part i, Cairo, 1975, 1-14 (= ed. I. ‘Abbās, Beirut, 1975-79, II part i, 11-12); *Rise and Fall*, 99, and the sources cited in n.° 47 there.

¹⁷ The beginning of Ya‘īsh’s rule is datable to 403/1012-13: Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Ṣila*, ed. Ḥusaynī, 41 f., n.° 71 (=ed. Codera, 38-39, n.° 69), where he is reported as having been involved in the death of a rival, Ibn Kawthar. But see on this further below.

was ejected from Cordoba, but he left the city shortly afterwards to attempt a return to the capital. In Shawwāl 400/May-June 1010 he succeeded in this endeavour, only to be assassinated there a few weeks later, in Dhū l-Ḥijja 400/July 1010, by Wāḍiḥ, his main supporter.¹⁸

Wāḍiḥ, who appears to have harboured the ambition to be another Manṣūr, then re-installed Hishām II al-Mu'ayyad (?redivivus) on the caliphal throne, and had himself named by him as *ḥājib*. In hopes of removing the other challenger for the caliphal throne, Sulaymān al-Musta'in, as a serious contender for power, he sent the head of al-Mahdī to his camp, near Cordoba, with proposals for an agreement. The Berbers supporting Sulaymān were not interested, however, in any arrangement which returned Hishām, especially with a Slav as his main minister, to power, and this overture by Wāḍiḥ was rejected. Sulaymān al-Musta'in himself displayed much grief over the killing of his rival, and sent the head to a son of al-Mahdī, called 'Ubayd Allāh.¹⁹

'Ubayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī, who was no more than sixteen years old, had been in Cordoba at the time of his father's murder by Wāḍiḥ. With the help of partisans of his father in the capital, however, he had managed to evade capture by him and now succeeded in making his way to Toledo. According to one source, he was well received by the Toledans, who even gave him, despite his youth, authority over themselves. This 'Ubayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī, if our source for him is to be relied upon, seems thus to be the first ruler of an independent Toledo after the fall of the caliphal-'āmirid régime.

Our information about this young man and his career is slight and confusing. His existence is recorded for us, unlike that of so many other minor Umayyad princelings, for virtually one reason only: because he was the son of al-Mahdī, and in the context of his father's murder. Apart from this context (and not fully detached from it), al-Maqqarī preserves some verses by this 'Ubayd Allāh in his *Nafh al-Tib*.²⁰ Here al-Maqqarī adds that he is said to have been known as «*al-aqra*'» («the bald one») an odd nickname for a sixteen year old, but plausible if

¹⁸ Lévi-Provençal, *HEM*², II, 311-15; Ibn 'Idhārī, *Bayān*, III, 93, 100. Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Ṣila*, ed. Ḥusaynī, 193, n.° 442 (= ed. Codera, 195, n.° 438), is a biography of a very pious man who died in Cordoba at the end of Dhū l-Qa'da 400/June 1010. His funeral attracted a large crowd, among them al-Mahdī «and all the men of his régime» («*jamī' rijāl mamlakatihis*»), and the biographer adds that «al-Mahdī was killed nineteen days afterwards».

¹⁹ Ibn Ḥayyān, quoted in Ibn Bassām, *Dhakhira*, I part i, Cairo, 1358/1939, 32 (= ed. I. 'Abbās, Beirut, 1399/1979, I part i, 46). Ibn 'Idhārī, *Bayān*, III, 100, does not follow the head beyond the camp of Sulaymān al-Musta'in.

²⁰ Al-Maqqarī, *Nafh al-Tib*, ed. R. Dozy, G. Dugat, L. Krehl and W. Wright, Leiden, 1855-61 (repr. Amsterdam, 1967), as *Analectes sur l'Histoire et la Littérature des Arabes d'Espagne*, II, 399-400.

he was indeed bald at that age. Beyond this there is obscurity, and that obscurity is deepened by the rest of our scanty material. In a couple of places we hear of someone known as Ghulām (*sic*) al-Faṣīḥ al-Andalusī who claimed to be this ‘Ubayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī, succeeding in persuading some people of the truth of this claim, and we are also given some verses (not the same as those in the *Nafḥ al-Ṭīb*) alleged to be by him.²¹ The name «Ghulām al-Faṣīḥ al-Andalusī» is awkward: «the boy (belonging to) the Eloquent Iberian»? or even «the Iberian boy (belonging to) the Eloquent (person)»? A name, as such, seems to be lacking.²²

The *Naqṭ al-‘Arūs* of Ibn Ḥazm offers some evidence which touches on this latter question, but deepens the mystery surrounding this character. In the version of this text published by C. Seybold, we have:

رجل ادعى انه عبيد الله المهدي قام بمجريط وثب به وقتل ولم يكن عبيد الله صح عندنا انه كان
مملوكا للعطار المعروف بالنصيح²³

This is translated by L. Seco de Lucena: «Un hombre que pretendía pasar por ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī se sublevó en Madrid, afincándose sólidamente en esta

²¹ Al-Ḥumaydī, *Jadhwat al-Muqtabis*, ed. M. b. T. al-Ṭanjī, Cairo, 1952, 387, n.º 983; repeated in al-Ḍabbī, *Bughyat al-Multamis*, ed. F. Codera and J. Ribera, Madrid (Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana, 3), 1885, 527, n.º 1581.

²² Curiously, though, we do have at least some parallels to it: Ibn al-Zubayr, *Ṣilat al-Sila*, III, ed. ‘Abd al-Salām al-Harrās and Sa‘īd A‘rāb, Morocco, 1413/1993, 63, n.º 69, is an entry for Abū al-Ḥasan Mufarrij b. Sa‘āda, «al-ma‘rūf bi-ghulām Abī ‘Abd Allāh al-Birzālī» (see also Ibn al-Abbār, *Takmila*, n.º 1832). Cf. also Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ghāyat al-Nihāya fī Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā’*, ed. G. Bergsträsser and O. Pretzl, 3 vols., Cairo, 1351/1932-1354/1935, II, 232, under n.º 3.374, where there is a reference to Abū ‘Alī Ghulām (? or: ghulām) al-Hirās. And at Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Makhlūf, *Shajarāt al-Nūr al-Zakiyya fī Ṭabaqāt al-Mālikiyya*, Cairo, 1350, 142, n.º 414 is an entry for someone called Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad of Denia *yu‘raf bi-ghulām al-fars* (?) (472/1079-547/1153), who was a Mālikī scholar of great distinction. As this example shows very well, this name, whatever else it means, does not indicate slave-status or anything like it. Another example is at al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta‘rīkh Baghdād*, ed. Muṣṭafā ‘Abd al-Qādir ‘Aṭā, Beirut, 24 vols., 1417/1997, vol. XI, 302, n.º 6.093: Abū Bakr ‘Uthmān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Baghdādī, *yu‘raf bi-ghulām* al-Kattānī. And the *qāqī* ‘Iyāḍ, *Tartīb al-Madārik*, 8 vols., Rabat, vol. VIII, 1403/1983, 118, has a reference to «Ghulām al-Abharī» among the teachers of someone in Baghdād during the fifth/eleventh century. See also Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta‘rīkh Madīnat Dimashq*, 65 vols., ed. ‘Alī Shīrī, Beirut, 1415/1995-1418/1998, vol. 54, 403, n.º 6.833, for a notice of Muḥammad b. ‘Alī *al-ma‘rūf bi-ghulām al-Rāshidī*, who ruled Damascus briefly in 317/929-318/930; and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Lisān al-Mizān*, Hyderabad, 1329/1911, I, 272-74, n.º 832: Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ghālib al-Bāhilī Ghulām Khalīl.

²³ *Revista del Centro de Estudios históricos de Granada y su reino*, 1 (1911), 160-80, 237-48, at 170 (reprinted in Ibn Ḥazm, *Naqṭ al-‘Arūs*, Textos Medievales, 39, Valencia, 1974, with studies and translation by Seco de Lucena; our passage is at 156).

ciudad, hasta que lo mataron. No es cierto que fuese el auténtico ‘Ubayd Allāh. Por el contrario, me consta que se trataba de un eslavo del droguero conocido por al-Fasīh».²⁴ Several features of this very short passage are puzzling, or worrying. First, we note the geographical problem: Madrid is not Toledo. While it is not too far from Toledo, it is, for all that, a different place. It is noteworthy at once, further, that the word *ibn* is absent between the name ‘Ubayd Allāh and the title al-Mahdī: a slip? an error? ignorance? The word *mamlūk* attracts attention here too, as suggesting slave-status more definitely than the word *ghulam*, which need not mean much more than «youth». The presence of the term «al-‘Aṭṭār» is also strange: is this a description of the man’s profession? or is it merely a professional label which has passed over into being a name? We have innumerable examples of this process, even for this very label.²⁵ And the word *al-ma‘rūf*, «known (as)» looks a little like a way of dealing with what may have appeared to be an obscurity in an earlier version, such as our other versions, in which only the term «al-Faṣīh» occurred. While each of these difficulties is fairly insignificant on its own, together they cast a thicker cloak of obscurity over what is already a difficult scene.

This version of the account of this young man is repeated in the version of the text published by Ḍayf (pp. 58-59) (with the word بن, missing in the Seybold-Seco text, correctly in place between the name of ‘Ubayd Allāh and the title al-Mahdī) and in the version of this text preserved in the manuscript (n.º 5374) of the *Naqṭ* in the Chester Beatty Library in Dublin (at f. 4 r) (also there with the word بن in place; there are some other slight differences between the three versions: see Appendix on this);²⁶ but in both there is a significant additional piece of information which is lacking in Seybold’s manuscript: between the word *qāma*, «rose up», and the word *bi-majrīt*, «in Madrid», these versions have the words ‘*alā al-Mustakfī*, «against al-Mustakfī». This can only be a reference to the later Umayyad caliph (*regn.* 414/1024-416/1025), and given the relationship between Ibn Ḥazm, the author of this text, and that caliph, if these words are original parts of the text, this would make the passage still

²⁴ *Boletín de la Universidad de Granada*, 13 (1941) 245-52, 387-440, 535-51, at 399 (= p. 80 of the 1974 volume).

²⁵ See also Marín, M., «Anthroponymy and society. The occupational *laqab* of Andalusian ‘*ulamā*’», *Romania Arabica Festschrift für Reinhold Kontzi zum 70. Geburtstag*, Tübingen, 1996, 271-79.

²⁶ Sh. Ḍayf, «*Naqṭ al-‘Arūs fī tawārīkh al-khulafā’* li-bn Ḥazm riwāyat al-Humaydī», *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts (Majallat Kulliyat al-Ādāb)*, Fouad I University Cairo, XIII/2, December 1952, 41-89.

more interesting: in such a case we should have an apparent reference to a man claiming (presumably falsely) to be a son of al-Mahdī, rising in revolt some ten to fifteen years after the deaths of the genuine son and of al-Mahdī himself. Could this have been an obscure Mahdist revolt? In the light of what follows, this may be of some relevance.²⁷

‘Ubayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī is said to have stayed in Toledo for a time, but finally he decided to make an attempt on the caliphal title in his own right, as heir to his father. He was quickly defeated in this attempt, and sent to Wāḍiḥ in Cordoba, who had him put to death.²⁸

Wāḍiḥ himself found able rivals in treachery among his own supporters in Cordoba. One of them, ‘Alī (or Aḥmad) Ibn Wadā‘a, killed Wāḍiḥ on 15 Rabī‘ II 402/16 November 1011, inaugurating a new stage in the uncertainty and confusion in the political scene in the country’s capital.²⁹ Although we have no explicit testimony as to the dates for the arrival of ‘Ubayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī in Toledo and his departure from there, it is nevertheless possible to establish the outside dates for these events. He must have arrived in the city at some point soon after the killing of his father in Cordoba by Wāḍiḥ, an event which took place in Dhū al-Ḥijja 400/July 1010. He is unlikely to have reached the city very much before the beginning of Muḥarram 401/August 1010. His own killing by Wāḍiḥ will have occurred before the death of Wāḍiḥ himself, in Rabī‘ II 402/November 1011. This gives a maximum of some fifteen months or so for the reign, if it may be so termed, of this youth in Toledo (and/or Madrid).

²⁷ Makkī, M. A., «A propósito de la revolución de ‘Ubayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī en Madrid», *Revista del Instituto Egipcio de Estudios Islámicos en Madrid*, IX-X (1961-1962), 255-60, also discusses this impostor, identifying him correctly, on the basis of Ḍayf’s edition of the *Naqt* (and correcting a mistaken hypothesis of J. Oliver Asín as to the nature of the rebellion which he led); he also translates the verses ascribed to the impostor into Spanish.

²⁸ Ibn ‘Idhārī, *Bayān*, III, 100; here the person who defeated and captured ‘Ubayd Allāh is called «Muḥārib al-Tujībī»: it is not clear whether this is to be understood as a name or simply as a description (? «the Tujībī fighter», «the soldier of the Tujībī»), in somewhat inelegant Arabic. See also, on this whole episode and the period in general, the passages from al-Nuwayrī translated by Pascual de Gayangos, in his translation of parts of the *Nafh al-Ṭīb* of al-Maqqarī, *The Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain*, 2 vols., London, 1840-43, II, 496-97, and also p. ix there (These passages appear not to be among the texts published in Arabic by Gaspar Remiro).

²⁹ Lévi-Provençal, *HEM*², 318. Lévi-Provençal (following Ibn Ḥayyān) calls him ‘Alī, but he is called Aḥmad by, e.g., Ibn ‘Idhārī, *Bayān*, III, 93. Lévi-Provençal, *loc. cit.*, gives the Christian date as the middle of October, not of November, but this is presumably a slip for Rabī‘ I, as he gives the correct *hijrī* date. On Ibn Wadā‘a see also al-Ḥumaydī, *Jadhwat al-Muqtabis*, ed. I. al-Abyārī, 2 vols., Cairo and Beirut (al-Maktabat al-Andalusiyya, 7-8), 2nd ed., 1410/1989, II, 499-500; Ibn al-Abbār, *Kitāb al-Ḥulla al-Siyarā*, ed. H. Mu‘nis, 2 vols., Cairo, 1963, I, 282-83, n.° 105, with examples of his poetry, and, for an unpleasant anecdote about his meanness, Ibn Bassām, *Dhakhira*, ed. I. ‘Abbās, Beirut, IV part i, 1399/1979, 53-55.

It may be possible to narrow this period down somewhat. There is an obscure hint in our sources that the arrival of ‘Ubayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī in Toledo may have been rather later than the beginning of 401/August 1010. We have a report that a certain Abū ‘Umar Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Ibn Wasīm of Toledo «raided with Muḥammad Ibn Tammām towards Maqueda, and when they were defeated he fled to Cordoba; but the people of Toledo sought to prosecute him (Ar. *ittaba’ūhu*) during the rule of Wāḍiḥ (*scil.* in Cordoba), and they won possession of him and crucified him; and he said at that time, “That was written in the Book (*kāna dhālika fī al-kitāb maṣṭūr^{an}*)”». ³⁰ Ibn Bashkuwāl uses Ibn Muṭāhir as his source for this information. ³¹ And Ibn Bashkuwāl adds, from Ibn Ḥayyān, that the date of this Ibn Wasīm’s death was Rajab 401/February-March 1011. ³² The edition of the *Ṣila* prepared by Codera has an isolated sentence which says: «and the crucifixion of Ibn Wasīm was on Tuesday 5 Sha‘bān 401/14 March 1011». ³³ Al-Ḥusaynī’s edition of the *Ṣila* has the same miscellaneous material as Codera’s, but with some minor textual differences, and, more importantly, without this sentence or any reference to it, which is strange, and from our present point of view irritating, as it tends to weaken any value that the datum might have. ³⁴ The same biographer, Ibn Bashkuwāl, has an entry on another Toledan, presumably to be identified as the second one mentioned above, «Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Tammām b. ‘Abd Allāh» of Toledo, who «was killed by the people of Toledo in 400/1009-10 or 401/1010-11», the date 400/1009-10 being furnished by Ibn Ḥayyān. ³⁵

³⁰ Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Ṣila*, ed. Ḥusaynī, 30, n.º 40 (= ed. Codera, Madrid, 1883, 25-26, n.º 38), leg. *ghazā* in place of the printed *gh.z*. The expression *kāna dhālika fī al-kitāb maṣṭūr* is a quotation from the Qur’ān, *sūra* 17:58, and *sūra* 33:6.

³¹ Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Muṭāhir al-Anṣārī was one of the sources of Ibn Bashkuwāl. He was from Toledo, and wrote on the *faqīhs* and *qāḍīs* of that city, dying in 489/1095; all of these facts make him a particularly valuable source for Ibn Bashkuwāl to have used here. See Pons Boigues, F., *Los historiadores y geógrafos árabe-españoles, 800-1450 A. D.*, Madrid, 1989 (repr. Amsterdam, 1972), 168, n.º 129; and now de Felipe, H., and Torres, N., «Fuentes y método historiográfico en el *Kitāb al-Ṣila* de Ibn Baṣkuwāl», *Estudios Onomástico-Biográficos de al-Andalus*, 3 (1990), 307-34, esp. 320-21.

³² This incident is mentioned already in Madoz, P., *Diccionario Geográfico-Estadístico-histórico de España y sus posesiones de Ultramar*, 16 vols., Madrid, 1846-50², XI, 207. I thank Maribel Fierro for this reference.

³³ Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Ṣila*, ed. F. Codera, Madrid, 1883, 637, in the middle of entry n.º 1427, one of a couple of biographies which are clearly out of place.

³⁴ Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Ṣila*, ed. Ḥusaynī, 126, in a note.

³⁵ Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Ṣila*, ed. Ḥusaynī, 464, n.º 1057 (a probable uncle of this man occurs in a list of dignitaries allegedly present at the *bay’a* of Hishām II al-Mu‘ayyad given by Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *A’māl*, 51, line 5 from the bottom; on the reliability of this list see the excellent study by Ávila Navarro, M. L., «La proclamación (*Bay’a*) de Hishām II. Año 976 d. C.», *Al-Qanṭara*, 1 (1980) 79-114). See further Marín, M., «Familias de Ulemas en Toledo», *Estudios Onomástico-Biográficos de al-Andalus*, 5 (*Familias Andaluses*), (1992), 229-71, at 244-45.

These two sets of remarks are very puzzling. Do they indicate a revolt by some part of the Toledan population in support of ‘Ubayd Allāh? And if so, do these two executions of prominent men of religious learning contain a hint of some religious element in ‘Ubayd Allāh’s revolt? The implication of Ibn Bashkuwāl’s entry on Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Ibn Wasīm could well be that, at least in Rajab-Sha‘bān 401/February-March 1011, Toledo, or some sections of her population, enjoyed good relations with Wāḍiḥ, then in control in Cordoba, and wanted to maintain such ties.

Regardless of how we answer these questions, what we have here does suggest that we may be justified in dating the arrival of ‘Ubayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī in Toledo a little differently. There are two, or even three, distinct, though slightly overlapping, possibilities. The first of these is to see his arrival in Toledo as occurring ca. Muḥarram 401/August 1010, soon after the death of his father, and his departure in a doomed revolt against Wāḍiḥ as occurring around Rajab-Sha‘bān 401/February-March 1011, less than six months later. In this case, we should see the deaths of Ibn Wasīm and of Ibn Tammām as part of the failure of what may perhaps be termed a Mahdist legitimist revolt in support of this ‘Ubayd Allāh.³⁶

The second possibility is to see these two executions of learned Toledans as not, or not necessarily, tied to ‘Ubayd Allāh’s revolt. In this case, the young man’s arrival in Toledo will still have occurred ca. Muḥarram 401/August 1010, quite soon after the killing of his father, and he will have departed from there, in his attempt on the caliphal throne, at an unknown date before Wāḍiḥ’s own murder. This is the possibility that we saw before. But this possibility can in fact be split in two: ‘Ubayd Allāh may have arrived in Toledo at an unknown date before the deaths of the two scholars; or he may have reached the city at an unknown date after these events. Given his own situation, it may be preferable to see his arrival as having occurred sooner, rather than later. But the evidence is insufficient to enable any decisive conclusions to be drawn on this question.

One element in the scraps of information that we have about these two scholars may encourage us, nonetheless, to see their deaths as connected with the fate of this young man. The identities of Ibn Wasīm and of Ibn Tammām, as men of religious learning, are what made them worthy of entries in a biographical dictionary of scholars, and hence what made information about them survive. But their character

³⁶ It would perhaps be just a little excessive to see this as an attempt to create a mahdist (as distinct from Mahdist) movement, but the title adopted by the father of this ‘Ubayd Allāh, together with what we seem to know about an impostor using his name more than a decade later (see below), may nevertheless afford some justification for the use of this label.

as religious scholars, the manner of their deaths, and the nature of the material that we have about ‘Ubayd Allāh, as rebelling from a base in Toledo (or at least close to it, if we are to accept the reports connecting his revolt to Madrid), as well as what is reported above of the career of the second man claiming to be the son of al-Mahdī, all suggest that the rebellion of ‘Ubayd Allāh may have contained an element of some sort of mahdist (? or Mahdist) legitimism.³⁷

Against this possibility, we should of course weigh the fact that in neither of these two cases are we told explicitly that the execution was in any way connected with ‘Ubayd Allāh. But this may not be a very strong objection, given the allusive and brief manner in which the biographical dictionaries so often speak even about such matters as these. And the fragmentary nature of at least part of these particular remarks may also hide a good deal.³⁸

TOLEDO AFTER THE UMAYYADS: THE B. MATYŪH

It would appear from this that the periods of rule in Toledo of the two B. Matyūh and at least one of the two un-named rulers mentioned by Ibn ‘Idhārī (for Ya‘īsh may, of course, have been the second of these) must be placed within a very short period. They must have occurred between the departure of ‘Ubayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī from Toledo (at some unknown date before Rabī‘ II 402/October 1011) and the beginning of the rule there of Ya‘īsh, probably at some stage in 403/1012-13.³⁹

Now Ibn ‘Idhārī also tells us that «when the *fitna* broke out in al-Andalus the governor in the city of Toledo and its environs was ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Manyūh». ⁴⁰ The meaning of the term *fitna* is fairly clear: normally it means

³⁷ Cfr. previous note.

³⁸ Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Ta’rīkh ‘Ulamā’ al-Andalus*, ed. Codera, 2 vols., Madrid, 1891-92, II, 36, n.º 1.524 (= ed. I. al-Abyārī, 2 vols., Cairo-Beirut, 1410/1989, II, 882, n.º 1.524), is an entry for Abū Bakr Wasīm b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Wasīm, «of the people of Qurṭuba», but there is no further information; at Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Šīla*, ed. Codera, 2 vols., Madrid, 1883, II, 585, n.º 1.301 (= ed. Ḥusaynī, Cairo, 1374/1955, II, 610, n.º 1.415), is an entry for Abū Bakr Wasīm b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Nāšir b. Wasīm al-Umawī al-Ḥantamī of Cordoba; his teachers, in Cordoba and in the east while on a pilgrimage, are listed; we hear about his activity in writing and teaching in Cordoba, up to his death there in the year 404/1013-14. Are these the same man (the absence of the name of the great-grandfather in entry n.º 1.301 [= Ḥusaynī n.º 1.415] need not be a difficulty here)? And do they represent a son of our Ibn Wasīm? On the family see also Marín, «Familias» (see n.º 35), 269-70.

³⁹ The B. Matyūh are mentioned also by ‘Abd al-Majīd Na‘na‘ī, *al-Islām fī Ṭulayṭula*, Beirut (Dār al-Nahḍa al-‘Arabiyya), n. d., 59.

⁴⁰ Cfr. n.º 8 *supra*.

«civil strife», but it is applied in the context of Ibero-Islamic history to the period following the collapse of central Cordoban authority. However, it is not always wholly clear just when this period is to be understood to have begun for any specific region or city. In this particular case, however, it seems likely that Ibn 'Idhārī used the term in a fairly loose sense, for the activities of 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Matyūh can be traced with some exactness for just the period in question.

The historian Ibn Ḥayyān reports that this 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Matyūh was in the army of Sulaymān al-Musta'in, outside Cordoba, at the time of the murder of al-Mahdī by Wāḍiḥ, in Dhū l-Ḥijja 400/July 1010. Hostile to al-Mahdī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Matyūh was delighted to hear of his death, and decided to abandon Sulaymān al-Musta'in and change his allegiance. He entered into correspondence with Wāḍiḥ, al-Mahdī's killer, and soon reached an agreement with him, by which he returned to Cordoba and appears to have been given a share in power there. We are told that there he «ran Hishām's affair[s] after the killing of Wāḍiḥ and [of] 'Alī b. Wadā'a (of which many details could be given), until Hishām's power grew weak, and Sulaymān [al-Musta'in] entered [Cordoba] against him, for his second reign».⁴¹

This suggests that Ibn Matyūh was the effective ruler of Cordoba at least from the death of Ibn Wadā'a (and of significance there from as early as soon after the death of al-Mahdī) until the takeover by al-Musta'in, in other words from approximately the beginning of 401/ca. August 1010 (the death of al-Mahdī) or from approximately Rabī' II 402/October 1011 (the death of Wāḍiḥ at the hands of Ibn Wadā'a) until Shawwāl 403/April-May 1013. We have some further information about Ibn Matyūh's activities in Cordoba and elsewhere, however, which not only confirms and amplifies what Ibn Ḥayyān tells us but also enables us to date his departure from the capital with greater accuracy.

In the *Kitāb al-Mughrib fī Ḥulā al-Maghrib* of Ibn Sa'id there are a couple of references to 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Matyūh.⁴² There, in a section entitled «*Quḍāt al-fitna*» («*Qāḍīs*, of [the time of] the civil strife»), we have a life of Abū Bakr Yaḥyā b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Wāfid. He was appointed as chief *qāḍī*, according to Ibn Ḥayyān in his *Kitāb al-Quḍāt*, quoted here by Ibn Sa'id, by

⁴¹ Cfr. n.º 18 *supra*.

⁴² Ibn Sa'id's *Kitāb al-Mughrib fī Ḥulā al-Maghrib* has been published by S. Ḍayf, 2 vols., Cairo, 1964². The passages quoted here are in I, 156-57. For the history of this work see *EP*, III, 926 (art. «Ibn Sa'id al-Maghribī», by Charles Pellat). In the first edition of Ibn Sa'id's text, published by Ḍayf in 1953, the surname of this 'Abd al-Raḥmān is given in two forms: at p. 156 he is called Ibn Munīr, and at p. 157 Ibn Manbūh; the relationship of each of these forms to Ibn Manyūh/Matyūh is clear, though the basis for the editor's (silent) correction of them in the second edition is not.

Hishām II al-Mu’ayyad at the outbreak of the Berber *fitna*: the appointment in fact occurred on 5 Jumādā I 401/14 December 1010.⁴³ In the text of Ibn Sa’īd, however, there also occurs the following passage:

He travelled to the East, and went on a pilgrimage, and met the learned, and established contact (with them) [Ar. *taḥakkaka*⁴⁴], and among those whom he met was Muḥammad b. Abī Zayd, the *faqīh* of the Maghrib in Qayrawān, and he stayed in contact with him (? *wa-lam yazal yaṣil sababahu*) until Ibn Abī Zayd died.⁴⁵ But he was harmed during his tenure of office by love of power (? *sulṭān*) and his obstinacy in rejecting a peace agreement with the Berbers, who had destroyed the people, and in this he differed from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Manyūh, the client (*mawlā*) of Ibn Abī ‘Āmir, the ruler of Hishām’s affair(s).⁴⁶ Now this (? he) was the reason for his dismissal on Wednesday 9 Dhū al-Ḥijja 402/2 July 1012. And he stayed in his house [under some form of house arrest?] until Ibn Manyūh left Cordoba, and the ‘Āmirid clients (*mawālī*) ran affairs; then Hishām called Ibn Wāfid back on Thursday [sic] 22 Rajab 403/6 February 1013 to the *qāḍī*-ship and the office of prayer-leader after he had made clear his dislike of the post and [after] Hishām applied pressure to him [to return].⁴⁷

In the next entry in this work, a life of Abū al-Muṭarrif ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. Abī al-Muṭarrif Ibn Bishr, who served as chief *qāḍī* from 407/1016 until 419/1028, there is another reference to our ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Matyūh: again quoting Ibn Ḥayyān, Ibn Sa’īd tells us that Ibn Bishr

... was given the post of *qāḍī* without the prayer-leadership for the period between the two «reigns» of Ibn Wāfid... His origins were from Beja, from a noble

⁴³ Cfr. Lévi-Provençal, *HEM*², III, 143 (n. 4 to 141), where there is a list of all those who held the office of *qāḍī al-quḍāt* in Cordoba from 291/904 up till 429/1038; al-Nubāhī, *al-Marqaba al-Ulyā*, ed. E. Lévi-Provençal, *Histoire des Juges d’Andalousie*, Cairo, 1948 (repr. Beirut, n. d.), 88-89, for a life of Ibn Wāfid; for the exact date of the appointment of Ibn Wāfid cf. Viguera, M.^a J., «Los jueces de Córdoba en la primer mitad del siglo XI (Análisis de datos)», *Al-Qanṭara*, 5 (1984), 123-45, at 125.

⁴⁴ Could this be a mistake for *taḥaqqāqa*, or even *tafaqqaha*? For *taḥaqqāqa* cf. Ibn Ḥazm, *Risāla fī faḍā’il ahl al-Andalus*, in al-Maqqarī, *Analectes*, II, 119, and trans. Pellat, Ch., «Ibn Ḥazm bibliographe et apologiste de l’Espagne musulmane», *Al-Andalus*, 19 (1954), 53-102, at 89 (though there it seems to mean no more than «to possess»).

⁴⁵ This is Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Abī Zayd al-Qayrawānī, the well known Mālikī jurist (310/922-386/996); cf. *EP*², III, 695 (art. H. R. Idris).

⁴⁶ It is not clear from the Arabic whether this refers to ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Manyūh, or to Ibn Abī ‘Āmir (al-Manṣūr) himself; the latter does not impose itself.

⁴⁷ The references here to Ibn Wāfid expressing clear dislike of accepting a post under the state, and to Hishām, the ruler, applying pressure to him to accept it are both reflective of conventional attitudes and behaviour; while they may also reflect genuine attitudes, especially on the part of Ibn Wāfid, we have no particular reason to suppose that they do, and, in the earlier part of the text translated here, in the reference to «love of power» (if this has been correctly understood), we may have testimony to the pure conventionality of these expressions. We cannot really know.

and wealthy house, and he was extremely well-educated both in general culture and in traditions, but he had little knowledge of *fiqh* and (had to be) compelled to (accept) the *qāḍī*-ship; he maintained a good rule, persisting in trying to resign until ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Manyūh left Cordoba,⁴⁸ and then Hishām removed him from office and brought back Ibn Wāfid, as has been related.⁴⁹

These statements suggest that ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Manyūh was in Cordoba at least during the period from the death of Wāḍih until as late as 22 Rajab 403/6 February 1013, when Ibn Wāfid was returned to the office of chief *qāḍī*, shortly before the takeover by Sulaymān al-Musta‘in. They also suggest that he played an important rôle in affairs there at this time, particularly in trying to reach an accommodation with the Berbers supporting Sulaymān. A report of a letter sent by Hishām to Sulaymān in the year 402/1011-12, in which a proposal for just such an accommodation was made (a proposal which was rejected by the Berbers), occurs in Ibn ‘Idhārī; although the exact date in the year 402/1011-12 is not given, it is clear from the political circumstances and other details that this must belong to the period of Ibn Manyūh’s power in Cordoba.⁵⁰

It is possible, however, to show that Ibn Manyūh actually left Cordoba rather earlier than the takeover by Sulaymān. In Ibn ‘Idhārī we have another statement to the effect that he left Cordoba before the end of 402/mid-1012. At the very beginning of Dhū al-Ḥijja 402/late June 1012, he is reported, together with the leaders of the slaves (*‘abīd*: or Slavs?) and the army (*jund*), to have gone to Hishām II al-Mu‘ayyad and to have explained the seriousness of the political and military situation to him in graphic detail. The caliph’s reaction, natural in a ruler who had suffered three decades of forced political inactivity under the tutelage of the ‘Āmirids, was one of helpless despair; he told them to do whatever they deemed best. Ibn Manyūh interpreted this in exclusively personal terms, and opted for flight. Taking with him a huge amount of treasure, he made for Badajoz.⁵¹ We have what appears to be a confirmation of his activity there at about this time in a report on the early history of that city in the taifa period.⁵² If

⁴⁸ Note here again the motif of unwillingness to accept office under the state.

⁴⁹ On Ibn Bishr see de la Granja, F., «Ibn García cadí de los califas Hammudíes (Nuevos datos para el estudio de la “šū‘ūbiyya” en al-Andalus)», *Al-Andalus*, 30 (1965), 63-78. It is worth noting that de la Granja (*ibid.*, at 68) suggests a much more modest background for this man, but he does so on the basis of part of his name, which may be an indication rather of a modest background of one of his ancestors.

⁵⁰ Ibn ‘Idhārī, *Bayān*, III, 108 ff.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 108-09 (Curiously, though, this report precedes the account of the letter sent from Hishām II al-Mu‘ayyad to Sulaymān al-Musta‘in in cited just above; see preceding note).

⁵² Ibn Bassām, *Dhakhīra*, ed. I. ‘Abbās, Beirut, 1399/1979, II part ii, 641, quoting Ibn Ḥayyān. Ibn Manyūh’s name is written here as *M.y.t.w.y.h./M.y.n.w.y.h* and he is given the title of *ḥājib*,

the reports of him as ruling in Toledo are to be accepted at their face value, then the only period during which he (and after him 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Matyūh) could have done so seems to be after his departure from Cordoba at the end of 402/mid-1012 and before the rise of Ya'ish at some unknown date in 403/1012-13. This is a maximum of some twelve months.

The extreme brevity of this time for two periods of rule by named persons and at least one by an un-named person (two if Ya'ish is not the second un-named one mentioned by Ibn 'Idhārī) raises a difficulty with this interpretation of the material. Another difficulty, more serious than this one (which can, after all, be resolved, if not very satisfactorily, by the assumption of very short periods of rule in Toledo for each of these individuals), is raised by the reports in Ibn Sa'īd.

We learn from these reports that Ibn Wāfid, opposed to an accommodation with the Berbers, was dismissed from office on 9 Dhū l-Ḥijja 402/2 July 1012, as a result of his differences with Ibn Matyūh over policy towards the Berbers; we are also told that he remained under house arrest thereafter until Ibn Matyūh's departure from the city; and we learn, further, from the same source that, following a period in office by Ibn Bishr, Ibn Wāfid was recalled to office by Hishām on 22 Rajab 403/6 February 1013. Unfortunately, we learn from Ibn 'Idhārī that Ibn Matyūh in fact left the city at some stage in Dhū l-Ḥijja 402/July 1012, i. e., at around the very time of his opponent's dismissal. This would have appeared to be the obvious time for his opponent to be recalled, not dismissed.

Of the possible ways of resolving this difficulty, none is entirely satisfactory. One is to assume that in fact the Ibn Matyūh whom we find active in Cordoba at this time is not the same as the one reported to have been in power in Toledo; such an assumption could be supported by the fact that we have two different sets of forms for this name: we have forms like Ibn Matyūh (and Manyūh, which differs from Matyūh by no more than a single dot) and we have others like Ibn Munāwⁱⁿ: unfortunately, while this is superficially a very attractive solution to this difficulty, the two sets of forms of the name occur in ways that make it impossible to accept. The form Ibn Munāwⁱⁿ is the form given by Ibn 'Idhārī on some occasions, but the form Ibn Matyūh/Manyūh occurs not only in Ibn Sa'īd and in Ibn al-Khaṭīb when discussing Toledo but also in Ibn 'Idhārī himself on the same subject. No good

which he is not otherwise known to have held (though it is not inherently impossible that he should have adopted it during his domination of Hishām II al-Mu'ayyad; and see Appendix); Ibn Ḥayyān tells us that «Sābūr al-'Āmirī, one of the associates (? Ar. *ṣibyān*) of Fā'iq the *khādim*, the *fatā* of al-Ḥakam (*scil.* al-Ḥakam al-Mustansir), had declared himself independent in (or "seized control of") Badajoz and the western *thaghr min 'amal al-ḥājib Ibn M.y.t.w.y.h*». It is not entirely clear what the expression *min 'amal* is intended to mean in this context, but the account does appear to provide an explanation for Ibn Matyūh's choice of Badajoz as a first refuge on fleeing Cordoba.

argument can be brought forward in favour of one form of the name as against the others (except that which sees a pun in the shape Manyūh). At the same time, there is no good argument either for seeing two separate individuals behind the two forms; given their rarity and their unusual character as Arabic names, they could very easily have been corrupted in the normal course of transmission of names in Arabic manuscripts once their original forms were no longer current.

The argument against the reading *M.t.y.w.h*, and for the reading *M.n.y.w.h*, is perhaps strengthened by Ibn 'Idhārī's phraseology: «And when the *fitna* broke out in al-Andalus the governor in the city of Toledo and its environs was 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn M.n.y.w.h, but his fate (Ar. *maniyyatuhu*) came to him during this (period)». Would it be stretching the text, or the author's intention, to see in this choice of words a pun on the man's name?⁵³ Another possibility is that we should understand the Arabic form in these names to represent something like Muño (from which we get the modern Muñoz). This would suggest a Christian background for the bearers of these names, which may be of significance in what follows.⁵⁴

A second solution is to see the awkwardness as resulting from errors in the sources and in their sources of information about what was, after all, a very confused period, but this is in reality to suggest that no sense can be made of the information in the sources; it is a counsel of despair.

A third possibility, which perhaps commends itself a little more than these, lies in a consideration of the development of events in Cordoba at this time: at the beginning of Dhū al-Ḥijja 402/late June 1012, Ibn Matyūh, according to our sources, explained the seriousness of the situation to Hishām; the caliph told him to act as he saw fit; on 9 Dhū al-Ḥijja 402/2 July 1012 he, acting through Hishām, dismissed the chief *qāḍī* Ibn Wāfid, who was in part responsible for the failure of his policy of peace with the Berbers; it is at this point that we should place the letter which was sent from Cordoba to Sulaymān and the Berbers, and rejected by them; seeing that the situation was by then completely hopeless, Ibn Matyūh will at this point have thrown up his hands

⁵³ The «Ibn Mādūyah» mentioned by al-Nuwayrī (in Gayangos' translation in *The Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain*, II, 491 and 496), is, as P. Scales («The handing over of the Duero fortresses: 1009-1011 A. D. (399-401 A. H)» *Al-Qanṭara* 5 (1984) 109-122) points out (at 116, n.º 21), probably a corruption of Ibn Māma Dūna; he cannot in any event be Ibn Matyūh (or Manyūh, or Manāwīn), as Ibn Matyūh must, because of his name 'Abd al-Raḥmān (quite apart from his political rôle), have been a Muslim, while «Ibn Mādūyah» was certainly a Christian. The name Manyūh is extremely rare: Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Šila*, ed. Codera, 494, n.º 1.091, is a biography of a scholar called Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ḥārith b. Aḥmad Ibn Muniyūh al-Naḥwī, of Saragossa, who was active in Granada in 473/1080-81.

⁵⁴ I thank Maribel Fierro for suggesting this possibility to me.

and taken refuge in flight, first to Badajoz and then on to Toledo. The long delay between that time and the re-appointment of Ibn Wāfid as chief *qāḍī* may then be explicable either as due simply to (fully understandable) indecision on the part of Hishām or as a result of a perceived lack of need for a new *qāḍī*, as Ibn Bishr occupied the post.

The dates of the periods of rule of the two B. Matyūh in Toledo thus become a little easier to define: as has been seen, the first of them did not leave Cordoba before somewhere round the middle of Dhū l-Ḥijja 402/mid-July 1012, and will have arrived in Toledo some little time thereafter, possibly after a visit to Badajoz, to cement his relations with Sābūr. Unfortunately, we do not know how long they remained in power in Toledo. This is of significance also for the reign of Yaʿīsh, as will be seen below. If we do not know how long they remained in power, we do, nonetheless, have a hint as to how their rule there ended. In the *Naqṭ al-ʿArūs* of Ibn Ḥazm, a miscellaneous collection of historical anecdotes, we are told that «ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Munūh died at the hands of a slave (or: a Slav) who was defending himself».⁵⁵ This is a very isolated remark, and the details remain obscure. The expression «defending himself» (which Seco renders mistakenly as «que tenía para que protegiese su persona»), lends itself to at least two, not wholly exclusive, interpretations: ʿAbd al-Malik may have been making a violent attack on a servant, or he may have been making a homosexual advance which was unwelcome. The Arabic permits either interpretation; and parallels in support of the second one can be found, for this very period. Nevertheless, whatever the correct interpretation of the background, this may well represent something of the end of this obscure pair of rulers in a very confused period. Such an end for the second of them would also help to offer some explanation for the readiness of the local *qāḍī* to step in as ruler. While we do have examples of *qāḍīs* as rulers, they are few, and the reason is easy to understand. *Qāḍīs* generally display, or are represented in our sources as displaying, reluctance to assume even the office of judge, because of the fact that such a post would put them in the position of judging their fellow-Muslims. Rule in the state, political power, as being something higher and beyond the status of a judge, would naturally be even less welcome to most *qāḍīs*.

⁵⁵ Ibn Ḥazm, *Naqṭ al-ʿArūs*, Valencia (Textos medievales, n.º 39), 1974 (including reprints of the text edition by C. Seybold and of a translation and studies by Seco de Lucena; see above, n.º 23), Arabic text 239 (of original edition, = p. 169 of this volume), Spanish translation p. 424 (of original publication, = p. 119 of this edition). The Arabic has *ʿabd al-malik bn ʿabd al-raḥmān bn m.n.w.h qatalahu ṣaqlabī lahu dhabban ʿalā nafsihi*. Seco translates *ṣaqlabī* as «esclavo», but this does not impose itself by any means.

YA'ISH (AND OTHERS?)

Things should begin to be clearer as we enter the calmer water of longer, more settled and more solidly documented periods of rule by better-known personages in Toledo. However, experience shows that where Toledo is concerned things are rarely simple. The reign of the *qāḍī* Ya'ish presents a number of aspects of interest, and as many matters of difficulty. We do not know exactly when Ya'ish came to power in the city. It is not wholly clear that he ruled alone. Despite the reports which survive, we know too little about his exercise of power there during his reign. And we cannot be sure when his reign came to an end or when the Dhū l-Nūnids came to power.

If the analysis offered here is correct, it may be reasonable to suggest that if Ya'ish became ruler of Toledo in the year 403/1012-13, then he will have done so relatively late in the year, as at least three and possibly as many as four other rulers will have preceded him in power there in the same year. The brevity of the period of rule of each of these in Toledo could thus also be part of the explanation for the ignorance of their names in the sources, unless, just as possibly, the shortness of the reigns of each of whatever number there were meant that a larger number than really existed was posited in the sources in error. One such instance could be the one (or two) un-named ruler(s) mentioned by Ibn 'Idhārī, one of whom could be a reference (out of place) to 'Ubayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī. On this, however, certain knowledge is unlikely unless major new sources become available.

There is, however, a further set of problems concerning the dates and the nature of the period of rule of Ya'ish. So far, I have placed the start of his reign in 403/1012-13 because of his apparent involvement as ruler in the murder of Aḥmad b. Sa'īd Ibn Kawthar in this year, and the end in 409/1018-19, because of a report that the Dhū l-Nūnids acquired power in Toledo in that year. However, it is possible, even perhaps probable, that both of these dates are mistaken, both by a number of years. Ya'ish may have begun ruling there some time later than 403/1012-13 (quite possibly later even than 409/1018-19) and the Dhū l-Nūnids may have taken over as late as 417/1026. And Ya'ish may, though less probably, have ruled for at least part of the time in conjunction with at least one other person. The problems arise in information about Ya'ish supplied by the *qāḍī* 'Iyāḍ and others.

Writing about Abū Bakr Ya'ish b. Muḥammad b. Ya'ish b. Mundhir al-Asadī of Toledo, 'Iyāḍ quotes Ibn Ḥayyān to the following effect:

He and his friend Abū 'Umar Aḥmad b. Sa'īd Ibn Kawthar obtained (Ar. *ilayhi wa-ilā ṣāḥibihī... intahat*) the leadership of their city (Ar. *baladīhimā*) after

their fathers. They were both honest men (Ar. *wa-kānā 'alā ṣafā'*). Now Muḥammad b. Ya'īsh was outstanding among his peers in knowledge ('ilm), until there occurred some rivalry between the two of them in the days of the B. Maysara, which led the two of them to quarrel with each other. Ibn Maysara leaned towards Ibn Ya'īsh and he put Ibn Kawthar out of favour and removed him to Santarem; then he sent someone who killed him, and his place lay open to Ibn Ya'īsh and he stood alone in the leadership of the town (*balad*). And when Ibn Maysara died, Ibn Ya'īsh brought his (? Ibn Maysara's or his own?) sons together (or: agreed with his sons) and acquired the leadership of the city (? Ar. *wa-qṭaṭa'a al-balad ri'āsat^{am}*). And he behaved like the *qāḍī* Abū al-Qāsim Ibn 'Abbād in Seville and al-Bakrī in the west of al-Andalus, and he defended his territory and ruled well (*wa-aḥsana al-siyāsa*)...⁵⁶

There are a number of difficulties with this passage, most notably that the *qāḍī* 'Iyād seems slightly unsure whether he is talking about Ya'īsh or about his father (Muḥammad b. Ya'īsh); linguistically the question remains unclear. Fortunately, from a historical point of view things are less ambiguous, for the *qāḍī* 'Iyād himself tells us (see below) that the father had died as early as 391/1000-01. More generally, the Arabic is not transparently clear at a number of points in the passage, though the overall sense of the passage can be made out.

Nonetheless, the passage seems to have led Prieto y Vives into error on the rulers of Toledo in this period.⁵⁷ This scholar appears to have understood the references to «leadership» in the passage to indicate political leadership, rulership. This seems to be mistaken. The reference to Ibn Maysara (whoever he was) indicates clearly that he was the actual ruler of Toledo at the time in question; and the context in which Ya'īsh and Aḥmad b. Sa'īd Ibn Kawthar acquired their «leadership» makes this clear too: they are said to have acquired it after the deaths of their fathers, and as successors to them. Now Sa'īd, the father of Aḥmad, died in «around 400»;⁵⁸ and Muḥammad b. Ya'īsh, the father of our Ya'īsh, died, according to the *qāḍī* 'Iyād himself, in 391/1000-01.⁵⁹ From

⁵⁶ Al-Qāḍī 'Iyād, *Tarīb al-madārik wa-taqrīb al-masālik li-ma'rifat a'lām madhhab Mālik*, ed. A. Bakrī Maḥmūd, Beirut, 1387/1963, 3 vols. II, pp. 755-56.

⁵⁷ Cf. Prieto y Vives, A., *Los Reyes de Taifas. Estudio histórico-numismático de los musulmanes españoles en el siglo v de la hégira (xi de J. C.)*, Madrid, 1926, p. 52.

⁵⁸ Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Šila*, ed. F. Codera, Madrid, 1882-83, p. 213, n.º 477.

⁵⁹ Al-Qāḍī 'Iyād, *Tarīb*, II, pp. 689-90; see also Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Ta'riḫ 'Ulamā' al-Andalus*, ed. F. Codera, Madrid, 1890, p. 396, n.º 1384, where we learn that Ya'īsh's father was born in 322/933-34. Both Ya'īsh and his father occur in the list of notables allegedly present at the ceremony for the pledging of allegiance to Hishām II al-Mu'ayyad, but, as the study of this list by M. L. Ávila cited above shows, the presence of a name in this list means nothing as to the dates of a man's life.

this, and from the lengthy accounts offered here of the learning of both pairs of fathers and sons, it emerges quite clearly that the «leadership» in their city acquired by the two sons of these two men after their deaths was simply preeminence on account of religious and legal learning.

Given what we know of the learning and piety of the two men, such an action as ordering his colleague's death may well strike us as unlikely in Ya'īsh. Ibn Bashkuwāl tells us that when the man sent to carry out the murder of Ibn Kawthar came in «he found him reading the Qur'ān; he understood that he wanted to kill him and he said: 'I know what you want; carry out your orders'; and he killed him. But it was given out publicly that he had been ill, and died. May God have mercy on him». Ibn Bashkuwāl adds, depending here on Ibn Ḥayyān, that he died, of poison, in prison in Santarem in 403/1012-13. The story reported above could easily be a retrojection of this, though it is not absolutely clear from the way the Arabic is expressed that the story of the murder is intended by the sources to be ascribed to the year 403/1012-13, like the story of the poisoning. The story of Ibn Kawthar's reaction to the presence of his murderer also fits well with other information that Ibn Bashkuwāl provides about him: apparently the family was wealthy, and, according to a report derived from 'Abd Allāh b. Sa'īd Ibn Abī 'Awn, some forty students, including himself, used to come to Aḥmad every year, during the months of November, December and January (sic), and he would feed them all.⁶⁰

On the basis of this text, we cannot be entirely certain that Ya'īsh did in fact order his colleague's death. Regardless of any individual, personal responsibility by Ya'īsh for this killing, moreover, involvement in engineering a man's death need not, of course, indicate share in the political power responsible for the carrying out of the murder itself.

The remarks associating Ya'īsh with Ibn Kawthar raise another matter as well. They suggest that, if Ya'īsh was actually ruling Toledo at the time when his colleague was murdered, then he was doing so in cooperation, or in association, with Ibn Kawthar. This would not be an impossibility: we know of the existence of colleges of rulers (though with three members, not two) both for Seville and for Cordoba at around this time.⁶¹ However, it would be extremely unlikely, and the sources do not seem to support such an interpretation. Nevertheless, there are hints, like the expressions found in the report in the *qāḍī* 'Iyāḍ itself, that if

⁶⁰ For details of the menus see the articles by Santiago Simón (cited in n.º 72) and Waines (cited in n.º 77). For Ibn Kawthar himself, and his family, see also Marín (*supra*, n.º 35), «Familias», pp. 262-63.

⁶¹ Cf. my *Rise and Fall*, pp. 87, 95, 137, 139.

Ya'īsh was ruling at this time, then he may well not have been ruling alone throughout his reign. For example, we have a report of Hishām b. Ibrāhīm b. Hishām al-Tamīmī, who died as a martyr in 419/1028, who is reported to have *nāzara fī l-masā'il* for «Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Ibn Mughīth and Ya'īsh b. Muḥammad». ⁶² It is possible, of course, that Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Ibn Mughīth should be regarded as one of the un-named rulers mentioned serially by Ibn 'Idhārī, but such information about him as we have suggests otherwise: it describes only his intellectual interests, and tells us nothing about any official posts, other than membership in the *shūrā*, that he may have held. ⁶³ More puzzlingly still, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Ibn Mughīth is reported here to have died in Jumādā II 444/October 1052. Since his brother, Aḥmad, who prayed over him at his funeral, died in Ramaḍān 459/July-August 1067, this date appears reasonable: ⁶⁴ but it looks rather late in the context of his relation to Ya'īsh, particularly if Ya'īsh was given to ridding himself of unwanted colleagues in less than wholly legitimate ways. ⁶⁵ We also have another case of similar type: this time it is a biography of a man who filled the same position in the service of the father of Ya'īsh, though unfortunately we have no dates in this case at all. ⁶⁶ A last case brings us back to Ibn Kawthar: this is an entry for Abū al-Walīd Hishām b. 'Umar b. Muḥammad b. Aṣḥagh al-Umawī Ibn al-Ḥanashī of Toledo, who similarly *nāzara fī l-masā'il*, in his case '*alā* «Ibn Tammām ⁶⁷ and Ibn Kawthar and others». ⁶⁸ The pairing of the first two of these is striking, given the relevance of Ibn Kawthar and our concern with pairings, but the presence here of «others» tends to lessen the possible significance of the pairing. Unfortunately, no date of death is given for this man. However, the wording in all of these cases suggests simply that a person who *nāzara fī l-masā'il 'alā a l-qāḍī* was subordinate to that *qāḍī* within a professional hierarchy of legal offices; it does not necessarily tell us anything about any position or authority on the part of the person or of the *qāḍī* outside that professional, legal, hierarchy. All of these examples, in fact, are

⁶² Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Šila*, p. 613, n.º 1422 (= ed. Codera, p. 587, n.º 1308).

⁶³ See the entry on him in Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Šila*, p. 504, n.º 1165 (there is no parallel in the edition of Codera).

⁶⁴ Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Šila*, p. 64, n.º 128 (= ed. Codera, pp. 63-64, n.º 126).

⁶⁵ There is an entry for a son of his, 'Abd al-Raḥmān, at Ibn al-Abbār, *Takmila*, ed. F. Codera, Madrid, 1889, pp. 551-52, n.º 1558; in 451/1059-60 he was a member of the Toledan delegation which came to Valencia to celebrate the marriage between the daughter of al-Ma'mūn Ibn Dhī l-Nūn and al-Muzaffar 'Abd al-Malik b. al-Manšūr Ibn Abī 'Āmir; he was still alive in 469/1076-77.

⁶⁶ Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Šila*, ed. Ḥusaynī, p. 616, n.º 1431 (= ed. Codera, p. 590, n.º 1317).

⁶⁷ Who is this? Could it be the Ibn Tammām whom we have already met, who was killed by the people of Toledo in 400/1009-1010 or 401/1010-11, together with Ibn Waṣīm? It appears just possible.

⁶⁸ Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Šila*, ed. Ḥusaynī, p. 614, n.º 1425 (= ed. Codera, p. 588, n.º 1311).

the same in type; and it is on one of these, alone, that Prieto's case in fact rests for the suggestion that Ya'ish ruled in conjunction with someone else.

We have no other information, so far as I know, about the Banū Maysara. The name is rare, though not unique.⁶⁹ But may it be the case that we have here another obscure reference to the Banū Matyūh? Such a view would gain some support from the fact that the place to which Ibn Kawthar is said to have been sent by «Ibn Maysara», Santarem, lies in the far south-west of the Iberian peninsula, and was at this time probably under the control of Badajoz, then ruled by Sābūr, with whom Ibn Matyūh seems to have had, as has been seen, very close relations of mutual obligation.⁷⁰

If this is the case, then this text raises another difficulty, of particular relevance here, with regard to the date of the beginning of the reign of Ya'ish in Toledo. I have assigned this to the year 403/1012-13, on the basis of the attribution to him of responsibility for the killing of Ibn Kawthar in that year.⁷¹ According to Ibn Bashkuwāl, Ibn Kawthar administered the legal apparatus (*waliya al-ahkām*) of Toledo together with Ya'ish, but «then [Ibn Kawthar] became a burden to [Ya'ish], and he arranged to have him killed (*dabbara 'alā qatlihi*)».⁷² According to the text of the *qāḍī* 'Iyād, it was not Ya'ish who was directly responsible for this, but «Ibn Maysara» (although Ya'ish seems to have been the ultimate beneficiary of this action). If 'Iyād is right in attributing this killing to Ibn Maysara (and if Ibn Maysara is indeed to be identified with Ibn Matyūh), and not to Ya'ish, then it seems to be necessary to place Ya'ish's assumption of power in Toledo somewhat later than 403/1012-13, though it remains impossible to know how much later.

⁶⁹ For occurrences of the name Maysara see C. J. Kraemer, Jr., *Excavations at Nessana*, vol. 3, *Non-Literary Papyri*, Princeton, N. J., 1958, p. 248, n.° 86 (a fragment of an account, of the seventh century C. E., with the name in Greek letters: Μαισαρα βε (ν) Αδι (= Maysara ben 'Adī); Ibn al-Abbār, *Takmila*, ed. F. Codera, Madrid, 1889, p. 552, n.° 1560 (a man from Saragossa; Ibn al-Abbār says here that the man is mentioned by Ibn Bashkuwāl [*dhakarahu bn Bashkuwāl*]), which in such contexts usually indicates an entry in the biographical dictionary of the relevant author, but there is no entry for this man either in Ḥusaynī's edition or in Codera's of Ibn Bashkuwāl's *Ṣila*).

⁷⁰ The name occurs also a few times in the history of Toledo in the earlier Umayyad period. It is intriguing to consider the possibility either that the occurrence of the name here represents a survival by members of the family in Toledan politics even at this stage or, alternatively, that the appearance of the form of the name here in our sources represents a confused memory of that family's earlier prominence.

⁷¹ Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Ṣila*, ed. Codera, I, pp. 38-39, n.° 69 (= ed. al-Ḥusaynī, Cairo, 1955, p. 41, n.° 71).

⁷² Ibn Bashkuwāl, *loc. cit.* Cf. also E. de Santiago Simón, «A propósito de la prodigalidad de un Alfaquí», *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos* (Anejo al Boletín de la Universidad de Granada), 21 fasc. 1, 1972, pp. 171-74.

Such a change in the date of the start of the reign of Ya'īsh has (at least in theory) implications also for the dates of the reigns of all those rulers, following 'Ubayd Allāh b. al-Mahdī, who preceded him in that rôle in Toledo. This is because 'Ubayd Allāh is the last of these rulers, before Ya'īsh himself, to whose activity we can assign a fixed date of any sort. Though we can assign something approaching a fixed date to the arrival of the B. Matyūh in the city, this is in fact no more than a *terminus post quem*, since they arrived there simply at some stage following their departure from Cordoba. All of these rulers, including Ya'īsh for most of his reign, may well have ruled for longer or shorter periods scattered over the entire period from the departure of 'Ubayd Allāh from Toledo up to the deposition of Ya'īsh, or, more precisely, up to our first datable attestation of Dhū l-Nūnid rule there.

If Ya'īsh indeed began ruling later than the year 403/1012-13, then it may be possible to assign to this series of rulers, whom it has appeared necessary so far to fit into the very short period of the year 403/VII 1012-VII 1013, a rather longer period. However, we have no real way of knowing more exactly when Ya'īsh took over power in the city. Things are not totally hopeless, for we can be pretty sure that the Dhū l-Nūnids were in control there by about 418/1027. We hear of them there at this time, and we hear of Ya'īsh's own death around that date too (see below). But this does mean that the period of these rulers' activity can not, may not, be too tightly defined.

If it is difficult to know when Ya'īsh assumed authority in Toledo, it is also difficult to know exactly when he lost it. According to another source, al-Sabī, also quoted (*ibid.*) by 'Iyād, Ya'īsh began as a good ruler, but later became corrupted by power, and as a result was eventually overthrown by the Toledans, his son, 'Abd Allāh, being killed in the process, in the year 417/1026.⁷³ He is said to have died in Calatayud either in 418/1027 or in Šafar 419/March 1028; the first date is given by Ibn Muṭāhir and the second by Ibn Ḥayyān.⁷⁴

Ya'īsh is described as generally a good ruler by the *qāḍī* 'Iyād:⁷⁵

...he defended his territory and ruled well (*aḥsana al-siyāsa*). In all this he did not call himself by the title of prince (*bi-sm al-ri'āsa*), contenting himself with

⁷³ 'Iyād, *loc. cit.* Waines (below, n.° 77), suggests a connection between Ya'īsh's restrictions on luxury baking and the deposition, as being the work of, *inter alios*, prosperous, and politically active, sections of the population of Toledo.

⁷⁴ Both quoted by Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Kitāb al-Šila*, ed. al-Ḥusaynī, Cairo, 1955, pp. 650-51, n.° 1520.

⁷⁵ *Tarīb*, II, pp. 755-56.

that of «*faqīh*»⁷⁶; and he did not give up (wearing) the attire of the '*ulamā*'; but he gave power and the title [of prince] to his son 'Abd Allāh. An example of his harshness was [his] prohibition on women going outside the gate(s) of Toledo behind funeral processions in crowds...⁷⁷

This example of reluctance to take on the titles of rulership is striking, not least because it is so early in the context of Andalusī political fragmentation after the collapse of Cordoban rule. While Ibn 'Abbād offers another example of a *qāḍī* taking power in a political vacuum, it is not entirely clear whether in fact he refrained from adopting titles implying rulership. In Cordoba, by contrast, somewhat later, after 422/1031, we find the first of the Jahwarids behaving in very similar fashion to that described here, refraining from adopting royal titles, and making a point of continuing to live in his own house, and not moving into the royal palaces (though, given what we know of the devastation caused during the preceding twenty years of violence and plunder, and of the general poverty of Cordoba at this time, there may well have been other, more severely practical reasons for this aspect at least of this ruler's modesty and restraint). As in general in such cases, the first Jahwarid's modesty as to titulature was not maintained by his successor. This aspect of Ya'īsh's rule may, however, have another relevance here. If he was indeed so modest as to the practice of rulership, and if he was really so deeply concerned about public and private morals, perhaps we should think again about the possibility of his having been involved, directly or otherwise, in the death of his close colleague (and, probably, friend) in the city in 403/1012-13. As against this, other cases show that a powerful ruler may easily content himself with such a title as *faqīh*; and they show similarly that, whether or not he remains extremely modest and pious in personal terms, he may have little or no difficulty in imposing his ideas as to personal modesty and pious behaviour on others with extreme harshness.

However this may be, the reconstruction which a combination of all these data makes possible suggests that we should see the royal career of this *qāḍī* as having a

⁷⁶ This title (if it was intended as such) is striking, in the context of the modern use of the same title for a ruler in Iran.

⁷⁷ For this last prohibition, cf. the ordinance contained in the work of Yaḥyā b. 'Umar, of the late third-early fourth/late ninth-early tenth century, in M. 'A. Makkī, «Naṣṣ jadīd fī l-ḥisba: Kitāb aḥkām al-sūq li-Yaḥyā b. 'Umar al-Andalusī (t. 289 A. H. = 901 A. D.)», *Revista del Instituto Egipcio de Estudios Islámicos en Madrid*, IV (1956), pp. 59-151 (of Arabic section), at pp. 124-25, §§ 34-35; E. García Gómez, «Unas "Ordenanzas del zoco" del siglo IX. Traducción del más antiguo antecedente de los tratados andaluces de Hisba, por ún autor andaluz», *Al-Andalus*, XXII (1957), pp. 253-316, at pp. 288-90, §§ 32-33 (sic). In connection with Ya'īsh's prohibiting women to follow funeral processions, it is striking, to say the least, that at around the same time (actually

slightly different structure, at least chronologically, from what has traditionally been thought: in this schema Ya'īsh will have started ruling at an unknown date after 403/1012-13. 403/1012-13 is to be rejected as the date for the beginning of his reign, as resting solely on the date of his possible involvement, as ruler, in the murder of Ibn Kawthar. In consequence, we have no reason to associate his rise to power with that year at all. All we can say with any certainty is that he came to power afterwards. His rise to power may have followed the success of a plot aimed at ridding himself of a colleague and potential rival, Aḥmad b. Sa'īd Ibn Kawthar; such an action will have had the effect, at least, of demonstrating his capacity for rule. And his rise will also, more certainly, have followed the departure or death of the second of the B. Manyūh. As has been seen, the second of the B. Manyūh seems to have died violently and suddenly, and it may be right in such a case for us to see the accession of Ya'īsh as ruler as a response to a very difficult situation which called for immediate reaction. It could of course equally be the case, if we have a plot aimed at ridding the *qāḍī* of his legal colleague, that we have here, in the death of the previous ruler, an echo of another such conspiracy. At all events, he will then have ruled Toledo efficiently, if with some harshness, from whenever this occurred until the people of the city revolted, possibly because of his harshness, killing his son 'Abd Allāh, in 417/1026 and exiling him to Calatayud, where he died a year or two later. In this case, it will have been only at this stage that the Dhū l-Nūnids were summoned by the Toledans to take power in the city.

A REVISED AND EXPANDED TOLEDAN KING-LIST

The list of rulers of Toledo between the fall of the caliphal-'āmirid régime and the assumption of power there by Ya'īsh, to be followed in due course by the Dhū l-Nūnids, should thus read somewhat as follows (*hijrī* and civil months are indicated by small Roman numerals, years in the normal manner):

a trifle earlier, in 395/1004-05-404/1013-14), al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh, the Fāṭimid caliph in Egypt, enacted a series of measures aimed at separating the sexes, restraining women's freedom of movement, and (?) reforming the behaviour of the people. These measures included even total house arrest for all females except very young girls and very old women; bath houses for women were closed; and shoemakers who specialised in producing women's sandals were compelled to give up their trade. See Lev, Y., *State and Society in Fatimid Egypt*, Leiden, 1991, p. 28 (with references); Halm, H., «Der Treuhänder Gottes: die Edikte des Kalifen al-Ḥākim», *Der Islam*, 63 (1986), pp. 11-72, esp. pp. 22-24. By 410/1019-20 some of these restrictions appear to have been eased, for we hear in that year of «gangs of black troops», acting with the support of al-Ḥākim, who «descended on bath-houses maltreating women» (Lev, *op. cit.*, pp. 33, 36, with references). See also, for the Toledan situation, Waines, D., «The Darmak decree», *Al-Qanṭara*, 13 (1992), pp. 263-65.

400/1009	Wāḍiḥ (in name of Muḥammad al-Mahdī)
not before i 401/viii 1010-not after iv 402/xi 1011	‘Ubayd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Mahdī
iv 402/xi 1011-xii 402/vii 1012	(not known)
ca. i 403/vii-viii 1012-	(i) ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Matyūh (possibly
later in 403/viii 1012-vii 1013	a former governor there for the
(or, probably, rather later still)	caliphal-‘āmirid régime)
	(ii) ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān
	Ibn Matyūh
	(iii) ? an un-named ruler mentioned by
	Ibn ‘Idhārī
	(iv) (?) (possibly another un-named ruler
	mentioned by the same writer)
	(v) Abū Bakr Ya‘īsh b. Muḥammad b.
	Ya‘īsh, <i>al-qāḍī</i>
ca. 417/1026-27	Abū Muḥammad Ismā‘īl b. ‘Abd al-
	Raḥmān Ibn Dhī l-Nūn Dhū l-Riyāsātayn,
	al-Ẓāfir

CONCLUSIONS

From the table given above it can be seen that between 400/1009 and some time in 403/1012-13 (or possibly some unidentifiable later date) we can trace at least four and possibly as many as seven different rulers in Toledo, not to mention the eight or nine months of 402/1011-12 (if not more) for which we have no information at all. Given the importance of Toledo, both as a frontier defence for Islamic territory in the Iberian peninsula and as a major centre of caliphal-‘āmirid power before the collapse of the Cordoban régime, this may appear either as surprising or as easy to understand. It would be easy to understand as reflecting the importance which different factions in the struggle for the caliphate attached to the city; and surprising as suggesting that, despite its importance and strength, it was relatively easy to win control of it.

A glance at the identities of the various rulers suggests that the different factions involved in the political struggles of the period in fact attached little importance to Toledo: the partisans of al-Mahdī, Wāḍiḥ and ‘Ubayd Allāh all found aid and refuge there, suggesting that it was an area of residual Umayyad support at the end of the Manṣūrid domination of the caliphal heritage, but the B.

Matyüh, who also spent some time in power there, are explicitly described in the sources as hostile to that branch of the Umayyad house which these ephemeral rulers represented. The B. Matyüh were in all probability 'Āmirid clients, and we should see their activity, in general terms, as part of the process by which so many former clients of the 'Āmirids sought to ensure their futures in the new political framework in al-Andalus after the collapse of the centralised system there. In more particular terms, too, it may be possible to see an explanation for the interest shown by the B. Matyüh in a refuge in Toledo: if their name does reflect, as was suggested earlier, a form originating in Muño, *vel sim.*, this would indicate a Christian background for the family. In an area bordering on Christian territory it would come as little surprise to see an attempt by ex-Christians, or their descendants, to have a more significant share in local politics with the benefit of potential support from local Christians or their Muslim descendants.

No other identifiable group of participants in the struggle for power in al-Andalus at this time seems to have devoted much energy to acquiring control of the city and the huge territory which it dominated. Hostility to outside control, by whomever exercised, may have played a part in persuading the Toledans to accept any and every pretender to local authority there, but there may have been another element at work too.

In a study of the significance of Christian involvement in the affairs of al-Andalus at this time published a decade and a half ago, the late Peter Scales demonstrated that the threat presented by the Christians in the frontier areas was extremely serious.⁷⁸ Between 399/1009 and 401/1011 they recovered, as a direct result of their involvement with pretenders to the caliphal throne, considerable territory and, even more importantly, a large number of strategically valuable fortresses marking the frontier between the worlds of Islamic and Christian military and political dominance in the Iberian peninsula. Many of these had been built or strengthened in the last decades of the fourth/tenth century. Their loss at the start of the *fitna* can, in retrospect, be said to mark the definitive beginning of the Christian recovery of territory in a visible way from an enfeebled al-Andalus. It seems likely that the Toledans, in the front line of the defence of Islam in the Iberian peninsula from the second/eighth century onwards, became aware almost immediately of the threat which this realignment of forces between Muslim and Christian in Iberia, in territory very close to themselves, portended for themselves as part of an Islamic polity in the peninsula. Regardless, therefore, of what happened in the old capital, far away to

⁷⁸ Scales, P., «The handing over of the Duero fortresses: 1009/1011 A. D. (399-401 A. H.)», *Al-Qantara*, 5 (1984), pp. 109-22.

the south, and regardless, too, of the identities of the claimants to supreme authority in their Islamic polity as a whole, they entrusted authority over themselves to anyone who appeared likely to offer them a certain stability and security against further Christian encroachments.

The correctness of such a view of the security, or lack of it, of Toledo in the face of the Christian threat is confirmed for us dramatically not only by events later in the fifth/eleventh century, when Toledo was the first major city in the peninsula to be recovered for Christianity by Alphonso VI, but by the account preserved in the *Primera Crónica General* of that ruler's motives for attempting the reconquest of Toledo. According to that source, while dozing one day as an honoured prisoner in a palace garden in the city, he overheard two Dhū l-Nūnid courtiers discussing how easily the city could be taken.⁷⁹ Whether or not this story is true is unimportant; what is significant about it is that its invention and use reflect both the reality of the situation and the awareness of this reality on the part of the Christians around the Christian monarch.

This study offers a number of benefits. On one hand it offers, via a micro-study of the sources for one very narrow and limited series of events, the potential for a surprisingly detailed account of developments in a particular place of importance during a particular period of critical significance. At the same time, and at a time when political history remains somewhat unfashionable, it is worth pointing to some benefit which a micro-study of this sort can have in other areas. This is precisely because of the nature of the sources at our disposal, as being concerned with events, on the political and military levels, rather than with processes. Such a method, by concentrating on the detail of the sources, brings out those elements which have the capacity to illuminate broader issues. Here the broader issues include the nature and extent of factional politics in the city of Toledo. Leadership there varied a great deal in this short period, and it is worth asking which element was the tail and which the dog in these cases. As has been seen, very many of these rulers came to Toledo from outside. May it be the case that they came merely as invited figureheads for local factions, at least at first, or should we rather see them as a response to a total lack of local leadership cadres in a city which, despite resistance to Cordoban authority, had nevertheless been ruled fairly effectively from the capital for a considerable time by the fall of the 'Āmirids? Clearly a far more intensive study of Toledo, both under the rule of governors appointed from Cordoba and under Dhū l-Nūnid rule, might answer

⁷⁹ See *Primera Crónica General que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289*, ed. R. Menéndez Pidal, with A. G. Solalinde, M. Muñoz Cortés and G. Gómez Pérez, Madrid, 1995², p. 504, cap. 827.

some of these questions, but success in such a study demands the discovery of new sources. The sources that we possess at present permit us to do no more than point to a number of individuals who will have been part of such factions; and we can occasionally point to the actions of a particular group or even to the local elite acting as a united front, for example at the end of the taifa period, against the ruler. But in general this represents the limit of our ability to penetrate the composition of the social and political elite of the Muslims in Toledo.

A further question relates to the B. Matyūh. As has been seen, we can extract a few details about them from our sources, though we cannot be sure, especially in the absence of any independent confirmatory testimony for the bulk of it, how far these may be trustworthy. But it looks significant in the present context that so much of our material for these rulers of Toledo actually concerns their period of activity in Cordoba, for it is that material, and its analysis, which enables us to date their arrival in Toledo. We have virtually nothing at all on them as rulers in the city itself. While this does perhaps confirm that the idea of the unity of al-Andalus was at this time, just, still somehow alive in the minds of the participants in the political struggle in the Iberian peninsula, it does little for our understanding of the political situation in Toledo itself. Our sources, generally seen as metropolitan in their focus, remain in this case also profoundly Cordoba-centred in their interests and concerns, at least for this period, and such information about other cities as emerges, as in this case, is likely to be influenced by this characteristic of the texts. We should like to know much more about these B. Matyūh: did they have any connection with Toledo before the end of the caliphal-‘amirid régime’s existence? Who were they and what sort of background did they have? What of their careers before their adventures in Cordoba and Toledo? Did they have connections with others? And did they fit somehow into a factional system or were they merely adventurers thrown up by the extraordinary circumstances of the day? It is worth stressing how extraordinary those circumstances must have been in the eyes of contemporaries and participants. To none of these questions can we find answers in the sources.

Another set of such questions relates to the possible participation in political activity in Toledo by non-Muslims, Christians. Excluded from the political sphere in Islamic societies with great success by Muslims from the very beginning, did they succeed here in acquiring a share in the turbulent public life of this marcher town, on the frontier between Islam and Christendom? The overall history of the city in the period from 92/711 onwards might make us expect such a development. If, on the other hand, Christians, as Christians, did not succeed in acquiring such a share in political life, did a different strategy produce political dividends for them? Did conversion to Islam act as a means to the maintenance and preservation

of earlier political significance for local people? Can we see recent converts to Islam from Christianity and their descendants here, more than elsewhere, influencing public life in their world? Given the position of Toledo, on the border with Christendom, such a situation would be of great interest. And given the relations of Toledo over the preceding three centuries with the central government in Cordoba, it would be of still greater interest. If recent converts to Islam and their descendants did not, on the other hand, acquire influence and exercise some degree of power in this area, at times like this, then we are bound to ask different questions, related to the shape of the society of Islam in the Iberian peninsula.

Beyond all this, it is possible to point to other aspects of such a study which are less positive. First among these is the nature of our sources. In the preceding pages quite a large amount of space was devoted to 'Ubayd Allāh the son of al-Mahdī. But it is noteworthy that a good deal of the material about him supplied by our sources is not only anecdotal but literary in character. Such information about his political career as the sources provide is incidental to the material that they contain about him as a poet. This sixteen-year-old youth seems to have had time in his short life to produce some indifferent poetry, and also apparently to inspire someone else to claim his identity a decade and more after his death, someone who also left some lines of verse. It is largely on account of those lines of verse that we know what little we do know about both of them. Without the verses, we may be fairly sure, our sources would not have devoted to either of them even the small amount of space that they do. The reason for this is partly because so much of the written sources for this period is constituted by a few anthologies (those of Ibn Bassām, al-Maqqarī, and some others like the *Mughrib* of Ibn Sa'īd), which are explicitly literary in intention and in character; their value for us as historical sources in areas beyond the literary goes far beyond the intentions of their authors, but the works themselves and the material which they contain emerge from and largely reflect literary concerns.

A second feature, related to this limitation of our materials, which is highlighted by such a study is the narrowness of the section of the population which it is possible to examine. In one sense, our concern here was with the political class of al-Andalus, in particular with that part of it active in Toledo. What emerges from this study is that, at least so far as concerns this city in this very short period, while we can illuminate some corners of the political world of Toledo, this is so only for those at the very top and for others when they happen, for example by virtue of their identity as members of the scholarly elite, to interact with them. Fortunately, in this case, this occurs several times, but it is not always thus, and there are all too many cases, even for this period in Andalusī history, for which such help is not forthcoming from the sources.

These two features, in their turn, bring out a third. As was suggested above, one set of questions to which we should very much like to find answers, for this as for other periods of Andalusī history, concerns the participation in political activity of Christians in an Islamic polity. Most of our material suggests, as has been seen, that Christians, non-Muslims in general, were thoroughly and permanently excluded from political activity from the very beginning of the existence of Islam. While this seems to be a fact, we should like to be able to confirm it, if only because it raises a whole series of questions about how Islamic societies were able so successfully to maintain the exclusive hold of Muslims on the right to participation in politics. Part of the reason why we cannot answer such questions lies in the silence of the sources: Islamic sources in Arabic do not, by and large, tell us about non-Muslim groups in their societies. We know far too little about the Christians of al-Andalus, and we shall never be able to go very far beyond the little that we do know. In the present case, we know nothing, yet it is inconceivable that the Christians of Toledo were wholly blind or indifferent to what was happening; it is also certainly the case that they constituted a large proportion of the population, though we cannot know how large. But even though Christians there by this time were speaking and on occasion also writing in Arabic, by and large the authors of the literary anthologies that provide so much of our information were disinclined to include non-Muslims or their work in their anthologies. The presence of a handful of Jews and a couple of Christians in our sources highlights this fact and suggests the possibility that there may have been many more.⁸⁰

APPENDIX 1: NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE FOR IBN MANYŪH/MATYŪH?

From the foregoing it can be seen that the time between 15 iv 402/16 xi 1011 and xii 402/vii 1012 includes a period, possibly as long as some eight months, during which effective power in Cordoba was exercised not by the caliph, Hishām II al-Mu'ayyad, but by Ibn Manyūh/Matyūh. This entire period falls within the *hijrī* year 402 (= August 1011-July 1012). We have some numismatic evidence for this year. It is conveniently brought together in George Miles' corpus of Umayyad coinage.⁸¹ This scholar reports evidence for both Hishām II al-Mu'ayyad and Sulaymān al-Musta'in. The latter material presents several difficulties, on the numismatic and on the historical planes alike, but fortunately

⁸⁰ For Jews and Christians in our Islamic Arabic sources for the fifth/eleventh century, see the chapters on Jews and Christians in my *Rise and Fall*.

⁸¹ Miles, G. C., *Coinage of the Umayyads of Spain*, New York (American Numismatic Society, Hispanic Numismatic Series, n.º 1), 1950.

this material is not relevant to the present enquiry.⁸² For Hishām, Miles reports both gold and silver.⁸³ The silver (n.º 346c-q) may be divided into three categories:

a) n.º 346c-f. In this category, the coins bear the name ‘Abd Allāh at the foot of the obverse field.⁸⁴

b) n.º 346g-1. In this category, the coins bear the name Sa‘īd b. Yūsuf disposed above and below the obverse field.⁸⁵

c) n.º 346m-q. This is a miscellaneous group. N.º 346m, it is suggested by Miles, should really be assimilated to the preceding group in respect of its inscriptions. N.º 346n is claimed by Vives to be an imitation. This latter scholar knew of two specimens, neither of which is at present available for study.⁸⁶ N.º 346o is a type described by Prieto as «very rare»;⁸⁷ but, as is normal with this writer, he cites no actual specimens. Of n.º 346p, a specimen/type listed only by Østrup,⁸⁸ Miles says «I doubt very much the correctness of the above attribution». And n.º 346q is a catch-all sub-category, including a number of specimens for which «details [are] lacking except that they are issues of Hishām II».

The third, miscellaneous, category of these coins can thus for all practical purposes be disregarded here. The first two categories differ essentially in that the first has the name ‘Abd Allāh below the obverse field inscription, while the second has the name Sa‘īd b. Yūsuf arranged above and below the obverse field inscription.

So much for the silver. The gold, similarly, can be divided into two categories: the first, n.º 346a, is a dinar type, with the name ‘Abd Allāh below the obverse field inscription. Unfortunately, it is reported only by Prieto, who says that it is unique, but (as is normal with this scholar) offers no location for the alleged unique specimen.⁸⁹ The

⁸² I propose to examine the problems presented by this material in a separate study.

⁸³ Miles, *Coinage*, pp. 524-27, n.º 346a-q.

⁸⁴ There are three specimens of varieties of this category in the collection of the Hispanic Society of America; in the last century Vives (Cf. Vives y Escudero, A., *Monedas de las Dinastías Árabe-Españolas*, Madrid, 1893, n.º 702, and p. 491) knew some fourteen specimens, but only one of these, belonging to the Academia de la Historia in Madrid, is still in the location which he lists; all the others were in collections which are now unavailable.

⁸⁵ There are three specimens (including one ex-Thorburn coin) of two varieties of this category in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford; there are two in the collection of the Hispanic Society of America and another in that of the American Numismatic Society, and there is one in Berlin. Vives listed (under his n.º 703) 47 specimens, but of these only four, one in the British Museum and three in the Academia de la Historia, are now in known locations. In respect of the remainder, as also in respect of some of those mentioned in the previous note, which belonged to the important private collections on Vives himself, Francisco Codera and Pascual de Gayangos, it is possible that some may have found their way to the collections of the British Museum and of the Hispanic Society of America and the American Numismatic Society. If so, then such specimens will be identical with some of those listed above, for the relevant collections. But this is in all probability impossible to establish conclusively.

⁸⁶ Vives, *Monedas*, n.º 1420.

⁸⁷ Prieto y Vives, *Los Reyes de Taifas*, n.º 15.

⁸⁸ Østrup, J., *Catalogue des monnaies arabes et turques du Cabinet Royal des Médailles du Musée National de Copenhague*, Copenhagen, 1938, n.º 2327.

⁸⁹ It is to be feared that this writer may be doing no more here than offering a theoretical account of a gold type whose original existence he may have deduced from the existence of a sil-

second category, n.º 346b, is better represented: there is a specimen in Berlin;⁹⁰ and there is an otherwise unpublished specimen in the Musée du Bardo, Tunis, reported to Miles by M. Farrugia de Candia.⁹¹ Prieto reports the type, claiming that it is «very rare».⁹² On this type we find the name Sa'īd b. Yūsuf, disposed, as on the silver, above and below the obverse field inscription.

The name 'Abd Allāh is found also on some specimens of the year 401/1010-11.⁹³ The name Sa'īd b. Yūsuf is found otherwise on coins of 403/1012-13,⁹⁴ and 404/1013-14.⁹⁵ And it appears on a single specimen of al-Qāsim Ibn Ḥammūd of the year 411/1020-21.⁹⁶ Because of the chronological distribution of the other specimens known bearing these two names, it seems natural to suppose that the coins of 402/1011-12 bearing the name of 'Abd Allāh should belong to the first part of that year, and those bearing the name Sa'īd b. Yūsuf to the later part of the year. It seems possible, however, that this neat schema needs to be slightly disturbed, by the insertion of a single specimen between the two groups, reflecting some minting activity on the part, or in the name, of our Ibn Manyūh/Matyūh.

Miles records one coin type, taken from the catalogue of the collection of the Museo Arqueológico Nacional, in Madrid, which may belong to the period of Ibn Manyūh/Matyūh and his domination of Hishām II al-Mu'ayyad in the latter part of 402/1011-12. This is Miles' n.º 351f (a dirhem). Miles' entry here is simply a transcription of that in the Madrid catalogue.⁹⁷ There the coin is described as having a slightly unusual lay-out for the (otherwise perfectly normal) obverse field inscription; its reverse field

ver type attested by surviving exemplar(s). There are many other cases in Prieto's work where this, or something similar, seems to have happened. See also, for more on this, my *The Caliphate in the West, An Islamic Political Institution in the Iberian Peninsula*, Oxford, 1993, passim.

⁹⁰ Nützel, H., *Königliche Museen zu Berlin, Katalog der orientalischen Münzen*, II: *Die Münzen der muslimischen Dynastien Spaniens und des westlichen Nordafrika*, Berlin, 1902, n.º 419.

⁹¹ See Miles, *Coinage*, p. 2.

⁹² Prieto, n.º 13a. It is difficult to see how Prieto can have thought the type more common than «unique», as when he compiled his work only the specimen in Berlin was published.

⁹³ Cf. Miles, *Coinage*, n.º 345b (a dinar in Paris, H. Lavoix, *Catalogue des monnaies musulmanes de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, II, *Espagne et Afrique*, Paris, 1891, 273, = Vives, n.º 700 = Prieto n.º 12a); 345c (a dinar found in Badajoz in 1932, described by Prieto in an article two years later: «Tesoro de monedas musulmanas encontrado en Badajoz», *Al-Andalus*, 2 (1934), 299-327); 345n-hh (some score or so of specimens, together with reports in Vives and elsewhere of nearly fifty specimens whose present locations are not known; but of course there may be some considerable overlap between this last category and those whose present locations are known).

⁹⁴ Cf. Miles, *Coinage*, n.º 348a (a dinar unique, in the collection of Vives: where is this coin now? = Prieto n.º 13c: «very rare»); 348c (3 specimens); 348d (2 specimens); 348e (over a dozen specimens, but all now not in known locations); 348f (a single specimen now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford).

⁹⁵ Cf. Miles, *Coinage*, p. 543, n.º 360n (one or possibly two specimens, with the name disposed above and below the field inscription on the reverse, unlike all the other cases considered here, where it appears on the obverse).

⁹⁶ This coin is in the Academia de la Historia in Madrid (reported by Vives, n.º 807 = Prieto n.º 66).

⁹⁷ De la Rada y Delgado, J. de Dios, *Catálogo de monedas árabigas españolas que se conservan en el Museo Arqueológico Nacional*, Madrid, 1892, n.º 287.

inscription is legible with the single exception of the personal name of the caliph mentioned on the coin. This name, Hishām, can, however, be inferred from the fact that he is identified as «al-Mu‘ayyad billāh». According to Rada, there are no marginal legends on this coin («sin orlas»), and the coin looked to him «un-Spanish» («no parece español»), a fact which may help to explain why he did not actually restore the name of Hishām on the specimen. Beneath the reverse field inscription on this coin there is another unusual element: this is an inscription, read by Rada as *m.f.w.y.h.* Rada, followed by Miles (who did not see the coin himself), marked this reading with a query.

As with so many issues of the period of the beginning of the fifth/eleventh century, the unusual on this specimen need not brand it as not genuine. If the name has been read correctly, there seems to be good reason to see here a reference to our Ibn Manyūh/Matyūh. The slight apparent mis-spelling of the name (or, just possibly, a mis-reading by the cataloguer) need not occasion surprise. There would be no significant difference at all between a *fā*’ and a *nūn* or a *tā*’ in the script used on these coins, particularly given the small size of the writing; diacritical dots to distinguish between otherwise similar letters regularly do not appear on such coins, so that the similarity between what was read by Rada as a *fā*’ and a *nūn* or a *tā*’ is all the greater; and the inversion of the third and the fourth letters, if not itself simply a mis-reading, might reflect no more than the fact that the name was unusual. The placing of the name beneath the reverse, as against the obverse, however, may indicate something much more significant in the present context. A name placed beneath the obverse field on such coins generally refers to a mint-official. A name placed beneath the reverse field, by contrast, generally refers to someone completely different, and more important. During the preceding thirty five years or so, this had been a *ḥājib* (al-Manṣūr or one of his sons), a local governor (al-Mu‘izz; only in north Africa), or the heir to the caliph (only in the case of issues of Sulaymān al-Musta‘īn; here the influence of the pattern offered by the Manṣūrīds is obvious). In all these cases, the placing of the name in this position was deliberate: here it was in very close proximity to the name and titles of the caliph himself. The model for this was provided by the issues of the first Manṣūrīd *ḥājib*, Muḥammad Ibn Abī ‘Āmir. The absence of the element «*ibn*» from the name on this coin need not be a cause for concern in this case, any more than it is on all the specimens of al-Manṣūr himself. There it is quite normal to find nothing more than «‘Āmir» in the relevant place on the reverse.⁹⁸

All this may well indicate that Ibn Manyūh/Matyūh saw himself, as others at this time saw themselves, as aspiring to fill the administrative and political vacuum created by the departure of the Manṣūrīds. That he failed in the attempt, and disappeared very quickly, need not invalidate such an interpretation of his behaviour. While he was in power, he will have assumed, or at least hoped, that he would stay for ever.

If the suggestion made here is correct, and this coin is a solitary representative of a coinage made for or by Ibn Manyūh/Matyūh, then this is a fact of considerable interest. It

⁹⁸ Cf. Miles, *Coinage*, pp. 67-69, «Names and Titles», n.º 45, with full discussion and dates; and esp. pp. 344 ff., for catalogue entries of the coins themselves.

does more than just enable us to re-assign a coin from one section of Miles' great work to another. The coin also attests to the importance attached even by ephemeral rulers or administrators in Cordoba at this time to the continuation of orderly government and the minting of coins, to their continuing use of standard formulae for their inscriptions, and also, perhaps, to a perceived need for coins. It also means that we can date the coin itself to somewhere in the second half of the year 402/early 1012;⁹⁹ and further, it means that we should probably date all the Sa'īd b. Yūsuf issues to the period following the departure of Ibn Manyūh/Matyūh from Cordoba, in other words to the very end of the year. This is of even greater interest, for the number and variety of such remnants of the issues with the name of Sa'īd b. Yūsuf seem to indicate a large amount of minting, especially for what must have been a very short period at the very end of the year. The fact of such minting with the name of Sa'īd b. Yūsuf seems in its turn also to confirm the departure of Ibn Manyūh/Matyūh from Cordoba before the end of the year.

APPENDIX 2: A PASSAGE IN THE ANONYMOUS *FATH AL-ANDALUS*

The anonymous work entitled *Fath al-Andalus*, published nearly a century ago by J. de González, contains a passage dealing with the early history of the taifa of Toledo which appears to mention yet another early ruler of this state.¹⁰⁰ The passage tells us that in the year 424/1033, the people of the city of Toledo chose Ibn Dhī l-Nūn as their ruler on the death of «Ibn Masāf».

Because of the large number of discrepancies between the statements in this work and what is known from other sources, the *Fath al-Andalus* has received very little attention from historians of al-Andalus in the century and more since it was first printed.¹⁰¹ I have attempted to show elsewhere that some at least of the difficulties presented by the work can be explained as resulting from a conflation at some stage of fuller accounts which contained material substantially the same as what is known to us from other sources.¹⁰² In this case, too, I suspect that a similar process has occurred: «Ibn Masāf» is quite plausible as a corruption, or a mis-reading, of «Ibn Munāwⁱⁿ» (though less so, it is true, of Ibn

⁹⁹ It is striking, if this suggestion is indeed correct, that unlike both the earlier issues naming a mint-official 'Abd Allāh, and the later issues naming a mint-official Sa'īd b. Yūsuf, this specimen names no mint-official at all. In the context of the political circumstances in which it will have been made, this may well be of some significance. But the silence of the sources here is impenetrable.

¹⁰⁰ Anonymous, *Fath al-Andalus*, ed. and trans. J. de González, *Fatho-l-Andaluçi: Historia de la Conquista de España, códice árabe del siglo XII*, Algiers, 1889, Ar. text p. 78 (there is a somewhat incoherent translation of this passage, Spanish text, p. 85). There is now a modern edition of the *Fath al-Andalus*, L. Molina (ed.), *Fath al-Andalus (La Conquista de al-Andalus)*, Madrid (Fuentes Arábico-Hispanas, 18), 1994, where our passage is to be found, without any comment, at p. 117.

¹⁰¹ For a nearly complete list of studies which discuss the work, see the edition of Molina cited in the preceding note, at pp. XL-XLI.

¹⁰² «Toledan Rule in Cordoba» (see above, n.º 3).

Manyūh/Matyūh). If it is a mis-reading of this type, then we should be faced with the statement that Ibn Dhī l-Nūn was the successor of Ibn Matyūh, who is also described as his *ṣihr*, or relation by marriage, in this passage, and that he succeeded him in the year 424/1033. Such a statement omits the information that there was at least one other ruler, Yaʿīsh, in between Ibn Matyūh and the Dhū l-Nūnids, but this can be accounted for, as I have suggested, by the assumption of a conflation having occurred, at some stage, of more substantial and more correct information than appears in the work in its present form. Such a statement also, it is true, appears to make the predecessor of the Dhū l-Nūnids rule until 424/1033, which cannot be the case: I am at a loss to explain this, but especially where dates are concerned, accuracy is perhaps the last virtue to be sought in such a text as this.

There is another possible way of explaining at least some of the difficulty in this passage: after reporting that Ibn Dhī l-Nūn took over in Toledo, it tells us that the city *kānat qablu li-ṣihrihi Ibn Masāf*. Could it be that, confused and confusing as it is, the text actually preserves the name of Ibn Manyūh twice? Could *ṣihrihi* be, in origin, a mis-reading of Manyūh? A *ṣad* might easily be mis-read as a *mīm*, in a name which is wholly unknown, and similarly a *hāʾ* might be mis-read as a *rāʾ*. In such a text as the *Fathh*, this is a possibility not lightly to be dismissed.

APPENDIX 3: THE PASSAGE ON ʿUBAYD ALLĀH B. AL-MAHDĪ IN THE *NAQT AL-ʿARŪS OF IBN HAZM*

The version of this published by Seybold has the following:

رجل ادعى انه عبيد الله المهدي قام بمجريط وثب به وقتل ولم يكن عبيد
الله صح عندنا انه كان مملوكا للعطار المعروف بالالفصيح

The version published by Dayf has the following:

عبيد الله بن المهدي قام على المستكني مجريط وثب به وقتل. قال ابو
محمد: صح عندنا انه لم يكن عبيد الله بن المهدي وانما كان غلام العطار
المعروف بالفصيح وادعى انه عبيد الله بن المهدي

And the version of the text contained in the Chester Beatty manuscript has the following:

عبيد الله بن المهدي قام على المستكفي مجريط وقبض عليه وقتل ثم صح
 عندنا انه لم يكن عبيد الله ابن المهدي وانما كان علام [كذا] العطار
 المعروف بالفصيح وادعى انه عبيد الله بن المهدي.

The similarities and the differences between the three versions are striking.¹⁰³ All seem to agree on the falseness of the claims of the person who rebelled; but his real identity remains a mystery, for the expression «the slave of the eloquent druggist», which seems to be what the text in its various versions is trying to say here, tells us nothing, and cannot have been much more informative to any medieval reader. Madrid, as the location for such a rebellion, is also puzzling, since it was not a place of any importance in this period;¹⁰⁴ and the reference to al-Mustakfī, as has been noted above, is also strange, given the long period, a decade and half, between the time of al-Mahdī's and his real son's genuine activities and the reign of this caliph. But, if the name of al-Mustakfī really was in the text written by Ibn Ḥazm, then it is likely to have been correct, since this writer knew that caliph very well, having spent some time in gaol during his reign, after serving as a vizier in the extremely short-lived administration of his predecessor al-Mustazhīr (16 Ramaḍān 414/2 December 1023-3 Dhū l-Qa'da 414/17 January 1024).¹⁰⁵

ABSTRACT

The period between the fall of the Umayyads of Cordoba and the emergence of the successor states in the Iberian peninsula is shadowy and unclear. In this article, I attempt

¹⁰³ The version of this passage in the edition of the *Naqṭ* published by Iḥsān 'Abbās, *Rasā'il Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī*, II, Beirut, 2nd edition, 1987, p. 58, shows no variations on these versions. It is the version of Seybold, with additions from the others.

¹⁰⁴ This is not entirely correct: it was a walled city, and appears occasionally in our sources in contradistinction, even in opposition, to Toledo; Toledan rebels against the last Dhū l-Nūnid took refuge there after the failure of their revolt in 474/1082, and even tried to make themselves independent in the city (*Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings*, p. 255). See also M.-J. Viguera, «Madrid en al-Andalus», *Actas III Jarique de Numismática Hispano-Árabe*, Madrid, 1992, pp. 11-35 (I am grateful to the anonymous reader for *Al-Qanṭara* for pointing this out to me).

¹⁰⁵ This study was prepared in Spain in the summer of 1998, which I spent working largely in the Departamento de Estudios Árabes of the Instituto de Filología in the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas in Madrid. It is a pleasure to express here my appreciation of the helpfulness and hospitality of my friends and colleagues in this institution, as also of the Spanish Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores, which provided me with a fellowship under their programme for foreign hispanists which made possible my visit to Spain for this period. I am also particularly grateful to Professor David Waines and to Dr. Maribel Fierro for reading this paper in draft form and giving me the benefit of their very penetrating criticisms; they are not, of course, responsible for my conclusions.

to offer a micro-study of the process in one place. Using literary and numismatic sources, I attempt a reconstruction of events in and connected with Toledo, and of the list of rulers who were active there, in the first two decades of the fifth Islamic century. This list is much longer (though almost all those mentioned in it ruled very briefly) than was previously suspected.

Because of the importance of Toledo as a frontier city, it is particularly important to know something of the process of the transfer of authority there at this time. Most of the local leaders seem not to have attributed much importance to the city; the local population, on the other hand, seems to have been willing to accept virtually any ruler who might protect them against the threat of Christian encroachment. The study shows the potential value of micro-studies in illuminating broader issues, such as factional in-fighting in such cities, but it also brings out the metropolitan bias and other limitations of our sources.

In three appendices I look at numismatic evidence for two of these newly identified rulers, at a textual crux in the anonymous *Fatḥ al-Andalus*, and at a difficult passage in the *Naqt al-'Arūs* of Ibn Ḥazm.

RESUMEN

El período entre la caída de los Omayas de Córdoba y la emergencia de los estados sucesores está muy poco claro. En este artículo intento ofrecer un microestudio del proceso, usando fuentes escritas y numismáticas, en lo que respecta a Toledo, así como la lista de sus gobernantes en las primeras décadas del siglo v. Una lista mucho más larga de la que se conocía.

Dada la importancia de Toledo como ciudad fronteriza, es particularmente importante dilucidar el proceso de transferencia de la autoridad en ese lugar y en ese tiempo. Los jefes locales no parecen haber atribuido mucha importancia a la ciudad mientras que la población local parece dispuesta a aceptar cualquier gobernante que les defienda de la amenaza cristiana. El estudio muestra el valor potencial de microestudios para iluminar aspectos más amplios tales como facciones rivales en las ciudades, pero también pone de relieve el punto de vista metropolitano y las limitaciones de nuestras fuentes.

Se añaden tres apéndices en los que se expone la prueba numismática de dos de estos gobernantes nuevamente identificados, se analiza un problema textual en el anónimo *Fatḥ al-Andalus* y un pasaje difícil del *Naqt al-'Arūs* de Ibn Ḥazm.